U. S. Congress. Congressional Record
11

Appendix

Connie Mack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the entire Nation was bowed in mourning by the news of the passing on February 8 of the great Connie Mack, who, for several generations, was an outstanding figure in the baseball world.

Connie Mack was born in East Brookfield, Mass., in my district, in the year 1862. Of humble Irish origin, he was raised in an atmosphere where the great national game was greatly encouraged, and early in life he became a capable, skillful player. So renowned became his reputation that he was recruited as a very young man into the big leagues. His career as a player was notable, and he became known in baseball circles as one of the most solid, dependable men in organized baseball.

When his playing days were over he became manager of the Philadelphia Athletics. It was in this capacity that he achieved greatest success. Under his brilliant leadership the Athletics won 9 American League pennants and 5 world championships.

Great as his reputation in baseball was and outstanding his record, Connie Mack brought something more than playing ability and managerial skill into the national pastime. Connie Mack was a man of rugged character and fundamental virtues. He never forgot the precepts of his early religious, family, and school training. He was noted for his honesty, sincerity, sense of honor, and fairness, as well as for his kind nature and charitable instincts. He befriended a great many people during his life and always answered the call to help another human being. Many baseball men who played under him, as well as those who played with other teams, turned to him for help and he had the reputation of never turning away an appeal for assistance from old friends and colleagues.

Connie Mack was a very shrewd trader and during his career built up several champion teams. He had an unusual ability for handling players and making stars out of men no one else had been able to manage. Possessed of an innate and deep understanding of human nature, Connie was able to get at the problems of individual players and bring them into a state of mind where they were willing to cooperate with him.

Many funny stories are told about his experience in this respect with recalcitrant players. On one occasion an eccentric star pitcher whom he was relying upon to win important games disappeared and could not be found, although he was scheduled to take his place on the mound and was urgently needed if the Athletics were to win. Knowing of this man's bibulous leanings, Connie Mack dispatched some of his agents to various drinking emporiums in a frantic search for the valuable pitcher who was finally found several days later driving a coal wagon on the streets of Philadelphia. He was brought to the field and in three successive games, beginning that very afternoon, he won resounding victories that spelled another championship for the Atheltics. This particular man, who shall remain unnamed here, was so unpredictable that several other leading managers had given him up and it was only Connie who could get him to pitch at all. Yet, as a result of Connie's skillful handling, his record was a most impressive one.

You could multiply experiences like this in the career of Connie Mack and they all add up to one thing—his essential knowledge of people and his ability to get along with them, however weird their personal quirks.

The contributions which Connie Mack made to baseball are so great that they could never be fully evaluated. His character, his ability, his courage, and great sporting heart, his kind and humble spirit, his patriotism—all stamp him as a man of honor, achievement, and high stature.

As a Representative of the district where Connie Mack was born and raised, I am proud to express my appreciation for the great contribution which he has made throughout his lifetime to the national game and to American life. The people of my district join with me, I know, in these expressions of esteem, pride, and gratitude as well as in extending to his bereaved family our profound regret for the sorrowful bereavement and irreparable loss which they have suffered. His passing leaves a great void in baseball and in American life.

The memory of Connie Mack will long continue to be an inspiration to all young men who participate in competitive sport. If they follow his example, whether they win or lose, they will find satisfaction in defeat as well as in victory, because they shall have played the game with fairness and with honor and that is the way any game should be played in America, and that is the way true Americans will always demean themselves in every activity.

I sincerely believe that the life and contributions of such a great man as Connie Mack should be memorialized in some way by the Federal Government. For that reason I requested the Post Office Department to strike off a special stamp to honor Connie Mack and the American sport of baseball.

In his eternal reward may Connie Mack find peace and rest with his Maker. In the elysian fields may the great game of baseball which he honored and loved so much go on forever.

I asked my good friend, John T. Morgan, of Wheelwright, Mass., noted sports authority and friend of Connie Mack, to furnish me with a short biographical sketch of the great Connie. Under unanimous consent, I include as part of my remarks the able statement of Mr. Morgan, and newspaper articles about Connie Mack.

The material follows:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF CONNIE MACK
(By John T. Morgan)

Cornelius McGillicuddy was born in East Brookfield, Mass., on December 22, 1862, when his father, Michael McGillicuddy, was in President Lincoln's army. At the end of the war his father came home and returned to his job in the mill. The first personal sorrow he ever knew was when a contagious disease struck our community. Our home became isolated, no neighbor dared enter. What the name of the disease was, I do not know. But this memory can never be erased from my mind. My little sister Mary Augusta, only a year old, died in my arms.

When Connie was 9 years old he worked summers in the cotton mill where he received 33 cents a day for running errands, carrying stock, and operating an elevator. The help were given an hour for lunch and Connie split this valuable time into 2 parts, 10 minutes for lunch and 50 minutes for 4 o'cat (a game of baseball played with 4 players). Even when taking time off for fishing or swimming in Lake Lashaway Connie was playing pitch and catch on the bank with his playmates. Connie was the catcher for the east Brookfield town team. In his last year with them they played the north Brookfields for the silver bat and championship of central Massachusetts before a record crowd at the Oakland Gardens in Brookfield on September 19, 1883. East Brookfield won by a score of 2–1.

"My father died when I was in my teens," said Connie, "and I consoled my mother with the fact that I would support the family. My first man's job at 16 years of age was to cut sole leather in a shoe shop. When I was 21, I went into a conference with my mother and told her I could be of greater help to the family if I went somewhere else where I could make more money. I argued that the other boys were now getting big enough to help her at home. When I told her I wanted to become a big-league baseball player she was shocked."

"I've got a chance to sign up with a professional team," I explained. "I don't want to spend my life in a shoe factory. She finally consented. 'Promise me one thing,' she begged. 'Promise me that you won't let them get you into bad habits. Promise me you won't drink.' "

"That promise," writes Connie, "I shall keep to the end of my life.

"I jumped into the professionals as a member of the Meridan team of Connecticut. A year later I was signed up by Hartford. From Hartford I went to the New York Metropolitan in the old American Baseball Association.

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

"In 1886 I was sold to the Washington Senators in the National League. I was one of the first players to go south on a spring training trip in 1888. It took us 3 nights and 2 days to make the trip. While I was in Washington I was feted by the fans and presented wtih a silver service at the end of 1887.

"Things were going so well with me at that time that I decided I should embark on another career. I was then 26 years of age and my mind kept going back to a certain girl I had left behind in New England in 1884. I fell in love with Margaret Hogan, of East Brookfield, but it wasn't until November 2, 1887, that I married her."

Connie jumped to Buffalo in the Players League in 1890. This league lasted only 1 year and Connie was back in the National League with Pittsburgh from 1891 through 1896. Connie managed the Pittsburgh Club from 1893 to 1906, then he went to Milwaukee Club and was manager of the Philadelphia Athletics in the newly born American League in 1900.

When the American League was organized Connie Mack was awarded the Philadelphia franchise. He hurried to that city to dig up local capital. Ban Johnson, organizer of the league, told him to see Ben F. Shibe, which Connie did. They organized a corporation and Shibe was made president. They had a franchise but no team or park, but they got things straightened out before the season opened.

Connie won the pennant in 1902, 1905, 1910, 1911, 1913, 1914, 1929, 1930, 1931, and World Series in 1910, 1911, 1913, 1929, 1930.

The World Series of 1929 between the Athletics and the Chicago Cubs gave Connie his greatest thrill in baseball. Instead of using Grove or Earnshaw or Walburg, his big three in the first game, he assigned a second stringer, Howard Ehmke, for mound duty. Ehmke beat the Cubs and smashed the record that big Ed Walsh, White Sox, had held for 23 years when Ed struck out 12 men in a world series. Ehmke struck out 13. In another game the Cubs were leading, 8–0, but the Athletics came up with 10 runs in 1 inning to win 10–8.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram of February 9, 1956]

CONNIE MACK DIES AT 93—BASEBALL'S GRAND OLD MAN

PHILADELPHIA.—Connie Mack, who helped pioneer baseball from the sandlots to the No. 1 sport in the Nation, died Wednesday at the age of 93.

Known around the world as the Grand Old Man of Baseball and one of the most beloved men in the history of the game, Mack—born in East Brookfield, Mass., December 23, 1862—died quietly with his wife, 4 daughters, and 1 of 3 sons at his bedside.

ILL SINCE OCTOBER

He had been failing steadily since falling out of bed and breaking his hip October 1.

Mack was in baseball 62 years, 50 of them as manager of the Philadelphia Athletics of the American league, a term unequalled in the history of the game. He led the Athletics to 9 league titles and 5 world championships before retiring in 1950.

CORNELIUS M'GILLICUDDY

The end for the man who changed his name from Cornelius McGillicuddy to Connie Mack to fit a baseball box score, came at 3:20 p. m. at the home of one of his daughters, Mrs. Frank Cunningham, in the Germantown section of Philadephia.

Mack had been unable to walk since his accident and only last week son, Roy, announced that for the first time since 1888 his father would not make his annual winter pilgrimage to the South.

"Dad is unable to walk," said Roy. "We carry him to and from the car every day for a short drive. We don't think he's up to making the trip South." Roy said he knew then that his father did not have long to go.

As soon as word of Mack's death became known, baseball figures from Commissioner Ford Frick on down hastened to eulogize the man who lived for baseball.

Said Frick: "This is a great loss to the game. Mr. Mack was practically Mr. Baseball himself. He always will be remembered for the gentleness, kindliness, leadership and continuity he gave our great national game."

In Chicago, Will Harridge, president of the American League, said: "To me, the name of Connie Mack always has been synonymous with baseball, standing for everything that was best for the game he loved. One of the founders of the American League, he held an unmatched record of service to the league and all baseball, as player, manager, and outstanding executive."

HAD GREAT STARS

Mack developed some of the greatest stars, men like Albert (Chief) Bender, Eddie Collins, Frank (Home Run) Baker, Jack Barry (Holy Cross baseball coach), Jimmy Foxx, Al Simmons, Bob (Lefty) Grove, Mickey Cochrane, Eddie Plank, and Jack Coombs. Seven members of his last championship team now are in baseball's Hall of Fame.

Connie himself entered the hall before any of his stars. He was among seven pioneers of the game elected as the nucleus when baseball's historic center at Cooperstown, N. Y., was founded in 1937.

After he retired as manager of the Athletics, Mack continued as the team's goodwill ambassador and chief rooter until it was sold in 1954 by his sons, Earle and Roy, to a syndicate headed by Arnold Johnson of Chicago.

HAD SEVEN CHILDREN

Mack was married twice and was the father of seven children. His first wife died in 1898.

His financial interest in the Athletics in 1952 was estimated to be 300 of the team's 1,500 shares.

Mack recognized as a builder of champions, also earned a reputation as wrecker of champions. Twice he sold and traded championship teams, starting all over again from scratch. He broke up his 1910, 1911, 1913, 1914 champions after they blew the world series in four games to the Boston Braves in 1914. For the next decade his teams wallowed in the second division, landing in last place seven times.

It wasn't until 1929 that the Athletics ascended the heights again under the leadership of the tall tactician. Then with such baseball heroes as Foxx, Simmons, Cochrane, Jimmy Dykes and Bing Miller, Grove, Earnshaw, Rube Walberg and others, the A's won three straight American League pennants and two world titles.

After losing to the St. Louis Cardinals four games to three in the 1931 series, Mack once again broke up his team. Despite his championships, the club was in debt. They so outclassed the opposition that fans wouldn't pay to see them play. So, all the stars went for some $500,000. The Athletics fell upon evil days and haven't won a pennant since, finishing in the first division only four times since 1931.

TO THE FINAL DAY

After the 1950 season, Mack turned the reins over to Jimmy Dykes who had returned to the club as a coach and later as assistant manager. Mack said he was stepping down because he was getting old and that 50 years was a long time to hold one job. Even after resigning as manager, Mack followed the ball club for a season, going to spring training and making all the regular road trips.

Baseball was his life to the final day.

Mack began his baseball career in East Brookfield where as a boy he worked in a cotton mill to help support his sisters and his widowed mother. He developed into an able catcher, played with professional teams in Meriden, Conn., and then with the Hartford, Conn., team of the Southern New England League.

The Washington National League club purchased him in 1886. After a little more than 3 years with Washington and a time with the Buffalo club of the Brotherhood League, he went to Pittsburgh where he became manager in 1894. Three years later he became player-manager of Milwaukee in the Western League. Milwaukee became a member of the American Association in 1900 and Mack's team finished second.

In 1901, when the American League was expanded under the leadership of Ban Johnson, Mack went to Philadelphia as manager, the beginning of the longest tenure of any major league manager. In his second year the A's won the American League pennant—the first of nine for Connie.

Mack was famous for directing his players from the dugout with the movement of a scorecard. He regarded himself as a developer of players and not a buyer.

LITTLE KNOWN QUALITY

Mack was a mild-mannered, but firm man. He rarely, if ever, cursed, and almost never scolded a player severely in the presence of others.

He said that managing a ball club, whether on the sandlots or in the major leagues, required tact, diplomacy, plain horse sense and above all, a great deal of patience.

A little known quality of Macks was his charity, particularly to old, down-and-out ball players. He was a target for many requests and how much he gave away was his secret. Those who knew him intimately said his donations were in the thousands of dollars.

Mack not only won honors on the diamond, but high civic honor was bestowed upon him in many sections of his land. After the 1929 World Series, the citizens of his adopted home, Philadelphia, awarded him the Edward W. Bok prize for distinguished service to the city, an award of $10,000 which previously had gone only to artists, scientists, educators and philanthropists.

[From the West Brookfield (Mass.) Country Courier of February 9, 1956]

FAMED BASEBALL MANAGER DIED IN PHILADELPHIA YESTERDAY—HE WAS IN HIS 94TH YEAR

Connie Mack, Mr. Baseball himself, East Brookfield's most illustrious son, died yesterday at the Philadelphia home of his daughter in his 94th year. Born Cornelius McGillicuddy in the ell of the house that stands on the corner of Maple and Main Streets now occupied by the William Giguères, he left his native town more than 70 years ago for Meriden, Conn., where he started the professional baseball career which became so famous.

He grew up with baseball in this country, starting to play in East Brookfield when no more than a schoolboy. He and his family moved during his childhood to a home which stood on North Brookfield Road until it was destroyed by fire many years ago. The second house from the railroad tracks stands on the site of the McGillicuddy homestead.

Francis Drake, of the North Brookfield Road, East Brookfield, 12 years younger than Connie Mack, recalls him well. "We lived on the same street," he told the Courier last night, "and I went to school with his younger brothers. He was always good to us. In fact he started his younger brother Tom out in hotel business in Worcester later on."

The village school attended by Connie Mack is still standing. Years ago it became St. John's Church.

From the turn of the century to November 1954, Connie Mack managed the Philadelphia Athletics, leading them to their first American League pennant in 1902. Later he won 8 other pennants and 5 world series. His last pennant was in 1931.

In addition to managing the Athletics, for many years he was part owner of the club and at the time of its sale in November 1954 to a Kansas City outfit, he and his sons Roy and Earle were principal owners of the club.

Twice in the 1930's he was honored in communities in our area. Nineteen thirty-one found him at a testimonial banquet in his honor at the Hotel Massasoit in Spencer. On the occasion of that visit he spoke to Spencer schoolchildren in Memorial Town Hall. In 1935 he was an honored guest at North Brookfield's Old Home Week celebration.

Mr. Mack was elected to Baseball's Hall of Fame in Cooperstown, N. Y., in 1937. Later the American League baseball park in Philadelphia was named Connie Mack Stadium.

Although in most recent years his team wasn't at the top, nevertheless to the very end he upheld the spirit of the sport of baseball. He, more than anyone else, pointed it up as being a national institution, a sport everyone can enjoy. Win or lose, Connie Mack always was a good sport, firmly believing that baseball is good for the American soul.

And so Connie Mack has passed from the stands. People in our area can be proud that a native of East Brookfield reached the greatest heights in the world of sports. Not only was he baseball's most respected figure, but one of our country's greatest citizens.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram of February 9, 1956]

MACK LAST HERE IN 1951—VISITED BARRY, BURKETT

Connie Mack, the East Brookfield native who became the Grand Old Man of Baseball, made his last visit to Worcester in 1951.

In the 4 days he spent in Worcester County, Mack, who was then 88, climbed three flights of stairs to a third-floor apartment at 189 Grove Street to pay a call on another baseball great—the late Jesse Burkett, one of the three men in the history of baseball to hit .400 in three different seasons.

The next day, after a 43-year absence, he visited with the man who played shortstop on his vaunted $100,000 infield—Jack Barry, baseball coach at Holy Cross College.

WORKED FOR SCRIP

Barry played in the infield made up of Jack McInnis, Eddie Collins, Barry, and Frank (Home Run) Baker. For an hour at the then Hotel Sheraton, Barry and Mack reminisced on how that infield sparked the Athletics to three straight world championships and then disintegrated after being beat in four straight games by the Boston Braves in the 1914 World Series.

It was in his visit to Burkett that Mack dispelled the common assumption that he had started in a shoe factory. It was a cotton mill, and he received a 10-cent scrip, not cash, redeemable in merchandise.

It was about the time of that visit also that Mack received the gift that pleased not only the baseball patriach but his sons, Roy and Earle. He was presented an oil painting of his old home on the North Brookfield Road, East Brookfield. The house had been destroyed by fire in 1916.

It was a gift from Mrs. Katherine Cosgrove, wife of Mark F. Cosgrove, at her home, 5 Crystal Street, Worcester. She was a friend of the Mack family.

The former Katherine O'Day, of West Brookfield, then an art instructor at Spencer and the Brookfields, Mrs. Cosgrove had painted the picture after considerable research.

The original home in which Mack was born Cornelius McGillicuddy stands on Main Street, East Brookfield—the second house west of the Baptist Church on the north side of Route 9.

In 1934 Connie Mack last brought his Athletics home to Brookfield. The late George M. Cohan was master of ceremonies that day.

The Mack family moved to Philadelphia in 1904.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Gazette of February 10, 1956]

CONNIE MACK WAS AN ALLTIME GREAT

East Brookfield has lost one of its outstanding sons. Cornelius McGillicuddy—as Connie Mack was christened—had not made his residence in East Brookfield for many years. But he was born there in the modest house on Main Street during the Civil War, and he retained an interest in his hometown throughout a long and active life. Until a few years ago, he was an occasional visitor to these parts.

Perhaps no man living has made such an impact upon organized baseball. From the time he started his career in East Brookfield, a skinny youngster who caught barehanded, until his death in Philadelphia Wednesday, Connie Mack's interest in the sport never flagged. He piloted his beloved Athletics to 9 league titles and 5 world championships during his half century as manager. Throughout, he was a force for clean baseball. Many of the greatest stars of the diamond got their tutelage under his fatherly direction.

On hearing of his death, Ford Frick said that Connie Mack was "Mr. Baseball." That he was, and those who knew him only by reputation, as well as those who were his personal friends, will note his passing with regret.

The American Council on Education Endorses Plan for a New Joint Congressional Committee Which Has Bipartisan Support

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the educational exchange program is of deep interest to the American Council on Education and of special concern to the council's commission on education and international affairs which is responsible for coordinating all council activities in the international area.

At its last meeting on March 1–2, 1956, the commission again gave careful consideration to various measures before the 84th Congress which propose the establishment of a joint committee to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Exchange of Persons Programs. These measures include House Joint Resolution 474, and Senate Joint Resolution 120 introduced by the Honorable J. W. FULBRIGHT for himself and Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

House Members who have joined with me in sponsoring this legislation include Representatives HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, VICTOR L. ANFUSO, THOMAS L. ASHLEY, CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, ROBERT C. BYRD, IRWIN D. DAVIDSON, THOMAS J. DODD, EDITH GREEN, DON HAYWORTH, HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, JR., THADDEUS MACHROWICZ, HENRY S. REUSS, GEORGE M. RHODES, PETER W. RODINO, JR., HUGH SCOTT, B. F. SISK, STEWART L. UDALL, HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., and HERBERT ZELENKO.

As a result of its study of these measures, the commission on education and international affairs of the American Council on Education took certain actions which are reflected in the following excerpt from the minutes of the meeting held at the beginning of March:

The Commission on Education and International Affairs believes that a well-planned program for the international exchange of persons has and can contribute significantly to international understanding, freedom, and world peace. Major weaknesses of the Government's program have been their intermittent character and the absence of a broad, inclusive, long-range plan. We resolve therefore:

1. That the Commission on Education and International Affairs supports the proposal to establish a special joint committee of the Congress for purposes of making a study of present and proposed exchange programs and of formulating proposals for a comprehensive and continuing program.

2. That the Commission on Educational and International Affairs recommends to the Secretary of State that he take all appropriate measures to achieve the effective coordination of such exchange programs as are authorized by the Congress and to bring them into proper relationship with exchange programs of intergovernmental and private agencies.

3. That the officers of the American Council on Education be asked to arrange for the presentation of these views at the time of public hearings on the proposed legislation.

I include as part of my remarks the text of a letter which I sent to my colleagues in the House of Representatives explaining the purposes of House Joint Resolution 474. Also included here is a short article by Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH which appeared in the October 1955 News Bulletin of the Institute of International Education; as well as a brief statement of the history and activities of the American Council on Education.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 10, 1956.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: I have introduced a joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 474, to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Exchange of Persons Programs. Such a joint committee will be able to make an important contribution to these international exchange programs.

It gives me great pleasure to be able to say that Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT has introduced a companion measure in the Senate as Senate Joint Resolution 120, and Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY has joined Senator FULBRIGHT as cosponsor of the measure.

I am hopeful that you and many other colleagues of mine from both parties will join with us in introducing this measure in the House. The text of our joint resolution is enclosed herewith for your study.

We believe that international exchange of persons has proved to be a valuable means of developing closer cooperation among the nations of the free world. The need for such cooperation is everyday more apparent. The

United States Government is using this technique both for building better understanding of our country abroad and for technical cooperation and economic development. Large exchange programs are now operated by the Department of State. Students, teachers, prominent specialists, and leaders in many fields are exchanged and outstanding cultural performers are sent abroad under these programs. The Congress authorized these programs through the Smith-Mundt Act (P. L. 402, 80th Cong.), the Fulbright Act (P. L. 584, 79th Cong.), and several other acts. American technical experts are sent abroad and foreign nationals are brought to the United States for training under the International Cooperation Administration (formerly FOA and point 4).

The Congress receives reports from the Secretary of State on these programs and reviews their operation annually in connection with appropriations. The Smith-Mundt Act also provides for a United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange which reports directly to the Congress on a semiannual basis.

All of these programs are reviewed separately, and by different congressional committees. They are extremely complex both from the point of view of administration and source of funds, and all use dollars and foreign currencies and rely to a large extent on the efficient use of private resources here and abroad.

It is, therefore, not surprising that some confusion has persisted in the Congress as well as in the public mind as to the relationships that exist between these programs. Yet broad public understanding and public acceptance of these exchange programs are essential if Congress is to support them. It is, we believe, imperative that this understanding be achieved and the confusion ended in order that these important activities can achieve the most useful results.

No concerted or continuing review of these programs and their relationships to each other has ever been undertaken by the Congress. Such a review is of the utmost importance and would be of inestimable benefit to the Congress and to the public. It would help all of us to make a more realistic appraisal of these programs.

The Joint Committee on United States International Exchange of Persons Programs which our joint resolution would establish will provide the necessary review to insure the most effective planning, operation, and administration of these important facets of our international relations.

Discussing the perennial crisis of exchange appropriations in Congress, Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, writing in the October 1955 issue of the news bulletin of the Institute of International Education, points out that although private exchange programs long antedate Government activity in this field, the role of the Federal Government is most significant and in recent years has become nearly indispensable.

Over the past few years, as he makes clear, a definite pattern has emerged in the process of getting appropriations for the Government's participation in international educational exchange programs, for instance, the President requests funds for an adequate program; the House of Representatives slashes this figure nearly in half. The Senate restores the full amount; and the final figure is a compromise between the two. The result, the Senator observes, is clearly insufficient appropriations, and he calls for grassroots understanding.

May I hear from you as to your interest in this legislation at your earliest convenience?

With kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

[From the News Bulletin of the Institute of International Education for October 1955]

PERENNIAL CRISIS

(By H. ALEXANDER SMITH)

Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, Republican, of New Jersey, was cosponsor of the Smith-Mundt Act and sponsor of the act, passed in 1949, authorizing the use of payments on World War I debts by Finland for educational activities, including exchange of students between the two countries.

THE CHALLENGE

"As long as we believe that knowledge is better than ignorance, that the truth makes men free, exchange of persons programs should survive and grow." That sentence, taken from the report of the Committee on Educational Interchange Policy on the Goals of Student Exchange, eloquently presents the challenge to those of us who do believe that knowledge and truth are the sound foundations on which to build enduring peace and a free and prosperous world.

Educational exchange plays an important, but by no means exclusive, role in the spreading of knowledge and truth. However, the almost ideal partnership through which we in the United States have combined private and public contributions to international educational exchange is a guiding example to be followed in attacking all aspects of international ignorance, prejudice, and misunderstanding.

THE SMITH-MUNDT ACT

There is no justification for complacency or inattention merely because a program has reached a high level of success. We must constantly review our goals, as did the Committee on Educational Interchange Policy, and, of equal importance, continuously inspect the foundation and framework on which we have built.

As readers of this bulletin are well aware, private exchange programs long antedate the Government's activity in this field, and still bear the major share of the burden. However, the governmental role is a significant one, and in recent years has become nearly indispensable. The legislative foundation on which the Government's participation is built consists essentially of two laws: Public Law 584 of the 79th Congress and Public Law 402 of the 80th Congress. The former is popularly known as the Fulbright Act and the latter as the Smith-Mundt Act.

As a cosponsor of the Smith-Mundt Act, I am particularly gratified with the outstanding success of the exchange program. My participation was inspired by the experience that I had personally with the activities of the Belgium American Educational Foundation, established by former President Hoover after World War I. This was an outgrowth of the old CRB—Commission for the Relief of Belgium—which saved Belgium during the First World War. The Belgian American Exchange program has been in continuous operation for a period of over 35 years. It counts among its alumni the leading Belgians in public life today. To it can be attributed directly the abiding friendship today between Belgium and the United States. It has been a model operation for many other private exchange programs.

THE FULBRIGHT ACT

The Fulbright Act inspired by my colleague, Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, originally enabled the use, for educational exchange purposes, of some of the foreign currencies available to the United States as a result of the disposal abroad of surplus property. As such it was a temporary program, but free from the necessity of annual appropriations. The Smith-Mundt Act provided a framework for a permanent program of much broader scope (in addition to the educational exchange features, this act is also the basis for the activities of the United States Information Agency), but required appropriated funds. Happily the Fulbright program now has available foreign currencies acquired by the United States through other means, and presumably will carry on indefinitely. Less happily, the program must now purchase these funds from the United States Treasury, thus becoming dependent upon appropriated funds.

It is in this context that we legislators who annually find ourselves on the firing line in the battle for appropriations, are forced to examine the foundation and framework on which we have built the Government's participation in educational exchange. For some years now I have had the growing feeling that, while the framework of the administration and programing can always be improved, the immediate problem is a crack in the foundation itself.

APPROPRIATION PATTERN IN THE CONGRESS

Over the past few years a definite pattern has emerged in the process of getting appropriations for the Government's participation in international educational exchange; the President requests funds for a minimal, but adequate, program; the House of Representatives slashes this figure nearly in half; the Senate restores the full amount, and the final figure is a compromise between the two. The result is, of course, a clearly insufficient appropriation.

In passing it should be mentioned that our successes in securing Senate approval of the full budget request have not been easy. The votes, when pressed in committee and on the floor, have been close. Unfortunately, in the House they have gone the other way, and deep cuts have been sustained.

Why? The program is an inspiring one, quick to catch the imagination of intelligent men, and never more important than today. The Congress is a responsible institution of Government, and responsive to the desires of the articulate voter—traditionally the House even more so than the Senate.

SUPPORT AT THE GRASSROOTS

The answer would seem obvious. Public understanding and public acceptance are the sine qua non for any long-range governmental program requiring annual appropriations. In the case of the exchange program we would seem to rely too heavily on an annual flood of testimonials at appropriations time, instead of building up a genuine and thorough year-round understanding of the program.

We have become too parochial, too ingrown. Happily we have had great success in securing wholehearted acceptance at the local level for the exchangees themselves. We must translate this acceptance—which has widely become enthusiasm—into a grassroots understanding of the program itself, and the role of the Government in it. When that has been accomplished, the appropriations should readily be forthcoming.

It is particularly appropriate that we renew our private efforts at this time, for the Geneva Conference, on the initiative of President Eisenhower, directed the Foreign Ministers to study measures to bring about freer contacts and exchanges to the mutual advantage of the countries and peoples concerned. This is one item on the agenda of the October meeting of the Foreign Ministers. We can do no less than give overwhelming support at home to this international interest at the highest levels of Government in promoting that which we believe in so deeply.

A BRIEF STATEMENT OF THE HISTORY AND ACTIVITIES OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

WHAT THE COUNCIL IS AND DOES

The American Council on Education is a council of national educational associations;

organizations having related interests; approved universities, colleges, teachers colleges, junior colleges, technological schools, and selected private secondary schools; State departments of education; city school systems and private school systems; selected educational departments of business and industrial companies; voluntary associations of higher education in the States; and large public libraries.

The membership as of July 1, 1953, was 1,097, consisting of 143 national and regional associations, and 954 educational institutions. Today, as in the beginning, membership in the council is by organization or institution, not by individual.

The council operates through its staff and the commissions and committees set up to perform specific services. Outstanding leaders in education, in related fields, and in public life serve on council committees and take an active part in educational conferences and studies.

Through the 35 years since its founding in 1918, the council has been a center of cooperation and coordination for the improvement of education at all levels, with particular emphasis on higher education. Its very existence, its functions as set forth in its constitution, its membership, and its activities reflect the peculiar genius of the American educational system—a system without national control, compromising a large number of autonomous units working together for the establishment and improvement of educational standards, policies, and procedures.

More specifically, the council has been a clearinghouse for the exchange of information and opinion; it has conducted many scientific inquiries and investigations into specific educational problems and has sought to enlist appropriate agencies for the solution of such problems; it has stimulated experimental activities by institutions and groups of institutions; it has kept in constant touch with pending legislation affecting educational matters; it has pioneered in methodology that has become standard practice on a national basis—its extensive series of tests, examinations, and cumulative records are representative achievements; it has acted as liaison agency between the educational institutions of the country and the Federal Government and has undertaken many significant projects at the request of the Army, Navy, and State Departments and other government agencies; and through its publications, now so extensive as to rank well with those of other educational presses of the United States, it has made available to educators and the general public widely used handbooks, informational reports, and many volumes of critical analysis of social and educational problems.

ORIGIN OF THE COUNCIL

The council came into being in 1918 as a direct result of the obvious need to coordinate the services which educational institutions and organizations could contribute to the Government in the national crisis brought on by World War I. The first meeting of educators looking toward that end was held in Chicago January 12 and 13, 1918, attended by members of the executive committees of the Association of American Colleges, Association of American Universities, Catholic Educational Association, and the National Association of State Universities. A larger conference was held in Washington on January 30, when an organization was formed and named the "Emergency Council on Education."

Eleven national educational associations were represented at this meeting and comprised the membership of the Emergency Council. They were: American Association of University Professors, Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations, Association of American Colleges, Association of American Universities, Association of State Universities, Association of Urban Universities, Catholic Educational Association, National Education Association, National Council of Education (NEA), Department of Superintendence (NEA), and Society for the Promotion of Engineering Education.

By the time of its next meeting, March 26–27, 1918, three additional associations had joined the Emergency Council: Association of American Medical Colleges, American Association for the Advancement of Science, and the National Council of Normal School Presidents and Principals.

The members of the Emergency Council on Education had not proceeded far with their work before they realized that there would be as much need for cooperative educational endeavor in time of peace as in time of war. Consequently, early in July 1918 the name of the organization was changed to American Council on Education, thus eliminating its original transient and emergency character, and visualizing its broadened scope in developing better relations with educational institutions abroad. The 14 founding organizations became constituent members of the permanent council.

ACTIVITIES OF THE COUNCIL

From its inception in January 1918 to the termination of hostilities in November of that year, the activities of the council were centered on the war effort. It performed many special services at the request of the President and various Government agencies, as it did again in World War II.

In peacetime it has broadened and intensified its study of American education, expanded its services to its member institutions and to educational institutions in general, and initiated and supported projects designed to promote better international understanding and relations.

In addition to its numerous services to the Federal Government, the council has made a number of State surveys of education at the request of State officers or legislatures. Among the surveys in recent years are those of Maryland, Illinois, Utah, Delaware, Alabama, Louisiana, and Hawaii.

Some highlights of educational achievement

Some of the council's activities of lasting value to American education are: the psychological examinations for high-school students and college freshmen, issued annually by the council from 1924 through 1947, and the Cooperative Test Service which functioned under the council's sole sponsorship from 1930 to January 1, 1948, when both of these projects were merged into the newly created Educational Testing Service; the National Teacher Examinations, established in 1939—a testing program administered on a nationwide scale; the American Youth Commission, composed of a group of leaders in civic and educational affairs who studied youth problems through a period of years and produced more than 30 volumes of enduring value; the Commission on Teacher Education, a cooperative Nation-wide project in which more than 50 colleges, universities, and public-school systems participated, resulting in a series of 20 published reports on a variety of problems; the Financial Advisory Service, which operated actively for the 5 years between 1935 and 1940, and produced 21 pamphlets on specific financial and business problems of institutions of higher education. The council was also exceedingly active in working for better and more uniform accreditation standards through a long period of years.

Ongoing council projects and committees include the Commission on Accreditation of Service Experiences established in 1945; the Inter-American Schools Service, established in 1943, and the Committee on Measurement and Evaluation, established in 1949 and continuing in a field in which the council has long been active. Other areas in which council committees have been influential in establishing policy in recent years include educational television, the education of women, intercollegiate athletics, college teaching, international cultural relations, institutional research policy, and religion in education. These activities are briefly described in connection with the responsible committees on pages 11–22.

EXPANSION OF MEMBERSHIP

Although the council originated as an association of national educational organizations, it soon became evident that both the organizations and the institutions of higher education would benefit by working together, and the constitution was therefore amended as early as December 1918 to provide for the inclusion of institutional members, that is, accredited colleges, universities, and technological schools, and for the inclusion of associate members—organizations with interests related to the work of the Council.

In June 1935 membership privileges were further extended to accredited teachers colleges, and later to State departments of education, public and private school systems, private secondary schools, junior colleges, the educational departments of business and industrial concerns, large public libraries, selected institutions of a specialized nature, voluntary associations of colleges within the United States, and selected universities outside the United States of America. The membership of 1,097 on July 1, 1953, comprised the following:

Seventy-nine constituent members (national and regional educational associations).

Sixty-four associate members (national organizations in fields related to education).

Nine hundred and fifty-four institutional members (universities, colleges, selected private secondary schools, public and private school systems, educational departments of industrial concerns, voluntary associations of colleges and universities within the States, large public libraries, etc.).

Almost all of the major educational associations are actively affiliated with the American Council on Education, which also includes institutional members from 47 States, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

THE MEN WHO HAVE DIRECTED THE COUNCIL

The development of the council naturally has revolved around the men who have served as its chief executive officer. Dr. Samuel P. Capen was its first full-time director, serving from 1919 to 1922, when he accepted the chancellorship of the University of Buffalo. He was succeeded by Dr. Charles R. Mann, who was director until 1934 when he retired. Dr. George F. Zook came to the presidency of the council in 1934 from the position of United States Commissioner of Education, having previously been president of the University of Akron. Dr. Zook served from July 1, 1934, through December 31, 1950. Dr. Arthur S. Adams became president January 1, 1951. Dr. Adams came to the council from the presidency of the University of New Hampshire. He was formerly provost of Cornell University.

Associate directors of the council have been David A. Robertson, who served from 1923 to 1930, John H. MacCracken from 1930 to 1934, C. S. Marsh from 1935 to 1944, and A. J. Brumbaugh, vice president from 1944 to 1950. The titles of director and associate director were changed to president and vice president in 1935. The office of vice president was discontinued in 1951.

The chairmen of the council have always played a most important part in its achievements, and the list of chairmen is a notable rollcall of some of America's greatest leaders

in education. The last several chairmen were:

1942–43: Edmund E. Day, president, Cornell University.

1943–44: O. C. Carmichael, chancellor, Vanderbilt University.

1944–45: Herman B. Wells, president, Indiana University.

1945–46: Alexander J. Stoddard, superintendent of schools, Philadelphia.

1946–47: George D. Stoddard, president, University of Illinois.

1947–48: Leonard Carmichael, president, Tufts College.

1948–49: Herold C. Hunt, superintendent of schools, Chicago.

1949–50: James B. Conant, president, Harvard University.

1950–51: J. L. Morrill, president, University of Minnesota.

1951–52: Everett N. Case, president, Colgate University.

1952–53: Robert L. Stearns, president, University of Colorado.

Midwest International Trade Development Center, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. HESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report:

MIDWEST INTERNATIONAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT CENTER, INC., CINCINNATI, OHIO., ACTIVITIES REPORT, MARCH 31, 1956

On April 22, 1956, MITDC will complete 1 year of operation. In that time, we feel much has been accomplished toward our goals of developing more trade, understanding, and peace between this Midwest area and the free world.

We have had inquiries from abroad requesting names of firms in this area, and we have established these contacts. We have found export managers for Midwest Radio & Television Corp., Central Tool Co., and Senco Products of Cincinnati, Ohio, and Record Files of Wooster, Ohio. We have had one trade luncheon here, and others are in the planning stage for other towns in the MITDC area. A trade mission to Latin America is planned for the fall of 1956.

We have endeavored, through questionnaires sent to almost 400 firms in this immediate area to find those desiring foreign markets and sources of supply. We have begun making market surveys for these firms in cooperation with Xavier University.

We have established contacts with the United States Export-Import Bank, the United States Department of Commerce, both locally and in Washington, with all the ambassadors and consuls in Washington, with all the American consuls abroad, and the consuls of other countries residing in the MITDC trading area. We have their complete cooperation, as stated in letters to our office, in passing along information concerning this center and its activities to businessmen in other localities to stimulate more trade.

We have secured a consul for Mexico for Cincinnati, Miss Aria Parke Schawe, who has had broad experience in Mexico and other Latin American countries, and the matter is now in the hands of the Mexican Government for approval. We have every reason to believe this appointment will be approved, and continuing efforts are being made by this office to secure consuls for other countries in Cincinnati.

We have provided translation services when necessary for firms or individuals and speakers for various organizations. We completed all research to provide names of all the leading manufacturers and industrialists in this midwest area. We are now mailing our house organ, the Trade Mart, to approximately 1,000 businessmen and other interested organizations in the MITDC trading area each month as well as to American consuls abroad who keep it on display for business opportunities in their localities.

We are affiliated with International House of New Orleans, receiving all of their experience and services. We have a competent corps of representatives in Latin America, in three European countries, one Asiatic country. We shall continue to secure representatives in other sections of the world.

Through efforts of MITDC, Xavier University is now offering a course in international trade. The University of Indiana is now exploring the possibility of offering more scholarships to Latin American students at American universities and obtaining scholarships at Latin American universities for American students. We have arranged for one exchange doctor in the department of radiology at General Hospital.

United States Congressmen GORDON SCHERER and WILLIAM HESS have been contacted, and they are arranging for a meeting in Washington of the various representatives in Washington from the Midwest area so that a statement can be issued jointly in favor of MITDC and arrangements can be made for more support of this project in Washington.

The State of Ohio, in cooperation with MITDC, is preparing a new booklet on Ohio in color. Farson, Huff & Northlich, of Cincinnati, Ohio, are now preparing the dummy for this booklet which will be published in various languages, seeking to draw tourists to Ohio. Mr. E. E. Schnellbacher, Director of the Office of Intelligence and Services, Bureau of Foreign Commerce, Washington, D. C., said in his talk before the American Association of University Women in Cincinnati, March 15, 1956:

"If instead of shipping goods to foreign countries, we sent ourselves and brought them back, or if we brought enough customers here to equal production, we would have a balance of trade. * * * Tourism is very sound business because you provide the service industries with dollars which they in turn spend. There is no estimate of how American tourist dollars spent abroad return to this country in purchase of materials from American industry. * * * France, for example, made more money from the United States through tourism than from all the things she exported to the United States in goods."

Mr. C. A. Harrell, city manager of Cincinnati, has been contacted regarding the city of Cincinnati assuming some of the expense of publishing this book concerning Cincinnati and Ohio. While the city probably will not be able to aid in financing, Mr. Harrell stated in a letter to this office:

"I will be glad to discuss this matter further with you, if you feel the city can be helpful, for I am very much interested in the type of thing you are doing."

Negotiations were made with WRUL, World Wide Broadcasting of New York City to transcribe their recording of the MITDC banquet speeches in October of 1955, and news of this banquet has gone all around the world together with the news of the establishment of this trade center. NBC-TV has also been in consultation with us, and MITDC is to be included in their special telecast from Cincinnati on April 17 for Dave Garroway's Today.

On the civic service side, MITDC has cooperated with the Children's International Summer Village to provide a luncheon for the delegates to the village. We have provided contacts, home entertainment including dinners, and industrial tours for the following visitors to Cincinnati:

Latin American businessmen brought by Amertool Services.

Japanese businessmen brought by Amertool Service.

Latin American agricultural team brought by United Stats Department of Agriculture.

Mexican group of teachers, secretaries, accountants etc., brought by Experiment in International Living.

Teachers from India, Japan, and Argentina brought by Cincinnati Board of Education.

Doctors from Latin America brought by Wm. S. Merrell Co.

We are now preparing, in cooperation with the Wm. S. Merrell Co. a dinner and reception for the 122 resident international doctors, interns, and nurses at the Greater Cincinnati hospitals.

We have cooperated with the Cincinnati Council on World Affairs for their Latin American Institute in January, and we have provided letters of introduction to various Cincinnati area people who were leaving for foreign travel. We have helped Ohio State University publicize its April 7, 1956, Regional Foreign Trade Conference covering a 5-State area.

The past several weeks we have been exploring the possibility of JayCee support of MITDC, having had a conference with Mr. George Kral, president, and Mr. Lawrence W. Bratburd, international relations chairman for the local group. We have also had correspondence with Mr. William Hellerman of Columbus, Ohio, Ohio JayCee director of international relations who is very much interested in MITDC and is urging support of it by the local group.

We have also had contact with Mr. Roth of the Retail Merchants Association, and they feel they will be interested in participating as Founder Members of MITDC. In fact, a membership campaign is now in the planning stage, and will be presented for Board approval within the next 2 weeks.

We have been exploring the possibility of publishing for distribution abroad, an industrial directory of the Midwest area in four languages, and we have discussed this matter with Diamond Directory and Conover-Mast Co. It is now under consideration by these two firms.

All of these efforts were made while we were also soliciting and obtaining memberships with a staff of never more than 4, most of the time with only 2, with a total budget for equipment, office expenses, salaries, etc., of only $21,799.94 with pledges and income of $21,850, leaving a bank balance at this time of $50.06. Naturally, as with all new enterprises, mistakes were made during the first year of operation. However, we feel these have been corrected, and we are now in a much stronger position to obtain more memberships and provide more services to our members and to the community because the necessary groundwork has just now been laid.

Many other cities are now considering establishment of just such a center as ours, and we have been getting many inquiries as to how to start a center. If we do not go full-steam ahead, these other cities will overcome our headstart and much of the export and import business which could come to this area through MITDC will be diverted elsewhere.

MEMBERSHIPS IN MITDC AS OF MARCH 31, 1956

Founder memberships: Aluminum Industries, Inc.; American Tool Works Co.; Armco International Corp.; Baldwin Piano Co.; Bishopric Products Co.; Cincinnati Enquirer; Cincinnati Milling Machine Co.; Thomas Emery's Sons Co.; Farson, Huff, & Northlich; Formica Co.; Gruen Watch Co.; Industry Export Service; Pan-American Airlines; Proc-

tor & Gamble Co.; Reardon Industries, Inc.; Sheraton-Gibson Hotel; Strachan Shipping Co.; United States Playing Card Co.

Sustaining memberships: Alms Hotel; Brighton Corp.; E. W. Buschman Co., Inc.; Central Trust Co.; Cincinnati Butchers Supply Co.; Cincinnati Tool Co.; Crosley-Bendix Home Appliances Division; Fifth-Third Union Trust Co.; First National Bank; Provident Savings Bank & Trust Co.; Staples Tool Co.

Out-of-territory membership: Cia. Transmares of New Orleans.

Active memberships: American Laundry Machinery Co.; Atco Tool Corp.; H. Blacker Printing Inks, Inc.; Campbell-Hausfeld Co.; Century Machine Co.; Dayton Rubber Co.; Fries & Fries, Inc.; George P. Gundlach & Co.; Huenefeld Co.; E. Kahn's Sons Co.; Keco Industries, Inc.; Karl Kiefer Machine Co.; Midwest Radio & Television Corp.; Price Y Cia., Inc.; Railway Supply & Manufacturing Co.; Shepard-Warner Elevator Co.; Dr. Frank C. Sutton, M. D.; Weber Engineered Products Co.; Wolf Machine Co.

The Farm Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to a constituent:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 10, 1956.

DEAR MR. ———: Your letter in regard to the farm situation, of course, gives me no cause to cheer for I know you have reason to feel as you do at the present time. Many farmers and others, including your humble servant, BEN JENSEN, are now, and have been for the past several years, greatly concerned and worried about the welfare of the farmers.

In justice to the Republican Party we must not lose sight of the fact that the Democratic Party was in full power in the White House and in Congress when Mr. Mike DiSalle, the Director of the Office of Price Stabilization, rolled back the price of cattle 10 percent on July 1, 1951, with President Truman's complete approval, and he said I will again roll back cattle prices another 4½ percent on August 1, 1951, and another 4½ percent on October 1, 1951. Why? Because they were very anxious to give the packinghouse workers the 9 percent wage raise which they demanded, and by so doing the price of steaks would not be increased. Immediately after the rollback went into effect the packinghouse workers were granted the wage increase they demanded.

Congressmen from the cattle-producing States took up the fight and we were able to stop all except the 10-percent rollback—but the damage had been done. Even before July 1, 1951 arrived, cattle prices went on the toboggan and took other farm commodities down the grade with cattle prices, and farm commodities kept tumbling down in price until the early spring of 1953 after the Republicans took over the White House and Congress, and abolished the Office of Price Stabilization. Then for several months the price of farm commodities leveled off and stabilized, until Benson and the Farm Bureau heads announced the flexible-support proposal of 75 percent to 90 percent, and again the price of farm commodities began to weaken and slide downward. Please read my speech of May 12, 1954, and my letter to Mr. Benson of September 30, 1955, copies enclosed. In 1954 the Republican Congress passed a farm bill providing, as you know, 82½ percent to 90 percent support prices for our six basic storable farm crops, corn, wheat, cotton, rice, tobacco, and peanuts.

We must also be mindful of the fact that the Democrats are right now in full control of both Houses of Congress, just as they were during the last session, which adjourned last August when the House of Representatives passed H. R. 12, amending the Agriculture Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities; that bill passed the House, May 5, 1955, by a vote of 206 yeas to 201 nays, and that bill reinstated the full 90-percent supports for the 6 basic storable farm crops and which I supported, but the Democrat-controlled Senate pigeonholed the bill for purely political reasons and nothing else. But ever since that time they have been very busily engaged in trying to put all the blame on the Republican Party for the decline in farm prices. While all this is water over the dam, it does point up where, and who, is responsible for the farm problem as it exists today. The thing we are interested in today is finding the right solution to the condition in which the farmer finds himself now—not only for the farmers' welfare, but for every American who over the long pull will sooner or later all be in the same boat.

Let us who are directly interested in the welfare of the farmer speak up, and make no bones about it. Let us say to Congress and to everyone who has a responsibility in the matter, that so long as everything the farmer buys at the counter is made or processed under a system of high supported and protected wage costs from the minute the raw product leaves the farm, the mine, or the water, just so long will it be a nation must to give the farmer like protection on the products he markets, for unless the farmers' dollar buys 100 cents worth of manufactured goods at the counter, and soon, I shudder to think of the consequences to our entire Nation.

According to a recent newspaper article, Henry Wallace, now of New York, said he favors flexible parity. Mr. Wallace was Secretary of Agriculture from 1933 to 1940, inclusive. Records show that our total farm income was less during that 8-year period than it was during the 8-year period previous to 1933. And, long after Mr. Wallace plowed under crops and caused little pigs to be destroyed, and after the New Dealers had spent over $19 billion tax dollars trying to prime the pump, top hogs sold on the Chicago market in 1940 for $5.70, and over 10 million Americans were out of work; but all those problems were solved quickly by World War II. All farm prices went up and up, and 14 million Americans were employed, in uniform. Oh, how soon we forget.

Now, I don't want any more of that kind of business. So, I'll continue to cast my lot with the Republicans, and I hope you will do likewise.

Sincerely yours,

BEN F. JENSEN,
Member of Congress.

American Youth, a Most Vital Asset

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on April 6, 1956, Adm. Arthur Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, addressed the biennial convention of the National Jewish Welfare Board, New York City, on the subject American Youth, a Most Vital Asset.

Admiral Radford's address follows:

We are met here this afternoon as privileged members of free society. Indeed, we are proud of this fact, proud of our beliefs in the right to live in freedom and liberty.

Of late, however, I have been disturbed by voices here and abroad who cry out that our beliefs are weakened and enfeebled. These voices claim that the United States is not equal to its tasks, and that world trends inevitably favor communism. They subscribe to a fashion of being cynical and even malicious about that for which the United States stands.

Now some of these voices may reflect wholesome criticism. Some may even reflect intelligent reaction against an easy-going optimism and a tendency toward self-complacency. Of this I cannot be sure.

But I am sure that if we forget our basic fundamentals and ideals, and if we do nothing to advance them, we will increase the dangers for the generations to follow.

You may remember playing baseball and how at certain times you had to come back to base and tag up before advancing without penalty.

So it is with us today. Reaffirming our age-old principles is like returning to touch base again. We reestablish contact with proven fundamentals. We make ourselves better able to live our lives, educate our young, and pray our prayers, all in freedom and self-respect.

This then becomes our American legacy to all people of all times.

Our legacy is threatened, however, by a formidable adversary—a group of men who know what they want with perilous clarity, and are determined to achieve it with violent persistency. For the Communists the present world situation is a continuation of unrest and disorders growing out of the explosive forces of modern society. Their weapons include intimidation, propaganda, and attack upon the human mind.

Indeed the subjugation of the mind and the corruption of the spirit are essential conditions to their success. As a result, one's mind and spirit constitute prime objectives of Communist activities.

Here then is the core of our struggle with Communist tyranny. Here must be raised our bastion of defense, a bastion to be defended with vigor and determination. More that that, it should be a bastion from which strong ideals can spread to drive back the forces of darkness.

For all intents and purposes, we are participants in a battle between good and evil—a struggle between light and darkness. The struggle is deadly, and it is serious. All that is necessary for evil to triumph is for good American citizens to sit back and do nothing.

MILITARY SERVICE

Now, because of the magnitude of the Communist military threat, our Nation maintains strong Armed Forces. We do this in order to help prevent war if possible, and to be ready to win it if it occurs.

Quite naturally, this affects the lives of our young people. A great many of them must devote some part of their lives to military service. In this way we help insure our survival as a nation.

This year, as last year, more men and women will be graduated from the Armed Forces and returned to civil life than will be graduated from all the colleges and universities in the country put together.

Yet, many young people have not recognized and accepted these facts. Some have heard rumors that because our draft calls currently are small, their chances of being called into military service run about 1 in 10.

This is an erroneous impression. Our experience indicates that about 4 out of 5 of our young men, who are not fathers, and who are otherwise physically and mentally qualified and available, can expect to enter military service before they reach age 26.

Today there are nearly 3 million men and women in the Armed Forces, and most of them are young. Nearly 70 percent of them are less than 26 years old. In fact, the overall average age of the American Armed Forces is slightly under 23.

I think it is unfortunate when, for the lack of a positive attitude toward military service, a young man today reaches his late teens or early twenties in an uncertain state. Such an individual then faces the draft, and sometimes has inconvenient and costly changes to make in the life pattern he has started.

Actually, military service need never be regarded as an onerous obligation, one from which the individual derives no advantages. There are some 30 or more choices to fit a young man's plan of enlisted or officer service. But none of them best fit the individual who has no plan, or who lacks the patriotic zeal to do his part for America's readiness.

It would seem wise for a young man, and his parents, to give serious thought to the time and manner in which he discharges his obligations. Selection of a specific alternative can be made in relation to a logical, progressive career plan. In many cases military service can represent a definite, constructive upward step toward one's ultimate goal.

In this regard, the Joint Chiefs of Staff are as much interested in the kind of citizen the serviceman is when he leaves the Armed Forces as we are with his training while in uniform.

You probably already know that the Military Establishment performs prodigious feats in feeding, clothing, equipping, transporting and training our Armed Forces. It spends billions on the newest weapons and on the most modern ships, planes, tanks, and missiles. It spares no effort to provide the ablest leadership in order to achieve a high degree of military readiness. These are matters you hear about almost daily.

But we are also deeply concerned with doing everything possible to see that our young citizens come out of military service strengthened in faith, morale, and dedication to our American way of life. Their dedication is of the highest consequence.

The reason is simple and clear. For all practical purposes, the best defense of our liberty is the acceptance of responsibility. Acceptance of responsibility is dependent upon citizenship training of all Americans.

Liberty is like a medallion. One side offers rights and privileges. The other side depends upon acceptance of corresponding responsibilities. For every single freedom, there is a kindred responsibility.

These may sound like truisms or ideals, and they are. But we have a way of forgetting them. A nation has need for truisms. American youth has need for ideals, and always shall. Ideals are like stars. To benefit by them, we do not need to reach them and hold them in our hands. We need them for navigation purposes. Like the seafaring man on an ocean, we need them to guide us on the right course.

THE TASK AHEAD

In our young people, we see the hope for tomorrow. They have the enthusiasm, energy, and daring so essential to the perpetuation of life. They also have the greatest stake in the spiritual, moral, and physical security of these United States. For their future is the Nation's future.

Accordingly it seems to me that it is our great American task, yours and mine, to demonstrate to our youth by our example, the basic fundamentals of freedom. The problem is not one of originating anything new. The problem is to strengthen our convictions, and thus become better equipped and more fit. We must demonstrate and teach, in the home, the church, the school, and in the Armed Forces, a growing regard for the rights—and the duties—of freedom.

Now while in the service, our young people need spiritual and moral resources to sustain them, a sense of mission to inspire them, and an abiding confidence that the people at home are with them. These compelling needs are needs which the military cannot provide alone.

For this reason, the Department of Defense relies on the resourcefulness and competence of voluntary citizens' organizations such as the National Jewish Welfare Board. I realize that for you it has been a 40-year job in which you have been seeking ways to help our young become mentally and morally stronger. I think you should press ahead with that work because it is now more important than ever.

The American youth is a vital national asset. We in the military hope our youth will always have the strength of character, the dynamic purpose, and the simple courage to hold fast to the right course in dangerous times. The security of our American way of life is dependent upon the courageous hard work of all citizens—not upon food, nor money, nor comfort—but upon plain old-fashioned fortitude of mind, body, and soul. For the more our Nation sweats in peace, the less it may have to bleed in war.

Mr. Walter A. Stewart and Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein an outstanding statement of Mr. Walter A. Stewart recently made before the House and Senate Appropriations Public Works Subcommittee urging accelerated flood relief and protection for the stricken areas of Massachusetts and New England.

Mr. Stewart, former able and distinguished president of the American Optical Co., is the head of the Quinebaug and French Rivers Manufacturers Association and has contributed greatly in connection with efforts to rehabilitate flood stricken area and secure adequate flood protection and disaster insurance for them. I desire heartilly to commend and thank him and his associatees for their vigorous, constructive work in relation to vital flood control problems of my district, State, and region:

My name is Walter A. Stewart. My address is Southbridge, Mass. I am a trustee of the American Optical Co. and chairman of the executive committee of the Quinebaug-French River Manufacturers Association, representing industry and the citizenry in the valleys of those 2 rivers in southern Massachusetts and eastern Connecticut. Southbridge and Webster, Mass., and Putnam, Conn., are 3 of the principal towns in the area. We were damaged to the extent of some $35 million by the floods which followed Diane last August and are here to ask you to speed up the construction of already-authorized dams in that area. Had these dams been in existence last August, the Army engineers tell us that 60 percent of the damage we suffered would have been averted. The project has been mapped and proposed by the Army engineers since 1941 and is known as the Thames River Basin project.

At this point I would like to insert in the RECORD a simple table showing past and presently contemplated expenditures for the four projects in which we are interested. Also for your information, I have here a map showing the general location of these projects, and a few pictures of last August's floods.

Quinebaug-French River Manufacturers Association

[In dollars]

	Previously appropriated	1956 (supplemental)	1957 (budget)	Estimated total cost[1]
East Brimfield	70,000	140,000	340,000	5,700,000
Westville	79,000	----------	----------	[2] 5,890,000
Buffumville	195,000	100,000	1,200,000	2,820,000
Hodges Village	----------	140,000	360,000	4,350,000
Total	344,000	380,000	1,900,000	18,760,000

[1] 1955.
[2] 1954.

At the presently planned rate of expenditure, these dams will not be completed for 9 years. With weather experts predicting that New England is in for a long cycle of hurricanes, we just can't wait that long for relief. My own company has already announced that it is going to build a new frame plant in Frederick, Md.; that one of the purposes is to spread weather risk. But most of the companies our association represents are small, one-mill operations which are dependent upon the water of our rivers and which cannot spread out into other areas. Another blow like Diane's could just put some of them out of business—a fate which neither they individually or New England as a whole can afford.

In this connection, I would like to point out that New England has received less than one-third of 1 percent of the $1.8 billion appropriated for flood control during the last 5 years, although we pay 7.5 percent of all Federal taxes. Those figures are Senator KENNEDY'S.

In general we ask, gentlemen, that the appropriations for all our projects be stepped up, in whatever amount is necessary to see their completion within 3 years. Specifically we urge you to recommend at least $100,000 for advance planning and engineering for Westville—to give us assurance that the entire system is underway.

Thank you very much.

Foreign Minister Artajo, of Spain, in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's Capitol is graced today and during this week by the presence of the Honorable A. M. Artajo, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Spain, who is being officially received and will hold conversations with the Secretary of State on important problems affecting the two nations and the free world.

I take this occasion to call to the attention of my colleagues the intelligent

and far-sighted attitude of our distinguished guest and the Spanish Government toward the menace of communism to the free world today.

The Spanish people have experienced, during their civil war, a long and bitter struggle with the forces of communism. As a result, they are well aware of the Soviet methods of penetration and terror.

The fate of the captive nations has always been met in Spain with deep and sympathetic understanding on behalf of both the people and the Government. It might be interesting to call to your attention that the Spanish Government has never recognized the Communist-sponsored regime in Poland, and still gives full accreditation to a Polish Ambassador representing the free prewar government of Poland, now in exile. On many occasions since 1945 official Spanish pronouncements were published to the effect that no lasting peace can be achieved as long as Poland, and the other subjugated nations of Europe, are not free.

Recent declarations by Generalissimo Franco and Foreign Minister Artajo confirm that this attitude in respect to the problems of captive nations is a fundamental principle of Spanish foreign policy.

On June 4, 1955, at the closing session of the International Congress in Escorila, organized by the Centre Européen de Documentation et d'Information, Mr. Artajo, who presided at this meeting, confirmed emphatically that "the liberation of the European countries occupied by communism is—from the point of view of justice—a historical necessity as well as a political one."

In an interview in January, 1956, with the representative of the Spanish paper YA, Mr. Artajo, when asked about the policy of coexistence with the Soviets, answered: "When Russia will liberate the subjugated countries, we will begin to believe in her good will of coexistence." Similar declarations were made by the head of the Spanish Government, Generalissimo Franco.

We will hail the presence of this far-sighted statesman in our presence and hope that his conversations with our Secretary of State will lead to a better understanding of the Communist menace and a more solid basis for a firm and lasting era of peace based on justice.

The Wait-for-a-Crisis Leadership of the Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it seems beyond argument that our foreign relations have taken a bad turn in the past year. Recent news from Iceland, Ceylon, and the Middle East has been disquieting.

Yet, surprisingly, in the face of these developments and the obvious success of the new Russian tactics, the President and Mr. Dulles seem undisturbed. They have not brought forth new policies and seem bent on exercising a type of leadership which waits for crises to develop before plans of action are formulated.

With the campaign season approaching, there is always a suspicion that judgments by Members of Congress are tinged with political considerations. Consequently, to support my statement, I present today two articles and an editorial which appeared last week, written by Walter Lippmann, Joseph C. Harsch, and the editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald. An article of similar tenor by James Reston, of the New York Times, was placed in the Appendix yesterday by the majority leader, Mr. McCORMACK, and appears at page A2832 of the RECORD. These gentlemen and the Post and Times Herald are not habitually critical of the administration and its policies, and their observations should have particular force at this time.

The articles and editorial follow:

LEADERSHIP AND STRADDLE

(By Walter Lippmann)

A great deal is being said abroad and here at home about how necessary and urgent it is that this country give firm and clear leadership to the non-Communist world. It is easier to say that than to do it. But I wonder whether the President and Secretary Dulles have not in fact come to think of the world situation in terms other than that of leadership, whether, indeed, they are trying to lead.

In the past few months Mr. Dulles has found himself entangled in an extraordinary series of dilemmas—in issues in which he is damned if he does and damned if he doesn't. He has been caught in the Goa dilemma between Portgual and India. In the Jakarta dilemma between the Netherlands and Indonesia, in the north African dilemma between France and the Algerian Arabs, in the Palestine dilemma between Israel and the Arabs, and in the Baghdad dilemma between Iraq and Egypt, in the Cyprus dilemma between Britain and Greece, in the Persion Gulf dilemma between Saudi Arabia and Great Britain, and so on and on.

This is all rather different from what it used to be in the pre-Geneva phase of the cold war. Then the issues were between Communists and anti-Communists. The line of leadership was self-evident. But now the issues which plague Mr. Dulles are very often primarily among our allies and the peoples that we are courting.

Mr. Dulles is in theory a believer, as he said in his famous Life magazine interview, in taking a clear position so that foreign governments will not miscalculate. In actual practice, beginning with Quemoy and Matsu and going on to Palestine, he has devoted an immense amount of his energy trying not to make clear choices in the dilemmas which confront him. I am not attempting here to criticize or to judge but only to describe when I say that a large part of our current policy is to work out ways of straddling the many horrid choices with which we are confronted.

The old much simpler days are passed when there was one great adversary and leadership consisted in opposing him. The great adversary is still there, to be sure, but he is playing a secondary part in the troubles of France in north Africa and of Great Britain in the Middle East.

The President and Mr. Dulles give the impression of being men who are not so much trying to lead a grand alliance as they are to disentangle themselves from its quarrels and to become if possible mediators. This is their line in Cyprus, in Palestine, and in effect in north Africa. They are trying not to become involved and committed and not to offend either side too much. Naturally enough, no one is very much pleased.

One wonders where the policy of straddle is heading, and what conception of America's role in the world is implied by it. Are they trying to accommodate themselves to the idea that there is an irresistible revolutionary tide of anti-Western passion rising in Africa and Asia, that they cannot hope to resist it, that they might in some places manage to appease it? It sometimes looks that way.

WARNING FROM ICELAND

On March 28 Members of Iceland's Althing passed a resolution calling for the withdrawal of all NATO armed forces from their country.

This action of the Althing was merely an expression of opinion as of the moment. It did not call for implementation by the Government. It was done shortly before an adjournment in the context of an election approaching on June 24. It may or may not lead to a formal withdrawal by Iceland from the NATO alliance.

The resolution was not, in other words, an act of Government, but only an expression of opinion by a Legislature which may well change when that Legislature reconvenes and also when the economic consequences of a withdrawal of the 7,000 United States troops in Iceland are more fully considered.

But when the Members of the Althing passed the resolution they gave the most specific expression to date of a point of view which has been stated with increasing frequency in countries which participate in the North Atlantic alliance.

The Foreign Minister of France and the President of Italy are two other recent sources of the opinion that the NATO alliance as it stands today is becoming obsolete and that the first need of the West in the post-Geneva world is not for a military alliance but for a much-improved economic and political association of the western nations.

There is no longer any doubt that a revolt against NATO is building up and that Iceland is merely the first country in which a legislature has gone one step beyond philosophic expression of the revolt.

One specific and immediate condition which lies behind the Iceland resolution is worthy of note.

In 1952, the first full year after the United States negotiated the arrangement under which United States radar stations and troops operate in Iceland, the United States purchased 25 percent of the total exports of Iceland. These consist mostly of fish in various forms—fresh, dried, tinned, and frozen. Iceland, incidentally, pioneered frozen fish sticks.

But in 1955 sales of Iceland's fish in the United States had declined to 13 percent of Iceland's exports.

In 1952, the Soviet-bloc countries took 7 percent of Iceland's fish exports. By 1955, Soviet-bloc purchases had gone up to 28 percent, or more than double United States purchases.

This change in the direction of Icelandic trade is not entirely the fault of the United States or its citizens. Wages have gone up sharply in Iceland, largely due to strike action by unions dominated by Communists. The price of Iceland's fish has gone up with wages and the fish has lost its competitive advantage of 1952 in United States markets.

But the cause of the decline in Icelandic sales in the United States is irrelevant to the result. The fact is that the Soviet bloc has become a more important customer of Iceland than the United States.

This provides an easy excuse or rationalization for a people long disturbed over what they regard as a threat to their ancient culture from the intrusion of an alien culture. The shift in trade has acted as a precipitant of older grievances. Iceland is questioning an alliance which cuts across the pattern of its trade in addition to the presumed pattern of its culture.

This is an inevitable process. Alliances which long survive are military expressions of cultural, political, and economic patterns. The incipient revolt against NATO springs, wherever it is found, from dissatisfaction with the cultural, political, and economic underpinnings of NATO.

In late February, President Gronchi, of Italy, came to Washington preaching a shift in emphasis in the NATO community from militray to economic collaboration. Behind it lies a leftward political inclination in Italy and economic needs which are not being satisfied by the United States.

On March 2, Foreign Minister Pineau, of France, let go a verbal blast against United States foreign policy. Behind it lay the fact that at that time the Franco-United States alliance was not of any visible help to France in its effort to save its great economic and political stake in Algeria.

The incipient French revolt has been stemmed momentarily by a strong endorsement of the French Government's new policies for Algeria. The Italian protest was not lodged in an acute form. It may well be that Iceland's tentative move will be reversed by new arrangements—perhaps by finding a way to revive the United States market for Iceland's fish.

The fact remains that the allies of the United States are decreasingly interested in the military alliance and increasingly interested in improving their economic and political relations, obtaining more support for their political purposes, and regaining more cultural independence. What the Althing did in Iceland is a warning that verbal protests had best be taken more seriously; a warning that unless Washington can put the western community on a broader basis it may some day find its community of military interests disappear without a successor.

THE CRISIS IN NATO

The crisis which has been confronting NATO for many months past is now plain for all to see. Iceland's action in calling for the withdrawal of all NATO forces is merely the latest, though the most spectacular, sign. The force in Iceland is American. It is there in virtue of a treaty concluded directly between the United States and Iceland at Iceland's request—a force which is mainly concerned with manning an airbase. It operates as the anchor of the northern flank of NATO for instant activation when NATO Europe is attacked. How Iceland could pull any weight as a member of NATO without permitting use of the base, as she proposes, is a mystery.

Iceland's request will not go into effect immediately. NATO must have 6 months' notice, and another 12 months is the due of the American Government as the initial contracting party. Furthermore, if the moderate views of the Independence Party should prevail at the polls in June, a reversal of policy is still poosible. What has prompted the Icelanders to demand withdrawal? Undoubtedly in a country with a population of only 155,000, the economic impact of a contingent of foreign troops is a constant irritant. It said from Reykjavik, however, that the easing of international tension is responsible. In other words, the seeming defection is the direct result of the summit conference at Geneva. In Iceland, where there is no military establishment, the view quickly gained favor that the parley at the top had come to what was tantamount to a nonaggression pact. That this was a mistaken view was argued in vain by this newspaper among others after Geneva.

However, more than the Geneva spirit is to blame for Iceland's default. What is equally at fault is the slackness and lack of coordination on the political level at NATO. Iceland, along with Greece, actually voted against a fellow NATO member, France, in the last U. N. Assembly. What an indictment of the lack of even diplomatic concert in NATO. Moreover, Iceland has been having trouble with another fellow NATO member, Britain, on fisheries. These divisive tendencies in NATO have been developing progressively.

When he was Supreme Commander at SHAPE, Dwight D. Eisenhower declared "Unity of NATO must rest ultimately on one thing—the enlightened self-interest of each participating nation." What have the great powers done to develop that self-interest? Nothing. Iceland is unable—and for that matter so are the other small powers in the Atlantic coalition—to detect any self-interest attaching to NATO membership. This is a challenge to the NATO Council when it meets in May. A political body corresponding to the military and economic groups must be created as a condition of NATO's very survival. Otherwise Soviet Russia, which, incidentally, is reported recently to have made an advantageous trade deal with Iceland, will simply divide and conquer what we are pleased to call the Atlantic Community.

Memorandum to Congress on H. R. 9065 Providing 15-Percent Increase in Benefits Under the Railroad Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, thousands of active and retired railroad employees and their families are concerned over the future of H. R. 9065 which is now pending before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

The following editorial which appeared in the March 31, 1956, issue of Labor explains in detail why early congressional action is warranted on this important legislation:

MEMO TO CONGRESS ON RAIL PENSION BILL

Members of the House Interstate Commerce Committee have had full opportunity to get the facts about the proposed amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act, as brought out at the committee's recent hearings. Other Members of the House and Senate have been presented with a one-sided picture, painted in daily newspaper editorials stirred up by some high officials of the Treasury Department and Budget Bureau.

Labor believes all Members of Congress, and the public, are entitled to hear both sides. The side not presented in the hostile editorials follows:

First, there is no question that retired railroad workers, their wives, widows, and other dependents, need increases in their pensions and benefits. Members of Congress know that from letters they receive from their constituents. The rail union chiefs are doing their duty in trying to get the needed increases.

Second, now as always, both Congress and the union representatives are trying to keep the railroad retirement fund financially sound, so its income will equal its outgo in the long run. So the needed pension and benefit increases will be matched by an income increase.

That's what the rail unions propose—a 1-percent raise in the retirement tax on the employees and likewise on the employers, lifting the tax on each from 6¼ to 7¼ percent.

Now let's lay the rest of the cards on the table, face up for everyone to see. The amendment bill proposes that railroad retirement taxes shall not be counted as earned wages in computing the Federal income tax. The effect would be to save most of the employes about as much money as they would pay in increased pension tax. The hostile editorials say there's something wrong about that. Well, let's ponder it:

In the first place, a rail worker never sees the money deducted from his pay for retirement taxes. The latter are an unavoidable expense, which he must pay to hold his job and earn a living on the railroads. In that respect, the pension tax is just like other "occupational expenses" and "business expenses" which are deductible on income tax returns.

They are too numerous to list here, except for a couple of examples. Professional men can and do deduct their bar association and medical association dues, thus reducing income taxes paid by lawyers and doctors. Union dues likewise are deductible. That's because such dues are working expenses, just as rail retirement taxes are.

Railroads are allowed to deduct their retirement taxes as a business expense. Why shouldn't the roads' employees be allowed to do the same sort of thing? Here's how it works out now:

Theoretically, the carriers and their employees are supposed to contribute "50–50" to the retirement fund. Actually, every $1 the employees contribute costs them 100 cents. But each $1 from the railroads costs them only 48 cents. They get back the other 52 cents by deducting the dollar from the profits on which they pay the 52 percent corporation income tax.

As a result, the 7¼ percent retirement tax proposed in the amendment bill would cost the carriers only 3.48 percent. The employees would pay their full 7¼ percent, unless they are allowed to offset the tax as proposed in the bill.

Even after such offset, most employees would pay at least 5.8 percent of their 7¼ percent pension tax, or nearly twice the 3.48 percent retirement tax actually paid by the carriers. That's because the offset would save the employees at the most only the 20 percent personal income tax on their contributions, while the carriers save 52 percent corporation income tax.

Also consider this: Railroads and other corporations are allowed to greatly reduce their income taxes by "charging off" in 5 years the cost of plants and equipment which won't actually wear out for as long as 40 years. A railroad worker "wears out" on the job in 40 years or less, but he gets no "charge offs" to reduce his income taxes while he's still able to work.

Both England and Canada allow workers to deduct their retirement system contributions from the wages and salaries on which they pay income taxes. The Treasury, Budget Bureau, and the hostile editorials say it would cost too much to do that here, and they present greatly exaggerated cost figures in an attempt to scare Congress and the public.

Congress should not allow this cost talk to divert its attention from the purpose of the bill—to give retired railroaders and their families badly-needed aid and the kind of

tax treatment they should have had long ago. If a proposal is right and fair, it should be approved, even if it means some loss of revenue. Congress and the Treasury could more than make up the loss by plugging 1 or 2 of the many tax-law loopholes which allow rich men to dodge their share of the burden.

Congressional Investigations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Tablet, of Brooklyn, N. Y., dated March 24, 1956:

CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS

The Tablet believes congressional committees investigating infiltration and subversion have performed a tremendous task for our country. Were it not for the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the Subcommittee on Internal Security, and the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee the Communists would not have been unmasked, nor would their plots have been revealed, but these insidious conspirators would now have it their own way.

That the committees have been effective—even though they have at times only scratched the surface—is clearly proven by recent activities to destroy them, so as to make it possible for security risks, if not traitors, to hold Government posts and to make it easier for subversive propaganda to be carried on. As a matter of fact, as the Tablet pointed out following the organized campaign to destroy Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, there has been a seemingly systematic attempt to make the anti-Communist appear to be the Nation's peril and the Communist or Communist suspect or fellow traveler the champion of liberty. The unfortunate part is that Government officials and agencies—some of them put into office to clean out traitors, borers from within, and poor security risks—have actually been engaged in covering up a bad situation or declaring war on those who seek to safeguard the Nation. We offer the following recent examples of what has been going on:

1. Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks and former Foreign Aid Chief Harold E. Stassen last Friday admitted that the United States had softened East-West trade barriers permitting—and unknown to the Nation—war material to go to Soviet Russia. And this to the detriment of our country. When Mr. Stassen denied war items were being shipped to the Soviet, members of the committee, both Republicans and Democrats, demanded a list of the items sent to the Soviet. The Senators were denied the list; the Government was protecting someone. Secretary Weeks, however, did assert the strategic items sent to the Soviet war machine in a decontrol bill represented a loss rather than a victory for our Nation.

2. Chairman FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, asserted that the National Labor Relations Board, once charged with being honeycombed with Communists, is still threaded by the same anti-American forces. Representative WALTER's investigators subpenaed about 20 NLRB workers to ask them about Red activities in the Government agency. When they appeared they brought from NLRB Chairman Boyd Leedom a letter ordering them not to tell anything to the Members of Congress. The stand, it appeared, was based on an Executive order written by Harry Truman in 1948 and it has still been continued by the administration which was elected to house clean and get rid of the Red and pro-Red saboteurs. Representative WALTER asserted the "most appalling" thing to emerge from the sessions was "the shocking indifference which enabled these people to pursue their objectives within the very Government of the United States."

3. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, under its very competent counsel Robert Morris, is continuing to bring up some startling information.

For instance, one of Mr. Morris' first tasks was to have a look at the Tass News Agency, which operates in this country as freely as any other news agency. Harry Freeman, of the Tass News Agency, said of himself:

"As a correspondent, I have had the opportunity to cover many of the important events of the past quarter of a century, including the San Francisco Conference of 1945, which founded the United Nations, most of the national conventions of the Republican and Democratic Parties, etc. Twice in the past I have been elected to the vice presidency of the Foreign Press Association, and I served for 2 years as a member of the standing committee of United Nations correspondents."

On the subject of his relationship to the Communist Party, Freeman testified: "To simplify the procedure, your honor, on these questions about Communist Party membership, and so on, the answer to Communist Party membership is 'No,' going back to August 1941. My answer to any question prior to that period is to invoke my privileges under the fifth amendment and to decline to answer."

This is only one example of the type of testimony that this committee has been putting into the record.

While these congressional committees have been courageously fighting a battle as important as if they were on the battlefield defending our Nation's cause, the enemy has taken great confidence by the activities of subcommittees, under Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., of Missouri, who have given the impression that the enemy of our country is not the Communist but the anti-Communist and that everything possible should be done to protect persons charged with belonging to the Red conspiracy from being exposed. These two subcommittees receive powerful backing from the Americans for Democratic Action, the Fund for the Republic and the press and radio liberals and pinks whose great apprehension seems to be that the Communists will be unmasked.

We believe the time is opportune for the Government to declare itself. If it is considered un-American to investigate or expose subversives or security risks, let the officials say so and Congress can act. On the other hand, if it is American and patriotic and aids national defense to investigate, inquire into and unmask those who would destroy our country from within, the Government should cooperate with and support congressional committees. It should, moreover, support honest employees like Donald Dozer, Bryton Barron, John Shaughnessy, and many others, including a whole contingent of men who told Senator MCCLELLAN and his committee that they protested against the sending of copper and other war items to the Soviet, as well as NLRB employees who opposed being gagged when they appeared before Congressman WALTER.

A national political campaign will soon commence. The majority of the people are looking with anxious eyes on Government officials, and those endeavoring to unseat them, to see who will best cooperate with, endorse and fight alongside of the congressional committees in exposing the enemy from within that works for the enemy from without.

The Paper Curtain Around the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. FORRESTER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 2, 1956, the Macon News, a daily newspaper published at Macon, Ga., carried an editorial entitled "The Paper Curtain Around the South." That editorial is so completely true that I wish that everyone could have the opportunity of reading it. The editorial is as follows:

Grover Hall, Jr., of the Montgomery Advertiser, is doing for the Deep South what Jack Kilpatrick, of the Richmond News-Leader did for Virginia. Both, solely through the power and fire and brilliance of their editorial pages, are leaders in the fight to show that the South has a case, and a good one, for desiring to maintain segregation.

Southern newspapers edited for southern people by southern editors ought to be inspired and enrolled in this fight against the hypocrisy of the northern press. Unfortunately, however, there are some southern papers which, through absentee ownership, lack of courage, or lack of conviction, act as if the furor over desegregation is beneath comment.

The Montgomery Advertiser has vigorously attacked an old target of ours: the paper curtain through which northern newspapers and magazine editors clearly see the faults of the South, but which prevents them from seeing their own situations. In many instances where both races exist in large numbers, this results in as strict a segregation policy as can be found in Dixie.

"Do as I say, not as I do," these Yankeeland journalists seem to be telling us.

Editor Hall put a staff writer to checking the society editors of a number of non-southern big-city dailies by phone. "Do you publish Negro bridal photos in your society section?" they were asked.

The New York Times ("all the news that's fit to print") had published one in its entire history. The New York Herald Tribune had printed "four or five" in its lifetime. The New York Journal-American, none. These three newspapers are published in an area including more than 1 million Negroes in its population.

Chicago has nearly 700,000 Negroes, but the Chicago Daily Tribune ("world's greatest newspaper") has never used a picture of a Negro bride in its society section. Neither has the Los Angeles Times.

The Washington Post printed a Negro bridal photo once and received so many protests from white readers that no pictures of any brides are used. The society editor of the Detroit Free Press reacted nervously to the Advertiser's inquiry, admitted none had been published recently, asked time to think it over and submit an answer by mail, and then apparently forgot about it.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch society department doesn't use photos of colored brides and always delicately suggests that there are Negro publications in the city which will print them.

There is a large Negro population in each of these cities. Presumably there is Negro

society in each of these communities, and naturally there are brides from among influential and respected Negro families. Yet these papers want to mix the races in the schools and segregate on the society pages where their white readers might object. Most southern papers, on the other hand, make no bones about wanting to keep the races segregated and segregate within their pages by running some Negro bridal pictures in their special colored sections.

Having by enterprise found all this out, Hall, editor of the Advertiser, offered the story to the Associated Press. The Montgomery AP bureau chief questioned the wisdom of filing the story. The Atlanta bureau took a quick look and decided it was not of interest to the public, so the story of northern racial discrimination was not relayed to other papers for publication.

The Associated Press is a cooperative newsgathering venture, jointly owned by all member newspapers. But it is controlled by a board of directors dominated by the big northern papers.

The other big wire service, the United Press, is a private corporation controlled by the Scripps-Howard newspaper chain interests. We have ourselves seen instructions from New York to United Press in Atlanta concerning the handling or substitution of words in racial stories.

This instance of how northern papers give intensive coverage to southern segregation while following a policy of segregation on their own society pages is only one of numerous other similar hypocrisies.

The only way the South can break through the paper curtain which nonsouthern publications have erected around us is to tell the story and to keep telling and keep telling it.

The South is not alone in this fight. There are millions of people in the North and the West who support the South's position, but the paper curtain prevents us from ever hearing much about it.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there is anyone in public life that is not familiar with this paper curtain referred to in the above quoted article. The newspapers have a great responsibility and privilege. I commend the Macon News for this splendid article and I hope that all newspapers in our country will follow its example.

Aspects of the Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, in connection with various farm measures under consideration of the House, it is pertinent to note at this time that the idea of taking cropland out of production in order to limit general agricultural output is not new. It was carried on very extensively in the early days of the New Deal by Secretary Wallace.

In fact, the original AAA program very closely resembled present proposals. It will be recalled that the original program was predicated on the allotment or quota system with limits fixed for the output of each farm to be administered by an Agricultural Adjustment Administration proposing to pay farmers for taking their land out of crop production.

As the law first operated in 1933, the individual wheat grower signed a contract with AAA to decrease his wheat acreage by 15 percent in the first contract and then he received a bounty of 30 cents a bushel on a percentage of his crops. Almost at the same time cotton and tobacco were covered and the rental of the land taken out of production was fixed according to the valuation of the land. Cotton growers, for example, were paid from $7 to $20 an acre depending upon the previous average yield of the land.

The Government hoped to take 10 million acres out of cotton then in the ground and actually that quantity of cotton was plowed under and the potential cotton crop for the year thus reduced by 4 million bales. In 1934 a similar program was inaugurated for corn, tying in a hog-reduction program. The objective was to reduce corn output by 20 to 30 percent and hog output by 25 percent. Corngrowers would receive 30 cents a bushel based on the appraised yield of the corn acreage rented. In that 1934 campaign about 1,150,000 signed by producers taking about 13 million acres of corn out of production and reducing hogs by about 13 million.

When these programs were underway, then came one of the worst droughts in a generation. In addition to the production cuts made by the Government, Mother Nature in her own caprice cut the corn crop until the original reduction program of AAA was actually doubled. The result was the smallest crop in 40 years. Because of the relationship between the corn supply and hog production, the raisers of hogs likewise reduced far beyond the intended figures and cut the number of hogs about 28 million head to about 35 percent of the base for 1932–33 production.

The 1934 curtailment operations in corn and hogs cost the Government over $350 million, the bulk of which went into the Corn Belt States, as presumably the bulk of payments under the proposed 1956 soil-bank measure would go. In those 2 years certain growers were paid $200 million for taking acreage out of production. The second cotton curtailment program started in the beginning of 1934 when 2-year contracts were offered to the farmers. Over a million individual contracts were signed under this program in which the Secretary of Agriculture rented and took out of production some 15 million acres and paid the growers about $115 million for cutting down the cotton acreage. The tobacco crop in 1934 at about the same time was reduced about one-third below production in the base years. Rice followed suit.

In the light of the drought of 1934, however, the following year what acreage not only did not shrink any further, but certain growers increased their sowing in 1935 by 6 million acres. You will recall that the Supreme Court decision in January 1936 declared the AAA program unconstitutional and the Department of Agriculture thereupon revamped its program building it around the voluntary system of conservation of land by which farmers were given direct payments for certain soil-conservation practices. The above figures were taken in the main from an article in Hoard's Dairyman magazine by Mr. A. B. Genung, of the New England Farm Foundation, and I believe that the statements presented are correct in every respect.

I desire to illustrate by presenting this statement that, insofar as Congress is concerned regarding the agricultural program, in one part of it at least, we are right back where we started from in 1933 when cotton was plowed under, little pigs were wastefully slaughtered, and the principle of scarcity was pursued as a national agricultural policy.

I think that all Members of this body are exceedingly anxious to help the farmers of the Nation. I would like to state that I, for one, do not believe that this Nation can long remain prosperous if over one-third of its population on the farms and in related activities are suffering from declining income.

It is certainly unsound and unjust to make the farmer buy in a protected market and sell in an unprotected one. It is unfair to apply price fixing to farm products in an otherwise free economy.

But it is also very unsound to tax the American people billions of dollars to support farm prices at a high parity level and as a result roll up in the warehouses of the Nation unprecedented, huge, and growing surpluses that hang like a black cloud over domestic and foreign markets and thereby serve to defer indefinitely the sound, permanent solution of farm problems that must be found some day, if we are to keep the American economy sound, healthy, and free.

On the other hand, I believe that any program we adopt should follow a line of sanity, soundness, and prudence and should be tied to our American enterprise system of which the American farm is probably about the best example. Let us seek solutions, not be along the lines of mass regimentation and price controls because those are the discredited methods of collectivism rather than the successful practices of free enterprise.

I hope that the Congress will work out a satisfactory program to solve the farm problem in the national interest as well as in the interest of the farmers.

Menominee Indians of Wisconsin Thank Indian Affairs Subcommittee for Considerate Treatment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, a delegation of Menominee Indians from Wisconsin recently visited Washington to testify before the Indian Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in support of H. R. 9280, a bill to provide that the ter-

mination of Federal supervision over the Menominees must be accompanied by the consent of the tribe and by protection for their forest. The following tribute to the Indian Affairs Subcommittee and to its able chairman, the Honorable JAMES A. HALEY, paid by James G. Frechette, of the Menominee Indian Advisory Council, of Keshena, Wis., who was chairman of the delegation to Washington, was published in the Shawano (Wis.) Evening Leader of Saturday, March 31, 1956:

FAITH RESTORED IN UNITED STATES, SAYS FRECHETTE ON DELEGATES RETURN

The following report on the Menominee Indian delegation's trip to Washington is by James G. Frechette, advisory council chairman.

The Menominee tribal delegation is very grateful that the House Indian Affairs subcommittee has favorably reported out H. R. 9280 (Congressman REUSS' bill), the bill to provide for the consent of the tribe and protection for our forests in connection with the termination of Federal supervision.

During our stay in Washington we testified before the committee that the Menominee Indian people had unanimously voted for this bill. The important accomplishment of this action is not realized by many people; hence, so much opposition and criticism had to be overcome by our delegation. There is only one place where the Menominee Indian Tribe will have an opportunity to be heard on the dangers that we now see as a result of Public Law 399, the Federal termination bill, and that is to get the attention of the committees of Congress that have to deal with Indian affairs. The only way you can get this attention is by the introduction of a bill. It was surprising to the delegation to find so many good friends of the Indian people anxious to see that this tribe is fully protected in the future. Not only have we met new friends but the many leaders and telegrams that were sent to Washington supporting our cause was very gratifying. We also had the support of some very fine American organizations; we wish to have them know how grateful we are for their interest in our affairs.

Even though Congressman MELVIN R. LAIRD, of the Seventh Congressional District, did not support the Reuss bill, we are sincerely grateful to him that he supported the cause of the tribe that the Federal Government should pay for the cost of the studies and planning that is necessary under the termination bill. It was through the work of all of us that the Laird bill, H. R. 6218, was allowed to remain as a separate bill. Congressman REUSS, at our suggestion, graciously had the funds part of his bill removed so that Congressman LAIRD's bill would not in any way be affected by the amendments in H. R. 9280.

We still feel there is a great deal of misunderstanding between all the parties involved in this termination move. We are at a loss to know why so much emphasis was placed on the Wisconsin Legislative Study Committee. Although we appreciate their help very much and we wish to continue the good work that has been done to date, the law still reads that the Menominee Indian Tribe must, by December 31, 1957, present a plan or plans to the Secretary of the Interior which has the effect of relieving the Federal Government of all future responsibility to the Menominee Indian Tribe as a tribe of Indians. We still feel that this responsibility must rest with the tribe and the future recommendations must come from the tribe; after all, what is the motivating plan behind the termination bill—isn't Congress trying to prove that the Menominee Tribe of Indians are fully capable of handling their own affairs? Our interpretation of this capability includes the hiring of experts and the seeking of good counsel and advice by people who we believe are in a position to give us such aid. Naturally we place the Wisconsin Legislative Study Committee in this position and above all, we wish to continue the good relationship we established with the University of Wisconsin. These people have been concerned in the light of expert advice and in our estimation this was the outstanding move the tribe made in trying to meet the mandates of Public Law 399.

If Congress will now follow the subcommittee's action the tribe will be in a better position to do the planning necessary to insure the tribe adequate protection for its future economy. We are more confident that we can produce such a plan by December 31, 1957, the date which the committee wrote into the bill as the target date. This would, in turn, give the tribe and the Secretary of the Interior a full year's time to December 31, 1958 to determine whether the plan was feasible or not.

The reception we have received in Washington restores our faith that the United States Government intends to respect our treaty rights and deal fairly with its Indian citizens.

Mr. Speaker, the Shawano Evening Leader is a lively and well-edited daily newspaper serving Shawano County, in which most of the Menominee Reservation is situated. For many years the Evening Leader has given wholehearted support to the Menominee Tribe in its struggle to protect the forest and to safeguard the tribe's future. An editorial comment on the report of the Menominee delegation, published on Tuesday, April 3, 1956, follows:

THE REUSS AMENDMENT

The Menominee Indian delegation has returned from a trip to Washington, D. C., and the Menominee leaders have expressed themselves as pleased with the House subcommittee's report of the Reuss bill.

The Reuss bill provides for the consent of the Menominee Tribe before Federal termination is effected and further provides for the protection of the Indian forests.

This measure must still be approved by the full committee of the House and must pass the House and Senate before it becomes law. Thus the proposal which the Menominee officials are happy with is still not yet a reality.

As Mr. James Frechette, the chairman of the Menominee Advisory Council, has pointed out the law as of now reads that the Menominee Indians must by December 31, 1957, present a plan to the Secretary of the Interior—which has the effect of relieving the United States Government of all responsibility to the Indians.

It is right and proper that responsibility should be placed upon the Menominees to work out a plan by which their assets would be protected. It is, and should be, their job to work out their own future destiny in cooperation with the University of Wisconsin specialists and the members of the State Indian committee.

At the same time, they are entitled to assurance that there will be adequate protection of their property during the process of termination. The recommendations of the Indian subcommittee best assures the tribe of the protection it is entitled to have.

What happens to the Menominee assets ultimately will be the responsibility of the Menominees themselves. But in connection with termination they are entitled to congressional assurance that their property will be protected. Therefore the Congress should not hesitate in enacting the Reuss amendment.

Camp Drum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith an editorial from the Watertown Daily Times, the largest newspaper in my district, having to do with the important question of a permanent status for Camp Drum.

Here is one of the few camps that can train a division, give them winter training, and so far the Army has refused to put it on a permanent status although they have put several down south on that same status. This camp is near the big centers of population in the northeastern part of the United States and a logical place for permanent training.

When I tried to get the Air Force to use Camp Drum in place of spending millions and millions of dollars on a new installation at Plattsburg the Army refused to give up Camp Drum for that purpose and still they only use it for summer training.

If a big corporation ran their investments in big installations the way the Army and Air Force do they would soon go bankrupt. This big expensive installation should be used, and I hope the Members of the House will read this editorial and use their influence toward that end:

CAMP DRUM

Once again the Department of the Army has turned down Camp Drum as a permanent installation. Congressman CLARENCE E. KILBURN was so informed yesterday through a communication from Secretary of the Army Wilber M. Brucker. Congressman KILBURN proposes to continue his efforts to put the camp on a full-time year-round basis. He is justified in continuing this effort because certainly the answer that the Army gave yesterday was inadequate.

The Army talks about reviewing its requirements for permanent installations so as to determine the most efficient and economical utilization of facilities, based upon military requirements and long-range estimates pertaining to the troop strength of the Army. There is an explanation that is an explanation.

It is odd indeed that the generals who have had anything to do with this Camp Drum always emphasize its value as a year-round installation but nevertheless find few who will listen to them in the highest reaches of the Army. Recall the remarks of all the generals who come up to the camp from time to time to inspect it and to plan its future. They all comment the same way, that the camp is important not only in times of peace, but in times of war, that it should be a year-round operation. General Crittenberger, former First Army commander, now retired, said so on several occasions; General Dahlquist, the former commandant of the Army field forces, and his predecessor, Gen. Mark Clark. They, of course, are out of the Army now, having earned, because of their judgment and able service to the country, an honorable retirement. On the other hand, up-and-coming generals like Lt. Gen. Bruce Clarke have counseled often and loudly in behalf of greater Camp Drum utilization. The counsel seems always to fall on deaf ears.

Congressman KILBURN is on strong ground when he continues to present the cause for keeping the camp open. The Department of the Army says no, and it appears that the Congressman has another big assignment ahead of him. That assignment is changing the negative approach of the Army to a positive approach. This whole area stands ready to back the Congressman in any way that it can when he makes his new effort.

Correcting an Injustice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, in the pioneer days of aviation, a courageous Wisconsin man demonstrated that the airplane could be used as an effective weapon in naval warfare. That man was the late Gen. Billy Mitchell. His contribution to the defense of our country has never been officially recognized. The honor is long overdue. The justice of such action is ably expressed in an editorial which appeared recently in the Sheboygan, (Wis.) Press, which I request permission to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The editorial follows:

CORRECTING AN INJUSTICE

Representative CARL VINSON, of Georgia, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, is opposing a resolution to posthumously commission Billy Mitchell as a major general.

His contention is that the resolution would have the general effect of eliminating from the record the verdict of the Army court martial that tried and convicted Mitchell. Vinson believes that it is for history to decide whether Mitchell was right or wrong.

William Mitchell, who died February 19, 1936, was a controversial figure for most of his 56 years. He served in France during World War I as commander of the American Army Air Service and continued to hold that position after the war. He held the rank of brigadier general.

Mitchell became an international figure in 1921, when he demonstrated to the world that planes could sink a battleship. The German battleship *Ostfriesland*, a war prize, was selected as the target of bombs released from planes. As distinguished guests aboard the transport *Henderson* watched in awe, the fledgling American Air Force, led by Mitchell himself, blew the battleship to the bottom of the sea. Mitchell and his supporters said the demonstration proved the battleship was obsolete as then designed. It proved that airplanes were supreme over all ships at sea unless ample air protection was available.

Later the same year Mitchell's planes were permitted to conduct a new demonstration against the battleship *Alabama*, obsolete and retired. The first bomb released by the squadron sank the ship almost immediately.

However, the Navy refused to accept the evidence. There were also differences of opinion in the Army. As a result of his strong advocacy of air over naval power, Mitchell was reduced to the rank of colonel in April 1925 and shunted off to Texas. When the Navy's dirigible, *Shenandoah*, was wrecked that year during a storm over Ohio with the loss of 14 men, Mitchell charged that the high command of both the Army and the Navy were "guilty of incompetency, criminal negligence, and almost treasonable administration of the national defense." The charges led to a court-martial in which Mitchell was found guilty of insubordination. He was sentenced "to be suspended from rank, command, and duty with forfeiture of all pay and allowance for 5 years."

President Coolidge confirmed the verdict and sentence on January 26, 1926. The same day Mitchell resigned from the Army.

There have been repeated efforts since then to correct as far as possible the injustice that was done to Mitchell. The posthumous award of the Congressional Medal of Honor was voted in 1946. The effort now is to restore the rank to which he was entitled as the result of his services to the country by amending the records of the Department of the Army "so as to carry Colonel Mitchell as a major general at the time of his death." The Army has interposed no objections to the resolution.

Our opinion is that history has passed judgment on Billy Mitchell and that this judgment is entirely in his favor. He pointed the way. Had his ideas won prompt acceptance, a great many of the sea losses in the early days of World War II might have been averted. Adoption of the resolution by Congress, we are sure, would reflect the desires of the American people.

Worse Than No Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD for the consideration of every Member who is really interested in solving the farm problem the following editorial which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of April 7:

WORSE THAN NO BILL

Practically everyone admits that the makeshift farm bill which has been hammered together by the Senate-House conferees, isn't much of a bill, and it was no surprise when Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation said: "It is too late for a soil-bank plan to be of any benefit to farmers this year."

Speaking before the Bankers Club of Chicago, Shuman said:

"Even if legislation were adopted within the next week, it still would require at least 60 days to work out the administration details, inform farmers and put the program into operation. This would mean that farmers would have to plow up crops if they wished to participate in the soil bank, and I don't think such a wasteful and destructive plan would set well with the American people."

We don't think so either, Mr. Shuman, and we agree with you when you say: "Farmers will have every justification for holding Congress accountable for any bad farm legislation they might pass now under the guise of the urgency of the situation. * * * The only way Congress can make up for the political juggling that has been carried on at the expense of the farmer and the general public is to stay on the job until it develops a sound farm bill in the long-time interest of agriculture."

What's wrong with the makeshift bill? Here are five cardinal faults, as explained by Secretary Benson:

1. Mandatory 90 percent of parity supports for 6 basic commodities—a program for 6 commodities isn't a program for agriculture.

2. Dual parity for wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts—a double standard which would make a joke of parity, and which would make parity a statistical stairway to the Promised Land.

3. Multiple price plan for wheat—it would hurt the small farmer by cutting his income and would increased the redtape which he abhors.

4. Mandatory price supports for feed grain.

5. A boost in price supports for dairy products.

"Together," said Benson, "these proposals add up to a hodgepodge which would increase surpluses as fast as the soil bank would reduce them. I see no logic in spending a billion dollars to pull down surpluses and spending another billion to pile them higher."

The President is expected to veto the emasculated farm bill, and if he does it may not prove to be the political hazard many experts fear. For there are many farmers like Shuman, who would prefer no farm bill at all to a bad bill—and who would prefer to wait for one that makes sense. This could be possible after the election heat has cooled down.

To Seek a Permanent Cure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Muncie (Ind.) Star of March 27, 1956:

TO SEEK A PERMANENT CURE

Hoosier Senator HOMER CAPEHART has offered to the Senate a farm proposal which may justifiably be called exciting. It is a proposal that Government research in the industrial uses of farm products, long carried out on a limited scale by the Department of Agriculture, be elevated to the status of the major phase of the farm program.

All of American industrial experience suggests that Senator CAPEHART is merely stating a simple truth in saying that the possibilities of expanding the market for farm goods by this means are limitless.

Expansion of the farm market is the only kind of measure which can possibly bring permanent solution of the farm problem. The opposite measure—reduction of supply—has been the objective of the present Federal program since its inception during the New Deal. To date all the effort directed at this objective over more than 20 years has not been able to bring even a single season's respite from the problem. If the program ever were successful in shrinking production to the size of the market, there could be no sense of assurance that the market would not then contract further and bring the problem back.

If on the other hand relief from the problem can be obtained by expanding the market to absorb the existing production, even if production then expanded further, as it undoubtedly would, still there would be every possibility that a continued balance could be maintained by perpetuating the ex-

pansive trend of the market, once established.

We hope Congress will be quick to grasp the potentialities of this proposal.

We question the proposition that the idea should be implemented by creating a new administrative agency and a new section in the Department of Agriculture. To be sure this has been the standard method of launching a project in Washington over the past 25 years or so. But it is not necessarily the best method.

The establishment of new agencies would be dramatic. But it also would be time consuming. Funds and energies for a considerable period at the start of the program would be dissipated in the building of a new segment of bureaucracy. Only when it has firmly laid the groundwork for its own perpetuation and expansion is a new Federal bureau ready to go to work at the task assigned to it.

It might be more effective to put the funds and energy into direct expansion of the existing research program of the Department of Agriculture. Surely sufficient emphasis could be achieved in the passage of the act to give the program initial impetus equivalent to that achieved by the psychology of establishing a new agency.

The basic proposal is a good one. The mechanics are important to the end that energy be applied as soon and as directly as possible to the achievement of the mission, with a minimum of diversion into the fields of new buildings, new plants, and new staffs.

Senator CAPEHART has hold of something.

Do Nothing for Whom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks the following interesting and sound editorial entitled, "Do Nothing for Whom?" appearing in the Boston Post of April 3, 1956:

DO NOTHING FOR WHOM?

Republican strategists are toying with the idea of labeling the 2d session of the 84th Congress a "do-nothing" Congress because the Congress, according to the spokesman, has not enacted legislation requested by President Eisenhower.

GOP planners may have the good sense to think it over before they let themselves in for a severe boxing around from organized groups apart from the Democratic Party who may very well inquire, "Do nothing—for whom?"

President Eisenhower submitted 201 requests to Congress in his several addresses between January 5 and March 19. These include the state of the Union, farm program, school budget, economic report, health, national parks, immigration, and foreign-aid messages.

The Congress is at the moment weighing 25 of this number in the farm bill which is in a conference committee. The President may not like what Congressmen are doing with his requests for farm legislation, but it cannot be claimed they are doing nothing.

The 201 requests submitted, however, include 62 requests submitted to previous sessions of Congress which were turned down and which have now been resubmitted. It is reasonable to say that Congress has acted once on 62 of the requests in previous sessions. There are 56 requests having to do with foreign policy, but the major bill is the one seeking $4,900,000,000 for foreign aid for fiscal 1957, and the requests, 7 in number, surrounding that bill.

There is always the danger of calling attention to the fact that important groups have been slighted in the President's requests for legislation, and that the farmers, who seek immediate relief, would get little of immediate assistance from the President's proposals.

In 1948, when former President Truman assailed the 80th Congress with such success, it was an alliance of labor and farm voters who accounted for the astounding success of Truman's campaign.

The President has only eight requests for labor legislation, one for equal pay for equal work, and the other for Federal regulation of private health and welfare funds, and renews six old requests. Similarly he has only 6 requests for military and veterans' legislation; all but 2 of these renewed requests were turned down previously by Congress.

Only two tax proposals came from the President; 1 to continue existing corporation taxes for a year, and the other to continue existing excise tax rates for a year. The rest of six tax requests are renewals of previously rejected requests, none of which would give the broad base of the taxpayers any tax relief.

In 1948 the Truman do-nothing charges against the 80th Congress specified that nothing had been done for the majority of taxpayers, which is a very different kind of appeal from charging a Congress with doing nothing because it finds nothing politically appealing in a President's program.

Tribute to "Lightning Joe" Collins, Noted Louisiana-Born Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, a great soldier has just retired from the United States Army.

I would have liked to have written something about the retirement of Joseph Lawton Collins who was appointed to the United States Military Academy from my congressional district, but my old colleague, Charles L. Dufour, of the New Orleans States, has written a better piece and expressed much more eloquently what I would have liked to have done.

Instead of an attempt to gild the lily I prefer to submit for the perpetual record the column which Mr. Dufour wrote upon the occasion of General Collins' retirement and to take this opportunity of concurring in Mr. Dufour's observations.

It was my privilege to return to New Orleans with General Collins when he was given a hero's welcome following the end of the World War. At the city-wide banquet which was given in his honor it was also my privilege to present him to his friends and neighbors from the city which sent him to West Point.

Mr. Dufour expresses the sentiments of all Louisianians in this piece on General Collins.

Here it is:

TRIBUTE TO "LIGHTNING JOE" COLLINS, NOTED LOUISIANA-BORN SOLDIER

(By Charles L. Dufour)

After 45 years in the United States Army, Louisiana's most noted soldier since P. G. T. Beauregard has retired.

I speak of Gen. J. Lawton "Lightning Joe" Collins, VII Corps commander in Europe in World War II and later Chief of Staff in Washington.

"Lightning Joe" called on President Eisenhower at the White House yesterday as part of his mustering out and he got from his old chief a warm "good luck to you, boy."

General Collins was one of the great American soldiers of World War II. His first mission after landing at Utah beach was to move across the Cotetin Peninsula and cut it in two to isolate and capture Cherbourg.

On June 26, 20 days after the invasion of France, Cherbourg fell to Joe Collins' troops.

"General Collins had conducted against it a relentless offensive," wrote General Eisenhower in Crusade in Europe, his war memoirs, "and as a result of the operation justified his nickname, 'Lightning Joe.'"

Joe Collins' next contribution came in a holding operation at Mortain, where the Germans poured in heavy tanks and powerful infantry elements to prevent an American breakout from the peninsula.

Several years ago, when Gen. Collins was at Tulane to receive an honorary degree, he spoke briefly at the T-Club breakfast on the similarity of modern war to football.

"In both," he said, "the strategy is to hit the enemy where he does not expect us to strike. And the tactics are similar. The line buck or quick opener in football has its equivalent in battle in the penetration. The envelopment is equivalent to the end run."

And then General Collins cited as an example of blocking in war, the great defensive battle at Mortain in August 1944.

"The Germans, pouring in everything they could to contain us in the Cherbourg Peninsula, counterattacked powerfully at Mortain," said General Collins. "It was the privilege of my corps to be in that great defensive battle and while we blocked, Georgie Patton and his Third Army made an end run into the open for the breakout."

What Ike thought of "Lightning Joe's" blocking, he puts into his book: "Had the German tanks and infantry succeeded in breaking through at Mortain, the predicament of all troops beyond that point would have been serious."

As the Allies swept across France to the German frontier "Lightning Joe's" divisions found themselves before Aachen, one of the gateways into Germany. "The city was stubbornly and fiercely defended," wrote Eisenhower, "but Collins, with his VII Corps, carried out the attack so skillfully that by October 13 he had surrounded the garrison and entered the city."

In the famous Battle of the Bulge, General Collins' men fought with distinction. When the Rhine was reached it was Collins' job to capture Cologne. "The VII Corps," wrote Eisenhower, "was quickly able to begin its southward attack, and from that moment on success attended us everywhere along the front." The VII Corps met heavy resistance at first, but overcame it.

Continued Eisenhower. "It continued a spectacular advance and on March 5 was on the outskirts of Cologne. We had calculated that this city would be stubbornly defended, as Aachen had been. * * * By the afternoon of March 7, Collins had taken over the whole city. Since we had estimated that his corps would be engaged there for a period of days in a heavy seige, the quick capture had the effect of providing us with additional divisions to exploit other victories to the south."

In every operation, General Collins justified the "Lightning Joe" label he had re-

ceived early in the invasion. His VII Corps, as Eisenhower summed it up "had been in the original assault against the Normandy beaches and soon thereafter had captured Cherbourg, had fought all the way across northwest Europe from the coast of France to the river Elbe."

Speed was the hallmark of "Lightning Joe" Collins and he knew how to inspire it in his men. General Eisenhower tells the story of how he got action in bridging the Rhine.

He summoned the corps engineer Col. Mason J. Young, and said: "Young, I believe you can put a bridge across the river in 12 hours. What kind of a prize do you want me to give you for doing it in less time than that?"

"I don't want anything," replied Young, "but if you can promise a couple of cases of champagne to my men we shall certainly try to win them."

"All right," said Collins, "I'll get the champagne if you get me a bridge in less than 12 hours."

In 10 hours and 11 minutes, the 330-yard bridge was completed.

At the start, I said that Joe Collins was Louisiana's greatest soldier since Beauregard. I would like to amend that, I think "Lightning Joe" is Louisiana's greatest soldier.

The ILO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, over a period of some months now the question has been raging as to the advisability of continuing the participation of the United States in the International Labor Organization. This has been spearheaded by Mr. William L. McGrath, an employer representative.

I, having participated in this conference on four different occasions, am very much opposed to such a notion. The International Labor Organization has been a valuable instrument among the nations to raise the standard of employees. A thought often overlooked is that raising the standard of living in underprivileged nations opens up markets for United States goods. Therefore, it is good business.

With your permission, I am including the following editorial from the New York Times of Saturday, April 7, which is an extremely good review dealing with this subject:

IN DEFENSE OF THE ILO

Attacks on the International Labor Organization, spearheaded by the United States Chamber of Commerce, urgently call for a rally in its defense. "One of the oldest and most useful international instruments for the development of a better way of life for all people," President Eisenhower has called it.

The drive to discredit the organization has grown out of the complaints of William L. McGrath, the most recent United States employer delegate. He has charged that the participation of Communist states in the ILO has made a mockery of its tripartite, employer-labor-government character, and has recommended that the United States pull out, or at least refuse to name another employer delegate. However, the chamber and the National Association of Manufacturers have recently nominated Charles H. Smith, Jr., for appointment by the President—but only for 1 year. In the meantime both organizations have called for Executive and congressional investigations of the ILO to find out whether this country should continue as a member.

We see no need for any such inquiry. The ILO's record, open to anyone who takes the time to scan it, supports the President's appraisal and documents the conclusion that the United States should not only continue its membership, but also increase its financial support. To do otherwise would merely strengthen the Communist influence, which is surely just what the chamber is seeking to avoid.

The recent acceptance of the U. S. S. R. as a member of the ILO did, of course, accentuate a weakness in its present structure—a structure designed to give employers and labor together an equal representation with governments in its councils. This aim is deflected when a government is the employer and workers are state employees, as in the U. S. S. R. and other Communist countries today—and that goes also for most Fascist-type dictatorships. In these cases governments get more influence than was originally intended. On the other hand, this situation is not nearly as serious as it may seem to the uninformed.

In the first place, the ILO itself is getting set to deal with this very problem. A special committee has recently made a thorough study of the degree of independence of employers and labor in every member country, to be used in deciding whether representation changes should be made. Also, the Communists have very little influence in the ILO, even as things stand today. The voting strength of the 8 Communist countries on the governing body is only 1 to 39, while in the organization as a whole they have but 32 out of the 284 total votes. The U. S. S. R. has so far failed completely to retard ILO activities directed against Communist practices. What influence it has will obviously be less if the United States continues as a member than if we should withdraw. (Those who want an excellent digest of the facts should write to the United States Department of Labor for its memorandum of February 1, 1956, on United States Participation in the ILO).

Furthermore, we do not share the doubts of the chamber of commerce about the value of the ILO in general. We agree with J. D. Zellerbach, United States employer delegate to the ILO from 1945 to 1948, who recently testified before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, that the ILO "has helped promote our national interests in many useful ways." Among others, he said, "it has encouraged positive programs for alleviating poverty, insecurity, and human exploitation, which are among the principal causes of social upheaval, revolution, and war." As he said, abandonment of our ILO membership would be morally and politicall indefensible.

Ray Willis—A Lovable Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Liberty (Ind.) Herald of March 29, 1956:

RAY WILLIS—A LOVABLE MAN

Raymond Eugene Willis was a lovable man. He was a type seldom seen in American politics. It is doubtful if any man in the State had more friends than Willis.

When he died last week, at the age of 80, his passing left sadness in many hearts, and by no means all of them Republican hearts.

Willis was primarily a newspaperman, even though he left it for the United States Senate in 1941 after his second campaign. He was the Republican nominee in 1938 and was defeated.

But he came back 2 years later to win by the largest majority ever rolled up by a senatorial candidate in the State's history. It was a memory that gave him satisfaction in later life after his own party denied him the nomination for reelection in 1946.

But this treatment never embittered Willis. It must have hurt him, but he never complained. He accepted the verdict and he worked loyally for those who had opposed him.

Willis enjoyed the friendship and confidence of many national figures, including the late Senator Taft and former Speaker of the House JOSEPH W. MARTIN.

He was the kind of a man who inspired confidence, and he always proved himself worthy of it.

For most of his married life his wife was an invalid in a wheelchair. That was something else of which he never complained. He lavished him love and loyalty upon her for more than half a century.

It was typical of his character.

Indiana has had many more colorful figures in politics.

But it never had one more steadfast than Ray Willis.

The Black Market Nickel Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include three letters which I have received from Col. Willard F. Rockwell, chairman of the board of the Rockwell Spring & Axle Co., on the black market nickel situation.

On March 15, 1956, and March 20, 1956, I placed information in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD concerning the black market situation in the use of nickel by American manufacturers. I indicated the hardships that are being caused to many small businessmen particularly in the plating industry when they are forced to buy 64½-cent nickel at prices ranging from $2.50 to $3 per pound.

I am enclosing with my remarks the three letters received from Col. Willard F. Rockwell, chairman of the board of Rockwell Spring & Axle Co. Colonel Rockwell states that:

Inasmuch as our company paid over $750,000 in 1955 directly for the purchase of black market nickel, and we do not furnish more than 7 percent of all the nickel plating required on the 1955 output of 8 million passenger cars, I estimate that over $10 million was spent by the entire automotive industry. It is probable that much more was spent, because one of the "Big Three" bought all

the available Chinese coins in Asia which had a nickel content, and recovered the nickel—which is a very expensive process.

He states further that:

Since the first of the year, the Defense Department has announced that it will attempt to find out how much nickel allocated to military contractors was actually used, which may disclose how much found its way into the black market. We have absolute proof that some steel companies have sold nickel which they received in excess of their requirements for military orders.

More significant is the statement of Colonel Rockwell that:

It is obvious that when big users are allocated only 25 percent of their requirements at the quoted price, but can buy the balance of 75 percent by paying a 300 percent premium, there is no real shortage which could not be alleviated by sufficient release from the Government's stockpile to break the black market.

I agree with this statement that there must be sufficient nickel available if any amount can be obtained on the black market at several times its regular market price. It also becomes more apparent every day that Dr. Flemming, as Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, is the key person to bring relief to the nickel users of this country. He is in the position to determine the adequacy of the stockpile. He also is in the position to see that parties who illegally sell defense-rated nickel, and there have been a number of these, should be properly dealt with. He also has the primary responsibility to see that businesses are kept in good condition and not forced to the wall since they are necessary for mobilization purposes. The Secretary of Commerce shares responsibility in this program since he has a duty to protect business and also to determine that the allocations of nickel are equitably made. The correspondence which I am including in the RECORD indicates that no one is doing a good job in determining the adequacy of allocations nor the uses to which allocated nickel are made. Copies of this correspondence are being referred to both Dr. Flemming and Secretary Weeks for comment.

Mr. Speaker, these matters are of great concern to me. It appears that the situation is merely drifting with responsible agencies sticking their heads in the sand.. Of most concern to me is the statement or inference by responsible businessmen that, "there may not be a defense need for the stockpile program for nickel with most of the world's supply in friendly hands in the Western Hemisphere; that there would be a surplus of nickel if the stockpile program were discontinued and that there must be some reason for the stockpile other than the defense need. Such inferences when analyzed lead to these queries: (a) Who is hurt and who profits by the stockpiling of nickel and an artificial shortage created thereby, and (b) who would profit and who would be hurt if the policy were changed?

The letters follow:

ROCKWELL SPRING & AXLE CO.,
Coraopolis, Pa., March 23, 1956.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCCORMACK: As a native of Boston and an alumnus of Mechanic Arts and Massachusetts Institute of Technology, I was very much pleased to have your letter of March 21 and to know that you are ready to take vigorous action on the nickel situation.

If you will obtain the United States Department of Commerce report: "A Review of Nickel in the United States, 1946–56," dated December 1955, you will find that most of my statistics are confirmed in that official report. On page 3, it states that 235 million pounds of nickel are assured to industry for 1956, including defense requirements of 65 million pounds. On page 5, you find this paragraph:

"The industry also points to the importance of developing markets in the face of a surplus of nickel which will occur when the stockpile is completed. It is necessary to begin now to build markets toward an increased consumption goal. Achievement of this goal is deemed to be in the best interests of both industry and the Government."

I enclose photostat of page 38, which shows the damage being done to the plating industry, its expansion, and its future, by the shortages.

It is obvious that when big users are allocated only 25 percent of their requirements at the quoted price, but can buy the balance of 75 percent by paying a 300-percent premium, there is no real shortage which could not be alleviated by sufficient release from the Government's stockpile to break the black market. The Office of Defense Mobilization announced yesterday that there would be a 300-percent increase in the amount allocated to industry for the second quarter of 1956, compared to the first quarter of 1956.

The enclosed memorandum on the Idaho Maryland Mines Corporation versus the United States may be of interest to you because the Court of Claims has decided that the gold mine owners are entitled to damages as a result of the action of the War Production Board in closing the mines in 1942. The court found that there was no necessity for doing it, and there were no benefits to the war effort. As a result of this decision, it is quite possible that the Government and its overburdened taxpayers will have to pay for the mistake of the War Production Board, and the precedent may encourage other victims of Government edicts to file suits when they can show damages.

I expect to be in Washington on Wednesday and Thursday of the coming week, and shall try to see you at your convenience to express my appreciation of your interest.

Respectfully yours,

WILLARD F. ROCKWELL,
Chairman of the Board.

ROCKWELL SPRING & AXLE CO.,
Coraopolis, Pa., March 23, 1956.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCCORMACK: Replying to your letter of March 21, enclosed please find copy of speech which you requested. On page 27, you will find the correct quotation: "Foreign military experts ridicule this 5-year stockpile, because they say the next all-out war will involve the use of atomic weapons, and if it lasts 30 days there will be no human beings left to carry on."

When I was Assistant to the Secretary of Defense in 1953, I was sent to Europe to attend the NATO conference in Paris on the allocation of munitions orders which were being paid for by the United States Government, and I also inspected munitions plants in Greece, Italy, France, Holland, Norway, and England for the purpose of determining whether they were operated on an economical basis. I visited many defense plants in these countries, accompanied by officers from the Army, Air Force, and Navy.

During my 1953 visit to the Defense Ministry in England, I was asked why our country was attempting to establish 3- to 5-year stockpiles of conventional munitions, military machines, and goods in NATO countries, and accumulating a 5-year stockpile of strategic materials in the United States. I replied that if I knew the official answer, I had not been authorized to give it, and, because of my official standing, it was improper for me to express my private opinion, but I would be pleased to report their opinions of our policies when I returned. The spokesman for the British Defense Ministry then told me that it was their opinion, concurred in by the other NATO nations, that the next war would not last more than 30 to 90 days, because the use of atomic weapons would devastate the earth if continued over a longer period. I have heard our atomic scientists express the same opinion, and I am sure that you have heard similar reports.

Inasmuch as our company paid over $750,000 in 1955 directly for the purchase of black market nickel, and we do not furnish more than 7 percent of all the nickel plating required on the 1955 output of 8 million passenger cars, I estimate that over $10 million was spent by the entire automotive industry. It is probable that much more was spent, because one of the big three bought all the available Chinese coins in Asia which had a nickel content, and recovered the nickel, which is a very expensive process. The alloy steel mill which furnishes our requirements is the fourth largest in the country, and their management tells me that they are buying 75 percent of their requirements in the black market at $2.80 per pound, and the balance at the market price of about 70 cents per pound for nickel alloy material. Our company has spent $70,000 in this first quarter of 1956, over and above the quoted market price of under 90 cents per pound for nickel anodes in carload lots, so the situation is far worse now.

The Big Three are our principal customers, so we had expanding business in 1955, while some nickel-plating competitors who supply bumpers to the small independents had a very great decline in their business, but they received the same amount of nickel anodes in 1955 which they received in 1954. Their supplies were never audited by anyone in either the nickel industry or the Federal Government. Allocations are based now on actual use in the first 6 months of the year 1950.

Since the first of the year, the Defense Department has announced that it will attempt to find out how much nickel allocated to military contractors was actually used, which may disclose how much found its way into the black market. We have absolute proof that some steel companies have sold nickel which they received in excess of their requirements for military orders.

The Secretary of Commerce informed me indirectly that: "When nickel was decontrolled in November 1953 the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization received assurance from industry that an equitable distribution of the nondefense nickel remaining after all defense rated orders were filled would be maintained. To the best of our knowledge and belief this undertaking has been faithfully carried out." We know that the promise to Dr. Flemming was not kept, because no one checked us or our competitors, and if anyone had checked the steel companies, they might have found how many sold excess supplies.

Just this morning, we were offered 100,000 pounds of nickel by a New York house, which refuses to name a price, but asks us what we are willing to pay. There are dozens of black market operators, but, as Dr. Flemming told you, there is no penalty on their operations. Sooner or later, a Government investigation will be started, but for many of the small users, the only result will be a post morten verdict.

As I was a member of the executive committee of the Army and Navy Munitions

Board during World War II, and was Acting Chairman of the Munitions Board in 1953, I know that all military requirement estimates contain at least 100 percent padding as a factor of safety. I know you have received information to this effect through your own strenuous efforts to introduce economy in military operations. There seems to be no doubt that the large supply of nickel in the black market is derived chiefly from excessive amounts allocated to military contractors and subcontractors, which are never audited by anyone.

A letter will follow answering some of your other questions which require more time. I am sure all industry, large and small, will appreciate your efforts to penetrate the mystery of the black market in nickel. I assume that the motorcar companies are not complaining because they have been under Government fire for many months, as you know, for their credit and dealer policies.

Thanking you for your interest, I am,

Respectfully yours,

WILLARD F. ROCKWELL,
Chairman of the Board.

ROCKWELL SPRING & AXLE CO.,
Coraopolis, Pa., April 2, 1956.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Congressman From Massachusetts,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: With your letter of March 21, you included a copy of your letter to Dr. Flemming on January 11, 1956. (Printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD March 15, 1956.)

Assuming that the questions asked in the Flemming letter are based on testimony given to your committee by Dr. Flemming, it appears that your committee has not received current information which is common in the nickel-plating trade.

If Dr. Flemming believes that "probably 96 percent of the nickel consumed in 1955 came from market-price sources," he is very badly mistaken. Our company spent $700,000 above the market price last year, and over $780,000 in the first quarter of this year. We were notified that ODM had arranged to increase the release for civilian use by 50 percent for the second quarter of 1956, compared to the first quarter. We have just been advised that we shall receive 15 percent less nickel in April than in the first quarter, although the Government records indicate that the nickel-plating industry is suffering most from the shortage.

Allocations to industry are based on any 6 months' period from January 1, 1949, to June 30, 1950, and we know that some companies are doing less business now, while some are doing more than they were 6 years ago. We believe gray market nickel comes from the excessive amounts given to companies which are doing less business. We know that much of the black market nickel comes from Government contractors who sell their extra military or AEC allotments in the black market, which is illegal. There is no law against the gray market, but ODM received a promise from the nickel industry in November 1953 (date of United States decontrol) that nickel would be distributed equitably. Dr. Flemming's report that an audit had been made in September 1955 indicates that he talked to producers, and not to consumers. It is strange that anyone making an audit would not ask the biggest consumers in the industry, and it certainly shows a disregard of small business not to find out how the small plating companies have existed. With the present price of $3 per pound in the gray market, it is possible that some consumers make more profit by selling nickel anodes than they could make by normal plating operations.

Our company has been forced by Government edict to give up some of its 90-cent nickel anodes to be replaced by nickel at $1.36 per pound, which represents higher cost Government purchased nickel from mines with poor grade ore. It certainly does not seem fair to ask the nickel-plating industry to carry the entire extra cost of this defense item, and then share all the other extra defense costs through their tax payments.

If the ODM has made a survey report, as they told you, prior to January 11, I cannot understand why they have not asked our company and the big three of the automobile companies where they are getting their nickel, which information would quickly disclose the extent of the gray and black markets.

You asked Dr. Flemming, "What right of appeal is afforded businessmen who feel that the present allocation system is not fair and equitable?" I have appealed to the Department of Commerce, to Senators and Congressmen, and to the nickel producers almost daily for 2 months, and have aroused very little interest in some quarters. The action of your committee resulted in the increased allotment for civilian use, but the International Nickel Co., through its agent, the McGean Chemical Co., immediately notified us of a 15-percent cut in our April quota. I am convinced that our purchasing agents are right when they tell me that every increased Government release has placed more nickel under the control of the gray market profiteers.

Senator CAPEHART told me that your joint committee intended to cross-examine some of the Government officials last Friday, but the adjournment of Congress on Thursday for the Easter vacation made it impossible, and most Government officials were out of reach or out of Washington.

In view of the fact that the gold-mine owners have won a decision in the Court of Claims that they are entitled to damages because their operations were closed down by WPB edict in 1942, we are asking our attorneys to investigate the possibility of a similar suit against Government officials.

We talked to your assistant, Mr. Ward, last Wednesday. He was not only very helpful, but his military experience has made him familiar with the military padded requirements which are probably the principal source of black market nickel.

Thanking you again for your interest, I am,

Respectfully yours,

WILLARD F. ROCKWELL,
Chairman of the Board.

Thoughtless Criticism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, what critics of the Secretary of State fail to comprehend—perhaps because they have not given it sufficient thought—is that the Secretary thinks first and then talks, as is obvious in his recent message to the country, here repeated by columnist David Lawrence in his article appearing in the Washington Evening Star of March 28, 1956. This is a tremendously important statement which should be thoughtfully read by everyone:

CRITICISM OF DULLES APPRAISED—SOME WOULD OVERLOOK THE VALUE OF PERSONAL VISITS TO OTHER NATIONS

(By David Lawrence)

Some Americans occasionally become so provincial that they don't see the forest of world affairs for the trees of political partisanship and pettiness.

At a time when bold, imaginative policies are needed "to win the minds of men"—as the call for international understanding is so often phrased—the criticism now is being advanced by partisans here that Secretary of State Dulles does too much traveling.

Democratic Senators, possibly for lack of any other issue, are foisting on their constituents this kind of criticism. The other day, for example, one Democratic Senator said of Secretary Dulles: "He has spent weeks of precious time doing what others could do just as well on his behalf—indeed, I think better. * * * He belongs at home. He should stop talking and, if it is not out of order, start thinking. Mr. Dulles should cease being a salesman and start being a statesman."

Such talk might be understandable if it came from a Republican isolationist, but when it comes from an internationalist Senator on the Democratic side in a public speech, it causes wonderment, though in a political year anything of a critical nature that belittles the Secretary of State is considered by some politicians to be permissible even it it does tend to weaken and discredit America in the eyes of people abroad.

Mr. Dulles, in his speech last Friday night, gave his answer over the radio to criticisms of this sort, but the Democratic Senator in question made the above-quoted speech the next evening just the same. Mr. Dulles had said:

"I have just returned from a 19-day trip which took me to 10 countries of Asia. It gave me the chance to talk intimately with the leaders of each of these countries. That is a great aid to good international relations. We can, of course, write each other notes. But talking face to face is the best way yet invented for enabling men to understand each other.

"I also took part in the annual meeting, held this year at Tokyo, of the heads of our 14 United States missions in the Far East area. I discussed our policies with them and answered their questions and received their suggestions."

What many Americans do not realize yet is that the airplane has made it possible for a United States Secretray of State to make a trip to 10 countries in Asia and be away from his desk only 19 days. European foreign ministers have always preferred personal contact to note writing, especially since the distances between their capitals are short. But an American Secretary of State traveling around the globe is something new. It pays dividends over and over again in moral values.

For every time a Secretary of State visits another country, the newspapers there give big space to his friendly utterances. It is publicity not usually obtainable for the American viewpoint and reaches millions of people whose friendship is important to the United States in the battle against Communist imperialism. Likewise, when a Secretary of State visits a small nation, it is considered a compliment by the people who are visited.

Why, for instance, did President Eisenhower go to Geneva except to show by his personal attitude that the American people wanted to be known as friendly to the people of Soviet Russia? Why did Bulganin and Khrushchev go to Yugoslavia and India, and now plan to go to Britain? Why is Nehru planning to come to Washington? Why is Mr. Eisenhower thinking about returning the visit of Nehru by going to India?

The answer is that all these missions serve a tactical purpose in the new battle of ideas.

Couldn't ambassadors do the same thing? Hardly—because the prestige of a top man representing his government and his people means more than 100 notes of old-fashioned diplomacy. The ambassadors themselves clamor for such visits and do much to pave the way for the success of these missions.

But what about the Department of State while the Secretary is absent? On important matters he can always be reached by radio telephone, or by cable. On the usual questions of administration, the Department of State has a large staff of executives with specific responsibilities for decisions relating to different areas of the world. This goes on even when the Secretary is at his desk.

The average voter isn't interested in making Mr. Dulles punch a time clock in his office but is anxious for the Secretary of State to do what he can to advance the cause of world peace even if, as President Eisenhower has so often said, it means traveling to the ends of the earth.

AVC Asks Arms for Israel To Meet Communist Bloc

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct to the attention of our colleagues the following statement issued in February 1956 by the American Veterans Committee, concerning the Egyptian-Czech trade agreement. The statement is prefaced by a resolution which the committee adopted in November 1955 in urging that the United States provide Israel with ample arms and military equipment for defense.

WHEN IS AN ARAB STATE A SOVIET SATELLITE?

"The unchanging goals of the United States are world peace and the defense of the free world. In its partnership with non-Communist nations the United States should help strengthen all forces devoted to peace and democratic institutions.

"THE MIDDLE EAST

"The Middle East situation has become explosive again—tensions between Israel and the Arab nations are aggravated by the Communist decision to supply arms to Egypt and other Arab states. Russia's entrance into this area introduces the serious threat that hostile, warring Arab nations will soon have not only arms superiority but external support for aggressive actions. We support the United States desire to effect a security guaranty to both Israel and the Arab States through the United Nations, but until such guaranty is effectuated we urge that the United States provide Israel with ample arms and military equipment for defense." (From the International Affairs Platform. Adopted by the American Veterans Committee, November 1955.)

Over 6 months ago Egypt entered into an arms deal with Red Czechoslovakia. Friendly warnings from the United States and other western nations that Communist arms and trade might lead to Arab political dependence on the Reds, have been characterized by Egyptian spokesmen as "meddling" and "interference." There is, nevertheless, growing evidence that Egypt has moved far down the road that leads to the status of a Soviet satellite. Egypt provides a case history of what can happen when a nation, for whatever motives, seeks Communist aid for the solution of its problems.

Evidence of Cairo's shift in the Kremlin's direction has appeared almost daily in reports published in the government-controlled Egyptian press—most influential in the Arab world—and in radio broadcasts emanating from Cairo. If corroborating evidence is needed, it can be found in responsible American newspapers and magazines such as the New York Times, Time magazine, Newsweek and U. S. News & World Report.

ANTIWESTERN PROPAGANDA

The 6 months since Nasser announced the Czech arms deal have witnessed a rising crescendo of antiwestern propaganda both in Cairo press and radio. In this campaign against the free world, the United States is target No. 1, closely followed by Britain and France, and daily the Arab masses are subjected to heavy doses of antifree world hatred. Conversely, nothing unfriendly is said about the Soviet European bloc and Red China, and the net effect has been to pave the way for deeper Communist ideological penetration. Here is the documented record:

"The United States suddenly is the butt of attacks more vitriolic than at any other time in Egyptian-American relations. Russia, on the other hand, is receiving unprecedented bouquets. The voice-of-the-Arabs radio broadcasts originating in Cairo speak of the Soviet Union as being sincere, honest, and impartial in its attitude during the present arms dispute. Some Arab leaders are drawing contrasts between what they term an understanding Russia and the imperialistic United States." Cairo dispatch, U. S. News & World Report, October 14, 1955.

"CAIRO, December 1.—The United States today is Egypt's official whipping boy. Every day the state-controlled press and radio are lashing out at Uncle Sam. An Egyptian propagandist told me frankly that the people are being conditioned to an anti-American feeling 'in case we decide to turn it on full force.' * * * We are accused of trying to destroy Arab unity, we are subtly ridiculed and our motives are suspect. In news stories and feature articles are planted the seeds of suspicion and hate." (Dispatch by Staff Writer William Longgood to New York World-Telegram and Sun, December 1, 1955.)

"CAIRO, January 14.—A new voice is reaching out to the people of the Middle East and Africa with growing strength and influence. * * * The 'Voice of the Arabs' is rapidly becoming the most influential propaganda medium in this vast area that has so lately sprung into the limelight as a new arena of the struggle between the great powers of the East and West * * *. Its news and political commentary never varies from the policies of the Governments of the sister Arab States of Nasser * * *. But the voice's broadcasts have brought official protests to the Egyptian Government from the State Department in Washington, from the British and French Foreign Offices and more recently even from the Governments of the sister Arab States of Iraq and Jordan. The latest protest came from the newly named Jordanian Government of Premier Samir el-Rifai who complained * * * that the 'Voice of the Arabs' had a strong influence in stirring up the violent anti-West riots that ended only after a military state of emergency had been clamped on the entire country." (Osgood Caruthers, New York Times Cairo correspondent in the New York Times, January 15, 1956.)

CAIRO RADIO SPEAKS

"Justice and logic require that we now defend and not attack Russia, and that we now attack and not defend Britain and America which have shown falsehood, deceit, fallacy, and ill will." (Al Akhbar, daily, quoted by Cairo Radio, October 14, 1955.)

"The United States, O Arabs, does not want to offer aid which is not backed by influence. She does not want to loan funds without interests in some form of colonization. * * * Russia, on her part, seizes the golden opportunity and begins to express support and get closer, and indeed to offer economic aid, financial or technical, without America's excessive demands. * * * Russia is fully ready to offer aid without desiring to buy consciences, freedoms or even homelands. * * * Russia is courteous, helpful and cooperative toward us, while * * * the United States shuns us, lets us down and prevents aid from reaching us." (Cairo, Voice of the Arabs, October 11, 1955.)

[What is democracy?] "There is, for instance, the United States, the stronghold of democracy. It is the capitalists who rule the country while the masses are busy chasing dollars and watching baseball games. Everyone knows the Soviet Union is a democratic state and that its rulers come from the masses. They rule through the Community Party." (Cairo Radio, October 11, 1955.)

PRO-SOVIET SLANT

"It was Khrushchev who announced that the Soviet Union sympathizes with the Arabs. It was Bulganin who attacked the Baghdad Pact and all military alliances, describing them as imperialistic acts in new forms with only aggressive aims. It was the voices of the two leaders which together maintained that this persistent foolish policy of the West constitutes a breach of the Geneva spirit which gave rise to world-wide optimism. It is no wonder therefore that this dual voice finds an appreciative reaction in the hearts of the Arabs and is worthy of being greeted with thanks." (Cairo Radio, December 31, 1955.)

"Communist Chinese Premier Chou En Lai has received a mission of Egyptian newspapermen who are now visiting China. Chou En Lai told the Al Akhbar reporter that he hoped the next Afro-Asian conference would be held in Cairo. The Communist Chinese Premier said he would take that opportunity to visit Egypt. He went on to assure the Egyptian journalist that China supports the Arab states in their efforts to win their independence and integrity." (Cairo radio, December 29, 1955.)

"The United States will continue to aid countries fighting Communist infiltration. It will also endeavor to find a solution to the tragic dispute between the Arab states and Israel, for it is anxious to retain the friendship of both parties—so said President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message. * * * Eisenhower's words sound so hollow now that the Soviet Union has embarked on its 'courageous peace campaign.'" (Lebanese newspaper Al Jaridah, quoted by Cairo radio, January 8, 1956.)

"If Bulganin and Khrushchev were to plan from the Kremlin a policy they would like Britain and America to follow in order to arouse Arab public opinion against them, and make way for Russia alone to win the sympathies of the Arab states * * * could they find a better policy than the current one pursued by the London and Washington Governments? * * * Can the Arabs contemplate this attitude without growing indignant and shunning any scheme designed to humiliate and subject them to the dictates of wanton Zionism in America and Britain? And can the Arabs view with satisfaction, thankfulness, and appreciation the clear and strong declarations of Comrade Khrushchev? * * * Could any man with a particle of dignity or sense of fairness in Egypt and the Arab states as a whole, fail to welcome these statements and thank the person who made them? * * * O statesmen of the Western World, awake from your stupor.

Know that we are neither your slaves nor anyone else's * * * and that we do not consent to kiss the hand which slaps us in the face, tramples our rights and prescribes our blood for our enemies. We give praise to any Eastern or Western statesman who sides with our rights, and condemns aggression against us, whatever the regime and doctrines prevailing in his country may be." (Col. Anwar al-Sadat, Egyptian Minister of State, in an editorial in Al Tahrir magazine, quoted by Cairo radio, January 3, 1956.)

SOVIET ECONOMIC INROADS

While this antifree world, pro-Soviet propaganda barrage conditions the minds of the Arab world, Egypt and her Arab neighbors are being manipulated economically into the Communist bloc.

Between August 1955 and January 1956, hardly a day passed when Cairo radio or Damascus radio did not carry at least one report of trade negotiations between an Arab state and a member of the Soviet bloc.

The fruits of these almost constant discussions were summed up on December 6, 1955, when the New York Herald Tribune reported from Cairo:

"Egyptian trade agreements have been negotiated with all Iron Curtain countries except Bulgaria and Albania."

The pattern of increased Arab trade with the Communist states was clear as far back as October 1955. In its issue of October 14, 1955, U. S. News & World Report reported from Cairo:

"Egypt has been tying up with the Soviet economy at an increasing rate in recent months. Sales of Egyptian cotton to the Soviet bloc have gone up fast, and cotton is just about Egypt's only export. During the last year the Soviet world bought more than twice as much cotton as ever before. Shipments have gone to Russia and Red China, as well as Czechoslovakia. Payment on the China deal was arranged in such a way that Egypt will have to buy products in other Communist countries in order to get full compensation. The same trend shows up in imports. Egypt now buys more than half her oil from Russia and Rumania. She used to get it all outside the Iron Curtain. The Egyptians are relying more and more on Eastern Europe for heavy manufactured goods and machine tools—such things as locomotives from Hungary and steel from Czechoslovakia. Even the wheat that has traditionally been imported from the United States and other Western countries is beginning to come from the Soviet bloc instead. As a result, Cairo is swarming with Communist trade delegations representing countries all the way from China to Poland. Their very presence has served to increase Communist prestige in Egypt over the last several months. The arms deal sent it higher than ever."

Details of successful Arab-Communist trade talks followed hard and fast. In its issue of November 28, 1955, Newsweek reported:

"Following the publicized announcement of Communist arms sales to Egypt (more than 200 MIG jet fighters, 150 heavy tanks, 6 submarines, and 500 artillery pieces). Egypt's Communications Minister Fathy Radwan and Gamala El Din Badewi, managing director of the Egyptian State Railways, returned from a visit to Prague with a Red bid to build a great new railroad network in Egypt. If approved, it would bring hundreds of Communist technicians into the area and make Egypt a communications gateway to Africa."

Cairo radio reported on November 30, 1955, that the Egyptian Permanent Under Secretary for Finance and Economy conferred with a delegation on means to facilitate the importation of iron from Communist China. Two weeks later, on December 14, 1955, Cairo radio reported:

"The agreement to import approximately 60,000 tons of iron from the Chinese Republic, which the Public Services Council had approved, has now been concluded and the iron actually shipped. It is now on its way to Egypt."

The East German Red regime was on the scene, too. On November 10, 1955, Cairo radio reported a 3-year pact:

"Minister of Trade and Industry Dr. Muhammad Abu Nusayr held a press conference November 10 at which he spoke about the trade agreement concluded November 10 between the German Democratic Republic and Egypt. The short-term agreement, he said, was concluded on March 7, 1953. The latest negotiations have resulted in the amending of certain of its articles in Egypt's favor. It has also been decided to raise the credit limit of the government of the German Democratic Republic from 500,000 to 700,000 pounds in order to enable it to increase its purchases from Egypt. The Minister then said that the long-term agreement stipulates that the German Democratic Republic pledges to purchase a minimum of 3 million pounds' worth of Egyptian products with a possible increase to 6 million pounds. The East German Government has promised to do its utmost to achieve the maximum limit. Abu Nusayr added that Egypt is importing complete factories and shipyards from the German Democratic Republic. The Minister concluded by saying that the German Democratic Republic is expected to send some technical experts to offer all kinds of assistance and impart experience to public and private organizations with regard to Egypt's requirements for its industrial and productive projects."

Hungary, meanwhile, has joined with Czechoslovakia in building bridges to span the Nile. The Beirut radio, on October 10, 1955, reported:

"According to a report from Budapest, Hungarian plants are now constructing seven highway bridges for the Nile Delta in Egypt. Each bridge will be 200 meters long and 12 meters wide. The bridges will be delivered late in 1957."

The Hungarians had other things to sell Egypt as part of the overall Red plan for economic penetration of the Arab world. On January 4, 1956, in a survey of Egyptian trade agreements with the Soviet bloc, correspondent Osgood Caruthers reported to the New York Times from Cairo:

"Hungary will send 93 Diesel switch engines to Egypt in return for E£2 million worth of cotton."

AN OVERALL SURVEY

The Caruthers survey also said this:

"The most important development in Egypt's economy in 1955 was the expansion of Egyptian trade commitments with the Soviet bloc.

"This expansion, accompanied by a marked increase in foreign Communist efforts to spread Soviet influence throughout the Middle East, caused deep concern among the western nations that were seeking to seal off the awakening and troubled Arab world from the menace of Red infiltration."

The free western nations had good cause for concern, too. As Issa Korachi reported to the New York Daily News from Egypt on November 1, 1955, Communist competition was pushing out western trade:

"France recently offered the lowest bid for a contract to provide Diesel hydraulic engines, but the sale went to Hungary. * * * An English company got beaten out of a big railway freight car contract when Poland offered to provide them for 27 percent less. * * * The Egyptian Health Ministry recently bought DDT from East Germany, as against an American bid."

A Christian Science Monitor correspondent in Cairo added a footnote to these developments in a dispatch published November 22, 1955:

"Early this year * * * the government saw fit to end the austerity regime and lift travel and import restrictions. * * * A few weeks ago, however, importers from the western countries were warned they could no longer have the foreign currency to buy from the West. If they wanted to do business abroad, they had to do it with Soviet and satellite countries. * * * One reason for this is Egypt's increasing difficulty in selling its cotton to western countries. Another reason is the huge amount of foreign currency being spent abroad, especially in Eastern European countries, for the purchase of heavy arms."

NASSER'S IDEA

Shortly after Premier Nasser announced the arms deal with Czechoslovakia he granted an interview to Time magazine correspondent Keith Wheeler. "It was my own idea," he said of the arms deal. "I had hesitated for 2 months, but at last in June I called for Soloc (Soviet ambassador to Egypt, now Chief of Middle Eastern Affairs in the Soviet Foreign Ministry) and I said, 'Sell us arms.' Really I was surprised when he accepted."

When Time man Wheeler asked Nasser whether he wasn't opening the way to the Russians with his arms purchases the Egyptian Premier replied, "There are not now any Russian or Czech technicians in Egypt." Technically, on this technical problem of technicians Nasser may have been right at the time he spoke.

The Nasser interview with Time was published on November 14, 1955. He may have been technically right about the technicians but one high-ranking United States official didn't think so. Appearing on a television program—College Press Conference, ABC-TV November 6, 1955—United States Assistant Secretary of State George V. Allen said: "There probably will be, and there probably are in Egypt right now, Soviet technicians, or at least, Communist technicians from Czechoslovakia."

RED TECHNICIANS

There was, of course, concrete evidence that some Red technicians were to be admitted to Egypt. In announcing the 3-year pact signed with East Germany November 10, the Egyptian Minister of Trade and Industry had said: "The German Democratic Government is expected to send some technical experts to offer all kinds of assistance and impart experience to public and private organizations."

And of course the Egyptian-Czech trade agreement, concluded several months before the arms deal, carried with it a provision that "The Egyptian Government is ready to facilitate the work of the Czech technical staff in Egypt."

Evidence mounted as time went on, however, that a considerable number of Red bloc technicians were, in fact, on the scene in Egypt. On January 20, 1956, the Associated Press reported from Washington:

"Premier Nasser is said to have admitted into Egypt possibly 150 Soviet bloc technicians to help assemble arms from Czechslovakia.

"Diplomatic sources who reported this today said the number is 5 times the 30 experts Nasser originally estimated would be necessary to help get into operating condition the guns, tanks, jet planes, and other arms.

"The increase is a source of concern to United States officials anxious to hold the growth of Soviet influence in the Middle East to a minimum.

"Egypt made a deal with Red Cezchoslovakia last fall for $80 million worth of military equipment, much of it now delivered."

Regardless of the number of Communist technicians actually in Egypt, it appeared quite early that other things were taking place that made the actual number of technicians on the scene relatively unimportant

RED PROPAGANDA

The U. S. News & World Report dispatch from Cairo, published October 14, also covered those angles. It said:

"The Communist influence isn't noticeable only in trade. Diplomatic missions of Russia and the satellites have all been getting bigger and more active. The Russian Ambassador is in frequent conference with Egyptian leaders. Russia has been given permission to expand its propaganda activities and has just recently taken over a building in downtown Cairo where it displays books and photographs and holds showings of Russian movies."

U. S. News & World Report noted some other developments as well:

"Russia began putting out a daily propaganda bulletin last month. Communist countries have been splurging with elaborate displays and other promotion stunts. East Germany, for example, staged a big fair in Cairo last spring, and spent more on fireworks for the affair than the United States Information Agency spent throughout Egypt in all of last year."

Finally, there was this significant angle:

"There is an increased tendency in Egypt's newspapers to go along with the Soviet line on international policies. Sometimes the papers print propaganda releases from Communist embassies without changing a word. For example, not long ago a Cairo newspaper carried a story extolling Czechoslovakia's 'ever-increasing living standard' and the high quality of its goods. The article bore the headline 'Czechoslovakia Makes the Stuff That Dreams Are Made of.' The whole thing came straight from a press release issued by the Czech Legation."

CONCLUSION

The disturbing evidence presented here clearly indicates that Egypt's kind of military and economic involvement with communism leads down the road to the fateful status of a Soviet satellite. Whatever Egypt's historic quarrel with Great Britain and the West, Egypt's freedom and destiny as well as the freedom and peace of the world can only suffer by cynical deals with Russia.

The United States as a partner in the free world alliance must make it clear to Egypt and the Middle East that we will respect and aid legitimate democratic aspiration of Egypt and the countries of the Middle East. We cannot, however, be blackmailed by dangerous games with Russia. We need to supply dynamic leadership which can help toward an equitable solution to the Israeli-Arab tensions.

The free world should offer positive and constructive action and should not under the guise of realism substitute debilitating appeasement.

United States Dollars Back UNESCO Currency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I suspect few Americans are aware that the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization has its own international currency, apparently backed largely by United States dollars. An informative article on this subject appeared in the February 24, 1956, issue of "U. S. A., An American Bulletin of Fact and Opinion." The article, by Alice Widener, is as follows:

Few bankers, international financiers or Members of Congress ever heard of UNESCO Coupons. Yet the coupons are largely backed by United States dollars and the New York Times has described UNESCO Coupons as "a new medium of exchange." The Times also has described the coupons as "international money which is proving its versatility around the world."

For people who have never seen this new and versatile UNESCO money, the Times furnished the description: [1]

"The coupons actually look like and are the size of old United States bills. They are printed in French and English, and come in demoninations of 25 cents, $1, $3, $10, $30, and $100. But instead of some Government redeeming the bill, 'UNESCO promises to pay an authorized supplier, subject to agreed rules and conditions, the equivalent in the currency of his country ——— dollars of the United States of America, at the official rate of exchange.' "

THE FIRST DEAL

Historicaly, the first transaction in UNESCO's dollar-backed money involved a Scotsman's purchase via UNESCO's London branch of a $2.50 book published in the United States. The New York Times reported that the deal went like this:

"The Scotsman who carefully wrote a check received from UNESCO's London branch a coupon covering the cost of the book plus postage. He mailed this coupon to the American Booksellers Association which handles the book-coupon program for UNESCO in this country. The A. B. A. passed the order on to the publisher who promptly mailed on the book—and the transaction as far as the buyer was concerned was closed. No currency had to be converted and no money was mailed riskily. Behind the scenes UNESCO redeemed the coupons with hard, green dollars."

FOUND IN THE MORGUE

Careful study of the foregoing prompts any reader to ask: Why behind the scenes? A well-informed reader, who is an outstanding business economist formerly with the United States Treasury, asked: "What does a coupon do that an ordinary check on UNESCO wouldn't do?"

To try to answer these and other pertinent questions, this writer took a look at the UNESCO Coupon record after having noticed in a Socialist magazine, December 1955, that "UNESCO Coupons are available for the purchase of machinery and chemicals."

The affair started, it seems, in 1948 with a "book coupon plan" devised by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) as a means of providing scholars and libraries with books from foreign lands. News about the plan was carried under "Education" in the press. And though the book plan was quickly expanded to take in films, international travel and 12 categories of scientific material (possibly including data, instruments and materials relating to atomic energy), a close study of 10 years' press clippings on UNESCO in the morgue of a great New York City newspaper shows that news about the coupons is still carried under "Education."

Perhaps that is why extremely few clippings even mention the scientific materials. For example, the Times Magazine article of January 7, 1951, states: "UNESCO currently takes the form of coupons for book or film purchases, though now they are being used for other goods."

They certainly are.

According to Mrs. Elizabeth Meechan of the UNESCO office at U. N. headquarters in New York City, "more than two-thirds of all coupons issued have been used for the purchase of scientific materials."

RAPID RATE OF GROWTH

As has already been stated, the coupon plan was initiated in 1948 with a $2.50 book transaction. On January 28, 1951, the New York Herald Tribune reported that the UNESCO coupon scheme "has caught fire" and continued: "The book coupon scheme of UNESCO, designed to overcome foreign exchange controls, has become a $1 million business in 2 years."

By January 1, 1955, the coupon plan had become a $6,500,000 affair. Of course, in our times this is generally regarded as a piddling sum. But the rapid growth in UNESCO coupon use is not piddling. If it should continue at the same rate, or at an increased rate, UNESCO coupons—limited only by the number of dollars which can be acquired by UNESCO—could become an important and possibly disturbing factor in international exchange. The coupons are not handled by banks.

THE INVENTOR

The author of the UNESCO coupon scheme is Dr. Jacob Zuckerman, an Israeli citizen who was born in Germany in 1908. After Hitler took over in Germany, Dr. Zuckerman went to Belgium and worked as branch manager in a bank until the invasion of Belgium by the Germans in 1940. In December of that year, Dr. Zuckerman became Chief of Foreign Press Section at the British Embassy in Lisbon, Portugal.

In 1945, Dr. Zuckerman worked for the United States Embassy in Lisbon with the International Control Committee as documents analyst. In December 1945, he went to work for the Library of Congress in Germany where, according to Dr. Luther Evans (then Librarian of Congress, now Director General of UNESCO in Paris), Dr. Zuckerman did an excellent job.

Late in 1946, Dr. Zuckerman joined UNESCO in the Division of Libraries. There he created the book-coupon plan, then a gift-coupon plan (now operating mainly through American schools, church, and labor organizations) and a travel-coupon plan.

At present, Dr. Zuckerman heads the Division of Voluntary International Assistance at UNESCO House in Paris and he has a permanent contract with UNESCO at $9,800 yearly. But, according to Dr. Evans, Dr. Zuckerman has recently applied for a finance job with the U. N. headquarters in New York City. While UNESCO has approved Dr. Zuckerman's change of job, the organization will be very sorry to see Dr. Zuckerman go for he has always been in good standing and was one of UNESCO's best executives.

Apparently, Dr. Zuckerman is as versatile as his internationally versatile new currency.

FINANCIAL INTRICACIES

It would seem that a finance job at U. N. headquarters is a most logical position for Dr. Zuckerman to fill. In the future there are bound to be extremely intricate international financial problems involved in the UNESCO coupon scheme.

For example, the Soviet Union is now a member of UNESCO, and though the Soviets are not yet a part of the UNESCO coupon group, according to the UNESCO office at U. N. headquarters "we hope they will come in shortly."

If the Soviets do take part in the UNESCO coupon plan, will they put up 4 rubles to the dollar for book, film, and travel coupons and for coupon purchase of scientific machinery, instruments, and chemicals in the United States?

As a matter of fact, 90 percent of the coupons purchased are to buy American goods.

---

[1] Learning's Currency by Herbert Mitgang, New York Times Magazine, January 7, 1951.

In reply to an inquiry by this writer, Mrs. Meechan said: "America is benefiting by this extra source of purchasing power made possible because soft currency countries are able to purchase coupons."

But how are American taxpayers benefiting from subsidy of soft currencies at an artificial rate of official exchange with United States dollars?

SECRET U. N. MEMORANDUM

Perhaps Dr. Zuckerman will be able to answer this question and other inquiries in his new finance job at the U. N. headquarters. There the Department of Economic Affairs has long been intensely interested in international currency or scrip schemes such as Dr. Zuckerman has devised.

For example, on August 11, 1951, memorandum 2 marked "For internal circulation only" was distributed to insiders working in the International Financial and Commercial Relations Section. This restricted memorandum "was prepared to serve as background material for the work of experts nominated under ECOSOC [U. N. Economic and Social Council] resolution 290 (XI), paragraph 19." This dealt with commodity controls and trade.

Memorandum 2 begins with explanation that it "is concerned with a number of suggestions aiming at regulating economic conditions by sweeping schemes involving either the stabilization of prices of primary products or the introduction of a new kind of currency for use in transactions between countries."

Of "special consideration" in the memorandum are two international currency schemes conceived in the early forties: that proposed by Lord Keynes of the United Kingdom; and that proposed under the title "International Stabilization Fund" by the United States. The restricted memorandum 2 tactfully refrains from mentioning the fact that this United States plan was drawn by Harry Dexter White.

The authors of Memorandum 2–F. Hilgerdt and C. M. Wright—state that the application of international currency schemes "would depend on a 'new deal' in all matters relating to commercial and exchange policy." They declare that the introduction of a new currency unit or a special type of script to serve as a buffer between national currencies is a technicality which in itself would not bring about a change in the factors which stand in the way of multilateral settlement.

NO UNESCO LOYALTY TO UNITED STATES

Whether or not UNESCO coupons are used merely as a technicality in bringing about a U. N. "new deal" in all matters relating to commercial and exchange policy, it seems clear that there are many technicalities in ordinary commercial transactions that can be avoided by coupon deals, especially the travel and scientific materials deals.

When the existence of these UNESCO deals was brought to the attention of an official in the United States Immigration Bureau, he said:

"This brings up very serious problems. It enables nationals to evade their own laws concerning currency. It enables travelers to evade many phases of scrutiny.

"UNESCO's attitude toward loyalty to the United States is well known. This presents a very complicated problem, especially with government representatives from countries which might not otherwise be able to get dollars."

Yes, indeed. UNESCO's attitude toward loyalty to our sovereign government is well known. On October 17, 1954, the American press carried the front page U. N. news that Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge had publicly criticized Dr. Luther Evans, American Director of UNESCO, for his attitude on loyalty cases involving United States nationals, and for his refusal to dismiss from the UNESCO Secretariat in Paris "United States nationals about whom there is reasonable doubt as to their loyalty to the United States." Later, UNESCO officially decided that an American citizen's possible disloyalty to the United States does not affect that citizen's integrity as a UNESCO employee.

UNESCO's basic attitude toward Americans' loyalty to the United States and toward the cold war in general is intimately concerned with the UNESCO coupon plan, for it is entirely under the control of UNESCO in Paris.

Because more than two-thirds of these coupons are for scientific materials, and because UNESCO has since its inception shown keenest interest in the development of atomic energy. Americans believing that loyalty to their country is, indeed, a part of their personal integrity should read an article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune, March 31, 1946, by John J. O'Neill, science editor and Pulitzer prize winner. Mr. O'Neill wrote:

"The U. N. Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization is about as vicious a piece of legislation as could be conceived. * * * Professing to support democratic principles the proposal is instead entirely dictatorial. * * *

"The United States representatives at the London conference comprised 7 official delegates and 23 others. Here the constitution of the UNESCO was framed. Among our official delegates * * * was just one scientist, Harlow Shapley. * * * Harlow Shapley did not represent science. He represented just Harlow Shapley and nobody and nothing else in the field of science. No scientific organization chose him as representative. The choosing was done entirely from the political field."

It would be interesting to know who did this political choosing. For in the handbook, The Communist Party of the United States of America, issued by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, December 1955, Harlow Shapley is listed on page 94 as one "of the most active and typical sponsors" of Communist fronts.

In 1946, John J. O'Neill, science editor of the Herald Tribune, reached the conclusion that UNESCO is in its entirety a political organization.

UNESCO'S PARISIAN DICTATORSHIP

Today, this political UNESCO entity exerts dictatorial control over a new medium of exchange or an international currency—UNESCO coupons.

On January 10, 1956, this writer telephoned to Mrs. Elizabeth Meechan at the UNESCO office, U. N. Headquarters, and asked how the coupon system is supervised and controlled.

Very courteously, Mrs. Meechan said: "The distribution of coupons is supervised by the UNESCO Executive Board and by UNESCO Council."

In rely to a question about what amount of coupons can be used to buy a single article, Mrs. Meechan answered: "$2,000—except in some cases—then exceptions are made up to $25,000."

This writer asked: "Who determines the exceptions?"

Mrs. Meechan replied: "It is solely determined by UNESCO's Executive Board in Paris."

"Who determines the priority of one country's bid for a certain piece of machinery over another's—say, for instance, Russia versus Italy?"

"UNESCO, Paris," said Mrs. Meechan, "is the sole judge of whom to give priority."

"This has great potentialities, hasn't it?"

"Yes," Mrs. Meechan said. "Great potentialities."

Though potentialities for dictatorial distribution and control of UNESCO coupons are indeed almost limitless (depending mostly on the number of hard, green United States dollars available) the official booklet UNESCO Coupons for Scientific Material discreetly states in a final sentence on the last page:

"N. B.—The price limit set for each article obtainable with UNESCO coupons is $1,500. Provision has, however, been made for UNESCO to waive this rule in certain cases."

The official booklet lists 3 American export firms that deal in all 12 categories of scientific materials. One of these firms issued an advertising pamphlet which states that the company "provides a single, convenient source of new and improved laboratory instruments and apparatus which have been recently designed to keep pace with the latest advancements in science."

NEEDED: AN INQUIRY

It seems that the dictatorial control of UNESCO over the printing, issuance, and value of the coupons, and also UNESCO's discretionary power to waive rules in various transactions, suggests need for a public and also a congressional inquiry into the matter. In making such an inquiry, persons seeking the facts might bear in mind that in the introduction to Export Controls Regulations of the Bureau of Foreign Commerce in the Department of Commerce there are listed seven exceptions governing the granting of export licenses, exceptions No. 3 and No. 5 relegate control over export of atomic-energy materials and technical data relating thereto to the Department of State and to the Atomic Energy Commission.

Moreover, in any investigation of UNESCO coupon transactions it might be well to bear in mind that in the Soviet Union and its satellites—including Yugoslavia, which is a member of the UNESCO coupon group—both education and industry are entirely controlled by the state.

The director of international sales in a great American corporation studied the UNESCO coupon literature and said: "It would seem that the flexible limits of the amounts of the coupons are governed by the directors of UNESCO on the basis of the merits of each case, rather than on the basis of published information for which anyone may qualify simply by following instructions. Making UNESCO's policies and all its transactions a matter of public information would go a long way in answering the many questions which are raised in the matter."

A former economist for the American Bankers Association asked: "Why the coupon? What does the coupon accomplish that a direct financial transaction with a check on UNESCO could not? Why have UNESCO coupons circulating throughout the money channels of the world?"

A professor of economics said: "The UNESCO coupon scheme enables foreign countries to get in international trade the same value on their soft money which they arbitrarily and artificially set as its value for internal use."

The basic questions asked by all experts whom this writer consulted are:

What are the controls over UNESCO printing, issuance, and value of the coupons?

Who are the controllers?

Is the purchaser identified?

Does the UNESCO coupon scheme enable purchasers to avoid the normal checks on ordinary commercial transactions?

Since UNESCO coupons are redeemable in hard, green United States dollars behind the scenes at U. N. headquarters, and since the United States is a supporter of UNESCO, it would seem that American taxpayers and Congress should know all there is to know about UNESCO's new international currency.

Address by the Honorable Robert Murphy, Deputy Under Secretary of State, Convention Breakfast of the New York Province of the Newman Clubs, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, February 12, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include an interesting address delivered on February 12, 1956, at the convention breakfast of the New York Province of the Newman Clubs held at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City by the Honorable Robert Murphy, Deputy Under Secretary of State:

Mr. Chairman, the New York Province of the Newman Clubs has greatly honored me by inviting me to take part in your convention dedicated to the theme "For a Better World."

This is a goal to which we all aspire. We can find guidance in our search for a better world in the life of Cardinal Newman himself and from the principles to which your clubs are devoted. Newman's Apologia and The Idea of a University remain classics today and were fitting inspiration for Timothy Harrington when he called his fellow students together to found a Newman club at the University of Pennsylvania.

John Henry Newman is a symbol of those who struggled for and attained happiness based on faith and spiritual understanding. His life was devoted to service of our faith and to increasing human understanding. We of the 20th century would do well to approach the difficult problems of our world in the spirit of calm and detached contemplation Cardinal Newman achieved.

Although he lived in what now seems a simple age, Newman's life span covered a period of great ferment and change. In the 19th century, industrialization was gathering momentum in Western Europe and the United States. New economic and social theories were challenging and testing the existing order. The concerns of the times were concerns about material things. It was said that men should have more goods; that goods should be more equitably distributed; that society should be reorganized to provide the maximum material benefits, to provide the greatest good for the greatest number.

Most of the economic and social ideas of the 19th century were idealistically conceived. They were intended to solve the problems created by new political institutions, by growing populations, and by the industrial revolution. The 20th century, however, has seen some of these schemes and theories used in practical life, and used in such a way as to destroy whatever may have been good, and to bring to dominance the error and evil they contain.

The materialist creed of Karl Marx, with its negation of faith and spirituality, its worship of the state alone, has become the enforced gospel of nearly a billion people, almost half the population of the world. Its economic dogmas have been adapted by Lenin, Stalin, and their successors to political and imperialist programs designed to promote Soviet communism into every part of the world. While this is an ideological purpose of vast significance it serves handily as a cover, and an effective cover, for good old-fashioned Russian expansionism.

These doctrines have strong appeal for many peoples, who are striving to improve their conditions and their standards of living. These peoples are often reluctant to believe that Communist intentions are predatory, that economic gain under the Marxist system will inevitably be at the expense of political liberty and spiritual freedom.

International communism is well armed for the struggle to which it is so fully committed. Its military forces include the two largest land armies in the world. It possesses substantial air power, and a growing stock of nuclear weapons. A huge percentage of the budgets and the resources of the U. S. S. R., of Red China, and of course the eastern European satellites are devoted to "national defense, armament, and internal security." Vast quantities of manpower are allocated to these purposes. As you know these millions of men and women have little or no choice when it comes to military service or in fact any labor for the State. Political and economic control is maintained by power in the hands of a few at the top and by tight organization in the ranks. By denying the needs of its own and subject peoples, the Soviet Union can set aside goods and equipment for export where it foresees political gain. Thus it can focus its resources on a given world area if it sees in that region a possibility of political gain. In the same way it can export technical assistance. And to the war of ideas it devotes vast resources which it can mobilize without much regard for public opinion. It has mastered the art of making the worse appear the better cause, of making the undemocratic sound democratic, of cloaking aggressive aims with peaceful words.

To meet this threat, a threat to the security of nations in addition to our own, the United States cooperates in an immense effort by the free nations to build their common strength. As a great power we have special responsibilities whether we welcome them or not. We have formed a system of alliances not only for mutual defense but for economic and social cooperation. We are doing much to drive home the story of what the free nations stand for and what international communism means.

Our strength is great, and we intend to remain strong. We intend to remain economically strong, militarily strong, and in particular morally strong. We must maintain faith and confidence in the values for which the United States stands. As Secretary Dulles has said: "The Government of the United States has, I like to believe, a rather unique tradition in this respect. Our Nation was founded on an experiment in human liberty. Our institutions reflect the belief of our founders that all men were endowed by their creator with inalienable rights and had duties prescribed by moral law. They believed that human institutions ought primarily to help men develop their God-given possibilities, and that our Nation, by its conduct and example, could help men everywhere to find the way to a better and more abundant life."

We share the tradition of a respect for human liberty and moral law with a number of the Nations with which we are now in close alliance. We must build upon these traditions and concepts if we are to build a better world. We must teach the new nations emerging in Asia and Africa the importance of these ideals. We must show them they can and must be adapted to their own conditions. We must teach by example that a society without moral value and without principles is doomed to fail, no matter how hard it struggles to build up economic and military power.

Not long ago Archbishop O'Boyle of Washington delivered a thoughtful and stimulating sermon on the conflict we face. "When mercy is considered treason," he said, "when truth is classed as a lie, and good is called evil, we are indeed faced with a monstrous perversion of human nature, a denial of every ideal that civilized man has cherished."

The archbishop accurately noted that communism appeals not only to the disgruntled, the bitter, and the neurotic members of a community, but also to men of sensitive nature and high ideals. He declared that there is danger we may look at the world struggle too narrowly, that we may concentrate too much on the economic, military and political menace of communism, and so neglect the battle for men's minds. "The American people should speak out," he concluded, "through their proper organizations and representatives, on the real nature of communism. We should realize that the struggle is total, and not merely a matter for Government action only." This is where I think you members of the national newman clubs have a major role to play. Why not mobilize your talents and your great abilities to spread an affirmative doctrine of the things for which your Government stands.

The United States is today making a tremendous effort to win the battle for men's minds. Our Government has a worldwide information program which is doing an effective job in many areas. Many nongovernmental groups are also doing excellent work in meeting foreign peoples and explaining our way of life. Missionaries, labor leaders, businessmen and thousands of other Americans are a vital part of our effort here and abroad to increase international understanding.

In the battle for men's minds, we (and I believe this applies especially to you club members) should make a particular effort to reach those men whose thoughts and ideas will be decisive in guiding the policies of the new nations in Asia and Africa. As Archbishop O'Boyle said: "In wide areas of the world, men of learning are the real leaders of their nations. This is particularly true in the nations newly freed from colonial status. It is in these very areas that the power of communism is growing with sobering speed."

Sometimes Americans have trouble understanding the attitude of the people of new nations. Usually these young nations want to solve their own problems their own way. They distrust foreign help and advice. They have an intense desire for rapid economic development. They know little about the Soviet Union but they are told its achievements are vast. Efforts are being made to persuade them that the pattern of Soviet industrial development has more meaning for them than the freer, more humane process by which the institutions of the United States and Western Europe were developed.

The tours of Bulganin and Khrushchev to India, Burma, and Afghanistan are efforts by the Soviet Union in the new direction. We would be foolish to deny that the new Soviet policy presents us with dangers and a challenge. Where formerly the Iron Curtain implacably shut off the Soviet Union and its satellites from the rest of the world, we now see "traveling salesmen," with broad smiles and back slapping, offering tempting bargains to the uncommitted nations. There are offers of economic and military aid, proposals for treaties of friendship, requests to set up diplomatic posts, and plans for interchange of experts in many fields.

It is ironic and typical, however, that at the same moment they speak of peace and friendship in India, Burma, and Afghanistan, the Soviets and their Communist allies continue their nuclear tests, their threats of war to take Taiwan, and their warnings of reprisal upon Iran and Pakistan for participation in the Western defense system.

In a sense the Soviets have put a new wrinkle in their traditional policy of zigzag. They have found it possible to zig and

zag at the same time. They continue to show plainly, for anyone who cares to look, that aggression is still their end, to be pursued by peaceful talk or warlike threats, or both—whatever suits the need of the moment.

By their own deeds they warn us again that we cannot delay our vigilance, we cannot lower our guard.

I have spoken to you already of the means, military, political, and economic, by which we must keep ourselves and our allies prepared to defend themselves. But the willingness and the ability to undertake our defense, while essential for avoiding war, is neither the only means nor the best means, in the long run, for preserving peace. We believe in a forward strategy not only in the military sense but in the political and social sense. As President Eisenhower put it earlier this year, "The sum of our international effort should be this: the waging of peace, with as much resourcefulness, with as great a sense of dedication and urgency a we have ever mustered in defense of our country in time of war."

One of the highest tests, I think, of the greatness of a nation is the test in times like these whether we can be strong enough to win a war, yet gentle enough to help the weak; resourceful enough to gain great wealth, but wise enough to use it well.

Moral leadership is a great asset in any struggle. It is especially important in the present world battle for the minds of men and women everywhere. The responsibility for moral leadership in our country certainly rests upon our Government, but not upon Government alone. It is also the direct responsibility of our churches and schools, of youth organizations such as the Boy Scouts, the 4-H Clubs, and especially of all these Newman Clubs of which we are justly proud. These agencies, civic and religious, must maintain the spiritual vigor and moral strength of the people who run our Government, who man our fighting forces, who carry on our dealings with other lands, who cast the votes that decide the course our Nation follows.

I am certain that your organization is doing a great deal, but you can do more. I have had close contact over the years with many young men and women who have been trained by our Catholic colleges and universities, and shaped under the guidance of the Newman Clubs and other groups. Most of them measure up admirably to the challenges they face.

But none of us must forget that the evil forces that oppose are tireless in their self-criticism, in their manipulation of Government programs, educational institutions and youth programs. Their brutal efficiency is high, and in all realism, we can expect it to go higher.

The moral superiority that our values, our system, have over those of the Soviets can and should be decisive in this contest between us. But it is not inevitable. Our values must be applied. Our system must be made to work. We must match their tirelessness with our own, their efficiency with ours, if our moral superiority is to be decisive.

In my lifetime I have seen a number of people become converts to our church. I am convinced that in most of the cases the conversion came not so much from words, however eloquent, but from deeds—from an example someone set in living a good life—from a creed that was lived. In the same way, as we seek to win the allegiance of the uncommitted nations to our standards and our values, we must do it by our deeds as much as by our words.

These nations will watch us, first, to seek how we apply our values among our own people. Our record in this respect is good, though certainly not perfect. The opening of the channels of opportunity, the emphasis on free choice and private initiative in the past few years has brought prosperity for nearly all Americans. In addition, progress has been made through legislative and judicial efforts to bring about greater social justice among our people.

Not only are we being watched in applying our values to our own people; we are being watched in applying them to other peoples. Here, again, we do not need to apologize for our efforts. In the past 10 years a number of nations have won their freedom from colonial control. It has been our policy to respect this new freedom. By our economic strength and in many ways we have helped it to survive and to grow.

It has also been our policy to support the further attainment of freedom by subject peoples who desire it. In particular we support the liberation by peaceful means of the peoples of Eastern Europe, who have been unwillingly made subjects of the new colonialism of the Communists.

Another means by which we have given moral leadership is through our efforts to bring about disarmament. The whole world was thrilled by President Eisenhower's proposal of Atoms for Peace in 1954, and again by his proposal for aerial inspection to insure disarmament in 1955.

The final means by which the United States has rendered moral leadership in the world is the courage, the determination, the high principle, the good faith with which President Eisenhower, Secretary Dulles, and the leaders of our Government, with the full backing and support of the American people, have faced the perils and the opportunities of this age in which we live.

Your convention is dedicated to the theme "for a better world." In these remarks I have tried to outline for you, perhaps inadequately, some of the obstacles that lie in the road to a better world, and more important some of the means by which we will surmount these obstacles. You who are on the threshold of your careers will play, I know, a major role in achieving our national objectives.

To all of you I wish godspeed and good luck as you go forward with your own efforts to bring this better world into being.

To Socialism by Way of Tax-Exempt Foundations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, thinking that a speech which I made before the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, at Columbus, Ohio, might be of interest to the Members, I am inserting it in the RECORD:

TO SOCIALISM BY WAY OF TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

(By Hon. CARROLL REECE, of Tennessee)

I

In this era in which we live, the old-fashioned virtues grow increasingly unpopular.

Liberal economists tell us that our Government (instead of cutting our suits to fit our cloth) should tax us to the limit of toleranoe and then borrow more from us in order to shower us with paternal blessings.

Instead of being taught independence, energy, and enterprise, our youth today is taught to look for security.

The man who believes in individualism, freedom, and self-reliance is ridiculed as antediluvian.

We approach closer and closer to socialism.

Most of those who urge us in this direction suffer the illusion that we can stop at a sort of extended New Deal.

But their British counterparts know better.

They see, and rely upon, the paternal state as a necessary transition—a stage between free enterprise and socialism.

Being evolutionary Socialists, they wish to reach their goal through the democratic process, and this requires the paternal state as a preparation for that goal.

They are confident, once this intermediate stage has been reached, that full socialism will follow inevitably.

But these British collectivists suffer under their own illusion, in turn. They refer to their ideal society as one based on production for use and not for profit. This slogan, also dear to the hearts of so many of our own radical educators, is pure nonsense.

One who works for his own profit is likely to work hard. One who works for the use of others, without profit to himself, is likely not to work any harder than he must.

And so this state which the British Socialists and our liberals envision, in which production will be higher and cheaper, can come into being only under the compulsion of communism or some other form of Socialist dictatorship—if it can come, at all, under any Socialist state.

II

This, then, is the illusion of British socialism, so much respected and aped by our own radicals, that they can stop at the point of democratic socialism.

Communists smile at this, knowing full well that the road to socialism is the road to collectivist dictatorship.

In this process they have materially weakened our people's patriotism. Flag waving is still with us, but patriotism in its deeper significance is fading—sadly fading.

An article in the United States News recently disclosed that fully one-third of the American prisoners of war succumbed to brainwashing without torture.

They were so weak in their patriotism, our schools had given them so little understanding of American principles, that they offered little or no resistance to the blandishments and seduction of Chinese Communist interrogators and propagandists.

Maj. Wm. E. Mayer, an Army psychiatrist, who made the study of brainwashing among 1,000 of our soldiers captured in Korea said he found even many soldiers had lost respect for patriotism. He said:

"I think a great many people feel that references to patriotism and love of country are somewhat embarrassing, unsophisticated, or foolish flag waving. I think this is to a very considerable degree the result both of well-meaning liberals, so-called, as well as others whose intentions are clearly destructive, to create the attitude that we should abandon love of country and patriotic ideals, as being identical with this evil thing called nationalism."

Where is the ruggedness which used to be so characteristic of Americans?

I attach rather clear meaning to terms such as "Americanism" and "the American way."

But to use terms such as these is to bring down a torrent of ridicule from the liberal press, writers, and commentators who dominate communications in the United States. These expressions are "corny" and "horse and buggy."

Behind this is a definite disparagement of patriotism.

Patriotism springs from nationalism, and nationalism has become a vice, not a virtue.

As the National Education Association has so often told our teachers and students, na-

tionalism is an obstacle in the way of achievement of the one world state without which, they say, we cannot have peace.

We are eventually to be merged into an international society—distinctly socialistic in its nature—an international Eden. And nationalism, they say, stands in the way of bringing us to it.

III

The president of the Fund for the Republic, Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, eloquently says:

"The Fund for the Republic is a sort of fund for the American dream. I do not think the fund can make the American dream came true, but perhaps it can help keep it alive and clear."

The American dream that is now occupying the attention of the foundation-financed intellectual cartel promotes the idea of government by an elite.

Robert Hutchins and the other members of this self-appointed professional intellectual aristocracy dream of an America governed by social scientists, guided by their benign infallibility under a system which frees the people from the responsibilities of freedom.

This is again illustrated by Mr. Pendleton Herring, of the Social Science Research Council, who wrote in 1947 concerning this matter:

"One of the greatest needs in the social sciences is for the development of skilled practitioners who can use social data for the cure of social ills as doctors use scientific data to cure bodily ills."

The degree to which this elite even penetrated the Federal Government is indicated by the 1947 report of the President's Commission on Higher Education.

I would like to give you a few significant extracts from that report:

"It will take social science and social engineering to solve the problems of human relations."

"Our people must learn to respect the need for special knowledge and technical training in this field (of social science) as they have come to defer to the expert in physics, chemistry, medicine and the other sciences."

I would like to say that by no valid definition can sociology and economics identify themselves as true science.

Seven years before this report was issued, one of the members of the President's Commission on Higher Education, Horace M. Kallen, wrote a magazine article entitled "Can We Be Saved by Indoctrination?"

I would like to quote two short paragraphs from that article:

"I find within the babble of plans and plots against the evils of our time one only which does not merely repeat the past; this is the proposal that the country's pedagogues shall undertake to establish themselves as the country's savoirs."

After some elaboration, Dr. Kallen concludes, "Having taken power, the teachers must use it to attain the 'central purpose' of realizing the American dream. They must operate education as the instrument of social regeneration. This consists of inculcating right doctrine."

Change the word "American" to "Fabian" and you are pretty close to the truth.

Another phase of this American dream might be found in another document for professional pedagogues entitled, "Molders of the American Mind," by Professor Norman Woelfel.

Here is one of his admonitions: "The younger generation is on its own, and the last thing that would interest modern youth is the salvaging of the Christian tradition. The environmental controls which technologists have achieved and the operations by means of which workers earn their livelihood need no aid or sanction from God nor any blessing from the church."

And he adds this final touch: "In the minds of the men who think experimentally, America is conceived as having a destiny which bursts the all too obvious limitations of Christian religious sanctions and of capitalistic profit economy."

All this has behind it the figure of Karl Marx, in one way or another. And this is just the kind of a thing being emphasized by the foundation in the field of social sciences.

There is a theory that the growth of Socialist influence in this country was accelerated by numbers of American professors who studied abroad at the end of the last century and came back to us full of new theories—intriguing, materialistic and social welfare philosophies, rooted in variations of Marxism, and depending upon a strong centralized government.

Whether this be the answer or no, there is no doubt that academicians had much to do with the suborning of public opinion through Marxism. In the long run, much public opinion is made in the universities; ideas generated there filter down through the teaching profession and the students into the general public.

As the egalitarianism of Marxism is attractive to many, socialism could have attracted many followers in America, anyway.

But there is no doubt that it could not possibly have affected us so widely and so deeply as it has, had it not been heavily financed.

This financing was supplied by several of the great fortunes built up by American industrialists under our capitalistic system.

This most certainly was not intended by such men as Andrew Carnegie and John D. Rockefeller, nor more recently by Henry Ford.

They would truly writhe in their graves if they could know that the foundations which they created have become the principal treasury of the radical movement in their country.

IV

It is difficult for the public to comprehend that this could be possible. The boards of these foundations have always contained many men who could not possibly have lent themselves consciously to an undermining of the free enterprise system. Indeed they did not. They just knew not what they did.

It happened, it began to happen, when these trustees, against sage advice, no longer confined themselves to the direct support of educational institutions, or religion, medicine, public health and science. It is difficult to put to propaganda or political use a grant to a college endowment or for medical research.

But when these foundations launched themselves into what are called the social sciences they made themselves vulnerable to a form of seduction and subversion against which they could not defend themselves.

When they entered the areas of man's relation to man—as the social sciences are so attractively described, they opened the door to political propaganda.

It is not hard to understand why these trustees went along usually without protest.

A great captain of industry is very likely to have just as high an IQ as a professor.

But when the industrialist sits on the board of a foundation which deals with areas which are both highly technical and extremely vague, he is not equipped to make informed decisions.

It is almost inevitable that he bow to the superior understanding of the academic adviser, just as he would to his doctor or lawyer.

Insofar as projects in the politically sensitive social sciences area are concerned, therefore, the decisions of the great foundations have been chiefly the decisions of academic advisers.

And the sad fact is that these advisers have come overwhelmingly from those who have been politically slanted to the left—and many of them far to the left.

One reason for this has been small grants are naturally unattractive to large foundations with large sums of money to dispense. A mass research project is something substantial—something to use up the money.

Yet mass research is rarely attractive to the conservative professor who needs support for individual research but does not want to run a large staff of computing machine operators and poll takers.

V

The liberal leftist educators, however, have become increasingly interested in the purely, or almost purely, empirical methods of research.

They have thought that they could translate some of the research methods of pure science into use in the social sciences.

It has been one of the outstanding fallacies of this large and terrifically influential group that human relationship problems could be solved mechanically and mathematically by what they call fact finding.

They have so often ignored or failed to take into account important and highly mutable factors such as love, patriotism, loyalties, motivations, and individual characteristics which are utterly incapable of measurement and quite beyond the application of a scientific approach.

Jealous, perhaps, of the true scientist in medicine, physics, etc., these men who have pompously and arbitrarily called themselves scientists, have concluded, and pronounced, that they are the only sound technicians. They have made themselves into a self-appointed elite. They call themselves social engineers.

Operating on a grand scale, they ponder mass symptoms and ignore individual diagnosis.

Armed with their punch cards and electronic brains they consider themselves far more competent to lead us into better pastures than the old-fashioned practitioners who permit themselves to be circumscribed by the known limitations of social science.

"This country was not built by an elite and it is inconceivable that it should ever be run by one," as President Jones, of Rutgers, says.

They have become messianic. And they have succeeded materially in their efforts, over the years, to influence our people.

Their approach has been what Professor Colegrove has called pathological.

They are always looking at what may be wrong with us, not for the purpose of improving what we have that is good and making it better, but for the purpose of supplanting it with something else.

These are the extreme followers of the cultural lag theory which assumes that our technological progress requires a new set of ethical values governing man's relation to man, and they are the advisers best equipped to furnish them.

So, in a period when informed men deplore our tragic lack of engineers and technicians, and the extent to which we are falling behind Russia in technological development, they have persuaded the great foundations to spend more on mass research in the social sciences.

The present shortage of engineers, physicists, and chemists is largely attributable to inadequate teaching of mathematics and the physical sciences in the secondary schools.

Young children have been encouraged to take social study courses rather than to accept the discipline of an exact physical science based on rigorous mathematical principles.

Teachers, too, have been encouraged to escape these disciplines, as they can readily major in a so-called social science, supported by a foundation grant, while they are preparing themselves to teach.

It is no wonder that it is becoming more and more difficult for industry or for Government to recruit from our schools the kind of people who can maintain our position in this age of science and technology.

The biggest foundation of all, the Ford Foundation, excluded itself wholly from such areas as science and medical research. The Rockefeller Foundation, last year, gave hundreds of thousands of dollars to a program of empirical research training in the social sciences. And so it goes.

VI

The same academicians to whom I refer, those who now so deeply influence the great foundations, have little respect for tradition and principle.

They are, almost all of them, followers of the theory of moral relativity, that there are no absolutes, whether religious, moral or civil.

What the facts disclose, is right.

They say: If the Rockefeller-financed Kinsey studies disclose that a large percentage of young girls have active sex-experience before marriage, we should change our laws and morals to permit this; if so many people have a touch of sex abnormality in their souls as indicated by Dr. Kinsey, laws against sex deviation should no longer be tolerated; in the economic field, if research indicates, that the Federal Government can do something more efficiently than can the States, the Federal Government should take it over, regardless of what our Constitution may say about the separation of legislative powers.

This discussion, this description, may give you the beginning of an idea of the type of mind of the intellectual whose opinions have directed the great foundations in the social sciences.

But they have not worked alone. There has come into being a new class of men, almost a guild—the professional administrators of foundations.

Selected largely under the advice of "liberal" intellectuals, they have come into practical operating control of these foundations.

These men, in turn, are overwhelmingly of a leftist political position. You would have to look hard to find a conservative among them.

All of them whom I have met, are pleasant, personable and attractive men who give the impression of complete sincerity (which is usually correct) and of complete objectivity (which is not).

There has been a further aid to the process by which socialism has been fed by the foundations. Just as these administrators have helped the leftwing intellectuals, intermediary organizations have been created to help the administrators—to serve as their advisers and retail distributors of their social science funds.

Typical of these organizations are the Social Research Council and the American Council of Education.

Nor must we forget the nefarious Institute of Pacific Relations, which the Carnegie Corp., the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the Rockefeller Foundation used to retail their funds to an aggregate of millions of dollars.

The IPR was Communist dominated and was more responsible than any other factor for the debacle which turned China over to the Communists.

The damage done by the foundations through the IPR cannot be estimated. It may have changed the whole course of history.

Intermediary organizations such as these have also come into the control of those consciously and actively to the left politically.

VII

And although the trustees of the great foundations think they run their foundations, except in the broadest sense, they do not.

Operating in areas substantially beyond their understanding (except in the most peripheral way) they rely on their leftist academic advisers, their leftlist professional employees and their leftist-controlled intermediary organizations, to make the decisions which are the most vital part of their trust function.

There is an occasional revolt such as that which, I suppose, occurred when the Ford Foundation made its magnificent grants last year to operating institutions, for which the people should be deeply grateful.

But even the Ford Foundation has not given up its major interest in leftist research in the social sciences nor its basic operating principle of permitting its experts, rather than its trustees, to determine the methods of operation.

I believe it might be safe to say that, in fields such as economics, sociology, and other social-science areas in which political slant can have a deep effect, the major foundations, both directly and through the use of intermediary organizations, have supported leftist thinking and leftist-slanted research and publication in the United States in the proportion of 10 to 1, compared with the support of the conservative or traditional. The proportion may even be very substantially greater.

Occasionable mistakes would be forgivable. But it is difficult to forgive mistakes in such volume. Moreover, mistakes can often be corrected.

And it is one of the most striking features of major foundation history in the United States that no substantial effort has ever been made to correct mistakes.

Let me give a few illustrations of what I mean, out of so many which could be recited.

VIII

There are some foundations which, like the League for Industrial Democracy, have been frank in their advocacy of socialism.

That foundation, originally the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, did not abandon its ardent propaganda for socialism after it changed its name.

This organization is avowedly socialistic and has openly operated as an educational arm of the Socialist Party.

Before the rapprochement between Hitler and Stalin in 1939, when the Socialist and Communist Parties in the United States worked to establish a popular front, many known Communists were assisted in placing their messages before the American people through the tax exemptions granted to the League for Industrial Democracy.

The League for Industrial Democracy is only one of many of the smaller tax-exempt foundations which have come into the control of those cautiously and actively engaged in subversion.

Although we think of foundations in terms of the great foundations such as Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller foundations, there are literally hundreds of smaller tax-exempt organizations which devote almost their entire income to the political area, like the League for Industrial Democracy.

IX

But some of the major foundations have been more subtle than LID and the IPR in their support of leftism.

Perhaps the most vicious and fateful product of foundation financing in our history was the Conclusions of the Commission on the Social Studies of the American Historical Association, published in 1934.

It became a bible of radical educators in our country, and its effects have been cumulatively with us. It has done us inestimable damage. It was financed to the tune of $340,000 by the Carnegie Corp.

Prof. Harold J. Laski, the philosopher of British socialism, said of this report:

"At bottom, and stripped of its carefully neutral phrases, the report is an educational program for a Socialist America."

And Harold Laski knew socialism when he saw it.

The report was, in fact, an utterly frank call to the teachers of America to use the schools for the purpose of indoctrinating our youth into an acceptance of socialism, which it called by the equivalent but softer name of "collectivism."

This monumental report was produced, not by a cross section of American academic opinion, but by a group overwhelmingly radical in its views, a group itself devoted to socialization. Read it, some day, and you will be shocked.

It should shock you more to understand that, after publication of this report, the president of the Carnegie Foundation, which had financed it, made a public statement in which he said that, although he, personally, did not agree with all of the report, he felt the American people should give a vote of thanks to its authors.

You might have thought that, having spent $340,000 to finance an advocacy of socialism in the schools, this great foundation might have supported a counterbalancing project—a study on the defense of capitalism by professors of contrary opinion so that the American people and the American educators could have the benefit of both sides of the argument, at least. Nothing like this was done.

The report was published and widely disseminated and today it stands as an educational charter in the United States.

Almost equally shocking and dangerous is the Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences which is regarded as the "bible" or the social sciences. It was sponsored with foundation money.

It is not only heavily slanted to the left but it slanders the free-enterprise system.

It would appear to be clearly designed to promote socialism among teachers and students.

The keyman in its preparation, Alvin Johnson, admitted he had two assistant editors who "asserted they were Socialists" and he said he was "informed" another was a Communist.

X

Do not think that these incidents stand alone.

American foundations contributed some $4 million to the London School of Economics and Political Science, for so many years the operating base of the late Harold J. Laski, and the fountainhead of Fabian socialism.

Devotion to the principle of academic freedom has been a tradition of the American Republic since its establishment. But I think that history has demonstrated that the London School of Economics and Political Science was at once something more and less than an institution of higher learning.

In the years immediately before World War II, it was communism's most respectable and effective forward base in the Western World.

The Carnegie Corp. selected Gunnar Myrdal, a Scandinavian Socialist, to do a major study on the race problem in our South.

Carnegie's Myrdal reported in his An American Dilemma that our Constitution "is in many respects impractical and ill-suited for modern conditions" and that its adoption was "merely a plot against the common people."

He also stated that Americans have "a relatively low degree of respect for law and order."

And he bemoans the "anarchistic tendency in America's legal culture."

Even before his Carnegie grant, Myrdal was a Rockefeller fellow at the School of International Studies in Geneva.

This is another example of the incredible fact that the fortunes piled up by industrial giants are being used today to discredit our system of enterprise of free labor and free management that gave them birth.

Our form of government, of course, does not appeal to this European Socialist, im-

ported by the Carnegie Foundation to teach us better ways of living.

Another Carnegie unit financed a book called Business as a System of Power, written by Prof. Robert A. Brady, who likened our Messrs. Knudsen, Stettinius, and Bernard Baruch to Hermann Goering, described our business system as a form of feudalism, and opined that "war is necessary for capitalist survival."

Professor Lynd, in his introduction to this important foundation-supported book, stated that "capitalist economic power constitutes a direct, continuous, and fundamental threat to the whole structure of democratic authority everywhere and always."

Another Carnegie-financed item is the Proper Study of Mankind, a book which was designed under the auspices of the Social Science Research Council, the major intermediary organization supported by the great foundations. This influential book, which sold 50,000 copies, was written by Stuart Chase, who has advocated collectivism by name.

XI

Mr. Chase was the selected apologist for many of the theses which those who operate the foundation combine favor, theses which push research and academic opinion to the left.

Among them is the cultural-lag theory, to which I have referred, that we must change our ways of living and even our social concepts because of our advancing civilization.

It may sound reasonable, that theory, but it is actually a medium for questioning our moral standards and our fundamental governmental and social precepts—an ideal way for those who are collectivist minded to undermine our beliefs and faiths.

The Rockefeller Foundation has been frank in its support of this dangerous cultural lag theory.

The Ford Foundation gave a million to the Friends Service Committee, which, in turn, sponsored the World Youth Congress, a Communist front, and sent a delegate to the World Youth Festival in Prague in 1947, an admittedly Communist affair. It also advocated Red China's admission to the United Nations.

Alfred Sloan Foundation financed public-affairs pamphlets, some of which were the next thing to Communist leaflets. They were sold in Communist bookstores but were also distributed to libraries and frequently used in high schools.

The evidence is plain that the leftist movement in this country has penetrated the foundation world as consciously and intentionally as did the Communists.

It was incontrovertibly established that the American Communists were directed by Moscow to infiltrate American foundations and to use their funds to promote communism in the United Staes.

We know that they succeeded to some extent, but we may never know the full extent, as their methods are devious. Two well-known foundations had their tax-exempt status lifted by the Treasury because of Communist subversion. And I understand the Fund for the Republic is now under investigation.

But in the case of the infiltration of collectivists or socialists into the foundations, we know a great deal about it. They have virtually taken over the operating phases of the major foundations, and through them or in conjunction with them have taken over a vast part of the direction of thought and teaching in our educational system.

We have called this use of the foundations for the promotion of socialism by the name "subversion."

For this our enemies have bitterly criticized us.

The Socialist in the United States prefers to have the term "subversion" confined to Communist penetration.

But the term "subversion" denotes an undermining, a chipping away. In this sense the promotion of socialism is clearly subversive of our institutions.

Moreover, it is my opinion, and I am far from alone, that subversion through socialism offers us a far greater internal danger than the threat of communism.

There is no doubt that socialism and communism go hand in hand. The Socialist may hate the Communist, but the Communist loves the Socialist.

The Communist knows that if the Socialist is able to get the upper hand and to destroy a capitalistic system, the Communist can quickly take over.

There is much misconception about the relationship of socialism and communism.

They are the same and identical thing except for one single difference—the Communist believes in establishing the Socialist order by force, while the Socialist is generally content to achieve it through subversive methods—by perverting a democracy.

I wish I had time to give you case after case of socialist propaganda financed by the Carnegie Corp., the Rockefeller Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and others, each without repudiation afterward, each without any effort being made to counteract the impact of what had appeared.

XII

As I intimated previously, one can perhaps exonerate the trustees who did not understand what was being done with the money they allocated to such projects—exonerate them for having been uninformed; yes.

But one cannot exonerate them for having abdicated their trust functions by relying upon professional employees and advisers and intermediary organizations to do their thinking for them.

Nor can one forgive them for either not having studied the products of their negligence or else having failed to repudiate or counter the evil which reading must have disclosed.

We must congratulate Mr. Henry Ford II for having finally had the courage to repudiate (in somewhat gentler language than one might have hoped for) the irresponsible and dangerous antics of the Fund for the Republic.

But does this belated and qualified disavowal excuse Mr. Ford and his fellow trustees of the Ford Foundation for having created this Fund for the Republic and placed $15 million in the administrative hands of Mr. Paul Hoffman and Dr. Hutchins knowing from their own experience with them, that they could use it for purposes conforming to their own radical political predilections?

I do not say that foundations should avoid the social sciences. They need support, just as do the true sciences, medicine, public health, the humanities, etc.

But I do say that the social sciences form a dangerous area for foundation activity unless they are approached with the greatest objectivity and realism.

There are perhaps dangers even in direct grants to institutions, such as universities, when these themselves are to select the areas of research and its administrators.

But there are natural protections within most such institutions.

The dangers are limited by its traditions, its academic organizations, its inter-conflicting opinion, and other factors which keep such an institution reasonably on the track of objectivity.

It might be better if foundations which wish to support social science research did so solely through undirected and unselected grants to universities and colleges.

But if they, with the help of their intermediary organizations, decide to design and control such research themselves, they must do so in conformance with their duty to the public to whose service they are, and by law must be, dedicated.

This dedication requires objectivity, which in itself is not easy. There are many excuses for avoiding this responsibility.

XIII

For example, professional foundation managers frequently talk about the desirability of using foundation funds as risk capital, in ventures where the chances of success are too remote to attract normal financing.

This is an intriguing concept, and has great validity when you are talking about medical research, and other basically non-controversial areas.

If, however, risks are to be taken with the form of our society, or with the form of our Government, or with public opinion in fields which affect our morals, ethics, and political theory, then I, for one, do not believe this to be a proper use of public trust funds.

When funds as huge and powerful as those of the Ford Foundation can be focused upon the proliferation of unscientific science, the risks to society are so great that I do not believe we can tolerate such risk-taking.

My time is too short to give you more. I must close with a plea to you and other like you to become alert to what has happened in the foundation world—and what is currently happening.

I close, as well, with a plea to the trustees of the great foundations themselves to give closer attention to their own organizations.

As matters now stand, the tremendous amount of good performed by these foundations is being jeopardized by their delinquencies.

It is possible pressure for legislative control of foundations may increase. I would deplore it if such legislation became necessary.

There is an easier cure, one which would permit these huge organizations to continue independently. They have done so much for the benefit of humanity and should be allowed to continue.

In your field of medicine, for instance, so many great accomplishments have been foundation financed.

But the great aggregate of good they have done cannot excuse the evil for which they have been responsible; and the day may come when society is unwilling to permit them full freedom unless they reform from within.

That is what I hope for, that their trustees will come to understand that they must restore these foundations to the full respect which careful management would entitle them, and to the very useful place in our society which foundations should occupy.

Such reform from within would entail jettisoning, once and for all, the political influences to which they have been subjected. It would demand a general housecleaning, both as to their academic advisers, their professional staffs, and the intermediary organizations which they support financially and use as retailers.

A foundation, by its very public character, must be wholly objective and wholly free from any political influence.

This is particularly true, obviously enough, when the political forces which seek to influence it are those which are seeking to propel us toward a state which they see as ideal but which must inevitably pitch us into slavery of socialism.

Our People of the Hebrew Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include

the following excellent editorial from the Chelsea Record, Chelsea, Mass., commemorating the Feast of the Passover.

Our own security and the prevention of Communist expansion is dependent upon a peaceful solution of Middle Eastern tension.

The dangers to Israel and the free world resulting from the Egyptian purchase of arms from Czechoslovakia, called for decisive action by our Government to end the threat of war in the Near East through the promotion of an honorable peace settlement between the parties.

Our American people will not permit the sacrifice of Israel to Communist infiltration of the Near East:

HAPPY PASSOVER

With much pomp and ceremony our citizens of Hebrew faith have been celebrating the feast of Passover during this week and will continue to observe the holiday part of next week. It is a holiday which commemorates Israel's liberation from Egyptian bondage more than 3,000 years ago.

The Jews are a people whose history has been filled with sorrow and sadness, but they have a few occasions of joyous celebration and the Passover holiday is just such a festival.

Family gatherings have been held everywhere, and the beautiful seder services generally held on the first and second nights of the holiday and presided over by the head of the family, and participated in by every member, including the children, was one of the highlights of the occasion. It is at this time that the full story of the observance of the feast is recounted and dramatized by the reading of the Hagadah, a book which narrates the story of the exodus and relates all the accompanying miracles, as well as psalms, prayers, and expressions of thanksgiving.

Today the Israelis are again being threatened, and the Egyptians again appear to be their main enemy. Those who read and understand the Hagadah are beginning to realize that the book, written a good many years ago, is not far-fetched and not a fairytale. It becomes more meaningful to the Jewish people as the years progress.

Not only the Jew but every liberty-loving people are now well aware that liberty must be defended, if not actively fought for in each generation, almost everywhere in the world.

It is the earnest desire and sincere wish of this newspaper that the Jewish people as well as the non-Jew will eventually settle their differences in an amicable manner.

Hon. Walter A. Gordon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, the University of California recently named the Honorable Walter A. Gordon, Governor of the Virgin Islands, as Alumnus of the Year for 1955. This recognition is another indication of the outstanding service Governor Gordon has rendered.

I join in paying tribute to this fine Californian and American whose work as chairman of the California Adult Authority and now as Governor of the Virgin Islands is bringing so much credit to our country.

I wish to include in the RECORD at this point, several articles from the California Monthly concerning Governor Gordon:

ALUMNUS OF THE YEAR: WALTER A. GORDON

A new name was added to a distinguished roster of Californians on March 23 when Walter A. Gordon 1918 was named the University of California Alumnus of the Year for 1955.

Gordon, who last summer was appointed by President Dwight Eisenhower to the Governorship of the Virgin Islands, has had a long and truly distinguished career as football star, Berkeley police officer, attorney, football coach and scout, and nationally known penologist. As chairman of the California Adult Authority, which grants parole and fixes terms of imprisonment, he pioneered developments which have contributed significantly to California's excellent reputation for its correctional institutions. He was with the Adult Authority 11 years before resigning to accept the Virgin Islands appointment.

During his student days, Gordon not only won honors as California's first All-American football player as a lineman on Andy Smith's teams of 1916–18, but also excelled in boxing and wrestling. Following graduation, he joined the Berkeley police force and continued studies at Boalt Hall for the law degree he won in 1922. He was in practice for 21 years as an attorney, taking time out for many years to work as a scout and football coach for the Golden Bears during the fall.

Former Gov. Earl Warren appointed him chairman of the California Adult Authority in 1944.

He assumed his duties in the Virgin Islands in September 1955. As the islands' chief executive, he guides the destiny of about 30,000 citizens. In addition 100,000 persons visit the colorful islands annually.

At ceremonies during the Charter Day Banquet on March 23, Gordon became the 13th person honored as a recipient of the Alumnus of the Year Award. Previous persons so honored are: Gen. James H. Doolittle, 1918, air force leader; Dr. Joseph Erlanger 1895, Nobel Laureate in physiology; President Robert Gordon Sproul 1913; Chief Justice Earl Warren 1912; the late Monroe E. Deutsch 1902, University vice president and provost emeritus; Glenn T. Seaborg 1934, Nobel prizewinning nuclear scientist; J. D. Zellerbach 1913, former ECA director in Italy; Kenneth Pitzer 1937, former director of research for the Atomic Energy Commission; Stephen D. Bechtel 1923, international builder; Horace M. Albright 1912, conservationist; General William F. Dean 1922, distinguished military leader, and Lillian Moller Gilbreth 1900, management engineer.

WALT GORDON: CALIFORNIAN, AMERICAN "ALUMNUS OF THE YEAR"

We think one of the finest things which has happened at the University of California in a long, long time is the selection of Walter A. Gordon, 18, as "Alumnus of the Year" for 1955.

The selection was unanimously made after careful consideration of many outstanding nominees by the Awards Committee of the Alumni Council, enthusiastically approved by the members of the Council of the Alumni Association and greeted with thrilling and heart-warming acclamation by more than 1,000 persons present when it was announced at the charter banquet in San Francisco on March 23.

The popularity of this selection, however, is not the reason it was a fine thing.

Perhaps the first and foremost reason that this was a splendid act is simply the fact that Walt Gordon so richly and clearly deserved the honor. The "Alumnus of the Year" award is made to that alumnus of the University of California who is determined to have made the most outstanding contribution to mankind or to the general welfare for the year in which the award is given. Of the many splendid nominees for the award for 1955, Walt Gordon stood quite clearly head and shoulders above the other excellent candidates.

His achievements, his contributions, have been solid and significant. They commenced many years ago, indeed when he was still a student on the Berkeley campus; they continued during his early years as an alumnus and increasingly through later years; and they have culminated within the immediate past to a point where Walt Gordon ranks today not only as an outstanding Californian but as a great American.

Another reason why his selection was such a fine one is simply that Walt is such a swell guy. We don't know if we have ever known a man who seems to be so universally well liked. It has been our pleasure to know and to be closely associated with Walt for nearly a quarter of a century. He has come into contact with literally thousands of people in all walks of life. There may well be people who don't like Walt—we don't know of anyone who doesn't have some detractors—but, frankly, we don't know of any of them. Instead, everywhere we go and among the thousands of people we meet and see, we hear only good words about Walt Gordon. This wide friendship and popularity hasn't happened because Walt is simply a pleasant man without positive views on those things which count in life. Rather, in fact, he does have very definite points of view on most matters of major issue. Rather, he is liked, respected, and almost beloved because he has the qualities of a real man. He has conviction for his own point of view but understanding of the other fellow's beliefs. He has positive suggestions for improvement, not negative reactions which result in impasse or failure. His warm, friendly manner is infectious in breeding true friendships—the kind which last through the years and across the miles. He has an understanding of human problems which surpasses that of almost any man we have met. Perhaps, in the final analysis, this great quality has enabled him to make the kind of positive contribution to mankind and the general welfare for which he has been recognized with this "Alumnus of the Year" award.

We have noted some of the reasons why we believe this was a splendid selection. There are other reasons as well. Perhaps we sum them up when we say that somehow this selection, to us, symbolizes the opportunity that is America. And this is the kind of America which was envisioned by our forefathers when they wrote into the founding documents of our ways of freedom and democracy the fundamental principle of equality of opportunity. As Californians, we can thank God that in this university, in this State of our great land, an award of meaning and importance such at this one is made on the basis of merit alone, and as the result of one's contributions, judged on their value and significance, by fair-minded fellow alumni and fellow citizens.

Walt Gordon, alumnus of the class of 1918, earned his spurs as the first football player in the West to be named to all-American recognition. He earned the respect of many a foe on the mat and in the ring as intercollegiate champion in boxing and wrestling. Several generations of football players were better players then and are better men today as a result of the coaching and teaching of Walt Gordon, assistant football coach at California. Many a California football victory can be credited to the wise counsel of football scout Walt Gordon. Police practices and the administration of justice in the

State of California have received valuable contributions from the work and teachings of police officer Walt Gordon. The practice of the law has benefited, as well, from the work of attorney Walt Gordon. The prison and parole system in the State of California and throughout the United States have benefited immeasurably from the service of Walt Gordon as member and chairman of the California State Adult Authority. Today, the United States and the peoples of the Virgin Islands both derive benefit and satisfaction because Walt Gordon is Governor of those islands. Yes, mankind and the general welfare have been served mightily by the contributions of our friend and fellow Californian whom we hail with pride and honor, our alumnus of the year for 1955, Walt Gordon.

Soviet Broken Promises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, in the light of the current diplomatic manipulations of the Red Kremlin, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House an editorial which recently appeared in Nowy Swiat, the Polish Morning World, and a pertinent letter written by my distinguished friend, K. Stefan Pomierski, of Glen Cove, N. Y., which was printed in the Tablet.

The material follows:

[From Nowy Swiat of March 22, 1956]

MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING

During the last few days it really did seem as if the press of our country was being taken for another ride by clever Red Russian tacticians. Once again voluminous news material and editorial comment on U. S. S. R.'s alleged internal trouble found its way into the columns of our daily newspapers. What happened in Caucasian Georgia has been presented to us as some sort of a revolt, nay, a full-scale revolution.

Stalin's and Beria's homeland probably has many ardent followers of these two paranoiac murderers among members of the local Communist Party. Kremlin bigwigs may have simplified their task of getting rid of them by the well-known method of provocation in which they excel. Khrushchev and his group are past masters in the art that made Machiavelli famous. Khrushchev's 7-hour speech, delivered during the 20th Congress of the Communist Party in Moscow, is still being analyzed in this country. His subsequent attack on Stalin is still making headlines. The New York Times honors the first secretary of the Russian Communist Party by calling him "a modern Oedipus," and poor Khrushchev has much trouble in finding out what it really means.

Though we may be suspected of oversimplifying a very complicated problem, we risk the statement that naive political thinking prompts us to make mountains out of molehills. The Georgian purges—no matter how extensive—serve two purposes: (1) Liquidation of Stalin's and Beria's adherents, and (2) producing much wishful thinking in the West. There is probably little revolt in Georgia. Remnants of the Ramashvili movement are dormant in that mountainous land, and they are the only ones that dream of Georgia's independence.

[From the Tablet of February 11, 1956]

RECALLS RED VIOLATIONS

DEAR SIR: Mr. Bulganin, by submitting to us repeated bids for a 20-year friendship pact, should be firmly reminded of the many pacts which were broken by the Communist dictators whenever it appeared to the advantage of the Soviet Russian regime.

Government officials, Members of Congress, editors, radio and television commentators should not hesitate to tell the American public and the world, over and over again, all the details as to the violations of these treaties by Red Russia.

We must always be strong and united in a grave hour such as the present by giving a fearless answer to impudent demands which obviously have an ulterior motive.

K. STEFAN POMIERSKI.

GLEN COVE.

Rt. Rev. Frances L. Shea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following inspiring eulogy given at the funeral of the Right Reverend Monsignor Francis L. Shea, V. F., by the Right Reverend Monsignor Patrick J. Lydon, pastor of St. Mark's Church, Dorchester, Mass.

Monsignor Shea is the late beloved pastor of St. Michael's Church, North Andover, Mass.

What a wonderful useful life he led. He contributed vitally to each of us within his reach. His departure is our great loss:

MONSIGNOR SHEA EULOGY TOUCHING

The eulogy given at the funeral of Rt. Rev. Msgr. Francis L. Shea, V. F. Thursday by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Patrick J. Lydon, pastor of St. Mark's Church, Dorchester, and longtime intimate friend of the deceased, follows:

"Fear ye not, for I have redeemed thee and have called thee by name, Thou art mine." Is. 43.

"To pronounce a eulogy simply to add to the reputation of the dead, or to flatter the deaf ears of a corpse with tardy praise would be but an empty gesture. But it can be of great spiritual profit to us all to draw attention to high and noble example, and to meditate on the common virtues as practiced in the everyday life of our beloved friend, Msgr. Francis L. Shea. This is especially true of a dead priest, for the priest is set as an example not only for his fellow priests but for the faithful as well. The strongest appeal that Saint Paul could make to his converts is contained in his words, 'I have given you an example.'

"But very often, as was the case with our dear friend, Monsignor Shea, the priest is by nature shy and reticent and only a privileged few are able to discern his many virtues and admirable qualities. For nearly 50 years, ever since he was a young man at Boston College High School, I have been his admiring friend, and reverently I shall endeavor to uncover some of his virtues that they may edify and be an inspiration for us.

"The text which I have chosen from the 43d chapter of the prophet Isaias was a promise that Almighty God made of old to His chosen people and in which each of us have a share: "Fear not for I have redeemed thee and have called thee by name. Thou art mine." Each of us was truly chosen and created by Him out of nothing and we belong to Him so closely that He tells us He has counted the very hairs of our head. And in this text He reminds us that we belong to Him by a second and more profound title, for He has purchased and redeemed us by His precious blood.

"But in a very special sense this text can be applied to every priest, for from his birth he is the object of God's predilection and special care. Out of all the boys in his neighborhood and in his school, Monsignor Shea had the marks of a divine vocation; he alone had been called by God by name to be His priest, to be His very own.

"Sometimes, as in the case of the rich young man in the Gospel, the one whom God chooses, for He never deprives anyone of his free will, shuts out the divine call, 'because he has much possessions,' too much love of home, hunger for human love, fondness for money, or love of ease.

"In the case of Monsignor Shea, our Divine Lord, who loved poverty, willed that our dear friend, like Himself, should be born in humble circumstances. And one by one, while he was yet very young took from him first, his father and then his dear mother, and one by one all the members of his family until all that remain to mourn for him are his three nephews and a niece. But in all his troubles he never wavered in answering God's call, and in June 8, 1917, nearly 39 years ago, he was ordained a priest by the late Cardinal O'Connell.

"He served a long and inspiring curacy in St. Peter's parish, Lowell, where he did outstanding work with youth and for several years conducted very successful camps for both boys and girls on the shores of a lake in Dunstable. At that time this kind of work was a new and untried departure in parish endeavor. All his priestly life in Lowell, West Roxbury, Medfield, and here in North Andover he has had a special and Christlike love of children. And the young were drawn naturally to him and little children felt at home in his presence. How happy he was when he secured his first school here and was able to build a fitting convent for the good Sisters. But his hunger for the little ones of Christ still drove him on and if God had spared him only a few months more he would have completed another school to accommodate all the children who clamored to enter under his care.

"Monsignor Shea had a ready smile that lighted up his whole countenance and his kindly spirit seemed to be perpetual with him, and made everyone he met his friend. It would be hard to meet a man who had so many genuine friends. He was easy to approach and his simplicity of character at once set everyone at ease. Whether one was a Catholic or not made little difference to him.

"Monsignor Shea never strove to be an orator in the accepted sense of the word, but with his consecrated and unselfish background he was bound to be different from other speakers. When the heart is full the lips become eloquent. He had the heart of an evangelist and was impelled to speak out for Christ, so that his hearers were moved by his direct and earnest message. His mind was well stocked by good reading that both enriched his ministry and gave him facility in explaining the holy mysteries of the faith in clear and simple language.

"For nearly 39 years this good priest had been zealous in caring for the sick and in teaching others how to die. And so he was well prepared himself to meet death unafraid when it quietly and unexpectedly came upon him early in the morning of the day after Easter.

"We cannot separate the grave from Easter. The first rays of Easter morning fell on a broken tomb and on a white clothed angelic spirit sitting on the very tomb. Listen to the comforting words of the angel—'Why weepest thou? He is risen. He is not here.' We must not think that we are about to lay away Monsignor Shea in the grave. St. Paul defines death as 'To depart and be with Christ.' Our Lord said the same thing to the dying thief, 'This day thou shalt be with Me in Paradise.' And to His disciples again he said, 'I go to prepare a place for you, that where I am you also may be.' We must never forget that the tombs of our dear dead are always empty, and if we have faith, we, too, can hear the angels telling us, 'They are not here. They are with Christ.'

"If we have faith, we can be closer to our dead than even when they were alive. Jesus cannot deceive us. He tells us, 'I am the Resurrection and the Life. He that believeth in Me, although he be dead, shall live; and everyone who liveth and believeth in Me shall not die forever.'

"And let us remember, dear friends, that Jesus showed Himself unchanged and unchilled by the grave. He arose from the grave with the same body which hung on the cross and He appealed to His sacred wounds to witness to His identity. Like Him our beloved dead retain all that is noble and beautiful of the affections of earth. They love us. They remember and think and pray for us.

"Therefore we must not think of Monsignor Shea as dead, but as living with Christ. Let us pray for him and every day when we visit this church that he loved so much, let us live with him in sacred intercourse by faith. It will help us so to live that when it comes our own time to die we shall be worthy to live with him, our dear friend, in Christ Jesus. Amen."

Cross-Florida Barge Canal Should Begin Construction Now To Prevent Submarine Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House of Representatives to an excellent editorial in the April 3 edition of the Washington Star, and to emphasize that the implications of this editorial, together with other available information, indicate that we should no longer delay the construction of the Congress-approved cross-Florida barge canal.

This editorial points out that our highest military authorities are united in the view that there is an extremely serious threat to our country from the continuous buildup of Soviet military power. Moreover, the editorial underlines the emphasis of Russia on submarines. As General Gruenther said, the buildup of submarines must be viewed in the light of the fact that there is no cold war value to a submarine. General Gruenther is quoted as saying that there are five times more submarines in the Soviet fleet than Germany had in 1939.

All of this points to a need for constant reappraisal of our military strength. It is my opinion that our armed services have been reduced too drastically. The tremendous loss to our country in World War II from German submarines and the potentially much greater threat from Russian submarines in the future point up the fact that our country should do longer delay the immediate construction of the cross-Florida barge canal. The statistics show that the canal could have been paid for by the losses which would have been prevented in World War II if it had been under operation at that time. Now that the threat to American military and domestic shipping has been so greatly increased, there should be no further delay in commencing this project. The editorial reads as follows:

SOVIET POWER AND THE SEA

As emphasized in their recent testimony before a House subcommittee on defense appropriations, our highest military authorities are united in the view that our country has never before faced a worse threat than the one now confronting it in the form of Soviet armed power, actual and potential.

This power, backed by a steadily expanding heavy industrial base, has within the past decade been built up on a truly massive scale. As a result, equipped as it is with a growing arsenal of atomic-hydrogen weapons, the Soviet Union today is second only to the United States in terms of military might. In fact, in some fields—such as the development of guided and ballistic missiles—it may be ahead of us in certain respects. Moreover, as everybody already knows, its combat-ready army is the biggest in the world, and its air force is rapidly becoming as formidable as our own. Similarly its navy, which was a puny and inconsequential thing 10 years ago, now is very strong, particularly in its submarine branch.

Indeed, in the opinion of at least some of our military leaders, the buildup of Russia's Navy—a navy still far behind ours in many categories, but apparently bigger than Britain's—constitutes the most significant development of Soviet grand strategy since the end of the Second World War. And an especially sobering aspect of that development has been the emphasis placed on submarines. Last year, for example, the Kremlin built more of these lethal undersea raiders than the rest of the world combined, and quite a few of them presumably are capable of launching not merely torpedoes against ships but missiles against land targets. Now totaling about 400 in a combat-ready status, they do not yet include any that are atomic-powered like our *Nautilus*, but large numbers of them are advanced snorkel types whose potentialities are unquestionably deadly.

The fact that the Russians have gone all out in building such craft has elicited another warning from General Gruenther, commander of NATO forces in Europe. Thus, as he declared in Paris the other day, "I can explain in terms of the cold war why they have 175 divisions in Russia, 20,000 planes, and 60 divisions in the satellites. But I can't explain 400 submarines. There is no cold-war value to a submarine. It is a hot-war weapon. They have five times more submarines than Germany had in 1939." And no one who remembers the battle of the Atlantic, and how Hitler's U-boats came close to severing the allied lifeline between America and Britain, needs to be instructed in the significance of such a military statistic. Clearly, coupled with its land and air strength, the Soviet Union's seapower—meaning primarily submarines—adds up to a potential menace of the first magnitude. Small wonder that Admiral Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, has stressed to the House group that "It is essential that the United States recognize this growing threat in time. We cannot be sure today that we are moving fast enough to keep ahead." We ought to make sure. There should be no doubt about it whatever.

St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I insert therein a very remarkable tribute to St. Patrick's Day which was recently paid in the columns of the celebrated Clinton Daily Item by my dear and valued friend, and distinguished fellow townsman, Mr. Alexander Cameron Duncan.

Mr. Duncan, who recently celebrated his 88th St. Patrick's Day, is a native of Ireland, a great admirer of the great Scottish poet, Bobby Burns, and devoted to the illustrious Scotch-Irish tradition. I have known Mr. Duncan since my early youth, and it has been his unfailing custom through his long and useful life to celebrate St. Patrick's Day and the birth of the great Robert Burns, apparently with equal zest and spirit.

His love of America where he has spent so many years of his constructive life is truly inspiring, and he is rich indeed in spirit, in courage, in loyalties, and friendships. He is exceptionally active and vigorous and moves about his daily routine with exceptional alacrity.

It is said that "as a man thinketh in his heart, so is he," and that is certainly true of Alexander Cameron Duncan, because in his heart he is a fine, tolerant, Christian gentlemen, a true friend whom the entire community respects, admires, and loves, and an American of whom we can all be proud.

I regard it as a privilege to express to him my compliments, appreciation, and gratitude for his outstanding tribute to the honored St. Patrick, and I am sure it will be interesting to the Members of Congress and a great many people throughout the Nation who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

As I celebrate my 88th St. Patrick's Day I want to remember one grand old Irishman, a friend of mine for many years.

He is Patrick Donahoe who was editor of the Pilot, America's oldest Catholic news weekly which celebrates its 127th year of publication this year.

The celebrated Bostonian was awarded Notre Dame's medal for his outstanding services to the Catholic cause in the United States.

He died at the age of 90, after having for nearly 70 years played an eminent and honorable role in the Catholic life of Boston.

It is 70 years since I saw the peat reek rising from those Irish, whitewashed thatched homes. I was 1 of 10 born in such a house. Four of us remain, all over 80 years.

Saturday, March 17, we celebrate St. Patrick's Day. With St. Patrick's Day spring comes to Ireland, and to the hearts of Eire's sons and daughters wherever they may be.

Throughout the length and breadth of all Eire's many counties from Cork to Caven, from Kerry to Kildare, from Meath to Mayo, St. Patrick's Day is celebrated in every cottage, every castle in every croft and hamlet. There is no whitewashed cottage so humble, no country estate so proud or pretentious that the memory of Eire's patron saint is neglected on this significant day.

It is a day of reverence and reverent memory of pride in Eire's destiny.

In every peat-perfumed cabin, Irish hearts turn to St. Patrick and his great labors of love for his land and folk of Eire. And far beyond the borders of lovely Eire, devoted men and women of Irish stock throughout the world seek out a bit of shamrock to make their hearts rejoice or, failing that, a bit of green ribbon to recall the land and its loveliness, the folk and their rollicking good humor whence they sprang.

For there is no lovelier land than Eire. No sturdier men and women than the folk it breeds. And there is no people so true to its faith, so loyal to its martyrs, so proud of its heroes, as the proud folk of Gaelic blood and speech. To all Eire's clans St. Patrick is patron saint.

ALEXANDER CAMERON DUNCAN.
CLINTON, MASS.

South Dakota's Excellent Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend the South Dakota Press Association held its annual convention in Sioux Falls, S. Dak. At the same time this fine organization of newspaper editors and publishers observed its 75th birthday. All of us, from time to time, have stressed the importance of what the American press means to this liberty-loving land. During the South Dakota Press Association convention last weekend a very fine editorial appeared in the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader, written by Fred C. Christopherson, editor. This editorial discussed the merits of the weekly newspaper, of which there are nearly 200 in South Dakota, and it pointed out the relationship of the weekly newspaper to the community which it serves so well that I wish to place this editorial in the RECORD. One statement in particular is of interest to my colleagues, I am sure, and I want to call special attention to it. The Argus-Leader wrote:

> The weekly press in South Dakota, we are inclined to believe, is as good as any in the Nation. The editors are representative citizens of their communities and their State. They express themselves freely and well. No political party and no organization control them. Their viewpoints are their own, set forth clearly and frankly.

I am certain that the above statement is true of newspaper throughout the country in most instances. I think it is significant that this comment did not come from an editor of a weekly newspaper, but from a daily newspaper editor, from a man in a position to observe weekly newspaper operation without prejudice one way or the other.

The editorial follows:

The South Dakota Press Association is in convention in Sioux Falls today and to the members we extend a special welcome.

This association is now in its 75th birthday and its meetings in this city have been frequent. Thus it is that the members come here as old friends and renew a happy relationship that has extended over the years.

The SDPA membership is composed largely of the editors of weekly newspapers and it seems appropriate upon the occasion of their visit to pay a tribute to what they have done and what they are doing. The weekly press in South Dakota, we are inclined to believe, is as good as any in the Nation. The editors are representative citizens of their communities and their State. They express themselves freely and well. No political party and no organization control them. Their viewpoints are their own, set forth clearly and frankly.

They mean much to their communities—much more, in fact, than their communities always realize. Invariably they are in the forefront of a movement to build their towns whether it be a bond issue for new schools or a campaign to improve a highway.

Visit these towns and look about you. Rarely, if ever, can you see a good civic project that did not come into being without the vigorous support of the editor of the weekly newspaper. All of these reflect his helpful viewpoint, his loyalty to his hometown, and his eagerness to promote that which is worth while.

The town with a thriving weekly newspaper is a good town. The town without a newspaper is gravely handicapped, as such communities well know. But occasionally it is a case of, so to speak, "not missing the water until the well goes dry." The wise community will appreciate what its press is worth and maintain it.

This is not to suggest that the weekly press can't stand on its own two legs as a business institution. Actually what it has to offer to its subscribers and its advertisers is a good buy, one of the best. For a modest payment, it provides the news of the community and the area week in and week out. It distributes an advertiser's message into virtually every home in the community and the surrounding area. And it's widely and carefully read by the subscribers.

The SDPA has convened more frequently in Sioux Falls than in any other city. This pleases us, of course, and suggests that the meetings have been pleasant and productive. We hope that the current session is equally worth while.

Premier Nasser, of Egypt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, permit me to direct to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial on Premier Nasser, of Egypt, which appeared in the New York Times of March 30, 1956:

EGYPT ON A RAMPAGE

The rise of Egypt to a position of primary importance in the Middle East today is one of the most dramatic and—in the circumstance—most disturbing developments of post-war history. The importance, in this case, lies in the ability and determination to cause mischief. The democratic West is the sufferer from the policies pursued by Premier Nasser of Egypt; the Soviet bloc is the gainer. Tension and the threat of war have increased. Britain and France are protesting; the United States remains silent.

These are the bare facts and they are more than enough to explain the disappointment in the Western World over the meteoric career of Colonel Nasser. From his personal point of view and from the point of view of Egyptian and Arab nationalism, Colonel Nasser has been a great success. He is today the outstanding figure of the Arab world and Egypt is the most important country.

Colonel Nasser's appearance on the stage of Egypt's contemporary drama in 1952 was welcomed. He was the dominating figure in the revolutionary army movement that overthrew King Farouk. Since February 1954, he has been Premier of Egypt. At first he was merely one of a group of officers on whom he was dependent, but lately he has been all-powerful. It has been argued that any alternative to Colonel Nasser would make matters worse, bringing chaos and confusion. This is an almost invariable argument in favor of dictators. In any event, no one is trying to overthrow Premier Nasser.

The British have publicly complained over the anti-British and revolutionary propaganda of Egypt in East Africa and the Near East, and the French are even more bitter over the incitement to revolt of the Moslems in North Africa that comes from Cairo and the material help given to rebels. All the Western powers expressed their concern (dismay would have been a better word) when Colonel Nasser last September accepted the offer to buy arms from the Soviet bloc, and we now learn that Egyptian officers are being trained in their use behind the Iron Curtain. Unfortunately, it was precisely this dangerous move, which brought Russia into the Middle East for the first time, that sent Colonel Nasser's stock soaring in Egyptian and Arab eyes.

U. S. S. "Saratoga" To Be Commissioned April 14, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that on April 14, 1956, the U. S. S. *Saratoga*, CVA 60, will be commissioned at the New York Naval Shipyard. Upon commissioning, she will become the most powerful fighting ship afloat in the entire world. I believe that the *Saratoga* name is entitled to such an honor because the new ship will succeed to the name carried by five previous ships which participated in illustrious and memorable service to the United States. The name was originally taken to commemorate the famous Battle of Saratoga of our Revolutionary War, which proved to be its turning point. All of the ships which have since borne this name have fought with great distinction for the United States.

The first U. S. S. *Saratoga* was an 18 gun continental sloop-of-war which was commissioned in April of 1780. Although her life was a short one, she distinguished hereself by capturing several ships carrying heavier armament and taking vessels

into port as prizes of war. When last seen, in March of 1781, the U. S. S. *Saratoga* was heading out in pursuit of a strange vessel which had been sighted on the horizon. She disappeared from sight and her fate was never known.

The second U. S. S. *Saratoga* won her fame on Lake Champlain in the War of 1812. Commissioned on April 11, 1814, she was a 26-gun corvette and first saw action on September 11, 1814. At this time a great battle was shaping up for control of the Great Lakes. The British hoped by gaining control of the lakes, they could invade the United States from the north. In one of the decisive battles, the *Saratoga*, as a result of brilliant seamanship on the part of her captain, was able to defeat the British flagship, which carried 39 guns. As a result of this action, the British plans for the northern invasion of the United States were abandoned, and the United States maintained control of the Great Lakes.

The third U. S. S. *Saratoga* was a first class sloop carrying 20 guns. She received her commission in July of 1842 and served as an integral part of the United States Navy from that date until 1907. During this period of 65 years, the *Saratoga* saw action in the Mexican War, was part of Commodore Matthew C. Perry's squadron in 1853 during the negotiations for the treaty which opened Japan to the West, helped blockade the South Atlantic Coast during the Civil War, and served as a training ship for naval apprentices. She was finally sold to the State of Pennsylvania in 1907 for use as a training ship.

The fourth U. S. S. *Saratoga* was so named for only part of her naval career. She was launched in December 1891, as the U. S. S. *New York*, an armored cruiser carrying all the latest naval improvements. She was Admiral Sampson's flagship in the crucial Battle of Santiago in the Spanish-American War. On February 16, 1911, her name was changed to the U. S. S. *Saratoga*, which she carried until December 1, 1917. During this time she served as the flagship of the Asiatic Station. On this date, the vessel's name was again changed to the U. S. S. *Rochester*, and subsequently took part in the Nicaraguan campaign of 1926–31 and other important naval engagements. In 1938, she was stricken from the list of naval vessels.

The fifth U. S. S. *Saratoga* was probably the most famous of all of the ships to bear this illustrious name. She was launched in April of 1925 and was the first United States vessel to be launched as an aircraft carrier. During the years 1925–41, the U. S. S. *Saratoga* served as a training vessel for aircraft carrier pilots and contributed greatly toward the promotion of naval aviation.

On December 7, 1941, the U. S. S. *Saratoga* was in San Diego Harbor. The following day she was dispatched for the South Pacific carrying marine aircraft to bolster the defenses of Wake Island. Wake Island surrendered before help could reach it, and the *Saratoga's* planes were delivered to Midway Island, where they were of great help in repelling air strikes against the island.

The *Saratoga* next saw action in May of 1942 when she delivered additional aircraft to the carriers which took part in the Battle of Midway. She then became a member of Task Force 17 and served as the flagship of Vice Adm. F. J. Fletcher. From this time until she became a member of the famed Task Force 58, the U. S. S. *Saratoga* carved out a magnificent name for herself. She participated in the landings and capture of Guadalcanal. She conducted successful raids against the eastern Solomon Islands. She was responsible for the sinking of the Japanese aircraft carrier *Ryujo* and for severely damaging the Japanese seaplane carrier *Chitose*. She lent great assistance in the marine strikes in Empress Augusta Bay and later in Tarawa. In March of 1944, she took part in operations against the Japanese-held islands of Java and Sumatra. She then returned to the United States for repairs and joined Task Force 58.

As a member of this notable task force, the *Saratoga* took part in the first carrier-based attack on Tokyo in February 16–17, 1945. She then lent her support to marine units in the invasion of Iwo Jima. During this operation she was severely damaged by 4 suicide planes and 7 bombs. She returned to the United States once again for repairs and spent the rest of the war performing training duties at Pearl Harbor.

The battle-scarred grand old lady of United States aircraft carriers was finally swallowed up by the waters of Bikini Atoll as a result of the underwater blast of the atomic bomb test on July 25, 1946.

The sixth U. S. S. *Saratoga* not only will be the world's most powerful warship, with a 60,000-ton displacement, but will contain all of the latest mechanical improvements since her sister ship, the U. S. S. *Forrestal*, was designed. She has an overall length of 1,039 feet, an extreme beam of 252 feet, and her speed will be in excess of 30 knots—34 miles per hour. She is equipped to carry the latest jet aircraft. Sufficient replenishment-at-sea equipment will allow her to remain away from port for extended periods of time with no loss to battle efficiency.

The ship's complement numbers 3,800 men. These men will be fed by a galley which can dispense 1,100 loaves of bread, 9,400 pounds of vegetables, 1,000 pounds of dairy products, 4,600 pounds of meat, and 12,100 pounds of dry provisions per day. They will be medically cared for by a complete 84-bed modern hospital, and a pharmacy. There are also 6 battle dress stations, 10 decontamination stations, 192 first aid boxes, and 4 dental offices.

The contract for building this vessel was awarded to the New York Naval Shipyard on July 23, 1952. The keel was laid on December 16, 1952.

I believe that a special word of commendation should be given to the men who have worked so diligently on the construction of this vessel. These men of the New York Naval Shipyard have proven that they are a "can do" shipyard and have taken those two words as their motto. They have performed their jobs with such great efficiency and quality that I know that when this vessel is delivered to the United States Navy, it will be as perfect a fighting machine as can be constructed anywhere, anyplace, anytime.

With such a ship in the capable hands of experienced naval personnel, under the command of Capt. Robert J. Stroh as her first commanding officer, the name of the U. S. S. *Saratoga* will go on to greater heights in the annals of our United States Navy. Let us pray that she will win her place in history by her might as a preserver of peace, rather than as a defender in war.

British Colonial Rule of Cyprus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct to the attention of our colleagues the following resolutions adopted by all the Greek fraternal organizations of New York City at a mass meeting held at Manhattan Center on March 18, 1956, in support of the demand of the Cypriot people for freedom and self-determination:

RESOLUTIONS RE BRITISH COLONIAL RULE OF CYPRUS

Two thousand Americans, representing 125,000 fellow citizens of Greek descent in Greater New York, having convened today under the auspices of the Cyprus Federation of America and the Federation of Hellenic Societies, in Manhattan Center, because of the unprecedented banishment of Archbishop Makarios and his associates, reviewed the following points, among others:

1. Greece and the Greek Cypriots have publicly and repeatedly offered to let Britain keep all the bases she needs both in Cyprus and Greece, as has been the case with United States bases in Greece.

2. The military issue is not whether the British are to abandon their base on Cyprus but rather whether that base, whatever its value, is to be strong or weak.

3. As recent events demonstrate, continued British colonial rule of Cyprus greatly weakens NATO and the free world.

4. The issues were narrowed as a result of the recent negotiations to: (a) Amnesty for all political prisoners; (b) the length of time of British control of internal security; (c) the composition of the legislature.

5. The rights of the Turkish minority can be fully protected.

6. The Cypriots, a mature, civilized people, could govern themselves today.

7. The competence and jurisdiction of the United Nations to consider the Cyprus question has already been established. However, action has been deferred in order to give the opportunity to the parties concerned to settle the issue through private negotiations.

8. The British Government broke off the recent negotiations between Archbishop Makarios of Cyprus and Governor Harding.

9. Cyprus presents a problem to American policy to be met by moral considerations of anticolonial principles rather than by commitments to colonial allies.

After considering the above, the following resolutions were unanimously passed:

"*Resolved*, That—

"(a) We strongly protest against the abduction, banishment, and imprisonment of Archbishop Makarios, the elected religious and political leader of the Greek Cypriot community; Bishop Kyprianos, of Kyrenia, and their associates in the movement for freedom, and we urge their immediate release and restitution to their Sees.

"(b) We strongly condemn the sacrilege performed by the British forces in invading the sanctity of the churches and monasteries in Cyprus.

"(c) We condemn the use of force by the British as an instrument of policy designed to stifle the demand of the Cypriot people for self-determination and freedom, as such policy can only lead to further violence and the alienation of our NATO ally, Greece.

"(d) We condemn the use of collective punishment of innocent people as an instrument of retaliation and revenge.

"(e) We strongly request that our Government, in the interest of American foreign policy and prestige, insist that the British abandon their strong-arm methods, resume negotiations in good faith, release all political prisoners, and apply self-determination to Cyprus.

"(f) As Americans, we shall never cease our efforts in support of government by consent in Cyprus and throughout the world.

"(g) In the interest of American military and political policy, we urge all Americans of Greek descent to write to their relatives and friends in Greece and Cyprus, telling them of our full and unending support in order to forestall any possible neutralism and alienation of our NATO ally, Greece.

"(h) We urge our Government to support the position of the Greek Cypriots that the elected majority must have voting control in the proposed legislature in accordance with normal democratic principles.

"(i) We commend the expression of sympathy of our Ambassador to Greece and the statements of our President and State Department, and urge that our Government assist in arriving at a just settlement of this dispute.

"(j) We commission the Committee on the Cyprus Question of the Cyprus Federation of America to forward these resolutions to our Government."

Curb Proposed on Military Landgrabbing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Interior has been holding hearings over the past several weeks on military reservations of public domain lands. There is a growing concern, especially in the far West, about the ever-increasing acquisitions by the military of public land areas, thus precluding the multiple use of these public lands for grazing, mining, lumbering, water conservation, recreation, and sportsmen. Our effort to put a little sense into the continual efforts of the armed services to grab off more and more public lands was recently applauded in the Bakersfield Californian of March 15, 1956. The editorial is as follows:

CURB PROPOSED ON LANDGRABBING

Prompted by the continual efforts of the armed services to grab off more and more of the public lands and some that are not public, Representative CLAIR ENGLE, of California, and chairman of the powerful House Interior and Public Lands Committee, announced this week that he will sponsor forthcoming legislation to curb this trend.

Under terms of Mr. ENGLE's proposed legislation, any withdrawal of more than 5,000 acres from public use status by any Government agency or department will require congressional approval. This will insure a hearing during which the facts of the case may be aired and protests can be heard, a procedure that is not always available under present conditions.

Mr. ENGLE was aroused most recently by the Navy's demand that it have millions of acres of Nevada land allotted to it for gunnery ranges, and the facts as brought out in a hearing conducted by Mr. ENGLE revealed that the Air Force already has more than enough land allotted to it for the same purpose and has offered to share with the Navy.

There is no reason why land cannot be used by planes of both services for this purpose, through coordination and planning, and some of the highhanded and dubious practices in taking over land for military use should be stopped by Congress.

The California Congressman points out that the situation at present leaves Congress and the people no say in the matter whatever. "At present, any executive agency that says it needs any part of the public domain," he asserted in a recent statement, "can request the reservation of that portion of the public domain, and for all practical purposes by its own action set aside large parts of the public land areas of the country. This is the practice being followed by the military. We want to stop that except in case of small withdrawals that would be too numerous and too troublesome to take before congressional committees."

Mr. ENGLE cites an alarming situation and one that should be dealt with by legislation according to his suggestions. There is another point with which the public generally is unaware and which results in a wholesale looting of public lands.

Under present procedures, the military can demand and get millions of acres of public domain for its purposes, legitimate or otherwise, use it as long as it likes, then turn it over to the General Services Administration to be sold as surplus. The public never gets the land back.

Under terms of Mr. ENGLE's bill, the land, after being used by the military, must revert to public domain. This is important. Another provision makes it mandatory for the executive agency requesting the withdrawal of public land for special purposes must give notice of what other types of use could be permitted and under what conditions.

Present conditions and public interest demand that speedy and favorable action be given on Mr. ENGLE's bill and the people will have to let their Congressmen know of this, because the military and other executive departments will have their knives out for this one in Washington.

Flood Control and River Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to present an address delivered by me before the annual convention of the Red River Valley Association in Shreveport, La., on April 3, 1956, entitled "Flood Control and River Development—Its Progress and Its Objectives":

During the last 15 years, especially, this has been a land of greatly increasing population. During the easy recollection of everyone here, this country has grown from a population of 142 millions of people in 1940 to 166 million people at the present time. This growth has pushed us into a period of prosperity and development the like of which this Nation has not heretofore seen. New houses, new buildings, new factories, new and wider roads, great airports and other means of expansion. Our transportation facilities have been taxed at times to the utmost and our network of roads has been repeatedly expanded and enlarged only to find that our plans, as wild as they appeared to be, were inadequate to meet the burden of traffic placed upon them.

During this period of time, one would naturally think that as a nation our plans should envision an increase in our program of water transportation and that these plans should go forward with the thought that water transportation should carry its full part in the development of the Nation. Strange to say, such has not been the case. We have not developed our water roads as we have developed our macadam and concrete highways.

Just before leaving Washington I obtained figures to indicate the progress we are making in our river and water development throughout the country. I find the following: During the year 1951 we appropriated in Congress, roughly, $505 million for flood control and river and harbor development; during 1952 we reduced and appropriated $477 million; during 1953 we further economized and appropriated $446 million. In 1954 this sum appropriated went down to the alltime low of $366 million. In 1956, I lead the fight on the floor of the House for more money and we were able to report for the current year the sum of $477 million, an increase of over $100 million. In addition to the sum of $97 million which the House added to the bill which came out of the Appropriations Committee, the Senate added some ten to fifteen million dollars more.

The United States Army engineers were so surprised at this change of attitude of the Congress that they were hardly prepared to spend this additional money, although it was badly needed in the pushing of the projects which had been pending a long time. As a result, I am told that some of the money appropriated last year will not have been fully expended when this present fiscal year comes to an end.

In spite of all of these facts, I am somewhat disappointed that the Bureau of the Budget failed to recommend at least the sum which Congress had previously appropriated. For the coming fiscal year the budget recommends the appropriation of $457 million—a sum which if appropriated will put us back again on the road to an increasing program of water development.

I am president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, and in this capacity I am familiar with the attitude of the people of this country in relation to our present problem. Our organization has recommended to the Congress and to the President that we work for a budget of $1 billion per year for all water resources uses. This means that over the long pull we think that this Nation needs an annual appropriation of $1 billion to continue our work of development and to maintain properly the work previously completed. With the present recommendations of the Budget Bureau, we will have to expand our appropriation some $250 million per year to meet this goal. Our budgeted expenses in regard to almost everything else has in-

creased tremendously—food, labor, clothing, construction, have all increased tremendously; but there seems to be the idea that we can continue the water-development program with the same budget and the same expenditures without an increase. Well, it just can't be done.

It is now apparent that Congress is turning the corner. This change is due to what? Last year, when the Appropriations Committee brought to the floor of the House of Representatives a bill which would have reduced the budget estimated needs of rivers and harbors by some $50 million, some of us connected with the National Rivers and Harbors Congress called a meeting of all Members interested, in the caucus room of the Old House Office Building in Washington. At this meeting we had some 60 Members present, and we passed 4 resolutions, asking that I see that they were introduced into the Congress. I am proud to report that everyone of thes 4 resolutions passed the House and that as a result of this action we restored to the bill some $97 million. This was the first time in 10 years that we had been able to reverse the trend toward diminishing appropriations.

That this is a definite trend is well shown by the fact that I as president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress joined with others and succeeded this year in adopting an amendment in a deficiency appropriation bill which gives New England money she is entitled to receive for needed help as a result of three disastrous floods within the last year and a half. Again, we repeated this action in the case of the Carolinas which came to us this year with a plea for help which no sympathetic person could deny. In three instances, therefore, recently we have reversed the trend of appropriations and have been able to give the Nation something like the money needed for these purposes.

It was at an annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress 2 years ago that the President of the United States announced the appointment of a Cabinet committee to work out recommendations for a national water policy. Undoubtedly, some definite policy in furtherance of the development of this great natural resource is needed for our guidance. I look forward to a definite policy stabilized over a period of years which will assure us in advance what is to be expected in our program.

We have made tremendous progress under our present system of handling our program—but in all fairness, I think with better planning, we could have made much more progress. I do not favor the establishment of a new Board of Review to further screen our projects. This was the recommendation of the President's Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy recently. Such a Board is not necessary and adds to the tremendous number of agencies which already have a part in the screening of projects before they are completed. Do you realize that some 28 separate steps have to be taken in the authorization of a project. These usually require a period of several years, with continual checking and investigating going on until the project is finally screened by Congress and becomes the law of the land. A further process—a new board—could only mean that new and burdensome bureaucratic processes would be added to the careful program we presently have set up.

Rather than add to the number of agencies and processes which must be considered in the authorization of any flood-control project, I would say that our chief problem and my chief concern is our increasing difficulty in obtaining money in the Congress. Year by year this has developed into a great fight; and as a rule, we make the heavy appropriations only after a great catastrophe has struck our economy.

In 1927 when the great flood struck the Mississippi Valley, our total approved civil works program was only $1,200,000,000; and the sum of $800 million had been expended on this program. This left a backlog of only $400 million of work to be done on 1927 prices.

In 1937, following the increasing interest in flood control due to the passage of the 1936 Flood Control Act, which, by the way, was sponsored by my uncle, Senator John Overton, the backlog of construction had grown from $400 million to $900 million and at 1937 prices. By the year 1947, when we had adopted the concept of basinwide development as applied to our valleys, our backlog of approved projects had grown to $5.4 billion at 1947 prices.

Today, our situation is anything but envious. We have an approved program of civil works construction, approved by Congress, which totals some $19 billion. Of this program, we have spent some $7 billion through the years, leaving us as of this hour $12 billion in unconstructed projects at present-day prices.

Of course, some of these projects are obsolete and some are undoubtedly not necessary because of intervening developments through the years. But even taking into consideration all of these things, I do not believe that anyone will seriously question the fact that our authorized list of projects will exceed $8 billion. This is the situation at a time when we put all of our power and our influence behind a real program to advance the needs of the Nation. This is the situation at a time when our increased population, our larger cities, millions of acres more land in cultivation and in pasturage all cry loudly for an active aggressive and comprehensive program.

There has been talk in Congress about flood insurance. This was in fact the administration recommendation. Much emphasis has been given by Members of Congress to such a program; and I hope that some method will be developed to lighten the heavy burden which falls upon a community, State, and on the Nation when a great disaster like the New England floods visits a section of the country. I am, however, not too optimistic about such a program.

We can approach this matter much better by a frontal attack. The closing the stable door after the horse has fled type of approach may mitigate the suffering and the hardship but it will not prevent the flood. Far better it is for the Congress to approach this matter from the viewpoint of one who wants to prevent the tragedy rather than extend financial sympathy after the pall of death and destruction has fallen.

My friends, the use of water resources by a people is not a new program. It is as old as are the pyramids of Egypt. In fact, the first information which we have after the dawn of history regarding flood control and irrigation comes fom the Middle East. It was along the Euphrates and the Nile Rivers that man first made a serious effort to conquer the floods.

Along the Nile River which traverses desert country for many miles, ancient Egyptians broke the ground, built little irrigation ditches and dams, and tried in a meager way to cultivate a little fringe of land along the banks of the Nile. They tried their peculiar method of controling floods by throwing their children into the muddy waters of this often-swollen stream, to the crocodiles, to appease their gods and have them stop the ravages of their lands and loss of their lives by flood waters. Perhaps it was the information which their engineers gained from developing drainage and flood-control works which later gave them the skill to construct monuments that stand through the ages, as the sphinx and the pyramids.

Much time has passed since then; and we are still fighting the problem which was old to even Egypt itself 5,000 years before Christ. It is for you to judge just how much progress has been made by us since the days of the pharoahs and the Egyptians. I earnestly believe that had we determinedly set our minds toward the work of eliminating floods in our own land and using our greatest natural resource—water—we would have made much more progress than we can boast of today.

Department of Veterans' Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith include the text of a bill I today introduced, at the request of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, to establish a Department of Veterans' Affairs. It is similar to a bill which I introduced as H. R. 351 in the 82d Congress and as H. R. 23 in the 83d Congress.

I have long felt that the Veterans' Administration should be a department instead of a bureau and with a Cabinet head. It has a tremendous responsibility to perform in the care and assistance of our veterans. It involves the expenditure of very large sums of money, and the head of the Veterans' Administration is responsible for the administering of six large business activities.

The Department of Veterans' Affairs should be treated with the greatest respect and consideration. It is only fair to the veterans and to the country to do so.

The text of the bill follows:

H. R. 10381

A bill to establish a Department of Veterans' Affairs

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established at the east of government an executive department to be known as the Department of Veterans' Affairs, and there shall be at the head thereof a Secretary of Veterans' Affairs, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The provisions of chapter 1 of title 5 of the United States Code shall be applicable to said Department, and in furtherance of such purpose, section 158 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 1), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Eleventh. The Department of Veterans' Affairs." The said Secretary shall cause a seal of office to be made for the said Department of such device as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken of said seal.

SEC. 2. There shall be in said Department an Under Secretary and five Assistant Secretaries, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall perform such duties as shall be prescribed by the Secretary: *Provided*, That one of such Assistant Secretaries shall be the Surgeon General and another of the Assistant Secretaries shall be the General Counsel. Such Assistant Secretaries shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum each.

SEC. 3. There is hereby transferred to the Department of Veterans' Affairs all person-

nel, files, records, property, reservations, and facilities of the Veterans' Administration of both the central office and field stations. The balance of all appropriations and all trust funds of the Veterans' Administration shall be available for expenditure by the Department in the same manner as if originally specified in the respective statutes authorizing or creating such appropriations or funds.

SEC. 4. All contracts and agreements entered into, and all orders, rules, regulations, delegations, permits, or other privileges issued or created by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, shall continue in effect until modified, superseded, or terminated. All laws relating to the Veterans' Administration, and those relating to veterans' benefits generally, shall remain in effect except as hereby modified and shall be administered by the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs.

Washington Merry-Go-Round

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 21, 1956, I placed in the Appendix of the RECORD the syndicated column of Drew Pearson under the heading "Washington Merry-Go-Round," as it appeared in the Washington Post.

I am happy to say that the item has attracted considerable attention and much favorable comment. I am advised that since the publication of the article, the Federal official involved has resigned.

My attention has just been called to the fact that the column as it appeared in the Washington Post was abbreviated, no doubt on account of space requirements.

The full column without deletions appeared in the News and Observer published in Raleigh, N. C., on March 21, 1956, to complete the record I am setting forth in full as follows:

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND
(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON.—Ezra Taft Benson may not know it, but a conflict-of-interest political blow-up is simmering right under his nose. It involves Carl O. Hanson, State director of the Farmers' Home Administration in Montana.

The Farmers' Home Administration is supposed to spend its entire time on the difficult problem of helping the small farmer. It is supposed to go right into the farmers' homes and aid with their economic problems. Especially, it is supposed to help the small farmer in time of drought. However, there is conclusive evidence that instead of helping small farmers, FHA State Director Hanson has been acting as a woolbuyer for the Draper Co., of Boston, also helping direct the affairs of radio-TV station KOOK in Billings, and charging up political long-distance calls to the Government.

He was also spending part of his time and some Government money in an abortive effort to elect Wesley D'Ewart to the Senate in violation of the Hatch Act. Government officials are banned by the Hatch Act from engaging in politics unless they are of Cabinet or Little Cabinet rank.

The activities of Mr. Carl O. Hanson are highly important not merely because of irregularity in Benson's Agriculture Department but because they throw light on one reason why farmers are so sore at the Secretary of Agriculture. They recognize that he has very difficult crop-surplus problems, and they would be more sympathetic with crop surpluses if it were not for the manner in which Benson's officials have spent their time politicking and helping big companies rather than small farmers.

For instance, Secretary Benson himself, on October 9, 1954, personally and publicly demanded the defeat of Senator JAMES MURRAY of Montana, and the election of GOP Congressman Wesley D'Ewart. Immediately Benson's boys in the Agriculture Department took the cue and went into high gear—not for the farmer and his difficult problems, but for candidate D'Ewart.

This was during the tragic drought of 1954. Despite that, farmers' home director Hanson made more than 100 long-distance calls for private or political purposes and allowed them to be charged up to the taxpayer. This column has obtained a record of Hanson's supposedly official phone calls at that time, and they show that he even phoned D'Ewart at the Royal Hawaiian Hotel in Honolulu, December 16, 1954. Cost to the taxpayers, $15. This incidentally was after D'Ewart was defeated.

It was also at a time when Hanson should have been working his head off to help farmers borrow money to meet the drought disaster.

Instead, he was employing persons whose services he used for unofficial and political purposes, including his personal and private business. John Costello, appointed by Hanson, acted as chauffeur and errand boy, including wool-purchase duties for Hanson. Darrell Coover, appointed by Hanson, served for 1 month, not on FHA business, but purely as a political organizer.

Mrs. Katherine Carter, Hanson's private secretary, reported that on some days she wrote as many as 14 letters not pertaining to FHA official business.

The personal letters she wrote for him on office time included letters to Mr. Malcolm Green, president, Draper Co., Boston, as well as letters to Charles Crist, his radio business partner; and typing wool contracts on FHA time.

Mrs. Carter had quite a difficult time trying to divide her boss' legitimate Government business calls from the personal and political calls and naturally took the commonsense step of asking her boss which was which.

This made Hanson sore and he told her, in effect, to mind her own business.

Miss Kathleen Roche, the secretary who succeeded Mrs. Carter, also had a tough time sorting out Hanson's phone calls. Sometimes calls came in collect from such people as A. P. Davies, lobbyist for the American Meat Institute and wool producer Ed McReynolds.

On one occasion after Hanson had placed about 15 long-distance calls to various persons with whom he discussed his wool-buying business, Mrs. Carter asked him how he could get away with private business while in Government service.

Hanson replied that his superiors in Washington knew about his private business and condoned it, and that his wool-buying netted him three times as much as his Government salary.

Another man Hanson used to call long distance was Martin Littleton, ex-attorney for Frankie Costello, king of the gambling underworld. Littleton was then a radio-TV speaker for Candidate D'Ewart. Other calls went to Al Schlaht, D'Ewart's campaign manager and publisher of the Billings Yellowstone News; also Bill McKay, head of the Montana Republican Committee.

What makes the farmers' blood boil is that the State directors of the Farmers' Home Administration under Charley Brannan, all career civil-service men, were ousted by Benson. They had kept out of politics, concentrated on the problem of helping farmers.

Benson, however, removed their civil-service standing which made them open to firing. The Supreme Court, later, ruled that this technique was illegal and Benson had to hire these men back.

In addition, Secretary Benson had to pay $100,000 out of taxpayers' money to make up the back salaries of FHA State directors whom he fired. Meanwhile, he has been paying out Government money to his own politically-minded State directors like Carl O. Hanson, who seems more interested in continuing his own wool-buying and violating the Hatch Act than in helping small farmers.

Negro Mob in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article from one of the South's most outspoken newspapers, the News and Courier, Charleston, S. C., under date of Wednesday, April 4, 1956, entitled "Negro Mob in Washington." It is a crying shame that the newspapers in metropolitan Washington suppress news in the local papers from the people. However, regardless of the Iron Curtain of Washington, the people know what is going on, and they realize that despite the protestations of those in authority, integration is a hollow and hypocritical mockery. The South has found the answer to the race question, regardless of those who claim we have not.

The article follows:

NEGRO MOB IN WASHINGTON

An outbreak by a mob of Negro teen-agers in Washington is a blot on race relations in the National Capital. The youths threw stones, knives and clubs at the police and misbehaved disgracefully.

What propaganda value the Communists will make of this event the News and Courier does not know—nor do we particularly care. The News and Courier is more interested in domestic peace within the United States than in the opinions of our countrymen that may be held by East Indians, South Asians or North Siberians.

A combination of race agitators and politicians seeking Negro votes has stirred useless and avoidable race troubles within our own country. In the South, white and Negro people lived in harmony until 2 years ago, when the Supreme Court ruled that separate public schools no longer are legal. Since then race relations have deteriorated steadily.

Washington for years has been feeling the impact of Negro migration. Now it is feeling some of the more acute pains of racial aggressiveness, encouraged by a deliberate campaign to arouse Negroes.

We do not attempt to analyze the immediate cause of the outbreak Monday in Fort DuPont Park, on the southeastern edge of Washington. We are told that more than 1,000 Negro teen-agers were engaged in defiance of police after two rival gangs started fighting. We know also that in some other big cities, outside the South, Negroes have formed gangs and created reigns of terror.

These will get worse, we predict, so long as race propaganda and coddling persist.

Many reasons will be ascribed for Negro lawlessness. Much blame will be heaped on the South. But it is obvious that race relations in the segregated South are better than in the nonsegregated cities of the North, East, and West.

Surely that fact will seep into northern minds and illuminate the problem. Meanwhile, southern people of both races should guard against any such demonstrations as occurred Monday in Washington.

The Red River Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, at the recent annual convention of the Red River Valley Association, Maj. Gen. John R. Hardin, division engineer of the lower Mississippi Valley, made a brilliant address on the subject of flood control and navigation in the Red River Valley. General Hardin is one of our superior engineers who has devoted his life and his talents to the military service. A large part of his time has been in the civil functions work of the Army engineers, and in this capacity he has displayed an understanding and shown an exactitude in his judgment far beyond that of the average efficient engineer. The contents of his address makes big news for those of us who live in the Red River Valley in Louisiana, Arkansas, Texas, and Oklahoma.

The address follows:

SPEECH BY MAJ. GEN. JOHN R. HARDIN, DIVISION ENGINEER, LOWER MISSISSIPPI VALLEY DIVISION, CORPS OF ENGINEERS, UNITED STATES ARMY, BEFORE THE RED RIVER VALLEY ASSOCIATION, SHREVEPORT, LA., APRIL 3, 1956

It has become the custom for the Division Engineer, Lower Mississippi Valley Division, to address this Association on the status of water resource improvements within his division. Today, I would like to tell you something of the progress we have made and what we hope to accomplish during the coming year. In addition, I should like also to devote some time to a discussion of the whys and wherefores of the economics of navigation developments.

First, where do we stand now, and where are we going?

The construction of Texarkana Reservoir was begun in 1948, and progress has continued without interruption. We expect that $1,226,000 will be made available to us for fiscal year 1957, which amount will allow us to complete this project. Channel improvements below the dam and some relocation items are all that remain to be done. Railroad and highway relocations are nearly completed. We are all very anxious to see water in this reservoir as soon as possible. We have approved a plan to impound water to within 5 feet of conservation pool level beginning on or about July 1, 1956, provided present progress is maintained on certain highway and railway relocations. Before raising pool level above this stage, it will be necessary to advance the remaining highway work to a point where the risk of flooding will be minimized.

Since 1954, when construction was undertaken on the Ferrells Bridge Reservoir, $3,697,000 has been made available to us for construction of this project. We anticipate that about $4,300,000 will be made available for fiscal year 1957, which will allow us to continue the acquisition of land, continue relocations and the construction of the dam, and to initiate construction of the control and diversion structures for the outlet works.

I know you will be happy to learn that our latest cost estimates indicate that this project will be built for less than the $20,900,000 originally estimated. If this forecast is borne out by experience in the next few years, it should result in a substantial reduction of the costs to be borne by local interests.

The project which we refer to as "Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam" is a major component of the comprehensive flood-control plan. The project consists of raising and strengthening levees and providing bank stabilization works at locations where it is more economical to protect flood-control structures than to relocate them. The levee portion is about 83 percent complete, and the bank stabilization program is about 41 percent complete at the present time, based upon the monetary authorization for this feature. During this coming fiscal year, we hope to have about $500,000 made available to us for use in continuing the stabilization work at critical locations.

There is, as you know, an authorized survey for Red River Bank Stabilization Works, which has as its purpose the development of a general plan for stabilization work on the Red River, its need, and its justification. Initial funds have been appropriated for this study, and we hope to make some progress in the remainder of this fiscal year. Due to a shortage of technical personnel, we have had to devote available talents to what we considered was work of higher priority.

Let us turn our attention now to the Overton-Red River Waterway, about which so much has been written and said lately. As I am sure all of you are aware, there has been more than a little doubt as to justification for and even some opposition to this project. These attitudes emphasize the necessity for reevaluating the economics of this very large undertaking before entering the construction stage. However, we are required, as a matter of longstanding policy, to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Chief of Engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, and the congressional committees that the project is sound before construction funds are requested. We must know beyond any reasonable doubt that the project is thoroughly justified, which means that we must make up-to-date estimates not only of the costs of building the project but of the benefits which will be derived from it. This is necessarily a time-consuming process. It is a process requiring great thoroughness. And since so very much depends upon the results of our findings, I thought it would be of interest to you to hear something of the manner in which we conduct the economic study as a part of the initial detailed planning.

When the report was prepared recommending the Overton-Red River Waterway, and which the Congress authorized in 1946, an economic study of cost and benefits was a most important element of the supporting data. We are all aware that great changes in the economy of the region have occurred since the time of authorization. New industry, new wealth, greater population are all obvious changes. Costs of everything have likewise changed in the 12-year interval since 1944. A comparison of costs and benefits arrived at long ago had to be reexamined before it could be said that what was a good investment for our country then was still good in 1956.

This necessary reevaluation involves a survey of current potential transportation savings, drainage benefits, up-to-date detailed construction cost estimates, and a determination of the costs of relocating bridges, gas lines, power and telephone lines, roads, real estate costs for rights-of-way, and spoil disposal areas. All these details are required because the economic value of the project is based not only upon Federal cost but upon local costs as well.

The costs of relocating highways are based upon estimates prepared from data furnished by and coordinated with the Louisiana highway department. As you know, local interests must pay for all highway relocations and for the modification of existing highway bridges over navigable waterways, and the relocation of utilities. Such costs have increased greatly since the project was originally authorized. Not only have costs of materials and labor risen, but there are many more highways, bridges, and utilities in the valley than there were at the time of authorization.

Experienced staff appraisers of the New Orleans District Real Estate Branch, with the active assistance of the real estate personnel of my office, spent several months making up-to-date field reconnaissance survey to determine real estate costs for this proposed project. They spent considerable time in extracting data from Parish records of real estate transactions and other real estate documents. They also interviewed local real estate people, farmers, bankers, school trustees, store owners, and local, State, and Federal agricultural representatives. The data obtained were combined with an evaluation of present land uses, current market price of commodities, and a consideration of the effect that the canal will have upon land values. The result was a summarized land value estimate which we believe to be the most reasonable estimate possible.

We are now refining our cost estimates for construction. We are also making engineering studies of the exact canal alinement, in cooperation with the Louisiana Department of Public Works and other interested parties, to select the best alinement possible from an engineering standpoint.

I have discussed only a few of the more important factors we are having to take into account in determining the cost of constructing this waterway. On the other side of the ledger, we are making an analysis of the benefits that can be expected from the project once it is in being.

Since many of you are businessmen and all of you are taxpayers, with a personal interest in the investments your Government makes, I thought it might be of interest to you to hear something of the manner in which we conduct a study of the benefits which are expected to be developed from a project of this kind. Time does not permit my discussing the minute details involved in making a complete transportation analysis, but a discussion of a few of the highlights should provide an insight into the complexity and the thoroughness of such an undertaking.

To make an accurate determination of the potential traffic that might move on the proposed waterway, we must make a study of existing commerce in the area—not just that along the banks of the river, but the commerce that might reasonably be expected to move into or out of the area by water.

As an example of the extent to which we explore such possibilities, we make an analysis of commerce being carried by railways and trucks, into and out of the area, not only to determine the types of commodities but also their points of origin and their destination. There is a sound reason for this. A waterway can handle commerce moving in certain directions only. For example, tonnage originating in the Red River Basin bound for New Orleans or Memphis would be readily evaluated for its potential by the water route, while tonnage with a destination such as Tucson, Ariz., would not. Then, of the commerce considered favorable from a directional standpoint for waterway

movement, we must determine what portion is suitable for waterway shipment because of its type. These include bulky commodities and commodities which do not depend upon speed of shipment. Then, it is necessary to evaluate the acceptable portion for waterway movement.

Our next step is to subject this list of commodities to an analysis, the purpose of which is to determine the expected future needs for the commodity. As you can readily see, this involves a study of trends of regional economics. For example, if we are attempting to determine whether more or less commercial fertilizer will be shipped into a region, we can only evaluate this if we know something of the future requirements for commercial fertilizer in the area in question. In addition, we must consider the prospects of whether in the future there is any likelihood of a material change in the source or the destination of the commodities being studied. For example, let us again suppose that substantial quantities of commercial fertilizer were being imported into the region for regional use. If a manufacturer of commercial fertilizer built a plant in the region to supply its use, water shipments of this commodity should decrease.

Of course, we cannot foresee all, or even any substantial part, of the distant future. But we can be realistic, and we can use experience and the science of economic evaluation to make a reasonable prediction as to what can be expected. This requires a rather searching look into the economic future. While we may, in all propriety, consider increases in potential waterway movements due to population increases or requirements for an expanding industry already established, we cannot be unduly optimistic in our assumptions concerning future migration of new industry to this area by reason of building the waterway. Our approach, therefore, must be a conservative one supported by facts as sound as we can determine them.

Even at this point in our analysis, there is still much to be done. We must now determine the savings in the cost of transportation that can be effected, which involves a number of factors. We must analyze present railroad freight rates between points of origin and destination, and in certain cases truck rates also. In addition, insofar as we can, we must find out what contract prices are in existence for large truck movements. Where commodities are bound for far distances we must consider combinations of rail-barge and truck-barge rates.

After this it is necessary to analyze the cost of barge movements. For example, we know from experience and current rates on other portions of the great inland waterway network that it costs a certain amount to move a certain commodity a certain distance on a canal such as that proposed. Knowing the expected tonnages and the distances they will be moved, we can determine the costs of shipments using the waterway in comparison with the present costs of shipment by other means.

In our study we include, in addition, the costs of loading and unloading at each port and the port costs of transferring commodities for transshipment, and the like.

Putting it as simply as possible, in studying the feasibility of a project we make a thorough economic analysis, weighing benefits against costs, very much as an industrialist who is contemplating a plant expansion or the enlargement of a sales territory.

The Overton-Red River Waterway is a project which is naturally of great importance to you. There is, justifiably, a great interest in seeing it undertaken and brought into being. But I am sure that as citizens and taxpayers you are equally anxious that the project be determined as a sound investment before it is undertaken. And that is where we stand on this project at the present time.

The first trial balance on this economic study has almost been completed. There is a great deal which we have yet to determine, and we may have to revisit the area and carry our transportation studies further. With your active cooperation, I am sure that the job will be much easier, and I am certain that this is one thing we can count on. With so much at stake for the future of this valley and the contiguous areas, we must not at this stage jump to hasty conclusions. Biased opinions are easily rendered, but careful, dependable findings in complex problems such as this are difficult and time-consuming. I would urge that we all keep an open mind until our studies are completed.

Wisconsin Another Warning of Farm Sentiment?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the pending vote on the farm bill, the following editorial from the April 5, 1956, issue of the Des Moines Register is timely:

GOP TROUBLE IN MIDWEST

Political observers who are well acquainted with the habits and current motivations of Wisconsin voters are interpreting the outcome of Tuesday's primary election in that State as a sharp warning of trouble ahead for the Republicans.

Their analyses of the returns show that Senator ESTES KEFAUVER has increased his popular following in the State. The Democrats made their best showing in a good many years in the proportion of voters casting ballots for candidates for delegate to the Democratic National Convention. Returns from rural areas indicated that farm votes were cast in protest against the Eisenhower administration's price-support policies.

In the light of Senator KEFAUVER's recent victory in Minnesota, these interpretations of the results in Wisconsin carry more weight than they would standing alone.

The ballot box evidence in these two midwestern farm States points to real trouble ahead for the Republican Party where the farm and small-town vote is concerned. Unless the administration finds some way to check this trend, Republican strength in Congress from this region may be still further reduced next November.

The administration's biggest hope is that President Eisenhower's personal popularity will offset some of these losses. To what extent that hope is well founded cannot be measured by the Wisconsin election.

Senator KEFAUVER polled approximately 316,000 votes Tuesday. Four years ago, his total was 207,520. The total Democratic vote cast at that time was 241,525. He had nominal opposition from two other candidates. This represents a gain for the Democrats of more than 74,000 votes.

The Republican vote Tuesday for Eisenhower delegates totaled close to 418,000. Four years ago, the total was 776,624. This represents a drop of approximately 358,000 votes. But 4 years ago, a hot contest between supporters of Robert A. Taft, Earl Warren, and Harold Stassen added spice and interest to the Wisconsin GOP primary. This year there was almost negligible opposition to the Eisenhower slate.

But neither was there a contest in the Democratic Party this year. This increase in the number of Democratic ballots must be interpreted, then, in either of two ways. KEFAUVER's personal popularity has increased enough to attract more voters to the Democratic ticket, or the gain shown by the Democrats represented a protest drift away from the Republican Party.

It would seem that the latter might be more nearly correct, since all other polls of Wisconsin sentiment have shown a much wider spread between President Eisenhower and Senator KEFAUVER in personal popularity than the election returns would indicate.

The Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the farmers of the Nation will have their day in the House of Representatives. Tomorrow we will have a showdown and when the votes are taken the farmers of America will be able to count their friends one by one. The farmers will then know whether Members of Congress are interested in their welfare and in their livelihoods. The tragic downward trend in farm income has led the farmers of the Nation to the brink of bankruptcy. The question each Member of the House will decide for himself tomorrow is whether or not, he, as a Representative in Congress, understands the desperate plight of agriculture and is willing to pull the farmers back from the brink of bankruptcy or whether we shall let them continue on in their distressing and disturbing plight.

The bill we will consider tomorrow represents a real effort to check this downward tragic trend in farm income and to increase farm income in this good year of our Lord, 1956. The deletion of a single provision of this bill would tend to give speed and momentum to the decreasing of farm income.

Mr. Speaker, I have just received a very thought-provoking letter from one of the great farm leaders of the Nation, the worthy master of the National Grange, Herschel D. Newsom, to which was attached a table containing some very interesting figures. I hope that all Members will read and consider the comments and figures submitted to me by this great farm leader, a man in whom all Members of Congress must have great faith and confidence and a man who is loved and respected by farmers of our country. Herschel Newsom is a man with great vision, and he has worked diligently and intelligently in the cause of agriculture, a cause to which he has dedicated his life and his time and his efforts. I hope that the advice of this man, a real friend of the farmers and an American in the true sense of that word, will be given consideration by every Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I also today received a letter from one of the most intelligent and dynamic farm leaders of our country, a man who is held in high esteem by the people of my State of North Carolina and who has worked year in and year out for the farmers of my district and State, Harry B. Caldwell, the Master of North Carolina State Grange. The last paragraph of Mr. Caldwell's letter is brief and to the point, and I hope that it will be read by every Member of this House when the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD comes out tomorrow morning:

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C., April 10, 1956.

The Honorable HAROLD COOLEY,
Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thousands of rural families and farmers are hoping that the scheduled motion to recommit the farm bill—with instructions to delete the wheat program long advocated by the National Grange and by wheatgrowers themselves, and also to delete certain other measures contained in the bill as reported out by the committee on conference—can be defeated by a resounding vote in the House of Representatives.

Recommittal for any purpose at this date would surely serve to delay this needed legislation. So far as the soil-bank provisions of this legislation are concerned, it is already late enough in the spring that they are of questionable value to farmers this year, at least in the South. Further delay would tend to destroy any remaining potential value, for 1956, of the soil bank and other factors in the bill which may tend to influence spring planning and planting.

It is the position of the National Grange that, even though the report of the committee on conference fails to conform perfectly with Grange views, the bill now before both Houses of the Congress is a constructive bill because it recognizes the seriousness of the decline in farm income and takes action to deal with it—this year. This action is absolutely necessary. It is of paramount importance if the income position of farmers is to be maintained in 1956, and not lowered further.

All of us need to recognize that there is no such thing as a perfect farm bill in the eyes of all the different interests. Therefore, we believe the time is at hand for all who are truly interested in agriculture and the farmer—and the farmers' plight—to put an end to their predilections and accept what appears to be a reasonable and workable compromise.

All of us need to recognize, also, that the principal effect of the motion to recommit—for any of the reasons so far advanced—would be to reduce farm income this year.

It is our earnest hope that the Congress will approve this conference report forthwith and that it can become operative speedily.

While it is abundantly clear that the conferees have been motivated by their wise and proper recognition of the 1956 emergency in farm income, it is equally clear that the measure contains a number of constructive features that contribute to the development of a sound, long-time, farm program.

The domestic parity program for wheat, for example, is a highly constructive advance in farm legislation. It is, in fact, one of the most significant changes in the farm program that has been made in many years. It recognizes the desirability of preserving the right of American farm producers to have access to markets on a competitive basis; it further recognizes the fundamental fact that American farmers alone cannot be expected to compete, even in their own domestic primary markets, at world price levels when no other Americans are expected so to do. It is highly regrettable that some spokesmen for American farmers have failed to recognize this fundamental fact and value in the grange wheat program.

The National Grange and rural families generally are deeply appreciative of the diligent effort made by yourself and your colleagues from the House Agriculture Committee to draft and present a measure that will have constructive and wholesome influence on farm income in the immediate future.

We are in possession of highly significant figures that indicate clearly that the decline in farm income and rural purchasing power is much more serious than has been recognized by the sponsors of this motion to recommit this bill. It is not our purpose to burden you with a mass of figures and statistics, many of which you are undoubtedly familiar with, but I am taking the liberty of enclosing a set of figures from one of the fine farm production areas of this country near my own home. Even a casual study of these figures will clearly indicate the validity of the above statements. These figures themselves clearly indicate the reason that we are beginning to get increasing numbers of reports to the effect that bank examiners are cautioning rural banks against further expansion of credit to farmers for the purpose of paying interest charges which are not available out of current farm income. These are the factors that are contributing to the rapid increase in farm mortgage indebtedness.

Let me repeat that it is the earnest hope of the National Grange that your colleagues in the House of Representatives will vote against the scheduled motion to recommit this measure, and will then forthwith proceed to approve it by a resounding margin.

Respectfully yours,

HERSCHEL D. NEWSOM,
Master.

CHANGES IN FARM EARNINGS AND RELATED FACTORS, BY TYPE OF FARM, ILLINOIS, 1953, 1954, AND 1955

TABLE 1.—*Average size of farm—tillable acres—for grain, hog, and cattle farms, Illinois, 1953, 1954, and 1955*

Type	Tillable acres		
	1953	1954	1955
20 grain farms	389	394	394
20 hog farms	248	255	289
10 cattle farms	280	280	294

TABLE 2.—*Acres planted to corn and average yields per acre by type of farm, Illinois, 1953, 1954, and 1955*

Type	1953		1954		1955	
	Acres in corn	Yield per acre	Acres in corn	Yield per acre	Acres in corn	Yield per acre
		Bu.		*Bu.*		*Bu.*
20 grain farms	136	71	136	51	134	74
20 hog farms	107	68	103	45	112	69
10 cattle farms	103	69	84	54	115	67

TABLE 3.—*Average net management returns per farm for grain, hog, and cattle farms—Illinois, 1953, 1954, and 1955*

Type	1953	1954	1955
20 grain farms	$7,836	$4,632	$1,161
20 hog farms	6,640	4,265	[1] 2,900
10 cattle farms	513	[1] 1,358	[1] 6,795

[1] Loss.

Decrease in earnings per farm during 2-year period 1953–55:

	Per farm
Grain farms	$6,675
Hog farms	9,540
Cattle farms	7,208

Source of data: Illinois Farm Business Records, Melvin P. Gehlbach, chairman, Soil-Bank Association, Lincoln, Ill.

NORTH CAROLINA STATE GRANGE,
Greensboro, N. C., April 10, 1956.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HAROLD: We have examined the conference committee bill and report and I wish to commend you and your colleagues for the results achieved. I am sure that farmers throughout the United States are grateful for your continued efforts in their behalf.

Farm income has dropped to a critical point and unless steps are taken to bolster commodity prices there is serious trouble ahead. Farm prices in most instances are down to support levels and are likely to continue at those levels for some time to come. Consequently, we were pleased with your efforts to raise the level of supports. We believe that this provision in the pending bill will bring some increase in income for farmers during the current year.

We also appreciate your support of the Grange sponsored domestic parity program for wheat together with a similar provision for rice. We believe that these provisions will help producers hold important world markets without destroying prices for their products on the domestic market.

We were also pleased to note that our tobacco growers have been included in the soil bank section of the bill. This may result in some voluntary reductions below acreage allotments by growers and thus help to bring supply into better balance with demand.

We hope that Congress will accept the conference committee report and that any motion to recommit this legislation with instruction to delete the domestic parity program for wheat or reduce price support levels will be defeated.

Again thanking you for your vigorous efforts in behalf of our farmers, I am

Cordially,

HARRY B. CALDWELL,
Master, North Carolina State Grange.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*——Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*——
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*——
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*——The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*——
Bender, George H., *Ohio*—120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*—
Bible, Alan, *Nev*——
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*——The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*——
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*——
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*—
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*——The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*—The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*——Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*——
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*——4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*——3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*——The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*——
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*——
Daniel, Price, *Tex*——
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*——
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*——
Duff, James H., *Pa*——
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*—
Eastland, James O., *Miss*—5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*——
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*—
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*——
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*——
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*—
George, Walter F., *Ga*——The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*—
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*——
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*——
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*—
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*——
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*—Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*—
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*—
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*——
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*—
Jenner, William E., *Ind*——
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*—
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*——
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*——4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*——
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*——
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*—
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*—
Laird, William R. III, *W. Va*—
Langer, William, *N. Dak*—2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*—Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*——
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*—
McClellan, John L., *Ark*——
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*——
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*——The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*——
Martin, Edward, *Pa*——
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*——4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*—
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*—
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*——5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*——122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*—The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*—
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*—
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*——
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*—
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*—
Purtell, William A., *Conn*—
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*—
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*——
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*—2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*—
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*——
Smathers, George A., *Fla*—
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*—Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*—
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*——4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*——
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*——
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*——
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*—
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*——4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*——2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*——
Wofford, Thomas A., *S. C*—
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*—Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Johnson of Texas, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Barkley, Anderson, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Morse, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, ———, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Scott, Bible, Neuberger, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, ———, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Laird, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, ———, ———, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dill, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Appendix

The Road Back to a National Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the March 1956 issue of UAW–AFL Auto Worker, Mr. Robert W. Gilbert has contributed an important and thought-provoking article entitled "The Road Back to a National Labor Relations Act." Mr. Gilbert's article is an important contribution to the growing literature on the subject of the invasion of federally granted labor rights by State legislatures, agencies, and courts.

The dangers resulting from the abuses of labor injunctions by State courts were pointed out 3 years ago in the staff study entitled "State Labor Injunctions and Federal Law," prepared for the Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. Gilbert has rendered a distinct service in summarizing recent developments in Federal-State jurisdictional problems in the field of labor relations, and I invite the attention of my colleagues to his illuminating article.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROAD BACK TO A NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

(By Robert W. Gilbert)

Last December 2, the Supreme Court of California handed down two very important labor decisions recognizing the "exclusive primary jurisdiction" of the National Labor Relations Board over union disputes with employers engaged in interstate commerce.

These two cases, *Benton* v. *Painters Union* and *Garmon* v. *San Diego Building Trades Council*, followed the recent trend of decisions by the Supreme Court of the United States. Under such cases as *Garner* v. *Teamsters Union* and *Weber* v. *Anheuser-Busch, Inc.*, the Nation's High Court has again firmly established this pattern of Federal-State labor jurisdiction:

1. State courts and labor boards may not regulate strikes, picketing and other concerted union activities which are prohibited by Federal labor laws.

2. States may not regulate concerted union activities which are protected by Federal labor laws.

3. State labor agencies may not conflict with NLRB procedures and policies in employee representation cases.

4. State courts may not grant relief to an interstate business against union activities unless the employer has first applied to the NLRB and the Board has "affirmatively declined jurisdiction."

What happens where the National Labor Relations Board has refused to take the case? The United States Supreme Court hasn't ruled on that point yet. In a memorandum decision handed down in January 1954, Kinard Construction Co. case, the Court held that a State could not act to halt picketing where the employer did not first apply to the NLRB for relief, leaving open the question as to "whether the State court could grant its own relief should the Board decline to exercise its jurisdiction."

In the Garmon case, the California Supreme Court attempted to guess how the United States Supreme Court will eventually answer that question. A 4 to 3 split decision, the majority opinion in the Garmon case was written by former Associate Justice Edmonds, since retired from the California high court. It declared that State courts are free to issue injunctions once the NLRB has ruled that it won't take jurisdiction over the particular employer.

According to the Garmon decision, State courts may even enforce Taft-Hartley restrictions against picketing for a closed shop contract with an interstate concern although the closed shop is permitted under State law—in a case where the NLRB's regional director has already dismissed a previous representation petition filed by the employer.

Why has there been so much conflict in the courts over the location of the boundary line between Federal and State jurisdiction in labor matters? Two decades of trade union history disclose the background of this important problem.

After long and bitter experience with repressive State laws and anti-union injunctions, organized labor hailed the passage of the Wagner Act by the New Deal 74th Congress in 1935 as a Magna Carta. A national labor policy protecting the right of employees to form and join unions and to engage in concerted economic activities for purposes of collective bargaining had become "the supreme law of the land."

The Senate Labor Committee, in reporting on the Wagner Act, pointed out that—

"Section 10 (a) gives the National Labor Relations Board exclusive jurisdiction * * * and * * * establishes clearly that this bill is paramount over other laws."

Between 1935 and 1947, the United States Supreme Court struck down several State laws and State labor relations board decisions because they conflicted with policies adopted by Congress and the NLRB. Then, in 1947, organized labor condemned the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act over President Truman's veto by the reactionary 80th Congress as a slave labor law. Taft-Hartley reversed the Wagner Act policy encouraging self-organization of employees and collective bargaining, under the pretense of restoring equality of bargaining power between labor and management.

The Taft-Hartley Act made serious inroads on the concept of a truly national labor policy. It deleted the word "exclusive" from the definition of NLRB power to prevent unfair labor practices. It authorized the Board to abdicate its jurisdiction in favor of State labor agencies under certain circumstances. It amended section 14 of the Federal Labor Act to wipe out union-shop agreements in those States and Territories adopting so-called right-to-work legislation.

The Taft-Hartley Act was the go-ahead signal for revival of another NAM-inspired drive for antilabor bills in the State legislatures. In 1947, 14 States adopted restrictive laws against union security. (Three of them have since repealed these right-to-wreck laws.)

Even more liberal States like California (which had rejected the right-to-wreck measure at the polls in 1944) adopted a so-called jurisdictional strikes law in 1947. (This law still opens the door to strike-breaking through the creation of company unions in a manner forbidden by the NLRB, despite some amendments passed in 1955.)

From coast to coast, efforts were made by antiunion employers to use State courts to enjoin picketing, striking, and boycotting under the pretense of local enforcement of the Taft-Hartley Act. Such efforts were rejected by the California Supreme Court in the case of *Gerry* v. *I. L. G. W. U.*, decided in June 1948, holding that the Taft-Hartley amendments could not deprive the NLRB of its exclusive jurisdiction.

When a Los Angeles trial judge sent a retail clerks' union leader to jail for supposedly picketing in violation of the Taft-Hartley Act, the California Supreme Court freed him on a writ of habeas corpus in the fall of 1948.

Meanwhile, the United States Supreme Court began backsliding in the face of the rising torrent of antiunion propaganda. It upheld the Arizona and Nebraska right-to-work laws as constitutional in January 1949, and permitted the Wisconsin Employment Relations Board to enforce restrictions on maintenance-of-membership agreements that March.

On February 28, 1949, the Supreme Court handed down its startling decision in the case of *International Union, United Automobile Workers, A. F. L.* v. *Wisconsin Employment Relations Board*, popularly known as the Briggs-Stratton case.

That ruling allowed the Wisconsin Board to order the UAW–AFL's Local 232 to cease and desist from engaging in sudden work stoppages at plants where the UAW–AFL had been certified by the NLRB.

Soon realizing that it had gone too far in Briggs-Stratton, the Supreme Court struck down a Wisconsin Board order restricting union security in February of 1950; invalidated a Michigan strike vote law that May; and, in February of 1951, knocked out a Wisconsin ban on public utility strikes. These three State actions were held invalid because they interfered with rights conferred upon employees by section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act.

The State courts were slow to respond to this backswing of the Supreme Court pendulum in the direction of restoring a national labor policy. Even the relatively liberal California Supreme Court held in a 4–3 decision on March 10, 1953, that the national labor policy did not prevent an injunction against picketing an interstate business under the State Jurisdictional Strikes Act. (*Sommer* v. *Metal Trades Council.*)

That same December, the United States Supreme Court proved the error of this California version of the Briggs-Stratton doctrine. In *Garner* v. *Teamsters Union*, it held that a State antipicketing injunction must fall where it conflicts with the Federal policy. The Garner opinion specifically found that "the public interest is

served by freedom of labor to use the weapon of picketing."

Labor attorneys, like this writer, were doing their utmost during this crucial period to persuade the NLRB to actively oppose conflicting State court rulings. In the Capital Service case, I wrote the NLRB General Counsel, on behalf of the A. F. of L. unions involved there, demanding that he "institute legal action in the Federal courts to compel (the employer) to cease prosecuting its State court suit" while charges were pending before the board. The United States Supreme Court eventually held, on May 17, 1954 (*Capital Service, Inc.* v. *N. L. R. B.*), that the board could secure an injunction in Federal court forbidding the employer to enforce a California court order against A. F. of L. picketing, for the purpose of protecting the Federal agency's exclusive jurisdiction.

In March 1955, the Weber decision came down, invalidating a Missouri antipicketing injunction in a so-called jurisdictional quarrel between two rival labor unions because the NLRB has "exclusive primary jurisdiction to pass on the union's picketing."

State courts are at last beginning to accept the mandate of the United States Supreme Court that they must show deference to the national labor policy, as evidence by the Garmon and Benton decisions of the California Supreme Court on December 2, 1955. (However, the Benton case permitted an antipicketing injunction to stand against the Roofers' Union in the same case because it applied to a local business enterprise of the same employer which did not affect interstate commerce like his interstate painting business, being picketed by the Teamsters and Painters Unions. As mentioned above, the Garmon case permitted an antipicketing injunction to stand where the board's regional director had dismissed the employer's petition on the ground that his business did not affect interstate commerce enough to justify the attention of the NLRB.

The Garmon decision did expressly recognize that—

"The reason for preventing State courts from acting in cases in which the Board has jurisdiction is to * * * avoid diversities and conflicts likely to result from a variety of local procedures and attitudes toward labor controversies."

Free collective bargaining is one of our Nation's strongest bulwarks against tyranny, both foreign and domestic. If we are to indeed remain "indivisible, with liberty and justice for all," America must adopt a national labor policy which is more equitable than the Taft-Hartley Act and which will apply uniformly in all of the 48 States and the Territories.

Now that the Supreme Court has returned to its traditional view that the national labor policy is the supreme law fof the land, the next major goal should be to elect a President and Congress this November who will be pledged to eliminate the antilabor features of the Taft-Hartley Act. Elimination of the right-to-wreck feature of section 14 (b), which makes State union-security laws paramount to the Federal law, is must legislation.

School Segregation in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, when the white people of the South made it clear that they intended to resist and to seek to reverse the recent unconstitutional decision by the Supreme Court in the school cases, veritable torrents of abuse and bitterness were leveled at them from some so-called liberal sources.

It is refreshing to find that in areas other than the South there are those who have seen through all the implications of the decision. There came to my desk an editorial from the Standard-Times, a daily newspaper published in New Bedford, Mass., dealing with this subject, from which I wish to read one sentence:

We are sorry for the southern whites and southern Negroes to be pawns in this politicking of the Supreme Court.

I am sure there are thousands of persons throughout the country who will agree with this editorial, and there are many thousands, both white and Negro, who live in the South who will appreciate having such a stalwart and understanding friend in the North.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IKE ASKED FOR IT

In two recent press conferences President Eisenhower discussed the school segregation issue in the South, saying this is "a time when we must be patient" and try to avoid "a tremendous fight that is going to separate Americans and get ourselves into a nasty mess."

Unfortunately, the mess which the President deprecates, already exists and should have been foreseen, when, under White House pressure, the Supreme Court reversed the law of 60 years standing with reference to school segregation in the South.

Several cases involving alleged discrimination against Negroes in Southern schools were pending in the Supreme Court when former Governor Warren became the new chief justice. The views of the President against segregation were well known, as may have been those of Chief Justice Warren. But to make doubly sure the Supreme Court made the right decision, the President instructed Attorney General Brownell to appear in the case, as a friend of the court, urging desegregation.

Two important provisions of the Federal Constitution are involved in the desegregation decision. The 14th amendment, approved in 1868, forbids any State to "deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

The other provision of the Constitution directly affecting the desegregation problem is that one which specifically says, "The powers not delegated to the United States, by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

Under the former provision of the 14th amendment, no State could discriminate between Negro citizens and whites with reference to schools or otherwise. Under the second provision, the 10th amendment, control of the schools was specifically reserved to the States, as not having been delegated to the Federal Government.

Obviously, under the 10th amendment the South had the undisputed right to control its schools, unless its policies violated the 14th amendment forbidding discrimination between Negroes and whites. For 60 years the Supreme Court had ruled the 14th amendment requires equal school and other facilities, but not identical; in other words, schools and other facilities "may be separate, but must be equal."

The Warren decision, which the President now faces with pleas for patience, destroyed the school formula of the South, a formula under which admittedly the Negroes of the South and the South had made steady and peaceful progress for more than half a century.

In a windy decision by Chief Justice Warren himself, the Chief Justice said in effect, "The very fact of segregation constitutes discrimination, gives the Negro a sense of inferiority, etc."

That this is untrue is evidenced by the fact many of the leaders of the Negroes in the South and the North, including many of the Negro school teachers of the South, not only feel no inferiority as a result of segregation, but object to attempts to force desegregation upon either Negroes or whites.

Though the President may not himself have been influenced by political considerations, the Warren decision was heavily weighted with politics.

Leaders close to the President undoubtedly told the President desegregation, if accomplished during his administration, would go a long way toward winning back the Negro vote of the North. This vote had been lost to the New Deal of the Roosevelt-Truman era.

Not only was such a purpose highly improper, but it has not and it will not work. For one thing, there is no segregation problem in the North—for there is no segregation. For another thing, the Negro vote, to whatever extent it was and is Democratic, is influenced by the New Deal philosophy, which only can be cured, if at all, by the process of education, a process which has been rudely struck down in the South by the recent Supreme Court decision.

Another equally improper consideration which is thought to have been influential in the Supreme Court's "political decision" is that there was thinking emanating from the State Department that desegregation would eliminate Communist-inspired criticism of the United States in India and others of the countries of the dark races.

Here again the administration did not see beyond its own nose. The antipathy of India does not spring from segregation in southern schools, etc. It springs from the fact that India, while recipient of our generous bounty, is basically Communist in its sympathy and is interested in the segregation issue of this country only because it suits its own propaganda purposes.

We're sorry for the southern whites and southern Negroes to be pawns in this politicking of the Supreme Court. We're sorry for Ike now that he sees what he helped to procure and produce. It's going to take a lot more than patience to solve this one—on Ike's part as well as of those in the North and South whom he beseeches.

Joint Disarmament and the Foreign Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech I recently made concerning mutual reduction of 15 percent in the arms budget of the United States and the Soviet Union with part of the savings to be allocated to the joint foreign aid program administered by the United Nations.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER AT JEFFERSON-JACKSON DINNER OF YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUBS OF MARYLAND, BALTIMORE, MARCH 10, 1956

As we meet here tonight, the representatives of the world's great powers are gathering in London to prepare for the resumption of disarmament talks which have a life-or-death significance for our Nation and for all nations.

The peace-loving peoples of the free world are looking to the United States for responsible leadership in breaking a 10-year-old deadlock on reduction of armament which must be resolved if our way of life is to survive.

I fervently pray that our country's representatives will be inspired to display true leadership when they face up to the Russians during the coming crucial meetings.

It is high time that this Nation began using the weapons of resourcefulness and imagination and initiative in dealing with the Communists.

They are weapons far more powerful than the hydrogen bomb.

They are the only diplomatic weapons with which we can persuade the Russians or maneuver them into joining us in our clearly demonstrated determination to limit the weapons of destruction which are as pressing a burden upon the Russian people as they are upon our own.

I have been a frequent critic of the Eisenhower administration because it has come forward with no plan for disarmament until a few days ago—although Secretary Dulles says that he has reason to believe that the Russians would like some relief from their great burden of armaments.

Harold Stassen is in charge of creating a disarmament plan. He has tried hard to carry out his assignment. But he cannot get the members of the Eisenhower team to agree with him. On one thing, Secretary Dulles disagrees. On another, Secretary of Defense Wilson disagrees. There are varying degrees of disagreement throughout the rest of the administration.

If we had a President other than President Eisenhower, he would have made a decision by now between the opposing forces on the team. But President Eisenhower insists that only unanimous agreements be brought to him. This is the same policy which he has applied with unhappy effect to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The result is that despite the peace offensive of the Soviet Union, the United States is unable to start one of its own.

Our allies are growing restive because of our inaction. It is damaging our prestige in such United Nations gatherings as the forthcoming talks in London. It is eating away at our leadership of free world forces. Yet the team can make no decision and the President will not.

I said earlier that I am a frequent critic of this administration.

I have reason to be—both as a Democrat and as an American.

But I am not so partisan a critic that I will not recognize even a small modicum of inspiration when the administration finally bestirs itself into action rather than merely abiding by its familiar and melancholy waltz pattern of following while the Russians lead.

I think President Eisenhower's letter earlier this week to Russian Premier Bulganin, proposing to negotiate on reductions in the level of nuclear and conventional armaments was a step in that direction.

Like all of you, I was pleased by the Russian Premier's preliminary reaction, which was a grudging concession that the Eisenhower proposal was—and I quote—"good."

I do not think the Eisenhower proposal goes far enough. But if it has elicited this initial Soviet response, then it might provide the basis for fruitful negotiations across the conference tables in London.

Last summer, leaders of this administration went to the "summit" at Geneva full of hope and little more. They returned with nothing but bruised feelings. Their hopes were dashed by Soviet hostility and vastly superior Soviet diplomacy. As a result, we suffered a major defeat in the eyes of the world.

This time the hope must be balanced by a full quota of stern determination to persuade the Soviets that they have nothing to gain by obstructionist behavior. This time, the hope must be supported by positive programs, so skillfully conceived that for the Russians to spurn our honest offers to halt the arms race would hand them a major defeat in the eyes of the world.

But I wonder if the administration's representatives are going to London so armed to meet the Russians?

I refer you to a front page story in yesterday's New York Times, which reported that Harold Stassen was flying to London today with—and I quote—"a new set of disarmament proposals in his briefcase with a suitcase full of hope."

I don't like the comparative weight of his baggage, do you? I wish Mr. Stassen well on his mission, but I was rather disturbed when the New York Times reported a news conference held by Mr. Stassen in these terms—and again I quote:

"The accent was on his hopes, rather than on the substance of the proposals he planned to put before the United Nations Subcommittee on Disarmament when its so-far fruitless negotiations are resumed in London March 19."

Are we in for another summit disaster? Is Mr. Stassen, who tries hard enough to wage peace, going to be forced to stuff rejected and inadequate proposals back into his briefcase because the "team" simply lacks the spark needed to create disarmament programs calculated to capture the imagination of peace-loving peoples throughout the world?

Will Mr. Stassen come home with his suitcase barren of hope because the "team" simply can't agree on a program so expertly contructed that the Russians cannot reject it without serious loss of face—particularly in the uncommitted areas of the world where they have seized the initiative from us?

My friends, if ever this Nation needed a change in leadership, the time is now. However, under our democratic processes, that change will not come before next November. But it will come!

In the meantime, November is eight months away. And eight months can be an eternity in the fast-moving world of today. The time to achieve a reduction of armaments is during the next few weeks in London.

One of my chief complaints about this administration is that it has failed to take hold of proposals previously made which offer great hope of achieving peace. I am thinking particularly of a far-sighted proposal by the late Senator Bryan McMahon which should be given fresh consideration at this critical moment in history.

The administration is also duty-bound to give careful consideration to fresh programs—whatever their origin and even if they stem from Democratic sources.

The administration has long acted as if it considered the conduct of our international relations its own special preserve. This has been particulary true in the field of armament reduction. Well, it's high time it put the conduct of our foreign relations on a truly bi-partisan basis—as we Democrats did.

I have a plan to propose to the Eisenhower administration which would, I believe, put a powerful brake upon the arms race—and, at the same time, help us to meet the new and insistent Soviet challenge of nonviolent expansion in the Middle and the Far East.

I offer it to the administration in a completely unpartisan spirit. Indeed, if the administration accepts this plan, and actively strives to put it into operation, it can become one of the proudest plants in the GOP campaign platform.

And if it succeeds, every Democrat will give this administration credit for a major achievement in helping to secure the peace we Democrats so earnestly desire.

The plan is simple.

I call upon President Eisenhower to instruct our representatives in London to propose that Russia join us in an immediate and mutual reduction of armament expenditures by 15 percent.

Coupled with this proposal, and to be made a binding portion of the arms reduction agreement, would be the condition that one-third of the amount saved will then be put into a pool for economic aid to underdeveloped areas.

This joint point 4 program should be administered by the United Nations in such a manner that neither the Soviet Union nor the United States could individually claim the credit for its successes or be blamed for its failures.

In this manner, the Russians will be prevented from making the sort of inroads in the underdeveloped areas which their propaganda drive is now accomplishing in the Far East.

And—who knows?—perhaps a joint endeavor of this nature, administered impartially by the United Nations and combining a reduction in the tools of war with an increase in the tools of economic self-sufficiency for a third of the world, might constitute our first real advance toward peace in 10 years.

In order to extend the greatest benefits of the program to the underdeveloped nations, the first act in its implementation should be the calling a U. N. sponsored economic conference to permit the underdeveloped nations to determine the most lasting long-term benefits from the sizable economic resources which the mutual cut in armament expenditures would provide.

If the Russians refuse to go along with these proposals, they will not only stand condemned in the eyes of the world as foes of arms reduction and peace but—more important, the peoples of the underdeveloped nations will see them stripped of their pretenses and exposed as aggressors who dangle offers of economic aid only for propaganda purposes.

If they are forced to go along with us, then they will help us to accomplish a task for which there is an urgent need in terms of humanity and which will serve our own democratic purposes by strengthening the defenses of the recipient nations against the economic chaos on which communism thrives.

I do not wish to bore you with figures, but let us examine briefly what the allocation of one-third of the savings in arms would mean to whole populations in other parts of the world whose major concern is keeping 1 day away from hunger:

Our budget for arms is roughly $35 billion. Although a sizable portion of the Soviet outlay for arms is concealed in other expenditures such as heavy industry, all available intelligence indicates that Soviet expenditures approximate our own.

Simple arithmetic shows that this plan would funnel approximately $3 billion into a fund to further freedom and prosperity among the new nations of the world who are struggling desperately to achieve self-sufficiency.

Surely this is a plan in keeping with the forward-looking traditions of the Democratic Party, the party which created the Marshall plan, NATO, and point 4.

I am the first to admit that the implementation of this program presents obvious administrative problems. But, for the love of humanity, let us not permit paper problems to stand in the way of creating a new force for good in the world.

From our purely domestic viewpoint this plan has the merit of offering a reduction in the income taxes paid by the average American. With one-third of the savings going to assist young nations in need of help, the other two-thirds could be lopped from our national budget and passed along to the taxpayer who needs relief most—the little fellow.

Importance as they are, however, it is not with reductions in income taxes that I am concerned most.

The question of peace and war is the most crucial of our times. Not only is our own safety involved but the safety of all men everywhere.

Civilization as we know it, and even life itself, may hang in the balance.

The balance has been going against us under this administration.

Let us swing that balance our way and win world opinion through concrete proposals designed to relieve international tensions, improve the economic conditions of the nations, and take the peace propaganda offensive away from the Russians.

I think the plan I have outlined constitutes one such proposal. I commend it to your attention and to the attention of this administration with a warning that time is running out and the time for action is now.

The Congress and the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Congress and the Constitution," which I recently made on the radio.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONGRESS AND THE CONSTITUTION

There is one fundamental idea which underlies the structure of our governmental machinery—the unwavering distrust of a strong Executive, be he President, King, Prime Minister, or Governor. The Federal Constitution, as well as the constitutions of the 48 States, contain specific limitations on the powers of their Chief Executive, including limited succession, confirmation of executive nominations, removal of executive officials, restraints on spending, and others.

It is, of course, natural that this should be so. The colonists who tore away from England had had enough of strong executives, of autocratic kings and autocratic governors.

When independence was established, they worked to design a government in which the executive would be under the control of the people. Their success is visible in the Constitution.

They made the Executive subject to the watchfulness and the will of Congress, subject thereby, to the will of the people. Congress was established as the eyes, ears, and the voice of the people. It performs the noblest function of government; that of making the laws. The function of the Executive is to put those laws into effect exactly as Congress wrote them. Nothing more.

Examination of the Constitution will reveal how carefully the Founding Fathers spelled out the differences between the authority of the people and those of the President. The decisions of the President are always limited by the higher tribunal of the Congress, but decisions of the Congress—within the Constitution, are final.

The Congress has the conclusive power to pass laws. The President may veto legislation, but his veto is never final. It can be overturned by a two-thirds majority of the Congress and that decision is final.

The President has the power to grant pardons and reprieves. But that power does not include pardon of impeachment which is a decision of the Congress.

The Constitution provides that the President shall be Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States, but he cannot use those Armed Forces in war, except by the action of Congress. The power to declare war is vested, exclusively, in Congress. Again we see that the decisions of policy are those of Congress—the management or administration of those decisions are the President's.

The President negotiates treaties and foreign agreements, but any treaty so concluded is worthless unless two-thirds of the Senate consents to their enactment.

The President can nominate officials and judges, but his power to appoint them depends upon the consent of the Senate.

The complete dependence of the Executive on the approval of the Congress is inherent in the fact that the Congress controls the power of the purse—the raising and spending of funds. Without money, no Executive can operate and without congressional action there is no money.

Finally, we see the intention of the Founding Fathers, to make Congress the supreme authority, in the provision for impeachment. The Congress can remove, by impeachment, any civil official or Federal judge. Why the Congress can, by impeachment, remove the President, himself. But there is no parallel authority to remove Members of Congress. No one can remove a Member of the Congress during his elected term of office. Why? Because he represents the people, and in this land, the people reign supreme over the affairs of Government.

It is for these reasons that Alexander Hamilton, in the Federalist papers, speaks eloquently of the "superior weight and influence of the legislative body in a free government." It is upon this superior weight that a free government must rest. Once the balance of influence shifts to the Executive, free government has set foot upon the road of self-destruction.

Yet, that road has already been set upon by our Nation. We are, in fact, well on our way toward its end. The Executive has become superior to the Congress in weight and influence.

As the affairs of the Nation became more numerous and life more complex, there began a trend toward increasing the scope of the Executive. Today, actually, it is the Executive, as represented by the person of the President, who wields virtually all of the power of government. The Congress has helped increase the Presidential power by a direct abdication of its functions.

We have a growing body of laws which vest tremendous powers in the hands of the President, or some Presidential appointee. I recall that in the recent farm bill before the Senate, there were over 20 instances of the delegation of congressional power to the Secretary of Agriculture, including such vital functions as the determination of how much money shall be spent under the various farm-support and soil-bank programs.

A second source of increasing Presidential power is open usurpation. Usurpation was effective because the Congress failed to exercise its powers, especially its powers to remove officers who tried to operate above the law. The recent example of a President making war in Korea without asking for congressional consent, is an example of autocratic Executive power in this country.

When such an act is committed, the Congress has a clear obligation to assert its authority. To declare war is constitutionally the power of Congress alone. Any other method of making war is, therefore, clearly unconstitutional. A President who thus violated the Constitution violated his oath of office to uphold and preserve it. Congress had the power and the duty to act. It did not act and thus another of its powers slipped into the hands of the Executive.

Why is it that Congress has allowed this state of affairs to come about and then to continue? I think the answer is rather simple. The voters, the people for whom the Congress speaks, have been indifferent. We have concentrated increasingly at election time on the Presidency. That has been the star of the whole show, with the congressional candidates all too often playing a secondary role. Yet it is the Congress that makes the laws upon which the Presidency operates.

Perhaps the increasing power of the President is largely due to the changed attitude of the people as a whole. We look now to the Federal Government for the solution of most of our problems, problems which traditionally have been met by the State and local governments, or private initiative. The President is symbolic of the Federal Government as an entity, whereas the Member of Congress represents, first of all, his constituency back home.

A continued weakening of that congressional authority will have as its inevitable result the creation of an all-powerful Executive. In other words, a system of dictatorship.

What is the answer? Because Congress is in your hands as the voting public, so is the answer. The election of a Congress, determined to protect the traditional constitutional concept of Congress and Executive, will automatically restore the balance of power.

We know, from experience, that an aroused Congress is the best defense against the encroachment of Executive power. Even in these times, when the Executive power had reach its high point, Congress, once aroused, has shown the power it can wield.

Twenty years ago a powerful Chief Executive, one who had what many considered a rubberstamp Congress, attempted to destroy the judicial authority of the United States by packing the Supreme Court. No one expected anything but consent from the Congress. Yet a small handful of determined Constitutionalists refused to accept this emasculation of the Constitution. They decided to fight out the issue on the floor of Congress. When the battle was over, a very surprised President found that he had been defeated.

We have seen more recent struggles between President and Congress. Another President took it upon himself to decide the assignment of troops to any part of the globe at his whims. The Congress again took issue and there ensued one of the great historic debates in our history. The result was a reassertion of the right to declare war only by the will of Congress.

When the Internal Security Act of 1950 was passed, it was vetoed by the President and all authority and propaganda of the executive branch of Government was mobilized to make that veto stick. But an aroused Congress, determined to protect the security of the Nation, set aside the veto.

The story is the same with the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.

In these glorious flashes of reasserted congressional authority, we can see the potential salvation of our Republic. Only the Congress has the constitutional force to oppose Executive dictation, to force a return to limited Presidential power.

But Congress will do the job only if those who make up its membership are dedicated to that cause. Weak, compromising men, men who prefer that the Presidency have both authority and responsibility, will never be able to do that job.

The answer, therefore, lies with the Congress. Those who believe in the traditional constitutional form of government for this land must concentrate their effort on the election of a constitutional Congress. Each Member of Congress is an important link in that chain.

In the selection of candidates to run for Congress in either party, you, as the individual voter, must do everything possible to assure the nomination of candidates unequivocally dedicated to the preservation of constitutional American government.

In your district, a few hundred votes may assure victory to the side of constitutional government, whereas, millions of votes are needed in a nationwide election.

Important as the Presidency is, the restraints Congress can place upon the Chief Executive can render harmless attempts to usurp power.

So, I say to you, make certain that no one is elected in your district who does not adhere to constitutionalism, that no one is elected who believes in globalism, in one-worldism, in unlimited authority for the President. If you do your part, the victory will be ours.

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the rabbi of the Congregation B'Nai Jeshurun, in New York City, Israel Goldstein, has recently distinguished himself with an outstanding speech on American foreign policy. I regard this speech as an admirable and constructive statement regarding present American foreign policy deficiencies and the opportunity we have to correct them. I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY DR. ISRAEL GOLDSTEIN

We have witnessed since the meeting at the summit the steady evaporation of the Geneva spirit. Indeed, only a few days ago the spirit breathed its last and was interred by Secretary Dulles without benefit of ceremony.

History will record who was the assassin of the short-lived Geneva spirit. It will note that the Soviet leaders revived the Stalin policy of cold war and that they again plainly showed that they are bent on world domination. It will take into account the Soviet's cynical and ruthless penetration of the Middle East, and the inflammatory remarks of Bulganin and Khrushchev in the Far East. For a time there was a glimmering of hope that the Communist regime would relax the terrible pressures on the millions it holds in thrall. We had hoped, for example, that it might loosen the stultifying grip it clamped on Jewish communal life, but all evidence points to the contrary. Recent observers, men like the editor of Davar and Harry Schwartz of the New York Times, both of whom recently visited Russia, have given us accounts of Jewish life in the USSR, which leave little room for hopefulness. These plain facts will instruct historians as to who destroyed the Geneva spirit.

But what we are likely to forget now, as the Geneva spirit is relegated to the historical dustbin, is that at best it was not meant to be a final adjustment of East-West rivalry. It was meant to be an interval in which two opposing concepts of life, the democratic and the totalitarian, agreed to put aside the threat of military warfare and to wage the battle for the adherence of men by the thrust of ideas instead of the thrust of bayonets or atom bombs. The spirit of Geneva in no way relieved the democratic nations of the responsibility of winning the uncommitted millions of the world. On the contrary, it should have inspired us to multiply our efforts to rally behind the banners of liberty, progress, and the common welfare, those peoples of the world who yearn to live in dignity and freedom. The threat of mutual annihilation has convinced all of us on both sides that the struggle today must become a struggle for the minds of men; and this form of civilized warfare will go on.

The foreign policy of our country is the instrumentality through which we conduct this struggle. All our cultural resources and energies should therefore be enlisted in fashioning this instrument. This should be a time in which discussion, debate, reexamination should be encouraged. Such reappraisal of our foreign policy can indeed prove agonizing, but the results of failure to engage in such reappraisal could prove even more painful. It is difficult then to understand why at this crucial juncture there should be such bitter resistance by the administration to criticism of its foreign policy. While a common front may have been necessary during wartime, insistence on rigid uniformity is harmful at a time when it is necessary to evolve a policy that must accommodate itself to fluctuating events and new realities.

When the administration seems to be heading in an ill-considered direction in an area as vital as foreign policy, criticism can hardly be viewed categorically as stemming from mere political partisanship. Certainly there is every evidence that the Communists are forging ahead of us in terms of winning, if not the adherence of many people of the world, at least serious attention to their insidious propaganda. This fact of itself makes it exigent for us to devise a new and more dynamic counter-policy.

There was a time when our military commitments were an extension of our foreign policy. Today this process is being reversed. Now our foreign policy has become an extension of our military undertakings. At a time when we should be uniting the peoples committed to democracy, we are busy concluding military pacts and erecting strategic frontiers having regard to nothing but military considerations. We refuse to differentiate between one nation from another. We equate democracies with dictatorships. We unite in one vast military scheme petty potentates and peoples yearning to be free. We construct for ourselves worldwide Maginot lines, like NATO, SEATO, Baghdad, the Balkan Alliance, etc. To the dismay of the architects of our foreign policy our Maginot lines have proved to be no defense against ideas and we have already seen how easily Soviet Russia plays leapfrog with our pacts and penetrates into those very areas which we had regarded as safe and invulnerable to Communist infiltration.

Thus we have let the Communists steal a march on us. They have offered the oppressed and those who have smarted from the indignities of the colonial past, honeyed words and an appearance of solicitous regard for their welfare. Posing as champions of anti-colonialism, they have purloined from us those democratic and humanitarian symbols which once made us the beacon of hope throughout the world. They exploit the grievances and aspirations of the awakened millions throughout the world. We, on the other hand, are letting slip through our fingers the friendship and good will of scores of millions in Asia and Africa.

The simple truth is that we have markedly failed to convey a more inviting image of ourselves to those millions. What is sorely needed is a tremendous expansion of our information service which will do us justice. But an even greater change in our policy is needed in the economic area. The recent successes scored by the Soviets derive in considerable measure from their promises of technical and economic aid. We have failed to respond adequately to this crying need. This is an area in which, if we will it, we can easily outdo the Russians; and it is astonishing that we have not concentrated on it. Nothing is clearer than the fact that we must imaginatively enlarge our point 4 type of program and aid generously in the economic development of the poverty-ridden lands.

It would be naive not to concede that in the interest of security, it is legitimate and desirable for a nation to seek allies and friends—and even at times to form alliances with countries with which it cannot see eye-to-eye. But this is different from courting nations whose philosophy and views are diametically opposed to it. We have tended to blind ourselves in this regard. In our frantic search for allies we have overlooked the sorry record of Franco Spain; we have shirked our responsibility in extirpating Nazism in Germany, and, as a consequence, we have discouraged our democratic friends in Europe who view our protestations and slogans with skepticism. Expediency is understandable as an element which must be given some consideration in a balanced and judicious foreign policy, but when it becomes the overriding impulse, when it obscures all other needs, then a fatal process is set in motion. A nation with moral pretensions, even a powerful one, cannot afford to lose its moral position and its moral influence. When expediency becomes the raison d'etre of our foreign policy, we have lost our moral position and influence. Our military weapons may be massive but our ideas have become minuscule. We can threaten devastating holocausts but we cannot kindle a flicker of hope in the minds and souls of men.

Let us take the example of how we have fared recently in the Middle East.

Let us suppose that we had adopted a policy addressed to the interest of the misery-ridden peoples of the Arab lands and had shared with them the American economic genius and democratic promise, would the situation in the Middle East have been different? I think that merely to ask the question is to answer it. It is plain that we have been in downright error when for the past 20 years we have vacillated in our policy, falsely encouraging the hopes of bellicose Arab potentates and dictators. We should have made it clear that the interests of America were pinned on moral aims and not tied to oil. We should have said to all peoples of the Middle East, Arab and Jew alike, "Let us join together in constructing a meaningful and impenetrable bulwark against communism. Your rivers are flowing into the sea. Let us join together and create power projects to give you light and water and industry. You have vast lands lying arid, let us in common irrigate them and plant them and give you shade and

food and farms. You have suffered from disease; let us together bring you sanitation and medical assistance and hospitals and restore your health and vigor. You have great traditions unknown because of illiteracy and lack of educational facilities. Let us help you build your schools, train your teachers, print your books, and help you share in the human heritage of learning. Let us raise your standards of life. Let us share with you the blessings of democracy and so help you order your life that all men shall have equal opportunity. You Arabs need not be envious of the great strides which your neighbor, Israel, has made in economy, industry, education, and health, and in the development of its democratic institutions. Everything which Israel has achieved lies within the realm of your own possibilities. Let us protect each of you from aggression by the other. We want Arab and Jew to flourish and prosper.

Had such a policy been pursued, the picture in the entire Middle East might be different today. The Soviet Union could not hope to wean the Arab peoples away and the leaders of these peoples would not have hazarded the chance of allying themselves with Russia, if such a true and firm pact based on morality and humanitarianism had bound the Middle East to the Western World.

Our opportunity for recovering the ground we have lost throughout the world still remains. Secretary of State Dulles, in a major address on foreign policy, has recognized the fatal inadequacy of the system of military arrangements which he himself has created. In a series of eloquent passages, he set forth the great need for projecting the true interests and aims of America to the rest of the world, when he said: "We need to recapture the spirit which animated those who during the last century went throughout the world carrying the benefits of a new way of life. * * * They believed in a moral law and in its concepts of justice, love, and righteousness. * * * Our Government gave aid and comfort to those elsewhere who sought to increase human freedom. * * * What the world needs to know at this juncture is that our Nation remains steadfast to its historic ideals and follows its traditional course of sharing the spiritual, intellectual, and material fruits of our free society; in helping the captives to become free and helping the free to remain free * * * free in the sense of genuine opportunity to pursue happiness in the spirit of our Declaration of Independence."

If these indeed become not merely rhetorical declarations but guiding principles of American policy, we should quickly see a rejuvenation of democratic hopes and a building of alliances far more formidable than the military barriers we have erected against communism. The policies of the democratic countries would no longer be static, confined within a military straitjacket, but would become dynamic, surging forward and winning not only the uncommitted peoples but even ultimately bringing some measure of relief to those suffering under the yoke of the Communist regimes.

However, America, a democracy, unlike the Soviet, a dictatorship cannot afford to turn into a Janus presenting two different faces to mankind. We cannot present ourselves to the world as the pure apostles of democracy when certain of our practices at home flout the deepest values of democracy. We cannot promise peoples the freedoms of democracy while at home we deny or restrict these freedoms. We cannot dispatch emissaries of freedom from ministries of injustice. The colored peoples of the world will not believe us when we tell them that we want to help them to be free and equal when at the same time we discriminate against them within our own borders. The desegregation decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States were more eloquent messages to the minds of men in faraway parts of the world than any military assurances. But the lawless defiance of these decisions by local constituted authorities and the outrages of justice such as the brutal murder of Emmet Till, and the failure to convict and punish his murderers have undone a thousand pledges and have betrayed the highest interests of the United States.

We cannot export what we do not ourselves manufacture. Our message of equality, our effort to create among our allies a sense of mutual respect, become ludicrous if we still harbor an immigration law which discriminates against them, and offers gratuitous insult by arranging ethnic and racial groups in a mythical hierarchy of superior and inferior groups. We cannot pose as the friends of all men when our immigration laws are animated by a spirit of suspicion and hostility toward the stranger knocking at our gates.

We must restore the wholeness of the American personality. If the words of our Secretary of State are to carry conviction abroad, we must also make them meaningful at home.

Let us indeed restore this spirit in which our Nation was conceived, as the guiding spirit of our foreign and domestic policy. Only then, as a vigorous, free, democratic America, can we go forth in the vanguard of the democratic world to insure victory in the struggle for the minds of men.

Vice President Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a thought-provoking letter from former Representative John J. O'Connor to the editor of the New York Times. I think the letter warrants the attention of the American public.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAW OFFICES JOHN J. O'CONNOR,
Washington, D. C., March 18, 1956.
EDITOR, NEW YORK TIMES,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: In today's Sunday Times, your Washington correspondent, Mr. Arthur Krock, has a political article, as usual, headed "NIXON Gets Big Lift for Place on Ticket," discoursing on the President's kindly references to his Vice President and the extraordinary spontaneous write-in primary vote in New Hampshire in behalf of Mr. NIXON.

In his article, Mr. Krock, under a heading "Hard-Core of Opposition," lists certain grounds of antagonism to Mr. NIXON as (1) being personal, that the Vice President is too cocky, etc., (2) that President Eisenhower will lose votes if Mr. NIXON is on the ticket, (3) that Mr. NIXON has expended himself (whatever that may mean), (4) that he is an oppositionist, and (5) that he has gone too far and too fast for a young man. That's all.

It is astounding that Mr. Krock, with his long attendance at Washington, does not express the real, down-to-earth opposition to Mr. NIXON, as, for instance, columnist Mr. George Sokolsky has so well done, to wit: that it all stems from Mr. NIXON's service on the House of Representatives Un-American Activities Committee, where he took the lead in exposing the pumpkin papers, which led to the incarceration of Secretary of State Acheson's beloved protege, Alger Hiss. That, together with other outstanding patriotic service on that great American committee, which I, as chairman of the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives, had some hand in creating, back in 1938, on which championship your newspaper approved me at the time. Mr. NIXON incurred the everlasting wrath, hatred, and brutal opposition of all the Communists and their supporters, the leftists, the pinks, the State Department perverted crowd and their ilk, including President Truman and other officials who supported the Hisses and the Whites, etc.

In bulk, this motley crew adds up to millions in this country of ours. Having done their job on Senator MCCARTHY, they drool to vent their spleen on their present victim, quite naturally, like Senator MCCARTHY, a veteran of our national defense.

That's the "hard core of opposition" to Mr. NIXON, and nothing other or less.

I do not personally know Mr. NIXON, nor Senator MCCARTHY, and as a lifelong Democrat, it is not likely that I shall campaign in support of Republicans. But because there may still remain, despite the New Deal, a small vestige of decency and sportsmanship in politics, I feel compelled to address you, Mr. Editor, and I trust you will deign to publish this letter.

Yours very truly,
JOHN J. O'CONNOR.

Resolution Relating to Senator McCarthy, Adopted by Abraham Lincoln National Republican Club of Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution of the Abraham Lincoln Republican Club of Chicago.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ABRAHAM LINCOLN
NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CLUB,
Chicago, Ill., February 29, 1956.
The CLERK OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The following resolution was passed by unanimous vote of 1,000 persons attending the Abraham Lincoln birthday celebration in Chicago on February 11, 1956, and it is requested that this resolution be brought to the attention of the entire membership of the United States Senate:

"PROPOSED RESOLUTION

"Whereas the United States Senate did condemn Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, for failing to discuss his income and personal finances before a partisan political committee of the Senate; and

"Whereas Senator MCCARTHY has been overwhelmingly vindicated by the Internal Revenue Department of the United States Treasury by proving conclusively, after an exhaustive investigation, that Senator MCCARTHY had overpaid the Government of the United States by more than $1,000; and

"Whereas the recent trial of Paul Hughes in New York City demonstrated beyond the shadow of a doubt that a certain clique of leftwing politicians and newspapermen plotted to spread a campaign of hatred against this outstanding American Senator: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Abraham Lincoln National Republican Club and guests attending the all-day Lincoln celebration in Chicago on Saturday, February 11, 1956, That the United States Senate is urged to rescind its former action against Senator McCarthy and pass a resolution of commendation for his fearlessness in exposing the Communist conspiracy, and for his great Americanism."

Very truly yours,

Edgar C. Bundy.
President.

Interview by James T. Farrell With Adlai Stevenson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Sunday, March 4, the weekend magazine section of the New York Post published an article by Mr. James T. Farrell, the renowned American novelist. That article consisted of the impressions of an interview Mr. Farrell had with Gov. Adlai Stevenson. Having been written as it was by Mr. Farrell on the basis of a long meeting with Governor Stevenson, it conveys as well as anything I have seen a deep sense of Governor Stevenson's attitude on civil rights and other basic issues of the day.

I ask unanimous consent that this article by Mr. Farrell, published in the New York Post of March 4, be published in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Talk With Adlai Stevenson

(By James T. Farrell)

After speaking with Adlai E. Stevenson in his refreshingly modest office here in Chicago, I have the impression, strongly and firmly, that he is determined to provide an unmistakable example of political responsibility in his campaign to win the Democratic presidential nomination next summer.

He does not wish to compromise himself by making promises which he cannot reasonably hope to fulfill if he is elected. And he intends to speak the same language on issues in every part of the country.

Governor Stevenson has thought much and seriously on the issues which involve freedom and the fate of the individual in modern society. Steeped in American tradition, both in a personal family sense and more generally, he retains a vivid image of the freedom and individuality of the American Midwest in Lincoln's time. He wishes to see that earlier spirit of individuality retained and reenforced in an age of technological and political revolutions which are altering the entire character of modern life.

Like Lincoln before him, Stevenson believes America is "the last best hope of democracy." He regards the coming presidential campaign as "a seminal test" of our democratic society. He is far from convinced that we are in an era of automatic progress and prosperity. Complacency can lead to stagnation which could well rot the foundations of our progress. And he asserts that the danger from abroad and inherent in communism has not lessened.

On the Israel-Arabian issue in the Middle East, he wishes to see the arms balance restored but also repeated his earlier proposals to calm down the situation; he is apprehensive of any inflaming of passions. The series of shocks which have occurred to people all over the world in recent decades have, in his mind, created increased anxiety and dangerous tensions; and he warns that we could drift away from reason toward violent and destructive passions.

While he has great hope for the future of America, he likewise is much concerned about its future. Each generation must reengage in the struggle for freedom. Ideas and beliefs such as these stand behind the campaign he is now making. And in that campaign, he is prepared to risk defeat rather than to contribute toward rousing ugly and dangerous moods.

Sunburned from his California campaign trip, Stevenson was harried for time. He had a mountain of mail awaiting him; speeches for a rough campaign trip to Minnesota had to be prepared; there were many consultations. At the outset he stated he was too pressed for time to talk, but then, carried away by his ideas, he spoke frankly and openly.

The question of civil rights is on his mind. According to his view, the use of force in the present circumstance involves the logic of secession. He is concerned with preserving unity in the country. Reactions to the stand he took on civil rights in Portland, Oreg., February 13 were mixed.

However, he received a considerable number of letters supporting his position against the use of force, and his proposal and appeal for steady and orderly progress toward greater equality. Also, he appeared to be somewhat surprised by antipathetic reaction to his position.

Stevenson takes modest pride in the record on civil rights of his own administration as Governor of Illinois. He took a summary of that record from his desk to hand to me, but on looking at it, he remarked to his press assistant that the staff had failed to point out that the accomplishments of his administration were not all his personal doing, and that credit should have been given to others as well as to himself.

Among the actions he took as Governor of Illinois was that of issuing an order desegregating the Illinois Nation Guard. In addition, he ordered that all leases for concessions in Illinois State parks carry the following paragraph:

"The concessionaire agrees that no person shall be denied or refused full and equal use of accommodations and facilities on account of race, color, or religion."

Governor Stevenson also said that when he was special assistant to Frank Knox, wartime Secretary of the Navy, he drafted the first memorandum concerning desegregating in the naval forces. While he was recently campaigning in California, a Negro, Lt. Comdr. Dennis Nelson, visited him. Thanks to the Stevenson memorandum, Lieutenant Commander Nelson had been able to gain promotion in the Navy and he was almost indignantly surprised to hear that Stevenson's record on civil rights had in any way been impugned.

Stevenson reiterated his intention not to approach the question of civil rights from motives of political expediency. But he also said with some fervor that "we must press with uninterrupted and uncompromising pressure" toward the achievement of equality. He appears quite fully to appreciate and understand how the counsel of patience can be misunderstood by those who carry in their souls the stains and the injuries of oppression and inequality. But to him, patience is not a word implying inaction.

He believes that the courts, due process of law, and steady persistent education are the only reasonable means whereby we can keep moving ahead to enlarge our civil rights and to approach our ultimate goal of equality. Stevenson thinks, on this question as on all others, not only of an immediate action but also of ultimate and definitive solution.

He seeks consistently to propose means of action which will lead ahead to the ultimate goals solutions. And on the issue of civil rights and equality especially, he wants to avoid violence and the inflaming of ugly moods.

He used the word "tensions" in this context and as well when he commented more generally. He stressed and then re-emphasized that the appeal to and the use of methods of reasonableness and reliance on reason provide the only sound and solid basis for lessening or dissipating these tensions.

Adlai Stevenson is a complicated man. His mind is quick, active and very flexible. He is open to argument and will change his views if convinced that they are not sound. When he talks, ideas come forth almost on top of one another; they tumble out of him. He is highly articulate and can present his thought with clarity and lucidity that approach being unusual in American politics. But at the same time, he is shy, modest and reticent. He is decidely reticent about his personal feelings.

This fact results in the growth of some false impressions in the developing public image of Governor Stevenson. He does not fit the ready-made cliches which are accepted as an image of the politicians. He retains his own traits of character, his independence of mind even under the gruelling pressure of a campaign. It seems to me that he knows that he must first of all be true to himself and his own nature if he is to be prepared to serve in the high office which he seeks and well might win.

The world is not as rosy as it is made out to be by "the hucksters of Madison Avenue." But rather than play Cassandra, he stresses our need to accept the challenges of our era, to face them with dedication and intelligence, to meet and to master them. And in this context, he states and repeats with determination and conviction that he will not, no matter what it cost him, contribute to any worsening of dangers and to irrational emotionalism; these, he fears can tear away the fabric of American freedom.

Inspired by the example of Lincoln's Illinois, he tends to see freedom and equality like twins. His views on both have been strongly colored and clearly inspired by the speeches and writings of Lincoln. In an address on Lincoln, delivered in November, 1951, when almost no one thought of him as a Presidential candidate, he asserted:

"The struggle for human liberty must go on. It must be re-fought by every generation, for democracy is threatened not alone by foreign ideologies but by selfishness, indifference, intolerance, demagoguery and disloyalty to public trust right here at home. Lincoln's fight is not finished."

In terms of new situations, Lincoln's fight must go on. The ideals of Lincoln should be our ideals. For this represents the best in the American tradition. And his sense of that tradition is markedly influenced by the fact that Stevenson is a Middle Westerner. His memory and knowledge of the Middle Western past gives him a strengthened sense of change. He knows and knows well what miracles of change have happened in America. In continuing a path which allows for even more miracles and change, he believes we must constantly guard and enlarge freedom and equality.

On February 13, he said in Portland, Oreg.: "Freedom, as I understand it, means that a man may advance to the limit of his natural endowment without hindrance because of his race or religion.

"Equality, as I understand it, means that a man may advance to the limit of his own merits. And particularly it means that every citizen shall be guaranteed equal treatment under the law."

He insists these conceptions demonstrate that he has a clear and steady position on civil rights and that he has consistently maintained this position over a number of years. And when he stated that we must press with uninterrupted and uncompromising pressure toward the achievements of our goals of freedom and equality, he looked straight across the table at me and his eyes lit up. He was talking like a man with tested convictions.

The presure of the Stevenson campaign is now beginning to grow. The rise in the volume of mail has been regular and now the Stevenson office receives an average of at least four to five hundred letters a day. Stevenson attempts to answer as many of these letters as is physically possible.

He continues to give much time and thought to his speeches. However, he sometimes has a conference with speech writers and they prepare a draft for him. He then goes over the draft, changes, revises, and makes the speech his own. He consults often with his staff when he is in his Chicago office, and he is usually very easy and familiar with those who work for him. The Stevenson research staff is small, but Stevenson stresses research. He always wishes to present only facts that can be bulwarked with proof. He tries to have a solid layer of fact underneath the eloquence and the rhetoric which he manages so ably.

Governor Stevenson spoke of the National Stevenson for President Committee with special pride. This, an outgrowth of Volunteers for Stevenson in 1952, was recently established. Barry Bingham, publisher of the Louisville Courier-Journal, and Mrs. Edison Dick, a former Wendell Willkie Republican, act as cochairmen of this organization.

Stevenson believes that this committee serves the Democratic Party and will aid significantly in strengthening and building it. He has real hope, regardless of the outcome of the campaign, that the National Stevenson for President Committee will bring new members to the Democratic Party and that their loyalty will be deepened. It will also play a role toward achieving the constant rededication of the party to the principles he believes must bind it together. These are principles affirming freedom, emphasizing the steady and orderly progress in the never ending struggle for liberty and in the constant effort to achieve greater material improvement.

Stevenson talks more of issues than of politics. In fact, it is difficult to approach him on questions if one's views are framed merely in terms of sheer political expediency. Most clearly, he wants to win, and he is moving ahead into high speed with determination. But he wants to win in terms of his principles; he is resolved to act and speak in such a way that he will have served his principles and his country to the best of his ability.

Neglected Friendships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Neglected Friendships," from the Concord Daily Monitor, Concord, N. H., published on Tuesday, April 3, 1956. The editor and publisher of this paper is James M. Langley, who represented this country in the recent trade negotiations with the Philippines, and who has particular insight into American-Filipino relations.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEGLECTED FRIENDSHIPS

The deterioration of our relationships with Iceland to the point where that nation's Congress has asked us to withdraw our troops from this vital mid-Atlantic NATO base illustrates the difficulty the United States seems to have in maintaining cordial relations everywhere abroad. There is, somehow, a failure in following through once we establish a good relationship.

The Philippines is another case in point. Anti-American feeling there has been rising steadily for some months, whereas only last year the relationship had been better than for a long time. The improvement culminated in the resounding support Filipinos gave President Magsaysay's supporters in the fall congressional elections and the repudiation they dealt Senator Recto, previously the principal critic of the administration and an outspoken foe of the United States.

Now the Magsaysay Government is at pains again to defend American aid, military and economic, and in the areas of trade is forced to oppose highly nationalistic and unrealistic proposals which would choke off both export and import business and reduce badly needed foreign investments.

Some of this sentiment arises from politician jockeying in anticipation of the national elections which will occur in the Philippines next year. More of it seems to arise from failure on the American side to treat the Philippines, too often, as other than an orphan. The United States has extended considerable aid, but it has not managed to do so in such a way as to convince some important Filipinos that it is done for other than purely selfish reasons.

There is also the problem of Communist agitation, ever present in most of the nations with which we must deal. In the Philippines this communism is of the Chinese variety, principally, at present, and is subtle subversion rather than the violent and recognizable Huk sabotage which President Magsaysay has been largely instrumental in eliminating.

One of the stickiest situations between the United States and the Philippines, as in Iceland, is our bases arrangement. Ever since the Philippines were given their freedom an agreement has been sought which would spell the arrangement out, but no agreement has been reached.

The New York Times, in commenting upon the Philippines editorially, describes the situation as serious, if not critical.

It is follow-through which we seem to lack in our handling of such matters. We take too much for granted. The Secretary of State shows up in Manila occasionally and some kindly and sincere words are exchanged but when the Ambassador on the ground tries to get action from Washington in the interim between such calls we stall, or we withhold giving him enough leeway to make some progress upon his own.

Often effective personnel in our embassies is all pulled out at once. Too often lame ducks are appointed ambassadors. Coordination between our Department of State and other agencies of our Government, particularly those which come under the Defense Department, is poor.

The problem is not one of too little personnel. If anything, it is just the reverse, the old, old story of too many cooks. It is also a problem of attitudes, and American tourists are not the only Americans who somehow manage, even when they try not to, to look down their noses.

We never before had so many world responsibilities and we seem not to have learned how to assimilate them. At times we overemphasize attempts to fit our relationships with each country into set, universal patterns, which, if it could be done, would simplify world affairs, but is nevertheless one source of considerable irritation to many nations, particularly small and newly independent nations which do not have the machinery or the manpower or the wherewithal to handle international matters as the older and greater states may.

Advancement of Soviet Precision Time Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Swiss Find Russ Precision Time Industry Is Advanced," written by Robert W. Richards, and published in the Elgin (Ill.) Daily Courier-News of March 31, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SWISS FIND RUSS PRECISION TIME INDUSTRY IS ADVANCED

(By Robert W. Richards)

WASHINGTON.—When Communist Party boss Nikita Khrushchev spoke of how Russia is developing its precision time industry, he wasn't boasting, Swiss experts have disclosed.

The Swiss have examined the new Soviet watches, now in full production, and found them excellent, according to a published report in the current Horological Journal.

The disclosure by Khrushchev in a 7-hour harangue of the 20th congress of the Communist Party, that the Russians are manufacturing watches to develop skills for precision time instruments of war is cited by Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, as another example of Red technological progress in the military field.

The Missouri Democrat, a persistent critic of administration defense policies, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Frank Kuest, of the Washington bureau staff of the Copley newspapers, which was published February 29 in the Elgin, Ill., Courier-News.

WATCH PRODUCTION AMAZING

SYMINGTON said it was significant that in his February 15 speech the Communist Party chief quoted amazing production of watch movements for so infant an industry. He also noted that only a small percentage of the 19,500,000 watch movements turned out were going into the consumer market.

Commerce Department analysts, going over the Khrushchev's address sentence by sentence, according to Correspondent Kuest, were struck by the fact that reference was made to units of production rather than percentage of gains.

As the reporter pointed out, the manufacture of a single watch in 1950 and 2 in 1951 could be cited as a 100 percent gain. But Khrushchev disclosed a planned production of 16 million watches in 1954 to sell to Rus-

sians, with a goal of 22 million by 1955. These figures, according to Swiss sources, were not quite realized but 200,000 wrist watches in steel cases have been sold to the civilian population of the Soviet, though they are not obtainable in Moscow.

The Probleda watch, with a second hand, is obtainable in the capital of the U. S. S. R., though only a small quantity of the intended production of 140,000 have been sold.

What was important to the Swiss industry, however, was the good quality of manufacture of the new Russian timepieces.

NECESSARY FOR DEFENSE

Russia's watchmaking was regarded here as a necessary adjunct of its military machine. Without the skills needed to fabricate time percision tools of war, as the three American watch companies—Elgin, Hamilton, and Waltham—long have maintained, a nation would be seriously if not fatally handicapped.

In contrast to Russia's embargo on Swiss watches, this country imported 5 million Swiss watch movements in 1947, while the 3 United States producers were turning out 2,300,000.

By 1954 the 3 domestic companies produced 1,716,000 movements while imports rocketed to 7,390,000. That same year, according to Khrushchev, Russia produced 16,800,000 timepieces, of which 5,600,000 were available for sale to the public.

The balance, it is believed, either went to the Russian Army or into intricate military devices.

The Plight of Our Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, we all recognize that the schools of our Nation are overcrowded and many have waited with expectation and hope that Congress would approve a sound and proper legislative measure to provide assistance by way of Federal grants-in-aid to school building construction. The President's Committee on Education has recently made extensive recommendations in the field of education and while I do not agree with all of the proposals, many of them are worthy of our earnest and thorough consideration, particularly the recommendation for a Federal-State fund matching program for school construction on a basis similar to the Hill-Burton hospital construction program.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have reproduced in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Washington Sunday Star, dated April 8, last, with reference to the plight of our schools. Some of the frills mentioned in the editorial need to be eliminated but basic and fundamental issues should be resolved.

The editorial follows:

THE PLIGHT OF OUR SCHOOLS

There are several highly debatable points in the report just submitted to the President by the Committee for the White House Conference on Education. But this is understandable. For the report makes no fewer than 79 recommendations in a sweeping study of 6 broad aspects of the complicated and acute problems confronting our country's system of public elementary and secondary schools.

Perhaps the most controversial section of the report is the one that unanimously indorses the majestic ideal and the great lifting of sights (unique to America) that envision education, in both grammar and high schools, as a thing that should embrace far more than the three R's or the so-called tough subjects designed to discipline the mind and make it grow. Although it recognizes, in passing, that these subjects are important and fundamental, the President's committee has placed singularly little emphasis on them.

Instead, declaring that it is no longer proper to restrict teaching to mental skills, the committee's 34 members—headed by Neil McElroy, president of the Procter & Gamble Co.—have been at pains to emphasize their approval of an educational enlargement (carried out over the past 25 years) that covers 15 areas in addition to the three R's. These areas, which are not duplicated in most other countries, include classes in cookery and housekeeping, training leisure-time activities like dancing, and instruction in swimming and automobile driving. The committee is all in favor of such programs, although it acknowledges that they greatly increase the need for classroom facilities, require many more teachers, and create a real danger that our elementary and secondary schools, in trying to do a little of everything with what some people regard as mere frills and furbelows, may wind up doing nothing well.

Yet, despite the challengeable character of its philosophy as regards the intellectual regimen that our children should face, the President's committee has rendered excellent service to the Nation in reemphasizing the great seriousness of our shortage of teachers and school facilities. A few statistics point up the story. At present there are about 35 million Americans enrolled in our grammar and high schools, and this total is expected to grow to almost 48 million by 1965. But already, owing primarily to an 18-year lapse in the building of its educational plant, the United States urgently needs to have between 200,000 and 500,000 additional classrooms by 1960—a need that simply is not being met at the current rate of construction. Similarly, chiefly because of poor economic inducements, our supply of competent teaching personnel falls far short of present and prospective requirements.

What is to be done about this? As far as school construction is concerned, the President's committee—with only a few dissents—has found that the States and local communities have the fiscal capacity, especially because of our steadily expanding national economy, to carry most of the load, but it recommends, among other things, Federal financial aid on a short-term emergency basis. As for teachers, the committee forecasts a difficult situation for the next 10 and possibly 20 years, but it feels confident that the supply will be sufficient in the long run if immediate steps are taken to improve the economic status of the profession with sharp pay increases (eventually doubling the present low scale) and related rewards comparable to what is offered in other fields of endeavor.

The problems involved in all this are obviously going to plague us for many years to come. Certainly, as Chairman McElroy has said in his letter of transmittal to the President, "The issues confronting the schools are so complex and so bound to the inevitable changes of time that no one report can hope to be more than an installment of what must be a continuing study." But the situation is by no means insoluble. The White House committee has made that much very clear.

Some Curious Relationships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Some Curious Relationships," written by George Sokolsky, and published in the New York Journal-American on Wednesday, April 4, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME CURIOUS RELATIONSHIPS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Just as the Burgess and Maclean espionage cases will not die down in Great Britain, so does the Harry Dexter White espionage case stay alive in the United States. The fact that Lauchlin Currie, formerly administrative assistant to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, has lost his American citizenship, makes one think of White because Currie was one of the select group of White's friends and associates who met at the Athens Cafe in Washington on May 11 (no year given.) The list was found among Harry Dexter White's papers with the following names:

Mr. Appleby, Executive Offices; Mr. C. B. Baldwin; Mr. Oscar Chapman, Interior (he will invite Mr. Fortas and Mr. Mike Straus); Mr. Ben Cohen, White House; Mr. Oscar Cox, FEA; Dr. L. B. Currie, White House; Dr. Ezekiel, Agriculture; Mr. Murray Latimer; Dr. Lubin, White House; Mr. David Niles, White House; Mr. Randolph Paul; Mr. Milo Perkins; Mr. Pritchard, NWA; Mr. Aubrey Williams; Mr. Fortas, Interior (Under Secretary); Mr. Jonathan Daniels, White House; Mr. James Rowe (?); Mr. Wayne Coy, Budget Bureau (?); Mr. Leon Henderson (?); Major Kades; Mr. Michael Strauss, First Assistant Secretary, Interior.

HAVEN'T SCRATCHED SURFACE

It has now been made public, along with other documents, by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. A trying volume to read, because it is only a compilation of documents from which is is impossible to draw any conclusions; it is nevertheless important because just as the British have suddenly realized the dangers of espionage by British officials in the interest of Soviet Russia, so here in this country, despite the work of various congressional committees, the FBI, the Departemnt of Justice and other agencies, the surface has not yet been scratched and we are not yet in a position to define in unmistakable terms, which will hold up in any court, what is a spy, what is a subversive, who is just a fool, who is a fighter for a strict interpretation of individual rights acecording to the Constitution.

Take this list, for instance. It includes more non-Communists than Communists and precisely what does it prove that Harry Dexter White arranged for them to dine at this rather obscure restaurant on a day in May? What did they talk about?

However, when we look at the record, we find some curious relationships. Paul Appleby, for instance, is now associated with Governor Harriman in New York State, in charge of the budget. In 1946, Appleby was reported to have said:

"A man in the employ of the Government has just as much right to be a member of

the Communist Party as he has to be a member of the Democratic or Republican Party."

In 1953, he explained this away as follows:

"The real character of the Communist Party greatly differentiating it from our conventional parties had not then been revealed."

POSITION BELIES IGNORANCE

But that is nonsense. Mr. Appleby must have read or heard something about the Russian Revolution by the year 1946. He must have read or heard something about the Soviet form of government, the one-party system, the power of the politburo, the authority of Stalin. He could not have achieved the important position of Under Secretary of Agriculture and be as ignorant as he claimed to be of one of the important movements in the history of our generation.

I know nothing about Paul Appleby's relationship to the Communist Party, one way or the other, but it is fairly clear from his statements and from a memorandum dated March 23, 1944, in which he recommends Nathan Gregory Silvermaster for his loyalty and good citizenship, that Harry Dexter White knew how to use highly placed friends and that Appleby did not know how to resist such men as White, Lauchlin Currie, or Alger Hiss who wanted to designate Appleby as Assistant Secretary General of the United Nations.

For all we know, this party at the Athens Cafe might have been nothing more important than a sorority meeting in a girls high school, but then in the development of the Washington bureaucracy, these were important persons who held key positions in many departments and who were able to influence the decisions of those above them. It would be of public value if one of the persons on this list came forward with a picture of what these No. 2 men in Government were doing under the leadership of Harry Dexter White. Perhaps they will say that they were only appraising the difference between vodka and slivovitz.

The Heritage of Old Age Should Not Be Despair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter:

THE HERITAGE OF OLD AGE SHOULD NOT BE DESPAIR—NEWSLETTER No. 179

APRIL 9, 1956.

DEAR FRIEND: The fastest growing population group in our country consists of the men and women age 65 and over. Today there are 13½ million of them. With 1,000 more joining their ranks daily, their number is expected to increase to 20 million by 1975.

For some of them the golden years are the culmination of a rich, rewarding life. They view advancing age with a dignity and charm like that of President John Quincy Adams, who was congratulated on his 81st birthday by a friend who asked: "How is John Quincy Adams today?"

"Quite well, thank you," Adams replied. "John Quincy Adams is quite well. But the house in which he lives is becoming quite dilapidated. Time and the seasons have nearly destroyed it. It is tottering on its foundations and the roof is worn quite thin. Yes, the old tenement is becoming quite uninhabitable and I fear that John Quincy Adams will have to move out of it soon. But he himself is quite well, thank you, quite well."

For most elderly people, however, advancing years bring increased burdens. A recent study by the reliable Twentieth Century Fund reveals that nearly three-fourths of those aged 65 and over either have no income of their own or earn less than $1,000 per year. But this deplorable lack of sufficient funds represents only one aspect of their difficulties. The Council of State Governments reports that they are particularly subject, as well, to unequal opportunity for employment; inferior housing; separation from family and friends; widowhood for more than half the women; inadequate medical care; lack of hospital insurance just when chronic diseases hit; hospitalization in mental institutions because of insufficient nursing homes and rehabilitation facilities; spiritual deterioration because of belief that the community is no longer interested in them. The list is long, the impact heavy.

What is the Federal Government doing to help them? Unfortunately, not very much. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which is supposed to be concerned with their plight, has attacked the matter with all the ferocity and speed of a snail. Last year Secretary Oveta Culp Hobby appeared before the Appropriations Committee and admitted the Federal Government was 10 years behind in its work on behalf of older persons. Yet she requested a budget of only $65,000 to deal with the enormous task. We hoped for a more sympathetic attitude when Secretary Folsom appeared this year, but there was none. The Secretary said he wanted the same budget and to continue with the same system of using a small general staff and leaving to agencies such as the Social Security Administration, the National Institutes of Health, and the Department of Labor the responsibility for developing adequate programs to cope with the problem. This was the arrangement which brought sharp criticism by the Appropriations Committee upon the Department for its indifference to the needs of older persons, and the demand that substantial progress be made during the next year. But if the committee expects any improvements after having voted the same inadequate budget, it is indulging in wishful thinking. What is needed is a Bureau of Older Persons established within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to help the States make an intensive effort in the field of aging and to coordinate their activities.

A few days ago President Eisenhower announced that he was creating a National Council on Aging whose members would be made up of representatives from each of the agencies now dealing with problems affecting older persons. What this means is that the President has now given a name and status to the present hit-or-miss, decentralized system. Apparently, the same policy of postponement, of drift without direction, is going to continue.

One feels about the President's action the same as Sir Harry Lauder's caddy must have felt after having completed 18 holes of golf with him on a bitterly cold day. The caddy had done a fine job. After paying him the regular fee, Lauder slipped something into the caddy's hand saying: "That's for a glass of hot whiskey, lad." The caddy opened his hand. There in his palm was a lump of sugar.

Almost a century ago Benjamin Disraeli wrote in one of his novels: "Let us hope that the heritage of old age is not despair." That is still our hope.

Your friend,

SIDNEY R. YATES,
Member of Congress.

Sports Builds Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, many Members of Congress, I am certain, will remember former Congressman Samuel A. Weiss, of Glassport, Pa., who voluntarily retired from Congress in 1946 to become judge of the Court of Common Pleas of Allegheny County, Pa.

Judge Weiss has through the years gained a wonderful reputation for sound judgment, fairness, and tolerance, and has worked untiringly and energetically to help bring about a closer understanding between all peoples. The speech which he made at the 20th annual John T. Taylor memorial award at the Amateur Athletic Union dinner held in the William Penn Hotel on March 22 is an example of his continuing efforts in this direction.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Judge Weiss' speech:

SPORTS BUILDS BROTHERHOOD

(Address by Judge Samuel A. Weiss, chairman of the Olympic Fund, at the 20th Annual John T. Taylor Memorial Award, to Arnie Sowell, great Pitt track champion, at AAU dinner, William Penn Hotel, March 22, 1956)

Mr. Toastmaster, reverend clergy, honored guests, Dr. Joyce Brothers, and Col. Eddie Eagan, and ladies and gentlemen, this is a wonderful occasion, this great outpouring of Pittsburgh's finest citizenry to pay tribute to Arnie Sowell, Pitt's great track champion, a colored chap of humble but proud parentage and one of the greatest runners in the world. The complexity of this Dais reflects the spirit of America, for here you see people of every walk of life and of every faith, color, and creed joining together in the real spirit of brotherhood to pay tribute to a humble colored chap. That is the real American heritage, established by our forefathers who left foreign shores because of religious and political persecution abroad to establish in this Nation a shrine of liberty dedicated to freedom and justice for all. That is the spirit that is inculcated in the mind and heart of every American youngster and runs in the veins of the blood of our American youth today. It has clearly reflected in the character of our youngsters in every war we fought to preserve freedom.

As a Member of the United States Congress during World War II, I had the privilege to travel through war-torn Europe before the end of that catastrophic conflict in June, July, and August, 1945, and we witnessed great cities in shambles, desolation, poverty, and misery everywhere. But the real spirit of brotherhood was reflected in the American cemeteries on the European battlefields at Andilly, France; Solers No. 1 and No. 2 in France; the 1716th General Hospital Cemetery base in Italy overlooking Mount Vesuvius; and the desolate cemetery in Anzio. We Congressman saw the thousands of crosses of Christianity intermingled with the stars of David and it reflected deep thought as I observed the names on these crosses and stars:

Hallahan, Shanahan, Patterson, Rusziewski, DiGiocomo, Donatelli, Rosenberg, Wash-

ington—yes, black boy and white boy, Catholic, Protestant, and Jew—they fought together, they bled together, they died together, so that we might live together.

A month ago friends of Mr. Hyman Rogal, outstanding communal leader and brother of Max Rogal, another devoted citizen, honored his 45 years of devoted service to the Y. M. and W. H. A. of Pittsburgh by having a beautiful mural painted in his honor at the "Y" depicting the four chaplains on the sinking *Dorchester* that has become a national symbol of brotherhood.

As a part of this national symbol it was my great privilege as a United States Congressman, together with 32 Members of the House and Senate, to be present when they christened the U. S. S. *Dorchester*, the largest troopship ever built in the history of America. Five weeks later she embarked on the high seas with the largest number of GI's ever to attempt a crossing of the Atlantic. On the third day of her voyage, on a dark and stormy night, the *Dorchester* was struck broadside by a German torpedo and the entire crew knew the ship was doomed. On board this ship were these four chaplains, who have become a world symbol of brotherhood by the *Dorchester* disaster. They were Lt. Alex Goode, a rabbi and a friend of mine from York, Pa.; Lt. Clarke Poling, whom I also knew, and son of Dr. Daniel Poling, one of the greatest Baptist ministers in America; and I can truthfully tell you that Clarke was a chip off the old block; and Lt. George Fox, a Presbyterian chaplain; and Lt. John Washington, a Catholic priest.

"These chaplains uttered words of cheer and words of prayer to the boys struggling in the water; they threw out lifebelts with the captain and his officers, to thousands of the youngsters; the lifebelts gave out and they took off their own and threw them to several struggling soldiers. Within minutes after the *Dorchester* was struck it began to sink. These God-fearing four chaplains were last seen kneeling together with their arms around each other with prayers on their lips and their eyes to the Heavenly Father. Here were 4 chaplains, of 3 faiths, who practiced, worshiped, and lived until their very death, the simple religious ideology 'the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man' and 'greater faith hath no man.'"

Why can't we follow such an example? We, of the Christian-Judaic heritage, firmly believe in God, and would not dare to breach His covenant. Do we not all believe in that great pronouncement enunciated in the Old Testament and spread the world over through its quotation in the New?

"Have we not all one Father,
Hath not one God created us all,
Why do we deal treacherously every man
against his brother profaning the
covenant of God."

We live in a troubled world, really a powderkeg where the slightest spark may ignite and inflame mankind to its destruction because in modern warfare civilization is doomed.

So, I believe, competitive sports events is the greatest common denominator to help build world brotherhood. It will take years and years of diplomatic statesmanship at the United Nations and through out State Department to attempt to accomplish what can be done by our athletes in one world olympic event.

American sportsmanship is unparalleled anywhere in the world. There are no barriers, boycotts, or segregating obstacles to a champion, regardless of his faith, color, or creed. I have attended several championship fights in New York. I have seen around me doctors, professors, lawyers, clergyman, cabbies, bankers, laboring men, rich and poor alike, of every religious faith, stand is rising ovation as Joe Louis, great colored heavyweight champion walked slowly to his corner following one of his knockouts. He was a great champion, of deep humility and a credit to his country and his people. The same holds true on the barred gridiron where the American sportsman yells himself hoarse for a Joe Savoldi (Italian), "Biggy" Goldberg (Jew), Johnny Michelosen (Lithuanian), "Levy" Jackson (colored), and Flanagan (Irish). They don't care what his faith or color, as long as he plays the game clean and hard. Why do some Americans hate? Is not my story proof enough that this is contrary to God's philosophy:

"Do not hate thy brother in thy heart, but love thy neighbor as thyself."

What difference does it make where a man was born, the color of his hair, the crook in his nose, the shade of his skin?

It behooves all of us to always remember and memorize the words of Rochelle:

"Just today I chanced to meet,
A man upon the crowded street,
And I wondered whence he came,
And I asked him, tell me true,
What was once his nation's name,
Are you Pole or Russian Jew,
English, Irish, Italian, Prussian,
And he held his head on high,
And he made me this reply,
What I am is "naught" for me,
In this land of liberty,
For in my soul as man to man
I am just American."

So, Arnie Sowell, I salute you, as a great young American deserving of the tribute being paid you by the AAU, as the "1955 Pittsburgh athlete of the year," and I feel certain that when you go to the Olympic games at Melbourne, Australia, if you display the same fighting qualities and determination as displayed by Col. Eddie Eagan, one of our honored guests tonight, who won the middleweight boxing championship at the 1920 Olympics; and the determination displayed by Dr. Joyce Brothers, charming and lovely psychologist who won the Revlon $64,000 question on boxing, and who is also an honored guest tonight, you cannot fail. For your splendid parents, present tonight, taught you to fear God and love your neighbors, and this lesson you have learned well, for your coach at the University of Pittsburgh, Carl Olson, one of the best track coaches in America, said:

"Arnie Sowell is one of the greatest runners in the world, but beyond that, he is a young man of God, a gentleman, and a real scholar."

Speaking for Harry Keck of the Sun-Telegraph, our toastmaster and one of the most respected and able sports editors in America, the more than 500 friends gathered here tonight and for all Pittsburghers:

"This court concurs in Carl Olson's utterance."

May God bless you, Arnie, and all other athletic award winners tonight, including Al Wiggins, greatest swimmer in Ohio State history and last year's athlete of the year, and we know, Arnie, that you will bring back the bacon from Melbourne.

United States Stand on Cyprus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, Ambassador Phelps Phelps, who has served the United States Government in far flung posts from Samoa to the Dominican Republic, has recently addressed communications to the Newark Evening News and The New York World Telegram commenting on the resolution which I and other Members of the Senate have introduced subscribing to the principle of self-determination for Cyprus.

I ask unanimous consent that these two letters to the editor be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Newark Evening News of March 20, 1956]

UNITED STATES STAND ON CYPRUS

To the EDITOR:

SIR: I should think that every real American would want to give his wholehearted support to the resolution on Cyprus, sponsored by New York's Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN and signed by 17 other senators. When you come down to it, self-determination was one of the first objectives of our own Revolution, second only, perhaps, to the burning desire for human dignity and equality. And where else should a people seeking self-determination look for leadership but to the United States, who fought to obtain it, and then fought again and again to keep it?

Yet, when our leadership is sought, we persist in shilly-shallying until we lose the respect of our own allies, as well as the respect of those who would have us lead them. We have evaded our moral responsibilities to the point where we are in danger of losing the cold war, and we will lose it unless we decide now to take a stand upon the Cyprus and similar issues which (as Senator LEHMAN's resolution says) "is consistent with that principle of self-determination to which the United States has historically subscribed."

The stand we take cannot be motivated by any desire for friendship with any nation, nor by a desire to keep any nation's good will. It must be taken upon a principle and the principle of self-determination is one of the rocks upon which our country was built.

Yet, at the Caracas conference of 1953, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles departed for Washington before the issue of colonialism could be discussed in his presence. And in 1955 we again evaded our moral responsibilities when the Algerian question was brought up in the U. N. Assembly and our delegate failed to take a stand; when the problem of New Guinea came up at the same Assembly, and our delegate refused to vote, and when that Assembly decided against a discussion of Cyprus principally because we and a few others opposed it.

Millions of Europeans, Africans and Asians who also seek self-determination were keenly disappointed at such actions, as they are now disappointed at our attitude, thus far, on the Cyprus issue.

PHELPS PHELPS,
Former Ambassador to the Dominican Republic.
NEWARK.

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of March 20, 1956]

SENATOR LEHMAN'S RESOLUTION CALLED WORTHY OF SUPPORT

(By Phelps Phelps)

The resolution on Cyprus sponsored by Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN and signed by 17 other Senators deserves our support. We are a nation whose existence owes itself to our belief in the principles of self-determination. Yet, when those to whom these principles also are sacred seek our help, we evade our moral responsibilities and side with nations bent upon preventing the exercise of these principles.

The Lehman resolution asks merely that we "impress upon Britain the wisdom of seeking to exercise leadership in the cause of freedom rather than by the use of force for the sake of repression, and not to use her own security interests as an excuse for the frustration of the legitimate aspirations of the people of Cyprus."

NEWARK.

The Quest for Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter:

THE QUEST FOR UNDERSTANDING—NEWSLETTER
No. 178

MARCH 19, 1956.

DEAR FRIEND: Veteran Congressmen are like doctors in affecting a professional air of poise and self-confidence. Rarely do they seem disturbed. Even though they may be torn inwardly by doubt, fear, or anger, outwardly their attitude is one of totally unruffled composure.

Witness, for example, the ease with which Hanry Clay disposed of a hostile Congressman whom he encountered in one of the narrow corridors of the Capitol. The angry man refused to move over. "I never give way to scoundrels," he snapped as he pressed forward. Clay bowed and stepped aside. "I always do," he retorted as he continued on his way.

Members of the Appropriations Committee, handling as they do the purse strings of Government, generally possess this quality to a great degree. Long experienced in intricate problems of Government finance, they take even the most unusual and extraordinary budget request in stride. However, a hearing before our committee last week subjected us to an extremely rigorous test.

We were visited by a delegation of some of the Nation's most eminent scientists. They were asking for $28 million to complete preparations for the International Geophysical Year, the worldwide scientific exploration which will take place in 1957. They came loaded with charts, graphs, mathematical formulas and a disarmingly simple manner. But as soon as they began their presentation we knew we were going to have a rough time.

Dr. Richard Porter, one of the country's great experts on rockets, was the first witness. He discussed the proposed experiment to launch a small sphere, called the earth satellite, into outer space to revolve around the earth like the moon. Dr. Porter soon had the committee members revolving quite dizzily around him. In response to the blunt question, "How are you going to get the thing up there?" Dr. Porter replied: "We get it up there by rocket propulsion * * *. This is the fundamental equation of the rocket." Turning to the blackboard, he wrote the following:

$$\Delta v = Vg \log \frac{m\ 1}{m\ 2}$$

Then he proceeded to make the formula clear: "The change in velocity in any kind of rocket," he explained, "discounting gravity and the effects of air, in other words, just the effect of the rocket propulsion, is equal to the exhaust gas velocity times the logarithm of the mass at the beginning, divided by the mass at the end."

Chairman ALBERT THOMAS, of Texas, was equal to the occasion. "That is just simple," he said—"go ahead, Doctor." The doctor went ahead. For a brief period he moved through his complicated processes, and then, as though he had had enough, he summed up: "The satellite stays up because of centrifugal force. It is projected into its orbit by a three-stage rocket weighing 22,000 pounds at takeoff. It probably will be a spherical object about 20 to 30 inches in diameter. The final object will weigh about 20 pounds. It will carry instruments for at least one experiment at a time, which will radio information back to us on earth."

Until this summary, one of the committee members had been wishing for a more simple, if less scholarly explanation, like that of the astronomer who, while observing the heavens through the huge telescope at Mount Wilson Observatory, suddenly announced: "It's going to rain." His students were impressed, and one asked, "How do you know, sir?" Still peering through the telescope, the scientist declared: "Because my corns hurt."

It was the chairman who asked the $28 million question. He wanted to know whether the enormous amounts of time and energy and the scientific brains and effort to be poured into the experiment would bring commensurate results. Dr. Porter's answer was in the affirmative. "The important thing is not knowledge," he said, "but understanding. Understanding comes from knowledge. It comes from all kinds of knowledge. By taking the bits of knowledge we will get from the programs on aurora and air glow, and the upper atmospheric rocket program which gives only spot pieces of information, and by taking the continuing information we will get from the satellite program, I very confidently predict that the greatest upsurge of new scientific understanding of our time will follow."

The committee approved the funds for the experiment. Aware of our own limitations, we did not want to impose restrictions on those who know none—who are looking toward the horizon beyond the horizon—who are looking for greater understanding.

Your friend,

SIDNEY R. YATES,
Member of Congress.

Do You Trust Your Diplomats?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Marquis Childs has written a most timely column which I feel is worthy of serious consideration by every Member of Congress.

Our diplomats abroad are the eyes and ears of our Nation. They are, actually, our first line of defense. The responsibility for keeping our Government accurateley and currently informed of developments abroad is execlusively theirs. They are highly skilled men in the profession and in order to do the job properly, they must be dedicated and outstanding men.

Entertaining is a very important part of their job—a part that cannot be ignored. State dinners and informal receptions accomplish much toward selling America's viewpoint. At the same time this form of entertaining creates a feeling of friendship and good will.

Our diplomats abroad, with a much heavier responsibility, are paid much less salary than the majority of our American businessmen representing their companies in foreign lands.

I do not know of a single conscientious diplomat who has not had to go deeply into his own pocket each year to cover the expenses of his minimum representation. I feel that we owe an obligation to our experienced diplomats to provide an adequate representation allowance. So, in the appropriate words of Mr. Childs:

We must recognize that we are grown up and we must act like grownups. The time has long since been overdue for us to put trust and confidence in the men and women who represent us overseas.

The full column by Mr. Childs, which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald for Tuesday, April 10, 1956, is as follows:

WASHINGTON CALLING
(By Marquis Childs)
DO YOU TRUST YOUR DIPLOMATS?

In 75 embassies and nearly 300 consulates throughout the world the United States has its representatives. It is a sad reflection on the richest and most free-spending nation that these representatives are treated like poor relations who cannot be trusted with the silverware.

The Department of State has come to Congress with a request for $1 million for what is called, in the language of bureaucracy, the "representation allowance."

This is the money granted our diplomats to pay for entertaining they must do in their job of winning friends and influencing people. It is the personal exchange across a dinner table or at a garden party that is the most effective form of enlisting friends.

Yet when it comes to funds for this purpose Congress reflects what seems to be a curious split in the American character. Even Congressmen who should know better talk about "diplomacy by dipsomania" and the "whisky allowance" while columnists and commentators come up with sour jokes about the "Martini circuit."

This seems to reflect a dark suspicion of diplomats in general and of American diplomats in particular.

The niggardliness that results puts a severe handicap on our representatives abroad and often imposes serious personal hardships on them. It is one reason for the decline in morale and standards in the American Foreign Service.

In the course of travel in Europe and Asia in the past 2 years this reporter encountered many instances of what the hardship means.

Take, as an example, Consul John Jones in a far eastern city where American trade in vital materials is important. This is a typical case, only slightly disguised.

It is part of Jones' job to entertain local officials and businessmen as well as many Americans on business trips. He gets an annual "representation allowance" of $330, which becomes available at the beginning of the Government year on July 1.

On July 4 he gives the required Fourth of July party, costing about $400. The new year, therefore, is only four days old when he has spent $100 out of his own pocket. And all his entertainment thereafter must be at his own expense.

This is a Moslem country where virtually no alcohol is consumed but where proper soft drinks, sandwiches and so forth cost about as much as Martinis.

And Consul Jones' wife is suffering from her second attack of amoebic dysentery and there is no English-language school for their children. Consul Jones' salary is $8,500 before income taxes, and living in this remote part of the world involves extra expenses.

Manifestly, it is unfair to add to his other hardships the necessity for paying out of his own pocket to do his job.

One reason political ambassadors occupy the important diplomatic posts—London, Paris, Rome—is that no career foreign service officer, unless he happens to have a private income or a rich wife, can afford these posts. The representation allowance for Great Britain for the Ambassador down through the consuls, this year is $21,900.

That may sound large for "entertainment." But suppose a big international conference is being held in London at which the United States is contesting with the Soviet Union to put across the American view. An embassy reception, with American officials having a chance to talk informally to the delegates, would be extremely helpful.

Such a party for 750 to 1,000 guests would cost from $4,000 to $5,000 or, at one whack, a third of the $15,000 personally allowed the Ambassador out of the $21,900.

What galls American paying out of their own pocket to do an essential job is that countries maintained by American dollar aid have diplomatic missions around the world that spend lavishly.

In one capital visited by this reporter last year, the American Ambassador was using an official limousine of 1951 vintage and somewhat uncertain habits, while the Ambassador of a power supported entirely by United States dollar aid rolled up in a block-long 1955 Cadillac. The American Ambassador was not complaining mind you, but he did think the contrast was a little pointed.

If we are really to play a part in the power struggle and if, as we like to tell ourselves we are, the richest and the most powerful Nation in the world, then we must put aside these mean reservations.

We must recognize that we are grown up and we must act like grownups. The time has long since been overdue for us to put trust and confidence in the men and women who represent us overseas.

Minnesota Primary Results Demand Parity Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune and reflects some of the reasons for the crushing defeat of the Republican farm program in the Minnesota primary. This is most important in consideration of the farm bill before Congress. I wish to call attention to the fact this county went Republican by better than 2 to 1 in 1952 but reversed itself to a practical 2 to 1 vote in the Democratic primary in 1956. This is concrete evidence of farm wishes for adequate income.

The article is as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Tribune of April 8, 1956]

How Is Farm Situation? Everyone's View Differs

(By Leonard Inskip)

LITCHFIELD, MINN.—A farmer last week signed a $1,025 note to Northwestern National Bank of Litchfield and went out and bought a used bailer.

A second farmer bought some parts for his rake and got busy patching up the worn implement to make it last another year.

A third farmer laid cash on the counter when he purchased a new tractor.

Those three farmers—their fortunes and misfortunes—are part of the farm picture in Meeker County, one of the counties in the heartland of Minnesota. A few years ago all three might have been in the market for new equipment.

How badly has the Meeker County farmer been hit by falling farm prices? Is his buying power way down?

The answers of farmers and businessmen reveal varying opinions. Ask 10 people their views and you may get 10 different answers.

"More farmers have been hurt than not," replies a businessman. "My business shows it."

"Sure, farm income was down last year, but the situation has been exaggerated by politicians and newspapers," answers a Government worker. "Some farmers told me they had their best year."

"Farmers in general had as good a year last year as in recent years," says one farmer.

Perhaps one measure of how farmers themselves feel about their present situation was shown by last month's primary election vote.

In the 1952 primary, there were 2,001 Republican votes in Meeker County, compared with 424 Democratic. In the regular election the vote was Eisenhower, 5,750; Stevenson, 2,833.

In the 1956 primary, however, there were 1,344 Republican ballots called for, compared with 2,619 Democratic.

Said Ralph V. Johnson, a young Greenleaf Township farmer who voted Republican and who supports Secretary of Agriculture Benson: "The results probably were caused by farm unrest."

Johnson admitted his own income dropped last year.

"I had to pay an income tax in 1955, but didn't this year," he said. "And I'm not going to buy any more implements than I absolutely have to."

Johnson, who is considered a progressive farmer by his neighbors, said he is trying to cut corners to improve his operating efficiency.

Andrew W. Johnson, another Greenleaf farmer, is a Purple Heart veteran of World War II fighting on Luzon.

He stepped from his barn and looked at a small tractor parked in the barnyard.

"I'd like to get a tractor with more power this year, but don't think I'll be able to," he said. "We went pretty heavy in hogs last year and all we got back was the feed cost."

"I'm putting off buying any implements until the Democrats get back and prices come up," said James Pollack, Forest City Township, as he loaded a sack of feed into his car.

"I'm not going to buy one thing this year—can't afford to," said Pollack, a small, part-time dairyman.

Pollack formerly worked at the Lake Street plant of Minneapolis-Moline Co., which began a partial shutdown of the plant last week.

Moline, like many other farm-equipment manufacturers, is faced with the problem of farmers not buying enough new machinery to keep factories humming.

Richard Woetzel and his son, Erhard, who operate a 160-acre dairy farm in Dassel Township, were shoveling manure from their barn.

"I shipped a couple of cows last week and got about $120 apiece for them," Woetzel said. "Shortly after the war I would have got about $300."

Last year Woetzel bought a bailer, but spent $50 to keep his side rake going.

This year it looks as though the rake will need new teeth but Woetzel thinks he'll patch it up rather than buy a new one.

Even though his total farm income dropped from $8,000 in 1954 to under $7,000 last year, Woetzel invested money in home improvements in 1955.

A. R. Anderson, cashier of the Dassel State bank at Dassel, said farmers aren't as well off as they once were, but pointed out that bank deposits have been holding up well.

Sales of new implements are down, Anderson said, and "a lot of farmers are going around to auction sales and picking up used machinery."

A Dassel implement dealer agreed: "Sales haven't been what you would call rushing."

He said his shop's repair work has increased.

"The older farmers aren't digging into their socks to buy at this time, and the young guy has had pretty rough sledding."

He pointed out price increases by manufacturers last year haven't helped sales very much.

Despite this, he said he was optimistic that 1956 still will be a pretty good year for sales.

An official of another Meeker County bank, who asked not to be identified, said, "I don't believe farmers are hard up. Our deposits don't show it, if they are.

"Generally speaking, good farmers are making money and they're buying all they need to buy," he said. "There is always some who can't buy all they want.

"The farmer in most trouble is the young person who entered farming in recent years," he said. "And he's either sold out by now or has had a rough time."

Clarence Weber is one of the leading implement dealers at Litchfield. He handles International Harvester products. Recently International Harvester reduced its output at 2 tractor plants by 20 percent.

"I've sold more tractors so far this year than at the same time last year," Weber said. "The average farmer is buying as much this year as last and more than one farmer has told me 1955 was his best year."

While Meeker County hog raisers suffered low prices last fall, crops generally were excellent.

Weber admitted he had his first repossession of a tractor in 10 years this year, but said it came back from a farm too small to be an efficient operation.

The implement dealer, by the way, diversified his operations somewhat recently by taking in a partner in the implement business and by branching out into lumber sales.

Howard Grant, county agent, estimated county farm income was down about 10 percent last year, but said he also knew many farmers who had a good year.

He said Litchfield implement dealers have told him sales are normal to good, with one dealer reporting some sales between $5,000 and $10,000.

William S. McGee is president of Northwestern National Bank, Litchfield's largest.

His bank, he said, has not made as many farm machinery loans this year.

"Farmers got hurt on hogs last year," he said. "It was only the wonderful crop that saved us."

McGee said farm debt is still healthy in relation to the Nation's economy, but "the farmer is beginning to worry he won't be able to meet his obligations."

"Farmers are getting smarter," said a Litchfield businessman. "They're learning a good tractor will run for 15 years and doesn't have to be traded in every year any more than I have to trade in my car."

He said one implement dealer recently went out of business at Litchfield and that another has taken on an appliance sideline.

"Generally, business is down quite a bit for many retail establishments," he said. "I don't think things will get any better this year because the odds are against our getting a crop as good as last year's."

One firm, which 3 years ago had no trouble with overdue payments, now has a man on the road 3 days a week making collections.

Another businessman said politicians and newspapers have put farmers in "an unsettled state of mind" and have made the farmer "very much afraid of what is going to happen to him."

He cited this example:

"One farmer I knew became so convinced the small farmer is doomed that he bought a $10,000 annuity policy rather than putting the money into his farm as he should have done.

"He figured that if he's out of business in 20 years he'd still be able to get by with his annuity policy and social security."

This businessman divided farmers into four groups: those with their farms paid for, those with a mortgage only on the farm, those with mortgages also on equipment and marginal, hand-to-mouth operators.

The first two groups, he said, comprise about 30 percent of the country's farmers and have weathered falling prices fairly well.

The second two groups, totaling 70 percent, have suffered from low prices, he said.

One implement dealer noted there are vast differences among farmers' attitudes toward increased Government aid.

"I know one young lad who's adopting new pasturing and feeding techniques he figures will save him $5,000 a year," he said. "You don't hear him crying about Benson, the administration and price supports.

"But when you talk about new modern farming methods he's all ears—and he's buying new machinery from me."

The county's farmers are reported to be fairly evenly divided between membership in the Farm Bureau and the Farmers Union. Both are competing for members.

Quite frequently, the individual farmer's views on what should be done about the farm problem reflect those of the organization to which he belongs.

The Racial Problem—Editorial From Cordele Daily Dispatch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. FORRESTER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 26, 1956, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a splendid editorial in defense of the South, written by Hon. James H. Gray, publisher of the Albany Herald, Albany, Ga. Mr. Gray was born, reared, and educated in Springfield, Mass., and his editorial appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 26, page A2634.

The Cordele Daily Dispatch, a newspaper published at Cordele, Ga., carries an editorial written by Hon. E. W. Mathews, publisher, who was born, reared, and educated in the North, but who came south just a few years ago and in that short time has become a leading and influential citizen and wedded to the southern way of life.

Mr. Mathews thinks as does Mr. Gray, as evidenced by his editorial of March 22, 1956, reading as follows:

E. W. "SASSYFRASS" MATHEWS SAYS

Look magazine ran an article in this week's issue, which was promoted through every newspaper in the State of Georgia, we presume. The article was based on segregation and what it is like for a Negro soldier in Albany, Ga.

There is only one way to solve the segregation problem, in the way of this old fellow's thinking, and that is to leave the southern people of both races alone, and they will solve it in their own way, and it will probably be better for all concerned.

We were raised in the North. Old Sass in a few cases went to schools which were attended by a few Negroes. We thought little of it at the time, but as we look back those 45 or more years, when we were in the lower grades, the Negro student in the schools which we attended had a poor way of life.

First of all, in those days there were many less students than there were desks, so the Negro student was placed in the rear of the room, with empty seats surrounding him. He was never called upon to go to the blackboard, nor was he ever given the opportunity to recite or read in front of the class. He was in effect segregated in a nonsegregated school.

Negro teachers: Old Sass nor any of his children ever had a Negro teacher, nor do any of the four of us ever remember one being in one of our schools. Mrs. Sass attended segregated schools in West Virginia.

When Yankee magazines and newspapers and some of their crackpot writers, approach the segregation issue from a sensible point of view without the thought in mind of creating mass hysteria and racial animosity instead of using the segregation issue as a means of building circulation the entire country will be far better off.

Unfortunately we did not carefully scan the advertisement inserted by Look magazine in our newspaper or we would have refused to run it. The agency which sent the advertisement for the sake of the commission, is equally guilty of collecting an advertising commission which placed money before the well-being of the entire country.

Along with the publishers of magazines who are prone to rabble-rousing tactics for the sale of their publications, we place politicians of both the Republican and Democratic Parties in the same basket.

We have seen progress in the racial problem in Crisp County, for instance the building of a new Negro school in Cordele, which is far better than any which is being attended by the white students.

Crisp County and its school board will soon start construction of a new consolidated Negro school. The school will be equal to any other school in the county.

We have seen the laying of sewer lines in the Negro section to give better sanitary facilities, and many Negro owners of property rented to their own race gave Old Sass fits because they had to spend money to improve the living conditions of their own people.

We have seen the completion of a 175-unit Negro housing project, and at no time has it been completely filled, mainly because the Negro who could rent it for the same money he paid for a shack, did not want a better way of life.

Let the magazines and the large newspapers of the North investigate some of these improvements and the fact that there are more Negro teachers employed in southern Negro schools than there are in the entire North and they might be able to write an article which is fair to the white people of the South.

I have always maintained that we human beings react alike under similar circumstances. I certainly hope that the people of other sections will ponder in their hearts the truth that all of those who come from other sections into the South agree with the South and deplore the meddling and agitation caused by perhaps well-meaning citizens who do not know what they are talking about.

Israel: A Brief History of Recent Arab-Israel Relations and Suggestions for a Lessening of Tensions and Restoring the Balance of Power in the Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the privielge of inserting in the RECORD the excellent address made by our colleague, the gentleman from New Hampshire, the Honorable CHESTER E. MERROW, on Sunday evening, April 8, before the Jewish National Fund, Third Seder Celebration in Lakewood, N. J., which is in the district I have the honor to represent. It is a speech containing much wisdom and sound judgment and is a constructive contribution to the problems facing our country in the Near East.

The Third Seder Committee of the Jewish National Fund is headed by Irving L. Kantor who has done an outstanding job in administering his responsibilities. The Third Seder under his leadership has contributed more per capita to the Jewish National Fund than any other comparable community in the United States and this is certainly something to be proud of. Such an achievement does not happen by chance but is the result of outstanding leadership, devotion to duty, and the cooperation of everyone who is interested. May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that cooperation is not forthcoming unless there is respect and confidence in the leadership.

Mr. Robert J. Novins, the chairman of the United Jewish Appeal of the Toms River, N. J., community of Jewish farmers, also has contributed much in this undertaking. It is a great privilege for me to represent in the Congress these fine Americans and I am very grateful to my colleague, Congressman MERROW, in meeting with them and bringing to them the wisdom of his experience.

Mr. MERROW's address follows.

TENSION IN THE MEDITERRANEAN

The United States is much concerned with the tense situation that exists throughout the Mediterranean area. This section has always played an important role in the history of the world, and today, with the problems in North Africa, the striving for self-determination in Cyprus and the struggle by the young state of Israel to maintain its security, the Mediterranean holds the spotlight in international affairs. It is fervently hoped that satisfactory solutions to these problems may speedily be found. These issues must be resolved so that a general holocaust will not be loosed in this section of the world.

I welcome the opportunity to be here today to speak about one of the critical situations in the Mediterranean area, namely the relationship between Israel and the surrounding Arab states. Since the United States wholeheartedly backed the formation of the state of Israel in accordance with our traditions of freedom and self-determination, we are deeply interested and gravely concerned with the tension that exists in the Middle East. We are resolved that the state

shall not be overrun or destroyed, and we seek a peaceful solution to the controversy existing between Israel and the Arab states.

ESTABLISHMENT OF ISRAEL

On May 15, 1948, the new state of Israel was proclaimed an independent nation—a sovereign unit in the ranks of the world powers. Israel was established by a United Nations resolution, vigorously supported by the United States. The Declaration of Independence read by David Ben-Gurion pledged that, "The state of Israel will be based on the precept of liberty, justice, and peace, taught by the Hebrew prophets." Israel is the youngest democracy, and as such, is the great hope of freedom in the Middle East.

Israel has been an energetic and valuable member of the United Nations and has contributed greatly to the development and the success of this organization. I had the privilege of serving as a delegate on the United States Delegation to the 10th General Assembly from September 20 to December 20, 1955, and can attest personally to the valuable and statesmanlike contribution of Israel to the United Nations. Therefore, it is not only the United States which is interested in the welfare of this state, but the United Nations is deeply concerned since Israel was formed under United Nations' aegis.

Faced with weighty internal problems inherent to nationhood, Israel also had to deal externally with problems of, far greater moment. The tiny nation found herself wedged between the Mediterranean Sea and unfriendly Arab nations whose harassing border incursions and warlike utterances and actions compelled her to divert a large part of her resources from economic development to the defense of her frontiers. Even though this had to be done in the interest of self-preservation, there has been great economic development in the state of Israel.

On various occasions I have visited the country and have found that the progress is tremendous. It is a modern democratic state, in an area that is much in need of development and democracy. To compound the difficulty, Communist arms and technicians are being supplied to Egypt and to Syria, creating a grave menace to the national survival of the state of Israel. In view of this worsening situation, we will do well to turn our attention to a reexamination of Arab-Israeli relations and the role of the United States in the Middle East.

FIGHT FOR SURVIVAL

At the end of World War II, the centuries old dream of the Jews for a national homeland came true. Directly after the proclamation of the state of Israel by the United Nations, the states bordering on Israel engaged in open warfare against her. The United Nations immediately began an investigation of the matter, but it was not until many bloody exchanges had occurred and nearly a year of strife had taken place that any reasonable arrangement was found to terminaate the bloodshed. On February 24, 1949, an armistice agreement was signed by the interested parties and a momentary truce was instituted. But it was only a reprieve, for the hostile forays of the Arab nations have continued unabatedly from that date to the present time.

It would appear that the enemies of Israel are determined to destroy the tiny state and obliterate her from the Middle Eastern map. The Arab states have steadfastly refused to accept the new state of Israel as a reality and refuse to sit down at the peace conference table with her. This acceptance and conference should and must be forthcoming before the present difficulties can be resolved.

The United Nations has established the state and under no circumstances will we or the other powers allow Israel to be destroyed. Antagonistic groups within the bordering nations continue to boycott, infiltrate and sabotage Israel. At the present moment, Egypt, in making a bid for Arabian leadership in the Eastern Mediterranean, is attempting to use the northern frontier countries of the Baghdad Pact as its principal target.

The Baghdad Pact includes Britain, Turkey, Iran, Iraq, and Pakistan. The Baghdad powers are scheduled to meet in Tehran from April 16 to April 20. Deputy Under Secretary of State, Mr. Loy Henderson, will be an observer at this meeting. It is felt that the United States must put its weight behind this pact lest under the pressure of Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Syria, together with the agitation of the Soviet Union, the pact may disintegrate and then the way would be paved for penetration by the Soviet Union in the Middle East. It is unfortunate that Col. Gamal Nassar, Egyptian Premier who apparently is the main instigator of the opposition to Israel, has served notice on all that the Arabs will not hesitate in using force, even though it may automatically mean war.

BORDER DISPUTES IN 1955

Last summer the middle eastern crisis was further aggravated by operations by the Arabs in sporadic forays across Israeli frontiers. Attacks were met with counterattacks, terminating in an interchange of accusations and flagrant truce term violations by all parties. When the United Nations truce commission's investigation was completed, the Security Council held seven meetings between March 4 and April 19, 1955. The decision of the Security Council on March 29, 1955, was a condemnation of Israel's attack on Egyptian forces. The basis of this action was that the United States and the other world powers said the attack was in the nature of a reprisal—a premeditated act. They felt that the fact that Israel's borders had been harassed for months by Egyptian raids and infiltrators was not adequate justification.

TRIPARTITE DECLARATION OF 1950

The Tripartite Declaration of 1950, entered into between the United States, Great Britain, and France, recognized "that the Arab states and Israel all need to maintain a certain level of armed forces for the purpose of assuring their internal security and their legitimate self-defense and to permit them to play their part in the defense of the area as a whole."

The declaration also stated: "The three governments take this opportunity of declaring their deep interest in and their desire to promote the establishment and maintenance of peace and stability in the area and their unalterable opposition to the use of force or threat of force between any of the states in that area. The three governments, should they find that any of these states was preparing to violate frontiers or armistice lines, would, consistently with their obligations as members of the United Nations, immediately take action, both within and outside the United Nations, to prevent such violation."

ANTI-ISRAEL BROADCASTS

By the middle of the summer, the official radio mouthpiece of the Government of Egypt, Saut el Arab, had increased its anti-Israel barrage of slander and vituperation, with such statements as the following: "We cannot always remain in a state of war with Israel. We are therefore compelled to mobilize all Arab potential to exterminate her finally. Therefore let us plant in the hearts of the younger generation a hatred of Israel."

This sort of emotional nationalistic fervor can only lead to further misunderstanding and tension, with the passions rising in an ever ascending crescendo toward war and disaster.

SECRETARY DULLES' SPEECH ON AUGUST 26, 1955

Hoping to break this deadlock which has formed in the Near East, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles on August 26 devoted a major policy speech before the Council on Foreing Relations to the problem of how this stalemate might be broken. His proposals were among the most constructive efforts brought forth to stabilize the situation. He suggested that there be compensation for the 900,000 Palestinian refugees by Israel to be financed by an international loan, participated in substantially by the United States. The Secretary stated that security could be assured "only by collective measures which commit decisive power to the deterring of aggression." Mr. Dulles stated that, "President Eisenhower has authorized me to say that, given a solution of the other related problems, he would recommend that the United States join in formal treaty engagements to prevent or thwart any effort by either side to alter by force the boundaries between Israel and its Arab neighbors. I hope that other countries would be willing to join in such a security guaranty, and that it would be sponsored by the United Nations." The Secretary of State pointed out that the existing boundary lines were established by the armistice agreements of 1949. He said that the drawing of permanent boundaries is a difficult task and that the lines fixed by the armistice agreements of 1949 were not designed to be permanent in every respect. He reaffirmed the willingness of the United States to help in reaching a solution to the boundary problem and other matters.

Israel's reaction to this was favorable, of course, but its leaders felt it was only one step toward resolving the dilemma. They pointed out that Israel had always been ready to make peace with the Arabs and offer concessions on the resettlement and compensation of refugees as part of a general peace settlement. However, they insisted that the fact of a united Arab front pledged to destroy Israel as a sovereign state left them no choice but to make Israel stronger militarily and to strengthen its ties with other areas. Israel maintained that if there had been any genuine attempts by the Arab groups to compromise or diminish their intransigent attitude, she would be open to negotiation and suggestions. But Israel could see no such change in the Arab attitude forthcoming.

In July 1955, for example, David Ben-Gurion offered to meet with Premier Gamal Nasser "or any other Egyptian statesman who is ready to meet with me in order to consider ways and means of improving relations between Israel and the Arab States." No reply was made to this, but within the month armed bands of Egyptians were making deep raids into Israeli territory, west and north of the Gaza demarcation line. It has been obvious that from the Arab point of view the war was not over—after all, only an armistice had been agreed to, they argued. It is no wonder that Israel feels that she must do all she can to balance the military strength the Arabs are acquiring from the Communists.

On February 6, 1956, several Republican Members of Congress sent a letter concerning the Israeli-Arab situation to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. I support the views expressed in this letter and to it give my wholehearted endorsement. I quote certain parts of the letter: "Under the Tripartite Declaration of 1950, our Government recognized 'that the Arab States and Israel all need to maintain a certain level of armed forces for the purpose of assuring their internal security and their legitimate self-defense and to permit them to play their part in the defense of the area as a whole.' Because of a fear of growing imbalance of arms, the Government of Israel desires to purchase defensive arms strictly for purposes of self-defense. We have individually, and now collectively,

taken the position that Israel as a firm part of the free world should be allowed to obtain in the open market such weapons as would assure her protection against aggression. What is the position of the State Department on this matter?

"We do not contend that tension in the Middle East can be finally resolved by the provision of defensive arms alone. We are convinced that immediate negotiations for the conclusion of a treaty of peace between Israel and the Arab world should be undertaken. These negotiations should be effectively implemented by our Government in association with those governments which joined in the Tripartite Declaration of 1950.

"It is vital that prompt and decisive measures be taken to end the threat of war in the Near East.

"To achieve this end the negotiation of formal treaties guaranteeing the existing frontiers of Israel and the Arab nations is essential, but essential also is a willingness to negotiate such treaties. We believe that a treaty of peace and a guaranty of existing frontiers should be offered to all interested parties in the Middle East and should be implemented promptly as to the frontiers of that nation or those nations which accept the proposed peace terms. Otherwise we continue to be faced with the refusal of some nations to enter into peace negotiations or even to recognize the existence of the State of Israel. What is the position of the State Department in this regard?

"There are two additional matters as to which we seek information from the Department: first, we do not believe that economic aid should be extended to any nation which is engaging in warlike or aggressive maneuvers against any part of the Free World. Therefore, we would like to go on record as urging our Department of State to consider most carefully further extension of economic aid, denying such aid to those countries which by their actions endanger the peace and security of free nations. What is the position of the State Department in this regard?

"Second, we agree with your August 26, 1955, statement concerning the immediate desirability of economic and technical help in resettling those Arab refugees whose continued presence in their present location delays or impedes the possibility of a total solution of the Arab-Israel problem. What progress has been made by our Government and associated nations toward the solution of this matter?

"We recognize that the continuing effort of our Government to counter the spread of world communism has many facets. Action taken anywhere may have repercussions in all parts of the world. But we do urgently feel that our constituents will be better informed by frank statements of the position of the Department of State wherever that is possible, consistent with national security. As Members of Congress, who support the aims and objectives of this administration, we are particularly anxious that our constituents be advised that the Department is taking positive steps toward the protection of free nations such as Israel and toward the dissolution of dangers which, in threatening the peace of Israel, threaten also the peace of the Free World."

UNITED NATIONS ACTION IN 1956

As a further blow to the Israeli efforts to maintain a balance of power in this troubled Mediterranean area, on January 19, 1956, the United Nations Security Council unanimously voted to condemn Israel for an attack on a Syrian military post which took place on December 11, 1955. Even though Israel agreed that United Nations action must be supported, nevertheless, she felt she could not solely depend on the United Nations because the Soviet Union has a veto in the Council. From January on, therefore, the State of Israel has been pressing for more dependable and quicker means to meet the threat of aggression from the Arab States.

On the 4th of April the Security Council of the United Nations unanimously requested Dag Hammarskjold to go to the Middle East. This was done by the adoption of a United States-sponsored resolution. It is hoped that the Secretary General's mission will result in decreasing tensions in that area. Mr. Hammarskjold will endeavor to obtain better compliance with the armistice terms. His recommendations, which are to be reported to the Council within a month, are anxiously awaited.

ISRAEL STRIVING FOR SECURITY

Israeli leaders have been striving persistently for some additional guaranty for her security, especially in the form of a mutual-defense treaty with the United States and military assistance to Israel in order to remove the arms imbalance being created by Communist arms shipments to both Egypt and Syria. Israel is well aware of the long-run value of the Tri-Partite Declaration by the United States, Great Britain, and France to intervene in the event of organized aggression by either side, but, nevertheless, she does feel that at the moment of attack, arms and military materiel will be needed if she is to withstand the initial shock of the aggression for which no big power declaration can effectively act as a substitute. In other words, a security guaranty is not a substitute for defensive strength. As a supplement to arms it would be an excellent idea, but it cannot be considered an alternative solution, but rather as one piece in the whole fabric of security and defense guaranties.

I have always maintained that the Near East is an area vital to the security of the United States and that of the free world. The little State of Israel forms an important bastion of freedom and independence in that area. I feel that it would be perfectly proper and timely for the United States to supply arms to Israel in the context of that nation's legitimate self-defense and within the larger context of the security of the United States. This is possible within the framework of the mutual-security legislation, which is the basic law governing United States military assistance to friendly nations. I have been a firm supporter of this legislation since its first enactment in 1949 and I have consistently supported aid to the State of Israel under the mutual-security program.

Israel is already getting arms and assistance from France. We have taken the position that we have no objection to the shipment of arms to Israel by France and Great Britain. In view of the unwillingness of the Arab States to reach an equitable solution on the frontiers and, in view of the determination to oppose Israel as is evidenced by the attitude of intransigence, Israel should receive arms from the West to guarantee her security. Such arms are necessary in our own national interests.

The shipment of arms to Israel would, in my opinion, serve as a necessary military deterrent, the element which needs to be restored in order to maintain security in the region. Israel, it must be explained, does not insist upon a numerical superiority in arms but only an adjustment of the existing military imbalance resulting from transactions of the Communists. It is my firm conviction that a United States arms shipment would be a positive step to settle, or at least to lessen the present trying conflict, and certainly would further American and world democratic interests in sustaining and strengthening the new democracy of Israel. This is a feeling that is increasing in the United States as the situation in the Near East steadily deteriorates.

CONCLUSION

But apart from the moral and spiritual blow which this would mean to the whole free world, it is only too apparent to us that the loss of the sovereign state of Israel would be a crushing defeat to the United States, since the disappearance of this citadel of freedom would not only break the bonds of world democratic soldarity but would also open up the Near East to Soviet domination. The United States surely will not allow this to happen, and it is becoming a matter of increasing concern to every American.

I feel, as I have stated, that it is proper for us to furnish arms to Israel on the basis of the legitimate self-defense of the nation and within the larger context of the security of the United States. This situation must be settled peacefully, for if war comes it may well destroy not only Israel but may well engulf the entire world. Israel is the bastion of democracy in the Middle East. The state has been established by the United Nations and with our wholehearted support. We were the first to recognize Israel. Our influence and leadership must be used to make the existence of the state of Israel a recognized and accepted fact and we must vigorously oppose any solution to the Near East problem that would interfere with the sovereignty and security of the state of Israel.

The integrity of Israel is essential to our own security. Israel has made a valiant struggle for freedom and democracy. Israel stands foursquare against the Communists and anything that would impair the state would be of assistance to the Communists in their endeavor to firmly establish themselves in the Middle East. Stability in this area must be restored and arms are essential for self-protection. At the same time every effort must be exerted to reach a peaceful and satisfactory solution in this troubled area. If we help Israel build the necessary defensive strength to protect herself against aggression, she will be able to build in peace the model of freedom which I believe firmly will inevitably have a profound influence on the whole area of the Near East. Thus, by setting an example of peace and democracy, Israel will fulfill her historic mission.

Israel is the bulwark of democracy in an area where the Communists are using every effort to secure a foothold. This bastion of freedom is the free world's greatest hope of halting the incursion of communism in an area vital to our security.

The Right Step

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. DONOVAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, Steve Nelson, one of the most notorious Communist conspirators in the United States, a spy, saboteur, and traitor, was convicted in the Court of Quarter Sessions of Allegheny County, Pa., of a violation of the Pennsylvania Sedition Act and sentenced to imprisonment for 20 years.

A few days ago a divided United States Supreme Court, 6 justices against 3, reversed Nelson's conviction on the grounds that Congress has given exclusive jurisdiction to the Federal courts in the field of sedition, espionage and treason and that the State courts of Pennsylvania had no right to prosecute Nelson. So Nelson was freed.

There was no congressional intent to take away power from the States to jail Communist conspirators traitors when the Federal laws against subversion were enacted.

On April 9, 1956, I introduced H. R. 10335, a bill designed to make it clear to the Supreme Court that State Courts may jail seditionists when they have the evidence.

My bill is directed at and confined singly to the field of sedition. Its language is specific and clearly confers on the States the right to prosecute acts of sedition, and treason, against the United States and the States themselves.

It has widespread support. I cite the following editorial that appeared today in the Boston Daily Record of April 10, 1956:

THE RIGHT STEP

Congressman JAMES G. DONOVAN, of New York, has given the House of Representatives in Washington a bill empowering States to prosecute persons for sedition.

This is necessary legislation and it should have the support of every member of the New England congressional delegation.

Mr. DONOVAN says his measure is designed to correct the Supreme Court's decision of a week ago holding that State sedition laws are superseded by the Federal Smith Act.

There was no congressional intent to take away the power of the States to imprison Communist traitors when the Smith Act was passed in 1940," he points out, adding:

"My bill spells this out and makes it clear to the Supreme Court that State courts may deal adequately with their own seditionists when they have the evidence."

There were many New Englanders, including the leaders of both the Democratic and Republican Parties, in Congress when the Smith Act became the law of the land.

None of them, we are positive, had the remotest idea of stripping their own States of their traditional authority to crack down on the Communist conspiracy.

The Pilates in the Kremlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the recent renunciation of Stalin by the same men who once idolized him has caused much conjecture throughout the world. Many persons and newspapers have viewed the Communist turnabout with alarm, and the Baltimore Catholic Review, speaking editorially, has called the resultant situation a new era of "smile and guile." The editorial is extremely thought-provoking, and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of today's RECORD, so that it can obtain additional distribution. The Catholic Review, in which it was printed, is the official organ of the Archdiocese of Baltimore.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PILATES IN THE KREMLIN

The debunking of Stalin and the creation of an atmosphere of "smile and be happy—we want to be good," brings us around to the inevitable question: Have the leaders of the Soviet Union had a change of heart? The question is impossible to answer, and we might suggest, irrelevant.

Throughout history, nations of all types—good and bad—have been forced to adjust policies to meet the needs of complex times. In each case, the stated motives have been defined merely in terms of propaganda and form only part of a given picture. The Russia of Lenin had a set of motives which seemed plausible and drew sympathy from many. But the real fruits of revolutionary communism—evil and hate—came into their own during the reign of Stalin. It was he who set the pattern for the new colonialism, a monalithic, nationalist-Communist empire. And through the years of his rule down to the present time, the Communists have lived on a policy of brute force. They have trampled underfoot even the most elementary rules of morality. Hateful, violent persecution has no sooner disappeared from one corner of the world than it reappears in another. The advocates of communism have no respect for supernatural values and attempt to destroy in their path all hope.

But despite the fact that almost a third of the people of the world are under the oppressive rule of godless atheism, the policies of the late Joseph Stalin have been proved a failure. The top-heavy structure of Soviet colonialism creaks under the cracks of discontent. In addition, a formidable portion of the world's nations have banded together and served notice that Red colonialism can expand only at the price of war. And even the Soviet leaders know that war in the hydrogen bomb age must be avoided at all costs.

This is the main reason why it is irrelevant to ask whether the Communists have had a change of heart or whether they pursue their revolutionary objectives. What does matter is that the Soviets have been forced to seek a method of living with the rest of the world—how they go about it is what really matters.

The repudiation of Stalinist practices seems logical, inasmuch as he perfected the blood bath technique. But the present board of governors at the Kremlin cannot escape history. If Stalin be guilty, they also are guilty. Were they not his trusted lieutenants? Did they not act with him and for him? And since Stalin passed to the Seat of Judgment have they not continued his policies?

This new era of smile and guile is a dangerous one. Some of our fellow citizens may want to buy the new Kremlin line hoping that it leads to peace. But until the godless ideology is renounced by those who now espouse it, there can be no peace. Not until the Christian leaders now languishing in alien dungeons are released to exercise their rightful ministry, can there be peace. Not until the love of God replaces the hate of man can there be peace in the home, the nation or the world.

This is the lesson to be derived from the Pontius Pilates of the Communist world. Blood is still on their hands.

The Blazing of New Trails in Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, on March 29, John S. DeTar, M. D., of Milan, Mich., was installed as the new president of the American Academy of General Practice at the academy's eighth annual assembly in Washington. On Friday, April 13, another Michigan man, John A. McCartney, will be installed as president of the American Pharmaceutical Association at that organization's 103d convention in Detroit. Mr. McCartney is director of trade relations for Parke, Davis & Co., in Detroit.

I am, of course, very proud that 2 Michigan men have been selected to head these 2 important organizations. The relationship of these two incidents, while coincidental, serves to point up the vital relationship between doctors and medication. Dr. DeTar personifies the famous family doctor, while Mr. McCartney represents the pharmacist who develops, manufactures, and distributes medication to the doctors and to the public. Both groups, working together, are continually blazing new trails in medicine.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which I recently read in the Prescriptionist, a professional pharmaceutical publication, dealing with the use of drugs in the treatment of mental illness at St. Elizabeths Hospital in Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAMILY REUNION

(By Bernard Zerbe)

The people above are walking through the grounds of St. Elizabeths, the famed hospital for the mentally ill in Washington, D. C. This happy family scene is a familiar one at the hospital these days, with more and more husbands, wives, and children visiting the hospital—talking freely, enjoying the knowledge that soon complete return to normalcy will be at hand.

Not too many months or years ago, such a scene would have been rare. It has developed only recently, since the advent of new pharmaceuticals for the mentally ill. These new drugs transform completely unmanageable people into cooperative, quiet, calm, willing patients. No longer the disturbed movement of the hands, jerking motion of the head, twitching, turning, leg crossed over leg, recrossed again—and again—and again, in a heart rendering futility of movement.

This is a story that is being repeated the world over today, through the use of the tranquillizing drugs. Some people, less fortunate than the patient in the picture, may have to take these drugs for long periods, perhaps for life, but the fact remains, it will be a new life, a life crowded with pleasure, free from torment, for everyone.

It has been said, and printed, it is regrettable that these new drugs are so costly; yet a day's treatment may possibly cost less than the price of a pack and a half of cigarettes. And even if the cost soared to the price of a carton of cigarettes, what price can be placed on freedom of mind, relief from tension, rebirth into a new and real world? Can cost be translated into mother's reunion with son? Father's release from worry?

Costly? Hardly. Early in 1956 the Director of St. Elizabeths reported that his hospital had operated so successfully that it had a $100,000 surplus in its budget—a rather remarkable report. When asked to explain this, he credited the new drugs as being the major factor. "Shorter duration of hospitalization, more visitations to the home, reduction in more costly treatment formerly

used"—these are the things that saved the $100,000.

Here then is living proof that modern medication, produced in our Nation's pharmaceutical laboratories, is actually saving money. While the individual unit price may seem high, the overall cost is minimal.

In all areas of health today, in heart disease, cancer, polio—make your own choice, pharmaceuticals are adding years to life. Who is to measure a year in pennies, nickels, dimes, or dollars? And who is to measure the tremendous contribution such medication makes to the national income, by returning men and women to productive lives.

All of this is contained in a little capsule or pill that is often no more costly than a package of cigarettes.

How many do you, or your friends, smoke a day?

New England's Economic Problems and the Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Seymour E. Harris, chairman of the New England Governors' Textile Committee, before the New England congressional delegation, April 11, in Washington, D. C.:

NEW ENGLAND'S ECONOMIC PROBLEMS AND THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

1. OCCASION FOR MEETING

The New England Governors' Textile Committee invited the New England congressional delegation to discuss the economic issues of New England with them and particularly with relevance to New England textiles and pending legislation.

The following issues seem especially germane for the consideration of the congressional delegation:

2. THE NEW ENGLAND ECONOMIC SITUATION

In the last 4 years New England has shared in the national prosperity and, what is more, has maintained its advantage of 9 percent of per capita income over the national average, a much better record than in the preceding 25 years. In manufacturing a loss of 62,000 jobs in textiles from 1947 to 1953 was offset by gains of 45,000 in electrical machinery (especially helpful to Massachusetts), 41,000 in transportation equipment (especially important for Connecticut), and 35,000 in miscellaneous (large gains for Rhode Island and Massachusetts). New Hampshire showed the largest relative gains, and Massachusetts and Rhode Island, the smallest.

3. LOSSES IN MANUFACTURING AND GAINS ELSEWHERE

From 1951 to 1955 (first quarter), New England lost 9 percent of its manufacturing jobs; but these losses were more than made up by gains of 14.4 percent in nonmanufacturing. (The largest gains were 95,000 jobs in Government, 51,000 in services and miscellaneous, and 58,000 in wholesale and retail trade.)

4. TARIFFS AND QUOTAS

Right along we have insisted that reductions of tariffs on textiles are unjustifiable. For example, in a recent period of almost 4 years (through September 1954), New England lost 38 percent of its textile jobs and even the South lost 7 percent. To injure the industry further through increased foreign competition under these conditions seems to us to be irresponsible behavior, to say the least. Our negotiators should not have cut tariffs on textiles—as they did recently at Geneva and may do again. If United States policy requires tariff cuts (and we have some reservations here), the burden should be put on the growing and thriving industries. Mr. Stanton, of Berkshire-Hathaway, one of the leading and most loyal New England manufacturers of textiles, will discuss the threat of Japanese exports and suggest remedial legislation inclusive of a quota. The vast majority of the Committee and the New England Governors unanimously have asked for a quota.

5. FLOOD INSURANCE

Three congressional committees have had flood insurance under consideration. The complaint has been made that there is not adequate interest. We assure the able chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, Congressman SPENCE, that there is great interest in this legislation. The Senate Banking and Currency Committee has two bills under consideration, an administration bill and the Lehman-Kennedy, etc. bill. The differences between these bills are not too serious. They both rightly stress rates not based purely on an actuarial consideration—that is, rates which would be prohibitive. They both see the need of ceilings on individual policies.

On March 26, the New England Governors issued a strong statement in support of insurance. In this statement and in a discussion with the Chairman of the New England Governors' Textile Committee, the New England Governors made it clear (1) that flood insurance was a must; (2) that they objected to the sharing of costs by States on the grounds of unconstitutionality (Governor Herter based his statement on legal interpretation); and (3) that they hoped for a higher ceiling on individual policies (otherwise, as Governor Ribicoff pointed out, serious unemployment might result.

6. FLOOD CONTROL

Flood control outlays in New England have been most inadequate and continue to be. The Government program $52 million, a minimum program, has been whittled down to $17 million of obligational authority for fiscal year 1957. (Included in the program was $12.45 million requested for beach erosion and navigation. But $3.1 million was granted.) In the last 5 years we have received from one-fifteenth to one-twentieth of what might have been expected relative to national outlays. In part, this is the result of failure to push ahead in New England as well as an unwillingness of Congress to tackle the problem vigorously.

7. TAX DEDUCTIONS FOR OUTLAYS TO PREVENT FLOODS

We would also like to see legislation enacted which allows extra outlays incurred by textile mills and other factories for the purpose of preventing floods to be written off much more quickly than is possible now. The Under Secretary of the Treasury Department has insisted that legislation is necessary to get this relief of taxes.

8. TREASURY TAXES AND DISBURSEMENTS IN NEW ENGLAND AND ELSEWHERE

We bring to your attention once more the large transfers of cash out of New England and other Northern States which help accelerate development elsewhere and aggravate the outflow of capital and industry from New England. Not alone some outlays in the South but excessive outlays, for example, for irrigation in the 13 Western States may be questioned. This problem is discussed in our Textile Report to the New England Governors (February 1956). This is relevant in re pending flood, farm, school construction, highway, etc., legislation.

9. SOME FEATURES OF TREASURY OPERATIONS

Note (1) that 5 competitive Southern States get 3 times as much out of the Treasury as they put in vis-a-vis the 3 major industrial States of New England.

(2) That the 10 richest States (mainly Northeast) pay 10 times as much in taxes per capita as the 10 poorest States (in the South and West).

(3) That Government financing through loans provides New England about one-sixth as much as might be expected from New England's contribution to the Treasury—in other words builds up the South and West at a rapid rate, in part at our expense.

(4) In 1 year (1952), New England transferred $1.3 billion net or 7 percent of its income via Treasury transactions.

10. DETAILS ON IMPORTANT PROGRAMS—LEGISLATION PENDING

In re pending legislation the following may be of interest. In 1954 (and similar results generally for 1953), New England received back in re taxes paid as compared to the national total as follows. (Thus in school construction we received 13 percent or about one-eighth back compared to our relative contribution to the Treasury taxes.)

	Percent
A. Aids to State and local government:	
School construction	12.83
Slum clearance grants	0.00
Aid for highways	62.63
Hospital construction	48.43
Old-age assistance	75.27
School district grants	64.71
All State and local aid ($2,958 million)	69.36
B. Projects within States:	
Army corps—civil projects	8.00
Reclamation, etc	0.00
Soil conservation	27.63
All ($944 million)	97.69
C. Grants and payments to individual groups:	
VA readjustment benefits	65.74
VA pensions	93.66
Unemployment insurance	99.24
Old-age benefits	117.66
All ($9,824 million)	95.57
D. Loans to individuals and groups:	
Small Business Administration	40.48
Farm Credit Administration	40.21
Rural Electrification	0.80
Commodity Credit Corporation	0.80
All ($6,173 million)	16.21
E. Loans: guaranteed and insured, ($4,934 million)	77.11

11. WHERE NEW ENGLAND LOSES

Note that New England gets back relatively little in aid programs, in operations of Federal Government in States and localities, and in loans. She does much better on insurance, veteran programs, and Government contracts.

Other important issues

We can discuss only briefly the following:

12. MINIMUM WAGES

The new $1 minimum, the industrialization of the South, and the more aggressive unionism in the South are contributing to a narrowing of wage gaps between North and South. With manufacturing wages up by 48 cents per hour (8 cents per year) since 1949 (the year of the last change in minimum wages), the increase of 25 cents in the minimum for 1956 may well be inadequate. It almost certainly will be 3 years from now. Preparations for a reexamination should begin now as well as improved enforcement.

13. MERGERS

We urge implementation of the 1954 tax revision which threatens disallowance of tax deductions for absorbing firms under merg-

ers which are undertaken for tax purposes. New England has suffered greatly from these mergers. In this connection, we bring to your attention administration proposals of a 90-day notice to FTC of mergers.

14. ABUSE OF TAX EXEMPTION

We are disappointed that a few southern Senators killed the amendment in the 1954 tax codification bill which would have discouraged the abuse of tax exemption by southern municipalities, determined to entice northern manufacturers to move South.

15. APPRECIATION OF THE HELP OF NEW ENGLAND CONGRESSMEN

We have always had the finest cooperation from our Congressmen—both Republicans and Democrats and on a nonpartisan basis. We appreciate this.

Bank's Report Received With Enthusiasm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL CHUDOFF
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works and Resources of the Committee on Government Operations, it has been my good fortune to have under the jurisdiction of the subcommittee the Virgin Islands and the Virgin Islands Corporation. These islands, which we purchased from Denmark in 1917, are making wonderful progress and going forward in a fine manner.

The new West Indies Bank & Trust Co. of the Virgin Islands held its third annual stockholders' meeting on March 15, 1956. It is amazing to see that the resources of this bank during the year 1955–56 increased from over $2 million to over $6 million. The bank is going a long way toward improving the economy and the business of the islands, and is making available small loans to those people living in the islands who could never get them before.

It is my thought that every Member of Congress should read the following article which appeared in the Daily News of the Virgin Islands, Charlotte Amalie, on March 16, 1956:

BANK'S REPORT RECEIVED WITH ENTHUSIASM

The West Indies Bank & Trust Co. held its third annual stockholders' meeting yesterday, March 15, 1956, at its main office in Charlotte Amalie. A large, enthusiastic audience was present. Mr. Silverman was given a rising vote of confidence after reporting on the excellent progress made by the bank during the calendar year 1955. Mr. Silverman pointed out that the total resources of the bank during the year increased from $2,871,589.50 to $6,171,250.51.

Mr. Silverman, in his statement, looks forward to even greater progress during the calendar year 1956. He stated: "It is definitely certain that with the improvement in the tourist economy of the islands, the stimulation of business which is expected from the return of the internal-revenue taxes under the Revised Organic Act, and the wise administration of these new funds by our government under the leadership of Governor Gordon, there should be a great economic uplift in store for the people of the islands. We at the West Indies Bank & Trust Co. expect to share and participate in this business upswing. We confidently believe that we have already generated considerable improvement in the economy of the islands. We know that we can continue to serve the people of the islands faithfully, with integrity, confidence, hope, sound judgment, and with ample security, as we have demonstrated, for the funds of our depositors which are held in trust by your bank. We believe that we are making an important contribution to the economy of the islands by our business loans, our construction loans, and through our general banking business methods. Gearing these activities to the tourist economy of our islands, I know we can look forward to another year of unprecedented progress for our people, the community, and of the growth of your bank."

In Mr. Silverman's closing remarks he pointed out the true significance of the existence bank; by comparing it to the bloodstream of an individual. He said:

"The circulation of money in a community is as vital as the circulation of blood in the individual. In each case "poor circulation" creates an anemic condition. Our bank seeks to circulate (through loans to persons of integrity and responsibility) every dollar for such purpose that the law allows. Money soundly loaned, to persons of enterprise creates conditions that set people to work. Working people create fresh wealth that eventually finds its way back to the bank in the form of new deposits—to be loaned anew for the creation of more wealth—more jobs."

Elections were held. The following persons were elected to the board of directors: Joseph Alexander; Dr. Roy A. Anduze; Gaston Benjamin, David Chinnery, Harry Gould, Henry L. Kimelman, R. H. Amplett Leader, Alexander Moorhead, Ralph Paiewonsky, Irwin W. Silverman, and Marion H. Thayer.

Mrs. Thayer is the first woman to be elected as a member of the board of directors of a bank in the Virgin Islands and the 31st woman to be elected to the board of directors of all of the banks in the United States. One hundred and sixty-three thousand nine hundred and seventy-nine shares, or 65 percent of the total stock outstanding was voted in person or by proxy.

Immediately after the stockholders meeting the board of directors met, and the following persons were elected as officers of the bank: Joseph Alexander, chairman of the board; Irwin W. Silverman, president; Ralph Paiewonsky, first vice president; R. H. Amphlett Leader, second vice president; Henry L. Kimelman, secretary, and Alexander Moorhead, treasurer.

Mrs. Breaux, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK B. BROOKS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Texas has given many outstanding leaders of courage and foresight to our Nation. It is my privilege today to recognize another of these leaders—Mrs. A. J. Breaux, of Beaumont—and to call attention to the splendid editorial about Mrs. Breaux published in the Beaumont Enterprise March 27, 1956.

Mrs. Breaux has long been interested in the vital issues which face our Nation, having held the important positions of national vice president of the American Legion Auxiliary, chairman of the national security committee, and president of the Department of Texas Auxiliary. She is at present chairman of the Legion's National Americanism committee.

After years of important service to her country in these vital posts, Mrs. Breaux is now a candidate for national president of the American Legion Auxiliary. I would like to take this opportunity to respectfully call to the attention of the House of Representatives and the people of our country her splendid qualifications of the highest degree of loyalty and integrity and her unswerving devotion to the people of the United States.

I would at this time insert the editorial from the Beaumont (Tex.) Enterprise:

MRS. BREAUX'S CANDIDACY

The nationwide campaign now underway to make Mrs. A. J. Breaux national president of the American Legion Auxiliary is being given strong support in Beaumont, Mrs. Breax's home town, and in other parts of Texas where her work for the American Legion is well known. She is at present chairman of the Legion's national Americanism committee.

Mrs. Breaux has held important positions in the Legion Auxiliary for years, serving as national vice president (southern division), as chairman of the national legislative committee and chairman of the national security committee. She was also president of the Department of Texas Auxiliary.

Mrs. Breaux's many frends in Beaumont and Texas, not to mention Auxiliary members in other parts of the country who know something about her distinguished record of service, feel that she has earned promotion. They hope that she will receive a deserved regard by being elected to the national presidency of the Auxiliary at the convention to be held next September 3–6, in Los Angeles.

Meanwhile, an intensive campaign to prepare and distribute biographical and other material has been started in Mrs. Breaux's behalf. Her Beaumont friends are confident that she will be just as successful in the top position of the Auxiliary, if elected to that post, as she has been in the many lesser offices she filled with credit to herself and the Auxiliary. If she should be elected president, both Beaumont and Mrs. Breaux will be signally honored.

Rt. Rev. Francis L. Shea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Lawrence Sunday Sun, Lawrence, Mass., memorializing the late Right Reverend Francis L. Shea, a man of boundless energy who interested himself in every cause for the betterment of mankind.

HIS MONUMENTS

In North Andover, there are three living memorials to the Right Reverend Francis L. Shea, who passed away on Easter Monday.

When he first became pastor of St. Michael's parish, only a relatively few years ago, the parochial "plant" consisted of the church and a wooden frame social hall that is now 75 years old.

Next to the church was the brick former Merrimac Public School building, which had been abandoned by the town. Monsignor Shea mentioned to a few parishioners that he was considering the idea of acquiring the school. Some of the reaction was discouraging. But there were those, even in those early days of his pastorate, who were inspired by his spirit. The parish purchased the old school and began to fill it up with children. By 1954, it was bursting at the seams with its pupil population.

Ere this overflow occurred, however, there was a need for a convent to house the nuns of the Order of Sisters of Charity of Halifax, who teach in the school. Monsignor Shea passed the word, and the parish built the convent.

The acute problem was in housing the school population, and it seemed that raising sufficient funds for the purchase of land and the building of a modern schoolhouse was out of the question. But the monsignor and his curates went ahead. Committees were organized among the parishioners. Then, one Sunday, teams of men of the parish deployed through the town, encouraged by a gift of land as a site for the structure. They raised in cash and pledges the amount of money necessary for a secure beginning of the project.

Construction of it is well underway. It will be one of the finest school buildings in the entire area, an asset to the parish and to the town and to the education of hundreds of today's children who will be the town's citizens in the years ahead.

No man could have done more for so many people. He gave them what they needed. He gave them his very life.

Monsignor Shea was an exceedingly rare type of man. He had the faculty of drawing people to him with such affection that they would strive to the limit to accomplish any project in which he demonstrated an interest. He was a brilliant organizer, purely and simply because his flock followed him without question or hesitation. He catered painstakingly to the spiritual welfare of his parishioners, and, at the same time, to their material comfort and advancement.

As gentle and unspoiled as the day he was born, "this saintly man" (and we quote the words of Archbishop Cushing, spoken several years ago) walked through life with no purpose other than to do good for all around him, to brighten their lives in the reflection of his own shining spirit, and this through the application of the holy virtues of his religious office.

Even though they attended his funeral, there are many people throughout Greater Lawrence today who cannot bring themselves to accept the fact of his death. In fact, no man really dies who leaves so many living memorials to his greatness.

Navy League Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD at this point an address delivered in Cleveland, Ohio, by Rear Adm. E. W. Grenfell, United States Navy, which I commend to the attention of each Member of Congress.

The address follows:

NAVY LEAGUE SPEECH

(By E. W. Grenfell, Rear Admiral, United States Navy, Cleveland, Ohio, October 27, 1955)

Mr. Hughes, honored guests, members of the Navy League, ladies and gentlemen, I am highly honored to have been invited to speak to you, members of the Cleveland Navy League. I am happy to see several of my old friends—one is Mr. George Codrington to whom the Navy will always be grateful for his exceptional foresignt in bringing about the expansion of the Cleveland Diesel Engine Corp. just prior to World War II—this foresight enabled his company to provide the United States Navy with submarine engines in pace with the submarine shipbuilding program, and thus this effort was instrumental in helping our submarines in their successful submarine warfare.

I am also delighted to see my old friend, Mr. T. Keith Glennan, president of the Case Institute of Technology. Many of you may not realize that it was he who was basically responsible for the great advancement made in underwater acoustics, which were extremely beneficial to both the antisubmarine and submarine service of our Navy.

And what a pleasure it is to salute your esteemed president of the Ohio Navy League, Mr. Tom Hughes. Tom began his submarine career as a guaranty Engineer over 18 years ago when he walked aboard my submarine, the USS *Pickerel*, and brusquely wanted to know "When do we get underway?" Since that time, Tom has had so much to do with our submarine navy that he might well be selected for one of our submarine commanders.

I open my talk today with three quotations:

1. "Naval strategy has indeed for its end to found, support, and increase, as well in peace as in war, the sea power of a country; and therefore its study has an increase and value for all citizens of a free country, but especially for those who are charged with its foreign and military relations."

2. "The ships that thus sail to and fro must have secure ports to which to return and must, as far as possible, be followed by the protection of their country throughout the voyage. The necessity of a Navy, in the restricted sense of the word, springs, therefore, from the existence of a peaceful shipping."

3. "A peaceful, gain-loving nation is not far-sighted, and far-sightedness is needed for adequate military preparation especially in these days."

The above quotations and particularly the last one—a word of warning to all of us—might have been written yesterday. Strangely enough, they were written 65 years ago by the greatest naval strategist of all times, Capt. A. T. Mahan, United States Navy. Nonetheless, these quotations are just as applicable to today's principles of modern warfare as they were 65 years ago. The freedom of the seas today is even more important than it was then, for our country in these times is more dependent upon the resources of other nations whose needed materials must be carried by ships on the surface of the ocean.

From the foregoing the subject of my talk today now becomes appropriate—The Need for and the Type of Your Navy of the Future.

It is not my purpose here today to tell you that there is a greater need for a Navy than there is for any of our other fine services. I am well aware that the history of our country has always shown that we have never had enough of any one military service at the beginning of any war. Thus it should be emphasized always that it is necessary for our country to have a well-balanced nucleus of all our 4 services all highly trained and with a firm and resolute esprit de corps; 4 services that will be extremely well prepared to answer the call when and if that tragic day should ever arrive—the beginning of another world war.

I feel it is appropriate to point out to you that all the military leaders whom I have ever known are actually peace-loving, God-fearing gentlemen. By virtue of their profession, however, they must constantly be on the alert and keenly aware of not only the military readiness of their own forces but those of any potential enemy. Consequently, it is our duty to our country and to you, our taxpayers, that we analyze this military problem constantly.

In this connection, the new Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Arleigh Burke, asked me to give you this personal message which I read with pleasure:

"In any war of the future, the highways of the seas will be more vital to our security and to our standard of living than they have ever been before. We must continue to protect merchant shipping which is essential to the operation of our defense industries and our civilian industries. We must be able to sustain and support our sister services overseas. We must be able to support our friends and allies. We must do all these things and in addition, we must be capable of projecting military power from and across the seas.

"We think that our Navy will be able to make a significant contribution either in a limited war or in a general war. We think the Navy can contribute both during the opening rounds and the slowing-down phases of a nuclear war. The Navy has already developed mobile nuclear reprisal forces—the new aircraft carriers with long-range aircraft, guided missile ships, and submarines. Seaplanes, too, will add a lot of punch and versatility to the Navy's air attack. All these forces will pack a terrific atomic wallop. They will be able to approach their targets from many directions. They can use many launching points. They will force the enemy to dilute his effort and they will multiply his problems of defense.

"The Marines have developed a new landing technique by helicopter assault. We must be able to land the Marines on hostile beaches. We must be able to land them through ports which may have been destroyed. We must be able to sweep mines and mine enemy waters. In short, the Navy must be able to defeat all kinds of threats regardless of what kind—or how or from where they may come."

As Admiral Burke has indicated to you the highways of the seas are more vital to our security today than they have ever been, and their protection will be even more important in the future.

Technical progress has given this Nation, as well as other nations, new opportunities to project increasing amounts of military power from the sea.

Looking across the Pacific and the Atlantic from the shores of the United States, the sea offers the United States the opportunity to rapidly move our mobile, nuclear naval forces to any location on the high seas. The security and the survival of our country demands that we exploit the advantages of the nuclear age. The Navy already has the first elements of a family of sea-based weapons capable of launching nuclear attacks from 75 percent of the earth's surface. This means that any enemy must now start thinking in terms of dispersing his offensive and his defensive efforts. Dispersal costs time, money, and effort. This means that, if he is wise, he must now start planning to defend his entire periphery. This too, will drain his vital resources. This means he will no longer be able to wholly concentrate his attention on the destruction of our retaliatory forces that are based ashore, both those within our continental United States and those forces are based overseas. No

longer can be concentrate his efforts against our fixed bases, our cities, and our communication centers. Should he make such a blunder, he will certainly invite his own destruction from the sea.

The Navy has developed a complete family of sea-based mobile reprisal forces. We are now building new aircraft carriers capable of launching many types of long-range atomic bombers. We are now procuring globe-circling, missile-launching submarines. We are producing missile-launching surface ships and all types of new missiles. We are converting all our major combatant ships from oil to atoms as quickly as possible. We are developing long-range jet seaplanes capable of dropping mines and atomic bombs, and doing many other naval tasks necessary for control of the sea. We are developing the many sea-based supporting facilities that will give the seaplane its maximum reprisal potential, for there is much more to a seaplane reprisal capability than the aircraft itself. Its success will depend on the myriad weapons of the sea which can provide it with both direct and indirect support—the submarines, the surface ships, the floating docks that can maintain, supply, and support its operational needs.

We are becoming more proficient in antisubmarine warfare, in minesweeping and minelaying. The Marines' new helicopter assault capability gives them more versatility and flexibility.

Our air defenses are, of course, being improved, particularly around the Arctic Circle; however, the Navy still has the job of protecting the weak flanks in both oceans.

In future wars we must be able to protect our own and friendly ports. We must be able to protect convoys. We must be able to defend against any threats to our ocean lifelines. More than this, we are obligated to our friends and allies under the terms of the NATO agreement. We must see to it that countries bordering the Mediterranean—Greece, Turkey, and Italy—are supplied and supported. Those countries must have the protection and the active combat support of the United States Navy. Their sealanes are their lifelines. The same holds true with Scandinavian Peninsula, as well as all the free nations of the Western Pacific—Japan, South Korea, Formosa, the Philippines, Burma, Thailand, New Zealand, and Australia. Those countries are dependent upon the Navy's ability to maintain control of the sea, which includes the air above and the subsurface depths below the sea.

The United States is committed by mutual defense treaties to the active support of 42 nations comprising 680 million people on 6 continents and across the world's major oceans.

But there are other reasons why the need for a Navy is growing more important with each passing year. It is a distressing thing to say, but Britain, our stanch ally who once ruled the seas, has been forced by budgetary reasons to reduce her combatant strength.

Simultaneously, the Soviet Navy, in sharp contrast, has been increasing both her naval and air forces. Nor has there been any recent indication of any letup in Soviet arms development and production. The Soviets have had a traditional interest in science, but they have also benefited by the influence of German scientists and military personnel who have augmented the Soviet regime following World War II. German scientists have introduced the great importance of the offensive capabilities of the submarine and the guided-missiles weapons system. At the present time, the Soviets are continuing to improve themselves in atomic warfare. They are building high-performance aircraft, swept-wing fighter jets, and long-range jet bombers. They are developing highly advanced mine-warfare systems, high-speed destroyers and cruisers that can be used as commerce raiders. They are developing a naval air capability. Their submarine production is staggering to contemplate.

Looking at the picture from the Soviet viewpoint, it must be apparent that the United States is in critical need of certain vital materials from foreign lands, materials such as iron ore, bauxite, manganese, tin, cobalt, chromium, rubber, mica, even coffee, sugar and spices.

If they can cut these vital lines of sea communications required for United States industrial survival, they will have made a long step toward ultimate victory. They must also realize that it would be just as effective to cut the sea line near the Eurasian Continent as it would be near the United States Continent. Their Navy is being planned accordingly. Additionally, there is a continuing build-up of long-range air arms and long-range guided missiles for a strong offensive against the United States mainland.

It is interesting to note the tremendous naval build-up that they have made in the past 10 years. From 1945 to 1955, according to Jane's Fighting Ships, the Soviet Navy has increased in size to the following figures: Battleships, 3; cruisers, 26 (with 6 more under construction); destroyers, 127; frigates, 47; submarines, somewhere between 370 and 400; patrol vessels, 102; ice breakers, 26; and many other miscellaneous craft.

In addition to the above, and for those people who belittle the Russian Merchant Marine effort, Lloyd's Register of 1954 shows them to have 1,052 vessels of almost 2½ million tons gross. This has been accomplished in spite of the fact that the Soviets have a shortage of steel manufacturing facilities.

This new naval effort of the Soviets plus their air potential, which has been mentioned many times by high ranking Air Force officers, indicates their evaluation of the importance of sea power and the ultimate supremacy of sea lanes.

Fantastic as our future naval plans may seem, this is the goal of the Navy today. This we can do provided all of us work hard and provided the Navy has the complete support of:

1. All of the people—you.
2. The Congress of the United States.
3. The dollars—and it will cost a lot.
4. The necessary engineers—and here industry must share with the Navy.
5. The large pool of maintenance experts required for such highly complicated electronics systems—here, again, industry must share with the Navy and curb its raids on our highly skilled manpower pools in the service.

The Navy will also require a high quality of patriotic, motivated men and women in both the enlisted and officer ranks of its service, and it is here that organizations like the Navy League can help by telling the young men and women of this country of the needs for such high caliber people in our service.

We must work fast. We must be right. We need your help and you need ours.

And now a word about another need for our Navy—a more peaceful need. As many of you are well aware, the resources of our land are being used up at a rate which is most serious. In many cases some of our vital raw materials have already been exhausted. As a result, a few of our farsighted scientists are turning their eyes and minds to utilization of the oceans and the valuable assets that can be derived therefrom. Oceanographers and ocean engineers do not believe that the sea is mysterious and unworkable, as some fiction writers would have you believe. They feel that with modest technical research and engineering effort some ocean industries may compete with land industries in the near future, particularly where some of the land resources are getting slimmer every year.

They point out that oceans are 40 times as big as the United States, and that the emergence of an island to slightly above the surface of the ocean imparts international significance to offshore real estate. It is likely that Texas towers or permanently anchored factory ships will add international significance to some of the offshore real estate that does not quite come to the surface.

The importance of this problem is noted by the fact that there was an international meeting at Rome this summer to consider the international aspects of the living resources of the sea.

History has shown that possession is usually nine points of the law, so if we want to be in on the ground floor of any international expansion seaward, we had best have some homesteaders or at least explorers in the field. It would appear certain that offshore real estate will be of great importance even though it is somewhat submerged. I think you can readily see then that if the above is so, our Navy will have another new and very important mission—the protection of these homesteaders and to aid them in the pioneering of their mission. The oceans will attract business and industry, and when it does they will need protection.

And thus this is the message I bring you today—a message which clearly proves that the United States will continue to need a Navy for many, many years to come. It will need a vastly improved, highly technical, and even more powerful Navy.

Since the War of the Revolution, and each and every war thereafter, our Navy has always been ready to combat the foe—has always been ahead of the other fellow, and it always will be ready. To do this, however, we need your help; we need you to understand the problem and support the reasons for the need of a Navy. We need your help to convince the people that a modern, superscientific, highly technical Navy must be so maintained and that its present end-mission is every bit as important as the mission of any other military service. The Navy will not win any war singlehanded any more than any other service has or ever will. But we sure can help and be an important cog in the military mission, just as we were in World War II—we will do so again.

The Honorable John W. McCormack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., Sunday, April 8, 1956.

This editorial reflects my sentiment and I heartily commend it and call its attention to Members of Congress because of its real value and interest. It is my privilege to have it incorporated in the RECORD since few men are better qualified for the position of President than our beloved majority leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK:

MCCORMACK FOR PRESIDENT

The most exciting political news to reach Massachusetts voters in many years is the disclosure that strong affirmative forces are at work espousing the candidacy of Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Boston, for the Presidency of the United States.

The campaign to boom the McCormack candidacy was launched by Thomas Dorgan, clerk of the superior civil court for Suffolk County, recently, and has gained wide momentum. Dorgan has urged Bay State Democrats to write McCORMACK's name onto their ballots in the April 24 Presidential primary in order that the attention of the Nation will be focused upon this great American.

As majority leader of the National House of Representatives, there is no questioning the fact that Congressman McCORMACK boasts the necessary experience and ability to serve as the Nation's leader. He has been a bulwark of strength for the free world for longer now than most political leaders can remember.

It is Mr. Dorgan's contention that with all the talk about dark-horse candidates from New York, Texas, Oklahoma, Missouri, Michigan, and Ohio, Massachusetts should not be overlooking its own favorite son.

He would be an ideal candidate and a more powerful standard bearer for the Democratic Party than anyone who has been mentioned among all the Presidential possibilities.

Supporters of McCORMACK describe him as the Abraham Lincoln of the modern age with a record saturated with honesty, ability, courage, and true Americanism. Never once in his long career has his faith in America wavered. During some of this Nation's darkest hours he was a stalwart leader fighting back the threats of fascism, communism, and other sinister influences. He has never known the path of anything but righteousness and courage.

In Washington, Congressman McCORMACK has been a favorite of Presidents, Senators, congressional colleagues, Cabinet members, and other national leaders. They have always recognized in him a man who although a great Democrat has always been ready to do what was wise for the people of America.

In Lynn where Congressman McCORMACK has many friends and supporters, it is to be hoped that the vote on April 24 will be a tremendous one in his behalf. Lynners should be firm in their determination to write the name of this great American on the ballot.

Congressman McCORMACK's political appeal has always been augmented by his charming and gracious wife, a former operatic singer, who has been a tremendous asset to him over the years.

Vice Presidency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, an editorial published by the Carlisle (Pa.) Evening Sentinel, on Friday, April 6, is pertinent to the hearings currently being conducted by a special subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. This special subcommittee, headed by our distinguished chairman, is considering the very grave and serious constitutional question of how to meet the crisis we shall face in the event of the inability of the President to function.

The editorial follows:

THE VICE PRESIDENCY PROBLEM

With President Eisenhower prepared to seek a second term, despite his age and his heart attack, many voters will take a closer look than usual at the party nominee for Vice President. Eisenhower is convinced that he can carry on full time for another 4 years in the White House, and his doctors give him a good chance to do so. But the very fact that the President would be 70 at the completion of a second term—and the fact that his heart is no longer perfect—pushes the Vice Presidency into special prominence in this election year.

Eisenhower himself has urged Congress to look into the problems that may arise when a President is incapacitated. The Constitution states that the powers and duties of the President shall devolve on the Vice President, not only in case of the President's death, but also in case of his inability to discharge the duties of his office. Yet the Vice President never has taken over except when a President has died in office. A House Judiciary subcommittee is to open hearings April 11 on the questions that would be raised by Vice Presidential succession on account of Presidential disability.

Proposals to ease the burdens of the White House occupant, either by delegating specific duties to the Vice President or by creating an additional office of Administrative Vice President, have been advanced by Members of Congress and others. Although the administration has displayed little interest in such proposals, President Eisenhower has given Vice President NIXON more tasks, and more varied tasks, to perform than have been carried out by any previous Vice President.

The Vice Presidency was not slated for the insignificant place it has held throughout most of American history. Quite the contrary. Under the Constitution as adopted, Presidential electors voted only for President. The man who came out second best in that contest was designated Vice President. By the nature of things, all those voted for were presumably of Presidential stature, as witness the first two Vice Presidents, John Adams and Thomas Jefferson. It was only after the 12th amendment required separate ballots for President and Vice President that the second post began to decline.

John Tyler restored its prestige for the time being. Tyler was the first of 7 men who have succeeded to the highest office through the death of the President. His succession after William Henry Harrison died in 1841 set a precedent in more ways than one. Despite cloudy constitutional language, Tyler took the oath prescribed for the Chief Executive and won recognition as President—not Acting President. But, notwithstanding this demonstration that a Vice President might become President in fact, nomination of an outstanding leader for the second office became more than ever the exception, not the rule.

National nominating conventions have concentrated on the race for first place on the ticket. When that is settled, the delegates are ready to go home. Hence they give little thought to choice of the man who, if the party wins, may be on his way to the White House. Selection of the Vice Presidential nominee thus is left largely to the chosen standard-bearer and simply ratified by the convention.

To change all this and make the Vice Presidency an office for which prominent party men would compete, it has been suggested that the Vice President be relieved of his relatively unimportant duties as presiding officer of the Senate and be placed squarely in the executive branch as an acknowledged Assistant President. Then he would be in close daily touch with White House affairs and well prepared to step into the President's place if need arose.

Two former Vice Presidents recently have had their say on other means of getting first-class men into the office. Henry Wallace urged a campaign to make the public, and in turn convention delegates, better aware of the importance of the Vice Presidency and of the need to apply other standards than the balancing of the ticket when making the Vice Presidential nomination. ALBEN BARKLEY favored nomination of both President and Vice President by direct, nationwide primary.

What, if any change in the status of the Vice Presidency might be made, is a big question. Despite all the pressure that may be applied so that Mr. Eisenhower, if elected, can delegate many of his own tasks to the Vice President, it cannot and should not be presumed that the Constitution will be quickly amended. On a matter like this, it is much more likely that many more years will elapse before any revision is made or an amendment added to the Constitution.

This is not a problem that can be solved except through long study and discussion—if there is any good reason why the Vice President's status should be changed in any respect. Simply because a President has been ill and is still in impaired health is no reason to throw powers to the Vice President to which the Vice President should not have the right. It would be better to elect a new President.

In the present situation, the GOP is pushing for more time off for the President and more work and power for the Vice President and the GOP has good reasons to seek action—for political expediency. The GOP could lose the election because of the health and who-will-follow issues. How many votes may be lost because of these issues cannot be counted. But, many of the electorate, of both parties, like Mr. Eisenhower so much that they may vote for his opponent because they would rather see "Ike" live and smile, than be seriously ill again and perhaps die because of selfish Republican politicians who care nothing about Mr. Eisenhower but seek to exploit their jobs and further their own ends. These politicians have made the mistake of drafting the President. Whether the harm is to be undone and "Ike" to retire in glory and honor, the electorate will decide—not politics.

Statement of E. J. Russell, of Troy, N. H., Woolen Manufacturer, at the New England Governors' Textile Committee Meeting With the New England Congressional Delegation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of E. J. Russell, of Troy, N. H., woolen manufacturer, at the New England Governors' Textile Committee meeting with the New England congressional delegation:

It gets harder and harder for us to understand the situation that continues to grow in Washington in regard to the textile industry, including our invitation to other countries to increase exports to us. We have today a wool manufacturing industry comprised of 600 establishments in more than 30 States. In 1947 the census showed over 800 establishments.

About 55 percent of this industry's production capacity is in New England; 20 percent in the Southern States, whose capacity is now growing; 15 percent in Middle Atlantic

States; 7 percent Midwest; 1 to 2 percent Far West. In the year 1946 we had 37,369 woolen and worsted looms in place, and in 1954, 26878. It was expected that the census at the end of 1955 would show about 21,000 plus.

The United States Department of Commerce Facts for Industry, March 6, 1956, shows woolens and worsted looms in place total 17,679 under date of December 31, 1955. Number of active looms by shift active on last full working day of the year: First shift, 13,419; second shift, 11,755; and third shift, 7,167. I call this to your attention to show that the industry still has more than ample capacity to meet present needs. In spite of the above, imports are increasing at a fast rate.

As imports increase and profits decline more manufacturers find they must do something and that something has in many cases turned out to be liquidation. At Geneva in 1947, to become effective on January 1, 1948, a reservation was negotiated which reads as follows:

"The United States reserves the right to increase the ad valorem part of the rate applicable to any of the fabrics provided for in item 1108–1109 (a) of this part to 45 percent ad valorem on any of such fabrics which are entered in any calendar year in excess of an aggregate quantity by weight of 5 percent of the average annual production of similar fabrics in the United States during the 3 immediately preceding years."

In the negotiations which gave birth to the above reservation, ad valorem duties slashed to a flat 25 percent from the rates in effect under the 1930 Tariff Act of 50–55–60 percent depending on valuation.

We feel that the 5 percent has been reached, because for the years 1952–53–54 the average production in the United States was 281,001,000 yards and imports of woven fabrics wholly or in chief value of wool in 1955 were 19,456,000 yards, or 6.9 percent. Let me call your attention to the makeup of this 6.9 percent. Fabrics the weight of which was 9 ounces or less, 16.8 percent; 9–13 ounces, 7.9 percent; 13–16 ounces, 3.8 percent; 16–20 ounces, 6.2 percent; 20 ounces and over, 9.3 percent—an average of 7.6 percent of products made for civilian use, or 6.9 percent including production of 24,567,000 yards for Government use.

But we find these figures do not stand the test because of a conflict of standards in that our imports are compiled on a pound basis and our domestic statistics information on a linear-yard basis.

During the month of February 1956 imports from the United Kingdom increased as follows: Square yards woolens, 85 and 74 percent in value in pounds. Worsteds, 65 and 56 percent in value in pounds. Market reports indicate that imports and commitments for Japanese and Italian fabrics have increased so we should reach the 5-percent trigger point somewhat sooner this year.

I would add here that in 1951 Japanese imports were only 178,000 square yards. In 1955 they were 2,262,000 square yards. Also much improved in quality over cloth seen here before World War II.

Wages paid in United States of America, $1.53, no fringes included. British and French, 45 cents; Italy, 30 cents; Japan 14 cents.

In July 1953 the National Association of Wool Manufacturers addressed the President of the United States calling his attention to the Geneva reservation and mounting imports of woolen and worsted fabrics and the fact that volume of such imports reached a 30-year record high in 1952, that 1953 imports were likely to surpass that record and urging that he give effect to the Geneva reservation.

In 1954 the statistical difficulties were pointed out to the Committee for Reciprocity Information and suggested that steps be taken to iron them out.

The changes in the number of plants and the decline in employment was called to the attention of Mr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, in a petition under date of March 14, 1956, petitioning as follows: "Wherein the Director is requested to investigate or reappraise what the petitioner consider to be the threat to national security presented by wool textile imports within the meaning of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955."

It is a question as to what our situation would be in case of another large mobilization in this country and could the requirements be met because of the continuous heavy liqudiation taking place in our industry.

In spite of all this the textile industry is one of the largest employers of labor in the country. We know industries that are replacing us in our New England section are paying lower wages. We also know that our older employees have a hard time finding new employment at as good pay. Our so-called skilled employees' skill are useless to them in other industries when we close. No employment or comparable wages are available in many cases in the towns where textiles move out or close down.

I would also like to direct your attention to manufactured products being imported. On Monday I spent the day at the Carwood Manufacturing Co., in Widner Ga. Mr. Harris, the owner, told me he had closed his shirt division where he made 75,000 dozen shirts yearly because he felt he could not compete with imported products.

I would like to close by reading a clipping from the Daily News Record of Monday, April 2, 1956:

"NAGOYA, JAPAN, April 1.—There is plenty of room to increase American imports of woolen goods, a visiting United States trade mission has informed Japanese businessmen.

"The opinion was given during discussion of a request by the Japanese for the mission to use its influence to prevent any increase in American tariffs or other restrictions against Japanese pottery, plywood, and sewing machines. The mission's answer concerned mainly these items but included woolen goods.

"Members of the mission, headed by Eugene Braderman, United States Department of Commerce, advised Japanese manufacturers to give further close study to American wool textile fashions."

Out, Damned Spot!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the wave of Russian speeches down-grading the late Joseph Stalin, has caught the headlines of the world press and provided much grist for columnists, commentators, editorial writers, as well as for the Secretary of State, who seems to feel the change inaugurates an era of good will.

One of the most refreshing and alert commentaries on the change is the following editorial published in the April 1, 1956, issue of Justice, official newspaper of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union:

OUT, DAMNED SPOT!

Capitalist propaganda became Communist doctrine last month. Overnight, Stalin—"beloved" leader of the Soviets—was transformed into the tyrannical executioner of its masses. The current rulers of Russia, meeting in solemn congress in the Kremlin, spoke only evil of the dead. The mighty Stalin, only 3 years in his grave, was at last given his real name—murderer—by those who, in the long years of his rule, bowed and scraped before him and smiled at him and sang his praises and hailed his benevolence and kissed him front and back.

There have been other times when Soviet leaders threatened to become civilized. Ultimately, such promises have turned out to be mere maneuvers through which they spread a little further the orbit of their dictatorship. Let the world befare. These are men bloated with a power they mean to keep and expand.

They come to the court of world opinion with bloody hands: Khrushchev, mass executioner in the Ukraine; Bulganin, Stalin's industrial executioner; Malenkov, Stalin's personal hatchetman; Mikoyan, chief purger of the Caucasus; Molotov, who waded through the blood baths of the 1930's to negotiate Stalin's love pact with Hitler.

These men comprised Stalin's collective leadership. The world that finally caught up with that other brutal despot—Hitler—held his colleagues as accessories of his bloody crimes. Those who shared Hitler's power and triumphs, it was judged, should also share his guilt and his extinction.

Now these Russian Goerings and Soviet Himmlers are trying to save their own necks with the biggest lie of all. It is reported that Khrushchev wept as he told the Communist congress that under Stalin he had often feared for his own life.

Did he weep as he kept killing to prove his continuing loyalty to Stalin? Did he smile the smile he has beamed throughout his Far Eastern travels as he gave the command to execute? Where was this butcher, now bleating like a lamb, when the Red Army officers were shot in the night, when the peasants were cut down like wheat? At which side of Stalin was he standing, silent and smiling, when Victor Alter and Henryk Ehrlich were martyred?

The bloody spots on their hands will not out. In the spotlight of the world's longing for peace, they repudiate the paranoic whose every wish was their command. But they do not repudiate his works.

They have not opened the gates of the slave labor camps. They have not ripped the gag from speech and press. They have not permitted free political parties or free trade unions. They have not taken the gun out of the backs of the Russian people. They have not smashed the chains with which they bound millions in the European satellite countries they conquered for the greater glory of Stalin.

Under penalty of death, their subjects will have to applaud them. But what more despicable creature is there in the world than the non-Russian Communist, who must now prove his loyalty to the Kremlin by echoing the charges which, until now he castigated as capitalist propaganda. If Stalin's death was communism's greatest good, what refuge in reason remains for those who won the coveted Stalin prizes, who enlisted in his peace offensives, who must now be immobilized by the fear of that ism which, sooner or later, must supplant Khrushchevism.

Not silence. Through silence, the murders and their camp followers prosper and survive. Here at home, the full impact of scorn, of exposure, of shame must be directed at those who were stupid but dangerous party-liners in the past and are ready to be so again in the future. In the arena of international affairs, peace will not be won by good-will tours arranged by the democracies for these Russian butchers. Their hands are bloody. Their tyrannical purpose is unchanged. Wherever they walk, they besmirch freedom.

Flood Control and Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

PRESENT STATUS OF FLOOD CONTROL AND INSURANCE

To: The Conference of New England Governors.

From: Seymour E. Harris for New England Governors Textile Committee.

(1) Recommendations of New England governors on September 23, 1955: The governors recommended expenditures of (a) $34.3 million for fiscal year 1957 for flood control projects recommended by Army Engineers and approved by the New England governors; (b) $12.45 million for construction in 1957 of navigation and beach-erosion projects; (c) authorization of an expenditure of $1.5 million for emergency funds by the Chief of Engineers for immediate planning of flood-control projects authorized in affected or potentially affected areas; (d) a supplemental appropriation of $3.5 million by next February 15 to start construction of such projects; (e) $200,000 to expand and expedite the authorized $600,000 New England hurricane survey; (f) $100,000 for studies of additional flood protection.

Total, $52.05 million.

(2) The report of the Joint Congressional Committee on Flood Control: The following table is reproduced from page 103 of the hearings before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report (this was produced by the Director of the Budget after needling by the committee at the hearings of February 1):

Accelerated northeast flood-control program, Corps of Engineers

[Fiscal years; in thousands]

	Number of projects	Total cost	New obligational authority requests in 1956 supplemental		New obligational authority requests in 1957 supplemental	
			Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction
Connecticut	1	$16,000	$140			$360
Massachusetts [1]	7	42,360	340	$400		7,866
New Hampshire	2	37,820		100	$600	1,250
Rohde Island	1	4,200				600
Vermont	9	64,330	571	300	500	5,828
Total New England	20	148,710	1,051	800	1,100	[2] 15,904
New York	1	9,200	80			1,030
Pennsylvania	6	46,510	455	300	160	4,000
Grand total Northeast	27	204,420	1,586	1,100	1,260	20,934

[1] Includes 2 projects under construction. [2] See note.

Note that the total amount of new obligational authority for New England for fiscal year 1957 is $17 million against the governors' request of $52 million. (See reservations in statement to Congressmen.) (Outlays on flood control are about one-half the amounts requested. Note also that the budget provides only $3.1 million of the $12.45 million requested for navigation and beach erosion, and there is apparently $1 million of the $1.2 million requested for a survey of hurricanes.)

The following colloquy occurred (p. 111) between Congressman CURTIS of Missouri and the Director of the Budget, Mr. Hughes:

"Representative CURTIS. One final detail: The chairman, Senator DOUGLAS, was commenting on the flood-control measures, and you mentioned that this had been cleared with the various governors of the States.

"I presume you included Governor Ribicoff, of Connecticut.

"Mr. HUGHES. Oh, yes; there is a regular group of New England governors that have worked together on this under the chairmanship of Denny Roberts, of Rhode Island.

"Representative CURTIS. The reason I wanted to mention it is because it seemed to me there was a partisan implication there, and I know Governor Ribicoff served with me, I served with him, in the House, and he is a good Democrat, and I am sure that there are no political implications in this. I suspect that your statement that they are moving ahead as rapidly as possible is accurate, because I never have yet known any Army engineers who are not willing to accept funds from the Congress if they can get them.

"Mr. HUGHES. This has not been a political situation at all. It has been entirely nonpolitical. Both parties have been in it, and the discussions have been on the basis of need and not on the basis of any political consideration, to my knowledge."

(2) Details of projects in budget, fiscal year 1957 (pp. 615–618):

Program and financing

[In thousands of dollars]

	1955 actual	1956 estimate	1957 estimate
1. Navigation projects:			
Housatonic River, Conn	321	329	125
Beals Harbor, Maine		200	
Portland Harbor, Maine	682	118	540
Scarboro River, Maine			205
Fall River Harbor, Mass			500
Mystic River, Mass		500	1,000
Portsmouth Harbor, N. H., and Piscataqua River, Maine and N. H		400	600
2. Beach erosion-control projects:			
Revere Beach, Mass			75
Winthrop Beach, Mass		150	60
Hampton Beach, N. H		130	10
3. Flood-control projects:			
(a) Local protection:			
Hartford, Conn. (Folly Brook unit)		344	
Norwich, Conn		227	370
3. Flood-control projects—Continued			
(a) Local protection—Continued			
Adams, Mass	487	1,213	2,726
North Adams, Mass	1	720	2,000
Woonsocket, R. I			600
Worcester diversion, Massachusetts			840
(b) Reservoirs:			
Thomaston Reservoir, Conn			360
Barre Falls Reservoir, Mass			1,150
Buffumville Reservoir, Mass			1,200
East Brimfield Reservoir, Mass			340
Hodges Village Reservoir, Mass			360
Otter Brook Reservoir, N. H			1,250
East Barre Reservoir, Vt			800
North Springfield Reservoir, Vt			500
Townshend Reservoir, Vt			420
Waterbury Reservoir, Vt			808
Wrightsville Reservoir, Vt			1,000

Listing of local protection projects (p. 619):

1. Worcester diversion, Massachusetts.
2. Woonsocket, R. I.

Reservoirs:

1. Thomaston Reservoir, Conn.
2. East Brimfield Reservoir, Mass.
3. Hodges Village Reservoir, Mass.
4. East Barre Reservoir, Vt.
5. North Springfield Reservoir, Vt.
6. Townshend Reservoir, Vt.
7. Waterbury Reservoir, Vt.
8. Wrightsville Reservoir, Vt.

(4) Federal flood indemnity program (Budget 1957, p. 349) (note that expenditures of but $25 million are provided for 1957):

Budget authorizations, expenditures and balances

	1955 actual	1956 estimate	1957 estimate
Budget authorizations available: Proposed authorization to expend from public debt receipts			$100,000,000
Expenditures and balances:			
Total expenditures (out of current authorizations)			25,000,000
Obligated balance carried forward			75,000,000
Total expenditures and balances			100,000,000

5. Provision of various flood-insurance bills:

	Senator LEHMAN	Senators KENNEDY-SALTONSTALL	Senator CARLSON	Staff
1. Administered by	Federal Disaster Administration	Small Business Administration	National Disaster Insurance Corporation.	Same as KENNEDY-SALTONSTALL.
2. Risks covered	All kinds of natural disasters inclusive of war.	Floods only	Floods, tidal wave, earthquakes, hurricanes.	Same as LEHMAN.
3. Coverage available	Up to $300,000 per policy for natural disasters and up to 75 percent of property value for war. Includes personal property.	Up to $250,000 per policy for industrial and residential real estate, nothing for personal property.	No limit for personal or real-estate insurance.	Up to $60,000 for 1 to 4 family houses and up to $250,000 per policy for natural disasters.
4. Premium rates	Set by Administration; varies with risks for natural disasters; uniform for war.	Set by Corporation. Vary with risks and importance of insurance to general welfare.	Same as KENNEDY-SALTONSTALL.	Set by President or his designee. Criteria same as KENNEDY-SALTONSTALL.
5. Payments to policyholders.	Value minus $200 for natural disasters; 75 percent for war damage.	Limits to be set by Corporation	Same as KENNEDY-SALTONSTALL.	100 percent first $1,000 and 80 percent amounts in excess of $50,000; up to 80 percent on amounts in between; no limits on war.
6. Total liability	$2 billion maximum for natural; $10 billion for war damage; no limit for war injuries, etc.	$500 million maximum first 6 months might rise in 1957 and 1958.	Maximum not specified	$2 billion natural; $10 billion war.
7. Private companies	Sell Federal insurance; write own; compensated for losses.	Same as Lehman	Alone write disaster insurance with Government subsidies.	Same as LEHMAN.
8. Financing	$1 billion borrowed from Treasury for natural disaster and $10 billion for war; other money from premiums.	Appropriation, premiums, salvages, investments.	Treasury buy $50 million of Corporation stock.	Do.

Source: Adapted from Congressional Quarterly, Jan. 6, 1956.

6. Recent developments: The Senate Banking and Currency Committee has been holding hearings on the administration bill, as well as on the bill supported by Senators LEHMAN and KENNEDY. Apparently, the committee is almost ready (March 22) to come to some decisions. Matters of disagreement, among others, include the financial participation of States (in the administration bill), ceilings of commitments (now apparently at $3 billion of coverage), and alternative rate structures (actuarial or influenced by considerations of public interest).

The major differences between the administration bill (S. 2862) and the Lehman, Kennedy, etc., bill (S. 3137), both under consideration in February–March 1956, are the following:

1. Coverage per policy is limited to $100,000 ($10,000 residential) in the Lehman bill and to $250,000 in the administration bill.

2. Rates are not based merely on an actuarial estimated basis. But the administration bill excludes rates below 60 percent of actuarial rates. The Lehman bill would set rates consistent with risks as far as possible but only to such an extent "as in the judgment of the Commissioner shall be consistent with the aim of offering insurance and reinsurance at rates reasonable enough to make available to those who need it at rates they can afford."

3. In the administration bill, States are required to pay half of the differences between estimated and offered rates.

4. Both bills set a maximum ultimately of $3 billion of coverage. But the administration bill provides only $500 million of Treasury cash and the Lehman bill, $1.5 billion.

5. The Lehman bill envisages coverage of all disasters ultimately; but in the meanwhile asks only for a study of disaster insurance.

At present (March 26) the Congress (Subcommittee on Public Works of Appropriation Committees) is considering the $141 million appropriation for flood control recommended by the administration.

The Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, with the farm bill being the major topic of the day in Congress, I submit for the RECORD two editorials of March 27 and 31 from the New York Times.

Much effort has been expended on the part of some to obscure as effectively as possible the real issues of the bill and the long-range benefit which would accrue to the farmer from the carefully thought out administration proposals for flexible supports and soil bank.

As one who will vote on this bill, I believe I have no choice other than to vote for the recommittal of the legislation, which, in its present hodgepodge form, would raise as many problems as it sought to solve.

The editorials follow:

[From the New York Times of March 27, 1956]

PRICE SUPPORTS AS AN ISSUE

Secretary of Agriculture Benson, speaking before the National Press Club, declared that, so far as he is concerned, he would be preferably willing to let the question of flexible versus rigid farm supports be an issue in this year's election. "There is more sentiment among farmers for flexible price supports today," said he, "than at any time since the war."

We hope the Secretary is correct in his estimate of the position of farmers on flexible supports. There has never been any question in our mind that the American farmer, once he perceives clearly the economic implications of the issue of flexible supports versus high, rigid supports, can be depended upon to make the intelligent choice. There have been times, however, when we have wondered if the Administration has done all that it might to force the hand of the politicians who promise to guarantee the farmer 90, and even 100, percent of parity for his products, without telling him what the consequences of such price-fixing are going to be in terms of his (the farmer's) longer-term future.

We are familiar with the arguments for flexible price supports, and in our opinion they are unanswerable. But if they are answerable, it seems to us that it is high time that they were answered by one or more of our candidates for the Presidential nomination who have elected to advocate high, rigid supports. Some of the friendly critics of Adlai Stevenson have actually suggested that in Minnesota he permitted Senator Kefauver to take the play away from him. Was this because Mr. Stevenson advocated flexible supports? Not at all. It is because while the Senator from Tennessee was promising the farmers 100 percent of parity for their crops Mr. Stevenson had the instinctive honesty to suggest that high, rigid supports might not of themselves solve the farm problem. To the best of our knowledge, this is the nearest any of the Democratic candidates, actual and potential, have come to holding high, rigid supports up to the light.

[From the New York Times of March 31, 1956]

FROM BAD TO WORSE

Even after the Senate had passed its aimless and self-contradictory version of a farm bill on March 19 the President did not abandon hope that Congress would produce a bill that reflected to at least a reasonable degree the spirit of the administration's farm program. He apparently felt that the Senate-House conference committee, being a small group, would take its responsibilities seriously, even though neither House of Congress had seen fit to do so, and, by combining the good features and the less undesirable features of the two bills, come up with a workable measure.

Unfortunately, not only has the committee shown no interest in selecting from the two measures before it those that bore some relation, however distant, to the administration's program; it seems to have been trying to outdo the efforts of those who framed the two bills to make a shambles of the comprehensive and integrated program into which the administration had put so much thought and effort.

The conference committee began by choosing the provision for high, rigid price supports contained in the House measure over the (at least theoretically) flexible support provision of the Senate version. That, it was to develop, was the tip-off as to what might be expected from this group. This vote to reject flexible supports, the very heart of administration policy, has been followed by vote after vote looking in the same general direction. Among the gimmicks that have been approved since then, though known to be opposed by the administration, are the dual system of determining "parities," the so-called "two-price" system for wheat (which is really a three-price system, providing for both foreign and domestic dumping), a similar set-up for rice, a provision for raising the price peg under "manufacturing milk," and one for freezing the existing acreage for cotton.

Not only has the conference version of a farm bill become increasingly objectionable from the standpoint of the administration with each passing day; its deterioration has begun to raise questions as to whether it can command the support even of the Senate. Meanwhile, another question that had begun to be asked a week ago seems to have

been answered. The question was: "What is the conference committee trying to do—is it trying to procrastinate so long that it will be too late to derive any benefit from whatever farm measure should be passed by the two houses, or is it trying to confront the President with a bill it knows he cannot possibly sign with a clear conscience?" At this point one might be forgiven for concluding that the answer is: "Both."

Stevenson Has Just Begun To Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is now clear that Adlai Stevenson's suporters have just begun to fight. Three weeks ago some commentators were quick to declare that Minnesota was a mortal blow to his campaign, but for Governor Stevenson this election has been a challenge and not a defeat.

There are too many undeniable marks of greatness on Adlai Stevenson for his party to thrust him into the discard. Our times demand vision and the very best available leadership—reasons why Stevenson is an imperative this year for his party and his country.

The case for the Stevenson candidacy was convincingly presented in a recent editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

I present that editorial herewith:

THE STEVENSON SITUATION

From our Washington bureau Marquis W. Childs has now written his second article concerning opposition to Adlai E. Stevenson within the Democratic Party.

The gist of what Mr. Childs has reported is this:

Democratic Party chieftains from farm and mountain States met in Denver early this month to plan presidential campaign strategy. They agreed that the Democratic nominee should offer a strong appeal to the farmers. Because former Governor Stevenson had taken a moderate position on farm legislation they came to the conclusion that it would be necessary to find a new standard bearer for 1956.

These leaders now interpret the Minnesota primary as proving them right. Senator KEFAUVER, so they say, outran Mr. Stevenson because the Tennessean took a more advanced position on agricultural price supports and the farmers of Minnesota rallied to his stand.

This is first of all a matter within the Democratic Party. Whom the Democrats nominate for President is primarily their own concern. They will be judged in November in terms of how their nominee rates by comparison with the Republican nominee.

But when a major party nominates for the presidency it takes a step that is also of concern to the entire country. For potentially that nominee, whomever he may be, is a prospective President. Thus the Minnesota primary and the deductions from it are matters of widespread public interest.

The former Illinois Governor developed a large and devoted following in a short few weeks in 1952 because he was something new and fresh in contemporary American politics. He pledged himself to "talk sense to the American people." Moreover he kept that pledge. He refused to promise more than he believed he could deliver. And he did not talk one way in one part of the country and another way in another part.

Indeed in the 1952 campaign Mr. Stevenson made it very clear in New Orleans that he believed that racial discrimination must pass from education, employment, and other important aspects of democratic life. And he let it be known in Texas how he felt about having 3 or 4 States gobble up the vast offshore oil wealth of the Nation.

Adlai Stevenson would be wholly out of character if he went about the country promising farmers the moon in an effort to be nominated. Were he to do so, he probably would lose as many votes as he would make. Millions of people are for Mr. Stevenson because he knows that there are no easy, pat solutions, because he invites them to serious, hard study of the issues, because he himself is the kind of man who will work thoughtfully and diligently on our problems within the framework of our institutions.

Can it really be true that these very qualities of sincerity and integrity which commended Mr. Stevenson after his nomination in 1952 should now handicap him in the 1956 race? If so something has happened to the sense of values of his party.

No one can be sure of how to weigh the factors in the Minnesota primary. If thousands of Republicans voted for Senator KEFAUVER to rebuke Democratic Governor Freeman and Senator HUMPHREY—and the number who did so apparently was large—the vote was not only not a vote on Mr. Stevenson's views and policies. It was not even a wholly measurable Democratic vote.

Certainly it would be an irony if a special situation in Minnesota started a political snowball that rolled up in Florida and California where other Stevenson-Kefauver tests are yet to come.

It would be an irony and it could cause the Democratic Party to offer less than its best-qualified men as its 1956 nominees. Our times call for the qualities of statesmanship. Folksiness and handshaking have their place but alone they are no substitute and never will be.

Our President Is Doing Something for the Old Folks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, we all recognize the growing need for a positive and specific program for our senior citizens, an ever-increasing group. To aid in this, I introduced a bill during the first session of this Congress, H. R. 3307, and this is one of a number of bills seeking to offer a solution to the problems involved in caring for our old folks. Now the President has announced that a Federal Council for the Aging will be set up, to develop a coordinated policy and give the needed impetus to a definite and active program. The following article from the Baltimore Sun of April 8 sets forth an outline of the problem and the plans and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

COUNCIL ON AGING WILL BE CREATED—PRESIDENT TAKES STEP TO GET NEW UNIT ESTABLISHED

(By Rodney Crowther)

WASHINGTON, April 7.—Doing something for the old folks—who constitute an ever-enlarging percentage of the population—was this week recognized as one of the major concerns of Government.

President Eisenhower, taking note of the multifarious activities in behalf of the aged which are now being carried on by the Federal, State, and local governments, moved to create what he named "a Federal Council on Aging." Its task will be to co-ordinate the programs.

So much is being done already for the aged by so many departments and agencies and so much new is in the process of being set up, that the President and other responsible officials thought it was time that they begin letting their right hands know what their left hands are doing.

REVOLVING CHAIRMANSHIP

The new council, which is to have a revolving chairmanship, will be headed initially by Roswell B. Perkins, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Perkins has been at work on proposals for the council for more than a year.

In a letter to a dozen departments and agencies, who were asked to name representatives to the council, President Eisenhower made it plain that the aim of the council would be to supplement the efforts of the agencies already administering programs for the aged.

The major aim will be to develop a coordination of policy, of planning and programing, so that duplications and much waste effort can be avoided.

The initial move of the new council will be to gather together here in the national capital some 200 to 300 Federal and State officials who currently administer programs for the aged. The meeting will be held June 5 through 7.

DETAILS NOT COMPLETE

Secretary Perkins said today that the details and the agenda for the gathering have not been completed. It has not even been decided whether it will be a public or a closed meeting, but probably the latter.

"It will be the function of the council," President Eisenhower said in his letter to the departments, "to review existing programs in the light of emerging needs, and make recommendations to the appropriate departments and agencies as to emphasis, priorities and provisions for unmet needs.

"Initiation of new programs and activities, and changes in existing policies will remain the responsibility of heads of the departments or agencies directly affected."

Already there are well over a dozen major programs for the aged being conducted in the fields of health, housing, employment, insurance and retirement. Some are strictly Federal programs. Many are joint programs between the States and Federal Government.

Recently the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare took a look at what is already being done to help the aged and what has been proposed for legislative action.

It adds up to an astounding total of activities affecting in all well over half of the 14 million persons who are now in the category of aged—that is, over 65.

The two major programs, both in the social security program, are old-age and survivors insurance program and public assistance.

At the beginning of this year, insurance benefits were being paid to 6,400,000 persons aged 65 and over. This is an increase of 2 million persons in 2 years.

Monthly payments to the aged are now averaging $78 for a retired worker with no

eligible dependents and $130 for a retired couple.

HELP FOR BLIND

In the field of public assistance, which is a Federal-State program, there are currently 2,500,000 needy persons 65 and over receiving cash assistance. The Federal share of grants to States for old-age assistance is running around $946 million a year.

Federal-State assistance is also going to the blind—half of these recipients being over 65—and to totally and permanently disabled persons, more than half of whom are over 55.

The Federally aided public assistance programs are in operation in every county in the United States and in the Territories.

But besides these major activities many other Government programs are aimed at helping the aged.

The 1954 tax-revision act gave a credit for retirement income from public and private pension plans. Allowable deductions for medical expenses were liberalized, affecting older persons particularly.

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The Department of Labor has initiated a broad program of research and action toward helping older persons find employment.

Approximately 3 million of the over-65 are gainfully employed and projects under way to offer job opportunities to the aged are expected to cause a steady increase in the figure.

There has been an intensification of research in the field of chronic disease, also of great benefit to the aged.

Since 1953 appropriations for medical research have increased from $51 million to $93 million.

Under the 1954 amendments to the Federal-State hospital-construction program a new emphasis has been given to construction of chronic-disease hospitals and nursing homes, it has been pointed out. These offer the aged long-term care at a lower cost per patient-day than the general hospital.

MANY PROPOSALS MADE

Vocational-rehabilitation programs have made vast strides in the last few years, benefiting thousands of aged. Since 1954 the number of persons rehabilitated annually has tripled.

Many proposals have been made for enlarging some of these programs and adding new ones.

For example, Congress has been asked for added funds for programs to provide broader employment opportunities. An increase in Federal funds of over $4 million has been asked for vocational rehabilitation programs.

Congress has been asked for increased support for Labor Department activities aimed at broadening job opportunities for elderly workers.

Legislation is now pending to broaden social-security coverage and make it virtually universal.

The administration has asked Congress for an increase of $27,400,000 in appropriations over the current year for the National Institutes of Health. Of this, $3,100,000 is for heart research and related activities; $7,300,000 is for cancer research; over $2,400,000 is asked for arthritis research.

As for the special problems of mental illness, the budget submitted to Congress asks an increase of $3,600,000 in research and related activities and, contingent on recommended legislation, $1,500,000 for a program of grants to the States for special demonstration projects in treatment of mental illness.

Health services to the aged are also being expanded and improved. Legislation has been requested for additional public assistance grants, to be matched by the States, for paying medical-care costs of indigent older persons.

Oil and Gas Leasing Regulations for the National Wildlife Refuges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Mr. Charles L. Horn, chairman, Minnesota Emergency Conservation Committee, Minneapolis, Minn., addressed to Assistant Secretary of the Interior Wesley A. D'Ewart on March 27, 1956, regarding oil and gas leasing regulations for the national wildlife refuges.

The letter follows:

MINNESOTA EMERGENCY CONSERVATION COMMITTEE,
Minneapolis, Minn., March 27, 1956.

Mr. WESLEY A. D'EWART,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior,
United States Department of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. D'EWART: We thank you for your letter of March 21 in which you make further comment with reference to the program of the Department of Interior regarding oil and gas leasing regulations for the national wildlife refuges. You state that the leasing regulations are ground rules for the application of laws established by Congress. We agree and wish to add that the laws have been on the statutes since 1920. However, it is well to bear in mind that the Secretary has discretion in the issuing of leases and the records will show that only 11 were issued during the 33 years prior to 1953. Both former Secretary Wilbur and former Secretary Ickes refused to issue some leases on refuges and their action was upheld by the courts.

You make much of the regulations employed by the Michigan Department of Conservation for safeguarding wildlife lands in that State and state that there has been no loss of wildlife values on the Michigan refuge lands because of oil and gas development over a period of several years. May we say in reply that there is always danger from leaks, even with the big operators who are reliable but what about the wildcatters? There is also interference with trucks, drilling rigs, seismograph explosions and other exploratory activities, as well as serving pumps always are a nuisance and are not compatible with wildlife. Even when there are no direct losses, leasing is not good.

By your letter you would have us believe that the leasing program has been a minor one, even though 577 leases have been granted, not 89 as first reported. It would appear that these additional several hundred leases were issued without the knowledge or consent of the Fish and Wildlife Service and, therefore, your statement that all of the leases have had the approval of the Service would appear to be groundless.

There has also been a reference made to the "stop order" that Secretary McKay was supposed to have had in effect. It is a matter of record that within a month after you testified before the House Committee the Department admitted to 495 more leases.

We acknowledge that the Secretary has the authority under the basic law, but it is our opinion that the Secretary could have exercised the same rigid control as was maintained by his predecessors. As a matter of fact, there is no justification from the standpoint of supply of oil, for the Department's own records show that the oil industry is refraining from pumping 1½ million barrels of oil per day now from producing wells due to economic reasons.

In reviewing the program of the Department of Interior for the past 3 years, we can express no surprise over the position taken by the Secretary with reference to these gas and oil leases. The leasing program is in keeping with the Department's policy on all natural resources: Its hydropower policy, its Indian land policy, its California duck-baiting policy. During these 3 years practically nothing has been held sacred, including our parks and our monuments, and the Fish and Wildlife Service has lost many of its key career men, and their places have been filled by old men turned out of administrative positions in several States. It has been a 3-year program of the Government by edict insofar as the Interior Department is concerned; the two most glaring examples being that of the edict on the sale of Indian land and the edict of opening inviolate game areas established by statute to wildcatters.

Lastly, you make mention of the fact that the revised oil and gas regulation for national wildlife refuges has been in effect now for more than 3 months, and during that period no leasing has been done except on the Lacassine National Wildlife Refuge in Louisiana. You are right. The reason for this, of course, is because opposition became so strong that the Department had to call a halt. However, there are about 300 applications on file and it is a matter of record that the Department disregarded its own "stop order" and it may be assumed that it will go ahead again when it can.

Sincerely,

MINNESOTA EMERGENCY CONSERVATION COMMITTEE.

A Bill To Amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 requiring that no civilian aircraft should be operated within the territorial limits of the United States, unless the owner thereof has given proof of his ability to respond in damages in such amounts as the Board shall prescribe, for the death or injury to any persons or damage to property resulting from the operation of such aircraft for which the owner thereof may be liable.

Commercial airlines adequately protect the public in this regard. However, the rise in the number of privately owned civilian aircraft with its concurrent rise in accidents have caused a problem somewhat similar, although smaller, to that involving the use and operation of automobiles.

Many thousands of our citizens have been maimed and killed, and their property destroyed in accidents involving the use of privately owned airplanes. Adequate compensation for such damage has not been forthcoming due to the

fact that many private owners of such aircraft are not financially responsible. This has resulted in economic privation and permanent suffering of the victims of these accidents who have found themselves with uncollectible judgments or claims.

This bill will provide adequate protection for the public in such situations.

Fluoridation of Drinking Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a letter from F. B. Exner, M. D., F. A. C. R., 316 Medical and Dental Building, Seattle, Wash., to Dr. Leona Baumgartner, commissioner of health, New York, N. Y., relative to the fluoridation of public drinking water in the State of New York.

Dr. Exner's letter is as follows:

SEATTLE, WASH., *April 6, 1956.*

Dr. LEONA BAUMGARTNER,
Commissioner of Health,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. BAUMGARTNER: There appear to be points on which it is necessary to set the record straight. A letter bearing your signature, and dated March 27, says:

"As to the Exner material, we did have a copy of Dr. Exner's letter submitted to Mayor Wagner shortly after our report appeared."

Your letter of transmittal to the mayor, relative to your report, was dated October 24. My report was sent in three installments—in May, August, and October. Only the last was received after your report was sent. Yet your report was largely composed of material which was completely discredited in my first two installments, and no attempt was made to refute my evidence.

Your letter of March 27 goes on to say:

"In it, Dr. Exner repeated the viewpoint he expressed during the 1952 Delaney hearings, but it had no new material."

I did not testify before the Delaney committee. It is not viewpoints but facts that concern us. And my report contained a vast amount of new material.

Moreover, I did testify before the Wolverton committee in 1954. That testimony was available to you, and is sufficient to discredit your report completely, yet you made no attempt to refute or answer it.

Another letter bearing your signature, dated April 2, says:

"A hasty glance shows that with many articles coming from Dr. Exner it contains instances of material quoted out of context and of earlier references which have been refuted later on."

In case you didn't know, all quotations are out of context; and this is never grounds for criticism unless the omissions are such as to subvert the meaning. This cannot be revealed at a hasty glance, but only by careful comparison with the originals. I have encouraged this by giving exact references to my sources; and if you had investigated you would have found that the originals are even more damning than space permitted me to demonstrate, even by quotation.

You will also note that I have used exact and extensive quotations, just to avoid any possible charge of distortion or quoting out of context; whereas your report consists almost wholly of unsubstantiated claims, and of indirect quotations, without exact references, and often distorted almost beyond recognition.

As for the "earlier references which have been refuted later on," I fail to see how this strengthens your case, since they are the reports on which your report is based; and since, moreover, my purpose in quoting them has been to demonstrate their complete lack of reliability. If it is true that they have also been refuted by others, that merely adds weight to my report, and invalidates yours even more completely.

As an example of your uncritical acceptance of questionable statements, on page 24 you say: "The Bartlett group showed 'no clinically significant physiological or functional effects resulted from prolonged ingestion of water containing excessive fluoride, except for dental fluorosis.'" If you had examined the actual data, you would know that the death rate in the upper middle-age group of subjects (50–65 years) was more than 6 times as high in Bartlett as in the control city of Cameron.

Perhaps death is not a "clincially significant physiological or functional effect" or, on the other hand, perhaps the difference was not caused by fluoride. The point is, however, that no attempt was made to prove that it was not. The difference, like many other differences that were found, was simply ignored. And, on February 29, 1956, Dr. Arnold, of the Public Health Service, admitted that this was the only study of the effects of fluoride on adults, on which the claims of safety are based.

As I pointed out to the mayor, in my open letter of January 20 (published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 26, page A833), Dr. Dean, father of fluoridation, was forced to admit under oath that charts he had presented in evidence to the California Public Utilities Commission contained data he knew to be worthless when he made the charts. Yet he has published the same charts in the January 1956 issue of the Journal of the American Dental Association as evidence of the safety and effectiveness of fluoridation.

You used conclusions from the same data in your report, yet if you had read my report, or examined the original data, you would have known they were worthless. You did neither, or you just didn't care.

On page 6 of your report, you say: "In general, fluoridation involves the supplementary daily ingestion of about 1 milligram of fluoride ion per person."

If we are talking about people and not averages, this means that everybody drinks about a quart of water a day, and you don't have to be a scientist to know that that isn't true. Water consumption from the public supply varies so widely that any effect of fluoride which occurs frequently enough to be recognized when there are 10 or even 15 parts per million of fluoride in the water, will occur occasionally where there is 1 part per million. In other words we can know that in any large population, some of the people will be seriously poisoned by the recommended concentration of fluoride.

This was why 1.0 ppm was set as the maximum tolerance for fluoride in a public-water supply, by PHS in 1942, and there have been no proofs of greater safety since. There is, in fact, more evidence that this amount is dangerous than there was at that time.

In your letter of April 2, you say "So far we have not found a single case in which harmful effects have been proven."

In the first place, the burden rests on you to prove that what you propose is safe, rather than on those who object to poison in their water to prove it dangerous. No such proof is offered, only third hand opinions based on discredited evidence.

If you had looked, however, you could have found evidence of harm. Cases of mild fluorosis are now officially reported from Newburgh. (See JADA, vol. 52, pp. 321–2.) Mild fluorosis is the kind you tell us will never be found with fluoridation. Dean's 1934 classification was used, according to which, in mild fluorosis:

"The white, opaque areas on the surfaces of the teeth involve at least half the tooth surface. The surfaces of molars, bicuspids, and cuspids subject to attrition show thin white layers worn off and the bluish shades of underlying normal enamel. Faint brown stains are sometimes apparent, generally on the upper incisors."

Such teeth are so disfigured you can see it from across the room; and the brown stain, which is faint in children, because progressively darker and disfiguring as long as the teeth are retained.

The disfigurement, however, is the least important part of the damage. It was produced by actual poisoning of the enamel-forming cells of the tooth bud while the tooth was forming and before it erupted. And we now know that at the same time that the tooth buds were poisoned, other body cells were poisoned and other functions were disturbed. The enamel damage is the most obvious, and one of the earliest effects to become evident. Other effects may take 40 years to give trouble, but that only makes them more treacherous, not less serious.

When the experimenters at Newburgh say the mottling they have produced is not objectionable, they do not mean that it is not objectionable to those who have it. They mean that they, themselves, do not object to causing harm to that many people. In fact, a spokesman for the Public Health Service said, in 1951:

"The criterion we have been using is that if there is some 10 to 20 percent fluorosis in the community, that would not be objectionable because in those places the degree of intensity is not greater than the accepted definition of mild" (4th annual conference of State Dental Directors, p. 65).

If you investigate, you will be forced to the conclusion that these things are true. Then you should certainly withdraw your recommendation to flouridate.

If you fail to do so, we can only conclude that you, like the Public Health Service, are willing to cause positive harm to 1 person in 5 in the hope of conferring a hypothetical benefit on some portion of the remainder. If such is your attitude, New York City is badly in need of a new health commissioner—one with a conscience, and who will take her duties seriously.

Sincerely yours,

F. B. EXNER,
M. D., F. A. C. R.

SEATTLE, WASH.

P. S.—Since this is a matter of grave public concern, I shall have to make this an open letter. F. B. E.

Serious Situation Facing New England Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

At a breakfast meeting of the New England Senators and Representatives with members of the New England Governors' Textile Com-

mittee today, Seabury Stanton, industry member from Massachusetts and chairman of the executive committee of Berkshire Hathaway, Inc., outlined the serious situation which faces the textile industry as a result of ever-increasing Japanese textile imports into the United States.

Mr. Stanton said that imports of countable cotton cloths from Japan had tripled between 1953 and 1955 and that Japanese exports to this country in January and February of this year were at a rate almost doubled that of last year. He pointed out that in the case of certain New England fabrics, such as velveteens and ginghams, the Japanese were supplying from 50 to 80 percent of the American market.

During the last quarter of 1955 when the new low tariff rates were first in effect, the Japanese imports greatly alarmed the industry, but because of a slight lift in the general textile activity during that period, the significance of these imports was not generally understood by the public. With business currently declining and prices being depressed, the increasing imports are going to cause and aggravate unemployment and short time. Some mills have already curtailed in New England and elsewhere as a result of this situation. Berkshire Hathaway, which operates 14 mills in New England, will have to curtail production unless relief from this situation is secured promptly.

Stanton termed as irresponsible the policy of the Government in reducing the tariffs and encouraging unrestricted Japanese imports at a time when employment was falling and earnings are low in the textile industry. "The Federal Government should be thinking of ways to correct the depression in the industry rather than to aggravate it," he said. "Repeated denials by Government officials that the industry is considered expendable is beginning to have a hollow sound," said Stanton, "as layoffs and curtailment continue and Japanese textile employment, profits, and production rise.

"The textile industry wants to share in the dynamic American economy and the workers feel that they should share in the rising standards. This can never be accomplished so long as our Government adopts a laissez faire attitude toward cheap, low wage Japanese competition. We should strive to bring the Japanese up to our level and not drag American industry down to their level," he said.

Catholics and the International Labor Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. KELLEY of Penusylvania. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am including the statement of the Catholic Association for International Peace concerning the International Labor Organization.

You will recall that this International Labor Organization has been under fire from the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers' representative, Mr. William L. McGrath.

I have, of course, been a strong advocate of the ILO after my experiences as a participant on four different occasions.

The statement follows:

CATHOLICS AND THE INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION—POLICY STATEMENT BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC LIFE

The International Labor Organization (ILO), one of the oldest of the so-called specialized agencies of the United Nations, is currently being subjected to severe criticism in certain circles in the United States on the grounds that the organization is now dominated by the Soviet Union and some of her satellites and is being used by the Communists for their own evil purposes. Within recent weeks this criticism has taken the form of an outright demand that the United States withdraw from the ILO. The extreme nature of this criticism and the persistence with which it is being repeated and publicized have forced a number of American Catholics to make a searching examination of conscience with regard to the ILO. The question inevitably arises: If the ILO, as is claimed, is really an instrument of Communist expansion, should not the United States break away even at the risk of destroying the Organization?

THE ISSUES CONFRONTING CHRISTIANS

The Catholic Association for International Peace cannot stand aside in this controversy. Participation in international life is a duty imposed by numerous directives issued by the Supreme Pontiff himself, and cannot be evaded by any conscientious Catholic. Moreover, it is incumbent on all of us to try to promote the cause of international peace. On the other hand, we do not want peace on any terms, and the means we employ to secure it must be adapted to the aims we seek. In other words, we must ask ourselves whether or not the ILO as at present constituted is an adequate instrument whereby Catholics, in cooperation with other men of good will, can promote international peace.

HOPES PLACED IN THE ILO

The ILO, which was established immediately after World War I, is the outcome of a generous idea, which opened up great hopes for the future. The representatives of employers, workers, and government had never previously met together at the international level to discuss questions of common concern unless their immediate interests were at stake. The founders of the International Labor Organization hoped to provide them with an international forum where, if possible, labor problems could be studied objectively and conflicting points of view could be frankly discussed in an atmosphere of mutual respect. The purpose of the discussions is not to pass laws at the international level, nor to amend the laws of individual countries behind the backs of their respective parliaments or legislatures, nor even to impose regulations on the countries concerned. The ILO issues no binding instructions; it works by means of persuasion. Nonetheless its influence is very real. As was noted by the Most Reverend Patrick A. O'Boyle, archbishop of Washington, a few years ago: "The ILO * * * is a living proof of the fact that it is possible for the nations of the world to cooperate with one another on behalf of the international common good."

The ILO is a meeting place for men with widely differing backgrounds, not only by reason of their social position (as Government officials, company directors, employers, wage earners, etc.), but also by reason of their political and religious opinions. This wide range enables the most conflicting opinions to be compared, and this in itself is conducive to better understanding and mutual confidence.

The ILO can take pride in its contribution to the development of human relations in industry. It is, as has been said, an international forum, where men of good will who believe that social progress ought to be the fruit of joint cooperation among the parties concerned contribute their hopes, their knowledge, and their experience in an effort to solve their problems and promote the general welfare. In the words of a former United States employer-delegate: "The ILO has served as a valuable forum for the presentation of progressive ideas on modern capitalism, on facilitating cooperation between management and labor."

An organization of this kind was not launched without long preparation. The Peace Conference at the end of the First World War did not lightly establish an official institution to deal with labor problems by means of international discussion. It did not require the peoples to accept an administrative body for which they felt no need. The International Labor Organization is the result of efforts stretching back for more than half a century.

The deplorable consequences of industrialization were clear to thinkers and statesmen as well as to the leaders of the workers and of industry; but unregulated competition made it impossible to adopt the measures that were needed in to name of common humanity.

The leaders of the Catholic social movement were acutely aware of this. As early as 1884, Monsignor Mermillod founded an international union in Fribourg, which met once a year to discuss current problems in the field of labor-management relations and in the field of social legislation. In 1887 the Swiss Descurtins urged the Federal Council of his country to call an international conference to organize an International Labor Conference. It was this which led to the Berlin Conference of 1890, at which the Holy See was represented by Bishop Kopp, of Breslau.

The year 1891 marked the appearance of Pope Leo XIII's encyclical, Rerum Novarum, which called upon Catholics everywhere to work for a worldwide solution to the labor problem. Moreover, in the early years of this century, the Holy See sent an official representative to the meetings of the International Association for Labor Legislation, and regularly made a financial contribution to it. It did so because participation by the church in an international effort to assist the workers and to bring about a far-reaching settlement of labor problems was the logical outcome of her social teaching.

The influence of the Catholic social movement on the establishment of the International Labor Organization was, moreover, acknowledged by the first Director-General of the International Labor Office, who wrote, at the time of the promulgation of Quadragesimo Anno: "The ILO is well aware that it is not a spontaneous creation, or the result of a sudden burst of enthusiasm, but rather that it owes it origin to efforts carried out over the years to bring about a close and active union of all the forces that followed the same ideals. The seed was sown in fertile soil which had been carefully prepared by workers who were devoted to social justice, among them those who took their inspiration from the encyclical Rerum Novarum."

Pope Pius XI himself made a similar statement in Quadragesimo Anno: "Furthermore," he said, "after the terrible war, when the statesman of the leading nations were attempting to restore peace on the basis of a thorough reform of social conditions, did not they, among the norms agreed upon to regulate in accordance with justice and equity the labor of the workers, give sanction to many points that so remarkably coincide with Leo's principles and instructions as to seem consciously taken therefrom?"

These being the origins of the ILO, it is not surprising that Catholics from all countries should have played an active part in its work, and that from time to time some of the delegations of the organization should

have included priests as well as laymen. While they cannot all be named here, mention should be made of a name of which Americans are justly proud—that of Msgr. Francis J. Haas, later Bishop of Grand Rapids, Mich.—who was chosen by the American Federation of Labor as a member of its workers's delegation to the Philadelphia Conference in 1944 (a unique case in the annals of the ILO).

QUESTIONS FOR THE FUTURE

At the present time, however, several questions arise in the minds of many Catholics in our own country. Does not the work of Catholics within the ILO—however admirable it may have been—belong to the past? Has not the situation changed since the Soviet Union and her satellites have become members of the ILO? Does not their membership in the organization provide them with a forum for expounding their own ideas and spreading their propaganda? May Catholics continue to work in an organization in which Communists are associated with them? Does this not ignore the clear warning of the Holy Father, in his encyclical, Divini Redemptoris, that "No person who wishes to preserve Christian civilization may collaborate with communism in any way whatsoever"? Does Catholic participation in the ILO violate the Decreee of the Holy Office of July 1949, which forbids Catholics, under ecclesiastical penality, to promote or support communism?

A REALISTIC SOLUTION

It is true that the Communists have 32 votes out of a potential 280 votes in the ILO Annual Conference, and that they are represented in the ILO governing body in the ratio of 1 to 39. We must also keep in mind that in the international labor field there are, besides the Communists, others who are either steeped in or tinged with Marxian doctrine. Nevertheless, the ILO is not a Communist organization or a Communist-dominated organization. Catholic participation in the ILO—and the same may be said for United States participation in general—is directed toward making the principles of social justice prevail in the international field. When Communists appear on the scene, are we to withdraw and make a weak surrender without a fight?

Here in the ILO we have the whole world of labor represented. When we work to protect the truth and show that it is only on the basis of sound principles of social justice that labor can find an answer to its problems and preserve the freedoms and dignity of the individual, are we not contending against communism and Marxism? If the ILO were to become an instrument or agency of communism or Marxism, then indeed we should be the first to denounce it and to recommend that the United States withdraw from it. As long, however, as it remain what it is, we should remain in it and contend for what is right. We have a duty as a nation to make our contribution to the international family of nations. In doing this, we must not be merely negative in opposing what is false, but also constructive in trying to make sound principles prevail.

Instead of advocating withdrawal, it would be preferable for American Catholics to insist that the United States participate in the ILO in a constructive, intelligent, and wholehearted manner, accepting its full share of responsibility for shaping the activities of the organization so as to promote social justice and international peace. This requires the cooperation of Americans from all walks of life who can work together with imagination and common sense—of government officials, trade unionists, and employers. Our government should accept, not evade, its responsibility in the matter of conventions on labor standards. Our government, employer, and worker delegations should seize the opportunity to use the ILO as a forum to promote social progress and to stimulate the improvement of social and economic conditions in less developed countries. It is time to go forward and assume leadership, not to withdraw and allow the Communist bloc to benefit from our default.

THE LEADERSHIP OF THE HOLY SEE

In conclusion, it should be pointed out that Catholics who are interested in this controversy will want to keep in mind that the Holy See, as already indicated, has been one of the ILO's strongest supporters from the very beginning of the organization. In November 1954, the Holy Father enthusiastically welcomed the members of the ILO governing body in a special audience at the Vatican and, echoing the sentiments of his predecessor, vigorously endorse the important work that they are doing for the cause of social justice. "Over the past 30 years and more," His Holiness said, "you have patiently and untiringly built up an achievement of which you can justly be proud."

In January of the present year, Father Joblin, a French Jesuit, was appointed to the staff of the ILO, replacing Father Albert LeRoy, S. J., a veteran member of the ILO secretariat. Father Joblin's appointment was made with the advice and consent of the Holy See, long after the problem of Communist representation in the ILO became a public issue. This obviously indicates that the Holy See is not prepared to withdraw its support of the organization.

In summary, the Communist problem in the ILO is admittedly a serious one, but surely it can be handled by methods less drastic than the withdrawal of the United Staes from the organization. As a matter of fact, United States withdrawal would only make matters worse and would play directly into the hands of the Communists. In the absence of the United States, the Soviet Union and her satellites could the more easily use the ILO as a sounding board for their own propaganda to the embarrassment not only of the United States but of all the other countries of the free world. Indeed, there is reason to believe that the Soviet Union and her satellites have come into the ILO precisely for the purpose of destroying the organization. It is our judgment that United States withdrawal would help them to achieve this end.

India Questions Advisability of United States Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable comment at home and abroad regarding our foreign aid program and especially the application of it to India.

As a part of my remarks I am including an article that appeared in the Times of India under date of January 18, 1956. It is a statement by one Mr. J. J. Singh. Members of Congress who are interested in a viewpoint which has not often been expressed by nationals of other governments will be interested, I am sure, in the statement by Mr. Singh.

The article follows:

REFUSAL OF UNITED STATES AID WILL ENHANCE INDIA'S PRESTIGE—MR. J. J. SINGH'S STATEMENT

Mr. J. J. Singh, president of the India League of America, said in New Delhi on Tuesday that India should decline any more aid from the United States as acceptance of it, he felt, contributed to a worsening of Indo-American relations.

Mr. Singh, who has worked for Indo-American understanding for many years, said the aid created certain expectancies in the United States, which India was rightly not willing to meet, and this in turn created disappointment and bitterness in America.

India could do without United States aid, he argued in a statement and declared she would increase her national prestige if she declined it.

Mr. Singh, who has been touring India for the past 2 months and is returning to America shortly, said he was equally against receiving aid from Communist countries and added, "Our slogan from now on should be: Trade but not aid."

The following is the text of Mr. Singh's statement:

"After mature consideration and study of the matter for the past 2 years, I have come to the conclusion that India should thank the United States for the aid so far received but decline to accept any more aid from the United States henceforth. I propose this because I am dedicated to the cause of creating better understanding between the people of India and the people of America.

"FRAYED RELATIONS

"It is a well-recognized fact that relations between India and America are not too happy. I wish to suggest that one of the causes for the frayed relations is the fact that India receives United States aid. This creates certain expectancies in the United States which India is rightly not willing to meet. That, in its turn, creates disappointment and bitterness in America, thus worsening Indo-American relations.

"Can India do without United States aid? I think she can, even though India badly needs foreign exchange for her second 5-year plan. There is a gap of approximately $1,600,000,000 between what India needs and what she expects to be able to raise. But this gap is not going to be filled by America. In the next 5 years, the most India may expect to get from the United States Government, either in the form of aid or loan, is about $300 million.

"In 1956, fiscal, the United States Government asked the United States Congress to appropriate $72 million for India. This figure was cut down by the United States Congress to $60 million. And, but for the urgent entreaties of the United States Ambassador in New Delhi, Mr. John Sherman Cooper, this sum would have been further cut by $10 million.

"From all indications and information available, it would be correct to assume that future aid will remain at the present level. This is further confirmed by President Eisenhower's budget message of January 16. It would be wrong to assume that if the Democratic Party were to come into power after the 1956 presidential elections, American aid to India will be substantially increased.

"According to the American system of Government, all funds must be appropriated by the United States Congress. The President and the executive branch of the Government can only make requests. As a result of my study of United States congressional circles, I can boldly state that economic aid to India will not substantially increase, whether the Democrats are in power or the Republicans are in power. The fact is that American tax-

payers are sick and tired of shelling out their money to foreign countries and particularly to countries which are not in their corner. And India is not in their corner.

"Will America be offended if India declined to take this aid? I can give an emphatic 'no,' as an answer. Not only will most Americans welcome such a move by India but it will increase our national prestige. Instead of being treated as 'ungrateful beggars' we will be treated with more dignity and respect.

"This is not to say that the overwhelming majority of the American press, which attacks us mercilessly today, will all of a sudden end its tirade against us. But, at least, no one will be able to accuse us of 'taking advantage of the cold war.' Nor will they be able to say that while we are taking money from the United States, we are siding with the Communist bloc to the detriment of the United States.

"BURMA'S CASE

"Burma has declined to take United States aid. Ever since that day, Burma's stock and prestige has gone up in America. Burma is as much a 'neutral' as India is, but one seldom sees Burma being attacked for her neutrality in America while we are constantly flayed on that score.

"A certain progressive section of American opinion as represented by the former United States Ambassador at New Delhi, Mr. Chester Bowles, is strongly in favor of the continuance of United States aid to India. This group feels that if India—a democratic republic—fails to build herself up economically, industrially and otherwise, and if, on the other hand, Communist China, a dictatorship, succeeds in her efforts to build herself economically and industrially, a dangerous example will have been set for the underdeveloped countries of Asia, who might then adopt totalitarian methods to achieve their ends.

"Basically, the argument is correct. But in practice, it does not stand scrutiny. Is it being contended that if India did not receive 50 or 60 million dollars annually from the United States, she will go Communist? The second 5-year plan envisages an expenditure of almost $14 billion in both the public and private sectors. Surely no one, American or Indian, can believe that out of this gigantic sum of $14 billion, the lack of $300 million from America will be the deciding factor whether India remains a democracy or becomes a Communist state.

"I must add that I am not opposed to India receiving economic help from international organizations, voluntary agencies, foundations, etc. Nor am I opposed to American private enterprise investing in India on our terms, or American industrialists, selling us machinery plants and other capital goods on a mutually suitable credit basis. I am opposed only to United States Government aid which has to be legislated and at which time United States Senators and Congressmen and the press have a field day attacking our leaders and our country. I am not being chauvinistic when I say that the time has come when we should think of our national honor and not expose ourselves any more to untempered tirades against us by continuing to take this aid.

"Besides these considerations, our generation will have a legacy of great faith and confidence if we were to build up our country without outside aid. Therefore, I am equally against receiving aid from Communist countries. I think our slogan from now on, should be, "Trade but not aid."

"This may create additional burdens for our people and may require greater sacrifices, but under the leadership of Prime Minister Nehru, I believe, our people will willingly tighten their belts and cheerfully make sacrifices in the service of the motherland."

Anglo-American Position in Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, permit me to direct the attention of our colleagues to Mr. Joseph Alsop's column of April 2, 1956, in the New York Herald Tribune, which is as follows:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph Alsop)

THE HIDDEN CRISIS

LONDON.—A bright spring sun has shone on London all this past week, bringing out the young green in the parks and squares, and gilding the whole beautiful, luxurious London scene with an extra sheen of gaiety and hope. But beneath the smiling surface, at least in the small circle of those who know the inwardness of Britain's world position. Middle Eastern developments are causing gloom so deep that it all but approaches despair.

"It feels now like 1936 or even 1937." Again: "This is the worst moment in the last ten years; I've not felt like this since just before Munich." And once again: "Finding a way out in the Middle East is so urgent that it may not be just a matter of days, but even a matter of hours."

These are not the remarks of shallow and hysterical men. They are statements that have been made to this reporter in the past few days by responsible and experienced leaders of the British government—brave men who have played great parts and have not flinched or quailed through all the perils Britain has experienced since the rise of Adolf Hitler.

The third of the foregoing quotations, moreover, is a paraphrase of the summation in a personal message sent by Prime Minister Sir Anthony Eden to President Eisenhower some days ago through an American official with whom the Prime Minister discussed the present Middle Eastern situation.

The opinions the Prime Minister expressed were so grave in all their implications that the American official asked for a summary of the conversation, in order to make sure his report was correct in detail. The hard-driven Prime Minister himself wrote out the informal message on the spot.

This is only one of a series of similar British messages to Washington, furthermore, all sent in recent days and all on the same theme. A very long formal message, setting forth the entire situation in fullest detail and urgently asking for determined American action on several fronts, was sent off rather more than a week ago. A further message, asking for clear proof of American support for the Baghdad Pact in the form of economic aid, was subsequently sent by Foreign Minister Selwyn Lloyd to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles.

As these words are written, the American response has not yet come through. The long days of waiting, no doubt occasioned by the absence of both the President and Secretary of State from Washington until only a few days ago, have given the British leaders the feeling of "shouting warnings into a feather bed." Although Prime Minister Eden has just visited the President, some members of the Cabinet have even advocated another flight to Washington, either by Eden himself or by a qualified personal emissary capable of putting the facts before President Eisenhower on a man-to-man basis.

Such, then, is the atmosphere within the governmental circle. The cause of it is relatively simple. In brief, the abrupt dismissal of Lt. Gen. Sir John Bagot Glubb from command of the Arab Legion in Jordan revealed a much greater fundamental insecurity in the British position in the Middle East than had been previously imagined.

Perhaps the London view is wrong, but the wisest men here think there is momentarily danger of a new coup in Jordan, paid for by Saudi Arabian oil dollars, organized by the Communist underground, and spurred on by the violent propaganda of the Egyptian radio. Another successful coup in Jordan, installing an anti-Western government there, would place the pro-Western government of neighboring Iraq in serious danger; and in this and other ways would directly imperil Britain's access to the vital middle eastern oil source. In addition, it would vastly increase the likelihood of an Arab-Israeli war this year—and the chances of war this year are already quoted at even by the highest authorities in London.

Jordan is by no means the only point where the situation is thought to be near the explosion point. Britain simply has not the military strength and economic resources needed to contain the Middle Eastern situation single handed. Meanwhile, no common Anglo-American policy in the Middle East has yet been agreed on in working detail. No agreement has even been reached in Washington on the practical implementation of the so-called Tripartite Declaration, by which we are committed to join Britain and France in punishing any aggressor in the Arab-Israeli conflict. In these circumstances, Britain is like a man who feels an enemy's hard fingers reaching for his jugular vein (which in Britain's case is the Middle Eastern oil source), yet can do nothing to ward off the attack. The blandest complacency appears to reign in Washington. But it is also well to remember that just as Britain's jugular vein runs through the Middle East, so too the strategic and political jugular vein of the United States of America happens to run through Britain.

Dependent Medical Care Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on the bill to provide medical care for the dependents of military personnel.

There being no objection the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILITARY CARE FOR CIVILIANS

The bill providing medical care for the dependents of military personnel which slipped through the House the other day calls for close scrutiny in the Senate. Its aim is laudable. At present the dependents of servicemen are given hospital and medical care if they live near military facilities; otherwise they are left to fend for themselves. Certainly this discrimination should be eliminated, and we think it is reasonable for the Nation to assume full responsibility for the medical care of the families of its defenders. Some large questions arise, however, as to how this care should be provided.

The measure passed by the House would allow the servicemen to have his dependents cared for in military hospitals or to

obtain health insurance with the Government paying part of the cost. As the insurance benefits he would obtain would afford far less security than medical care in Army, Navy, or Air Force hospitals, the emphasis would necessarily be upon expansion of those facilities to care for all, or nearly all, servicemen's dependents. Not only would this entail a great expense to taxpayers; more serious, it would result in the drafting of doctors to treat the wives and children of soldiers, with little regard for the needs of the remainder of the country.

Wives and other dependents of servicemen are civilians, and where feasible they should be cared for in civilian hospitals. It is true that military hospitals need some civilian patients so that their doctors will have experience in treating all types of cases. But this need can be met without moving toward the construction of military hospitals to care for nearly 3 million dependents of servicemen.

In our opinion, Congress ought to provide for paying all the cost of an insurance plan to assure medical care for these dependents, but the great majority of them should be treated in civilian hospitals when beds in such hospitals are available. It is not sound practice to build Federal hospitals and draft doctors to accommodate one group of civilians in discrimination against all others.

Dulles and Mohammed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct to the attention of our colleagues the article by Mr. Elias Gilner in connection with the recent testimony of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It appeared in the March 12, 1956, issue of Congress Weekly and is as follows:

REFLECTIONS IN THE NIGHT

(By Elias Gilner)

DULLES AND MOHAMMED

All of us have nightmares once in a while and I am no exception. The other night I found myself at the hearing of the Foreign Relations Committee when the Honorable John Foster Dulles was giving history-making replies to the Senators. I sat down between Senators FULBRIGHT and MORSE and listened.

As long as they dealt with oil and bases I did not interfere. The Senators have dealt with so much oil and natural gas lately that no outsider could possibly tell them anything. As to bases, everybody knows what base means after the shipment of the 18 tanks to haremland. So these two phases of the inquiry I permitted to proceed without interruption.

But when the Honorable J. F. D. made reference to the belief that a Jew had killed Mohammed, I had to break my silence.

"Mr. Secretary," I asked, "were you there when that murder was committed?"

He reflected for a while and with his wonted profundity replied:

"No, Senator; I don't think so."

I made a mental note of my new status and, glancing at Herbert Hover, Jr., I proceeded with more huzpah:

"Mr. Dulles," I said, "did your Saudi-Arabian informer give you the name of Mohammed's assassin?"

"No," said the Secretary.

"Did he tell you whether the assassin was Ashkenazic or Sephardic?"

"I don't follow you, Senator."

"I expected that," I murmured. "If you don't know the difference betwen these two, I'll drop the question. But I'll ask you another. Since you ventured into history, Mr. Dulles, and from this seat in the Chamber of the United States Senate, you are suggesting a new blood-libel, could you possibly tell me when, where, and under what circumstances Mohammed died?"

He mopped his brow. "It was in Arabia—ahem—in the seventh century; wasn't it?" he replied, uncertainly.

"Pretty good, Mr. Secretary," I encouraged him. "But you couldn't give me the exact date, place, and circumstances of his death; could you?" I made a point of stressing the word circumstances. He could not, and looked helplessly at me. Out of compassion for his mute plea, I said:

"O. K., Mr. Secretary of State, I'll give you the answer. No one killed Mohammed. He died of fever in the midst of those of his disciples who had deemed him immortal, in Medina, Arabia, June 7, 632."

Mr. Dulles, a bit discomfited, mopped his brow for a while in complete silence. Herbert Hoover, Jr., leaned over and whispered something into his boss' ear. Mr. Dulles nodded and pounded the table.

"But," he exclaimed, "the Saudi-Arabians declared that there was a Jew in it, so there must have been. After all, how can we doubt the word of slavetraders. Besides, our base at Dahren would be imperiled."

My patriotic feelings were aroused and I said: "Contrary to all precedents at such proceedings, and to your attitude toward Israel, I'll show you that I have a human heart. I'll help you.

"Well, there was a Jew, an apostate who became a leader of the faithful whose memory to the Saudi-Arabians, as Sunnites, is anathema. The man's Moslem name was Abdallah ibn-Saba. He was a Yemenite and founded the sect of ultra-Shiites long after Mohammed's death. You may recall, Mr. Secretary, that the Moslems are divided into Sunnites and Shiites. The Sunnites are the orthodox Moslems; the Shiites (the Iranians are Shiites) are sectarians (derived from the Arabic word shiah—a party) who championed Ali's right to be Mohammed's successor as the prophet's cousin and son-in-law. Abdallah ibn-Saba was an ultra-Shiite inthat he believed in the transmigration of souls and regarded Ali and his legitimate successors as incarnations of God. With this view the strictly orthodox Sunnites violently disagree. Over the ages Ibn-Saba's followers clashed with the Sunnites and in 780 they, with the aid of the more moderate Shiites, the Zaidites, even succeeded in wresting the caliphate from the Sunnites. This information, Mr. Secretary, will bring you no additional oil but will help you lay the ghost of a new blood libel, that is, if you are interested in correcting a false impression."

When I awoke, I recalled that the previous day was Purim and I had read the Megillah—the Book of Esther. Drowsily I began to wonder whether my meditations on Haman had not somehow catapulted me into the Senate Chamber. With the usual optimism of a Jew who had seen a lot of bad times and read about many more far worse ones, I said to myself: Ultimately all Hamans went down to defeat and the Jewish cause triumphed. Hence now, too, Israel's cause will triumph.

The important thing is to see to it that the ancient concept of kol yisroel chaverim (the brotherhood of Israel) is converted from a phrase into reality, from a thought into true brotherly deeds—big and small. The big deeds will give us strength; the small ones—warmth. And there is hardly a match or a substitute in our contemporary Jewish life for some of the heart-warming little deeds initiated by our forefathers in the distant past.

For instance, take shalach mones—the sending of gifts on Purim. Decades back in the European countries, however bad the overall conditions, however poor the given families, they managed on Purim to send a small gift, a token of a brother's heart throbbing for his brother in freiden un in leiden—in joy and in suffering. Here most of us have dropped this tradition and our Purim days are the grayer for it.

These meditations stemmed from a little incident which had occurred that morning. I was on my way out and opened the door when in walked three children. The oldest, a girl of about 12, was carrying a covered platter. It emitted a wonderful scent. The platter contained shalach mones from our neighbors, a young orthodox couple with whom we have a nodding acquaintance. But they remembered us on the morning of Purim. They remembered us even though we are not orthodox. What mattered to them was that we were Jews and neighbors; that in the hoary past an arrogant Amalekite, a Haman, conspired to annihilate us; that he failed; that the Jews of Susa celebrated, danced in the streets, showered gifts upon each other out of hearts brimming with joy.

And now, 26 centuries later, anti-Jewish, anti-Israel conspiracies are still taking place. Their forms are different, their intent the same. So my neighbors across the driveway felt the need of saying to me, to us; remember, our hearts are one. The chain between the Jewish hearts of Susa, of New York, of Tel Aviv and Jerusalem is not broken. Their hearts throb with joy in days of gloom and doubt. They can throb with hope and faith despite discouragement and cynicism.

Accept the token of it all—shalach mones. A platter of good things, good scents. A gift of remembrance that we are one. A small, warm, pleasure-bringing gift. A symbol of brotherhood. A reminder that big gifts to a people in peril can bring it new strength and ward off the threat.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—As we go to press it is announced that Secretary Dulles, in a corrected text of his remarks before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has deleted his statement that Mohammed was killed by a Jew.)

Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

Congressman H. A. DIXON:

I would like to respectfully urge you reject the conference report on farm legislation and particularly request you eliminate the three price system on wheat dual parity provision rigid 90-percent support price on basic commodity. It is my opinion if present bill is enacted it seems certain to increase flour prices substantially and force the consumer to pay the equivalent of tax on the price of bread. This type of legislation in my opinion is unfair to the great mass of working people and should be defeated.

FRED KUHLMANN,
CONTINENTAL BAKING CO.
OGDEN, UTAH.

All Eyes on the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of April 10, 1956:

ALL EYES ON THE HOUSE

Last week at his press conference President Eisenhower, asked for his opinion of the pending farm bill, which was still in conference committee, said he preferred not to render a final judgment until "a whole bill is in front of me." He admitted at that time, however, that he might settle for something less than the administration's original aims. "I have never been one," he told the newsmen, "to believe that you must hold up good things in order to attain perfection."

In some sectors there was a temptation to read into this statement a declaration that Mr. Eisenhower was prepared to make sweeping compromises on the mangled version of farm legislation that emerged from the Senate or the even more horrendous one that was nearing completion in the joint conference committee. It seems more reasonable to believe, however, that the President was merely demonstrating once more what he has demonstrated frequently in the past, namely, that he is a reasonable person—that he is prepared to accept things that he doesn't like, so long as the bill that comes before him represents a genuine attempt to carry out the spirit of the legislation he has requested.

In taking the position he did on that occasion Mr. Eisenhower seemed to be leaning backward in making it clear to the Senate-House conferees, who were abundantly aware that the bill on which they were at that moment putting the final touches, was unsatisfactory. If anything of the same spirit prevailed in the conference committee it was well concealed. The response of Senator ELLENDER's Senate Committee on Agriculture reflected the truculent, and even belligerent, attitude that characterized the record of the committee since it took charge of this legislation more than 2 weeks ago. If the President should veto the catch-all bill then entering its final stages, and ask only for the soil bank (the most important single proposal in his program), he was told that "he was going to wind up with a goose egg."

But those farm bloc leaders who may have interpreted as evidence of weakness Mr. Eisenhower's willingness to make certain concessions in order to get the substance of his program could have been told that they were courting trouble. It is one thing to give the President less than everything he has asked for; it is quite another to go along with him on the principal item in his program—especially when that promises something tangible for the farmer right away in this election year (which is the farm politician's idea of the way to solve the farm problem)—and then to proceed deliberately to write into the measure provision after provision that looks in the diametrically opposite direction.

Secretary Benson has rpeatedly warned Congress that, unless it was cleared up, the bill could not possibly be considered acceptable, but the farm members have completely ignored the warnings. It has appeared increasingly evident that they were determined to present the White House with a measure so repugnant to the spirit of the Administration's farm program that Mr. Eisenhower would have no alternative but to veto it.

Tomorrow Congress has its next to last chance to show whether it really wants to see at least a reasonably workable farm bill passed this year. Tomorrow the conference measure goes before the House for the latter's approval. Secretary Benson has specified more than once the five points by which the conference report falls short of being "a good bill." The President had a chance over the weekend to see with his top advisers "the whole bill" of the conference committee "before him." And it will hardly come as a surprise to anyone who has watched the steady deterioration of this legislation since it emerged from the committee in the Senate that he didn't like what he saw. As Republican House Leader MARTIN said in a statement giving the substance of the White House view, "The conference report doesn't meet the test of a good bill."

The country wil be watching what happens in the House tomorrow, as well it should. One sizable group in particular will be watching it. That is the membership of the biggest and most important farm organization in the Nation, the American Farm Bureau Federation, whose president, Charles B. Shuman, citing the five points raised by Mr. Benson—and one more—called upon Congress last week to reject this report.

Juvenile Delinquency and the School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert an editorial on juvenile delinquency written by Joseph Paul Bitzer, of Lemmon, S. Dak. The editorial appeared in the March 29, 1956, edition of the Lemmon Tribune and has aroused considerable local interest.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AND THE SCHOOL

(By Joseph Paul Bitzer)

Juvenile delinquency is considered to be one of the big social problems throughout the United States today. Cooperation and understanding are needed to solve it, and just as soon as the day comes when young people will know that they can no longer get by in doing things which are considered to be wrong, delinquency for the juvenile will no longer be the serious problem it is today.

THE SCHOOL PROBLEM

We hear a great deal about the school and juvenile delinquency. We also realize that there is a school problem throughout the Nation. Delinquency gets a good beginning in the school because here is a center where many students are forced to assemble for supposed-to-be learning purposes. Many types of personalities and ideas are represented in the school, and students have learned one thing for sure, and this is that school authorities in most cases are more afraid of the students than the students are of the school authorities. These students are not born bad, but when they are together they realize, by cooperation, they can really "go to town" and have a good time and worry little about getting caught and being punished. It is surprising how successful adults could be if they would practice some of the splendid cooperation for the good which the delinquents carry on for the supposed-to-be bad. Young people are quick to notice that in many situations adults who are to be playing the game fair are just as rotten, if not more so, than they themselves are.

Students are usually very honest in explaining what they are up to and why. A group of students told me the other day that they realized that they were not acting properly, but "why worry," when they will win out anyway. These same students told me how they saw to it that every year new teachers would come to the school and they also explained how they got rid of the teachers they didn't care for. The interesting thing is that the students knew what they were talking about and they had confidence in themselves.

There is a typical pattern. Certain students do not care to study or perhaps they just do not care for a certain teacher. Rather than come to school and give the teacher a chance and perhaps learn something from the teacher, the students go home, make up a story of some sort which will shock the parents and then the parents go to the school board, and the school board doesn't care for any trouble, so the superintendent is questioned and he and the other administrators feel it best to avoid trouble so the teacher is fired—does not get a contract for the next year, and then the teacher is given sugar coated explanations which are to build up his ego rather than have him feel that the student don't want him, and the school board and administrators do not care to "back him up," even if the teacher could be right and the students wrong.

Schools could and should be practical and often teachers and administrators could learn a few lessons from the students, but generally speaking the school should be operated so students go to school to learn to do what they are told, know what is meant by responsibility, and by this procedure the students will be able to "give and take" much better when it is their turn—when they are in charge of things themselves.

Many persons put all the blame on the school board. School board members, in many situations, are not supposed to be professional educators. And if the administrators would do their part and the teachers would cooperate, and the students would be trained to do their part, our schools would then be functioning in such a way that the school problems of today would be a thing of the past and students could actually say it is a privilege to go to school and they would also learn something and then they would qualify for their important role in life when the time came. Cooperation and understanding are needed.

CONCLUSION

Juvenile delinquency is one of the major social problems in the United States today. The only way we can remedy this evil is to let the offenders know that they can no longer get by with the things they have been doing and are doing. The evil is recognized and now it is time to do something about it—Put a stop to it now.

A Modern Medical Research Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Dr. Harvey D. Bingham which appeared in the professional journal, Northwest Medicine, of July 1955.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MODERN RESEARCH PLAN

It has long been apparent to all men of scientific mind that nature is very generous in divulging her secrets to those gifted with vision. Consequently, the following plan for a worldwide research problem evolved on the theory that nature is figuratively standing with open hands waiting for us to see the obvious wealth of knowledge she is holding forth. These secrets are not so hidden that they require years of tedious searching with elaborate and expensive research equipment, but, are secrets that lie in the open, waiting to be assembled, evaluated, and put to use in bringing about a higher state of world health.

In this day, when wars and prevention of wars cost billions of dollars, when yearly costs of governments run into staggering sums, cost of the following research program is but a trifle, while the valuable accumulated data would be tremendous. How great would be the benefits to humanity if more money were spent improving man's health and less spent on designs for man's destruction.

BASIC PLAN

The following basic plan, simple in effect, is to send medical men to all friendly nations to spend a minimum of 1 year accumulating data concerning all phases of health, and factors influencing health, in these countries. They would then return this information periodically to a central station for evaluation and analysis.

These men, presumably young physicians willing to work for a year or more on a salary before starting their own practice, will intimately mingle with the people of their designated country, constantly inquiring into the habits of those people concerning their predominant diseases, diets, life expectancy, climatic and economic influences, family life, birth control, and thousands of other factors which influence the health of those people. In this way, secrets of why one nation is free from one disease or has a high morbidity or mortality from another disease may be uncovered.

I believe that diet will be of special value in that it could easily lead us into more intelligent research on metabolic disorders. Diet alone may tell us why one nation has exceptionally strong teeth, another free from arthritis, and may provide clues concerning control or cure of many diseases thought to be due to a disturbed metabolism.

ORGANIZATION

Now, how can such a program be organized, financed, and conducted, and become an effective working institution?

Let us assume, due to its merits, that a large foundation such as Ford, Rockefeller, or the United States Government provides the financing.

As in any undertaking, a leader must be selected. This man must be carefully picked for his ability as an organizer, coordinator, and for his proven research stature. He will be chief director and will supervise all phases of the experiment. He will assemble the necessary personnel to classify and evaluate the data as it is received from the field. He will be responsible for assigning various problems to various medical centers and pharmaceutical houses for research and evaluation. He will direct publication and distribution of all pertinent material for the benefit of anyone interested in research.

PERSONNEL

In assembling his personnel, he will seek applicants from class A hospitals graduating interns. Care will be exercised to pick young physicians of high mentality and of an especially inquiring mind. Let us assume he will offer each suitable applicant a salary of $5,000 a year with all expenses paid. Factors such as ability to speak a foreign language may determine where the young physician is to be sent. When he departs for his designated country, he will be given a detailed chart showing the information desired. Each month he will send a complete report to the home station with his conclusions and theories. He will travel the length and breadth of his territory mingling with all classes, always asking questions, observing conditions, and in every way possible gathering information concerning the health of that nation. He may observe that there is total absence of asthma or tuberculosis in his territory and not know why until his information is digested later at some research center. Because of his medical background, he will be able to gain valuable information from physicians and hospitals in his territory. In this way stubborn diseases, whose cause and cure have eluded us, may begin to be controlled. Vital clues may become obvious and lead to solutions of medical problems which have defied solution for centuries.

Many countries have areas in which there are no physicians or hospitals. Whole tribes of people live and die without ever having had other than tribal medicine man care. Many of these treatments have merit because primitive medical care has been handed down from generation to generation and has been found to have value without anyone ever knowing why this or that herb or cure was efficacious. The investigator may be taxed to the utmost in elliciting this information from tribal medicine men or midwives.

Because so many of our drugs are of plant origin, a student of botany could well be included in the team. Also, due to the influence of vectors in transmission of disease and their effect on general health, consideration should be given as to advisability of an entomologist (could be a qualified student) being on each team to accumulate all possible information concerning insect life in the given area. Presence or absence of certain insects might well be the clue to presence or absence of any one disease in that area.

BASIS OF PLAN

Practicality of this research plan received strong support in the recent Vidiclinic on coronary heart disease. Some astute observer noted that Italians suffer less from coronary heart disease than do Americans. Thus a research group from Minnesota is now actively endeavoring to discover the cause. This could easily become the pattern for many other diseases which plague the human race.

Major premise behind this theory is based upon the reason that discovery of a great number of medical facts has been by accident rather than by elaborate and expensive research. Diabetes, a common, well-known disease, was discovered many, many years ago in the Near East by someone observing that honeybees swarmed around the urine of some soldiers and ignored that of others. An account of the early history of chinchona bark was reported by the botanist de Jussieu who visited Loxa in 1739. He learned of a Jesuit missionary who had suffered an attack of malaria and who was cured by chinchona bark administered to him by an Indian medicine man from a neighboring village. Dr. William Withering, of Birmingham, England, obtained knowledge of the value of digitalis in treating dropsy from a home remedy used by an old lady in Shropshire in 1775. "Beautiful lady" or belladonna was used by Italian women in the 14th century to dilate their eyes and thus enhance their beauty. Physostigmine was first discovered in the 17th century when Negroes of the Calabar coast of West Africa were observed to be using it as an ordeal for persons accused of crimes. Curare, a relatively recent discovery, was first found in South America, where it was used by the natives to poison the tips of their arrows. This caused a quick paralysis. Now it is used widely in surgery as an adjunct to various anesthetics. Thus, could we be passing up valuable medical information because we are so unobserving of natural phenomena. Why not a planned method of observation?

In view of the colossal sums of money spent yearly on research, I believe this method will show far quicker and greater returns per dollar spent.

The United States and Middle East Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Joseph B. Schechtman, a specialist in Middle East affairs, has written the following article entitled, "The Bogey of Arab Oil," which contains a number of interesting observations on United States oil needs. It appeared in the Congress Weekly for March 12, 1956:

The discussion of United States policy in the Middle East is being largely dominated by the oil argument. Those advocating the necessity—if not the desirability—of concessions to Arab demands, irrespective of their justness and reasonableness, point out that already in 1952, proved oil reserves in Middle East were reckoned at some 55 percent of world reserves, or 72 percent of those outside the Soviet Union.

Last month, when President Eisenhower was conferring with Prime Minister Eden on a common Anglo-American policy, there appeared in the New York Times of February 3 a well-timed upward revision of this estimate. It was based, as the paper itself candidly stated, on an obscure table buried in the background documents attached to the so-called McKinney report on peaceful uses of atomic energy. This table was compiled by Wallace E. Pratt, who was described as a man who had spent a lifetime in the petroleum industry, i. e., in the service of oil companies—and who himself acknowledged that his data reflected the views of all the major oil companies. In striking contradiction to the assessment by the United States Department of Interior (buried in the same documents), which estimated proved Middle East oil reserves at 97.5 billion barrels at the end of 1954, and to that of the Oil and Gas Journal which evaluated them at 126.3 billion barrels at the end of 1955, Mr. Pratt's table asserted that those oil reserves amounted to 230 billion barrels, thus more than doubling all previous estimates. According to this presentation, the Middle East contains three-quarters of the entire proved reserves of the non-Soviet world.

Since both the peace economy and prospective war requirements of the free world are largely dependent on an adequate oil supply, these figures were clearly intended to provide the Arab States with a powerful, almost irresistible, means of pressure. It is claimed that the Arab States by denying to the United States and its allies access to their oil riches, by canceling American and British concessions, could divert the lifeblood which the free world must have for its very existence. This thesis is disputed by Dr. Benjamin Shwadron, editor of Middle Eastern Affairs and author of the authoritative book, The Middle East, Oil and the Great Powers. In a letter to the New York Times, he showed that the rulers of oil-producing Arab countries could ill afford to dispense with American and British oil companies since their budgets are almost com-

pletely dependent on the oil revenues they receive from them.

Let us examine the prevailing notion that the free world cannot do without "Arab oil," and how realistic is the possibility that the Arab rulers could do without the Americans and the British.

The term "Middle East" as depository of oil reserves is being currently used as synonymous with oil-producing "Arab States," more specifically with Saudi Arabia and Iraq, which are both oil-rich and violently opposed to any pro-Israel move of the Western democracies. This is a gross misrepresentation. Of the 8,800 million tons of proved oil reserves in the Middle East (1952 estimate), Saudi Arabia was credited with 2,250 million tons and Iraq with 1,650—a total of 3,900 million tons, or 44.4 percent of the total. The remaining 55.6 percent was divided as follows: the Sheikkdoms of Kuwait (where half of the concession is in American hands) with 2,500 million tons; Qatar with 300 million; and Bahrein (the entire concession is American) with 40 million; Iran with 2,000 million tons (40 percent of the concession is American); and Egypt with 80 million tons has never been a source of supply for the world market. Thus, Saudi Arabia and Iraq by themselves are not nearly as formidable as when they are falsely identified with the "Middle East" as a whole.

Nor should the term "proved reserves" be considered as identical with actual production. In 1952, the United States, with one-third of the world reserve, was producing half of the world's oil consumption, while the Middle East, with over half of the world's reserves, was yielding less than one-fifth of world production. It must be taken into consideration that in the years 1951–54 the Arab sector of the Middle East had largely profited from Dr. Mossadegh's cancellation of the British oil concession in Iran. The Iranian nationalists expected that this step would cause a major calamity in the Western World's oil supply. They were badly mistaken. During the 3 years when no oil was flowing from the refineries of Abadan—Saudi Arabia, Iraq, and Kuwait eagerly availed themselves of the opportunity to increase spectacularly their oil production, and in terms of crude oil easily made good the loss of the 32 million tons of the Persian output. Saudi Arabia alone raised her production from 26,196,852 tons in 1950 to 46,174,073 tons in 1954. Stephen Hamsley Longrigg in a study, Oil in the Middle East, published in 1954 under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, noted that "already by 1952 there were those who saw more embarrassment than satisfaction in the reappearance of major Persian supplies on the market."

The abortive Iranian attempt must have brought home to the Arab oil-producing countries the hard truth that by abstaining from production they leave no unfillable void in the world petroleum market, and that the losses sustained during such abstensions are almost never recoverable. Indeed, though Iran had in 1954 concluded a new oil agreement with a consortium of eight Western companies, she has as yet not even approximately restored her former place in the oil production of the Middle East region.

It is not likely that Saudi Arabia or Iraq would be very tempted to repeat the disastrous Iranian performance. Their loyalty to the cause of the Arab League can hardly be expected to go so far as to risk the loss of their oil royalties which, in 1954, amounted to $260 million for Saudi Arabia alone and which constituted more than three-fourths of her entire budget. Saudi Arabia's conduct at the time of the Palestine partition decision is indicative in this regard. John B. Philby, probably the most qualified expert on Arab affairs, writes in his Arabian Jubilee:

"The only really effective action which the Saudi Arabian government could have taken, namely the cancellation of the American oil concession as a policy against American championship of the Jewish cause, was never considered seriously, or considered only to be rejected out of hand as prejudical to the economic interests of the country, in spite of a spate of propaganda sponsored by unfriendly elements in Iraq and Transjordan."

King Ibn Saud assured the Arabian American Oil Co. at the time that its concessions were in no way jeopardized. The New York Herald Tribune reported on February 27, 1948, that "in return for his friendship, Aramco redoubled its lobbying in Washingington to convince the Government that support of Palestine might force abandonment of the potentially greatest investment in any foreign country." Forcefully pursued by William B. Eddy, former United States Minister to Saudi Arabia, this argument failed to impress the United States Administration. Herbert Feis, a State Department adviser, noted that the "fear that the Arab States might cancel the concessions owned by American or British oil enterprises if their governments consented to the partition of Palestine * * * has shown itself unfounded." In his opinion, "the fear now that, in the event of a war with the Soviet Union, the Arab States would willingly turn towards the U. S. S. R., and transfer control of the oil resources," is equally unfounded.

The possibility of the oil-producing Arab countries breaking off agreements with the United States under any circumstances is very slight, but even such an eventuality would prove far from catastrophic. The fact is that the United States is in no way dependent on oil supply from the Middle East. The known underground producible reserve of crude petroleum in the United States is estimated at nearly 28 billion barrels. This is, however, far from the limit of this country's actual oil resources. According to A. I. Levorsen, Professor of Geology at Stanford University, and past president of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists:

"Today, as always, since the beginning of the oil industry, the biggest petroleum resource is that which is as yet undiscovered. The present known reserves are but a working stock, and they reflect a balance between costs—of discovery, production and carrying charges—and the incentive to discover new reserves. The fact that the present United States reserves represent only twelve times the current consumption is not necessarily alarming, since the average proved reserve has for many years fluctuated between 12 and 15 times the annual consumption. Discovery in the past has more than kept pace with consumption, and reserves are currently the greatest recorded."

Harvard's professor of geology, Kirthley F. Mather, considers it "a safe expectation" that "the actual reserves of oil beneath the United States surface are twice, and perhaps as much as three times, the proved reserves of 28 billion barrels."

Any discussion of oil needs and supply in this country must take into account the fact that American geologists, engineers, and economists have devised refinery techniques which insure the most efficient use of every barrel of oil brought to surface. At the same time, every effort is being made to speed up the discovery of new pools, either in new localities or by deeper drilling in oil-fields, as well as to increase the percentage of recovery from already discovered pools by improved methods of production.

In addition to domestic oil resources, the United States can always count on proved reserves in the Caribbean-Gulf of Mexico region which, as of January 1, 1949, amounted to over 20 million barrels, while total proved reserves for the remainder of North and South America are estimated at 18 million barrels.

It should also not be overlooked that modern science and technology have provided an alternative source of supply for petroleum products. Already now, an appreciable fraction of American requirements is being met by the synthesis of liquid hydrocarbons from natural gas. A pilot plant for the synthesis of petroleum from oil shale has been put into operation at Rifle, Colo., by the United States Bureau of Mines. Methods of synthesizing petroleum products from coal, developed by German scientists before and during World War II, are being checked and improved in the research laboratories and demonstration plants of governmental bureaus and private corporations in the United States. During the war, these methods produced substantial quantities of synthetic gasoline that helped materially in providing power for the German war machine. In peacetime the success of the oil-shale industry in Scotland and Sweden proves not only the technological but also the economic feasibility of this expedient.

Outlining the prospects of supplanting natural oil by synthetic sources, Kirthley F. Mather describes these alternative sources as almost unbelievably abundant. In the United States alone there is enough oil shale and coal available to provide the equivalent of 2 billion barrels of crude oil each year for at least 1,000 years. A. I. Levorsen puts the United States natural gas reserve at 174 trillion cubic feet; Canada has a reserve from 5 to 10 trillion cubic feet.

It is true that the presently available methods of synthetic oil production are still too complicated and expensive to permit competition with natural petroleum products. Professor Mather is, however, confident that this is not an insuperable obstacle and that there is every reason to expect the gradual replacement of natural oil by synthetic products which will prove adequate for all human needs, for as long a time as they are needed.

It is evident from these figures that this country relying solely on its own production will be more than adequately supplied for the foreseeable future. Should the two oil-rich Arab states, in a sudden burst of destructive fanaticism, ever decide to cancel American and British oil concessions, those oil companies will of course suffer financially, but there is certainly nothing frightening about this prospect for the vital interests of the United States and its allies. They can do without Arab oil.

Why I Am Dedicated to Teaching

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, recently, in the Lepanto (Ark.) Record for March 24 there appeared an essay written by Mr. J. D. McGehee, superintendent of schools at Lepanto, which was awarded high recognition in the Lion Oil Co. teacher essay scholarship fund.

This essay, entitled "Why I am Dedicated to Teaching," is an affirmative document characteristic of the highest ideals in the field of education. It indicates the basic ingredient which ranks our educational system among the leaders in the world—a devoted and a dedicated teaching staff.

Mr. McGehee, who is recognized as one of the leading educators in Arkan-

sas, has made of his position in the Lepanto schools a forum for work in all phases of community endeavor and has extended the scope of educational assistance into all phases of community living. In this, Mr. McGehee has broadened his own abilities and has given to his community even a greater service.

The Lion Oil Co., one of the fine industries of Arkansas, has carried on a program of public service far afield from its commercial endeavors. The diversified programs of the Lion Oil Co. have made Arkansas a better place for its citizens to live and prosper. Many young people have earned scholarships and many adults have received assistance for research and others have received recognition for service because of the enlightened and public spirit of the Lion Oil Co.

For these reasons, it is an honor to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this essay and commend both Mr. McGehee, the educator, and the Lion Oil Co., the highest type of American business.

WHY I AM DEDICATED TO TEACHING

(By J. D. McGehee)

Any reason that I may give as to why I am dedicated to teaching could probably be categorized as a selfish one.

First of all, I just plain love children and youth. I love all children—the meek, the lowly, the dirty ones, the retarded ones, the mentally alert, the extrovert, and the introvert. I love to observe, to work with, and to assist this stream of humanity in its constant search for ways to dramatize the God-given talents peculiar to each individual.

I love the challenge that accompanies the enthusiasm, the profound faith and optimism of youth. I love to live, and children were not born to die—only to live.

I love to live and work on the frontiers of society as we attempt to recreate and fashion from day to day a dynamic, democratic social order. I love to work in the broader aspects of teaching with adult citizens. I love to be a part of the leadership that helps the citizens of a community crystallize their thoughts and desire, and in turn helps establish worthy community goals which tend to strengthen democratic institutions.

I love to soldier in an army of dedicated citizen-teachers who have as a common goal the eradication of man's age-old problems—ignorance, injustice, and poverty. I love to think that I am on the front line of defense in this great struggle for freedom as we know and love it in a great constitutional democracy. I teach with the high hopes that my children may have the opportunity to teach also, provided they choose to do just that.

During World War II, on the battle-scarred fields of Europe, I made a covenant with my conscience that given an opportunity, I would forever dedicate my life and talents to the field of public education, for it was then and is now my sincere conviction that the strong public school more than any other institution stands as democratic capitalism's greatest ally.

Finally, the spiritual values inherent in the discipline of teaching is a soul-searing experience. The opportunities in teaching for learning, for traveling, and for sharing one's experiences with others, are unequaled.

Perhaps more than all this I teach because I am dealing with individuals who have a spark of divinity in their souls and minds, and somewhere in the interaction of minds I link myself with immortality.

And as I teach, I hope to pass on a way of life that is ever expanding and more bountiful in individual choices and awards. In this process I ask only that there are some to hear, and learn, and understand, that they may shape and endure, and thus truly fulfill themselves.

Loyalty to American Idealism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the inspiring address delivered by Timothy J. Murphy, national commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, the evening of March 24, 1956, at the Hotel Bradford in Boston, Mass., on the occasion of a reception to National Commander in Chief Timothy J. Murphy by the Department of Massachusetts, Veterans of Foreign Wars:

LOYALTY TO AMERICAN IDEALISM

(Address delivered by Timothy J. Murphy, national commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars)

"It is of the utmost importance that there be, among our people, a great revival of faith in those ideals which lie at the bedrock of our freedom ,our economic order, and our American way of life." (From top award, Freedoms Foundations, Valley Forge, 1955, by Vincent Godfrey Burns.)

In an address on Americanism, by a good VFW member, Judge Michael Musmanno, said: "I asked my father 'what it was you said when you kissed the flag?' He replied: 'I said thank God for a country where an immigrant coal miner's son can become a judge.'" That father expressed simply but more eloquently than he knew, the meaning of America, the land of opportunity in contradistinction to life in the Old World; for him a basic American ideal had been realized in the distinction attained by his son. Yes, they came from everywhere, the Englishman and the Dutch, the Irish, Welsh, and Scots, the Italian, Greek, and French, the Teuton, Norse, Spaniard and Slav, Negro and some orientals—all seeking freedom—religious, political or economic, and all contributing in various ways to making American a land of one people with one language who can say with pride: "This is my home."

They know it to be a home because in it they enjoy the maximum of freedom. They know it to be a government conceived in the name of Liberty, and one established by, and for, the average man. Most know that it did not just suddenly happen, this Union of free States but is in the light of history a culmination, the promised land at the end of the long and bloody road on which man travelled in his quest for freedom. Immortal documents mark its tortuous and uphill course: Magna Charta, the Mayflower Pact, Jefferson's Rights of British America, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, the Bill of Rights, and the Emancipation Proclamation. Freedom emerged triumphant but it still must be defended.

We recognize that much remains to be done to make our democracy work fairly and efficiently particularly in the realm of its economic system and civil rights but some instead of offering constructive criticism and working for the betterment of the state chisel away at things that made the land great. They play directly into the hands of our formidable enemy. Those offenders are the "parlor pinkos," half-baked intelligentsia, and some left of left "liberals" found in all segments of our society; those who harm the most operate in the higher institutions of learning, public schools, and in publicity media. Some have been exposed, others ran to cover and many asked the protection of the fifth amendment. However there are many misguided individuals today, who although not Communists follow various left-wing Professor Snerds, men with impressive academic degrees and called the higher thinkers. It is believed that too often these disciples of the Snerds, the young teachers and writers, parrot the remarks and line of thinking of this peculiar species of pinko in order to claim membership in what they believe to be a stratospheric intelligentsia—a lofty place in the world of the mind, far removed from the ordinary citizen. Many of this ilk tag veterans and veterans organizations as hero worshippers, practitioners of a corny, outdated Americanism, and always hitting the Congress for handouts. This type of intellectual is so above the crowd that he thinks little and cares less of what the John Does and the Bill Browns think about public and international issues. The voices from the grassroots are for him a thing of sound and fury, signifying nothing. He does not know that democracy as a way of living with others is usually defined as a government by the people. For such Snerds and their satellites we must be on guard.

This must be watched for particularly in the school teachers with strong leftist tendencies who instruct our youth. Some of them wittingly and some of them unwittingly are directly down the alley of the Communist master plan for infiltration with the intent of winning the minds of our young men and women.

What is the Russian plan? One of the best terse explanations that I have seen was disclosed by one who should know, a Russian and naturalized American, Nicholas T. Goncharoff. The ex-Russian tank commander in World War II is now Director of the Free Russian Youth Club in New York City. His mother died of undernourishment in 1933 because of Stalin's organized famine and his father was exiled to Siberia and seen no more along with many more of the 100,000 clergy and priests sent there by Stalin between 1928 and 1938. Goncharoff, naturalized citizen and good American, who had had enough of it in Russia, told a group of prominent American businessmen what aside from general espionage, he believed the plan of the Communist conspiracy in the United States to be.

First. To use the official institutions of the United States, especially the educational institutions to influence the youth of America.

Second. To work with energy and great cleverness between both the professors and the intellectuals in the United States.

Third. To infiltrate labor unions—especially steel unions, oil and electric.

Fourth. To take advantage of all the mistakes of the social, economic, cultural and religious agencies in the United States. And never to work directly as a Communist but rather to influence the people who are pacificists and isolationists. To achieve misunderstanding, dissatisfaction with and also the possibility of splitting the allies of the United States.

This might be called the long-range mission of the Communist Party in the United States. We are all wise to the short-range, kiss-and-make-up policies. And as Cardinal Spellman said last year: "We Americans need to remember how definite a sentence of death has been passed upon us by the very power by whom we have been asked peacefully to coexist." But mark you at the very top of the list given by the Russian-American was the use of educational institutions to influence youth, and the influence that they hoped to exercise on certain intellectuals and professors.

For this reason I beg of you report to the FBI all those that you believe to be Com-

munists and fellow travelers but watch closely the Professor Snerds and their followers. The first important check is have they or do they now belong to Communist-front organizations? Every member of the VFW should have the Senate's latest valuable study: "The Communist Party of America: What it is. How it works."

It is also time to grow apprehensive when teachers belittle the stature and ideals of the Founding Fathers. Teachers that call John Adam an unintelligent lawyer; or Thomas Jefferson insincere; or George Washington a mediocre individual who had aspirations to become new world royalty are, if the teachers are sane, trying purposely to weaken our youngsters belief in the greatest men our country ever produced, and inferentially to belittle our institutions and Government. They are not the people we want to teach our children.

Watch this also: such apologists and debunkers of our history, often men who claim to have little in common with the average man, will disparage veterans' parades such as Loyalty Day, and decry our turning out on certain days to perpetuate the memories and keep alive the history of our heroes and revered dead. Their reaction to these activities is that veterans are publicity seekers and showoffs. We must be standing for some of the things that they would forget; we must be fighting for some of the American issues that they oppose.

If democracy is a right way of thinking, then it should be made a reality in every phase of home and school thinking and practice. I submit that sound patriotic education, solid Americanism, supported by facts, will more than anything else develop in our youth a profound love of country and a hatred of communism. Now, not all educators will go along with this, particularly the Snerds. Sometimes they write considerable twaddle about professors and their rights—how they should be the judges of the books and courses of instruction presented. Now let's get this straight, we of the VFW most certainly stand for academic freedom, freedom of speech and thought, but not for the freedom of leftwingers and their varying degree of pink satellites to influence youth by pointing out the charms of the Soviet world, plugging the philosophy of Karl Marx, and playing down the precious depository of American happiness, the Constitution of the United States and those who framed it.

Many prominent Americans have taken up the cudgels in this fight that will continue in varying degrees as long as these are totalitarian philosophies. Paxton Blair, former justice of the Supreme Court of New York, said: "It must be affirmed that every citizen in a free economy, no matter the wares he plies, must defer to the sovereignty of the consumer." Our children and our grandchildren are the consumers of education. We pay the bills. It is the duty of those who love this land, have defended its institutions in wars, and expect to pass them on to posterity to scrutinize with care both the teachers and the books of youth—our most precious possession. Do we not want our progeny to preserve liberty for themselves and posterity? I do hope that all fathers and mothers will keep a keen eye on the kind of education that their children are receiving. We should expect schools to give students a workable understanding of the democratic way of life. Is that being done in your community?

It is desirable that young people think hard and straight about the basic American principles. There is plenty of room for divergence of opinion on details; that is one reason we have elections. But no authoritarian system in the world would dare accept the basic principle that men, irrespective of their race, religion, or class are born as in this American world with equal rights that the founders thought to be unalienable—"life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." That is the essense of it all, the alpha and omega of the system, the law, and the prophets.

The Declaration of Independence, the charter of liberty, and the Constitution of the United States, the charter of human rights, were expressions of the thoughts and feelings of the plain people—farmers, laborers, mechanics, shopkeepers, and artisans. Their unorganized but deeply felt ideas of a democracy were, after much debate, given polish in language and exactness in content by such men as the Adamses, Jefferson and Madison, Franklin and Hamilton, and others. But these great leaders would have approved the words of Carl Sandburg, the poet:

"Let us make pioneer prayers.
Let working clothes be sacred."

And here in the New World, amid a political scene that had then become chaotic, the representatives of the people, and voicing the people's highest aspirations drafted the Constitution; in the oft-repeated words of Gladstone "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." This accomplished at a time when only the most cultured, highest born, and most aristocratic men could hold office in Europe, and where the people had little, if anything, to say about the government—lands wherein there was also much racial and religious persecution. But a new race had developed over here, one of men who had tasted liberty, and as the repression of their rights became more pronounced, the people rebelled. In fact, the bloodless revolution of 1689 in the Bay Colony of Massachusetts brought back a modicum of self-government that had been previously enjoyed, but historians are agreed it foreshadowed the spirit of '76.

In this respect, it is of interest that in the commemoration this year of the 175th anniversary of the State constitution of Massachusetts, our State bar association has developed a comprehensive program to inform school children of the history and implications of their constitution and its influence in the drafting of the Constitution of the United States. It is of interest that the Bill of Rights of the Federal Constitution is an almost verbatim copy of the declaration of rights of the Massachusetts constitution. It is a program designed to inform as well as to inculcate respect for the people of that day who were both spiritually and mentally prepared to preserve liberty "for themselves and posterity."

There have been many fine talks and lectures on the subject. Among them that of Rear Adm. Samuel Eliot Morison, noted historian and official historian of the Navy. In his brilliant address, he pointed out that after all the Massachusetts State constitution was the product of many plain people, the hardworking down to earth men of simple life but who expressed themselves freely as to the issues and particularly such things as a bill of rights. These talks took place at town meetings, in gatherings at the village stores, and in the churches of the State. The farmers of western Massachusetts said that they wanted a constitution that would "protect them from themselves." But a constitution was brought forth and adopted in 1780 with John Adams often called the father. This cross section of the people, the average man of their day wanted as Al Smith said in a speech at Harvard on the Federal Constitution, something that would "guarantee" and "safeguard." He called the Federal Constitution, the "night watchman of democratic representative Government," and added, "Keep your eye on the Constitution." Smith knew back in 1933 that crackpots, "pinkos," "one worlders," and now the Communists and their fellow travelers would do all possible to try and to erode it by subtle means.

Admiral Morison wrote of these early Massachusetts people as being "tough but nervous" a "tenacious but restless race." He said they were "a people with few social graces, yet capable of deep friendships and abiding loyalties; law abiding yet individualistic, and impatient of restraint by Government or regulation in business." To them and those of the other colonies who forged a Nation of States should go our highest homage and a perpetual remembrance by us, the people who inherited their good earth. May we of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in this confused time intensify our efforts to remember our patriots, what they stood for and what they accomplished. I hope that we will always sponsor a loyalty day and carry on our Americanism program even though some of our fellow citizens pooh pooh it. We do not propose to pass on a watered down heritage, and we shall resist in every way possible the efforts of the Communists, Snerds, and others who try to lessen its greatness.

We know that this Nation that shelters us and nurtures us is not perfect. Yet it stands as the greatest free system of Government in the history of mankind. And it is our duty to strive for that perfection called the American dream. Never forget that if we are complacent and fail to practice and defend the ways of democracy, we can lose its priceless benefits.

The Constitution of the United States, a living thing, susceptible of growth, was not for any particular generation, but as Henry Clay said in the Senate "for posterity—unlimited, undefined, endless, perpetual, posterity." That means our children, and their children, and on and on. That is why all we can do for them in the way of sound education that teaches the privileges, rights, duties and responsibilities of the good citizen, comprise a major contribution to the preservation of the Republic. A loyalty to Americanism is the best bulwark against communism.

Let us see to it that no brand of left wingism, domestic or imported, undermine the ideals that gave meaning to the spirit that conquered a wilderness and developed the rich and powerful America where an immigrant coal miner's son may become a judge. Yes, rich and powerful, but are we not assisting countries throughout the earth with staggering sums of money and goods? That bespeaks a great country with a great soul wherein dwell high ideals and democratic principles. And since democracy is only the sum total of its individuals, as the individuals move toward higher ideals so moves the Nation.

Let us be loyal to pure Americanism; let us keep faith in the beliefs of the founders. As Carl Schurz said: "Ideals are like stars. You will not succeed in touching them with your hands, but, like the seafaring man, you choose them as your guides, and following them, you will reach your destiny."

My friends, this country, the leader of the free world, has a glorious destiny. It is the protection of that precious thing called freedom. That we will achieve if we pursue with all our hearts the time proved democratic ideals of free men in a free state. And with God's help we cannot fail.

There Is a Bottom in the Barrel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, rich and powerful as we are, is there a logical reason why we should

assume the burden of contributing to the support of the rest of the world? Endeavor through education and force—and don't forget the force—to maintain peace throughout the world?

There are other lands greater in area than the United States. Other nations with far more people. Yet some people assume that we should, and insist that we must, wherever on earth there are those who have less than we, divide with them. That whenever, wherever, nations quarrel, we should step in and, figuratively speaking, knock their heads together, insist they cease fighting. We would be as successful doing that as is the individual who ventures into a neighbor's home to settle a family argument.

Since World War I, we have given other nations more than $51 billion. If all the babies, the helpless, those who for some reason or other do not pay an income or other tax, pay their full share, you and I owe on that contribution around $300 each.

Some nations used 3 billion of the dollars we gave them to decrease their national debt. As we borrowed that $3 billion, we are paying $90 million a year interest on that $3 billion while our debt piles up.

While our national debt in 1916 was but $971,562,590, we have jumped it as of March 20, 1956, to $277,249, 684, 429. You figure how much you owe of that. I'm tired.

Now the Congress is being asked for an additional $4,858,975,000 for foreign aid for the fiscal year ending July 1, 1957.

We can ruin ourselves by imposing an ever-increasing tax burden on ourselves. We can, and eventually we will, if we continue our give-away program, destroy our prosperity, impoverish ourselves, be forced to repudiate our national debt, or find ourselves working, yes, perhaps fighting, for other nations.

There is a bottom to the barrel and, in my judgment, we have reached it.

It would be all very well to borrow money to help others or to furnish our allies munitions of war, if we could be sure that they would in time of need stand with us, oppose our enemies, fight Communism. But experience tells us that when their own interests are involved, other nations forget all about us, each does what it thinks will best preserve its own sovereignty.

Today, while we are sending aid and munitions of war to other countries, hoping to stop communism, those countries are doing business as usual with the Communist-block countries. They have been shipping more than 250 separate items, machines and machine tools, to Communist governments for the past 2 years. That is the report of a Senate committee of which JOHN L. MCCLELLAN is chairman.

Is it not about time we quit pouring our money down a rathole, wasting our substance and munitions in other lands, where eventually they reach the Communists? There are plenty of things which need doing here at home, not the least of which is the perfecting of our own national defense.

Resolution of Flood and Hurricane Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolution.

Extensive Federal programs are required and urgent to rehabilitate stricken areas and prevent future floods. Accordingly, Congress should endeavor to enact effective remedial measures:

RESOLUTION ON FLOOD AND HURRICANE PROTECTION AND OTHER PURLIC WORKS PROJECTS, NEW ENGLAND REGION NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, BOSTON, MASS., APRIL 2, 1956

Whereas hurricanes have caused great damages in the thickly settled areas, industrial centers and cities of New England, as a result of heavy rainfall and floods on the rivers and from tidal inundation along the coast; and

Whereas torrential rainfall accompanying hurricanes throughout southern New England during 1955 caused great floods leaving over 200 dead, inundating homes and personal properties, businesses and industries, highways and communities and disrupting all orderly activities in the area, with total damages of over $500 million; and

Whereas hurricanes of 1938 and 1954 struck without warning in the coastal areas of New England leaving over 500 dead and causing total damages of $500 million; and

Whereas floods are a recognized threat to New England lying in the pathway of tropical hurricanes which may strike on rivers and coasts bringing rainfall which causes floods greater than ever before experienced; and

Whereas completion of construction of authorized flood control projects already initiated is urgently needed together with the earliest possible planning of additional projects for areas which are threatened by future floods; and

Whereas the enormous growth of small boating creates a need for improving harbors, which are a major attraction and economic resource in the New England area; and

Whereas the New England States have already appropriated large sums to combat shore erosion which is already far advanced; and

Whereas the trend in economical ship design is toward deeper draft vessels which require the deepening of major commercial ports and channels: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New England delegation to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress here assembled recognize the service they may render to the people of the New England States by working together as one unit to obtain the full amount of the funds needed for flood-control projects; and be it further

Resolved, That funds be requested immediately for accomplishment of the New England flood-control program for fiscal year 1957 in an amount not less than $12 million; and be it further

Resolved, That funds in the amount of $1 million be requested for the study of hurricane protection in the New England coastal area in fiscal yera 1957; and be it further

Resolved, That the projects committee, recognizing the projects for Narragansett Bay area, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts; and the New Bedford-Fairhaven area, Massachusetts; as essential to local and national welfare and that the applications for these projects be reclassified and endorsed classification I, as soon as construction costs are available. If the projects committee is not sitting at conference on projects in New England, that the member of the projects committee of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, New England, be authorized to reclassify these projects and place in classification I; and be it further.

Resolved, That funds in the amount of $3 million be requested for the orderly construction for navigation and beach erosion projects and $100,000 be requested for studies and special investigations in fiscal year 1957; and be it further

Resolved, That funds in the amount of $4 million be requested to meet the requirements for maintenance of existing flood control reservoirs and channel and harbor projects in fiscal year 1957; and be it further

Resolved, That the bill sponsored by Senator PRESCOTT BUSH and entitled Senate bill 3272 is urgently required to advance needed protection from floods in the New England region.

Attest:

LARRY M. HESS,
Regional Director.

A Plea for United States Action on Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the burning issue of Arab-Israel relations in the Mideast, I submit for the RECORD a letter written by New York State Attorney General Jacob K. Javits, as published in the March 30 New York Herald Tribune.

No one can question the ability and energy of former United States Representative Javits in his endeavors while a Member of Congress to help resolve the tension in this area. He speaks with authority and wisdom, and I must agree that the time is now for our leadership to spring into action which will strongly assert our alliance with the Democratic State of Israel, by making provisions for aiding her with arms for her legitimate self-defense.

The letter follows:

A PLEA FOR UNITED STATES ACTION ON ISRAEL

To the New York Herald Tribune:

Time is short for us in the Near East. The armistice border between Israel and the Arab States has become not only the newest but the most active Communist front in the world. The Communists have made their overt move by arms sales to Egypt and through Egypt to other Arab States near Israel.

The Communists are exploiting the intransigence of the Arabs for their own purposes, in an effort to use it as a reason for, and the basis of, their infiltration and ultimate penetration of the whole Near East area. They are exploiting also what must be a certain hopelessness among much of the Arab leadership at the moment when so much in real advances for the Arab peoples

could be hoped for, but which, instead, offers them hatred of Israel. The Communists are arming the Arabs and proffering them economic and technical assistance apparently for the sake of fomenting and bringing on an Arab-Israeli struggle, which they wish to regard as inevitable. They must believe that in this struggle, no matter who wins or who loses, communism can gain the most.

The United States faces a situation where Israeli-Arab tension is not merely an isolated factor within an isolated area of the world, but creates the danger of a conflict of the utmost moment to our policy in its most vital aspects. The President himself has recognized the danger by noting the highest priority for the maintenance of peace to be in the Near East area.

Our country's policy is clear. The Secretary of State said in his testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, as recently as February 24, 1956: "I consider that it is one of the basic elements of the United States foreign policy to seek the preservation of the State of Israel."

What we need to know is how our country intends to implement this policy. Thus far, implied threats of unfriendliness by the Arab States, jeopardy of airbase leases, the British attitude and similar developments have induced the State Department not alone to stay its hand but even to allow shipment of tanks to Saudi Arabia, one of the principal Arab powers threatening Israel.

Our country has apparently even allowed itself to be humbled by restrictions on the admission of United States citizens on governmental missions including military service into Arab States by virtue of their religious faith in the effort to influence what it hoped would be a reasonable attitude.

United States policy, if it continues to be based on these considerations, can give the Communists a dangerous success in the Near East. If we fail to help to secure Israel's national integrity, then we have failed one of our closest friends, a member of the U. N., a center of freedom in the Near East, an indispensable refuge against persecution, and the embodiment of a whole people's aspiration.

Such default would endanger reliance upon us by other States similarly situated; and would have allowed the Arabs to gain a success beyond their fondest dreams through their new association with the Soviet Union which would tend to deliver their peoples ever more into the hands of the Communists. On the other hand, by helping to secure Israel we maintain our great reputation for standing by the friends of peace and liberty and we demonstrate that Communist alliances do not pay.

For the American people, there is a great practical issue involved as well as a great moral issue. Practically, Egypt, with jets and other new arms supplied by the Communists, might overrun Israel in weeks. The estimate of time when Egypt and other Arab States may be able to use effectively their newly acquired Communist arms against Israel is considered to be very much shorter than in the United States. Israel circles call it this summer.

It is stated that the jet aircraft, submarines, and other weapons which are being obtained by Egypt from the Communists are so greatly superior to conventional weapons with which the Israel armed forces are supplied that even if badly operated, their superiority will be manifest.

Morally, the issue before the American people is this: Israel is a nation created to meet a world need under the auspices of the U. N. and with the strong support of the United States. It is an expression of our deep concern as a people over the rights of long-suffering minorities.

The great American tradition is to decide questions of foreign policy on moral grounds when they get really complex. Efforts nicely calculated to appease the Arab States, which stand so intransigently against negotiations for peace with Israel—as Israel has offered time and time again—could only cause the whole Near East to be engulfed in a "Red Sea."

The impending mission of Mr. Dag Hammarskjold, Secretary General of the U. N.; the current discussions of the United States, United Kingdom, and France looking toward the means for implementing the tripartite declaration of May 1950, assuring Israel and the Arabs against aggression; and the undoubted diplomatic offensive led by President Eisenhower to maintain Near East peace are certainly to be welcomed.

But even they are not enough to assure that the shock of aggression against Israel—which has by full governmental action pledged to the world its renunciation of any such action against the Arabs—will be met without dire consequences in destruction to Israel or world conflagration. Nor does Israel seek any defenders but its own brave people—given the means. For the same reason, therefore, that NATO was established in Western Europe in 1949 Israel needs and should be allowed by us to get arms for legitimate self-defense now.

We cannot jeopardize Israel's survival and so our Government needs to make a decision, and make it promptly. Perhaps the most urgent matter in American policy today—based on my observation of the situation in Israel—is the need for prompt decision. I can see no real alternative to a decision that would reassure Israel regarding the independence and security by arms, strictly limited to legitimate self-defense—in the first instance. Only in this way under present conditions may the path to Arab-Israeli peace across the bridge of regional economic and social interest—including resettlement of the Palestine Arab refugees and the Jordan River water project—again be opened.

The alternative is either surrender to the Communists or appeasement. Should we allow the Communists to show the Arab states how to liquidate Israel, we will have guaranteed a vast increase in Communist prestige in the Middle East, and perhaps even the creation of new Communist satellites there. And yield we never will; appeasement, as we have learned since Munich, is only the first step before admitting defeat or undertaking some mortal struggle.

J. K. JAVITS,
Attorney General, State of New York.
NEW YORK, *March 27, 2956.*

Congress Declares War on Imperial Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News, of recent date. The editorial is terse and to the point, and needs no elaboration by me:

"THE WORLD MUST BE MADE SAFE"—CONGRESS MADE ITS FATEFUL DECISION 39 YEARS AGO

(By Fraser Edwards)

Stark drama packed the historic hours before Congress declared war on Imperial Germany 39 years ago today.

From the moment President Woodrow Wilson told a grim Congress in joint session "the world must be made safe for democracy," the fateful decision never was in doubt.

But the small, stubborn opposition from Senator and Representatives with large constituencies of German blood made it a bitter battle.

Emotional tension mounted almost to a frenzy before the final, formal action which sent 2 million American fighting men to France—and Germany.

Many moving scenes have occurred in Congress since but they all are anticlimactic compared with what this reporter witnessed and experienced between 8:35 p. m. April 2, and 3:12 a. m., April 6, 1917.

No director could have more skillfully set the stage for President Wilson's appearance at the Capitol, less than a month after his inauguration for a second term, to which he had been elected on a "He kept us out of war" platform.

PACIFISTS MOVED IN

Congress was on edge. For days truculent pacifists had besieged congressional offices, forcing their way in to see Vice President Tom Marshall and Speaker Champ Clark among all the others.

When a pacifist called Massachusetts' Senator Henry Cabot Lodge a coward, the scholarly 68-year-old statesman knocked him down. The man was beaten severely by a crowd before he could be rescued by police.

Night sessions of Congress always lend dramatic effect. The signal light shone on the great gray dome as President Wilson rode to the Capitol on the night of April 2, surrounded by a cordon of clanking cavalry.

Vice President Marshall already had led the Senate to the House chamber, nearly every Senator wearing or carrying a small American flag. They ranged themselves behind the black-robed justices of the Supreme Court, the Cabinet, and envoys of foreign nations, many in brilliant uniforms.

A FEW WERE SILENT

When the President mounted the Speaker's dais at 8:35 p. m., Congress stood and gave him a 5-minute ovation, the warmest reception he ever received at the Capitol. Only members of the small, die-hard, anti-war faction sat on their hands.

Congress listened intently as Mr. Wilson cataloged the crimes of German submarines against humanity. Hundreds of Americans, including women and children, had been murdered on the high seas in the Kaiser's unrestricted U-boat warfare.

He recited his efforts to avoid war, including armed neutrality. Even that, he said, was not enough to cope with the outlaw subs.

ONE CHOICE

"There is one choice we cannot make, we are incapable of making," the President's voice rang as he neared his request for a resolution recognizing that Germany was making war on the United States. "We will not choose the path of submission."

At the word "submission," an old Confederate soldier in the front row on the House floor dropped the hat he was holding and led the applause and cheers. He was the Chief Justice of the United States, Edward Douglass White, one-time Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. Wilson got a different reaction when he said it was "a fearful thing to lead this great peaceful people into war."

The arch foe of the war, Wisconsin's Senator "Old Bob" La Follette, underscored that by loudly clearing his throat twice.

President Wilson didn't even pause on his punchline: "The world must be made safe for democracy."

WILLIAMS RESPONDED

Mississippi's Senator John Sharp Williams was the first to catch the significance and started the roar of approval.

Many men who had made history and others who were to make it were on the floor that day. The last of the old Rebels were there—North Carolina's Representative Charles M. Stedman and Alabama's Senator John Hollis Bankhead, the only man ever to wear the Confederate gray on the Senate floor.

The GAR was represented by Minnesota's bearded old Viking, Senator Knute Nelson and Ohio's Representatives David A. Hollingsworth and Isaac R. Sherwood. Hollingsworth voted for war, Sherwood against it.

In the Chamber were three future Vice Presidents—Texas' Jack Garner, Kansas' Charlie Curtis and Kentucky's Alben Barkley. And six future Speakers—Garner, Illinois' Henry T. Rainey, Alabama's Will Bankhead, Tennessee's Joe Byrns, Massachusetts' Frederick H. Gillette and Ohio's Nick Longworth.

THREE ARE STILL THERE

Only three of the men present still are in Congress—Senator BARKLEY and West Virginia's MATT NEELY in the Senate and Georgia's CARL VINSON in the House.

The most dramatic moment in the House debate came when the Democratic leader, North Carolina's Claude Kitchen bolted the President.

But none doubted Mr. Kitchen's sincerity when he told the House:

"My conscience and judgment, after mature thought and fervent prayer for right guidance, have marked clearly the path of my duty, and I have made up my mind to walk it if I go barefooted and alone. I must vote against the resolution."

HEFLIN WAS HISSED

Alabama's Tawm Heflin was hissed by some Democrats when he challenged Representative Kitchen to resign both his leadership and his seat in the House. Alabama's John Burnett, half Senator Heflin's size, and 17 years his senior, lunged for Tawm but the Sergeant at Arms intervened.

Montana's Jeannette Rankin, the first woman ever elected to the House, cast her first important vote on the war resolution. She voted "no" and burst into tears.

Action in the Senate was delayed by the objection of Senator La Follette to immediate consideration of the resolution. Then he launched into a 3-hour speech against it. John Sharp Williams denounced the speech as "pro-German, pro-Goth, pro-Vandal, and anti-American."

Nebraska's Senator George Norris aroused the Senate by charging that Congress was about "to put the dollar sign on the American flag." Senator Williams branded that utterance as "grazing the edge of treason."

It was only after 13 hours of bitter debate at 11 p. m. April 4, that the Senate voted 82 to 6 for war. The House adopted the war resolution, 373 to 50, at 3:12 a. m. on April 6.

President Wilson signed the United States into the great conflict the same day.

TWELVE WILLFUL MEN

The "no" votes in the Senate were cast by 6 of the 12 willful men Mr. Wilson denounced after they had scuttled his armed merchantmen proposal. They became better known as the Dirty Dozen.

They were North Dakota's Alse Gronna, Wisconsin's Old Bob La Follette, Nebraska's George Norris, Oregon's Harry Lane, Missouri's "Gumshoe Bill" Stone, and Mississippi's long-haired James K. Vardaman.

Three of the twelve protested long and loud but in the end voted for war. They were Iowa's Senators Albert B. Cummins and William S. Kenyon, and Arkansas' Senator William F. Kirby.

The other three: New York's James A. O'Gorman, Minnesota's Moses Clapp, and California's John D. "Mother" Works, already had been retired to private life.

It was appropriate that Utah's Senator Reed Smoot, a Mormon apostle, should close the Senate debate with this prayer:

"God, hasten the day when liberty will be enjoyed by all the people of the earth."

Seventy-Fifth Anniversary of Tuskegee Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Across a Perilous Terrain," prepared for delivery at the 75th anniversary celebration of the founding of Tuskegee Institute, on March 25, 1956, by Buell G. Gallagher, president of the City College of New York.

I am advised by the Public Printer that the cost of printing this article is estimated to be $200. It is estimated to require two and a half pages of the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD notwithstanding that fact.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACROSS A PERILOUS TERRAIN

Words do not come easily on this day. All the good and noble and true sentiments which have been uttered and written about Booker T. Washington in the 75 years since his feet first trudged the Alabama dust have memorialized him and his achievements far beyond our poor powers to imitate or improve. To embellish would be gratuitous, to praise is unnecessary. The living monument of his labors speaks for the founder far more eloquently than fullest oratory or rich encomium. To return after an absence of 15 years and once again to walk the gracious paths of Tuskegee among its quiet trees and noble buildings is to renew one's faith in Washington's great heart and fighting spirit. The act appropriate to this moment is not much speaking, but the bared head bowed in silent reverence to Almighty God for this His child. As a lad of 9, he had been listed among the chattel assets of his master as worth $400. As a man of faith, he placed the whole world in his debt.

Yet there are words which must be spoken in this hour of national crisis. If these words are true to the spirit and intent of him we honor, they will be winging words of hope soberly informed by desperate facts which do not dismay.

The happy phrase which titles this address is given me by Basil Mathews in his biography of Tuskegee's founder:

"The moving and truly astonishing drama of Booker T. Washington's life exercises its spell upon our imagination as we see him moving with his strange blend of wary shrewdness, unswerving courage, 'pawky' humor, and cool fortitude, across a perilous terrain toward a clearly envisaged, although distant goal."[1]

[1] Basil Mathews, Booker T. Washington, p. 30.

The year was 1881. Less than 20 years had passed since presidential fiat had started a social revolution midway in the dreariest, weariest, and bloodiest war mankind had known. As Washington came to Tuskegee, the scars of war and the fresh wounds of reconstruction lay across the land red in anger. The army of occupation had been followed by the freedmen's bureau, and both had been supplemented by an army in petticoats—the northern schoolteachers who came as missionaries to teach and live with the freedmen and to demonstrate to a skeptical and hostile region the meaning of human kindness and brotherhood. The hopes which emancipation had quickened were by 1881 like tender plants choked in a garden of fast-growing weeds; and there were not wanting those who preferred the weeds to the flowers and were ready to say so.

The legacy of conflict into which Washington came was not new. It reached well back into antebellum days. Forty-six years before Tuskegee was founded, North Carolina had abolished its school for free persons of color, in the same year that abolitionist literature had been banned from the United States mails and burned in the streets of Charleston, S. C. Raging in the North, as well as the South, the controversy had split Lane Seminary, resulting in the founding of Oberlin College in the wilds of Ohio to admit students "irrespective of color," to be followed by its sister of like purpose in Berea, Ky.

When Washington came to Tuskegee, it had been 40 years since John Quincy Adams, "old man eloquent," had stood before the United States Supreme Court and successfully convinced the court that the rights guaranteed under the Constitution inhere in each individual, regardless of his color. The Amistad case of 1840 was to be followed by the Dred Scott decision of 1857, in which the same court qualified its earlier stand, declaring that a slave was not a citizen. Booker Washington was a lad of 11 when Lincoln was shot. He grew up in a world where "Carpetbagger" was a term of contempt matched only by "Scalawag," where long chimneys marked the sites of former mansions, where terror stalked the highways and the number of Negroes lynched in a single year sometimes ran into four figures. It was a perilous terrain to walk, in this Alabama village in 1881.

Fear stalked the land. Looking back many years later, Booker Washington recalled the stories of slave insurrections he had heard as a child. From the perspective of maturity he spoke:

"No matter how good the relations between the individual master and his slaves, each race lived in constant fear of the other * * * It is fatally true that no community can live without fear in which one portion of the people seeks to govern the other portion through terror."[2]

As he began his work at Tuskegee, the tragic days of Reconstruction were coming to a close; the equally tragic days of Restoration were already begun. The hooded nightriders frightened out the carpetbaggers and terrorized the freedmen. Indefensible though these things may be, they are understandable. An intolerable sense of injustice spurred the poverty-stricken white South. Unreconciled in defeat and unreconstructed by force of arms, the dominant group set grimly about the business of restoring the old order through new devices. Slavery was gone: in its place came racial caste.

Emancipation had freed the slaves; the 14th and 15th amendments had sought to give freedmen citizenship. But social revolution calls for something more than external change if it is to succeed, and the hearts and minds of men in power rejected the new order of freedom. The whole of

[2] Op. cit., p. 11.

economic, political, social and civic life was to be patterned not along the lines of democracy, but according to ideas of racial domination and subordination. So well entrenched did racial caste become that it was the universal practice throughout the South and much of the North long before the Supreme Court in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* in 1896 admitted the doctrine of "separate but equal" to judicial tolerance.

The amazing thing about human nature is its wide distribution among mankind. The problems of racial caste were not—and are not now—limited to either racial group or to any geographical section of the Nation. With varying degrees of intensity, and with various devices of custom and law and convenience, caste was established throughout the Nation, leaving here and there little islands of democracy. It is not for us to pass judgment upon history; history will judge us. It is enough for us to recall the words of that great Southerner and slave holder, Thomas Jefferson, who said, "I tremble for my country when I think of the Negro and remember that God is just."

There is no cure for blank despair and utter skepticism except through historical perspective. Thus, it can be argued—and I think rightly argued—that slavery was a great step forward in human history when it first was introduced. Previous to the instituting of human slavery, warriors killed their captives. But when a defeated enemy was enslaved instead of killed, he acquired some value. He was worth more as chattel than as a corpse. To place even limited value on human life was to make a step forward. Slavery was better than annihilation.

Similarly, it can be argued that a system of racial caste is better than slavery. Certainly the phenomenal progress of the 90 years since emancipation would not have been possible had slavery continued. The material and spiritual progress symbolized and epitomized in Tuskegee Institute is an enrichment of American life within the confines of caste. It would not have been possible under slavery.

But today's crisis presents us with another choice. Everybody knows that racial caste and democracy are in irrepressible conflict. The only differences are between those who want democracy and those who prefer caste. Once again history moves toward another phrase of the irrepressible conflict, with acceleration and crescendo. Once again we walk a perilous terrain.

The more recalcitrant opponents of democracy, those whom history has dragged screaming and kicking into the 20th century, by their vehemence betray their fears. Did you ever notice that the preacher pounds the Bible hardest precisely when he is least sure of what he is saying? Deep down within themselves, the defenders of white supremacy know they are wrong. Carried on the wave of the future, they struggle against the inevitable. In so doing, they misrepresent the true opinions of most of the people, while at the same time they contribute to the atmosephere of fear and terror which makes difficult the work of men of good will.

Here, for example, is a classic statement in defense the slavery. The Honorable Alexander Stephens is speaking on the constitution of the Confederate States of America:

"Many governments have been founded upon the principle of enslavement of classes, but the classes thus enslaved were of the same race in violation of the laws of nature. * * * The Negro by nature or by the curse of Canaan is fitted for that condition which he occupies in our system. * * * The substratum of our society is made up of material fitted by nature for it, and by experience we know that it is best not only for the superior race but for the inferior race that it should be so. It is indeed in conformity with the ordinance of the Creator." [3]

So spoke the rearguard, defending slavery at the very moment that it was on its way out.

So, too, with the defenders of caste. Midway in the 90 years that caste has been upon us, in 1910, the superintendent of schools of Memphis, Thomas P. Bailey by name, addressed the National Education Association:

"Public peace and the safety of the state demand that the less developed race be subordinated to the more developed, under conditions as they exist in the South today. The caste of kin is the practice of the theory that blood is thicker than water; and the Sermon on the Mount cannot invalidate God's own law of the survival of the fittest. If these widely different races cannot blend their blood—and instinct and science say nay—the only real foundation for democracy, equality, actual or potential, does not exist and cannot be created. * * * Southerners understand the apparent cruelty imputed to the God of Israel, who is represented as commanding the extermination of nonassimilable peoples. But the more refined killing of today in the South is not the taking of a Negro's life but the impassive and relentless murder of a people's hopes. But better this than worse that might be. * * * Sometimes we must be cruel would we be kind." [4]

Reminiscent of the theological and sociological arguments with which slavery had been defended, these words were spoken in defense of caste. This sort of defense has been given often since emancipation. It continues. The more caste is exposed for what it is, the more do its defenders defy the course of history. Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, of Mississippi, rose on the floor of the Senate of the United States on June 20, 1944, and declared:

"I have no prejudice in my heart; but the white race is a superior race and the Negro is an inferior race, and the races must be kept separate by law." [5]

So speaks the voice of rear guard reaction, defending a caste system which is on its way out just as surely as slavery was once on its way out of American life. We can understand this voice for what it is, but it need excite in us neither fear nor condemnation. There are always men who shout their defiance of the onward movement of events. We hear them but are unmoved. We listen rather to the quiet voice of human understanding, leading us forward, undismayed and undeterred.

Just 10 years after Senator EASTLAND made his defense and declared his defiance decision day of May 17, 1954, brought the quiet words of the unanimous High Court for our guidance. "We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place." The death knell of a dying order had struck. Caste, like slavery, was doomed. As the Court said a year later, nothing can be permitted to vitiate that principle—the days of "separate but equal" are gone. We stand on the threshold of democracy.

The question is not whether we shall cross that threshold. The question is only how and when. And if we can disregard the shrill shouts of the terrorists, if we can listen to men of moderation and conviction, we shall step with confidence and quiet fortitude into a brighter future. The issues today are much the same as they were in 1865 or 1881, even though the controversy is on a more advanced level. And today, as in former times, these are years of testing which will separate the men from the boys. We walk a perilous terrain.

II

It was Booker T. Washington's great contribution to American history that he blazed a trail across the ground we now must travel again. How did he make his journey?

No speech in the history of American race relations has had an effect so immediate and electrifying, nor led to so much subsequent controversy, as his Atlanta Exposition speech in 1895. It may be that we can learn something from a fresh examination of that speech, keeping it in the context of its times. What did he say, and under what circumstances?

Facing representatives of all factions in a country which had torn itself asunder over slavery and which was sharply divided over the new institutions of racial control, Washington took his position. To the members of his own race he said, "Cast down your bucket where you are. Cast it down in making friends, in every manly way, of the people of all races by whom you are surrounded." Neither servility nor bitterness, but friendship—friendships to be deliberately sought and affirmatively made.

He threaded a dextrous path between the patterns of the past and the hopes of the future. Accepting as a fact the presence of a system of caste, he said, "In all things that are purely social we can be as separate as the fingers."

But even as he admitted the presence of caste, he rejected its major premises and sowed the seeds of its undoing, for he added: "Yet one as the hand in all things essential to mutual progress."

And if anyone doubts where his true intent lay, let him read again the words which followed immediately on these others:

"There is no defense or security for any of us except in the highest intelligence and development of all. If anywhere there are efforts tending to curtail the fullest growth of the Negro, let these efforts be turned into stimulating, encouraging, and making him the most useful and intelligent citizen. * * * There is no escape through law of man or God from the inevitable:

" 'The laws of changeless justice bind
Oppressor with oppressed;
And close as sin and suffering joined
We march to fate abreast.' "

In the face of the newly established patterns of racial caste, and in the presence of both races and all sections of the Nation, he spoke the sentiments which James Weldon Johnson was later to put in poetic form:

"TO AMERICA

"How will you have us? As we are
Or struggling 'neath the load we bear?
Our eyes fixed forward on a star
Or staring empty in despair?
Rising or falling? Men or things?
With lagging pace or footsteps fleet?
Strong, willing sinews in your wings
Or tight'ning chains about your feet?"

This is the sober truth to which Washington brought his listeners in 1895. From that insistent question he never turned, and never let others turn. "There is no escape through law of man or God from the inevitable," he said, no way to avoid a common destiny toward which we march abreast—together.

Turning again to the members of his own group, he advised the most thorough preparation possible for full participation in and contribution to American life. He insisted that lack of preparation would always stand in the way of full acceptance. For these commonsense statements he has been widely criticized; but it is probable that the perspectives of history give us today a somewhat more serene vantage from which to judge the merits of his utterance. Especially should we note that in the very moment that he

[3] Quoted in B. G. Gallagher, American Caste and the Negro College, p. 10.

[4] Quoted in Odum, Social and Mental Traits of the Negro.

[5] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 20, 1944.

urged Negroes to prepare themselves diligently for enlarged opportunities, he stressed the things for which all should struggle, saying, "It is important and right that all privileges of the law be ours." Put that sentence into the context of fear and timidity at the moment in which he spoke, remember that he was speaking where racial caste was already an accepted fact, and then realize that he was, in fact, arguing 60 years ahead of his time for the opportunities which at long last are becoming ours.

In his decisive hour, Booker T. Washington found a pathway and pointed it out—a path which enabled him and his fellow citizens of both races to face the future together. And in that moment, he showed that this path was one which meant that all compromises were temporary, and that the common destiny which claims us all places us under moral obligation to each other.

No matter what tack his course took, from that moment forward Washington knew his port of destination. A few months later, accepting an honorary degree from Harvard University, he spoke before the alumni dinner:

"Often through oppression, unjust discrimination, and prejudice, but through them all, we are coming up; and with proper habits, intelligence, and property, there is no power on earth that can permanently stay our progress."

He knew whereof he spoke. In his final days he looked back over the crowded years and said with simple conviction, "I do not recall that I ever became discouraged over anything I set out to accomplish."

Oh! Indomitable faith which calmly recognized that nothing can escape the inevitable.

III

Today, we stand in the opening stages of the third great phase of American racial patterns. Slavery has gone, giving way to caste; now caste is doomed, and the glimmerings of democracy are before us. Once again comes the moment in which men of good will and high conviction must refuse to heed the siren calls of political opportunists and parlor demagogs, when we must be undeterred by the threats of the extremists and undaunted in our expectation of the inevitable.

Now, there is a gradualism which is born of fear, fed by terror, and exploited by prejudice. This is not the gradualism of which we speak with approval. There is another kind of gradualism which is best seen in the actual timetable of American history. Surely the believers in democracy have worked through gradual processes.

Were not 2½ centuries of slavery sufficient as a preliminary to caste? And is not a century of caste a long enough period during which to hesitate on the doorstep of democracy? What more gradual process could be wished except by those who would turn the clock of history backward? What more gradual steps could have been taken than are shown in the patient waiting of the millions through the generations of disappointment?

And who is moderate in this present hour? Surely the quiet, clear language of the Supreme Court is given in tones of moderation. Everywhere throughout the Nation, not in a single State or section, the verdict applies. We are enjoined to leave behind the transition stage of separate but equal which has served its day, and to move toward a fuller realization of democracy. Varied local problems must be solved. All that is required is that a prompt and reasonable start toward full compliance be made, and that there be progress with all deliberate speed. Surely this is the course of moderation. The extremists are those who challenge it, call the Court subversive, defy its jurisdiction, and demand that the Constitution itself be revised. The extremists are those who talk irresponsibly of resort to armed force in defiance of the law of the land. They, too, will tire of their role.

For the moderates are already prevailing. Let us not be fooled by the loud words of riotous actions coming from a few places. The moderates are already winning the day. In 12 of the former segregating States, compliance has already been completed or is underway. In 43 of the 48 States, the State supported institutions of higher education admit applicants without reference to race and solely on the basis of personal merit. In more than half of the privately supported colleges and universities of the former segregating States, the doors have been voluntarily opened to all. More than two thousand Negroes are now studying side by side with whites in what were formerly all-white institutions; and this has been accomplished without overt incident and with amazingly satisfactory results. Here are no threats, no intimidations, no wildly circulated rumors and suspicions—no immoderation. Here, instead, is the quiet courage to welcome the inevitable and to step into the future without fear. This is moderation.

And near the top of the list of those who work gradually, and without the tools of terror and excess, we must put the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. The NAACP is accused of extremist action and dubious alliance. There is no word of truth in such accusations. Let the record speak.

The association waited a quarter century before bringing its first suit to open up a single graduate school to one Negro. From the Gaines case to the school segregation cases was another 20 years of quiet, painstaking gradualism in the bending of the color bar. By the time the Court spoke in 1954, that bar was bent so far that it could scarcely be called a bar any longer, except in those islands of resistance were extremists are seeking to defy the inevitable.

In the much publicized case of mob violence at the University of Alabama, you have a perfect illustration of the gradualism with which the NAACP works. Miss Lucy's application at Tuscaloosa roots not in the recently rendered Court verdicts of 1954 and 1955. It goes back to the Heman Sweatt case of 1950. Miss Lucy waited 2½ years after that case before even filing an application; and she waited another 2½ years before pressing he suit for admission. Name one other person, qualified for entrance to the University of the State of Alabama, who has exhibited the patience and gradualism here shown by one who waited 5 years for action.

The NAACP asks for nothing not guaranteed to all citizens by the Constitution of the United States. Is this immoderation? The NAACP has 60 percent of its membership in the former segregating States. Is this rightly to be called agitation by professionals and outsiders? And for that matter, your speaker today has lived longer in Alabama than in any other State. He knows race relations in the Deep South from long study and full experience. He concedes the right of an outsider like Senator EASTLAND to come over to Alabama, and insists on the same right, in discussing a national problem. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, is a moderating influence in American life, made of persons in both races and all sections, working through lawful means to bring closer that day for which all men pray—the day of dignity and decency for every child of God.

Take just one more example of patience and moderation. Look at the record of Federal funds distributed to the States for land-grant colleges and universities. There are two channels through which these funds flow to the States. The first derives from the Morrill Act of 1890 and its subsequent amendments in the Bankhead-Jones and other amending acts. These funds are administered through the United States Offices of Education. For 65 years these funds have come to the 17 segregating States and have been applied with scrupulous honesty in accordance with racial safeguards written into the law. Within each State, the funds have been divided strictly in accordance with population ratios. At present, the Negro institutions receive 30 percent of these funds, as Negroes make up 30 percent of the population. Even in the States where resistance to desegregation is strongest, there has never been any deviation from the honest administration of funds appropriated by Congress under racial safeguards for the land-grant institutions.

But there is another source—and a much larger one—from which funds also come to the States for land-grant institutions. These funds flow through the Department of Agriculture, and Congress did not write racial safeguards into the legislation. Result? When these funds reach the States, they go to the institutions for whites only. If equitable distribution under the old separate but equal doctrine were to have been made, Negroes would have received their fair share of these funds also. Their fair share would have amounted to a little over $7 million, in the most recent year for which reports are available. This is 16 times as much as they actually received under the laws where racial safeguards were observed. Nothing has ever been done about this. Not by the Department of Agriculture to which protests have gone time after time in successive administrations under both political parties. And not by any Chief Executive either. Nothing is being done today, and nothing is promised. Meantime, the Federal funds flow to the States, there to be divided so that Negroes are cheated at the rate of 16 to 1.

Has there been any change in this practice since May 17, 1954? There has not. Despite the full moral authority of the decision of the Supreme Court which could have informed Executive action, the Federal Government continues to send out its funds to be wrongly spent at the rate of 16 to 1. This has been going on for decades. How gradual, how moderate, how silent should we be? Surely we cannot be accused of immoderation or of being extremists if at long last we call for action to correct this evil?

The footnote to this matter is informative. There is now under discussion in the Nation's Capital legislation which proposes to bring Federal aid to the States for schools. In the light of experience with the land-grant colleges and universities, can it be said with any assurance that, where racial safeguards are not included in the legislation, equity results? Let those who feel otherwise assume the burden of proving their contention. I see but one thing which would make racial safeguards in the Federal aid bill unnecessary. Let the voices of moderates, those who believe in complying with the law, in all the States to which these funds will flow—let those who are prepared to welcome Federal funds to do the job justly and wisely and well—say so. And let the voice of moderation respond from the floor of Congress with the quiet assurance that the funds are on the way.

True moderation does not connive to evade the law. True moderation does not accept the Court in the Dred Scott decision and then reject the Court in a later decision. True moderation stands for the rights of all men under the Constitution. True moderation believes in the inevitable.

On this founder's day at Tuskegee Institute, let us recall the faith of the Nation's Founding Fathers.

"We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by the Creator with certain unalienable rights. * * * To secure these rights, governments are formed among men."

It was Tuskegee's founder who held that there is no power on earth which can permanently stay our progress.

As we set out, like him, across a perilous terrain, one sentence of Washington's becomes our compass, our immovable point of reference:

"I will let no man drag me down so low as to make me hate him."

May God richly bless the memory and further the work of the great founder of a great institute.

The Middle of the Road—Where It Leads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an unusually pertinent article entitled "The Middle of the Road—Where It Leads," which, I feel, deserves the attention of every Senator and every other person in America.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Human Events of March 24, 1956]

THE MIDDLE OF THE ROAD—WHERE IT LEADS

(By Richard M. Weaver)

When you drive your car, do you drive in the middle of the road? This seems a silly question to ask because you don't, of course, if you want to stay alive and get somewhere.

But a lot of people have been sold on the idea that the middle of the road is the safest place in politics and on all sorts of controversial questions. They have been led to believe that in the middle position you are out of harm's way and you are more likely to be right than those who are on either side of a question. A little thought will show that this idea is borne not of wisdom but of confusion or fear or both.

Properly speaking, middle-of-the-roadism is not a political philosophy at all. It is rather the absence of a philosophy or an attempt to evade having a philosophy. All great movements in the past have grown out of and have depended upon some self-consistent view of man and society. They have presented a program embodying clear principles, and people have gotten behind the movements because they wanted the principles to triumph. In no case did they labor and fight to see the principles bartered away for a few concessions by the opposition. If they felt they were right, they were not willing to settle by splitting the difference between themselves and the enemy. The great sacrifices of history have not been inspired by political trimming and unmanly compromise. Try imagining the figure that Washington would cut in history today if he had decided on a compromise settlement with the British.

Middle-of-the-road policies have a false attraction for some people because they keep they from having to think a position through. All they have to do is borrow a little from the parties on either side of them, add this us, and tell themselves that this is the "sound" position. But a position half way between right and wrong is not a sound position. It only postpones and makes more difficult the eventual decision. And there are different views of man's destiny which can never be made compatible.

Middle-of-the-roadism is seldom anything more than short-sightedness. It is not an insight into political matters because it is wholly dependent upon what other parties say, or stand for. It takes its bearing from them. And far from being safe, it is just the spot to catch brickbats from both sides.

When you ask people why they have adopted a middle-of-the-road position, you nearly always discover that they fall into these two groups. The first group has been deceived into believing, as we have just noted, that you find the right by averaging right and wrong. If this were true, there would never be any use for intelligence and moral conviction.

The second group is usually fearful of taking a position which an enemy might characterize as "extreme" in spite of the fact that many ideas are attacked as extreme for no other reason than that they express clear-cut principles. Nearly all advocates of principles have been attacked at one time or another as "extremists." But if the principles were sound, the leaders generally prevailed. It does take some intestinal fortitude to champion an idea that has powerful enemies. But people who are frightened by this kind of criticism are usually afraid to stand up for any principle.

There is a third group of middle-of-the-roaders which is even less admirable than these two. These are the opportunists, the believers in pure expediency, who think that the best chance is to take a middle position and play off both sides against each other. Then while the parties on either side are fighting they try to run off with the bacon. These are the ones who believe that you cannot really stand for something and win an election. They are generally afraid of all ideas because their sole object is to get into office. They are politicians in the worst sense of the word. Everybody recognizes this type of political leader.

History, however, shows that they are dead wrong even about the matter of winning. Occasionally dodging about in the middle of the road does lead to a temporary victory. But these are fleeting successes for the simple reason that you can't fool all of the people all the time. In their hearts people despise a trimmer and, as soon as they find him out, they leave him. The great causes which have triumphed and the leaders which have led them have never been found in the middle of the road. They have set their course by some ideal and have resisted all temptations, which have sometimes been many, to come halfway to the other side. And the parties which have played the game of compromise on vital issues have seen their glory and their power vanish. For proof of this, let's go to history.

A century ago this country had an important and powerful party called the Whigs. Its leader was the attractive Henry Clay and he had support from the best elements in all parts of the country. But his party made the fatal mistake of trying the straddle the fence on major issues. As a result, it was not Clay, "the Great Compromiser," who went to the White House, but the hard-hitting Andrew Jackson. By 1856 the Whig Party was dead. Stephen A. Douglas tried the same trick, looking for the middle of the road between issues that were in direct conflict. He lost to Abraham Lincoln, who had taken a definite stand on one side. Even when the Democratic Party has won, on issues that many do not approve of, it has done so in taking a decisive stand for something. Better an opponent whose position you are certain of than a supposed friend whose only interest is in dodging the crucial issues. Such has generally been the judgment of the American voters on those who were merely looking for the line of least resistance.

We find that the story has been the same if we look at British politics. Two generations ago there was a powerful party in England called the Liberal Party. It was able to win elections at times and name the Prime Minister. Today it is little more than a ghost, a negligible element in British political life. The explanation of its demise is the same as that of the American Whigs. It tried to be a middle-of-the-road party, a party of compromise. But as always, the more pressing issues became, the more impatient people became with temporizing and half solutions. The result was that the Liberal Party was squeezed to death between the Conservative Party and the rising Labor Party. These represent with considerable distinctness a right and a left. That is to say, they offer the people reasonably clear alternatives. The poor Liberal Party, interested solely in being tepid on all matters, has virtually ceased to exist.

So much for the claim that the middle of of the road is the path to success. Dodging issues and watering down solutions is not merely the way to failure; it is the way to extinction.

All great political parties owe their vitality to the importance of the things they stand for. And this is never truer than in periods of defeat which, in the normal alteration of political circumstances, must sometimes occur. A beaten party with a real issue has an excellent chance of coming back. A beaten party without an issue is a dead duck. And those parties which have tied their fortunes to some personality who happens to excite the masses are only setting a term to their effectiveness. When he goes, as he must, the wind is out of their sails. A party which has abandoned issues for personalities cannot overnight make itself a party of principles again.

These considerations have a melancholy bearing upon the situation in our country today. There is one group, not clearly distinguished by a party name, but quite definite about what it wants and expects to bring about in this Nation. Most accurately speaking, it is the party of collectivism. It works on various fronts and under various labels, but there need be no confusion about its objectives. It wants an America, new-modeled according to the Soviet Union.

There are two ideas in the philosophy of collectivism of which every American ought to be aware. One of them is a thoroughgoing materialism, which insists that man is merely a natural animal, which repudiates religion and all belief in the Divine Providence, and which maintains that happiness is purely a matter of gratifying this animal's appetites. The other idea is that the state is supreme and the individual nothing; that society should be managed down to the smallest details by a centralized authority, and that there is no higher power—no human tradition, no conscience, no precept of religion—by which this control can be criticized. An all-powerful state, designed along engineering lines to satisfy the physical wants of the masses, is their aim and goal, although often it is their method to admit only part of it at a time. In the writings of their prophets, Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, however, it is revealed without any squeamishness.

You would think that in this country of ours, with its heritage and its achievements, there would be a tremendous outcry and opposition to anything so one-sided in its interpretation of history and man's nature and so chilling to human instincts.

There is a great segment of our population to the right of collectivism and morally committed to fight it. Strange as it may sound, however, a good many of its leaders have adopted the policy of appeasement. Instead of issuing a direct challenge, in terms of principle, they have tried to see how many concessions they could make without being

accused of surrender. They have tried to see how closely they could approach the position of collectivism while still paying lipservice to what they are supposed to be defending.

Logic and duty call for them to stand up for their side, not to fight the battle by retreating from it. They have sought a middle-of-the-road position between a militant collectivism and our tradition of freedom and individualism. Historical examples show that the next step is capitulation, or liquidation of the party which is so cowardly.

If this should come about, it will certainly be recorded by history that no people ever gave up so much for so little. We possess a great, beautiful, inspiring country. In our comparatively brief history we have created some traditions that any people would be proud to sustain; we have borne leaders and heroes to match those out of Plutarch; we have accomplished many things which by previous standards were thought impossible. We have combined equality with a method of rewarding success and distinction which has no parallel in history in its ability to produce social satisfaction and incentive to achievement.

Best of all, we have created a spirit of kindness and helpfulness which mitigates the lot of life's failures without trying absurdly to place them in the driver's seat. Every candid foreign observer is struck by this, and we feel intuitively that it is a very American thing. "Nowhere is cruelty more abhorred," Lord Bryce wrote admiringly of the America he saw. Now it is proposed to exchange this for the regimentation, the directives, the penalties, perhaps even the forced labor camps and executions of an alien and inhuman philosophy.

There is little doubt that the middle of the road today leads in this direction. The radicals know what they want; too many of the rest of us only temporize and hope. Already a good many people are behaving as if their conscience hurt them over being American, so they give a little here and a little there in the hope of not being too offensive to the truculent enemy.

This is the reason that even the election of 1952 did not halt creeping socialism. Because no influential leader drew the line in terms of clear principle, the immence bureaucracy of the New Deal was allowed to consolidate itself further. This and that clamorous group has been able to extort state aid according to New Deal methods. All candid observers realize that the trend toward statism has not yet been reversed.

The need of the time is for a leadership willing to face the facts. Complacency toward what is happening is a betrayal of the America we have inherited. The kind of leader that people are willing to stay with, and to sacrifice personally for, is the kind that says, "I'm going to fight it out on this line if it takes all summer." Wavering and self-defeat through compromise where vital points are at stake never yet held a following. To win this struggle we have got to get on the right side of the road and keep it with resolution.

Small Business Loan Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD an article appearing in Facts magazine of March 1956, with reference to the loan and assistance program of the Small Business Administration.

The article follows:

Small business can be the corner grocer or a medium-size bottling factory. Definitions are as infinite as the size and scope of small business.

Congress defines a small business concern in this general framework: one which is independently owned and operated and not dominant in its field of operation.

HOW MANY SMALL BUSINESSES?

Under this and certain other criteria used in determining whether a firm is eligible for Federal assistance, 4,000,000 of the Nation's estimated 4,200,000 business establishments are considered to be small business.

WITHOUT A NAY

Small business is important business.

Public Law 268 passed without a nay vote last summer. It extended for 2 more years the Small Business Administration, brought into being July 30, 1953. The lawmakers, apparently, believed in the bill's preamble which declared that Congress and the Government "should aid, counsel, assist and protect * * * the interests of small business concerns."

HOW?

In carrying out this program, the SBA offers three major services:

Contracts assistance: It aids small firms in obtaining a fair share of Government contracts, military and civilian. Big producers and contractors are also urged to place more orders with small firms.

Management and technical aid: SBA assists owners of small businesses with their problems through counseling, publications, and cooperating with educational institutions in furnishing administrative management courses for owners.

Loans: It grants business and disaster loans when necessary financial aid is not available from private sources.

WANT A LOAN?

There may be some redtape involved in applying for an SBA loan, but pull is not a factor. A small-business man in distress should first apply to his own bank. If he is turned down, the bank may be willing later to make the loan if SBA will share it. The original application can go through any one of SBA's 37 field offices.

Some basic credit requirements: Good character, evidence of ability to operate the business successfully, sufficient capital to assure that (with the loan) the applicant can operate on a sound basis, and reasonable assurance of repayment of the loan.

CAUTIONS AND LIMITATIONS

SBA money is taxpayers' money. Loans must conform to the law—no shenanigans allowed. Requests for some types of loans will never qualify.

SBA can lend up to $250,000 to a single borrower. The terms: (1) maturity period may range from several months to 10 years; (2) interest is usually 6 percent per year on direct loans. In loans in which the SBA participates with a bank, the rate may be lower. Collateral may consist of: mortgage on plant and equipment; assignment of warehouse receipts for marketable merchandise; assignment of certain types of contracts; a mortgage on chattels; or, in some instances, assignment of current receivables.

CEILING EXCEPTION

The $250,000 loan ceiling does not apply to corporations formed by smallbusiness concerns for pool production or purchase of raw materials or supplies. Here the ceiling may be $250,000 multiplied by the number of firms in the pool.

SCORECARD

Breakdown on loans through December 31, 1955:

Business loans: Approved 2,270 business loans totaling $114,045,903. About two-thirds of these were made in participation with banks and other lending institutions. Further breakdown: Direct loans: 767 for $32,340,426. Participation loans: 1,503 for $81,705,477.

Disaster loans: Approved 3,299 for $37,904,978. The disaster loan ceiling, $25 million set by law, was reached during the New England floods. SBA continued to make loans on a business-loan basis (interest ceiling of 6 percent). The disaster-loan rate is 3 percent.

FURTHER REPORT

Contracts assistance: Proposed Government purchases totaling $778,681,486 earmarked for small business through November 25. Small concerns had received 7,915 contract awards amounting to $418,905,426.

Referral program: Field offices of the SBA have made more than 289,000 notifications of prime contract opportunities, and small firms have received contracts in substantial amounts in the period from July 1, 1954 to November 1, 1955.

The SBA moved recently to help small merchants modernize their businesses. The new program: SBA will lend up to $15,000 for as long as 5 years to those who rent space and have little except fixtures and inventory to show for collateral. Normally, such small merchants could get bank loans for only 60 to 120 days. A backstop for the Government in the program requires the local banks to underwrite 25 percent of the loan.

PUSHED AROUND?

There has been talk of small-business men in distress being pushed around because of the law itself and an overly stringent administration. The arguments: A loan is available only if it can't be obtained from private sources. This (it is charged) means you can't be eligible for SBA help unless you are a bad credit risk.

Other charges: SBA demands too much security. Loan investigations take too long. There are too many instances in which the law forbids loans, and there is too much redtape in applying for a loan.

BANK'S ATTITUDE

The banks are generally cooperative with SBA's activities and small business. In addition to participating in two-thirds of loans granted to date, the banks have loaned personnel and set up offices on the scene in times of disaster. (William Kelly, spokesman for the American Bankers' Association, expressed some hostility last year in testimony on Capitol Hill; he said there were instances in which SBA interferes with banks' activities.)

SBA is aware of the complaints against it and feels they are unjustified. The agency points out: It must follow the law as it was passed. It wasn't set up to compete with banks. It endeavors to make only sound loans. A bank many times has prior knowledge of an applicant's background. Uncle Sam is starting from scratch in each instance. Yet, SBA says the average time of a loan investigation is a month.

RULES, RULES, RULES

Some rules are SBA's own, such as the criteria (allowed by law) used in determining in specific cases whether a concern is small business. Here they are:

A manufacturing firm employing more than 250 and less than 1,000 may qualify, depending on the size standard set for its particular industry.

Distribution trades: Net sales of $5 million per year is the ceiling in the wholesale field; it is $1 million in the retail field.

Service trades: Small if receipts are $1 million or less annually.

Government work: Where the SBA is giving contract assistance, a firm employing less than 500 qualifies.

THE OTHER EYE

At year's end the Nation's economy still was booming, and small business was helping to make some of the noise. But small-business men, even in this optimistic atmosphere, have one eye on business indices, the other on Washington, in this election year.

COMMITTEE DOORS

Rarely does Congress make small business an open target. But some pot-shots are taken behind closed committee doors. When the SBA extension bill was stalled in the Rules Committee, an emergency 1-month extension was pushed through to save the law from dying July 30. Finally, on the night of adjournment, the 2-year measure was passed.

LOOKING AHEAD

Congress has been passing laws for more than 60 years aimed at helping small business. Most have been controversial; none has been universally welcomed. During the current session of Congress, small business will be watching to try to prevent the loss of any of its gains of past years. Of particular interest: proposed amendments to the wage and hour laws, and the study of NLRB jurisdictional criteria.

SBA PROPOSALS

Congress has been asked to lift the disaster loan ceiling of $25 million by several millions of dollars in order that New England flood loans of last year may be converted to the disaster-type (3 percent interest category). This has bipartisan backing.

There are only a few millions of dollars left in the $105 million revolving fund for business loans. (The first substantial repayment of loans is just beginning to come in.) The total fund is often estimated as too small to do real good. Should the repayment procedure bog down, the SBA would be in the same distressed fix as many of the small businesses it has helped. The present law authorizes a revolving fund of $175 million, but the full total has never been appropriated. If more funds are needed because of heavy disaster loans this year, Congress would have to authorize more money.

SBA could also use, but probably won't get, a hike in its own budget, which now totals about $5,500,000, covering 750 permanent employees.

FAILURES

Why this concern over small business? The answer: The farmer and other segments of society have long been given special attention. Proof of the need: Business failures in 1954, 11,086; failures in 1955 also exceeded 11,000. Such failures, say SBA experts, are traceable to a lack of technical know-how, merchandising and management, or both.

It is usually a new, rather than an established business, which fails. Many times it is one which was started with insufficient capital to weather the rough spots of the early years. The old saw, "It takes money to make money," still holds true.

Petition Regarding the Siler Bill, H. R. 6427, and the Langer Bill, S. 923

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I have received the following letter on behalf of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air:

BUTTE, MONT.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. METCALF: I am sending you a petition about the Siler and Langer bills. Will you kindly include the number of signers in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD? Thank you.

Sincerely,

THURE JOHNSON.

Enclosed with this letter was the following petition, signed by 24 residents of Butte:

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition you to exercise the proper discretion vested in you by passing legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air, a practice which nullifies the rights of the State under the 21st amendment to control the sale of such beverages.

At a time when 1 out of 10 drinkers is becoming an alcoholic there should be no encouragement to increasing the use of such beverages. Children and youth are being misled to consider them harmless, especially by the audio and visual suggestion of radio and television.

Mrs. Thure Johnson, Mrs. Arne Adsem, Mrs. Lulu Boggs, Mrs. Elmer Carlson, William C. Dockins, Art Johnson, Ruth Hanson, Mrs. Audrey Stoughton, Mrs. James Cadigan, Mrs. Jo Ann McKindau, Rhynold C. Arich, Mrs. Mary J. McLeod, Mrs. Margaret Wirtz, Mrs. Fern Gregerson, Mrs. O. J. Wenger, Mrs. R. C. Arich, Mr. Clarence R. Foster, Mrs. Clarence R. Foster, Thure Johnson, Mrs. Elmer Wilson, Elmer Wilson, Mrs. Lillian L. Comer, Mrs. William Boggs, Mary Shaffer, Butte, Mont.

International Paper Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. F. NORRELL
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

NEWS RELEASE ISSUED BY INTERNATIONAL PAPER CO.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 10.—The International Paper Co. plans for immediate construction of a newsprint and bleached kraftboard mill were announced today by John H. Hinman, chairman of the board of directors of International Paper Co.

Mr. Hinman said that the new $57 million mill will be located near Pine Bluff, Ark. It will have an annual capacity of 130,000 tons of newsprint and 165,000 tons of bleached kraft board.

International Paper Co. is presently completing a 115,000-ton newsprint mill at Mobile, Ala. This mill, which is scheduled to start up in September of this year, will be the first newsprint mill ever operated by the company in the South.

The chemical pulp mill and bleached kraft machine in the Pine Bluff mill are expected to be in operation by the third quarter of 1957, followed about the end of the year by the ground-wood mill and the newsprint machine. The mill will employ about 1,450 men and women when it is in full operation.

Arkansas is third in the Nation in the number of tree farms, and timber harvest is an important cash crop to most farmers. For many years International Paper Co. has purchased about 85 percent of the wood consumed by its mill at Camden, Ark., from farmers and small landowners, and in recent years the company has opened six mechanized pulpwood concentration yards in the State to provide convenient local markets where pulpwood may be sold directly to the company.

"The rapid industrial and agricultural expansion in the South in recent years has made it one of the fastest growing markets in the world for newsprint," Mr. Hinman said today. "Completion of the projected Arkansas mill will make it possible for our company to make a substantial addition to the South's newsprint resources and will help us to meet the expanding demand in the Southern States for locally produced newsprint."

Last year, International Paper's Canadian subsidiaries produced a total of 864,469 tons of newsprint. Announced additions to the company's Canadian capacity were delayed to some extent primarily because of difficulties experienced in obtaining prompt delivery of equipment, but will reach an annual rate of 920,000 tons later this year.

The company was one of the pioneers in the production of bleached kraft fourdrinier board during the late 1930's. This is the strong, white paperboard used in food packaging, particularly frozen foods and the foods sold by the supermarkets in individual prepackaged units.

In 1925, the company was the first major paper company to move South. Today their southern kraft division operates 9 pulp, paper, and board mills in 6 Southern States, and employs approximately 18,000 men and women. Backing up its manufacturing operation is a staff of 450 trained foresters who manage the company's acreage and work with the thousands of farmers and small landowners throughout the South who supply pulpwood to the mills.

Peter D. Vroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there was waiting for me on my return from a few days in my district in Chicago a letter telling of the death of Peter D. Vroom. For half a century he was my close friend. For a number of years illness had confined him to his home, but the bonds of a long and dear friendship were kept freshly vibrant by frequent exchange of letters. I shall miss those messages from my friend who now has passed to another and a higher sphere.

Peter D. Vroom was one of the finest newspapermen that I have ever known. He was reporter on the Chicago Tribune during the colorful era of James Keeley. Oldtimers in Chicago will recall Jim Keeley as a powerful and dynamic newspaper editor. Pete Vroom was so close to Jim Keeley that when the latter left the service of the Chicago Tribune to take over the public relations of the Pullman Co., Pete Vroom went with him.

The world in which he was such a vibrant personality has gone. He was past

80 when the hand of death was laid upon him, and most if not all of his associates in the journalism of the period of his prime had preceded him to the grave. I should not want his passing to go unnoticed. He was in every sense of the world a great American, and he lived up to a great and a proud name.

I am happy that that name of Peter D. Vroom will be continued in the generation of the present by his son, also named Peter D. Vroom. Back in colonial days, in the early years of the Republic and in the developing years that followed there has always been a Peter D. Vroom. How many of that name and of that blood served as governors, as judges in the courts and in other high public offices I cannot say with exactness, but the number was large.

One of that family, whose name erroneously is spelled Broom in some published lists of the makers and signers of the Constitution of the United States, was but 35 years of age when he served with Washington, Madison, Hamilton, and the other immortals in the writing of the Constitution of our country. Maj. William Pierce, a fellow delegate to the Constitutional Convention, spells the name correctly "Vroom," in his pen sketches of his fellow delegates.

If my colleagues will turn to page 1959 of the biographical directory of the American Congress they will find that another of the family blood and name, Peter V. Vroom, was elected as a Democrat to the 26th Congress, convening on March 4, 1839. This Peter D. Vroom was electer Governor of New Jersey as a Jackson Democrat in 1829, 1830, 1831, 1833, 1834, 1835, and 1836. He was a presidential elector on the Democratic ticket of Pierce and King in 1852 and also a presidential elector on the Democratic ticket of Seymour and Blair in 1868. He at all times carried proudly the name of Peter D. Vroom. My friend whose death has brought to me a load of grief carried proudly and well in his day and generation that name. To the son, to whom is left the rich heritage of a good and famous name, is presented a challenge that I know he will meet in the spirit of his father and his forebears.

To the widow, Hope, and to the son I extend my deepest sympathy.

Civil-Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced two more legislative proposals prepared in collaboration with the Department of Justice to supplement the measures introduced Monday as part of the administration's civil-rights program. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER], who joined in proposing to establish a bipartisan Commission on Civil Rights and a Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department on Monday, are likewise sponsoring this legislation.

One of these bills is designed to, first, prevent anyone from threatening, intimidating, or coercing a voter in any election; second, authorize the Attorney General to institute civil action in such cases; and, third, eliminate the requirement that all other remedies must be exhausted before cases can reach the Federal courts. The second proposal would give the Attorney General authority to bring civil suits against civil-rights conspiracies, such as groups attempting to deprive a citizen of equal treatment. In the past, such suits could be filed only by the injured individual.

Enactment of these 2 measures and the 2 introduced Monday will be an important step forward in guaranteeing the civil rights of all citizens regardless of race, creed, color, or political affiliation. At an appropriate time during the deliberations of the Judiciary Committee next week I shall offer these four proposals in a single bill as a substitute for the omnibus measure which we are now considering.

I trust that serious and open-minded consideration will be given these proposals. If we try to bite off more than we can chew, Congress will get exactly nowhere—as in the past. On the other hand, if we follow the administration's moderate and constructive suggestions on civil rights I am confident we can reach agreement and get favorable action. Solid accomplishment is now possible. Let us not ruin the chances of success by an unrealistic approach to this serious national problem.

Discharge Petition on H. R. 11 Unnecessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a most unusual petition has been filed to discharge the House Committee on the Judiciary from further consideration of Mr. PATMAN'S bill, H. R. 11. This petition seeks to force a vote on this bill on the House floor without the benefit of committee hearings.

Members of the House, and particularly those who have signed or indicated an interest in signing this petition, should be apprised of all the facts. They should know that the House Judiciary Committee scheduled hearings on this bill well prior to the filing of the discharge petition. Specifically, on February 24, 1956, I advised Representative PATMAN by letter that the House Judiciary Antitrust Subcommittee would hold hearings on his bill April 18, 19, and 20, and would afford all interested parties an opportunity to testify. Some 2 weeks later, on March 12, the discharge petition was filed.

It is not only unusual, I think it is unprecedented, for a discharge petition to be filed after the chairman of a standing committee of this body announces that he is scheduling hearings on a bill.

Members should also understand the complexity and far-reaching effect of H. R. 11. Without prejudging this bill in any respect, it should be noted that it seek sto overturn a 1951 decision of the Supreme Court in the Standard Oil of Indiana case. If ever there has been a bill pending before Congress which requires careful deliberation, this is such a bill. Manifestly, it should not be voted upon by the membership of the House without benefit of committee hearings, including cross examination of witnesses, and committee recommendations.

This bill, H. R. 11, is designed to amend the antitrust laws. I think the record of the House Judiciary Antitrust Subcommittee shows beyond question extreme vigilance in support of the competitive principles embodied in the antitrust laws. Never before, to my knowledge, has a discharge petition been filed on an antitrust bill.

In light of these considreations, together with the fact that intensive hearings will be held on H. R. 11 starting next week, those who have already signed the discharge petition may well wish to reconsider and withdraw their signatures.

Report on Southern Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Southern Italy: Land Reborn." This interesting report was writen by John J. Navone, S. J., and appeared in the January 14 issue of America magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Europe and all the world are today watching the regeneration of southern Italy. There the political battle for men's loyalties has reached a climax. The south is the cockpit of Italy, and it is there that the future of the Italian Republic may well be decided.

For centuries the barren, teeming southern two-fifths of Italy, which is home to 37 percent of the nation's people, has been a vast poorhouse. World War II, which destroyed 28 percent of the south's already lagging industrial capacity, seemed the final blow. Hundreds of men, young and old, unable to work because there were no jobs, lounged in scores of squalid town squares. Of every 1,000 southern Italians, only 308 were employed. Better-off southern Italians lived 4 and 5 in a room; the destitute inhabited caves, for in many villages there had been no new building for a hundred years.

Since the war, the Italian Government has poured millions of lire into the south in an all-out effort to bring economic health to the land and people of this backward area. New plows broke 3 feet of earth where for

centuries the surface had been barely scratched by the ancient ox-drawn implements. New land was cleared, fertilized, and irrigated at Government expense. New peasant proprietors for the first time tilled their own fields, which they had bought from the wealthy landholders.

NEW FACE OF THE SOUTH

Should nostalgia ever call the former Calabrian or Apulian emigrant back to his home, he will find little to remind him of former days. Soon it will be beyond recognition. In the Tuscan Maremma, in sun-hammered Lucania, trails have become roads; roads have been transformed into highways. The wilderness has been cleared.

If the former emigrant goes to Rome, he can examine the blueprints of farmhouses, resembling Swiss chalets, that are now beginning to scatter life over the desert. The great Sila Plateau and the Caulonian Plains of Calabria are typical of the seven official zones of the land reform. Here the land has been divided and planted and has begun to pay under the new small peasant proprietors.

With the whole face of southern Italy changing, the north will not be long in feeling the effects. Since the days of Italy's unification of 1870, the taxes of the north have been drained off into the economically deficient south. Now industrial towns and cities will rise up in the south too. But growth will be slow and gradual. New markets will create new industries. People with money to spend will create a demand for commodities, but the people do not yet have the money. The March 1955 issue of Esteri reported that Italy's per capita annual income was only $385 in 1954.

FINANCIAL BLOOD TRANSFUSION

In June 1955 hopes soared high in the south. A $70-million World Bank loan, the largest European development credit granted by the Bank to date, went to Italy's Cassa per il Mezzogiorno (Southern Development Fund), the special Government agency set up in 1950 to push a 12-year $2-billion southern economic revival program. Hampered by petty politics and insufficient funds ($180 million yearly), the Cassa moved slowly, but results are already apparent. Under the stimulation of this new prosperity, private investors have poured $329 million into the region. The Cassa has built 18,000 new farmhouses and 1,800 miles of road, and has increased electrical consumption by 43 percent. It has created about 200,000 full-time jobs and added 2 percent to the national income.

As of October 1954 it had redistributed 1.16 million acres of land, making proud landowners (of 10–15-acre farms) out of 90,000 peasants. Other detailed projects are still to come: safe drinking water for 1,200 towns, irrigation projects, construction of 1,300 miles of new roads and rehabilitation of 6,400 miles of old ones, new hotels to attract tourists.

Last June's World Bank loan, in which the Bank of America has a $5-million share, will finance a $20-million irrigation project to triple the annual value of the Catania Plain's agricultural production by 1967 and create 10,000 new farm jobs in the immediate area. Another $20 million will help private investors finance seven new factories (fertilizer, fruit processing, cement, chemicals, and medicine, pulp and paper, woolens). The remaining $30 million will build eight power projects to increase southern Italy's electric generating capacity by one-sixth. Through such loans Italian dreams become a reality.

MORAL REPERCUSSIONS

The implications of an economic revival for southern Italian morality will be tremendous. The July issue of Italian Affairs revealed the discrepancy in morals between north and south when it stated that thrice as many crimes had been reported in Naples as in Milan during 1953, though these two cities have populations of about the same size. The hitherto wretched economic state of the south has spawned begging, disease, and prostitution on a grand scale. Hundreds of thousands of peasants used to present themselves a few hours before dawn in the squares of the big communes to offer their services for work. When the contractor arrived, only a portion of these were taken on. Those left without work cursed the society that proved incapable of insuring everyone a loaf of bread and a hopeful future.

But what if the peasant were fortunate enough to be employed? The daily wage in southern Italy is about $1.25 for men and 80 cents for women. Furthermore, the average farmworker in the south works only 78 days a year. In Campania he can find work for only 43 days and in Sicily for only 77. This points to another factor differentiating north and south. In Lucania, in the south, for example, 65 percent of the income comes from the land, whereas in Lombardy, in the north, only 17 percent comes from that source. Industrialized Lombardy, with only one-eighth of the national population, produces nearly one-third the national income.

The Italian Government realized that the problem is not only economic but moral. The Cassa agency was created to provide homes for the poor, because Italians have always realized that a proper home environment is essential to rebuilding the family and the nation. The organization builds communities of attractive redtiled homes with gardens in localities where the inhabitants can find opportunities for work. By October 1954, it had completed over 111,000 such dwellings. This figure does not include a far greater number built by various cooperatives and private firms. By rebuilding homes, Italy is also rebuilding its family life.

NEW LIFE ON THE LAND

The new proprietor pays $3,000 for his farm over a 30-year period. Each farm costs the Government approximately $6,000. The yield from these farms is already twice that of farms in the same area not sharing in the benefits of the reconstruction program. Within walking distance of each set of farmhouses, a community center is either reconstructed or built anew. Every community is provided with a church and resident priest. A nursery run by sisters, a first-aid station, a clubhouse, a large meeting room where movies can be shown and a cooperative grocery store are found in every center. The farmers are instructed in the latest methods of scientific farming and husbandry and given fertilizers, seeds, vines, and young fruit trees. The Government gives tractors and other equipment to the community cooperative.

Santa Maria di Respeccia, Gaudiano, Borgo Appio and scores of other new rural villages mean far more than the increased production of foodstuffs. They mean that many former cave and tenement dwellers are being given a sense of personal dignity and encouragement to participate in the social life of their communities.

A new life has begun for the former victims of poverty, who are now buying dress and suit material, shoes, bicycles, kitchen implements, even toys.

AMERICA AND ITALY

Now that the period of Italy's postwar tutelage is almost over, America's task becomes that of helping Italy to grow stronger in her own right. It is doubtful whether the United States can ever become an adequate market for Italy's agricultural exports. American tourism, even on a grand scale, can hardly serve as a deciding factor in the difficult national economy. What we can do, through more humane immigration policies, is to open our doors wider to Italy's surplus population. For despite every remedial measure, unemployment in Italy cannot be brought below the 2 million mark. America should also take the lead in establishing a long-range international resettlement program of adequate proportions.

Italy simply cannot go ahead fast enough to satisfy some Americans. They fail to appreciate the stubborn practical difficulties confronting the Italian Government. Many, for example, were disappointed with the outcome of the Sicilian elections of June, 1955, in which the Communists polled 30.6 percent of the vote. (It was 30.2 in 1953.) Why, they wonder, cannot the government win public confidence faster?

Government surveys help to explain why middle-of-the-road parties in Italy, as elsewhere, find the going hard. They show that nearly 2 percent of Italians live in cellars, garrets, or warehouses. Nearly 90,000 families live in caves. All in all, nearly one-fifth of the entire population lives in subnormal housing conditions. More than 7 percent never have meat, sugar or wine, or another 8 percent have these items only infrequently. With the exception of the Portuguese and Greeks, the Italians have the lowest daily calorie-consumption rate in Europe. Some 2.7 million families are still in the "impoverished" bracket.

The Abbé Pierre has observed that every society has a law that can be called the law of life or death. It is this: a society becomes decadent when it orientates its activities toward bettering the lot of those who are already comfortable, leaving the surplus, if any, for the poor. Conversely, a society finds harmony and prosperity when an essential aim of its activity and production is to satisfy the needs of those who are in want. If the Abbé Pierre's observation is correct—and "I believe that, at least in the case of countries like France, Spain, and Italy it is—then Italy seems to be on the right track.

Statement of Edward L. Torbert, Vice President, Onondaga Pottery Co., in Behalf of Vitrified China Tableware Industry, Before the Ways and Means Committee on H. R. 5550, March 13, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Edward L. Torbert made an excellent statement before the Ways and Means Committee on March 13 against H. R. 5550. This bill would provide for United States participation in the Organization for Trade Cooperation which would mean an American endorsement of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade recently formulated at Geneva.

If Congress continues to surrender its powers to regulate the tariff and commerce, it will have adverse effects on many of our domestic industries. The Onondaga Pottery Co., manufacturers of vitrified china tableware, of Syracuse, N. Y., has already suffered from unfair foreign competition. Many other industries in every section of our country will likewise suffer unless we here in Congress unite and protect the economy of the United States.

I commend the statement of Mr. Torbert to the attention of this Congress and the American people:

Mr. Chairman, my name is Edward L. Torbert. I am vice president of Onondaga Pottery Co., manufacturers of vitrified china tableware.

At every opportunity afforded by public hearings since inception of the Trade Agreements Act I have spoken on behalf of the vitrified china industry of the United States. Today I represent the same industry interests as well as the company with which I am presently employed.

May I make plain at the outset of my remarks that I am not opposed to international trade and United States participation in it. Exchange of goods between nations is a desirable practice when this can be carried on to the mutual advantage of participating countries.

We are considering here the proposal, H. R. 5550, which would authorize a procedure in implementation of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 and our Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955 through United States participation in the Organization for Trade Cooperation and subscription to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

To the extent that this trade legislation, enacted and proposed, stimulates trade between nations that is mutually advantageous, I favor it. However, when the intentions of the proposers and administrators of such legislation are clearly dedicated to expanding international trade on the theory that greater trade is a desirable objective in itself, then I am unalterably opposed to it.

While I shall speak with respect to H. R. 5550, it is impossible for me to contemplate this proposed legislation except in the light of bitter firsthand experience in seeking relief from fateful decisions of committees and negotiators whom you have, to date, entrusted with the responsibility of entering into equitable trade agreements with other nations.

We have in this country many long-established industries using native raw materials, employing American workers efficiently at United States labor rates and supplying products for the United States markets they helped to create.

It is an indisputable fact that our Government has assisted and encouraged the production and imports of displacing foreign products as a means of making available the dollars needed by foreign countries to pay for needed United States exports.

This reckless sacrifice of American job security and capital investment is the work of individuals to whom Congress has turned over the power to negotiate trade agreements. Under their handling, the burden of foreign aid, which should be shouldered equally by all citizens, is being forced upon a helpless segment of our industrial economy.

Aside from the injustice of this inexcusable hurt to individuals and industries, we have, in my opinion, clear warnings of danger to our general economy and standards of living.

Just a word about our vitrified china household tableware industry. At each hearing to which reference has already been made, I reported the progress of imported china tableware. Today I have the letest available information. In 1955 the total imports of household china tableware, including Japan, United Kingdom and Germany, reached the amazing total of 6,872,000 dozens. This is more than 90 percent of all the household china purchased in the United States in 1955. Our United States producers of china tableware shared among themselves less than 10 percent of our United States market. What percentage of our market must any industry give up to the foreign low-wage producers before it can be assured by our negotiators at GATT of any part of our market?

The ascendancy of foreign producers in world markets is a matter of record. American manufacturers, who were at first concerned with retention of their foreign business, now find their domestic trade threatened by imports. A growing number of such firms is being obliged to transfer operations to low-wage areas abroad in an attempt to cope with this situation.

I can report that, within my limited acquaintanceship, there are men in three industries who have swung from a public position of freer trade to a private admission that American business must be protected—this in a 2-year period. Each has felt or foresees the pinch of foreign competition. Each, for reasons of expediency, must be silent at this time.

I do not feel that I exaggerate this situation. I am also concerned over dependence on the Escape Clause section of the Trade Agreements Act of 1955 and provisions of Section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to relieve these problems. Both are cumbersome procedures even if there were a disposition to make the best possible use of them.

With the economic effects of rising foreign competition making themselves felt in all parts of our land, a further divorcing of foreign trade regulation from congressional control could have grave consequences indeed.

I share the opinion of many, and I hope you gentlemen are included, that this is no time, if there ever is a right time, to surrender any right to control our industrial and agricultural destiny to an international body of economics whose interests and ideologies differ greatly from our own.

There can be no doubt that, in matters of trade, the GATT has served certain nations well and that representatives of the United States in that body have yielded much in pursuit of their goal of an international trade organization with teeth in it.

United States delegates are on record as opposing our use of quotas, tariffs and other regulatory devices; the need for which the Congress of the United States, on the other hand, clearly recognizes. Yet our United States delegates to the GATT approve the use of trade controls by other GATT members.

Presumably, the United States would have to be reduced to a relative position of economic and trade disadvantage before our delegates would ask other nations to permit the Congress of the United States to employ trade controls as a means of raising the level of American industrial and agricultural activity to that of GATT members in general.

This giveaway attitude evidenced by our delegates may explain, in part, the mockery which is made of peril-point hearings and other procedures legislated by Congress to provide just treatment of domestic interests.

In conclusion, I should like to borrow two paragraphs from the letter of a businessman which, I understand, each of you has received recently:

"In this day, when much of United States industry is still adjusting to the postwar effects of international trade revival and when we hear increasing talk of commercial exchange with countries behind the Iron Curtain, I wonder if we are moving in the right direction with GATT and OTC.

"Would it not be more prudent for us, instead, to bring a little closer to Congress the control of our imports and exports to make sure that industry and agriculture in this country are kept strong in our fight to save democracy from communism?"

I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you again.

Communism Still Wars on Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, in a recent issue of the U. S. News & World Report there appears an article entitled "Communism Still Wars on Religion," written by Msgr. Maurice S. Sheehy, a Catholic clergyman and a member of the Naval Reserve Forces of the United States. The article is a very penetrating one, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNISM STILL WARS ON RELIGION

(By Msgr. Maurice S. Sheehy)

The Communist strategy of divide and conquer is nowhere more apparent than in the field of religion. Since religion, of whatsoever form, is the only power that the Communist leadership fears, it must be destroyed. A tolerance is shown only to those political sycophants who wear ecclesiastical clothing.

Last January, I heard rumors in Europe that a large group of American churchmen were to be taken on a guided tour of Russia. I knew that no Ctaholic priest would be invited, since—despite the guaranty given when diplomatic relations were resumed between Russia and the United States—members of the American diplomatic colony have been deprived the past year of the services of any Catholic priest.

The news reports, inadequate indeed, would indicate that in taking nine prominent Protestant clergymen to Moscow, the Communist strategy may have backfired. It is not impossible that the next step in Moscow, dramatic and misleading, will be to suggest that Russia establish diplomatic relations with the Vatican. It is not within my competency to suggest the answer such an offer will receive. One condition even for discussion—a condition Communists would not meet—would be freedom of the church to carry out its mission.

The only consistency in Communist policy has been in its antireligious program. From Marx—who in 1843 declared: "Religion is the opium of the people; our duty is to deliver the people from this opiate"—to Khrushchev, there has been no change. Recently, Khrushchev declared: "We remain atheists. We will do all we can to liberate a certain portion of the people from the charm of the religious opium that still exists. We are doing everything we can to eliminate the bewitching power of religion."

In my visit to Europe in January of this year I contacted as many sources as possible. The mention of some would expose them to immediate imprisonment and possibly to death. The Vatican issued in Osservatore Romano this cryptic warning: "Do not be taken in by communism and its coexistence. There will be no baptism of communism."

It was my privilege to have a private audience with Pope Pius XII who, more than any living person, has time and again warned the world of the nature of communism. I am not permitted to quote His Holiness directly, but his voice, nearly stilled in death 15 months ago, has never been more vigorous than today in warning of our great peril. The antipathy toward His Holiness in Moscow is reflected in the large Soviet Encyclo-

pedia, which describes the Holy Father as "a true guardian of capitalist interests and one of the centers of international reaction * * * the fierce enemy of peace and democracy * * * an ally and instrument of the most aggressive imperialist powers."

Cardinal Fumisoni Biondi, who has often wept over the casualty lists of murdered missionaries during his service as head of the propagation of the faith, in discussing with me the situation in satellite countries, used the word found in Pope Pius XI's encyclical on communism. The word is "diabolical," as is to be noted in the excerpt from the encyclical printed in the chart on page 146.

Briefly condensed here are some of the facts reported of the Communist war on God behind the Iron Curtain.

1. POLAND

Poland is a nation with historic Catholic tradition on which the Communist anti-God campaign centered most of its forces. The reason is obvious, religion must be destroyed in Poland in order to eliminate it from other Slavic countries.

What are the facts? MVD General Ivan Serov was commissioned to carry out plans already drawn up in 1944–45 to eliminate Catholicism. He works through the Polish Ministry of Public Security. The Communists were fearful of revolt within Poland if a direct frontal attack was made in 1945. Serov therefore sought to make the Catholic Church an instrument of Communist policy, such as is the Orthodox Church in Russia today.

Imprisonment of Polish church leaders and a campaign of terror for priests and faithful moved too slowly. In 1949, the Communists confiscated Polish church property, nationalized hospitals and schools, and even abolished the famed charity organization of the Polish hierarchy, "Caritas."

In 1950, Polish bishops were forced to accept a church-state pact in order to continue a minimum of spiritual ministration. In return for a promise not to support anti-Communist activities, the hierarchy was pledged a certain amount of freedom of religion and education. Like most Communist pledges, it was broken. When the Polish bishops refused to sign the infamous Stockholm peace appeal, Serov let loose a ruthless persecution, imprisoning priests and sisters and closing schools. Through the prewar Polish Fascist, Boleslaw Piasecki, he sought to organize a "progressive" Catholic movement to infiltrate the Catholic Church with Soviet puppets.

Of over 10,000 priests, only 60 could be coerced, and most of them had been broken in health in prison. In furious resentment, the Communists then imprisoned the beloved Polish primate, Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski. This was an egregious blunder in strategy. The reaction of the Catholic faithful was to unite behind the cardinal. Parishioners stood guard over their priests to protect them.

Fifty-nine seminaries have been closed in Poland since 1952. The theological faculties of Cracow and Warsaw were liquidated. The University of Lublin had theology and canon law stricken from its curriculum.

Yet something has gone wrong with the Communist war on religion in Poland. The campaign to reeducate youth and to destroy belief in faith through instruction, delegated to a committee of clergymen and secular Catholic activists, confused some but it did not accomplish the planned schism.

The Catholic Church in Poland is still an indigestible morsel in the gullet of communism. Why? Largely, in my opinion, because the Communists, directing their blows toward the head, ignored the heart of Poland.

The most stupid blunder, worse even than imprisonment of the Polish primate, was to ridicule the devotion of the Polish people to the Mother of Christ. Our Lady of Czestochowa has always been saluted as Queen of Poland. In 1955, 10,000 pilgrims participated on foot in an act of worship at the famous shrine. In Rome I heard that soldiers—sent to intercept the pilgrims—turned back before an apparition which some identified with the Virgin Mary.

While I was in Rome in 1951 a Vatican official also told me he found Pope Pius XII weeping after a conference with 2 Polish prelates. His Holiness has been the strength and support of Cardinal Wyszynski and his priests. Only a few months ago Pope Pius XII, in a letter to the cardinal, urged "the strongest possible resistance to the perfidious acts of the godless."

2. HUNGARY

Hungary is now the base of operations for attacks upon religion in East Germany. A Roman Catholic Review From Hungary, printed in German on expensive paper, is distributed throughout Austria as well as Germany. The main purpose of the review is to suggest that Catholics in Hungary enjoy freedom.

The Communist press in Hungary constantly attacks the head of the Catholic Church. Its youth organ, Szabad Ifjusag, recently railed: "Pope Pius XII, father of conspirators, is said to have 'warm feelings' toward the Hungarian people; at least this is what the traitor Archbishop Josef Groesz stated, 'The holy father is heart and soul near his beloved Hungarian people.' "

Communists are doing everything possible to prevent parents from sending their children to religion classes. In Hungary, the peace priests' committe was set up to divide Catholics. Yet the Communist paper Zala attacked "the so-called peace priests." "Priests," Zala declared, "remain propagators of religion, regardless of their political creed; we Communists propagate the dialectical, the scientific materialism, of which both ideologies compare like fire and water."

What about the life of a Catholic in Hungary today? From the Catholic News Service in Vienna comes this description:

"If someone enters the house of the parish priest, the local Communist Party knows it the next day, and a few days later, the competent office in Budapest enters the case in its files. * * * People also know that going to church entails more or less severe reprisals."

Again, in Kathpress, we read:

"Fathers who let their children attend religious classes are subjected on their work site to an interrogation by party officials on why and how long they intend to have their children attend religious classes. The consequence is that, in the towns, only about 30 percent—or, at best, 50 percent—of all children attend religion classes."

There are only five seminaries functioning in Hungary, but some students are being educated elsewhere to a service that may expose them to death. Many of the Hungarian priests are literally living underground; others have "disappeared."

3. COMMUNIST TRIUMPH IN THE BALKANS

There are two reasons why the Communist persecution of religion in the Balkans has achieved desired results. First, the Communists did not seek to appease religious feelings, but set upon a program of destroying the church immediately; secondly, Catholics were a minority, ranking in numbers behind both Moslems and members of the Orthodox Church.

The Communists in Rumania also had as a scapegoat a courageous and vigorous American prelate, Archbishop Gerald O'Hara, now apostolic delegate to England. In the satellite countries, hatred of the Catholic Church and of the United States of America seems to be synonymous.

When the deportation of Archbishop O'Hara was ordered, he was escorted to the station in the early hours of the morning. However, all members of the non-Communist diplomatic set were at the station to see him off.

Next, the Reds struck at the oriental rite. This was accomplished by a puppet, the Patriarch Justinian, an active Communist. Schools were nationalized in 1948 and students were instructed to salute the teacher with the greeting: "There is no God!" to which the teacher would reply: "And there never has been."

In 1948, all bishops and 700 Uniate priests, subjects of the Pope, were arrested. Decree No. 358 formally liquidated the physical body of the oriental rite. It was against this abuse of Communist power Archbishop O'Hara stood adamant until his expulsion in 1950. At least 700 priests were executed in Rumania.

Bulgaria was a pushover for Communist strategy. The 60,000 Catholics, divided between Latin and oriental rites once had considerable influence, largely because of excellent schools. In 1949, a bishop and 47 priests were arrested. Catholic churches in Bulgaria have all been closed.

In Albania, approximately 100,000 Roman Catholics were ruthlessly persecuted, and of the 120 priests in that country in 1945, only 20 may be found today. No Catholic bishop remains. In August 1951, the Communist leaders in Albania issued a decree, ludicrous in the light of antecedent activities, that no ties existed between Albanian Catholicism and the Vatican.

4. CZECHOSLOVAKIA

In 1929, when Catholics were in the majority in Czechoslovakia and practicing the tolerance imposed upon them by their religion, a young Communist deputy, Klement Gottwald, shouted at the majority party: "You ask what we Communists want. We want to break your necks."

Gottwald is, of course, now dead, but his spirit lives on in his Communist successors. Here, as in Poland, the antireligious campaign had to be slanted toward the people. Apologetically, the ruling party committee known as BRNO in a 1955 directive states:

"We are deeply sorry that we are forced to acknowledge our failure to smash the religious sentiments of the masses. We underestimated the strength of religion. * * * In spite of severe restrictions placed upon the church, in spite of fierce antireligious propaganda waged by the party and the state, relatively few people have been induced to leave their religion. * * * We were forced to change our tactics because the party was steadily losing influence, while religion was at the same time constantly gaining strength among the people. We made too many martyrs.

Czechoslovakia bore heroically the cross of martyrdom. Of its 7,000 priests of 1945, over 3,000 were jailed. "Concentration monasteries" reeked with the odor of Dachau. Many religious were shipped to slave-labor camps.

Today, nearly 70 percent of the Catholic parishes in Czechoslovakia are without resident pastors. The heroic Archbishop Beran, who fought valiantly against the Communist tide, has disappeared.

Here, too, the Communists centered their efforts upon schools. A pseudo-"Catholic Action" program was announced, but only 20 priests joined it. Seminary courses were compelled to include Marxism. Teaching orders of religious were simple and brutally eliminated. All church property was nationalized. The religious press was throttled. A few apostate priests and Catholic laymen tried to set up a "subservient" Catholic Church.

When priests could not be subverted, the Communists announced that women were being ordained to the priesthood. When Red "priests" took over parishes, the congregations remained at home.

The Czechs stanchly resisted the effort to take religious from hospitals. A grapevine

communication has also kept them informed of the lot of countless priests in Red prison camps.

On July 17, 1955, the Communist-controlled Nova Svoboda admitted that it was not winning its war. "There has been no substantial improvement in the struggle against religious obscurantism," it stated, "as may be seen from the fact that 63 percent of all children are still attending classes of religious instruction." On February 29 of this year, the same paper warns: "Atheistic propaganda must be carried out * * * consistently * * * otherwise idealistic (?) ideas might afflict the minds of the people."

CONCLUSION

What is the master plan of communism in its attack upon religion? Previously the attack was carried out in four steps: terror and violence toward the clergy; destruction of the religious press; suppression of worship by official decree; indoctrination of youth in Communist-controlled schools.

More recently, at least since the Geneva Conference and its great psychological victory in portraying Russian leaders as wanting peace, the Soviets seem inclined in a few areas to relax the tensions of persecution. China, North Korea, and Asiatic territories are still in the throes of martyrdom. The current rumblings from Russia may have a religious bias; or, as a Vatican official informed me, "the Communists will find, if they read history, that no power has been able to stifle man's hunger for God."

Communists have sought to give Protestants behind the Iron Curtain the impression that the Soviet is opposed only to Catholicism; yet, particularly in East Germany, Catholics and Protestants have been brought closer together by Communist opposition than ever before, even sharing houses of worship.

Since the memorable address of Khrushchev, it might appear that the Soviet high command has enough on its hands in internal dissension to monopolize its attention for a while. Prior to this development, Communist propaganda agents had mapped out a divide-and-conquer program, using Israelis as a wedge, between Christians and Jews. Here, too, Russia is playing a clever game, playing both ends against the middle in its efforts to stir up Arab against Jew and representing Christian elements as against Israel.

The devout Jew in the satellite countries is in as much danger today as he was in under the Hitler regime. Loyalty to his religion stamps the Jews there as a dangerous character. A Vatican official who was active in the underground through which many Jews escaped in Italy during the Fascist regime pleaded with me in January to make sure that some avenue of escape was open, particularly in Rumania, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, when another effort might be made toward mass extermination of Jews.

Surprising though it may be to some, the influence of the Catholic Church has been used in the satellite countries, and in the Ukraine particularly, toward discouraging abortive revolutions which might end, as the Katyn massacre, in wholesale slaughter. The church believes that at death the redemptive work of the incarnation of Jesus Christ ends for the dying soul. It does not believe it can turn toward God those who are dead. On the other hand, placing confidence in Him who said, "Have courage, I have overcome the world," it is confident of ultimate victory for those who place their trust in God.

The following incident, related by Eddy Gilmore—who spent several years in the Soviet Republic of Georgia—in 1953, is quite significant:

"Halfway up Mount David, where Stalin's mother, Catherine, is buried, a groundskeeper pointed to her grave and sighed. 'Look at it,' he said, 'it's falling to pieces. He never visited it. He never cared. God of mine, what a man to have for a son.' Then he crossed himself."

Where Do Moderates Meet?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, Virginians, since May 17, 1954, have been trying to work out a plan whereby public education can be continued on a segregated basis in the future as in the past. We are not willing to accept integration of our public schools, at least I am convinced that the vast majority of our people feel this way. I am afraid that some confusion has arisen in the minds of a large number of Virginians over the so-called assignment plan. They failed to realize that the adoption of the assignment plan will mean integration of the pupils of the public schools in Virginia. I trust that this will never be done. Once integration is recognized anywhere in Virginia on a State level we will have lost the fight for segregation.

Fortunately for Virginia, the editor of the Richmond News Leader has made exhaustive and extensive study of this problem. He has, in his forceful editorials, presented the facts to the people in their true light and has done much to clear up the issue. Tuesday, April 3, 1956, there appeared in the News Leader a splendid editorial answering the question of "Where do moderates meet" and on Monday, April 9, 1956, there appeared a splendid editorial pointing out the dangers of the pupil assignment plan and the effect its adoption would have upon the fight we are making to preserve the inherent rights of the State to regulate its own affairs.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include these two editorials:

WHERE DO MODERATES MEET?

The past 4 or 5 months have witnessed a subtle and possibly significant shifting of public attitudes toward the South's grave problem of school segregation. For the first time since the Supreme Court's decision nearly 2 years ago, influential voices are being heard to say that the South's position is not wholly without justification.

Northern newspapers, which had been scolding the South and reading us sermons, are conceding now and then that the North has failed to solve its own problems of race. Even Time and Life magazines, which hate the white South and pass up no opportunity to hold us up to ridicule and contempt, have slightly eased their torrent of abuse and misrepresentation. Time, for example, permitted a brief hint to creep into its columns last week that integration of schools in the District of Columbia is not an unqualified success. Some highly respected newspapers, for example, the Wall Street Journal and the Indianapolis Star, have taken the view—without supporting segregation as such—that the South's constitutional objections are soundly based.

This more thoughtful consideration of the South's case is clear gain. So, too, there is much to be said for the good motives of the many persons in public life who are urging moderation.

But at the risk of being misunderstood (which is a high risk when so many publications are still determined deliberately to "misunderstand" the South), we would urge that the counsel of "moderation" be carefully examined. It will be found, we submit, that when the polite and well-intentioned overtures are acknowledged, moderation is still spelled "integration" in the North, and moderation still means "continued segregation" in the South.

What is the common meeting ground of public figures so far apart as Senator EASTLAND and Adlai Stevenson? Where do Mr. Eisenhower and Senator Thurmond agree? It is on this alone: That violence is to be deplored and must be prevented. But everyone, or almost everyone, deplores violence and believes it must be prevented. When we have agreed that violence is bad, where else can agreement be found?

Northern moderates, in final analysis say the Supreme Court's opinion was sound at law and must be obeyed. Southern moderates contend that the Constitution alone is the supreme law of the land, and urge that the Court acted beyond its powers. Northern moderates say a start should be made toward compulsory integration; southern moderates say that no start is acceptable that would in their view, lead inevitably to the destruction of their most cherished institutions. Northern moderates hold that public education is a proper concern of the Federal Government; southern moderates insist that it is among the clearly reserved powers of the States.

Moderation may be, as Euripides termed it, "the noblest gift of heaven." Considered abstractly, it is doubtless, like majority rule, a good thing. But there are times when naked majority rule works a monstrous injustice, and there are times when compromise can be fatal. We recall the comment of Warren Pollard some years ago, when as president of the transit company he declined to submit a labor dispute to arbitration. "They could," he said grimly, "arbitrate us right out of business."

The South can be moderated right into chaos, too. Let us keep in mind.

NORTH CAROLINA SPEAKS PLAINLY

The editorial section offers the full text today of a plain-spoken report to the Governor and General Assembly of North Carolina, released last week by a seven-man advisory group headed by Thomas J. Pearsall.

Virginians will recognize in the North Carolina report many of the same convictions and recommendations expressed by the Gray Commission in its report to Governor Stanley last November. The Pearsall Committee proposes a form of pupil assignment in accordance with what the assigning unit (or officer) considers to be for the best interest of the child assigned, and also recommends—in order that North Carolinans may be assured of escape possibilities from intolerable situations—a program of tuition grants. This second recommendation will require amendment of the North Carolina constitution; and among the amendments suggested is a provision by which any local unit, by popular vote, could suspend the operation of public schools in that unit.

The North Carolina report is notable in several respects. It contains none of that softly liberal sentiment that is so often reflected by the North Carolina press. There is not one line in the report suggesting any affirmative support for the Supreme Court's school decree. In hard and bitterly resentful terms, the report describes a very dangerous situation that could become a dreadful situation quickly. The committee feels unanimously that the people of North Carolina will not support mixed schools. The

report recalls the heavy burden that the white people of North Carolina have carried almost wholly, in order that Negro children could be educated. In accepting this burden, the people of North Carolina erected a school system on the foundation of racial separation. The decisions of the Court have destroyed that foundation, and hence have destroyed the school system which we had developed. The problem now is to build a new system out of the Supreme Court's wreckage of the old. Recommendations follow, toward achieving that end.

With much that is contained in the Pearsall report, many Virginians will agree. But it may be that nearly 5 months of considering the quite similar Gray report in the Old Dominion have provided a perspective for Virginia observers that merits study by our friends in North Carolina.

Members of the Pearsall committee regard the Court's opinion as "erroneous." They believe "it could cause more harm within the United States than anything which has happened in 50 years." They denounce what they view as "constitutional amendment by judicial fiat." Yet they are ready to concede that "we must live and act now under the decision." It is "binding upon us."

This newspaper would agree that we must act now under the decision, but our hope is that no action will be taken, either in Virginia or in North Carolina, that would lead to creeping integration of public schools. Once a pupil assignment law is passed, and once local school boards assign pupils of different races to the same school, we will have confessed officially that our State constitutional prohibitions against integration have been voided by valid mandate of the Supreme Court. We do not believe the time has come when such capitulation must be made. Rather, we believe the situation calls for continued resistance by every legal, honorable, and constitutional means that can be devised.

The tuition-grant plan, drastic as it may be, is a form of such resistance. Amendment of compulsory school attendance laws offers another form of resistance. Appeal to sister States to protect the reserved powers of all States is another avenue. Refusal of local governing bodies to appropriate funds for mixed schools is an approach that must give the courts serious concern, for southern judges, we may be assured, are by no means eager to accept the onus for closing southern schools and depriving thousands of children of public-school education. And simply by continuing to operate segregated schools in every county and district, until the courts come to such schools with specific orders, we can place an enormous burden of litigation upon the enemies of the South. All of this, and much more, is embodied in a plan of firm resistance.

But pupil assignment is not based upon resistance. It is based upon acceptance. It reflects, however reluctantly, a willingness to comply. It acknowledges the Court's power and surrenders to it piecemeal.

We are not ready to surrender. The South's case is daily gaining support across the Union, as our sister States reflect upon the evident trend of Supreme Court opinions. Many isolated incidents, reflecting increasing resentment by school patrons, cumulatively take on new significance. The South is far less prepared to integrate this year than it was last year.

If we continue to fight, inch by inch, never recognizing the Court's mandate as morally right, giving in only where we are compelled by superior force to give in, we may yet stave off the catastrophe of massive integration of our schools.

State Guards and Civil Defense: Specific Recommendations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, during the recent national conference of the State Guard Association of the United States, the Honorable William L. McGill, State coordinator of defense and disaster relief for the State of Texas, gave an address that should have the thoughtful and studious attention of all Americans seeking to keep this Nation fully prepared to defend its freedom and liberty.

Mr. McGill, who has served in various responsible offices of the State government of Texas, is well qualified to discuss this important subject, and I commend his statement to all Members of the Congress:

STATE GUARDS AND CIVIL DEFENSE: SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

(By William L. McGill)

There is no experience more invigorating and satisfying than to be the member of a team—a team seeking cooperatively and in harmony and unison to achieve a desired goal for a common cause.

You and I come together today in such a relationship, and I am grateful for the opportunity which this occasion offers to express most genuine gratitude for the consistent cooperation and helpfulness of the Texas State Guard in every phase of the civil defense and disaster preparedness plans of this State.

In the State disaster districts which we have organized to bring the program closer to the people and to expedite the dispatching of State and mutual aid assistance to communities in distress, the Adjutant General of Texas has designated leaders of your organization as the representatives of his department.

You have worked diligently in the inauguration of the Ground Observer Corps in Texas, as an important phase of our Nation-wide air defense system, and I am sure you will continue to give this very essential service your leadership and your support.

Under the inspiration of General Rooke and through the close cooperation of Colonel Cooper, important progress has been made in the field of communications, and I am quite sure that, before too long, we shall have in Texas a State-wide emergency communications system that will serve us exceedingly well as we face the tests which the future will bring.

We joined with enthusiasm in the support of the recently passed Public Law 364 and we are gratified over the additional means it offers the State in strengthening the State Guard. At the same time, we share the disappointment, generally felt, over the fact that the Congress did not include provisions for Federal equipment and support.

It was my opportunity recently in Washington to hear a discussion of these matters by the Honorable Carter L. Burgess, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, Personnel, and Reserve, and I found in him a firm friend of the entire State Guard program. He expressed the opinion that the Federal Government should lend direct assistance to any such militia program.

It is my thought and hope that, supplementing the assistance which can be given by full-time staff members and divisions of State departments and by neighboring communities through the mutual aid system, we might have, sponsored by the Texas State Guard, mobile support units which could be moved to the scene of major calamity when the need arose for well-organized, thoroughly trained disaster relief leaders. The personnel of such units would of necessity possess a thorough understanding and knowledge of essential techniques of survival—would be skilled in first aid, rescue, radiological monitoring, emergency police duty, and in the basic principles of fire fighting.

Such units, sponsored by the State Guard, could be formed, I think, without doing violence to the established mission and function of the guard as an element of the State militia should the National Guard be federalized. We understand, of course, that we cannot build the basic civil defense organization around units or potential units of the military forces, such as the National Guard and the State Guard. As we understand it, the thinking behind this national policy is that the military forces will have most serious and essential functions in connection with actual contact with the enemy, the protection of vital plants and installations, and the combating of sabotage and other enemy action, and that the civil populace must rely upon its own volunteer effort and the help of the regular governmental services—such as fire, police, health, and welfare—for the relief and rehabilitation work contemplated in the program of civil defense.

However, the type of warfare which we can expect in this nuclear age would not necessarily require the immediate deployment of ground troops to distant points, and, in all likelihood, it would be some time before the National Guard was entirely federalized. Units of the State guard, could, therefore, serve effectively in those early days as the mobile support units we have mentioned and could, all the while, be training other citizens to take their place in civil defense activity should the State guard personenl itself be assigned special duty as a part of the State militia.

We would hope, therefore, that the State guard could at this time give favorable consideration to steps such as these:

1. Take a poll of State guard personnel to determine how many have Red Cross certificates as graduates in basic first aid and encourage those not so trained to enroll at once for instruction which local Red Cross chapters are prepared to give;

2. Encourage State guard personnel to take the advanced courses qualifying them as first-aid instructors and take leadership in teaching courses in this most essential skill. I think every civil-defense worker should, by all means, be trained in first aid. Indeed, our present campaign is also to have one member of every family possess this knowledge which just may be the difference between life and death for the individual so trained and for those about him.

3. State guard personnel will want to know the basic techniques of rescue and be prepared in time of crisis to direct the removal of victims who are trapped in demolished buildings, under cars, and elsewhere in the stricken area. A State rescue school is now provided where in a period of 5 days the essential phases of this skill can be learned. This school is located on the campus of Texas A. and M. College. With the cooperation of the Federal Civil Defense Administration, the State has built there a "street

of ruins," containing buildings in varying states of demolition. The latest rescue equipment and highly trained instructors are provided and upon completion of the 60-hour practical course, the graduate is qualified to instruct classes in rescue in his own organization, industry, institution, and community. There is no tuition fee. Room and board at minimum rates is available.

As quickly as possible, State guard personnel should be given specialized training in radiological monitoring. We can take steps to provide the equipment and the necessary personnel for this training when a sufficiently large group requests it.

At the last session of the Congress we secured passage by a unanimous vote in the House of Representatives of property declared surplus to the needs of Federal agencies. The bill will be before the United States Senate in January, and we are very hopeful that it will be approved by that body. If this bill passes, it is just possible that State guard units establishing civil-defense organization could obtain Federal property appropriate to their needs.

How many and how varied, and how vitally important, are the things which the State guard can do to advance the common goal of providing maximum security for our Nation and its people and protection for all those things which make men free.

And how anxious we are to have your continued leadership and your fine help.

Speaking to a group such as this, I need not go into detail as to the well-nigh incredible results of an enemy attack with nuclear weapons, supplemented by chemical and biological warfare, acts of sabotage, and all the other devices which our chief foe in the world is capable of employing. You know these facts as well as I.

Nor, I trust, do I need to remind you of the words of Ovid—written a long, long time ago—when he said: "When the sea is calm, the careless sailor takes his ease."

The United States Government is now spending between 35 and 40 billion dollars a year for the maintenance of this country's Military Establishment—holding it in readiness against the possible threat of foreign attack.

If world dangers are so real as to make necessary the outlay of $35 billion a year for our military forces alone, is it too much to suggest that a minute fraction of that amount be appropriated also for a realistic home-defense program to enable our people to prepare for the very real prospect that the next war—if, God forbid, it does come—will be fought in our own town squares?

So, in all realism, we are met here today to counsel together, to determine how best we can cooperate in the development of a team, with integrated and coordinated and capable effort, equal to the need which could come upon us all too soon.

Just as it is a fact that no community of people we know, no town or countryside is exempt from the perils of natural disaster, it must also now be faced that the destructive power of the new weapons which are stockpiled today is such that no part or parcel of our land would be free of danger in the event of a nuclear war.

The latest explosion of a hydrogen device dug a crater in the surface of the earth 175 feet deep and a mile in diameter. A bomb of this size—our scientists tell us—will give dangerous heat damage to a distance of 25 miles under suitable weather conditions. The area affected by blast is about 300 square miles, and fires will be started, and skin burned, over an area of 2,000 square miles.

The military and atomic energy authorities of the Nation warn that our chief enemy in the world now has the weapons of which we speak, the same kind of weapons we possess, has the weapons and the planes to transport them, and that probably 10 and certainly not more than 25 percent of those planes could be intercepted before they dropped their deadly load.

As if we did not have enough to challenge our powers of comprehension, the Eniwetok explosion made it clear that a groundburst could conceivably bring about a radioactive fallout over an area of 7,000 square miles and at least 190 miles downwind from the center of the burst.

All civil-defense concepts have of necessity been revised.

We do have answers. We can cope with even this incredible force of destruction, but they are somewhat different answers from those we evolved several years ago. (And I suggest that the revision of plans as new conditions develop and new situations emerge is in no sense an evidence of indecision but rather af alertness and awareness and readiness to face the ever-changing dangers of the new day.)

That brings us to the newest safeguard against the nuclear weapons—and that is the concept of evacuation. When the bomb hits, it's a very good idea simply not to be there.

With the 2- to 4-hour warning which we could conceivably get there is reasonable hope of moving people away from the place where the bomb may most likely drop. The immensity of the task, the complications involved in traffic control, medical care, emergency feeding, clothing, and housing, and all the other problems inherent in moving great numbers of people in a time of stress and strain—all of these things might frighten and frustrate less hardy people than those constituting the governmental forces, the relief agencies, and the citizenship generally of a community, a state, and a nation like ours. With those who say that evacuation just can't be put into effect, I respectfully disagree. America is greater than we think. Its government on every level, its public servants, its people of the rank and file, have again and again risen in times of danger to superb heights of organizational skill and personal resourcefulness and valor. I submit that no problem has yet been too great for them to solve, no calamity too vast for them to survive, no test too grueling for them to pass.

A meeting like this—of people like you—can be the answer to the problem which is set before us. I have not the shadow of a doubt but that the combined competence and capacity and courage of a group such as this and of similar groups like yours throughout the length and breadth of the land will see us through.

We are a chain of many links, each indispensable to the strength of the whole. I think it is a good chain, a strong chain, a chain sufficient unto our present great need.

If we have been skilled enough to build the civilization we now know, we should, with God's help, be wise enough to save it.

To that end I know we shall all dedicate our finest thought and our best effort.

I shall look forward with much anticipation to the opportunity of working very closely with you in the days which lie ahead.

Address by Justice Anthony J. DiGiovanna

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, during all the time that I have been privileged to be a Member of this greatest of all legislative bodies, nothing has afforded me greater joy than the recognition that a close and warm friend of mine, Mr. Justice Anthony J. DiGiovanna, of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, has achieved honorable distinction in an equally important branch of our system of government; that is, in the judiciary.

Because of his profound learning, his background, and his highly commendable public service in past years, Justice DiGiovanna was recently invited by the highest judicial tribunal in the city of New York to address the newly admitted members of the New York bar.

I am certain that my colleagues will find this address most interesting because the learned jurist speaks of the law not merely as an art or a profession, but as offering the opportunity for great public service, of which Mr. Justice DiGiovanna himself is a notable example.

Mr. Speaker, Justice DiGiovanna's address is published in the New York Law Journal, April 6, 1956, and reads as follows:

SUPREME COURT JUSTICE DIGIOVANNA ADDRESSES NEWLY ADMITTED MEMBERS OF THE BAR

Two hundred and forty-six men and eighteen women were admitted Wednesday to the New York Bar by the appellate division of the supreme court, second judicial department. The court consisted of Presiding Justice Gerald Nolan and Associate Justices George J. Beldock, Henry L. Ughetta, James T. Hallinan, and Philip M. Kleinfeld.

On this occasion Supreme Court Justice Anthony J. DiGiovanna, at the invitation of the justices of the appellate division, addressed the newly admitted attorneys as follows:

"Mr. Presiding Justice, associate justices of the appellate division, and newly admitted members of the bar, the great privilege of addressing a group of attorneys just admitted to the bar is indeed a high honor because it affords to the speaker a wonderful opportunity of welcoming an already distinguished group into a great profession. I say 'already distinguished' because I appreciate the fact that you have achieved a milestone in your lives in having graduated from an accredited law school, and in having passed the strict legal requirements of the bar examination and the exacting standards of the committee on character and fitness.

"Mr. Justice Holmes keenly observed that 'the business of a law school is not sufficiently described when you merely say that it is to teach law or make lawyers.' The duty of the law school, he explained, is "to teach law in the grand manner, and to make good lawyers.' Since I know that you have had the kind of law school training designed to teach you the law of the land and to inspire you to cherish our American traditions, I have a most definite feeling that I am addressing a group of lawyers who are educated and dedicated to uphold the brilliant traditions of the law. It is, therefore, with that awareness of my responsibility that I accept the privilege and opportunity of saying a few words to you on this felicitous occasion.

"I will speak to you, as briefly as I can, about the practice of law, but only of the practice of law as a great profession dedicated to public service in the achievement of justice. I stress this because I share with Justice Holmes the earnest belief that, regardless of the uncomplimentary remarks which are made by unfair critics about law and lawyers, it is universally recognized that,

of all secular professions, ours has the highest standards of ethics and integrity.

"Our profession has a history that is ancient and noble. Although it achieved greatness in the Roman civilization, it antedates Rome. And with every succeeding generation it becomes clearer that the practice of law is an honorable profession limited to men of the highest integrity, who by virtue of the excellence of their character and thoroughness of learning are willing to serve the community in the administration of justice.

"Dean Roscoe Pound points out in his book The Lawyer From Antiquity to Modern Times that in a profession three ideas are essential—organization, learning, and the spirit of public service. He adds very significantly that, although the idea of gaining a livelihood is involved in all callings, and, indeed, may be the only purpose of certain callings, 'in a profession it is incidental.' Surely, I do not mean to tell you today that the question of earning a livelihood is of little import, nor do I want to minimize the importance of that objective, but since the question of earning a livelihood is often so uppermost in our minds, you need no reminder concerning such matters, and no discussion is consequently necessary. Such an observation, however, can never overshadow the essential elements of our profession, and hence a reminder of these essentials is always in order, particularly when addressing the future leaders of our profession into whose hands we place the sacred trust of the future of our profession and our Government itself.

"The element of organization is necessary if we are to pool our training and knowledge for the good of our Nation. This implies that, through the bar associations, and by reason of your active participation in their programs, the legal profession can actually improve the law of the land and better the administration of justice. It also implies that, through organization, the profession can help mold public opinion so as to make our Nation aware of dangers that may exist from sources that would threaten to destroy our form of government and our cherished institutions. Organization also implies that the legal profession is a self-disciplined one because it voluntarily assumes the important duty of insisting that all of its members adhere to its traditionally high standards, and that the profession itself will penalize anyone who does not maintain those high standards and who, by his conduct, detracts from its prestige or otherwise injures its good name.

"The second essential ingredient of your profession is learning. No one can dispute that ours is a learned profession. From the very beginning it was constituted of a class of learned men pursuing a learned art. Learning is one of the important attributes which distinguishes a profession from other callings, vocations, and occupations, however important or valuable they may be in their contribution to our society. This does not minimize the importance of the contributions of other callings in our society, but rather highlights the nature of the art that the lawyer practices. The law historically possesses a cultural ideal which furthers the exercise of that art. This thought is expressed by Dean Pound in the following words: 'Problems of human relations in society, problems of disease, problems of the upright life, guided by religion are to be dealt with by the resources of cultivated intelligence, by lawyer, physician, and clergyman.' He instructs us that, to carry on their task most effectively, these men must be more than resourceful craftsmen: 'They must be learned men.'

"The third essential idea which is descriptive of any profession, and ours in particular, is the fact that it is descriptive of any profession, and ours in particular, is the fact that it is practiced in a spirit of public service. The fundamental difference between a trade and a profession is that a trade aims primarily at personal gain, whereas a profession is interested in the exercise of its powers in a way beneficial to mankind. This distinction in no way should detract from the dignity of their trades and callings. Surely there is no one among us who does not appreciate the contributions made by all men in a complex society. I would not be so callous or ungrateful as to detract from the calling of your parents, whose efforts and hard labors made possible your realization of your hopes and ambitions in becoming members of the legal profession. Yet it is important that you realize, as practicing lawyers, that ours continues to be the professions dedicated to public service. These ideas are the qualities which have given our profession its special dignity and eminence.

"I am sure that Mr. Justice Benjamin Cardozo, in an inspiring address entitled 'Our Lady of the Common Law,' had reference to these qualities when he spoke of the profession of the law and referred to its 'capacities, realized and unrealized, for service to mankind.' These capacities are best realized if each and every one of you stands fast to all of those personal qualities collectively described by the word 'character.' The learned jurist explained that character, the key to behavior and the social order, includes, among other things, 'industry, fidelity, as well as conscience and honor.' These are the traits that you lawyers must possess in order to enhance and exalt the prestige and influence of the legal profession.

"From this moment forward never forget in your daily lives the nobility and glory of the profession you have chosen to practice. With resolute determination and with the necessary spiritual insight and ideals you will not fail.

"I congratulate you and wish you many happy and fruitful years of successful practice."

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Role of Government in the Field of Labor-Management Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting address delivered by the Honorable Joseph F. Finnegan, Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, on April 10, 1956, on the role of Government in the field of labor-management relations, before the Alabama Chapter of the Society for the Advancement of Management.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT IN THE FIELD OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

(Address by Joseph F. Finnegan, Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, to the Alabama Chapter, the Society for the Advancement of Management, Birmingham, Ala., April 10, 1956)

The phenomenal advance of the American economy, directly traceable to increased efficiency and the expansion of our country's productive capacity, is a story with which you are all familiar. It has not occurred in a vacuum. Organized labor has undergone equally startling growth, and the role of the Government as a moderating influence between these two expanding segments of our economic society has had to keep pace.

Bill Pierce, my Regional Director for this area, has warned me I would be talking to a group of skilled, mature, and sophisticated management representatives when I meet with you, so it may be a little like carrying coals to Newcastle to refer to the high plateau that American industry has achieved. At the end of World War II we were wishfully talking about the possible industrial expansion that would offer employment to as many as 60 million people; yet today we find the level of employment reaching 63 million and projecting upward. Last year our gross national product was crowding toward $400 billion and this year it looks as though it will reach that pinnacle. Inventiveness, ingenuity, skill and research are opening new vistas of products, processes, and production through atomic power, automation, electronics, new chemicals and synthetics.

Many of you are probably not as familiar with the growth picture of labor as you are with that of industry, so I am going to try to furnish a brief survey as a further backdrop for my remarks concerning the role of Government in relation to the collective bargaining scene.

Some 18 million people in the United States, comprising almost one-third of our employed nonagricultural work-force, are union members. These people are organized into more than 195 unions, which are either national or international in scope, and have more than 75,000 local charters scattered all over the United States. These union members work under about 125,000 collective bargaining agreements. Thirteen unions account for almost half of the previously mentioned union membership figure of 18 million; and out of that 13, 6 unions have a combined membership of nearly 6 million members. The newly merged AFL-CIO accounts for approximately 16 million members out of the aforementioned total organized work-force of 18 million members.

The numerical strength of organized labor is only the beginning. The annual income from dues of labor unions is estimated at nearly a half billion dollars per year, with some $150 million of this going to the international unions to support their functions. Recent reports indicate that unions also control, either directly or indirectly an added $26 billion in pension and similar trust funds, which are being augmented at the rate of between 2 and 3 billion dollars per year. In addition to this, many unions have additional income from the investment of their substantial assets.

I mention these figures not as a viewer with alarm, because I am not alarmed at these figures. They are merely indicative of the extent to which our philosophy of free, voluntary, collective bargaining enacted by our duly elected congressional representatives has been accepted and implemented by the working people of the United States, as well as by industry.

So, if we take an objective look at the American industrial scene of today, it brings into focus the picture of management and labor as they appear today on opposite sides of the collective-bargaining table. Industry comes to the bargaining table financially strong and dynamically progressive, with a record of industrial progress unparalleled in the history of the world. Organized labor comes to the bargaining table financially and numerically strong, and militant in its demands.

Many economists and students insist that labor and management, as they approach the area of collective bargaining, are seeking goals which are not dissimilar. In a very general sense I agree with this proposition. Enlightened management today realizes that higher profits depend upon greater productivity, and that higher productivity depends upon the welfare of the worker; upon his wages, hours, and working conditions and, more importantly, upon respect for his dignity as an individual in a free society. The worker, on the other hand, realizes that his welfare is secure only when his employer can make an adequate profit.

Nevertheless, there remain certain fundamental elements, inherent in the relationship between the parties, which indicate inevitable disputes in resolving basic conflicts of interest. It would be asking too much of employers and employees to expect their desires, and the answers to their desires, to fully coincide. Wages can never be as high as the worker wants them to be, nor profits as high as the management representatives desire them to be. Someone must manage, and some must be managed, and certainly a difference of opinion as to the nature and extent of such management rights and limitations should astonish no one. Among the many descriptive terms applied to mediation is that of peacemaking and the chief function of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service is to prevent or minimize industrial conflict, but it would be unrealistic and the worst kind of Pollyannaism to believe that strikes are going to become obsolete as our booming economy continues to expand.

We all decry, and rightly so, the losses arising out of work stoppages, losses to the worker, losses to the employer, losses to society in general; but the end result of strikes is not all on the negative side. Strikes can, and often do, have a salutary effect on the thinking of labor and management representatives. Long-standing tensions are often removed by strikes, and mutual respect created for the opposing party. Recognition of merit as to the validity of contested positions is often substituted, out of the ordeal by battle, for suspicion and distrust.

In the wake of public clamor growing out of highly publicized strikes, it is also easy to get a warped impression as to the aggregate effect of strikes upon our economy. I grant you that there is a chain reaction in some strikes, but that is true of almost anything that affects the free flow of commerce. If you are inclined to shudder at the statistics which show 20 million, 22 million, or 23 million man-days lost during a calendar year by strikes, consider for a moment that during that same year avoidable industrial accidents claimed about 38 million man-days of productive time, and that avoidable absenteeism was responsible for approximately 20 times as many man-days lost to production as were all of the strikes. What I am trying to emphasize is that while strikes are probably an inevitable expense, under our democratic system of free collective bargaining, in resolving the conflict of interest between the parties, those strikes are first of all a small price to pay for the freedom inherent in our system. Second, they have some actual benefits in both the immediate and future relationships between the parties; and last, they actually affect our economic structure much less than other factors which we consider to be of almost no moment, and take in our everyday stride.

Lest you gain the impression from these comments that the Federal Government, or the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, believes that strikes are necessary or desirable, or underwrites the thesis that it is willing to let the parties slug it out without care or consideration for the public interest, let me assure you that this is not true. When I talk about a governmental policy of hands-off in certain phases of labor disputes, it does not mean that Government is going to ignore these disputes nor take a passive attitude toward them. Mediation is not merely a passive or persuasive approach to industrial disputes. Strikes, as well as disputes that may lead to strikes, call at times for very positive and aggressive steps. Thus you will find this Service, in addition to normal mediation procedures, at times (as in the recent Westinghouse strike) urging arbitration, fact-finding, or other means of resolving difficulties so long as the means employed conform to the basic principle of leaving to the parties the ultimate choice of how their destinies are to be determined, without compulsion from the Government.

Let's consider my earlier statement that a certain amount of conflict between labor

and management is bound to occur. Granted this to be true, where then should the parties look for solution of their difficulties when they are confronted by a breakdown in the collective bargaining process? Before attempting to answer this affirmatively, let me give you a negative answer. The solution to the collective bargaining problem does not lie in the hands of government, either Federal, State, or local. It is fundamental to our American doctrine of free collective bargaining, working within the framework of a free economy, that the parties be directly charged with responsibility for working out their own problems and that they discharge their joint responsibility without governmental interference. As free men, employers and employees should not, under normal, peacetime circumstances, be required to submit to Government decisions as to conditions governing their day-to-day relationships. Any other answer would be in derogation of man's inherent dignity, be he worker or employer.

Now, if government is not to assume the primary responsibility for making collective bargaining work, is not to provide the detailed solutions to collective bargaining problems, and is not to have the determining voice at the bargaining table—what, then, is its role to be?

A proper and constructive role for the Government, it seems to me, involves two aspects or functions.

Government should first provide a minimum legal framewark within which the parties will enjoy the best possible climate and opportunity to develop a constructive and productive relationship, and to avoid strife. Government should then encourage the parties to earnestly endeavor to work out their differences within this legal framework, without the government directly having a determinative voice in the substantive bargaining processes.

The basic part of the minimum legal framework provided by the Federal Government is, of course, the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947—the Taft-Hartley Act. All of us, at times, find various aspects of this ligislation which we consider to be less than perfect. Whatever its defects it does appear to establish, with a minimum of interference of compulsion, legal rules that encourage the peaceful coexistence of labor and management.

The second important phase of the Government's role in collective bargaining is making available to the parties, when they are unable to resolve their own problems, the optimum of assistance, without control, determination or meddling. As developed over the years, the mechanism to achieve this has evolved into the functions of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, which I have the honor of directing.

Mediation, as you know, is the process of interceding between individuals, groups of individuals or even nations, to assist the parties to amicably compose their differences—with not element of compulsion. The most effective tool of the mediator is persuasion. It is not his function to tell the parties what they must do or must not do. His function is that of helping them to work out their own solutions; not to make up their minds for them.

Mediation is reason and persuasion; and, curiously enough, therein lies the vitality and strength of the process. If a difference of opinion is composed by the parties themselves, either with or without the intervention of a mediator, it has a much better chance of establishing a healthy, lasting relationship than any solution imposed upon the parties by government fiat or otherwise.

One of the best means of implementing this philosophy is for the Government to make it clear, not only by words but by its acts, that it is not going to be the servant of labor, nor the servant of management, but will only provide qualified administrative facilities and personnel to actively assist the parties in working out their own destinies.

With all of the popular ballyhoo and bellyaching about too much Government interference, it is a little strange that the refusal of government to intervene in collective bargaining situations should be the subject of complaint or criticism. Yet all too often, parties who decry Government interference in the abstract will actively solicit Government intervention in a situation affecting their immediate personal interest. It seems to me there are two principal reasons why this has been true. Some bad habits and some bad tactics.

The worst bad habit I have in mind is the tendency of both parties to bargain only up to a certain point, and then turn to the Government to bridge the gap of their differences.

During the war years when, of necessity under a war economy, free collective bargaining was practically suspended, the normal give and take of collective bargaining and the free play of respective economic forces were relegated to the sidelines. In a great many instances, the parties (during the war years) approached the bargaining table for the primary purpose of making a record to justify an application to the Government to intervene and decide the labor dispute. Little real, genuine collective bargaining took place in this setting where the parties had some place to go other than the bargaining table.

You would have thought that when the wartime, regimented economy disappeared, the bad habits of this sort would, likewise, have evaporated; but they did not. There are still people on both the labor and the management sides of the fence who can't resist the temptation to demand special, exceptional, or emergency governmental intervention in an attempt to secure for themselves by intervention, bargains which they have been unable to secure around the table.

These requests for intervention by the executive branch of the Government have been denied by the present administration, and events have shown the wisdom of this course. The national emergencies have vanished, agreements have been reached, collective bargaining is still in good repute, and sound relations have, in most instances, been established.

The worst of the bad tactics I have in mind is the tendency on the part of some elements—unthinking elements—of both management and labor to try to get the Government to take a pro-them attitude with respect to their collective bargaining position. With little or no thought or consideration for the ultimate effect which such demands for Government intervention would have on the fundamental principles under which our progress and prosperity have been built, they behave as though Government exists only to further their own short-term objectives. They are perfectly willing to sell the hour to serve the minute. A sharper, two-edged sword is hard to imagine. Temporary gains are of little comfort if the institutions under which we prosper are destroyed in achieving such gains.

I am profoundly convinced that governmental partisanship in the field of labor relations is a fatal philosophy and should be avoided like the plague. Necessarily, there will be government policy and procedure changes in this fluid and dynamic field of labor relations; but whatever changes are made must not be undertaken on the basis of political pressure from either labor or management, for appeasement or for temporary expediency.

The thoughts I have expressed today are neither new nor original with me, but it seemed to me that there was a need for a restatement of them at this time.

We are all familiar with that old saw which runs that government is best which governs least. That is still true. I submit that the ends of both labor and management are best served by a government which insists upon the parties making their own settlements and is neither prolabor nor promanagement, but simply pro-American. Those representatives of labor and management who seek to enlist the aid of Government on a partisan basis and who criticize it because it has refused to take sides, do a serious disservice to our American concept of industrial democracy. They are blind to the fact that the true friend of labor and the true friend of management is that government which carries out its role in labor-management affairs in an impartial and even-handed manner.

If shortsighted representatives of labor or management should ever succeed in causing government agencies dealing with any aspect of labor matters to take on a partisan color, those agencies will have lost their utility as peace-making instrumentalities in the collective bargaining process. When political expediency, prompted by either labor or management pressures, takes over and we find Government injecting itself into bargaining problems in a partisan role, then indeed should the warning signal be sounded—because, at that point, the underlying tenet of voluntary, free collective bargaining will have been sold down the river, and a totalitarian type of thinking substituted which is foreign to the basic philosophy of our country.

Foreign Arms Aid Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the APPENDIX of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following article from the April 16 issue of Newsweek magazine by Henry Hazlitt entitled "Foreign Arms Aid Again":

FOREIGN ARMS AID AGAIN

(By Henry Hazlitt)

Many Members of Congress are becoming increasingly skeptical about either the need or wisdom of further foreign "economic" aid. But most of them continue unhesitatingly to endorse further "military" aid. Is the difference very real?

The truth is that one kind of aid can easily act as a substitute for the other. When we relieve another nation of the need to pay for its own defense, we in effect give it just that much more funds to spend, say, on economic "welfare" schemes. Failure to recognize this substitutability of foreign aid has led to much mental confusion. "Military" aid is not in fact solely a military question. It is primarily an economic question. The chief question is not. How much defense does Ruritania need? but, Why can't Ruritania afford to pay for its own defense? Why must that burden fall on the American taxpayer?

I present below a table showing the latest fiscal year's armament expenditures of 15 of our aid beneficiaries stated as a percentage of (1) their total central governmental expenditures, and (2) of their gross national product. The record of these countries is compared with our own.

While such international comparisons cannot be precise, they are accurate enough to furnish much instruction. Comparing the overall dollar figures, for example, the United States alone is spending on national defense three times as much absolutely as these 15 nations combined. (Some $39.7 billion against a total of $13.4 billion.) We are also spending much more relatively—10.2 percent of our gross national product against an average of 6.6 percent for these 15 beneficiaries.

The United States, which is giving the defense aid, is spending some 62 percent of its total budget on defense, whereas these 13 countries receiving aid (if we omit for the moment Formosa and Yugoslavia) are spending on the average only some 26 percent of their total central government budget on defense. This is another way of saying that while we in the United States can afford to spend only some 38 percent of our total budget on nondefense items, these 13 beneficiaries of arms aid are spending some 74 percent of their total budgets on nondefense items.

This relationship can hardly be excused on the plea of poverty. Among the countries that are spending relatively most on defense are Greece, Turkey, and Formosa. (It is only fair to add that they are doing this partly because of our defense aid.) The outstanding exception of Yugoslavia is not reassuring. It is frankly a Communist country. We are unlikely to find it on our side when the chips are down.

Is it a good idea for us to rob our own defense, in order to pay for part of the defense of countries that are comparatively indifferent about their defense or do not take the Communist military threat very seriously? Instead of our contributing nearly $3 billion to these countries for their defense, why wouldn't it be a good idea simply to suggest to most of them that they transfer part of the total of $36.1 billion they now spend on nondefense items to their present modest $13.4 billion for defense?

Defense expenditures

Country	Percent of total Government expenditures	Percent of gross national product
Belgium-Luxembourg	18.3	4.1
China (Formosa)	59.0	12.0
Denmark	20.4	3.3
France	27.6	7.3
Germany	23.9	4.1
Greece	33.2	6.5
Italy	22.0	4.1
Japan	12.0	2.0
Netherlands	22.6	6.0
Norway	26.8	4.5
Portugal	33.6	4.5
Spain	31.6	4.5
Turkey	35.2	5.7
United Kingdom	31.2	8.9
Yugoslavia	77.5	11.6
United States	61.7	10.2

The Role of the Independent in the Automotive Parts Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an analysis of the role of the independent manufacturer of automotive parts in industry, as set forth in an address delivered by Mr. Joseph W. Burns, chief counsel of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Burns was appointed chief counsel of the subcommittee by the late Senator Harley W. Kilgore, and has been in charge of the study made by the subcommittee since it was authorized early in the first session of this Congress. His address was delivered at San Francisco before the convention of the National Standard Parts Association on February 22, 1956. It outlines in clear and understandable language some of the problems which have developed in the automotive industry in this period of economic concentration.

Mr. Burns has served with distinction in the Tax Division of the Department of Justice and was a special assistant to the Attorney General before entering the private practice of law in New York in 1945.

I recommend the address to the attention of all Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF THE INDEPENDENT IN THE AUTOMOTIVE PARTS INDUSTRY

(Address by Joseph W. Burns, chief counsel, Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary Before the National Standard Parts Association, San Francisco, February 22, 1956)

Although the antitrust laws affect most people in one way or another, the public knows very little about them and probably cares less. The Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee recently held public hearings with respect to General Motors Corp. as a case study of bigness and concentration of economic power. As a result of our public hearings, various segments of the automobile industry, including dealers, independent parts manufacturers and distributors, at all levels, have realized that they personally are vitally concerned with the antitrust laws.

Representatives of your association and other members of your industry appeared before our subcommittee. They told of their problems in competing with the three major automobile manufactures in the production and distribution of automotive replacement parts and services. They raised the question whether the antitrust laws are adequate to preserve competition in your industry. Witnesses described the difficulty in selling parts and accessories to dealers in competition with the car manufacturers who had advantages which were difficult to overcome. They related their fears of the expansion of the car manufacturers into the replacement parts market, which may eliminate many independents. I am happy to come here to discuss these problems with you.

There is a great deal of misunderstanding about these laws, and a great deal of uncertainty and confusion. I believe it might be helpful to you for me to explain some of the terms used, in order that you may better understand the problems. Since your association has appeared on your behalf before our subcommittee, you should know just what part it plays in the legislative process.

The problems upon which Congress must act are so complex and time-consuming that it is necessary to have committees to do the basic work, and the other Members rely very heavily on the committees' conclusions. The work of each committee is divided among several subcommittees. Every Senator is a member of 2 full committees and usually at least 4 subcommittees. Generally the work carried on by a subcommittee is based upon a program planned and developed by its professional staff. At this point, probably I should make it clear that although I serve as chief counsel and staff director, my comments today represent my personal views and should not be attributed to any member of the subcommittee.

The problem of regulating competition in a dynamic economy is both difficult and complex. Where to draw the line between healthy competition and undesirable competition is the problem which perplexes Congress, the courts, and the Commission.

The Sherman Act has been referred to as a charter of economic freedom. In a very broad sense, it stands as a statement of a basic policy that our economy thrives best where there is freedom of competition. This basic policy has generally been accepted throughout the country. But the Sherman Act itself, as a statute, has not proven adequate to achieve this objective completely.

Today there is considerable concern about the increasing concentration of economic power. In order to try to understand this problem, our subcommittee has been studying the automobile industry. The history of this industry shows that as the automobile gradually developed from the original horseless carriage, thousands of separate businesses were created. It is one of the outstanding examples of a new product becoming the basis for a whole new industry. It afforded unlimited opportunity to individual initiative and enterprise.

Hundreds of individual businessmen built up substantial businesses as manufacturers, wholesalers, jobbers, and retailers. Some of these manufacturers are themselves of substantial size, with assets in the millions of dollars. Since the beginning of this industry there have been dozens of car manufacturers purchasing parts, assembling cars, and marketing them under brand names. Today, many parts manufacturers and distributors are concerned about the future of their businesses. At present there are only six automobile producers, with 95 percent of the market concentrated in the three largest. The concentration at the level of the automobile manufacturer is causing concern not only to the automotive parts industry, but to the Government enforcement agencies as well.

THE BIG ISSUE

The big issue presented by the concentration in the automobile industry is not whether the Big Three are competing, but whether they should have such economic control over the entire industry. We must assume that to obtain the advantages of mass production and nationwide distribution and servicing, a car manufacturer must be big. Since bigness carries with it economic power, the relationship between the automobile producers and other segments of the industry presents a difficult problem.

Of course, one company may be better than the others and achieve a dominating position solely through skill and efficiency. At the present time, the antitrust laws distinguish between internal and external growth. The law imposes certain limitations on growth by merger or acquisition where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly. But there is no limit to the size of a company, or the number of different fields or industries in which it may operate. However, success in the competitive contest should not be assured to a big corporation solely on the basis of its size and power. The problem is to have rules of the game which will permit competition on a fair basis. In sports, competitors are divided into classes in order to endeavor to have equality. In boxing we do not put a flyweight in the ring with a heavyweight. In some sports, like golf, we provide handicaps to equalize the positions of the competitors.

The big question is: should a limit be placed upon the size of a company, or the number of fields in which it may operate?

The objection to any limitation is based upon the fundamental policy of freedom. Big companies argue that they should be as free as small companies to move in any direction.

Those who believe that limitations may be necessary point out that the fundamental constitutional guaranty of liberty and freedom applies to individual human persons, not to the artificial person of a corporation. Before the corporate form was evolved our laws dealt with persons. When the corporate form was developed the law treated corporations as persons for some purposes, and not for others.

The corporate form has proven an excellent vehicle for permitting individuals to combine their resources in order to develop enterprises which could not be developed by individuals or small groups. Since the privilege of operating through the corporate form is one granted by government, it should follow that government may properly control the use of the privilege. It would seem that a corporation might be permitted to grow and expand until it reaches the point where its activities are detrimental to the public interest.

Some people believe that in the automobile industry and with the General Motors Corp. in particular, this point may have been reached. The enormous size of that corporation, with over 500,000 stockholders, over 600,000 employees, plants in 119 cities of the United States and in many foreign countries, has caused many to pause and ponder whether it is in the public interest to allow it the same freedom of action as is permitted to small businesses.

There are two factors involved in this problem. One is that General Motors' advantage over you manufacturers and distributors is due to its size and financial power. If all of you chose to combine your resources you might become big enough to balance your power against General Motors. But even if you all wanted to combine, the antitrust laws would not permit you to. It is considered undersirable public policy to permit such a combination. If the effect of your combining is undesirable, because of the power it would give the combination to affect competition, should General Motors have the privilege of enjoying power which you cannot? If we are concerned with effects, rather than form, should we not have laws which consider the effects?

The other factor is that in large corporations such as General Motors, a tremendous amount of economic power is placed in the hands of a few corporate managers. Is it wise public policy to have a few persons in a position to control so large and important a segment of the economy?

The problem is whether our changed industrial economy has reached the point where the public interest requires that some limitation be placed upon the use of the economic power of a corporation which in and of itself makes competition so one-sided. To those who object to regulation, it is well to take note that regulation has already been with us for a long time, and it is simply a question of what kind, how much, and by whom.

The problems of the manufacturer of parts and accessories are in some respects different from those of distributors. A parts manufacturer who sells to a car manufacturer usually sells both for original equipment and replacement. We have found that in some instances a single price is given the car manufacturer regardless of the use made of the parts. The price to independent wholesalers was much higher than the replacement parts price to car manufacturers. The Robinson-Patman Act prohibits a parts manufacturer from selling replacement parts to a car manufacturer at a different price from that given to other distributors, unless there is cost justification. These price differences give the car manufacturer a great competitive advantage over independent wholesalers. If the car manufacturer is to compete with the independent wholesaler in the distribution of replacement parts made by independent parts producers, he should be required to compete on equal terms.

The parts and accessory manufacturers who do not sell any original equipment are the ones who feel the full impact of the concentration of the car manufacturers. They have the psychological problem of convincing the public that their products are as good as similar products used as original equipment. They have to overcome the great advantage the car manufacturer obtains from widespread advertising, particularly the type relating to genuine parts. They have the practical problem of competing with the car manufacturers for the replacement business of the dealers.

The distributors have succeeded in the past in obtaining a substantial part of the replacement business of the dealers. However, they have always had a problem in selling to dealers, as long as the factory was competing for the dealers' business. The distributors had a little help from the antitrust laws in this respect, since the factory cannot legally force dealers to buy parts. In fact, the Federal Trade Commission issued an order against General Motors in 1941 requiring it to cease and desist from forcing dealers to purchase unwanted parts and accessories.

Here is a specific case where practices of General Motors were held to violate the antitrust laws. But has the law been effective to help you? As early as 1934 parts and accessory manufacturers complained to the Federal Trade Commission that General Motors was coercing its dealers to buy only from GM. In 1937 the Commission issued a complaint. After a full hearing the Commission issued an order against General Motors in 1941. Now, what is the situation today, over 20 years since you started complaining?

COERCION AND RETALIATION

Witnesses testified that in spite of this prohibition, General Motors zone and district managers have continued to put pressure on dealers to purchase replacement parts and accessories from General Motors. This is an example of the lack of effectiveness of the law. One witness testified that he made heaters for Chevrolets, and had been able to make sales to dealers. Then he found that the dealers were unable to obtain Chevrolets without factory-equipped heaters, and they canceled their orders. At Detroit, General Motors insisted it did not require dealers to take factory-installed heaters, yet the dealers told the manufacturer the zone and district managers insisted they take them. After the manufacturers complained to the Federal Trade Commission its investigators interviewed the dealers. Now here is the most disturbing thing about the power of the factory over the dealers. They denied to the FTC investigators that the factory had coerced them. Yet when a member of my staff interviewed one of these dealers he stated he had been coerced, but pleaded that he not be called as a witness because of fear of retaliation from General Motors.

As long as the power of General Motors over its dealers is so great that they fear to tell the truth to Government officials, no laws can be effective. The dealers who are a principal market for distributors are becoming more and more a captive market for the factory. Regardless of what Detroit said General Motors policy is, the testimony of the dealers revealed that they were compelled to purchase parts and accessories from General Motors for fear of losing their franchises. The problem of the independent distributor is closely related to the problems of the dealers. They have forcefully presented their problems to Congress. Any relief which the dealers obtain from the pressure of the car manufacturers will, to a certain extent, benefit you.

But there is another problem which would not be solved immediately. That involves General Motors' plan to induce its dealers to act as wholesalers in direct competition with independent jobbers. Another part of the plan is to have independent wholesalers sell General Motors parts made in the car divisions.

The antitrust laws do not prevent the institution of either of these plans. The distributors claim they are harmed in two ways. First, they have to meet additional direct competition from the dealers. Second, the wholesalers are required to carry a greatly increased inventory in order to have the same full line as their competitors.

What does this GM wholesale parts plan mean to the independent manufacturer and distributor? A spokesman for General Motors, in announcing the purpose and objectives of the new plan, stated that since GM manufactured approximately 50 percent of all cars and trucks, it felt it should make effective a plan to penetrate the replacement parts market it is rightfully entitled to. If the profits in the replacement-parts market are so attractive to GM, then Ford and Chrysler might decide to adopt similar plans. This would immediately eliminate over one-half the market of the independent distributors.

INDEPENDENT INDUSTRY

What would this mean to the independent manufacturer of competitive parts? How many could survive if most of the car dealers purchase parts through factory outlets? What would it mean to independent manufacturers of parts for original equipment? If the independent distributors vanish from the scene, the parts manufacturer will be at the mercy of the car manufacturers. As long as there is an independent distribution system, the parts manufacturer can exercise a choice whether to accept the terms of car manufacturers, or sell only for replacement.

From the standpoint of the public, what difference does it make whether parts of similar quality reach their cars through independent wholesalers or by way of the car manufacturer and his franchise dealer? Considering the consumer, it is speculative what the effect would be. No one can tell whether the consumer would pay more or less than he now does. If such a development resulted in economies of distribution, it is conceivable that the saving might be passed on to the public. Lowering costs to the consumer is definitely in the public interest. But concentrating all distribution in the hands of the car manufacturer would eliminate much of the existing competition in this industry. And we have accepted as a premise that lower prices are more likely when there is competition.

Considering the general public interest, the effect of such a plan is not so speculative. Eliminating thousands of independent businessmen would definitely be a great social loss to the country. Economic considerations are not the sole test of benefit to the public. Congress has definitely adopted a policy of protecting independent business enterprises. The objection is to maintain a system of free competitive enterprise where the door of opportunity is always kept open to individual initiative and incentive.

What you want, and what the country wants, are the advantages and benefits that flow from the combination of resources which provide economic and technological benefits, but not coercion or stifling of incentive which may result from great concentration of economic power. The problem today is how to maintain an industrial structure which achieves these objectives. If the rules for regulating competition treat giant corporations and pigmies alike in all respects, there is no doubt what the outcome will be. Only the giant can survive.

This problem is not easy to solve. Enacting new laws may not be the best way to solve economic problems. It might be better if a strong sense of public responsibility on the part of corporate managers would make them realize that grasping every opportunity for profit, may not be the best policy when the result is to injure or destroy thousands of small enterprises. But, today all businessmen should recognize that some rules there must be, if fairness and equality of opportunity are to be maintained.

Independent parts manufacturers, distributors, and representatives of their trade associations have expressed to our subcommittee their concern regarding this GM wholesale parts plan. It is apparently too early to determine how serious it may be to your interests. However, the experiences of the locomotive and bus industries are a justification for your giving the problem your immediate attention rather than waiting until it is too late. General Motors went into the locomotive industry in 1934, and now controls over 75 percent of the production, practically eliminating from the market some of its major competitors. In the bus industry General Motors has obtained over 80 percent of the production, and has eliminated such formidable competitors as White Motor Co., ACF-Brill, and Twin Coach. If General Motors could eliminate a competitor which was big enough to have over $50 million of sales annually, what can it do to you?

While I have discussed the automobile industry and General Motors, the same conditions exist in other industries where the economic power of big manufacturers creates an imbalance with respect to both competitors and distributors. Our study of this problem will continue in an endeavor to reach a solution.

Organizations such as yours, made up of independent businessmen, who day in and out are faced with the practical realities of the competitive world, can be of great help to your representatives in Washington who are trying to find legislative answers to the difficult problems involved in attempting to revise the antitrust laws. You have appointed a committee to study the problems of your industry and to express your views to Congress. I hope that you will continue to support this committee and its program wholeheartedly. You may be sure that the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly will welcome and give careful consideration to your suggestions and ideas.

The Economy Pattern of American Policy on the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following article that appeared in the Manila Chronicle on March 16, 1956:

THE ECONOMY PATTERN OF AMERICAN POLICY ON THE PHILIPPINES

(By A. Montelibano)

I wish to thank the faculty and student body of the Francisco College, particularly the Commerce Club, for the opportunity given me to address you this afternoon. At a time when there is a raging controversy on the proper approach to the solution of our economic problems. I welcome this chance to air my views before a gathering of young men and women whose minds are open, and above all, whose future is at stake in this controversy.

I have chosen to speak on an aspect of our economic development program, the so-called American aid.

It is wrong to believe that the American policy towards the Philippines is dictated primarily by considerations of friendship. American policy in the Philippines is dictated by expediency and convenience. This conclusion is reflected in the distribution of American foreign grants and credits.

AID PATTERN

Let us analyze the pattern of American foreign aid distribution.

From the post-war year up to 1953, the United States foreign grants and credits totaled $44,326,000,000. Of this amount $33,234,000,000 represented net grants and $11,093,000,000 represented net credits. Who were the recipients of these grants and to what extent? Among the beneficiaries of these grants and credits, in the order of the magnitude of the amounts received are the following:

[In millions of dollars]

	Grants	Credits	Total
1. United Kingdom	2,989	3,805	6,794
2. France	3,233	1,712	4,945
3. Germany	3,586	203	3,789
4. Italy	2,291	300	2,591
5. Japan	2,400	44	2,444
6. Greece	1,114	85	1,199
7. Netherlands	827	241	1,068
8. China	994	57	1,051
9. Austria	982	13	995
10. Korea	874	21	895
11. American Republics	190	689	879
12. Philippines	717	86	803

I invite your attention to the fact that Germany received $3,789,000,000; Italy, $2,591,000,000; and Japan, $2,444,000,000 in American grants and credits. Altogether, these countries who were former enemies of America have received $8,824,000,000, or almost 20 percent of the total and thus were able to occupy the third, fourth, and fifth positions, respectively.

Soviet Russia was extended grants and credits amounting to $426 million; Poland, $434 million; Czechoslovakia, $188 million; and other Communist countries $44 million. All these countries are within the Iron Curtain which are now engaged in a cold war with the United States. Their total foreign aid is $1,092,000,000, or more than 2 percent of the total.

OTHER UNITED STATES AID

Even the neutralist countries in the cold war betwen the democracies and the Communists were also given liberal aid by the United States. Yugoslavia received $633 million; India, $255 million; Indonesia, $215 million; or a total of $1,103,000,000, or more than 2 percent of the total.

The Philippines who fought side by side with America and who sacrificed numerous lives and properties received grants and credits in the insignificant amount of $803 million, or only 1.8 percent of the total.

With respect to American aid in the form of credits, the total extended by the United States amounted to $11 billion. Of this the Philippines received only $86 million, or less than 1 percent of the total credits.

From the figures I have mentioned we can conclude that American aid in the form of grants and credits is based on a pure and simple policy of expediency. If the American policy was dictated primarily by friendship why has not the United States given the Philippines a bigger allocation of her foreign-aid grants in proportion to the love and friendship that the two countries profess for each other?

LEGAL CLAIMS

The Philippines has legal claims against the United States which have been pending settlement for many years. For example, we have a legal claim for the gold devaluation of the United States in 1933 in the amount of $24 million. The balance of our war damage claim has not yet been paid, amounting to $155 million. The United States has obligations to our veterans that are still unsettled. The total claims of the Philippines against the United States amount to $860,-211,458 as documented by the Laurel Trade Mission. If friendship is the criteria of American action in the Philippines, why has the United States not settled these claims and instead forced the Philippines to resort to borrowing, sometimes under onerous conditions that prevent the Filipinos from taking full advantage of such loans? The answer can only be because expediency does not indicate the settlement of these accounts by the United States.

Sadly, while America has followed a policy of expediency toward the Philippines, we on our part have consistently adhered to a policy dictated primarily by friendship, loyalty, and gratitude. We have clung to this attitude toward the United States in the expectation that she will reciprocate and recompense us in the form of aid greater than those to countries who claim no closer ties.

NO ADVANTAGE

We have not gotten any positive advantage in pursuing a policy based primarily on friendship and loyalty. America is taking the Philippines for granted. Because America knows that we sincerely subscribe to democratic principles and we have definitely alined ourselves with the democracies against the Communists, she has paid us less attention and used her foreign aid to attract those who may veer toward the Communist camp.

It is time that we revise our foreign policy and pattern it on a more realistic basis so that we can be placed at par with the United States in our relations with her. It is best for us that we adopt a foreign policy that shall look more toward the best interests of our country rather than depend purely on friendship with the United States or any other country. After all, the United States and all other countries adopt this policy of expediency in their relations with the Philippines.

Let us look at another phase of American foreign aid in the Philippines. The American commitment in the joint aid program under the Quirino-Foster agreement of November 1950 is $250 million. The United States has failed to comply with her commitment. In this agreement the American Government made us understand that $250 million will be made available for social, economic, and technical assistance. However, under the FOA (now ICA) program, the Philippines received only $91,261,000 as of December 1954, to which other grants were added in 1955 and 1956, making a total of only $137,946,000 allocated up to fiscal year 1956, or just about one-half of the amount committed to us.

JOINT PROGRAM

The total cost of administration of the joint program amounts to ₱63.9 million, ₱16.3 million of which was used by Filipinos and ₱47.6 million by Americans. The Filipino participation consists of 2 groups, namely, 1 representing the Philcusa (now NEC) employees with a total appropriation of ₱4,191,000 for 896 persons in 5 years, giving an average salary of ₱4,670 per person per year. The balance of ₱12,169,000 was used for Filipino participants in type A programs or to cover the expenses of those sent abroad for training, totaling 1,245 persons at an average cost of ₱9,780 per person per year. Three-fourths of these expenses are in dollars.

The total cost of American advisers in the joint program for the fiscal years 1952 to 1956 amounts to ₱47.6 million for the 727 persons involved or at an average of ₱65,500

per person per year. This expenditure for American advisers is divided into 2 categories: (1) the so-called type B technical assistance composing the personnel of the International Cooperation Administration, and (2) the type C covering the contract advisers in different government offices and agencies. The ICA advisers are costing us ₱24,492,000 annually and the technical assistants under contract are costing us ₱14,321,000. Of the first type we have in total since 1952, 520 persons, and of the second since 1952 to 1956, we have 207. Besides these, the ICA is using ₱8,808,000 representing 5 percent of the total peso counterpart in the joint program for their own expenses.

TECHNICAL PERSONNEL

At ₱65,500 cost per head per year, positively without any doubt or discussion, we will have much more and far better technical personnel than what we have. At this cost we can have the best not only of American advisers but the best of the whole world.

I am sure that among Filipinos there would be many who would have far better capabilities than most of these American advisers who come to the Philippines virtually as vacationers. Some are political proteges while others are fresh college graduates with neither the experience nor the knowledge about Philippine conditions. We can find more capable men among the Filipinos.

It would be the height of imprudence to entrust the future of our beloved country in the hands of foreigners whose interest in the Philippines cannot go beyond their self-advancement.

And while these American advisers around us are receiving such huge amounts, the Monetary Board, in view of the dwindling reserves, had to drastically cut the allowances of students abroad. Considering that the dollar expenses of these American advisers for the fiscal years 1952 to 1956 amount to $13,600,000 for the 727 persons involved during that period, or at an average of $19,000 annually per person, and the fact that the Monetary Board reduced the individual allowance of each of our Filipino students by $50 per month, it is only evident that if we eliminate only one American adviser, the dollars saved will be sufficient to avoid cutting the allowance of over 300 of our students abroad. Why not, therefore, cut the useless dollars that are spent for ICA advisers instead of cutting the allowances of our students abroad who are being trained as future leaders of our country?

My friends, let us reexamine our position. Our foreign policy must be revised to advance our national self-interest, first and foremost. Any foreign aid should be and must be administered by Filipinos for the Filipinos, with the minimum of foreign interference.

Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, Before La Crosse, Wis., Shrine Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it was my privilege recently to deliver an address before the Shrine Club of La Crosse, Wis. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain excerpts from that address.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY URGES 10-POINT PROGRAM FOR WISCONSIN DEVELOPMENT

(Excerpts of address by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, at Shrine Club, La Crosse, Wis., April 6, 1956)

COMPETITIVE RACE WILL BE INTENSIFYING IN 48 STATES

These days, we hear a great deal about competitive coexistence between the United States and the Soviet Union.

I need not comment in detail to you, the members of the Shrine (who know the great patriotic record of our own Shrine organization), how significant is this coexistence race. We of this country must make sure in this jet-atomic age that we stay ahead in the race for national survival. We must make sure that we are well prepared—on the home and foreign fronts—against any danger that may arise.

PATRIOTIC RECORD OF THE SHRINE

The Shrine, as we all know, is the playground of Masonry.

But the Shrine has its serious moments too. And throughout all Shrine activity, there runs the undertone and overtone of patriotic service, of promoting civic welfare and human betterment whether it be on behalf of crippled children or any other worthy cause.

And, of course, there is no cause more worthy, more essential than national survival—the greatest single obligations of this Republic—which is the great beacon to mankind.

THE RACE AMONG THE 48 STATES

I would like to point out, however, to my brother Shriners, that there is another type of competitive race—over and above our race with the Soviet Union. It occurs right in our own country. It is the race among the 48 States for progress and prosperity.

Every day, new developments are occurring in this competitive race. Factories move from one State to another. Companies start new plants or subsidiaries in one State or another.

We of the Badger State are anxious to keep our State to the fore. We want to move up—not to fall back—in the competitive race.

We want more contracts for Wisconsin, more and steadier jobs, fuller pay envelopes, more jingling tunes in the cash registers, more tourist income, more farm sales.

To achieve this, we'll require action, planning, teamwork, cooperation.

WE ARE INTERESTED IN QUALITY

Of course, we are definitely not trying to get the largest population, we are not trying to attract any type of plant, just for the sake of piling up big statistics of new business.

We are interested in quality. We want the best type of industry in Wisconsin. We want our own existing population to enjoy ever higher income. We don't want to sacrifice living standards but rather to raise them.

For these purposes, I am in continuous contact with the officials of our State government, with our governor, our State planning commission, and with other State officials.

I would like to spell out now a 10-point program for making sure that Wisconsin keeps moving forward in 1956 and in the years to come.

This is by no means a complete list, but it will indicate to you the sort of things which must be done.

CAPITALIZE ON MISSISSIPPI AND THE LAKES

1. Further use the great natural arteries available to us. That means the mighty Mississippi. It means the Great Lakes.

It means roads along the Mississippi and river traffic on the Mississippi, roads alongside the lakes and commerce on the lakes.

We must capitalize on these assets to the fullest. We must get all the possible traffic we can out of them—out of barge traffic and along the lakes, out of deepwater traffic.

2. For full lake benefits, we must secure the prompt deepening of the Great Lakes connecting channels. This means we must make all possible speed in securing congressional approval of the initial $5 million (out of the overall $110 million authorized) to deepen and improve the Great Lakes connecting channels west of Lake Erie.

EXPAND CREDIT FOR SMALL BUSINESS

3. Utilize the splendid facility of the Wisconsin Credit Development Corp. This is the organization designed at Madison, by our State officials with the cooperation of our State's banking profession, to provide needed capital wherever necessary, and otherwise unavailable, so as to expand industry or bring in new industry.

4. Further develop our Wisconsin highway system, which is so vital to our tourist industry, as well as to inexpensive transportation of our farm and business products.

Under Federal aid, the highway legislation now before the House, Wisconsin will get an estimated $345 million in the coming 13-year period for road improvement.

5. Strengthen Wisconsin aviation—meaning improve our airport system, our navigational aids. Facilitate the work of North Central Airlines, Northwest Airlines, and other fine airline companies serving our State. Expand the number of our pilots and civilian planes, as may be necessary.

MORE CONTRACTS FOR BADGERS

6. Bring in more Federal contracts wherever possible to utilize the skills and abilities of Wisconsin industry and workers for defense purposes.

7. Utilize Wisconsin camp facilities—like Camp McCoy—to the fullest. This has been my constant aim in Washington.

WISCONSIN WANTS FAIR-PRICED NATURAL GAS

8. Increase the amount of the fuel at good prices available to our citizens.

Right now, there are, as you know, numerous applications pending before the Federal Power Commission for bringing in more natural gas pipelines to Wisconsin. I, for one, want every additional cubic foot of natural gas we can get and use—for our homes, offices, stores, and factories. And I want it at good, competitive prices.

Thanks to President Eisenhower's wise veto of the Harris-Fulbright bill, we can feel reasonably assured that we are going to get fuel at a fair price. Had that bill not been vetoed, Wisconsin would have paid through the nose to the gas monopoly.

Fuel is a mighty important factor that is considered when a company weighs moving a plant to a particular State. We don't want Wisconsin companies moving to the South or anywhere else, so as to get cheaper fuel, subsidized by the Federal Government.

We want adequate fuel and/or fair private enterprise prices, for our State.

9. Keep Wisconsin ahead in scientific research, both through our great private laboratory teams, as well as through the marvelous research conducted by the University of Wisconsin and other splendid educational institutions.

This is a scientific age, and the State with scientific and technical know-how will forge ahead of other States which lag in scientific development.

KEEP WISCONSIN INDUSTRIAL PEACE

10. Last but not least, let's keep Wisconsin as a model of cooperation between labor and management, industry and agriculture, farm and city.

As we look elsewhere, we see first right now, as you know, the South is paying a bitter price because of racial tension.

Here in our own State, let's make sure of cooperation between all groups. Let's try to avoid the type of industrial warfare which crippled the great Westinghouse Corp. for 156 days, the kind of heated labor-manage-

ment bickering which causes losses to all, particularly the public, as a whole.

These then, are but 10 points in our "Forward, Wisconsin" program. You and I can and will add many more points as we seek to assure rising and lasting prosperity for the Badger State.

Address by Judge Morgan C. Harris at Naturalization Ceremony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I recently had the great honor of sitting next to Associate Judge Morgan C. Harris, of the Fourth Judicial Circuit of Maryland, during naturalization ceremonies for seven foreign-born residents of my State's Allegany and Garrett Counties. Judge Harris delivered an exceptionally stirring address to our new citizens; and, as I sat there listening to it, I felt that the words were just as appropriate for all those persons who were born a part of this Nation as they were for the seven women who were joining it by their own choice. Consequently, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Judge Harris be printed in the Appendix of today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is interesting to note that 3 of the women who took their naturalization oath before the judge were natives of Germany, 2 were from Italy, 1 was from England, and 1 was from Czechoslovakia. All except one had married United States servicemen.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In this jurisdiction it is customary for the court to address you with a few remarks before considering your respective petitions.

The magnitude of the action anticipated by each of you cannot be overestimated. When a person severs his or her relationship to the country to which he or she avers allegiance, and pledges fidelity to another, everyone realizes the greatness of the consequences that may result. This never should be done for selfish reasons or ulterior motives. Frequently one is required to make great sacrifices therefor, and at times it is necessary for wives and mothers to give their loved ones in defense of the country of adoption. Next to your love of God should come the love of your country.

It should be undertaken only after a thorough understanding of our form of government and what it stands for. We have a country "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." This does not mean that everyone is born with the same amount of physical or mental ability; it means that in relationship to Government every person here stands on an equal footing. Unlike a great many other countries, we believe that all Government is for the benefit of the individuals composing it, and that it derives its power from the governed. Widespread happiness would result if the remainder of the world should arrive at the same conclusion.

We have in this country two documents that are cherished and revered by all true and loyal citizens. They are the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. By the first we informed the world why we were severing our ties with the mother country, and declared ourselves a free and independent Nation. The latter conspicuous for its brevity, is the supreme law of this land; and has guided a very large country territorially, with probably 160 million souls since its beginning.

In times like these when the whole world is in a constant state of anxiety, when the rights of millions of human beings, as we view those rights, are being trampled under foot, we thoughtfully examine the institutions of our own country to find what we can and should do to preserve their benefits. Our Republic has existed for 169 years. It is the oldest of all living republics. It is well for us to remember that other republics, different from ours it is true, lived long lives. The Republic of Venice endured for 1,100 years; that of Athens, with some interruptions, for 900 years; Carthage for 700 years; Rome for 500 years; and other republics, such as those of Genoa and Florence, lived long lives. They all failed because of the natural inclination of men granted great powers to seize more power.

It should be recalled that Caesar, who undertook to protect the rights of the Roman people against the Roman Senate, himself ultimately became the master both of the people and of the Senate. Cromwell, who undertook to secure to Englishmen rights that had been seriously infringed, himself became the dictator of England. Napoleon, who undertook to secure for Frenchmen the liberty won through their revolution, himself became the Emperor of France and sought to become the Emperor of all Europe. All of these republics finally became despotisms or monarchies.

What is there in our Republic that promises to insure its continuity? Our forms are somewhat complicated. This will first occur to some. Our theory is the practice of checks and balances; the division of powers between the Federal Government and the State government; the division between the three departments of Government—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial; making the head of the executive department the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, but placing the power to declare war and the pursestrings within the control of Congress; the bicameral legislature; the necessity that all bills for raising revenue must originate in the House of Representatives; the requirement that all laws must pass both Houses and by a majority vote, but placing a check upon this through the veto power of the President, and preventing this power from becoming arbitrary by providing that by a two-thirds vote the Congress may pass a bill over the President's veto; and above all of these, placing the Supreme Court as the keystone in the arch of our liberties—a court that may declare void any act of the executive department or of the legislative department—a power which it must exercise in accordance with our fundamental law as found in the Constitution.

Mazinni said: "Democracy is the progress of all through all, under the leadership of the best and wisest." True democracy will carry on an insistent search for these wisest and best, and will elevate them to posts of leadership and command. Under the operation of the law of liberty, it will provide itself with real leaders, not limited by rank, or birth, or wealth or circumstance, but opening the way for each individual, to rise to the place of honor and influence by the expression of his own best and highest self. It exactly reverses the communistic formula, "From each according to his abilities. To each according to his needs," and upholds the principle, "From each according to his needs, To each according to his abilities." Democracy takes care to provide such a ladder of education and opportunity that the humblest may rise to the very top if he is capable and worthy. The most precious thing in the world is the individual human mind and soul, with its capacity for growth and service. To bind it fast to a formula, to hold it in check to serve the selfish ends of mediocrity, to deny it utterance and expression, political, economic and moral, is to make democracy impossible as a permanent social and governmental form. The United States is in sore need today of an aristrocracy of intellect and service.

National socialism would substitute corporate or collective responsibility for individual initiative. Therefore, socialism is primarily an attempt to overcome man's individual imperfections by adding them together in the hope that they cancel each other. This is not only bad mathematics, but worse psychology.

It will behoove those who become citizens of this great Nation to help in every proper way to see these salutary principles of government perpetuated.

This country is honest and sincere in its thoughts concerning, and its actions and relatioships with, the other peoples of the world and their governments. Its emissaries and ambassadors are taught to deal with truth and candor; and to abhor deceit and intrigue. If all other nations could see their way clear to have the same aims and desires, we would actually see the Christian maxim, "On earth peace, good will toward men" fulfilled; and the world would head into many years of peace, security and happiness.

The Cowardly Attack Against Columnist Victor Riesel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation has been appalled and disgusted at the cowardly attack perpetrated on Victor Riesel, the nationally syndicated columnist, when sulfuric acid was hurled into his eyes.

It is our hope and prayer that his eyesight will be fully restored.

It is our further hope and prayer that this vicious assault may serve to spark, once and for all, a crackdown on the part of public officials—Federal, State, and local—a crackdown on the part of the great mass of responsible union leaders, and rank and file members against the vicious thugs who have infiltrated into some unions and who are misusing the bona fide trade-union movement as a cloak for plundering and thieving.

I commend the hard-hitting statement of A. F. of L. president, George Meany, who promptly denounced this outrage.

However, as we all realistically know, there has been a tendency in times past for labor, for the public, and for public officials to become only temporarily aroused when a crime of this sort is committed.

I hope that this merely temporary reaction will not prove to be the case in this instance. I hope that this time organized gangsterdom will be hit hard

and hit continuously and lastingly so that its backbone will be broken once and for all in the trade-union movement or anywhere else in our country.

That will, of course, take a lot of doing. Past reform movements, such as those at the time of our Senate Crime Investigating Committee, have tended to die down after but a brief flurry of activity. That must not happen this time. As Vic Riesel himself said, from his hospital bed, "keep the heat on."

The best type of tribute that we can pay to Vic Riesel, lying swathed in bandages today, is to clean out the hoodlums and Reds who have been his implacable enemies since he began his column.

Newspapers in my own State, like newspapers all over the country, particularly the 193 which carry his column through the Hall Syndicate, have reflected our universal sense of shock at this murderous assault.

I send to the desk now the text of an editorial and column from the Wisconsin State Journal, a paper which has done an outstanding job in focusing public attention on this outrage.

May I note that, in times past, Mr. Riesel had kindly written up a great many of my own efforts, and efforts of my staff, against both racketeers and subversives. But if he had never mentioned a word concerning me or my staff or praising any other Member of the Congress, I would feel that he had rendered outstanding service to the American community. And I would feel a personal obligation to do everything i could to speak out as I am now doing.

I have been in contact with the Honorable Paul Williams, United States attorney for the area where the crime was committed, as well as with State and local officials, and it is my earnest hope that they will be completely successful in their crackdown efforts.

Lastly, may I say that perhaps the most eloquent tribute to Vic Riesel is the fact that he has been praised for his courage by every single writer and commentator with whom I am familiar. Tributes were, for example, paid by Ray Henle of the NBC Three Star Extra program, which has featured his analyses. Tribute was paid by Walter Winchell on his Mutual Broadcasting System program last Sunday night, by the New York Times, by editorials in the Hearst newspapers, by the noted columnists George E. Sokolsky and M. S. Rukeyser, both of whom, for example, differ widely with many of Mr. Riesel's views, but who nonetheless warmly admire his frankness, vigor, and pluck.

I ask unanimous consent that two editorials from the Wisconsin State Journal on this subject be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wisconsin State Journal of April 6, 1956]

A CHALLENGE TO LABOR'S LEADERS

George Meany, president of the newly affiliated AFL-CIO, has called the attack on labor columnist Victor Riesel "a challenge to all decent elements in our society and specifically a challenge to those entrusted with the task of law enforcement."

That it is. But it is more.

It is a grim challenge—though not the first—to Mr. Meany and the 15-million-member labor organization he heads. It is a clear call for a crackdown by organized labor itself on the slimy elements within its ranks that shoot and kill and sabotage to gain members, to shake protection money from employers, and to gouge American consumers out of millions of dollars.

The Riesel case is a dramatic one, involving as it does a syndicated writer whose dispatches for years have named names and specified dates and places on labor's lawbreakers. But it is no more deserving of punishment for the guilty parties than the case of the union rank-and-filer denied his rights, or that of the little shopkeeper whose place is smashed for refusing to "cooperate."

Acid was thrown into Riesel's face early Thursday, shortly after he completed a New York radio interview with two young members of the operating engineers who are trying to clean up their Long Island local.

It was about the same time that Thursday's Wisconsin State Journal was going to press with a Riesel column on the Federal Government's latest plans for smashing shakedown rackets in the food, trucking, and garment industries. The column, as it happens, mentioned acid and stink bombs, common weapons in the mobsters' fight against hold-out merchants.

The State Journal has been and is proud to be one of the 193 daily newspapers carrying Vic Riesel's column. It has admired his talent for getting the facts, but, more, it has admired the little guy's courage; he has been threatened repeatedly and told to "lay off." Riesel and the brave union men who have dared talk to him and to grand juries are fighting for the rights of every honest wage earner in the country.

It is a fight, now more than ever, that must go on until it is won.

Mr. Meany and his lieutenants know the men running these crooked locals. They are largely AFL unions in the construction trades and the teamsters. Violence is nothing new to either group—and the men responsible for the violence have stayed in control of powerful locals for years.

The cowardly attack on Mr. Riesel is a challenge all right.

A big part of that challenge must be accepted by labor's own top leaders who permit crooked union heads and men from the mobs to operate.

[From the Wisconsin State Journal of April 8, 1956]

"DON'T STOP THE COLUMN NOW," RIESEL SAID; SO HERE IT IS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This column is being written by Victor Riesel's staff after a dramatic bedside conference almost immediately after the injured columnist recovered from heavy sedation administered to ease the pain of the acid burns on his face and eyes.)

Victor Riesel, face scarred by acid burns, eyes puffed and painful, awoke from a merciful drugged sleep only an hour ago.

His first coherent conversation was with his two staff members who have been at his bedside from the moment they were first notified of the sneak attack which may cost Riesel his sight.

This measure of this brave newspaperman is in the words he first spoke: "How are Bill Wilkens and Pete Batalias (the two leaders of the reform group fighting against Labor Czar Bill DeKoning, of the Operating Engineers' Union)? Are they O. K.? Did anything happen to them? Tell them to take care."

His first thought, in his first moment of rational consciousness, was for the safety of these two "working Joes" whose fight for decency he supported so brilliantly in his columns for the past year.

His next words were the measure of a newsman's newsman. "Don't stop the column now. We'll discuss it each day when I'm awake. Then you two write it. Don't stop it and don't use guest columns. I can't see now, but I can still talk."

Typed or dictated, the exposures of corruption and indecency will go on, Riesel has vowed.

At least three law-enforcement agencies have called for all of the columns written by Victor Riesel in the last year. Their experts are pouring over the many exposures contained in them—paying particular attention to situations and names pinpointed in the past 6 months.

A spokesman for one of these law groups told Riesel's staff that "We are pretty much convinced that the attack had to stem from something relatively recent that the column exposed."

In addition to the columns, the texts of Riesel's recent broadcasts, in which he swung heavily at racketeering, in general, and racketeering inside labor, in particular, were also under close scrutiny for possible clues.

There is no question in the minds either of Riesel's staff members or the many law-enforcement officials to whom they have spoken that the brutal attack is linked to some phase of labor racketeering laid bare by Riesel. Most of these officials have also ruled out speculation that the attack was the work of some crank or amateur working on his own.

They point out that Riesel and his escorts were carefully followed from the scene of the broadcast to the site of the actual attask. His car was carefully noted. The assailant was spotted at the precise point where the car was parked. And the acid-tosser had been briefed to recognize Riesel on sight.

The preparation of the acid was a professional job, too. Most amateurs use lye or some lye solution. More often than not they toss it from the original can. This solution was highly concentrated sulphuric acid carefully carried in a special jar with a wide, open mouth. That the acid was tossed directly into Riesel's eyes in a practiced upward motion is also the mark of the pro, they added.

Many of the columns under close scrutiny discuss mob activities with national ramifications. Others deal with lush underworld operations centered primarily in the New York area. All involve men with long police records or with associates who are known criminals.

Nor are the law agencies overlooking some of the hard-hitting columns that exposed recent Communist directives to its cadres across the country. Or the exposures of the cooperation between pro-Soviet agents and underworld representatives on the New York waterfront.

One Federal official told Riesel's staff that everyone found to be involved in any way with the activities exposed by Riesel or connected with persons involved will be carefully investigated and perhaps questioned. Special attention will be paid to alibis for the time of the attack on Riesel.

Among the columns under scrutiny, this official indicated, are those dealing with the garment and trucking rackets, waterfront, and narcotics rackets, Communist activities, CP-mob tieups, perishable food industry extortion, sale of charters, sale of members of one union hood to another for a fee and terrorization of small-business men whose employees are primarily Puerto Rican.

Somewhere in the these fighting columns, they believe, lies the significant clue to those behind the attack on Riesel. Who are they? Only time, wide publicity, and effective policy work will tell.

The Other Face of Coexistence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, last summer, at the time of the Geneva Conference, which was to put an end to tensions, the Communist leaders were carrying on a vigorous campaign among escapees in the West to persuade them to return home.

Now we learn that, 3 or 4 months after the summit meeting, the Communist rulers of Rumania murdered hundreds of their political opponents and left their bodies unburied in the streets as a warning to their suffering people.

What makes more horrible this example of murder as an instrument of government policy is the seductive advertisements published by the Communist Government of Rumania, in the press of Western Europe and the United States, urging political refugees to return because a new era had begun.

Rumanian Communists had issued a decree of amnesty to refugee political opponents in July 1955. At home political prisoners were freed from the jails. Advertisements in our papers promised complete restoration of citizenship to refugees who would return, immediately upon their entering the country. Rumanians in Washington were invited to return, by an advertisement in the Washington Post of July 20, 1955. They were to call at 1601 23d Street NW. It was all very relaxed.

The murders took place in late November and December of 1955. Victims were apparently shot behind the ear by the security police.

The corpses were seen by eyewitnesses in the gutters of Bucharest and several other Rumanian cities. Reports have come from travelers, from returning refugees, and from various unimpeachable sources.

Published reports in the foreign press estimate the totals as high 2,800 victims.

Even Communists would not resort to leaving the dead in the gutters like dogs, unless their purpose were political. It is believed the men released from jail may have spoken too freely, in the innocent belief that the political climate had really changed. Communist officials acted promptly to dispose of the offenders, and to intimidate their desperate people.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Communist leaders of Rumania were thus disposing of political opposition in November and December of 1955, the very time when the U. N. Assembly was debating admission of the Soviet satellites to membership, in accordance with the infamous package deal which our Government sponsored.

I ask unanimous consent to have reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD some of the supporting documents.

There being no objection, the documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 20, 1955]

RUMANIAN CITIZENS

To offer the possibility of returning home to citizens and former Rumanian citizens, who are abroad and who wish to return to their country in order to integrate themselves in the constructive work of the Rumanian people, the Presidium of the Grand National Assembly of the Rumanian People's Republic has issued a decree of amnesty. By virtue of this decree amnesty is granted to all infractions dealt with by the Penal Code or by special laws—with the exception of the crime of homicide dealt with and punished by articles 463 and 464 of the Penal Code—committed by citizens and former Rumanian citizens, who, on the day of publication of this decree, are abroad, if they obtain authorization to return and if they return to the Rumanian People's Republic before August 23, 1956.

Former Rumanian citizens who are abroad and who take advantage of the amnesty, in accordance with the conditions of the present decree, regain citizenship of the Rumanian People's Republic upon entrance into the country. The decree provides also that persons who had lost their Rumanian citizenship, and who wish to return to the country and who return before August 23, 1956, by virtue of the obtained authorization regain citizenship of the Rumanian People's Republic upon entrance into the country.

The spouse and minor children who return to the country benefit equally from the action of regaining citizenship of the Rumanian People's Republic in accordance with the conditions of the present decree.

Citizens and former Rumanian citizens, who live in the United States of America and who wish to return to the country, may submit such request daily from 9 a. m. to 4 p. m.—to the consular section of the Legation of the Rumanian People's Republic, 1601 23d Street NW., Washington, D. C.

[Translation from Rumanian of item in Cronica Romaneasca of March 15, 1956]

A RUMANIAN REFUGEE STATES THAT HE HAS SEEN THE CORPSES OF 14 PERSONS EXPOSED IN THE STREET

A former steelworker from Timisoara who fled the country on January 14, 1956, has told Free Europe Press that in November 1955 he saw the bodies of 14 persons exposed on several streets of Timisoara. The bodies were guarded by the militia and by Soviet soldiers and nobody dared approach in order to identify them for fear of being arrested. It is believed that the victims were arrested during the night and executed in prison or in the woods. It is evident that the purpose was intimidation since the bodies of those executed were exposed in various districts of the city. The Romanian refugee states that on November 28, 1955, four students from the Polytechnic Institute who lived in the same neighborhood, namely: Gheorghe Lazi, Petru Gheletariu, Ionel Bob, and Ionel Stoicanescu, were arrested. Up to the departure of our informant they had not returned to their domicile and their families had not received any information regarding their fate. The Rumanian refugee believes that this wave of executions is due to the desperation which makes people talk openly against the regime.

In regard to the campaign for repatriation the same refugee gave Free Europe Press information regarding persons from the Timisoara area. A worker in a factory of that city was compelled by officials of the party and of the union to encourage his son, who had sought refuge in Belgium, to return home. The son yielded and upon his arrival in R. P. R. he telephoned his father. He has not yet shown up. His father found out that all repatriates are held by the Russians at their military headquarters in Arad for questioning. The same thing happened to three families of the German minority who returned from France in December 1955. While the men were detained at Arad their families were sent to work in kolkhozes. The men's names are: Hans Scheir, Frank Krepts, and Miklos Schulz.

[Translation from Rumanian of item in Cronica Romaneasca of March 8, 1956]

THE ARM OF JUSTICE IN R. P. R. IS LONG

Under this title we published in a previous number of this Bulletin information which had arrived from the radio station Free Europe in Munich regarding the bodies of certain persons shot and left in the streets of Bucharest. The radio station Voice of America transmitted on March 6, 1956, that, from the reports received, approximately 100 persons were shot and their corpses left in the streets as a reminder to the population as to who holds the power in Rumania. It is believed that the persons involved were political personalities and persons who were freed on the occasion of the amnesty of last summer. The reports added that similar incidents had also taken place in other towns of that country, on a smaller scale, also in the month of December.

Invocation Offered by the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army, at the Easter Sunrise Service at the Arlington Amphitheater on Sunday, April 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I am including a copy of the invocation delivered at the Easter sunrise service at the Arlington Amphitheater on Sunday, April 1, by the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army:

Our Heavenly Father, we are grateful to Thee for the privilege of this Easter morning with its quickening hope—the glory and joy of it—that Thou who didst give us life with its many blessings gave us also Thine only begotten Son—whose resurrection on that glorious Easter morn wiped away the darkness of Calvary and gave us the promise of immortality and eternal life—we pray for understanding of Thy ways—for the wisdom and courage that will give purpose to our lives.

We thank Thee for the opportunity of worshiping at this shrine—the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier which stands as a memorial to the memory of all those who through the years—at Valley Forge, at Gettysburg, at Santiago, at Flanders Field, the South Pacific, the beaches of Normandy, the hills of Korea—all who made the supreme sacrifice to keep this great land of ours free and a Christian nation—we thank Thee for the memory of those heroic lives; we pray for strength that we may rededicate our lives to Thy service. We thank Thee for those who in life are serving Thee through service to our country, are giving of themselves to keep us strong in Thy sight.

As these Knights Templar, symbolic descendants of the Christian crusaders of the Middle Ages, have unfurled their banner upon which appears the cross with the motto "In Hoc Signo Vinces" (in this sign we will conquer), we pray that men of good will may join in applying its meaning to the con-

quering of death by the Christian promise of immortality.

We ask these things in the name of Him who died more than 19 centuries ago and rose on Easter morn that we might have everlasting life, Thy Son, Our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

Death Be Not Proud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I am including a sermon delivered by the Reverend Thomas Sherrard Roy, D. D., Worcester, Mass., at the Easter sunrise memorial service in the Amphitheater, Arlington National Cemetery, at the service conducted by the grand encampment of Knights Templar. I am sure Members of the House and others will be interested in this timely message:

DEATH BE NOT PROUD

My subject is Death Be Not Proud. John Donne an English clergyman and poet of over 300 years ago wrote the words of the subject:

"Death be not proud, though some have called thee
Mighty and dreadful, for thou art not so:
For those whom thou thinkest thou dost overthrow
Die not, poor Death, nor yet canst thou kill me.
One short sleep past, we wake eternally,
And Death shall be no more. Death, thou shalt die."

This is the message of Easter. From the hid battlements of heaven on this morning, a host no man can number sings out the message of triumph that death is conquered. "Death, thou shalt die," for as Peter shouted forth a few weeks later at Pentecost, it was impossible for death to hold Jesus.

I. TRANSFORMATION

The first evidence that we have that death was conquered on that first Easter is in the lives of the disciples of Jesus. The greatest transformation in the thinking of men in a comparable period took place in the thinking of the followers of Jesus on that first Easter morning. If you think of what they had been through you will see them there as those who sit among the ashes of broken dreams, and thwarted ambitions and dead hopes. Then the news of the resurrection broke upon them. It was startling in its suddenness, bewildering in its mystery, and astounding in its apparent impossibility. There can be nothing surer than the fact that in spite of all that Jesus had said to them about rising from the dead they did not take Him literally. They saw Him crucified. They saw His limp form taken down from the cross and laid away in the tomb. To them He was dead. They felt the finality of death expressed by Gray in his Churchyard Elegy when he wrote:

"Can storied urn or animated bust
Back to its mansion call the fleeting breath?
Can honour's voice provoke the silent dust?
Or flattery soothe the dull cold ear of death?

If we could multiply all of the pessimisms of men throughout the centuries on the matter of death, the sum would be no greater than the pessimism of the disciples as they thought of the finality of the death of the Master. Through the long hours between the day of the crucifixion and Easter morning, their thought was upon death. When on this morning of the first day of the week the women came to the tomb to prepare the body for permanent burial their thought was upon death. The spices in their boxes to anoint the body, and the cerements over their arms in which to enfold it all spoke of death. The question on their lips, "who shall roll away the stone from the door," was its own testimony to their thought of death.

In spite of all that men have thought and written to the contrary, namely, that this was something they wanted to believe, it was not easy for them to believe in the resurrection. When the women, first at the tomb, came back to the Apostles and told them that Jesus was alive their words were received with derisive incredulity. "Their words were to them as idle tales," or as the translator Moffat puts it, "their words were nonsense." There is nothing more certain than that the disciples did not expect Jesus to rise from the dead.

It was just as certain that without exception the disciples believed that Jesus rose from the dead, so complete was the transformation in their thinking. Apparently there was no argument as to the possibility of the resurrection, they accepted it when they saw Jesus. They did not keep Him waiting in another room while they appointed a committee of their number to investigate the metaphysical implications of His presence, and present a detailed account of the procedure that brought Him from the tomb to them. He was alive to see, to hear, to talk, to listen. Here was a renewal of an enjoyable fellowship. They were not interested in arguments about the resurrection in the presence of a living Christ. They had a certainty which could not be questioned. It was not in a church, for there was no church; it was not in an authoritative creed, for there was no creed; it was not in an inspired and infallible New Testament for there was no New Testament. They had seen Jesus alive and had shared a new and intimate fellowship with Him.

It is still true that after all of the hypothetical questions about the resurrection have been asked, and all of the arguments for and against have been advanced, its certainty rests upon the certainty of a personal experience of the living Christ in which one affirms, "I know Him, and the power of His resurrection."

II. REVELATION

"Death, thou shalt die." The conquest of death by the resurrection is seen in the new revelation of God that the resurrection brought to men.

In this new revelation of God there is removed the last vestige of doubt concerning the perfection of God's plan for man. If life ends at the grave, as so many believe, then in spite of all that can be said otherwise, there will always be as there always has been a sense of injustice and frustration on the part of man. The frustration is an inevitable consequence of the recognition of incompleteness. When we see a man cut off in the midst of unfinished work and partially developed character we cannot avoid a feeling of unfairness if that is the end of it all. And we either apologize for God, or try to rationalize as divine the wisdom that has so ordered things. We cannot escape a feeling of the fragmentation of life, for which we pity ourselves, instead of being inspired with the thought that God reveals His perfection in the completeness of his plan for us.

That men will not accept the idea of death as the end is seen in such a man as Victor Hugo. Towards the end of his life he wrote these words: "For half a century I have been writing my thoughts in prose and verse, history and philosophy, drama and romance, tradition, satire, ode and song. I have tried all. But I feel that I have not said the thousandth part of what is in me. When I go down to the grave I can say like many others, "I have finished the day's work", but I cannot say, "I have finished my life." In the thinking of Hugo simple justice demanded that he be able to say, "My day's work will begin again the next morning. The tomb is not a blind alley, it is a thoroughfare. It closes on the twilight, but opens on the dawn."

Think of what a travesty of justice it would have been if Jesus had ended his life on the cross. All done at 33. We think of Him as a man who walked the earth among His fellows, carrying on the ministry that brought the blessings of a new life wherever He went. We stultify all that we call thinking, or reflection upon life if we conclude the cross ended His life. It would be an irrational world in which such a thing could happen. As a man named Snowden has put it: "If that great soul and white spirit vanished in the night of death, and left only a handful of dust under the Syrian stars, then we feel that we live in an irrational world which devours its noblest children and betrays all its promises. That any personalities, the highest and costliest embodiments of worth should be produced through the travail of divine birth only to be flung as rubbish to the void, puts to confusion all of our ideas of reason and right. Is God blowing soap bubbles? Did He dip the pipe of His power in the suds of matter and blow the character of Jesus, that it might entertain Him with its irridescence, burst to His satisfaction and be gone? The human mind and heart will ever refuse to believe in such a wreck or reason and hope." But when Jesus rose from the dead, and as Paul said, "brought life and immortality to light," He revealed a God who has a perfect plan for the development and completion of the life of His children, for it is a plan that cannot be circumverted by death. Paul was right when he said, "If in this life only we have hope in Christ we are of all men most miserable," for he knew that Christ inspired that which could never be realized here. God reveals His justice in this indication that man has eternity in which to work for completion.

There is a new revelation of life as well as a new revelation of God in the Resurrection.

Suppose that some one came to you and said: "Apart from its revelation of God what is the significant thing about the persistence of life after that which we call death?" What would you answer? You might say that it means endless life. But the fact that I am going to continue to live in spite of death may not bring me any great measure of satisfaction. Just continued existence makes no appeal to many a person. Think of all the things we do to kill time, to make the hours endurable; and think of those who find life so unendurable that they refuse to continue to live, and you will conclude that just continued existence is no prize, and cannot be considered the significant thing in this revelation.

Is it then sharing the joys of heaven? In the book of Revelation we have heaven described in terms of incomparable beauty and ineffable joy. But even that might pall on one after a time.

The significant revelation of life brought by the Resurrection is that now, this day, this moment you are living an endless life. The endless life is not something that is going to begin at some future point in your experience. It has already begun. As Peabody of Harvard has written: "The less one thinks of the future life as set apart by a grim wall from this life, the better for one's present duties and one's future peace. Life is not made of 2 detached existences, but is 1

continuous whole. Eternal life is not a problem of the future but a gift of this present world." That is, you will never be more eternally alive than you are now.

Preachers used to say to their hearers, "Prepare for death." What should have been said then as it should be said now is, "Prepare for life." For you are not going to die, you are going to live, and death is just an episode in that continuous life. And religion is not something that you acquire during your life so that you can have it as a passport to use at death to get you into heaven. Religion is that which will help you invest your life with that which is of eternal significance, for it will create the quality and determine the direction of an endless life. Thus and thus only do we conquer death. This is the message of Easter.

"He died!
And with Him perished all that men held dear;
Hope lay beside Him in the sepulchre,
Love grew death cold, and all things beautiful beside
Died when He died.

"He rose!
And with Him hope rose, and life and light.
Men said, not Christ, but death died yesternight.
And joy, and truth, and all things virtuous
Rose when He rose."

Lenten Reflections by William C. Doherty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Thought for Today," appearing in the Washington Evening Star on March 31, 1956.

This article was written by my very good friend, Bill Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, and to me reflects very adequately the true Christian character of this renowned labor leader.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LENTEN REFLECTIONS ON FAVORITE STORIES FROM THE BIBLE BY PEOPLE YOU KNOW

(By William C. Doherty)

My favorite story from the Bible is the story of the good Samaritan.

As schoolchildren we learned the story of the traveler who fell among thieves as he journeyed from Jerusalem to Jericho. St. Luke tells us that first "a certain priest, when he saw him, passed by on the other side." Next came a Levite who "came and looked on him, and passed by on the other side." But the good neighbor, the Samaritan, "when he saw him, he had compassion on him, and went to him and bound up his wounds, pouring in oil and wine, and set him on his own beast, and brought him to an inn, and took care of him."

There is, in the parable of the good Samaritan, a lesson for all. Unless we first learn how to give, how to help those less fortunate than ourselves, there is little likelihood that we will get assistance and comfort in our own times of need.

For those in a position of representing others in a free-trade labor union, the opportunities are ample to help others. It is one of the most satisfying features of any elective office in an organization.

There are similar opportunities to extend a helping hand, to lend guidance afforded to those in a position of authority. Unfortunately, the concept of the good Samaritan is too often forgotten. It is easier to follow the priest and Levite by passing up the chance to show mercy and compassion.

If it was neighborly in Christ's time to help those who could not help themselves, nothing has happened in our world in the interim to cause anyone to depart from that philosophy. Like the good Samaritan, we should make a positive effort to become our brother's keeper in his times of trial.

Agriculture Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a letter from Mr. Robert M. Harriss, 11 Station Square, Forest Hills, N. Y.

I believe that the Members of the House should have the benefit of this information. Letter and telegram follow:

FOREST HILLS, N. Y., *April 6, 1956.*

Hon. GEORGE S. LONG,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LONG: You may be interested in enclosed copy of telegram which I sent the Senate and House Agricultural Conference Committees.

For the reasons stated, I believe these agricultural surpluses are not a liability, but one of our greatest blessings and assets, if a constructive program is adopted and properly administered.

There is no over production of basic commodities, but under consumption, due to maldistribution. If half of these surpluses were stockpiled for national security, and not sold without the approval of Congress, and the remaining half sold equally monthly, over a period of years on long-term credit to the hungry and need of friendly foreign anticommunistic nations, these surpluses would soon disappear, and it would be a knockout blow to communism.

The selling of these surplus commodities should not be left in Government discretionary hands, because this would be a most depressing factor on prices.

Therefore it is urgent that a definite, constructive program be adopted and carried out.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT M. HARRISS.

FOREST HILLS, N. Y., *March 27, 1956.*

Senator ELLENDER.
Senator OLIN JOHNSTON,
Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Senator GEORGE AIKEN,
Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Hon. HAROLD COOLEY,
Hon. W. R. POAGE,
Hon. E. C. GATHINGS,
Hon. CLIFFORD HOPE,
Hon. AUGUST ANDRESEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

For the past 45 years I have been engaged in various branches of agriculture in Oklahoma, Texas, Louisiana, Florida, and New York in the production, ginning, milling, merchandising, exporting, etc., and in reference to the farm bill may I suggest the following for your good consideration:

First. The farmers and rural communities immediately dependent upon the farmers represent about 40 million people.

Second. Agriculture is our fundamental and greatest industry upon which the existence of the Nation depends.

Third. During recent years the farmers' income has declined about 20 percent. Therefore, agriculture is in a serious economic situation whereas the rest of the country has generally prospered.

Fourth. Parity prices which have been promised to the farmers represent his wages and unless the farmers receive fair parity prices and an equitable share of the national income we cannot have a sound prosperous economy.

Fifth. Drastic acreage reduction is not the solution and will seriously affect our national economy.

Sixth. There is no world overproduction of basic commodities but underconsumption due to maldistribution; in fact, hundreds of millions of hungry, starving people are in dire need of food and fiber.

Seventh. To leave the disposal of our surplus commodities in discretionary administrative hands is and will continue to be one of the most depressing effects on the market.

Eighth. Our God-given surplus commodities are not a liability but one of our greatest assets for national security and for combating communism provided a definite program is adopted and properly administered.

Ninth. Therefore, may I suggest that one-half of our basic surplus commodities be stockpiled for national security and not sold without the approval of the Congress and that the other one-half be sold equally monthly over a period of 7 years in long-term low-interest bearing loans to friendly foreign anti-Communist countries.

Tenth. If this definite constructive program is adopted and carried out it will quickly restore parity prices and be a knockout blow to communism.

Best wishes,

ROBERT M. HARRISS.

Trade Mission to Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to call the attention of my colleagues to certain practices being used by the Department of Commerce. I refer specifically to their sending representatives of the Commerce Department on a trade mission to Japan.

In this connection, I would like to read a dispatch from Nagoya, Japan, under date of March 29:

Japanese businessmen asked the visiting United States trade mission to use its influence to prevent any increase in American tariff or other restrictions against Japanese pottery, plywood, and sewing machines. The mission in turn said, "There is plenty of room to increase American imports of these products." The mission is headed by Mr. Eugene Braderman, United States Department of Commerce.

I am today writing the Department of Commerce demanding to know what is the purpose of this mission, who appointed them, why American businessmen who must compete with foreign imports are not officially notified by the Department of Commerce when such trade missions were sent abroad, and the purpose for which they are being sent.

This, Mr. Speaker, is just another instance of the "high-handed" bureaucratic methods being used by some of our executive departments.

Cardinal Mindszenty Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following article from the April 13 issue of Collier's magazine by the Reverend Dr. Joseph Vecsey entitled "Cardinal Mindszenty Today":

MUNICH, GERMANY.—On the eve of the Big Four summit conference at Geneva last summer, as though to symbolize the new Communist spirit of sweet reasonableness, Hungary's Red Government announced that it had freed Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty. The announcement gave two reasons for the release of the Roman Catholic primate: His advanced age and his poor health.

Those of us familiar with the cardinal's condition knew that he was neither sick nor aged; he had recovered completely from the frightful effects of the brain washing that preceded his trial for treason in 1949, and he was only 63 years old. His release, moreover, was not based on court procedure or official amnesty. It was just another arbitrary pronouncement by Hungary's Communist rulers.

Instead of clearing up the mystery surrounding Cardinal Mindszenty, the statement merely deepened it. The Government did not specify where or under what circumstances he was living, and it refused to permit anyone to visit him. In fact, there has been no trustworthy news about this prince of the church since his trial ended in a sentence of life imprisonment on February 8, 1949. Such information as has been leaked to the western press has been unreliable, when not completely false.

I am now in a position to tell the truth—the whole truth—about what has happened to Cardinal Mindszenty during the last 7 years. I can disclose not only the tragic facts of his arrest, interrogation, trial, and years of close imprisonment, but his present whereabouts, his state of mind, his health, and the reasons why the Communist regime felt obliged to stage—I use the word advisedly—his "release." I can also reveal how not long ago he refused to make a deal with the Reds for his complete freedom—and instead boldly laid down his own demands for full restoration of the rights of the church.

I am not a writer, nor a politician. I am a priest. My duty was and is to protect the interests of the cardinal, to whom I owe more than filial devotion. I have known him since I was a child; after my parents died, I was often taken into his home by his mother and treated as her own son. Cardinal Mindszenty helped me to become a priest. I taught religion in the same high school at Zalaegerszeg where he had previously taught; I served as his chaplain in the parish church there; I stepped into his chair as professor of theology at the seminary at Szombathely.

Right up to the day of his arrest—December 26, 1948—I was in close contact with him. And for three years after that I accompanied his elderly mother from her native village of Csehmindszent to Budapest on the few occasions when she received permission to visit her son in prison. To escape arrest myself, I was obliged to leave Hungary in 1952, but through sources inside the country I have still been able to keep in touch with the fate of the cardinal.

It has not been easy to collect and assemble this information. The task has taken me more than a year, and even now I cannot disclose my numerous sources. I began collecting the data for my own use, and that of my church. But when I learned that Dr. George Shuster, president of Hunter College and former United States Land Commissioner in Bavaria, Germany, was going to write a book about Communist Hungary and the Mindszenty case (due to be published in August by Farrar, Straus and Cudahy), I decided to tell him all I knew about the prelate. Then, to bring the real facts to a still larger segment of the American public, I agreed to prepare this article.

As this is written, Cardinal Mindszenty—far from free—is under arrest and confinement in southern Hungary, close to the Yugoslav border, in a place called Puespoekszentlaszlo. The name means "The Bishop's Saint Ladislaus"—that is, a locality dedicated to St. Ladislaus, a Hungarian king of the 11th century, and given to the Bishop of Pecs as a summer residence. The estate was seized by the Communists several years ago.

The main building is a castle built at the end of the 17th century. It has a park of about 300 acres surrounded by the Mecsek Forests on the slopes of the mountains of the same name. Around the castle itself are acacia shrubs and trees, and in normal times its rooms were used by priests and seminarians at the invitation of the Bishop of Pecs.

The Communists have set aside three large rooms on the ground floor for Cardinal Mindszenty's confinement—a bedroom, living room and dining room. The living room faces a wide lawn lined with rosebushes, beyond which the par starts with small strawberry bushes and a dense mass of spruce trees.

The cardinal is not alone at Puespoekszentlaszlo. During the day, there is always a plainclothes guard on duty in the house. (The guard is changed daily, presumably to prevent any one man from becoming too friendly with the cardinal.) Sometimes he and the prelate talk together, but the policeman does not sit with the cardinal at meals. At night the castle is surrounded by 25 Communist police armed with submachineguns.

The Reds have also given the cardinal a companion in the person of a priest of his own age, a pastor politically uninvolved, a rather jovial and calm man. Then there are an elderly woman cook, a maid and a butler. One must assume that they were selected by the political police and forced to report on the cardinal's every move.

Cardinal Mindszenty has almost everything he needs—materially. His little apartment is provided with beautiful china, new linen, an array of towels. The Reds even filled his bureau drawers—before his arrival—with winter and summer underwear, new shirts, two new everyday tunics and a third one for festive occasions with the red buttons of a cardinal.

The castle, of course, has an ancient chapel, and there the cardinal celebrates mass every day. The village is nearby but no altar boy is called; instead the priest-companion serves at the cardinal's masses, and sometimes accompanies them by playing Gregorian music on a harmonium. There is even a library in the castle, a purged library.

The cardinal's day is simple. He rises at 6 a. m., says mass at 7, and breakfasts at 8 with his companion. The breakfast menu is milk or tea, sometimes light coffee, and slices of Hungarian bread (two-thirds wheat flour and one-third potatoes). Butter, jelly, and honey are also on the table. Before lunch the cardinal walks for about one-half hour, then reads and talks with his companion.

Luncheon in central Europe is the principal meal of the day, and the dishes served are more substantial than at dinner. After luncheon the cardinal rests, then takes a walk, reads, again, has his dinner, and goes to bed around 10 p. m. Of course, the day is filled out with prayers. The cardinal recites the entire rosary every day, and, like every priest, he prays the divine office from his breviary. In addition, he visits the chapel before and after each meal and before going to bed.

He is not allowed to leave the park, nor is he permitted any visitors except—at long intervals—his mother. He is not allowed to write or receive letters. No newspaper is given to him. He has no radio set.

The cardinal is still a prisoner. Though his prison is more bearable, his life sentence has not been revoked. He cannot exercise his office as archbishop and as head of the Catholic Church in Hungary. He can be taken back to jail or the penitentiary at anytime. In fact, by the time this appears in print, he may have been moved to some new secret place. At the beginning, after he was taken to the castle, a doctor came to check his health every day; now the doctor comes once a week. Why he comes at all is strange, for the cardinal is not sick. Yet Cardinal Mindszenty cannot protest, just as he cannot express any desires. He is at the mercy of the Communists just as he has been since his arrest in 1948.

The cardinal's story is still full of mysteries for those who do not know the full truth. Why did the Communists bother to release him? What are their intentions? Is he sane? Was he really drugged at his trial? What happened to him after he was convicted and sentenced to life imprisonment?

The answers to these questions can be extremely important, not only to Hungarian Catholics but to the whole free world, to every man in good faith, because they throw light upon the real aims of world communism.

To understand the Mindszenty story, it is necesary to follow, step by step, what happened to the cardinal from the moment of his arrest on the day after Christmas in 1948. On that fateful morning he was taken in a black limousine with drawn curtains from his residence in the suburb of Esztergom to the Budapest headquarters of the political police, at 60 Stalin Avenue. There he was placed in a cell and left for 2 days to ruminate on his fate. He was given little, if any, food.

It was on the third day that his real ordeal began. Relays of interrogators started questioning him. Day and night for an entire week the inquisition went on. He was allowed no more than an average of 2 hours of sleep out of every 24.

But the questioning was only part of the softening-up process. The Communists showed the cardinal his young secretary, reduced by torture to almost animal-like dumbness. They brought in other priests and laymen, mercilessly beaten, to beg him to confess. They confronted him with

former friends, also priests, who told him the Pope and the entire Catholic Church had condemned his intransigent behavior. Other people whom he had known and trusted were paraded before him to assure him that the United States had abandoned Hungary and was indifferent to his fate.

The Communists' aim was to give the cardinal the impression that his fight for Hungary's freedom was totally hopeless, to convince him that he had been abandoned by his church and his flock. Every move the Communists made, every word that was spoken to him, was designed to create a sickening feeling of guilt within him that his fight was only causing hardship for the people and church he had sworn to serve.

Even after the initial nonstop interrogation, the Red inquisitors gave the cardinal little rest. No human being can endure such a strain indefinitely; some are tougher than others, but in time all break down.

The cardinal's breaking point came after nearly 6 weeks of this intensive brainwashing. Let me say right now that he was not drugged. All the tales that were circulated about various drugs being administered to the cardinal to prepare him for the trial are false. None was used.

To the Communists, the trial which began before a people's tribunal on February 3, 1949, was an anticlimax—merely the staging for the record of a well-rehearsed play. The cardinal, broken in mind and spirit, faithfully parroted the words that had been drilled into him, and 5 days later was convicted of treason, disloyalty to the Government, and 4 currency-law violations.

From the courtroom Cardinal Mindszenty was taken to the Budapest Collecting Prison, distribution point for Hungary's prison system. The prison is located in the heavily built-up Koebanya area in the eastern part of Budapest, close to factories and breweries. There a group of young men, whose identities I cannot disclose for obvious reasons, organized an intelligence service to keep watch on the cardinal. With the help of workers living in the district, they kept an around-the-clock vigil on top of a building overlooking the prison courtyard. They saw when the cardinal was brought in; they observed in what direction he was taken inside the prison; they noted the arrivals and departures of officials and interrogators.

The prelate was a broken man who needed rest and medical care. Yet he was placed in solitary confinement in a cell on the second floor and given only the usual prison food. He was not permitted to say mass, and he spent his days in mental prayer, reading his breviary. He continued to lose weight, his heart weakened, and he was suffering from insomnia.

One week after Cardinal Mindszenty entered the collecting prison, his mother began a concerted campaign to visit him. She had first tried to get permission to see him before his trial, but her letters to the Ministry of Justice and the chief prosecutor got no response. This time she was determined to get the necessary permission.

Mrs. Borbala Pehm, for that is her family name, is a remarkable woman. She is in her eighties and suffers from heart trouble and asthma, yet still helps care for the daughter, son-in-law, and grandchildren with whom she lives in Csehmindszent, a village in western Hungary some 200 miles from Budapest.

She always dresses in black, and true to her peasant origin she covers her head with a black scarf fastened with a knot beneath her chin. I have never met a person who lives so entirely on faith. This may sound commonplace coming from a priest, but I have watched her for many, many years. She never leaves a stone unturned when she sets out to achieve an objective. She works, she walks, she behaves as though everything depends upon her own activity. But she does so with an inward conviction that God will come to her aid.

I was not surprised, therefore, when she insisted upon going to Budapest to plead personally for permission to visit the collecting prison. I accompanied her to the capital, and she went on alone to see the chief of the prison affairs division in the Ministry of Justice. Her plea was denied.

She proposed to go next direct to Deputy Premier Matyas Rakosi, since 1945 Hungary's undisputed Communist boss. We begged her not to, but one day she sneaked out of the convent where she was staying and went straight to Rakosi's office in the government palace. The police, of course, did not allow her to enter, but she was prepared for this rebuff. She handed over a prepared letter in her own handwriting—the handwriting of a peasant woman that showed all the fatigues and strains of her life.

The letter did not beg; it asked only what was due her even in a Communist country—the right to see her imprisoned son. Never, in the more than 300 letters, memorandums, applications and other documents which she has submitted to the government in the last 7 years has she asked more than that. She knew she had the right to ask clemency, but she also knew that such a request might be misinterpreted and attributed to the cardinal.

Rakosi did not answer her appeal, so next morning she decided on another course of action. She said she felt the chief of police would receive her. We do not know why, but her intuition was right.

Accompanied by an elderly woman, a friend of the family, she walked directly into the headquarters of the Communist secret police and asked to see the man most feared in all Hungary, Gen. Gabor Peter, the terrorist boss who had masterminded the breaking and imprisonment of her son. A former tailor's apprentice who became a Communist as a young man during the 1930's, Peter was a man of boundless ambition and had been trained in the schools of the Russian secret police. He had learned his lessons well.

The two women were led into Peter's office. There the little peasant woman in black stood resolutely before the man who had shattered her son's mind and health and demanded the right to visit her son. Peter firmly told her that he couldn't do a thing; the case was out of his jurisdiction.

Mrs. Pehm stood silent for a moment. Then she looked into the eyes of the chief of police and said to him: "I wish you would imagine that, instead of my son, you were in prison and your mother was asking the favor to see her son. Can't you imagine your mother in my place?"

Peter, whose mother did not live in Hungary at the time, turned and left the room. For 10 minutes the two women stood as though rooted to the spot. Then Gabor Peter returned. He was smiling. "All right," he said, "you may see your son." Then he paused. The two women couldn't believe that he meant it. "And," continued Peter, "you can see him immediately, right now. My car will take you to the prison. Of course, however, you"—pointing to the mother—"must go alone."

Mrs. Pehm now understood, and she said almost automatically the next thought that entered her mind: "But, sir, I must go back to the convent to pick up the apples that I brought for my son. I can't go without the apples."

"I'm afraid that is impossible," Peter said. "It will take too long; there is no time."

"But I can't go without the apples," she repeated.

Gabor Peter looked at her in silence. Suddenly he pushed a buzzer and said, "I will send my secretary to a shop for some apples. Go down to my car."

A detective accompanied Mrs. Pehm on her visit to the collecting prison. There she was led into an office and left alone. There were two chairs in the room, and a table. Soon the cardinal was brought into the room by a guard, who promptly sat in one of the chairs. With Mrs. Pehm already seated in the other, there was nothing for the cardinal to do but stand.

It was the first time the mother had seen her son since his arrest nearly 2 months earlier. She was stunned. His face was pale and drawn, his eyes dull and he had lost much weight. The mother and son talked for 15 minutes of family affairs. Nothing was said of the trial or of political matters. Mrs. Pehm handed over the apples that Peter's secretary had bought, and the cardinal accepted them gratefully. Then it was all over.

Back at the convent, Mrs. Pehm sat down and once and composed a letter to the Ministry of Justice asking for medical care for her son. And she confided to one of the sisters: "I gave the apples to my son, but I didn't dare tell him whose apples they were."

Two months later, the cardinal's mother again asked permission to visit her son at the collecting prison, but was refused. She was not to see him again in Budapest, for in October 1949 the little group of watchers on the building across the street from the prison were appalled to see the cardinal helped into a black limousine and driven away. They felt helpless as the car disappeared toward the north. But they did not give up. They organized a new search, and finally found the cardinal in the penitentiary of Vac, on the Danube, 65 miles north of Budapest.

On his arrival at Vac, the cardinal registered like any other convicted criminal. His clothes and his body were searched for weapons and, although he had no lice, he was deloused by steam. His head was washed with kerosene as a further precautionary measure, and he was dressed in prison apparel.

Although again in solitary confinement, he was permitted some conversation with the special guard outside his cell. He was also allowed to say mass in prison chapel every morning that it was empty. Moreover, the food was adequate, and he was permitted to walk alone for about an hour. His health began to improve and his spirits rose. Sometimes he joked in conversation with the guards. But otherwise his daily routine remained the same: Prayer, reading, rosary, meditation, and expectation of food.

Then, 2 months after his transfer to Vac, the group that had been following the cardinal's whereabouts learned that their beloved bishop had been moved once again. All their efforts to find his new destination were in vain. From that moment, in late 1949, the wildest rumors began to circulate about the cardinal's whereabouts. He was reported everywhere, from a Communist-confiscated villa in Budapest's residential suburb of Huevoesvoelgy to a sanitarium near Moscow. All proved untrue.

For the first time, the Reds had succeeded in destroying all traces that led to the cardinal. Only one person, his aged and nearly helpless mother, by sheer force of character and unshakable faith in God, maintained a tenuous link with the prelate.

Every third month, from the time of her son's conviction, she applied for permission to visit him. When her pleas by letter went unanswered or were turned down, she would insist on visiting Budapest and appealing in person. Often these appeals also were unavailing, but she never gave up hope.

When permission did come through, she had to travel not only 200 miles from her home to Budapest, but another 65 miles to Vac, for even after the cardinal was transferred to a secret prison he was brought back to Vac to receive his mother. Altogether, during the 5 years from October 1949 through 1954, she saw him there some 13 times.

During 8 of those times—or up until the time I was forced to leave the country—I accompanied her to Budapest. Almost always the routine was the same. Since the village of Csehmindszent has no railway station, we had to get up at 4 a. m. in order to travel by bus to the nearest railway line. Then we had to change trains once before reaching Budapest.

Mrs. Pehm preferred to travel third class to save money. The family vineyard, main source of her income, formerly brought in sufficient funds, but after 1950, in order to save it from confiscation, the family had to deliver the grapes and wine to the government for ridiculously low prices.

Times have been hard for the 50 close relatives of the cardinal who live in Hungary. Because of their relationship to the imprisoned prelate, the men have found it difficult to get work under the Communist regime. Catholics contribute some funds for Mrs. Pehm, but for the family as a whole the main support—in the form of food, clothing and money—comes from a well-to-do American woman in New York, whose name I cannot disclose.

During our trips to Budapest, Mrs. Pehm and I were always watched by undercover agents—often by a whole swarm of them. One 1 ride, I detected 5 agents; 1 was disguised as a mechanic, 2 as passengers, the fourth as a hobo, and the fifth as a conductor. All tried to get into the conversation with us.

In Budapest I stayed with friends. At first, the cardinal's mother stayed in convents; after these were dissolved by the Communists in 1950, many nuns took apartments together, and for a while Mrs. Pehm stayed with some of them. Later on, she used the guest room of Budapest Theological Seminary, 1 of 5 the Communists permitted to remain open.

One night we decided we would go to the house of a religious community, the members of which were devoted to the cardinal. We arrived around midnight, and suddenly found ourselves homeless. The superior of this house, who was not a nun but a lay sister, became pale when she saw us. She hurried me into a waiting room and pleaded with me to take the mother away. "We can't afford—I can't afford to shelter the old lady at this time. I'm sorry."

Later I learned that the superior a few days earlier had been arrested by the political police and forced to sign a paper promising that she would report on the movements of certain people, presumably including the cardinal's mother. To have refused would have meant death or imprisonment.

When permission did come through to visit her son, Mrs. Pehm would go to the Ministry of Justice alone and, almost always accompanied by the same detective, be driven in an official car to the prison at Vac. There she would visit the cardinal in a small, bare room in the presence of another detective. Usually there would be no chair on which the cardinal could sit, and he never requested one. However, on one occasion, his mother asked the detective to move his coat from an extra chair so that her son could sit down, and the man obliged.

The mother always brought with her a gift of food wrapped in brown paper or an old newspaper. Most often it was bread or cookies she had baked, and some fruit; occasionally she even brought a roast chicken. The cardinal told here he ate sparingly of these gifts in an attempt to make them last until her next visit. As her visits became fewer, he took to saving bits of the dry bread just as a reminder of her physical presence and to bridge the gap until she next would be allowed to visit him.

The visits lasted anywhere from 15 minutes to a half hour, and the conservation dealt almost exclusively with family affairs. Other subjects were taboo, but occasionally some clues to the cardinal's treatment would slip out. Once Mrs. Pehm noted that her son was wearing a new cassock and commented upon it. He answered wryly that children are always dressed up when company is coming.

Moreover, Mrs. Pehm had become such a sharp observer that, by putting bits of new information from her together with data gleaned on previous visits, we could get a clear picture of the cardinal's health, behavior, and days, even of his Communist visitors.

From 1951 on, the Communists put more and more pressure on the cardinal. First they sent Monsignor Miklos Beresztoczy, head of the so-called peace priests, to him. The peace priests are an organization of clergymen who have been tortured or otherwise forced into advocating a progressive attitude toward the Communist regime, from which they receive a salary. The monsignor tried to persuade the cardinal to resign as Primate of Hungary, to promise to leave the country if he was set free. Cardinal Mindszenty refused.

Then the Reds sent another bishop to him, but the cleric merely delivered the Communists' message without putting any pressure on the cardinal. Other priests and Catholic laymen also were sent to talk sense to the cardinal, but all to no avail.

Why were the Communists so anxious to free the cardinal if he would agree to resign and leave Hungary? For them Cardinal Mindszenty had become a national skeleton, an uncomfortable burden for the Red government, one more reason for the people to hate them. Even high officials of the Communist government, heads of the Office of Religious Affairs, visited him. They were polite and they were eloquent, but they couldn't extort a single promise from the cardinal. He refused to donate his title of Primate of Hungary to the temporal power of the state.

Then, on March 5, 1953, Stalin died. Budapest reacted as though a national holiday of liberation had been declared. People began to talk freely. Members of the Communist Party—even officials—visited non-Communist friends and assured them that they had become Reds only in the interest of the community. Radio broadcasts of western stations were listened to openly.

Rakosi in his shrewd way saw how the wind was blowing and was prepared to release the cardinal. But as soon as the situation consolidated in the Soviet Union, the Communists in Hungary recovered and tightened their hold on the country. A big purge began. Gabor Peter, the man who maneuvered Cardinal Mindszenty's breakdown, and former Justice Minister Jyula Decsi, who supervised the trial, were themselves sentenced to life imprisonment as traitors.

But Rakosi and his surviving colleagues had learned something else from the flurry of excitement over Stalin's death. They started to ease some of the relentless pressure that they had been applying to the country. Writers were allowed to publish some short stories without censorship. Bibles and missals printed in the West were permitted to enter the country by the tens of thousands.

The Reds hoped to use Cardinal Mindszenty in a key role in this peace offensive. At the climax of their propaganda campaign, they wanted to release him in a dramatic way. Again Communist officials visited him and made offers; they promised the cardinal that he could stay in the country, though he would be confined to one place. All they asked was that he sign a paper renouncing his position as archbishop of Esztergom and primate of Hungary.

The cardinal refused.

In a new offer, toward the end of 1954, they told him he could go back to Esztergom to live in seclusion in his diocese, but that he would not be allowed to celebrate mass in the cathedral nor to give sermons.

Again the cardinal refused. And this time he went further. Once again in full command of his faculties, he courageously stated his demands for justice and an end to the church's persecution. First, he said, all priests should be released and given amnesty, and complete freedom should be accorded them. Second, he, the cardinal, should be released without conditions—that is, he would go back to Esztergom, resume administration of his diocese, and act as primate of Hungary. He would celebrate mass whenever he wanted, and he would preach. The Communists made no reply.

But the outside world knew nothing of his defiance of his Red jailers, of his refusal to make a deal with them. Therefore, the Reds continued their scheming for his spectacular release. Maybe, since he refused to cooperate, a fraudulent, fake release would be enough, they reasoned. They decided to try it.

Toward the end of 1954, although Cardinal Mindszenty was still in prison at an undetermined place, the Communists planted a news item through an Austrian news agency to the effect that he had been released. They wanted to evaluate the reaction of the Western World.

It was all that they had anticipated. The item was picked up by the press and radio and spread around the world. We in close touch with the Hungarian situation realized that the Western people believed the hoax. Few people asked for details.

Hearing the news through Western broadcasts, the cardinal's mother immediately applied for a permit to visit her son during the Christmas season. Although the cardinal, in fact, was moved to the summer palace of the Bishop of Pecs before the holiday the request was refused.

Meanwhile the Hungarian government decided to hold up confirmation of the cardinal's "release' 'until it would have maximum propaganda vale. That time came when the Big Four prepared to meet in Geneva.

As this is written, I cannot say how often Cardinal Mindszenty's mother has been permitted to visit her son in his new place of confinement, but she has been there at least once.

The summer palace of the Bishop of Pecs is a beautiful place. Perhaps as Cardinal Mindszenty looks out the huge windows at the rosebushes and the strawberry bushes in the garden, he is reminded, by their color, of the words which Pope Pius XII said to him in Rome, in February 1946, when he placed the red hat of a cardinal on his head:

"Receive the red hat, the special sign of a cardinal's dignity. By this is signified that even to death and to the shedding of blood you will show your courage for the exaltation of the Holy faith, and for the peace and tranquillity of Christian peoples."

The cardinal is still a prisoner, but by God's grace and his own courage he is still the shepherd of his flock, the Primate of Hungary. Not all the power of Caesar has been able to take this from him.

Free Government Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, today I recorded a speech for Radio Liberation, a democratic, anti-Communist radio sta-

tion broadcasting to the peoples of the Soviet Union in 17 languages.

I gave my talk on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of Russia's first parliament, the State Duma. I took that opportunity to point out that now more than ever Russia needs a freely elected government, a government which will heed the needs and aspirations of the people. Only such a government can respect the dignity of the individual, the right to dissent without fear of punishment, and the right to worship as one pleases. My listeners behind the Iron Curtain were told that not being a military man, I did not understand fully all the implications of an open inspection of one another's military installations, but as a legislator I know for sure that an open inspection of each other's election procedures by all the nations of the world would be the best guaranty for peace and freedom in the world.

We in this country, of course, do not fear the examination of our election procedures. As a matter of fact, we encourage the world to follow them. I believe the Soviet Union and the Iron Curtain countries would be more apt to accept an open inspection of their military installations than of their voting procedures, for such an inspection would shake to the very foundations the fundamental principles of a totalitarian Communist government. However, if they would consent to it, I am sure that by the next election we would have free governments behind the Iron Curtain truly representing the people.

How the Government Can Save

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "How To Save $7.5 Billion a Year," written by Frank C. Hanighen.

Mr. Hanighen is editor of the Washington newsletter Human Events.

The section at the end on "What You Can Do" is from the Committee for Constitutional Government of New York City.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Americans present a curious paradox toward the service of government. It is the biggest single class of service they buy. Its magnitude exceeds the output of several major industries combined.

Yet Government appears to be about the only service for which the American people seem willing to pay substantially more than a fair price. And they pay it with hardly a whimper.

Just how overpriced is the Federal Government, in particular, has been indicated in the voluminous studies of the Hoover Commission, officially styled "Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government." The waste that could be eliminated amounts to a minimum of $7.5 billion a year.

The reports, the result of a collection of 1 million facts, expose the never-ending power-grabbing empire-building expansion of the executive branch of the Government—far beyond the intent of Congress.

The waste and duplication described will baffle your imagination, unless you have been an on-the-scene observer of the bureaucratic octopus.

The official Commission and Task Force Reports—38 volumes containing 3 million words—are jampacked with examples of reckless expenditure.

Just a few can be listed here:

The Army has a 10.6-year supply of women's wool serge taupe uniforms. The Navy has an 8.1 years' supply of blue trousers and enough blue (not dress) jumpers to last for 9.3 years.

The Navy has enough canned beef and gravy and canned ham chunks to last 6 years and 7 months, some of it bought in 1948; enough canned hamburger—some bought in 1950—to last 60 years.

Random checks of "supply items in common use and easily obtainable from manufacturers" showed that military depots stock many such items sufficient for a 20- and 30-year supply and even in 1 case 128-year supply.

The total inventory of 10 "standard items with multiple uses and easy to manufacture," selected for study at Raritan Army Stock Control Point in New Jersey, represented an average 32.6 year supply.

WAREHOUSELAND

The warehouse problem is so stupendous and the inefficiency so great that the Government doesn't know what it has in storage or where it is. Often one agency is selling at a few cents on the dollar something which another agency is buying—perhaps at a premium to obtain instant delivery.

The Government owns or rents warehousing and storage space equal to 31,000 acres—a ground area twice the size of Manhattan Island. The operational cost amounts to $3.5 billion a year. Office space owned equals the space in 1,250 Empire State Buildings.

The task force discovered more than 100 million square feet of space not even listed on the operating records.

The Government owns 838 million acres of which 472 million acres is in the continental United States. The latter portion equals one-fourth the area of the 48 States. Real-estate holdings, exclusive of the public domain cost more than $40 billion.

SURPLUS SALES

For years to come the Government will be selling some $2 billion worth of surpluses annually for 5 to 7 cents on the dollar unless businesslike selling methods are adopted. These sales go on all the time because material is continuously becoming obsolescent or the supply periodically exceeds the need. The pool of material, estimated to be worth $155 billion, is scattered all over the world.

The task force on paperwork management found that Government redtape is forcing private business to produce more than a trillion words and figures annually and is costing executive agencies as well as industry hundreds of millions of dollars in expense that would be unnecessary under an efficient and simplified paperwork system.

Heavy as is the cost of paperwork to big business, it is well nigh unbearable to little business. Four million small-business men, said the Commission, must spend from 5 to 29 percent of their time compiling reports for the Government.

A sample of bureaucratic stupidity is a questionnaire asking for the answers to 106 highly detailed questions from firms making but one product in the apparel field.

A large number of the 4,700 reports demanded from business firms duplicate information that has already been furnished to "another bureau down the hall."

Great quantities of records are called for which are not used and sometimes are not even filed by the Government.

Some business firms refuse to answer questionnaires and the Commission found that often the refusals were never even noticed.

Financial agencies of the Federal Government—that investigate, guarantee or insure—have a capital of $16.9 million. These agencies under given circumstances can further draw upon the Treasury for an additional $14 billion. Their legal and moral liabilities aggregate $244 billion, only about $34 billion less than the legally admitted public debt.

When, many decades ago, people frightened of banks used to put their money in socks or mattresses, Congress created the Postal Savings System to induce them to put this money into the credit stream. Now the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation guarantees more than 98 percent of all bank accounts—100 percent of all individual accounts up to $10,000—and the Postal Savings System continues to function.

Borrowing on long term by the Rural Electrification Administration costs the so-called local cooperatives only 2 percent interest. This is 1 percentage point less—an interest subsidy of one-third—than it costs the Government to borrow on the same terms to lend to REA—without anything added for administrative expense.

Under the Federal administration the Government has backed $18 billion of mortgage loans disbursed by banks and other lenders. Savings banks, said the Hoover Commission, keep a reserve for losses of 6 percent; the FHA, 2 percent.

Perhaps of even greater importance than the Commission's sugegstions for bureaucratic efficiency are its recommendations to reduce Government competition with private enterprise.

The Department of Defense alone has an investment exceeding $15 billion in commercial-industrial facilities ranging from shoe repair shops to clothing factories, from cement mixing plants to sawmills, from chain stores to tree and garden nurseries.

Post exchanges and commissaries are cited by the Commission as typical of Government operation. The stores sell goods and services at or near the cost to the Government, often underselling even wholesalers because they often buy at low prices direct from the manufacturers. They pay no rent for either warehousing or selling space; the salaries of military personnel whose services are often utilized are not charged; no account is taken of wastage, spoilage, theft, or depreciation. No interest is paid on the Government investment. The enterprise pays no Federal or State income taxes.

The Commission calls the right to buy at these substantial savings a "fringe benefit" to Government employees and recommends that where such benefits ought to be given, it should be paid in the form of additional salaries. Except in isolated areas, post exchanges and commissaries should be liquidated.

The Commission says 1,000 of the business facilities operated by the Defense Department could be eliminated without injury to the national defense.

Most of the Government enterprises were begun in wartime; nearly all of the others were created as temporary agencies to meet the depression; but in virtually every case, when the time for liquidation came, the bureaucracy supported by the benefited individuals, pressure groups, and communities found excuses to continue the enterprise. Sometimes the extension was brought about in direct violation of the law, condoned by an administration lukewarm toward private enterprise.

MEDICAL EMPIRE

The Hoover Commission found that the Federal Government already has assumed partial or total responsibility for the medical care of 30 million persons. Hospital facilities costing $1 billion are used for the care of veterans with non-service-connected illnesses. The annual expense for nonservice cases is half a billion dollars.

In spite of this, some veterans' hospitals, because of unwise locations, still lack patients, cannot be operated efficiently, and should be closed. Others are overcrowded.

Now, what would the saving of $7½ billion mean to you?

The Hoover Commission, of course, takes no stand on how the savings should be applied. But here are possibilities being discussed in Congress. The $7½ billion could be applied, in whole or in part, to an urgently needed debt reduction.

Or it could be applied to reduction of taxes. The simplest tax cut for Congress to make would be a straight across-the-board cut to all individual taxpayers. Since the Federal revenue from individual income taxes is $30 billion a year, a $7.5-billion cut would mean a reduction of 25 percent in the personal income tax of every taxpayer.

Several States have made such cuts—across the board. The State of New York for several years legislated a straight reduction to every taxpayer of 25 percent. Later the cut was reduced to 10 percent. (After Harriman became Governor, expenditures of the State government jumped $100 million a year and the tax cut disappeared.)

Among alternative tax cuts, several of which can be combined to equal $7.5 billion, are the following:

If the married person deduction should be raised from $600 to $1,000 ($2,000 for a couple) the cost would be $6 billion.

An increase to $700 in the present $600 personal exemption (as a substitute for the married person's raise mentioned above) would cost $2.3 billion.

If the $600 exemption should be raised to $800 (instead of $700), the cost would be $4.5 billion.

Let's look at a different type of reduction.

If the top income tax rate for all individuals should be set at 35 percent, the cut would cost $2.4 billion a year.

If the top rate were set at 40 percent (instead of 35 percent), the cut would cost $1.9 billion.

If the top rate were set at 50 percent, the cut would cost $1.1 billion.

If at 60 percent, the cut would cost only $600 million.

When we realize that the total Federal tax collections from all sources in 1954 were $70 billion, it is amazing to learn that the total amount collected from individual rates above 35 percent was only $2.4 billion—a mere 3.4 percent of the grand total.

The shock is due to the extraordinary success of the Communist propaganda—repeated so often that millions now believe it—that 1 percent (or 3 or 5 percent) of the people own 90 (or 95) percent of the Nation's wealth.

The conclusion follows—if you believe the Communist-inspired propaganda—that with a sharply ascending progressive income tax, all little people should favor every Federal expenditure; they don't pay for it anyway. Government spending would not be at the expense of the little fellows, but only of the big boys.

But the conclusion is built upon a false premise. The truth is this: The Federal Reserve Board's Survey of Consumer Finances shows that in 1954 the families with incomes of $10,000 or over received about 20 percent of the total money income of all families. If all of the taxable income in excess of $10,000 could be totally confiscated by the Government, it would pay the costs of Government for only 4 weeks; and of course, the income to be confiscated would quickly vanish, once taxpayers were convinced that there would be no benefit to them from the production of income.

The present top personal income-tax rate is 91 percent. The small portion of the revenues obtained by the rates above the 35 percent figure makes it clear that the higher rates have a punitive rather than a productive purpose. Moreover, since the excessive rates sharply diminish the incentive to take risks, they punish all of the people, not merely the rich. In fact, they probably punish the poor much more than the rich (who can still live well) because the poor gain the most proportionately from the higher scale of living and the better-paying jobs created by costly modern production facilities.

The National Association of Manufacturers has sent to Congress a proposal under which the corporation rates, as well as the individual rates, would be gradually reduced over a 5-year period to a top rate of 35 percent. The association proposes a uniform cut in the progressive rates so that lower-income taxpayers would share in the reduction. The NAM plan is not premised upon any savings from the Hoover recommendations; it is based exclusively upon the increased tax revenues expected to flow automatically from the growth of the economy. Assuming a continuation of the normal 3 percent a year growth, NAM says that annual tax revenues from sources other than the rates above 35 percent will grow by $12 billion in 5 years, while the cut in Federal revenue from a 35 percent top rate would be $10 billion.

If the NAM plan should be adopted, the Hoover savings can be applied elsewhere.

"WHAT YOU CAN DO

"(From the Committee for Constitutional Government, New York City.)

"Now, what can you, Mr. and Mrs. America, do to persuade the President and the Congress to adopt the Hoover recommendations?

"Remember—the bureaucrats have a vested interest in creeping socialism. They will put up a fierce struggle supported by the ADA, CIO–AFL, and those business interests who sell to the Government and can be bribed into exchanging their belief in private enterprise for the profit they make on Government orders.

"Frank Hanighen's book, a condensation of Hoover Reports, gives you the weapons—the facts—with which to combat the bureaucracy.

"Build grassroots sentiment by sending copies of the book to influential leaders of your community.

"Send copies to strategically placed individuals and organizations. Among them:

"Libraries, city, high school, college.

"All principals and social science teachers in your shools.

"All social science professors in your local college or alma mater.

"The publisher, editors, and editorial writers of your local newspaper. (Deliver the books personally and ask for editorial support.)

"All members of the chamber of commerce and the junior chamber of commerce. (The national junior chamber of commerce organization made the earlier Hoover reorganization program its national project.)

"All members of your own service club and the leaders of other service clubs in your community.

"The leaders of civic-minded women's clubs.

"Trade union leaders.

"Your business friends throughout the Nation.

"Ask local organizations to pass resolutions addressed to your Congressman, Senators, and the White House. Promote active discussion in your clubs. Schedule panel discussions on your local radio station.

"Doing your part toward achieving the adoption of the Hoover program should be one of your personal objectives during the next 12 months. Do your part and you will be a good American citizen."

Dateline Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, my Louisiana colleagues and I have the pleasure of participating regularly in a filmed television program, Dateline Washington, presented every other week as a public service to our constituencies by station WDSU-TV of New Orleans.

This is a half hour, unrehearsed discussion program, produced and moderated by Miss Ann Corrick, Washington correspondent for WDSU. It alternates weekly with a local program, Dateline New Orleans, in which WDSU–TV presents local personalities in discussions of civic and other matters of interest to the citizens of the New Orleans area.

Dateline Washington concentrates on national and international issues which affect—directly or indirectly—the lives of all Americans, with particular emphasis on matters under consideration in Congress.

We invite as our guest a personality expert in his field, and devote the half hour program to an informal discussion and exchange of ideas. In this way, we are able to present to the people of south Louisiana all sides of an issue, so they may form their own opinions on the vital issues of our times.

In the past 2 years, on this program, we have presented the up-to-date facts on such vital issues as the peacetime uses of atomic energy; the state of our national defenses; the problems and needs of American education; the development of the Salk antipolio vaccine program; the operation of our foreign policy; the extent of narcotic addiction and its causes, and timely reviews of the ever-changing political situation. Dateline Washington has presented interviews with such topnotch authorities as U. N. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge; Administrator Theodore Streibert, of the United States Information Agency; Maj. Gen. Samuel Sturgis, Chief of the Army Engineers; Selective Service Director Lewis Hershey; Treasury Secretary Humphrey; Sir Roger Makins, the British Ambassador; House Speaker Rayburn; CBS Overseas Correspondent Howard K. Smith; and, of course, many of our able and informed Democratic and Republican Members of House and Senate. In order to present an unbiased picture of the political situation, we have had as our guests both Leonard Hall, Republican National Committee chairman, and Paul Butler, Democratic National Committee chairman. Many of these programs have made front-page news throughout the country.

In recognition of the consistently factual, timely, and public interest offerings of the Dateline Washington series over the last 2 years, the Sylvania television award panel last November awarded Dateline Washington and WDSU–TV a special citation for local public service.

In consonance with the high standards maintained by this program, on Sunday, April 8, Dateline Washington presented a guest and topic of such importance and inspiration that I herewith submit the transcript of this discussion so others may benefit from its content.

Our guest was Maj. Gen. Melvin Maas, former Member of the House from Minnesota, whose brilliant career with the United States Marine Corps was cut short a few years ago when he lost his eyesight. General Maas' account of his work as Chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped should give heart and hope to other disabled persons who have every right to work and live with the dignity we in this country accord to all our citizens.

The discussion with General Maas follows:

Miss CORRICK. Good afternoon. This is WDSU's Washington correspondent, Ann Corrick.

Thirty million American citizens are physically disabled in one way or another. Most are completely helpless. But an estimated 2 million disabled persons, if they knew how, or if they had the proper training, could be gainfully and usefully employed. Congress recognized this possibility in 1945, and, 2 years later, established the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped. Through the efforts of this committee many thousands of disabled persons each year are restored to gainful employment. Dateline Washington's guest today is the Chairman of the President's Committee, retired Marine Corps Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas. He fully understands the problems of disabled persons, for, in 1951, 1 year before he retired from the Marines, General Maas was overtaken with total blindness. Although this dropped the curtain on three separate careers, for General Maas it opened up a new and rewarding challenge for his tremendous and unselfish energies. He became Chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped in 1954.

Last year he was elected national commander of the Disabled American Veterans.

General Maas' first career was in business back in his native State of Minnesota, where he organized his own insurance firm. He spent 16 years in Congress as a Republican Member of the House from Minnesota, from 1927 to 1943. However, during that period he took time out to pursue another, overlapping career in the Marine Corps, where he specialized in marine aviation. He served as a private in World War I; as the youngest Marine Corps colonel in uniform in World War II, and he put on his uniform again in the Korean war to help revise the entire Reserve program.

The general made many friends while he was here in Congress, and here with us today are two who served with him—New Orleans Congressman F. EDWARD HÉBERT, chairman of the House Armed Services Investigating Committee, and HALE BOGGS, member of the House Ways and Means Committee.

Now, the general has been decorated many times for his services, and among his medals is the Carnegie Silver Medal for heroism, and there is quite a story behind that medal. It is legend, especially here in Capitol Hill, because the battlefield on which that medal was earned was the House of Representatives. It was in 1933, was it not, General——

General MAAS. No; 1932.

Miss CORRICK. That a man appeared in the House gallery with a loaded revolver and he threatened to shoot up the Congressmen. What did you do?

General MAAS. Ann, you mentioned an incident that has always been embarrassing to me, getting this Carnegie medal for it. I think I will reveal to you now the truth of what actually happened that day.

Miss CORRICK. I wish you would.

General MAAS. This nut in Congress—I mean the one up in the gallery—was waving this gun around. I did not see him to begin with. We were having a teller vote and I was one of the tellers. All of a sudden there was a great deal of confusion and everybody left suddenly.

Then Fiorello LaGuardia grabbed me by the arm and said, "Come on, Mel, let's get him," and with that he pointed up in the gallery. That is the first time I saw this bird waving this pistol around.

To get to him, you had to run up the aisle, out some swinging doors, around the halls and up some marble steps.

Just as we got to the door, LaGuardia went on out and I took one last look over there and I saw that this bird put his foot up on the rail. I was sure he was going to jump, and probably break a leg, so I had nothing more heroic in mind that running over and jumping on the guy when he was down—but when I got under him, the darn fool had not jumped. Here I was standing looking up at him, and he spotted me and waved the gun at me, and he said, "Will you give me 20 minutes to make a speech?"

Give him 20 minutes, I would have given him the shirt off my back. I said, "Yes, yes, yes, but it is against the rules to speak with a gun in the House. Give me the gun and you can make your speech."

He said, "I will give it to you," and with that he cocked it. It looked like a .75 millimeter cannot about that time.

The newspapers commented afterward how remarkable it was that I disarmed him with a smile. It was not a smile—it was a darn silly grin.

Congressman HÉBERT. What would have happened if he had not thrown you the gun?

General MAAS. Instead of running for Congress as I used to, I think I would have run from Congress.

Suddenly he changed his mind and did drop the gun to me. As soon as he dropped the gun, the cops all jumped out from behind the seats and grabbed him.

Congressman BOGGS. Mel, that is quite an interesting and very great career you have had. Why don't you tell us a little bit about the work you are doing now.

General MAAS. Well, Hale, I am actually in the most rewarding work that I have ever done. I do not mean financially because all of us on the President's Committee serve without any compensation of any sort. However, I am receiving more compensation in the way of gratification, feeling that I am making a contribution, more so than I have ever felt by doing anything else.

The work of the President's Committee is educational and informational. We are not a Government agency. We have a small Federal staff, but the Commitee is made up of about 300 organizations representing the heart of America. All of the great labor unions are members, all of the great employer groups like the Association of Manufacturers, and the United States Chamber of Commerce, are members, all of the veterans' groups, the Federation of Women's Clubs, the medical profession, social workers, and just dedicated men and women.

What we are doing is trying to educate employers and the labor unions and the general public as to the employability of handicapped men and women.

There are so many people who think that just because some of us have a personal physical inconvenience we cannot work. This is not true at all. We have to overcome centuries of prejudice and intolerance and discrimination against men and women who have a physical handicap.

It is tremendously heartwarming to see the growing increase in interest and awareness and desire to help in this campaign.

Congressman HÉBERT. The work which you are doing with this committee is very interesting and, of course, very constructive; but what is your feeling about a program which would educate people to prevent the accidents which cause disability?

General MAAS. Eddie, of course that is one of the disgraces in this country. However, the vast majority of those for whom we have to find jobs, strangely enough, are not handicapped by way of industrial accidents. Of course, these accidents are deplorable, but the vast majority of these handicapped people have become so handicapped by reason of illness and disease.

Congressman HÉBERT. That is exactly what I was hoping you were going to say, Mel. I think the work of the President's Committee is quite creditable and laudable and you are indeed doing a splendid job with respect to rehabilitating these people.

I think the big problem is, however—and I would like your comment on this—is educating through research and prevention. As I put it the other day in New Orleans when I was down there to dedicate the Lighthouse for the Blind, we all run to the man who has a white stick in his hand, but our greatest efforts should be given to preventing him from getting the white stick.

General MAAS. Of course, that is true, and we are tremendously interested in these research programs and their development. If the proper job is done in preventive campaigns—the biggest single number that we have are cardiac cases—if we can lick them at the beginning, then you would not have any need for the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

Congressman HÉBERT. What suggestions do you have? What program do you have for prevention?

General MAAS. I believe a great deal more intensified research must be done. Once you know how to prevent a disease or cure it, then the matter becomes routine. But the greatest mass of people who are physically handicapped are continuing—actually it is about 275,000 a year added to these rolls of the seriously physically handicapped. We need more research.

Congressman BOGGS. It seems to me in your work you have two basic problems: One is to convince an employer that a handicapped person can be a satisfactory employee, and the other, it would seem to me, would be the psychological problem with the handicapped person himself to convince him that he is still a useful member of society and can perform gainful employment of some kind or another.

How do you approach those two separate problems, the individual problem and then the employer problem?

General MAAS. You have identified them. They are the big problems. There is a third one, too, and that is educating those who are nonhandicapped workers to accepting a handicapped worker beside them.

Today there is considerable resistance among workers who just do not want handicapped workers working near them for fear that the handicapped person will cause an accident that will involve the nonhandicapped. Just to dispose of that, we have checked all of the records, and as far as we could determine throughout the country, we have yet to find one single case where a handicapped worker has involved a fellow

worker, so the non-handicapped do not have to worry about that.

The problem of educating the employer is our major problem, of course. The other problem is a social one, getting the handicapped to find out that there is such a thing as opportunity for rehabilitation; that they can be given vocational training so that they can become self-supporting. Some work is being done along those lines, but what the Congress has charged our committee with is primarily in the field of educating employers and labor unions, because there are problems involving labor contracts in this matter—educating them as to the desirability of giving the handicapped an opportunity to work and then convincing them that a well-trained, properly placed handicapped worker is not only as good as the average but, in most cases, they become superior. Being trained in a specialty, they become very expert in that specialty. The handicapped man or woman who is given a job is grateful for it, for one thing, and there is much less tendency to switch jobs.

Miss CORRICK. In what fields of endeavor are the handicapped people finding places today?

General MAAS. Actually, everywhere. There isn't any kind of a job today in this country that is not being performed by some kind of a handicapped person.

Miss CORRICK. Mostly in industry?

General MAAS. I would say the preponderance of the absorption of the physically handicapped has been so far in industry. In fact, we are quite concerned at the failure of the professions to accept them. I am thinking particularly now of the blind. With the critical teacher shortage in this country, there are hundreds of blind men and women who are qualified educationally and by temperament to teach—and yet through prejudice they cannot get jobs as teachers. Yet, there are many very fine blind teachers, not only in the colleges but in the secondary schools and even in the primary schools.

Congressman HÉBERT. I think the figures show in this country today there are some 314,000 blind people. In referring to the blind, Mel—and I know you are not sensitive about your affliction at all, and I think you and I both know that—I think it would be most interesting and most informative and certainly most inspirational if you would take a moment to tell us exactly what your reaction was when you went blind. I knew you and served with you when you had good eyesight, and I have known you for the years that you have been blind. It intrigued me as I am sure it intrigued those of the audience who watched you light that cigar just now; and what you told us before the program about the book you're writing called "How to Eat Soup With a Fork." To me, it is an inspiration. Just what did you do after you went blind and how did you rehabilitate yourself?

General MAAS. I was in the hospital at the time it happened for an entirely different thing. I had developed violent stomach pains which turned out to be an ulcer, and it was while I was being treated for the ulcer that my eyesight failed. Failed in one eye within a week and in the left eye within a couple of months, but it failed quite rapidly.

When the doctors gave me the verdict that I was going to be blind and it was going to be permanent blindness, actually for the first couple of days I wanted to die. I conceived of myself as just a blind, helpless old man. About the second morning I was lying in bed in a cold sweat. I could still see. I got up and went into the bathroom, took my shower, shaved, and dressed, keeping my eyes closed the entire time, and I suddenly realized that it was not going to be as bad as I thought. I could do normal things.

Then actually, Eddie, from then on, I was so busy that I never had time to think of it again. I was handling liaison with the Congress at the time and handling this Reserve legislation that we had up and they were sending people out from the Pentagon to see me, and you Congressmen were calling me and sending your secretaries up, so I had them put in a telephone next to my bed, and from then on I continued to carry on on the telephone 8 or 9 hours a day. Then I was sent to rehabilitation. I think learning about rehabilitation very early, before I was totally blind, was a tremendous lift. I learned that I could go to Hines, Ill.——

Congressman HÉBERT. I would like for you to develop that point just a bit because I think that must be one of the secrets of this whole program—your own rehabilitation and how you apply it to other people in your work today.

General MAAS. When I learned that I was going to be able to be trained to get about pretty much normally, and that I would learn to substitute a cane for eyesight for traveling, that I was going to learn typing so that I could communicate written messages to other people, and I would learn Braille, it was a tremendous lift to me.

When I got to the rehabilitation center I found how practical all of these solutions were—in fact, they had a slogan to the effect that when you finished this course you could do anything that you did before except drive a car. I made suckers out of them on that, because I drove a car.

Congressman HÉBERT. A lot of people are driving now who think they can see.

General MAAS. In fact, it was a whole new challenge to me.

You mentioned how I lit a cigar. I was getting quite frustrated. You know, being an old Congressman, I have to smoke my cigars. I was so frustrated that I was about to quit smoking. I took a match and just drove it up into the bottom of the cigar and struck it. It lit, but I had to laugh at myself because I had to smoke the wood. Then I got to experimenting and found that by holding a match underneath I could make it work every time.

In developing those things like dialing a telephone, I learned that if I put a little adhesive tape on the fifth dial of the telephone, then I could count very fast because I had four places to count from. I will bet you that I can dial a telephone faster than you can or anybody else with eyesight, because I do not have to waste time looking at the numbers.

Congressman HÉBERT. With my eyesight, I cannot dial a phone at all, as you well know. I am in the same position.

The reason I had a personal interest in asking you about these things was that I hope when the day comes when I am in the same position, I will have the courage to be as brave as you.

General MAAS. EDDIE, it isn't that. You have great vitality and you will carry on.

I found, in fact, that I am able to travel more extensively now than when I had good eyesight. Last year, I traveled 150,000 miles and I do all of my traveling alone.

Congressman HÉBERT. You went to New Orleans alone last year to make the November 11th address.

General MAAS. I have no difficulty getting around. With radio and the wonderful "talking books" that Congress provides for the blind, I am doing more reading now and better reading than I did when I had sight.

For instance, I get the Reader's Digest each month on these "talking books."

Congressman HÉBERT. Is that a Braille book?

General MAAS. No, a "talking book" consists of long-playing records. They have marvelous voices. They get the best actors and actresses and radio personalities, and they read books. Right now, I am reading The Robe on "talking books." The Government, through the Library of Congress, will furnish any of these "talking books" to a blind person. They do not have to be a veteran. They will also furnish the recording machine for playing these records. They lend it to them for life and then these long-playing records are put in fiber cases and they are mailed to the blind person, the regular catalog, without cost. When the blind person has read the book, he gives it back to the Post Office Department and the books are mailed back to the Library of Congress. It is like a circulating library.

Congressman HÉBERT. Exactly what is the procedure for receiving those "talking books," Mel? I think that is most interesting to blind people. Of course, they can write to their Congressmen, I know, but let us tell them how to get the books themselves.

General MAAS. All they have to do is get a doctor's certificate that they are totally blind or unable to read. With just that certificate they can write to the Library of Congress or, in fact, they can get the information through their local library in most cases. Otherwise, they can write directly to the Library of Congress, Washington 25, D. C.

Congressman BOGGS. What do you do at these meetings you attend all of the time?

General MAAS. Talk about the problems of hiring the handicapped and cite to them cases of employers who have hired the handicapped and what good employees they are. The most enthusiastic supporters of this program are the employers who have hired some handicapped people. They are good workers and they are not troublemakers. They have fewer accidents and their safety record is high. Their absenteeism is perhaps even a little less than the average worker.

Congressman BOGGS. I am certain that you must have the figures, but it seems to me that there must be a tremendous gap in the situation where you have a handicapped person who can earn a gainful living or a handicapped person who is dependent either upon his family or the State or the Government in some capacity. What is the difference?

General MAAS. I am awfully glad you asked that, because it is quite dramatic.

The average throughout the Nation—and this will vary in different States and different cities—for maintaining a person on welfare is about $1,500 a year. That goes on forever as long as you are maintaining that person. The average cost for rehabilitation, however, is about $600, and that is a one-shot expenditure. So take a $1,500 welfare person, give him rehabilitation and get him on the job, and you have not only saved the $1,500 but you have started receiving taxes from such an individual because these rehabilitated persons, both men and women who are on the job, very soon become themselves taxpayers.

Last year alone the men and women who became rehabilitated and were placed on jobs in the aggregate earned $115 million and paid somewhere between $9 million to $15 million in taxes. Whereas, the year before they had been costing the country nearly $50 million.

Congressman BOGGS. That is remarkable.

Congressman HÉBERT. Mel, in your program to educate people, it has been called to my attention that you hold annual essay contests. I have here the list of youngsters in Louisiana who won this year's contests:

First place: Sally Bett Grace, 304 South Holly Street, Hammond, La.: Southeastern High School.

Second place: Caroline Gayle Morgan, route 4, Joor Road, Baton Rouge, La., Central High.

Third place: Marie Massimini, 2130 Jena Street, New Orleans, Fortier Senior High.

Fourth place: Urline Andoni, 8335 Birch Street, New Orleans, Redemptorist High.

Fifth place: A tie by Juanita Matherne, 1508 Riviera Drive, New Orleans, Holy Angels Academy, and Charles Earry Hillebrandt,

1920 Second Street, Lake Charles, La., Lake Charles High School.

What were those essays?

General MAAS. It is a wonderful program, EDDIE. We sponsor nationally—and, incidentally, the DAV, which Ann mentioned, of which I am national commander, has put up the money for the essay winners. The first prize is $1,000, and they pay the expenses of the five winners to Washington to have their prizes presented to them at our annual meeting. It is a wonderful project because these youngsters write on some phase of the handicapped. We set the subject each year. Of course, it is the first time they have thought much about it, and they take it home and discuss it with their parents. Well, it is the first time that most of the parents have even thought about the problem or knew that there was such a problem. It also gives these kids a lot more confidence in knowing that if anything should happen to them, they can be taken care of. They have now learned that life will not be a blank for them. They have learned that the blind, the crippled, the amputees, can lead a perfectly normal life. As each generation comes along, they are learning more and more about it. They are going to be the employers and the employees of the future, so we feel that it is a most wonderful project.

Congressman BOGGS. Mel, is there some coordination in your work with the other programs like the program for retarded children, and that sort of thing?

General MAAS. We are not in the mental deficiency side of it, because we are chartered only for the physically handicapped.

I think that will come along in time. We are paving the way.

As we open up opportunities for the physically handicapped and educate the country to the acceptance of the physically handicapped, we feel it will open the path for the rehabilitated and retarded person.

Congressman BOGGS. In conjunction with the rehabilitation of the physically handicapped, the Lousiana State Unemployment Service has a special division for the employment of the physically handicapped.

Congressman HÉBERT. I think they all do.

General MAAS. Every State now does; in fact, in every local employment office there will be a specialist on the problems of placing the handicapped.

Congressman HÉBERT. In New Orleans, they go one step further, Hale, and I am sure you are familiar with this. I think they call it the Good Will Industries.

Stella Hanlon is the head of it down there.

Congressman BOGGS. They have that in all the States?

General MAAS. That is international.

Congressman BOGGS. And then they give the physically handicapped employment and very gainful employment.

Congressman HÉBERT. That is a fine thing; it is operated everywhere. That is a private operation.

Miss CORRICK. The general was conored recently by the Good Will Industries.

General MAAS. Yes, I was very proud to receive their international achievement award.

Congressman HÉBERT. That is another deserved honor.

Miss CORRICK. General, in your travels, you go overseas quite frequently, and I wondered if you could tell us what countries overseas are doing for their handicapped people.

General MAAS. There are some programs, but they are nowhere near what we do. We are beginning to stimulate them and it is giving them quite a lift and quite a challenge.

I have been particularly interested in Asian and African couutries where traditionally nothing was ever done for handicapped people. They were ashamed of handicapped people, and yet they have great numbers of them because of malnutrition, disease, and illness. Our program is giving them a tremendous lift.

Incidentally, an entirely new and different concept of America has been brought to their attention which is quite the contrary to the concept they were getting from Communist propaganda.

I attended these international conferences on rehabilitation of the World Veterans Federation. We now have 30 nations in it. I talked with delegates from Thailand, Ceylon, Pakistan, Indonesia, India, Nigeria, Israel, and Egypt, and they are tremendously impressed with what we are doing for our handicapped. When they learn that these great volunteer teams like the President's Committee and Governors' Committee take the cripples, as they call them, and give them medical restoration, vocational rehabilitation, and then actually get them jobs—to them, that is almost unbelievable. It is having a tremendous impact upon them.

I have had so many of them tell me, "Well, General, if your people think so much of the dignity of the individual that you take your cripples and restore them so that they can have dignity, then we believe that you are decent people and the Communists have been lying to us. The Communists have said that you are nothing but money-mad dollar-grabbing people. But those kinds of people do not worry about the dignity of individuals. So, if they have been lying to us about that, maybe they are lying to us about a lot of other things." So you see this program is having a very wonderful impact on the rest of the world.

Miss CORRICK. In helping to combat Communist propaganda against us?

General MAAS. Yes.

The one thing that these Asians and Africans want after centuries of suppression and colonization is not the Communist thinking of just more money and better clothing and more housing.

Miss CORRICK. I am awfully sorry, General Maas, but the clock is running out on us, and we must stop.

Thank you so much for being here on Dateline Washington, General Melvin Maas, with Congressman HALE BOGGS and F. EDWARD HÉBERT.

This is Ann Corrick.

Fluoridation of Drinking Water—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, fluoridation of public drinking water is one of the most controversial issues now before the public. Various official groups, such as the United States Public Health Service and the American Dental Association, advocate fluoridation. On the other hand, a large and increasing number of doctors, dentists, biochemists, nutritionists, and city water commissioners strongly oppose it.

Testimony before the House Committee to Investigate the Use of Chemicals in Foods and Cosmetics, of which I was chairman during the 81st and 82d Congresses, first alerted public attention to the possible dangers of flouridation. Interest has continued to grow and today, some 4 years after the conclusion of the investigation, I still constantly receive requests from people all over the country for material on the subject.

New York City is now considering the possibility of fluoridation. As a public service, in order to fully inform its readers of all sides of the question, the Long Island Star-Journal recently published a series of articles entitled, "Fluoridation: Menace or Blessing?" I believe that Lois Benjamin, the author of the series, has done an excellent job of reporting. The articles are objective, dispassionate, and informative.

Mr. Speaker, because of the country-wide interest in this, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the first of Miss Benjamin's reports:

[From the Long Island Star-Journal of February 27, 1956]

FLUORIDATION: MENACE OR BLESSING?—WAR ON TOOTH DECAY MEETS HEAVY OPPOSITION

(By Lois Benjamin)

With all the stops pulled out on the water fluoridation issue, the public uproar may break all of New York's existing records for sheer volume.

The hullabaloo has swelled in recent weeks with daily outbursts by religious groups, civic associations, and individuals condemning the idea of mass medication through municipal water supply.

And the program's supporters, once confident of its ready acceptance, now must face the possibility that fluoridation will be put to the test of a referendum—and that it may be rejected.

The fluoridationists are dazed by the turn of events. They entered the arena armed with an impressive set of scientific data, and accompanied by an impressive roster of revered medical and dental allies. They all had endorsed fluoridation as a major step toward the conquest of tooth decay.

The still-pending resolution before the city council, introduced in August 1954 urges that all community water supplies in New York City be treated with a fluoride-containing compound in the proportion of 1 part of fluoride to every 1 million parts of water.

Since 1951, New York's Board of Health has made 3 exhaustive studies of the history of fluorides, and submitted 3 lengthy reports to the mayor. Each time, its recommendation to fluoridate was wholehearted.

The latest report, submitted to Mayor Wagner last October, declared unequivocally that "the overwhelming weight of competent scientific opinion * * * is that water fluoridation is an effective, safe, practical, and much-needed public health measure."

All four of these claims have been challenged, and each has been defended. The swords continue to cross.

What floridation promises is a startling statistic: If the water supply is treated in the recommended proposition, children will suffer nearly two-thirds less tooth decay. The promise has been made by such groups as the United States Public Health Service, the American Dental Association, and the National Research Council.

To prove it to the skeptics, a 10-year experiment was set up in 1945 in the neighboring upstate towns of Kingston and Newburgh, as well as similar tests in Michigan and Ontario, Canada.

In the New York experiment, Newburgh's water supply was fluoridated; Kingston's was fluorine-free. After the decade of clinical examinations and dental studies of 100 children in each town, it was found that:

Newburgh's 6- to 10-year-olds have 60.3 percent fewer decayed permanent teeth than the same group in Kingston.

Not one first permanent molar was lost among the Newburgh children. In Kingston, 6.5 percent of the 9- and 10-year-olds had to have these teeth pulled because of decay.

Almost four times as many Newburgh children had no cavities at all in their baby teeth.

Newburgh also provided the fluoridationists with an answer to the widespread charge that fluoridated water causes "mottled enamel"—disfiguring scars on the teeth. The verdict of the Newburgh research staff was that no mottled enamel could be observed on the teeth of any child in the group.

Fluoridation's foes have held that even if the procedure helps cut cavities in children's teeth, the adult population would be forced to drink and pay for medicated water which holds no benefits for them.

But fluoridation's champions point to the study in Colorado Springs and Boulder City, Colo., where adults up to the age of 45 were observed. Boulder City's water is almost free of fluoride; Colorado Springs' water has a natural level of 2.6 parts per million.

Scientists found 60 percent less adult tooth decay in Colorado Springs. Boulder City's residents had lost 3 to 4 times as many teeth due to decay.

The safety of fluoridated water has been assured by the same respected medical groups. That fluorine in pure form is poisonous is true. That it is harmless in a compound at the recommended level is equally true. Fluoride, say the board of health, the city's, and the Nation's medical societies, is a normal substance in the body, and is contained in many of the foods eaten daily, notably fish and seafood. In general, excesses of fluorides consumed will be stored in bones and teeth and not in the organs or soft tissues.

The fluoride found naturally in food and the fluoride added to water in the experimental towns are identical in their chemical action and in their effects on human beings, the experts maintain.

The term "rat poison" has been used by antifluoridationists as scare propaganda, because sodium fluoride is used as an insecticide base.

The fact is that it would take a single dose of 400 gallons of 1 part per million fluoridated water to kill a person. The board of health calls the margin of safety enormous.

The Newburgh-Kingston project revealed no physical effects, good or bad, except for the dental benefits traceable to the fluoridated water. Populations which have drunk fluoridated waters over long periods have shown no increase in diabetes, kidney ailments, heart trouble, or any other malady.

As for the practicality of the project, estimates have been made in New York which indicate that the means of fluoridation would cost only $450,000 to install. Yearly maintenance would involve about 9 cents per capita.

The automatic action of fluoridated water has been termed a far more dependable weapon against decay than the unpredictable controls of diet, toothbrushing, or expensive individual fluoride treatments.

Whether fluoridation is a necessary step can only be answered by the fact that dental decay is 1 of the Nation's 2 most prevalent diseases. (The second is the common cold.) New Yorkers develop 7 million cavities a year, and pay $100 million in dental bills to repair the damages.

Fluoridation of Drinking Water—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, proponents of fluoridation of public drinking water often claim that opposition comes only from crackpots. This is not true, as Lois Benjamin points out in the following article, which I include under leave to extend my remarks:

[From the Long Island Star-Journal of February 28, 1956]

FLUORIDATIONS MENACE OR BLESSING?—EXTREMISTS' HYSTERIA HAMPERS CAMPAIGN BY SERIOUS OPPONENTS

(By Lois Benjamin)

An unusual trio of voices today is combined in a single, urgent chorus against fluoridation.

These are the three: A reputable band of doctors and biochemists who question the experimental records; the Government ethics group, which warns against playing doctor to unwilling patients, and the hard core of fanatics, who see it all as a vicious conspiracy to poison the population.

Unfortunately, the strident din of the scaremongers, some of whom have called the measure a "Communist plot to brainwash the country by doctoring the water," has drowned out the serious dissenters.

As a result, most opposition to fluoridation has been dismissed as misinformed hysteria.

There is much more to the story.

Seven days of public hearings before a congressional committee in 1952 brought 18 professional witnesses to Washington to give the pros and cons of water fluoridation. The committee, headed by Congressman JAMES J. DELANEY, of Astoria, compiled a report after all the evidence was in. That report urged caution.

The views recorded at the hearings were those of highly trained biochemists, nutritionists, denists, and health officials, all of whom had worked with and studied the effects of fluoridation.

Several questions were raised then which have not yet been answered in all the pamphlets, reports, and circulars that have been published on the subject.

One of the most important of these was posed by Dr. Robert S. Harris, a biochemist at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He pointed out that since fluorine only reduces the incidence of tooth decay, and does not prevent it entirely, fluorine may not be the answer to the decay problem.

As for fluorine deficiency being the cause of the problem, as has been claimed, Dr. Harris cited evidence that cavities have been both produced and prevented by many chemical and biochemical methods other than the addition of subtraction of fluorine from the diet.

All fluoridation experts, including the witnesses who appeared before the Delaney committee, concede that fluorine is poisonous if taken in large amounts.

The controversy, therefore, concerns the physical effects of fluorides in water at the recommended level of one part per million.

The profluoridationists say these effects are negligible. The antis take exception to this claim.

For one thing, it was asked, have the 10-year experiments in Newburgh-Kingston, Brantford, Ontario, and Grand Rapids, Mich., given us any information about the long-range effects of drinking fluoridated water? The children observed in these pilot groups, it was cited, make up only a small part of the population, and even they have not been observed long enough to prove the treatment harmless.

One of the dangers of fluoridation, admitted even by its strongest supporters, is that of "mottled enamel," which has been observed even where fluorides in the water are at relatively low levels.

The testimony of Dr. Margaret Cammack Smith, head of the nutrition department of the University of Arizona, involved her experimental research with fluoridated water and mottling.

Dr. Smith, who praised the United States Public Health Service findings as to the reduction of cavities through water fluoridation, nevertheless, declared herself opposed to the procedure.

Dental fluorosis, the technical term for disfiguring scars on tooth enamel, was found on the teeth of people in Arizona where the fluorine content is only .9 parts per million—lower than the recommended level for New York.

A partial explanation can be found in the fact that more water is consumed in Arizona's desert climate than in temperate New York, but even so, the margin is far from comfortable.

Even so-called mild mottling changes the smooth, glossy, creamy whiteness of normal teeth to a dull, unglazed surface with irregular chalky white patches.

In so-called moderate cases, the patches may absorb brown stain. In severe cases, the surface of the enamel is pitted and corroded. It was predicted that some mottling would occur on the teeth of the 10 to 12 percent of those who used fluoridated water.

There is no known method of treating or disguising mottled teeth.

Only partial protection against tooth decay, therefore, has been assured by fluoridation, "at the possible risk of damage of the teeth which is irreparable," Dr. Smith advised.

Other issues raised were: What are the effects of fluorides on persons with kidney disorders, who may store more than a safe quantity of fluoride?

What about people who have abnormally low tolerance to fluorine?

What are the differences in amount of water consumed, and what effect would greater consumption have on the safety ceiling of fluoride absorption?

The Delaney report stated that "a sufficient number of unanswered questions concerning the safety" of the program exists as to call for "a conservative attitude."

If a mistake is to be made concerning water fluoridation, the committee advised, "it is preferable to err on the side of caution."

Councilman Eric J. Treulich, of Richmond Hill, who introduced the original fluoridation resolution in the city council, withdrew it after reading the Delaney records. Treulich is one of those who question the ethics of fluoridating public water. He asks: "Is any city government justified in forcing people to drink it if they don't want it?"

Treulich declares he does not consider all the objections to fluoridation valid objections, but even if they are invalid, he feels they cannot be blithely overruled.

It has been countered that smallpox vaccinations, pasteurized milk, and chlorinated water are tolerated by many whose vehement criticisms were overruled for the sake of public welfare.

Treulich maintains that in the case of water fluoridation, there is no such danger of epidemic, contraction of fatal disease, or spread of germs.

"Fluorides are not necessary to make the water safe," he declared, and therefore there is a moral question involved, which must be answered.

Another active voice raised against fluoridation is that of the religious groups, among them the Christian Scientists, who object to medicine in any form.

Some food purist cults also belong in this category, as they also oppose altering any natural substance. They have called fluoridation "unconstitutional," but have had no success in courtroom attempts to defeat it on this ground.

Ironically, the work of the fanatics, most of which is based on bald fiction and frightening slogans, has been the most successful weapon against fluoridation in every community where the measure has met defeat.

Typical was the pamphlets put out by a Seattle, Wash., antifluoridation faction, de-

picting a skull-and-crossbones symbol, labeled "poison," and underlined by the question, "Do you want to drink this?"

Similarly, in Northampton, Mass., newspaper advertisements shouted that "fluoridation could play into the hands of our enemies. America is too big to be conquered by invasion, but with fluoridation machines at the reservoirs, the population * * * could easily be wiped out or made nonresistant.

But despite the meaningless catchwords of the fear faction, a good case against fluoridation can be built up by its responsible opponents. Whether experimental data answers that case beyond a reasonable doubt is the decision New York must make. The jury is still out.

Fluoridation of Drinking Water—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, the engineering difficulties involved in setting up a safe system for fluoridating drinking water are not generally realized. The following article, which I include under leave to extend, outlines the hazards and difficulties which would be faced by New York City in such an operation:

[From the Long Island Star-Journal of February 29, 1956]

SAFE FLUORIDATION OF DRINKING WATER JUST IMPOSSIBLE HERE, ENGINEERS SAY

(By Lois Benjamin)

Whether fluoridation of drinking water gives children stronger teeth, or whether it constitutes a grave risk to public health may be an academic question after all, as far as New York City is concerned.

Behind all the medical argument pro and con, lies a stubborn question of whether the thing can be done at all in a water supply system as large and as complex as New York's.

Through all the tumult and shouting, the Department of Water Supply, Gas and Electricity has remained staunchly opposed to the idea. Through two city administrations, it has warned that the project is impracticable.

New York City's water originates at points up to 125 miles away from the city. In the city, there are more than 6,000 miles of streets. In every street, there is a water main, and in addition to the more than 6,000 miles of pipeline in the streets, there are the lines running into every building to literally millions of water taps.

The recommended amount of fluoride is one part in a million. More than that is definitely dangerous. Engineers insist that to attempt to maintain so delicate a balance throughout a water system so far extended and so complex is virtually impossible.

Water Commissioner Arthur Ford of Jamaica Estates, who succeeded Dominick Paduano of South Ozone Park in the post, has refrained from stating his views since Mayor Wagner declared several weeks ago that he favored the fluoridation project.

But Ford's position, along with that of ex-Commissioner Paduano, was made abundantly clear long ago in several reports to the mayor.

Paduano still maintains a vital interest in the smooth flow of New York City's water. He spoke today of the peculiar problem which makes fluoridation in New York so cumbersome and unpredictable.

The point closest to New York where the feeding equipment would be installed, Paduano said, is Hillview Reservoir in Yonkers, just north of the Bronx. Hillview is the last of three stops made by the water after it leaves Schoharie Reservoir, which is 125 miles to the north. The middle stations are Ashokan and Kensico.

No other city handles a volume of water equal to that which rushes through that 125-mile journey, Paduano stated. New York disposes of 1,135,000,000 gallons a day.

The possibility of mechanical or human failure somewhere along that route, with such a volume, is unavoidable. With a potentially toxic chemical compound involved, Paduano said, the possibility becomes a dangerous risk.

It would be virtually impossible to prevent concentration of fluoride in some spots, and a consequent deficiency in others, Paduano said.

This can be vividly illustrated by the action of chlorinated water, Paduano pointed out. After the chlorine is fed into the water at Hillview the first group of homes to be supplied is in the Bronx. There have been frequent complaints by Bronx residents that concentrated amounts of chlorine can be detected in their water. The chemical, at these times, has not settled thoroughly in the system during the brief trip from Hillview to the Bronx outlets.

If chlorine can thus be tasted and smelled by Bronx water drinkers, what would happen with fluoride where the danger of mottled teeth occur at a level not much higher than the allegedly "safe" proportion?"

As for the engineering task, the "simple and economical" installation of fluoridating equipment pointed to proudly by the program's advocates is "not as simple as it looks," according to Paduano.

Delicate adjustments must apparently be made in the system to cope with even slight fluctuations in the supply of water. Sample tests and checks must be made constantly to protect the consumers against any possible surplus of the chemical. When dealing with so precise ratio as 1 ppm, no mistakes can be made.

With all due respect to New York's capable body of engineers, Paduano said "it would be quite an undertaking."

The former commissioner, who served 25 years with the department, added his voice to those who question the safety of the 1 ppm fluoride level.

The rate of consumption among water drinkers of various ages, occupations, and states of health in various seasons, is so markedly different, he emphasized, that a single "safety" level is impossible to determine.

"Considerable medical evidence," he added "contradicts the claim that one part per million of fluoride is a safe proportion in any case." Even if the solution could be guaranteed constant, and even if everyone's water intake could be guaranteed identical, the susceptibility to fluorosis varies widely, and there would be no way of forewarning a person with low fluorine tolerance."

Fluoridation of Drinking Water—IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, proponents of fluoridation of public drinking water often claim that the process is inexpensive. That may be true in some instances, but costs vary according to the size of the community and the engineering problems involved. The following article, which I include, points out certain expenses which many residents of New York City would have to absorb if their drinking water were fluoridated.

[From the Long Island Star-Journal of March 1, 1956]

WATER COMPANIES SEE RATE RISE IF CITY INSISTS ON FLUORIDATION

(By Lois Benjamin)

Apart from the thorny engineering problems New York must tackle—if the city decides to fluoridate its water—a separate set of difficulties exists in Queens, where there are two private water companies.

The two companies are the Jamaica Water Supply Co. and the New York Water Service Corp. Between them they serve half a million Queens residents. The 58 million gallons of water which they distribute daily is no part of the city's water distribution system. They bill their customers directly at rates fixed by the public service commission.

On the public health aspect of fluoridation neither company takes any stand.

"That is not a question for us to decide," Cyril B. Myers, administrative vice president, of New York Water Service, said today.

But both companies want their customers to know the special hazards and expenses involved in any plan to fluoridate the water.

If the city orders them to fluoridate, Myers explained, the city must expect to shoulder the responsibility for any injuries claimed by their 130,000 customers.

Since neither the New York Water Service nor the Jamaica Water Supply Co. would fluoridate voluntarily, the city also would have to make up the cost of the process by granting them a raise in rates.

This would mean a substantial bite on their customers, because fluoridating these private water systems is far more costly than treating a municipal supply.

Jamaica Water Supply, the larger of the two firms, pumps water out of 70 wells, and would require fluoride "feeding" equipment at each station. There is no central point where all the water for its customers could be treated at once.

According to Mrs. Helen G. Fooner, a spokesman for the company, both the cost and the method present great problems.

In 1954, the company had a preliminary study made at the city's request. The cost to fluoridate their system, which encompasses 40 square miles in eastern Queens and western Nassau, was estimated for two types of fluoride compound—the liquid (hydrofluosilicic acid) and the powder (sodium fluoride).

According to Mrs. Fooner, the cost of equipment for the liquid compound would be lower—about $100,000 for the initial investment, and $100,000 a year for operation. The company would have to add personnel to conduct minute and frequent sampling tests at each well, to insure the safety of the solution. All the wells connect directly into the distribution system at points very close to the consumers' homes.

If the sodium fluoride compound is decided upon by the city, the Jamaica Water Supply Co. would have to invest about $546,000—more than the estimated price of equipment for all of New York.

Mrs. Fooner explained that the feeders for sodium fluoride were larger and more expensive than those used for the liquid compound. She also said that these feeders could not be installed in the company's existing well stations.

This would necessitate the construction of special dust-proof buildings and protective equipment for the employees who mixed the solution. The annual maintenance for

this equipment would come to about $100,000.

Mrs. Fooner emphasizes the fact that these estimates were rough, and that the amount might be greater or less. The unchangeable fact, however, was that the customers would have to foot the bill, regardless of how staggering it might become, because it would be met by an increase in their quarterly rates.

Families supplied by the New York Water Service might have an easier financial burden, as that firm maintains only 13 well stations. On the other hand, the cost would be shared by fewer customers than in the case of the Jamaica Co.

The New York Water Service has not yet undertaken an engineering estimate. Myers indicated it would not do so unless the city reached a decision to fluoridate, and then issued a direct order to the company.

The position of the department of water supply has been that these private firms would be saddled with an even more difficult problem with several stations than the city has with only one or two.

Furthermore, it is argued, when the points of treatment are so close to the homes of consumers, the dangers of mechanical failure and human error are also increased. There would be no way of stopping any mistakes before the water reached the drinking glass, with the possible ill effects of too much fluoride compound.

Fluoridation of Drinking Water—V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, the question properly may be raised as to whether fluoridating public drinking water is the best way to make available the tooth-decay-resistant action of fluorine. The following article, which I include under leave to extend my remarks, shows how it can be given in six other ways:

[From the Long Island Star-Journal of March 2, 1956]

DRINKING WATER IS NOT THE ONLY MEANS—FLUORIDE CAN BE GIVEN SIX DIFFERENT WAYS

(By Lois Benjamin)

If New Yorkers don't want—or can't have—fluoridated water, how else can they put fluoride to work for children's teeth?

There are at least half a dozen ways, say the experts, in which the controversial "wonder" chemical can be made available without putting it in the drinking water.

Despite the claim that fluoridating public water supplies is the cheaper, best, and easiest method of cutting down dental decay, fluoride has been successfully rubbed on teeth, put in toothpaste, pills, and milk, and mixed with bottled water.

The cost and convenience of these methods vary, but any of them can be employed with assurance that tooth decay will be substantially reduced.

The process of swabbing children's teeth with a 2-percent fluoride solution is practiced by many dentists. Decay can be cut about 40 percent by this method, and it could be done on a citywide basis by dental hygienists on regular visits to schools.

The board of health calls this procedure expensive and impractical. It is true that the cost per child, estimated at $5 per year, would be much higher than the theoretical 9 cents per capita annual cost for fluoridated public water.

On the other hand, with swabbing, no fluorides would be consumed by the patient, no danger of mottled enamel would exist, and all of the caution necessary in dealing with a potent chemical would be eliminated without sacrificing the dental benefits.

The results of combining fluoride compounds with toothpaste have not yet been conclusive enough for any authoritative judgment to be made, but several manufacturers have begun to distribute fluoride-containing dentrifices, with the promise that they will produce a reduction in tooth decay.

The fluoride tablet has thus far provided the best alternate route to dental health. Pills are already on the market which produce the desired results.

The department of water supply calls the use of tablets the most rational method of distributing fluorides, and their reasons for the statement are carefully outlined in a report by their chemical laboratory.

The necessity of exact dosage has been stressed both by advocates and foes of flouridation. Water intake cannot be limited, estimated, or prescribed for anyone in any community. When water contains a chemical compounds whose consumption should be limited, there is no way of protecting the community against overdosage.

But tablets, in prescribed quantities, are one of the safest known methods of giving medicine.

Profluoridationists have again contended that this procedure is expensive. But according to the department of water supply, the city could buy fluoride tablets for about 20 cents per thousand.

The department report stated that 1,500,000 children up to 12 years of age could have fluoride pills for about 8 cents a year each—less than the price of one tube of toothpaste.

Even if the city did not undertake a public health program, the pills can now be bought at $2.75 per hundred in retail drugstores, and pharmaceutical firms say the price may come down.

It has been pointed out that once the water supply was fluoridated, there would be no way for a person to avoid taking fluorides if he suffered ill effects. He could not eliminate water from his diet.

But with a tablet system, it would be a simple matter to discontinue the treatment if there were undesirable effects.

As for the claim that storing fluoride tablets in the home is inviting trouble, this argument could be applied to any other bottle in the family medicine cabinet.

A child would have to swallow 230 fluoride tablets in order to receive a fatal dose. If this unlikely possibility is still considered dangerous, the tablet content could be cut in half for home supplies.

As for milk as a fluoride medium, some experts claim this solution would be ideal, since most children drink more milk than water, and their intake could be controlled.

Technically, it has been cited, measuring and mixing processes in milk production are more accurate than those in water distribution.

Some proposal to add fluoride to salt, sugar, flour, or other foods have been made. But the supervision arguments apply to these household items as well as they do to water. Intake could not be carefully regulated.

Although all the facts about these alternatives are not known, considerable research is being conducted to weigh their advantages and drawbacks.

Should the water fluoridation plan prove unsuitable for New York's vast system, or if its critics defeat it here, it is still safe to say that children need not be deprived of stronger, healthier teeth through the benefits of fluoride.

Conditions In Indonesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Arnold C. Brackman from the Christian Science Monitor of November 24, 1954.

Though this dispatch is over a year old, it exactly describes the situation in Indonesia today.

It seems to me there has been ample time for our foreign policy makers to understand what is going on.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT OF INDONESIA HELPS COMMUNISTS

(By Arnold C. Brackman)

JAKARTA, INDONESIA.—President Sukarno of the Republic of Indonesia apparently has identified himself openly with the Communists in the continued polarization here into Islamic and Communist camps.

The president, the most powerful figure in the country, thus has taken a step of great and grave importance for the future.

Let Mr. Sukarno speak for himself. These are paraphrases of three important speeches he has made in the course of the past several weeks:

At Medan, the capital of North Sumatra: I favor a "progressive" government; the present cabinet of Premier Ali Sastroamidjojo is "progressive," and I believe, in the national interest, that this cabinet should receive continued support.

CAPITALISM ASSAILED

At Palembang, the capital of South Sumatra: There are those who seek to bring about a Cabinet crisis. These opposition groups are traitors who wish to sell out their country to foreigners. We, in Indonesia, do not want to see capitalism prevail, neither foreign nor domestic. Although our achievements are few, we shall continue to be progressive.

At Surabaya, the capital of East Java: In building a new Indonesia, we must remain "progressive," and we must look to the masses. The Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China are model examples of countries where great construction is in evidence, based upon "progressive" mass appeal. These remarks do not necessarily mean that Mr. Sukarno is pro-Communist. Nor that the Communists, who wildly support him, are pro-Sukarno.

It is simply that they have been driven together in facing what they regard as the common foe, principally Islam.

An Islamic victory at the polls next year in the country's first general elections, providing free elections are held, would mean the curtailment of Mr. Sukarno's mixed power as a nationalist leader and as a constitutional President, an inkling of the sort of double existence which the President has maintaned skillfully and successfully for the past 10 years as chief of state.

PLAYS MAJOR ROLE

It is Mr. Sukarno's conviction that the only way to maintain unity at home among the divergent races and religions which make up this sprawling archipelago is by maintaining the present unitarian, secular Indonesian Republic. He believes a markedly

Islamic state would lead to the republic's disintegration.

As a consequence, the President and the Nationalist left-wing cabinet of Premier Ali, which he largely influences, has permitted the Communists here a free hand in building up their mass organizations.

For example, Perbebpsi, a Communist-controlled para-military front of ex-guerrillas, which commanded fewer than 50,000 members a year or so ago, today boasts a membership of upward of 200,000.

The Indonesian Communist Party (PKI), once broken and disjointed, still branded with responsibility for the Communist revolt against the republic in 1948, has developed now into an organization which claims 500,000 members.

At a PKI plenary session, held in early November, D. N. Aidit, party secretary-general, was able to say, "The PKI has become an important and great national power. * * * The PKI is playing a very important role in today's events."

Ominously, he added that in view of the present international situation "it is all the more important that we speed up our peace work in this country."

LACK OF FRICTION NOTED

In overseeing the Communist buildup in Indonesia, President Sukarno and the Cabinet seem to have become the victims of the balance-of-power theory. They created the Communist power here, with its hydraheaded fronts, in an effort to neutralize and counteract the influence of the Moslem Party opposition, whose largely undisciplined organization runs into millions of members.

As a result of this policy, a cold war between Islam and communism today exists in Indonesia. Its duration is its principal unknown factor.

Yet, free elections would give Indonesia's 80 millions, the majority of them adherents of Islam, an opportunity to peacefully determine their future.

In the eyes of many, an Islamic-dominated government would not necessarily spell the end to Republican unity. There is relatively little friction between Islam and either Christianity or Hinduism or Buddhism here. Indeed, the first formal opposition to Premier Ali's Government stemmed from a union in Parliament between the cross and crescent, between the Moslem and Roman Catholic factions. Since then they have been joined in the opposition by the Protestant Party.

The President's recent declarations have drawn expected support from Nationalist-Communist circles. The opposition, on the other hand, has questioned why Mr. Sukarno does not deem the election of Soviet Prime Minister Georgi M. Malenkov and Communist Chinese chieftain Mao Tse-tung as honorary chairmen of the PKI as an example of foreign intrigue inside an Indonesian domestic political party. They also may wonder why the President may refer to the United States in a lecture to Surabaya students as "liberal imperialist" while not even vaguely referring to the march of the new-style imperialism of the Communist world.

On the Other Foot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "On the Other Foot," published in the Zeeland Record for March 8, 1956. The Zeeland Record is one of Michigan's outstanding newspapers.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE OTHER FOOT

There are a number of sayings which are widely known and which apply very well today to the antics of the Democratic high command in regard to President Eisenhower's announcement of last week that he will be willing to run for a second term if the Republican Party wishes him to do so.

One of these sayings is: "It makes a difference whose ox is being gored," and another, perhaps more widely known, is: "The shoe is on the other foot."

Aware of the great popularity of Mr. Eisenhower, the Democrats have been ardently hoping for months that his announcement would be negative. In fact, many of their public utterances have been obviously designed to try to influence that decision.

While Mr. Eisenhower held his own counsel, the Democrats have confined their attacks to what might be termed "sniping." But now that their worst fears are realized and they know that they have quite a job in defeating such a popular President, the wraps are coming off and the attacks are getting more personal.

It used to be that political ethics, already considered low enough by many, dictated that the opposition refrain from attacking a candidate because of his health or physical deformity. It was a matter of, shall we say, reciprocal courtesy.

But now the Democrats, with the presidential campaign not yet underway officially, are throwing away the rules and, if the current action is any indication, no holds will be barred.

Such a deliberate campaign to undermine confidence in the President's ability to serve comes in particularly bad taste from the Democrats, who themselves, just a very few short years ago, were knowingly perpetrating a great deceit of the American public in regard to President Roosevelt's health.

It is an open secret that Mr. Roosevelt's health had begun to fail even before he sought his third term in 1940. But the Democrats were very careful to keep that a secret.

When Mr. Roosevelt ran for his 4th term in 1944 he was indeed a very sick man, and the top brass of the party knew it well. News photographers were barred from taking any pictures that might catch the haggard expression Mr. Roosevelt carried when his guard was down. To use a blunt description, Mr. Roosevelt literally had to be carried into the White House for his fourth term.

But despite the fact that this was also well known to the Republican high command, it is to their credit that they refused to trade on it. Nor did they point to Mr. Roosevelt's polio crippled legs as being a drawback to his doing the duties of his office.

In contrast to the Democrat pattern of personal sniping, it is most refreshing the way President Eisenhower frankly and completely took the American public into his confidence and put the entire matter of a second term squarely in their hands.

Never in our memory has a high public official been so straightforward with the people.

Although Democrats are trying to instill fear in the public mind that Mr. Eisenhower will not be able to finish out another term, the President's frank statement and the testimony of the country's most eminent heart doctors should allay that fear.

Admitting that there is always some element of chance that Mr. Eisenhower may suffer another attack, his medical report places the President's health on a par with probably any one of the candidates in the Democrat Party who are seeking to replace him. Are they suggesting that the doctors are falsifying?

We believe the American public recognizes the truth and appreciates the complete frankness with which President Eisenhower discussed his condition with them. And we think they will believe the President when he says that he is able to fully perform the duties of the office.

Democrat attempts to infer that he cannot do the job are the same as saying that Mr. Eisenhower's message to the American people last Friday night was a complete fraud.

It wasn't—and the people know it.

Address by New York Secretary of State Carmine G. De Sapio at a Dinner Before the Hapoel Hamizrachi Council of Greater New York, New York City, Sunday Evening, March 18, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. HEALEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following address of the Honorable Carmine G. De Sapio, secretary of state, State of New York, delivered before the dinner of the Hapoel Hamizrachi Council of Greater New York, in New York City, on March 18, 1956:

My good friends, it is a very great pleasure for me to join with you this evening in paying tribute to a great Zionist leader and to a man whose piousness and dedication have set him before the world as a symbol of character, integrity, and leadership.

I am very grateful for this opportunity to meet with you, and to give expression to those sentiments and to those emotions which shock and horrify all decent people. It is easier for me, as a Christian, to articulate the nausea and the shame of recent events in the Middle East, because it is understandably difficult for Jews—who have such deep spiritual and traditional ties with Israel—to take the position which cries out to be taken; to say the things which beg to be said and to do what humanity impells be done.

It is time for the Dr. Bernard Bergmans of America, and for his and your conterparts throughout the world, to have the responsibility of Israel shared by your Christian brothers, and to have the challenge for preserving democracy in the Middle East shared by all freedom-loving people.

It is time to declare that Israel is not a problem for Jews, but that Israel is a bastion for world survival. It is time to call opportunism by its correct name and to give the lie to the diplomatic double-talk which seeks to place upon the alter of expediency the dreams and the prayers of generations and the lives of millions. It is time to end political bigotry. It is time to build the kind of policies and the kind of philosophy upon which freedom can be sustained and only upon which justice can survive.

It is not enough that Jews for thousands of years have dreamed of the promised homeland. It is not enough that Jews in countless numbers have had their blood spilled by ruthless despots. It is not enough that Jews all over the world have contributed to

the growth and development of civilization against enormous odds and in the face of violent social and moral shackles. And it is not even enough that a tiny Republic opened its arms and its heart and its limited bounty to the refugees of the world and gave them not only haven, but hope; not only peace, but promise.

None of this is enough. None of the past suffering and the agony and the toil and the terror of years and years of bigotry and godlessness is enough. Now, again, the dream must be shattered, the hope crushed, the resolution, the determination, and the peace destroyed. And in what interest? In the interest of oil? Partly. In the interest of airbases? Partly. In the interest of poor judgment? Partly. In the interest of callousness? Partly.

The tragic fact is that in the combined, agonizing interest of all of these, together with bungling stupidity, Israel today stands on the verge of annihilation.

On February 24, 1956, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles—this Nation's official spokesman before the world—told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: "Saudi-Arabia practices very rigorously certain religious doctrines, and they have felt for a long time—it goes back centures—a very particular animosity toward the Jews, because they credited the assassination of Mohammed to a Jew."

This was said by the Secretary of State of the United States of America—a statement which he later withdrew, after, as he admitted, his advisers had told him he was wrong about Mohammed.

Does this statement by the Secretary of State sound familiar to you? For how many years now have the Jews been accused of the kinds of sins which encourage religious wars, unholy crusades and wholesale plunder on the pretext of religious revenge? What do you imagine Adolf Hitler would have said under similar circumstances? And what do you imagine Khrushchev says in support of his position? Indeed, what have the tyrants and terrorists said through the ages—to excuse their ruthless destruction—that our Secretary of State didn't say just 3 weeks ago?

Was it a slip of the tongue? Was it perhaps a sly attempt to condition the American people to an indifferent attitude toward the Middle East by characterizing the unrest there as religious rebellion? Or if, as he said, he was merely mistaken in his statement, how many such mistakes can we expect from a man who brings us one day to the brink of war, and the next day to the brink of spiritual and moral bankruptcy?

How many mistakes, and how many misstatements, and how many misrepresentations must we be expected to accept from the architect of America's foreign policy?

How many contradictions, and how many retractions, and how many apologies must we tolerate?

America represents herself to the world as the arsenal for democracy; the bulwark of liberty and the guardian of peace. And so one day we tell the world that we will remain neutral in the Middle East and the next day we proceed to send tanks to Saudi-Arabia.

The following day we tell the world that we will halt the shipment of these tanks, and then we send them anyway. One day America tells the world that it will not help Israel and then the next day it tells Israel that it has an open mind.

One day, one thing; the next, another. And while all this is going on, the Secretary of State expresses the judgment that all that the Arabs are doing are practicing religious doctrines which are based upon their belief that the Jews killed Mohammed. This statement—both in terms of historic accuracy and in purporting to represent the thinking of the Arabs—is as false and vicious as the nefarious lies in the counterfeit Protocols of Zion.

But the Secretary of State blandly declares that his advisers had told him he was wrong, as he gallantly withdraws the statement. And while it is true that remarks can be expunged from a record, you can never erase the philosophy; the meaning; the drive which such a remark represents. For here is a profound illustration of the great danger, not only which Israel faces, but which all of us face, as justice stands on the brink of destruction.

This diplomacy of doubletalk and double-dealing just has to be stopped. This diplomacy of dedication to private profit at the expense of international morality has to be stopped. This diplomacy of talking tough to Russia, and helping her to destroy Israel, has to be stopped.

My good friends, bigotry must be stopped.

But Israel, ladies and gentlemen, is neither the beginning nor the end. It is part of a pattern. It is the same pattern which allowed India to be wooed into the Communist orbit. It is the pattern which made possible a new understanding between Yugoslavia and the Soviet. It is the pattern of the delivery of a large portion of Indochina to Red totalitarianism. And it is the pattern for Russia's success in penetrating the Middle East.

And that is why Israel is not a problem for Jews, but a problem rather, for all the free world. That is why it is equally the duty of every Christian who cherishes freedom and justice to protect, to strengthen, and to build that gallant little bulwark for democracy and peace.

I am proud—prouder than I can say—to be able to participate with you in this dinner tonight, a dinner which honors a great leader at the same time that it provides the funds to build shelters along Israel's troubled borders.

Rabbi Bergman's life and work represent an inspiration not only to those of his religion, but to all those who respect truth and who love God. And your great Zionist organization, which Dr. Bergman heads, acts not only as a militant vigilante of faith and a teacher of truth, but has also established 72 agricultural settlements; 30 housing developments; 80 children's institutions and a network of schools in the promised land.

To Dr. Bergman and to you, my friends, I extend my warm congratulations as a Catholic and my deep gratitude as an American.

You have never—nor will you ever—be alone. For your work is just, your cause is noble, and you are possessed of the blessings of God.

Thank you very much.

Death of Gen. Dro Drastamat Kanayan, Armenian Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, unfortunately those who fight for the liberty and freedom from oppression of their peoples are not always rewarded with victory during their lifetime. It is all the more significant, then, that we take cognizance of those who have fought so hard and yet are called from this life while their work is yet incomplete.

Gen. Dro Kanayan, a leader loved by all his fellow Armenians and by others throughout the world, is such a man.

Even though he knew that the objectives for which he fought might never be reached while he lived, he never ceased to fight because he believed in those basic principles of freedom and liberty for his people.

His life can serve as an inspiring example to all. In recognition of his work, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Hairenik Weekly of March 15, 1956, which covers the life of this great man.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DRO DRASTAMAT KANAYAN

Dro, baptismal name Drastamat Kanayan, the hero of Bash Abaran and one of the Armenian Revolution's the last of the Mohicans, closed his eyes forever in New England Deaconess Hospital, Boston, last Thursday, March 8, at 8:45 p. m., leaving his family, his beloved organization, the Armenian Revolutionary Federation, and a host of freedom-loving Armenians prostrate with grief.

The list of Dro's heroic exploits in the fight for Armenia's liberation from Turkish and czarist tyrannies is legion, but he is best known for his victory at Bash Abaran, 1 of the 3 crucial battles of 1918—Sardarapat and Karakilisseh—whose victory saved the remnants of the Armenian people from certain extinction and set the stage for the proclamation of the independent Republic of Armenia. At that time Dro's division guarded the very gates of Erivan, the capital of Armenia, and his decisive victory, combined with the victory on the two other fronts, forced the Turk to recognize the Armenian right to independence.

Although the son of an affluent family, he renounced wealth, comfort, and a secure future, and chose the thorny path of the revolution for the liberation of his beloved people. He did not even finish his education, but from early youth he took up a life which was full of adventure and peril, and in that life he forged a record which has become a legend among the Armenians.

He was a dedicated soldier of the revolution, resolute, proud, and fearless. He never knew defeat, and he came out of all his battles unscathed. Early in his youth he went after the tormentors of the Armenian people. It was he who rid the Armenian people of two of its worst executioners, Nagashitze, the military commander of Baku, and General Alikhanov, the governor of Alexandropol, who had incited the Tartar hordes to massacre the Armenian populace.

During the Armeno-Tartar bloody encounters of 1905 he was the right arm of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation, which organized the defense stands under the leadership of the incomparable revolutionary leader, Nicol Duman.

Later, in 1916, as commander of the Second Armenian Volunteer Brigade, and in the ensuing unequal fights preparatory to the independence of Armenia, as commander of the Bash Abaran front, he was invincible and led his soldiers from victory to victory.

During World War II, having for his supreme concern the fate of the thousands of stranded Armenians within the battle zone, he carried out an extremely sensitive and perilous mission which he completed successfully and was instrumental in saving thousands of Armenian lives from massacre and the rigors of deportation.

He continued his sacred work during the peace years, relentlessly pursuing the merits of the Armenian cause before the nations,

with a clarity, sincerity, and a devotion which compelled the respect of all. His presence in the dispersion, from the Middle East to the United States, inspired the multitudes and kept alive the fire of patriotism, the love of the fatherland, and the eternal struggle for freedom.

He was one of the last of the heroes of the Armenian Revolution, Andranik, Keri, Hamazasp, Prince Arghutyan, Nicol Duman, Murad of Sebastia, Sepouh, whose sacrifices wrote a glorious page in the history of the Armenians. All homage and glory to the memory of a great Armenian.

Those Biased Polls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Reading (Pa.) New Era:

THOSE BIASED POLLS

So-called public opinion polls are going to be used more than ever this year in an attempt to influence the election outcome.

Although they pretend to be scientific, the opinion polls as applied to the thoughts and actions of voters at some future date are little more than the opinion of those who pay for the poll—taking invariably organizations and businesses sympathetic to the Republican cause.

Congressman GEORGE M. RHODES, during a House Post Office and Civil Service Committee hearing on Republic plans for higher postal rates, remarked that polls were being used to influence opinion rather than to record opinion.

From past experiences we are inclined to agree that this is true. The Literary Digest debacle back in 1936 and the distortions of politakers in the Truman victory of 1948 are outstanding examples of inaccuracies in polls.

Only recently, in Minnesota's Democratic presidential primary, the Minneapolis Tribune predicted in a statewide poll that Stevenson would receive 52 percent of the vote, KEFAUVER 39 percent, and 9 percent undecided. Actually, KEFAUVER got 57 percent and Stevenson 43 percent.

Pollster George Gallup said on November 14, 1948, after the Truman repudiation of all polls, that election polls serve no possible social good.

Maybe Gallup learned his lesson but we seriously doubt it. In fact, a new kind of popularity poll is conducted regularly to determine the degree with which President Eisenhower, and Democratic challengers such as Kefauver, Stevenson, and Harriman are liked by the people.

One such poll permits individuals to rate popularity on a scale that ranges from plus 5 to minus 5. Obviously, an individual who goes all the way in registering popularity with a plus 5 still will have only 1 vote on election day. Yet, the plus 5 popularity opinion gives undue weight to the candidate.

Natually, if a poll can be rigged to give President Eisenhower a popularity factor of 68 or 69 percent, it might convey the impression that 68 or 69 percent of the voters are going to cast ballots for him next November. Here is definitely a poll being used to influence, rather than measure, public opinion.

Most polls are hit-or-miss at best. Few people have ever been interviewed by a major poll, or know someone who was. Furthermore, the average citizen keeps his politics to himself until he gets into the voting booth.

Voters would do well to remember that big business money and big publishers like Henry Luce of Time magazine use their polls to sway public opinion, if they can.

The only reliable poll is a record of candidates' votes on important issues. If you stick to that kind of information the chances are you will vote for your own economic interest without the aid of distorted popularity gauge that bears little or no relationship to the bread and butter issues affecting workers' lives.

H. R. 12

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, like nearly every other Member of the House who represents a substantial agricultural district, I have followed the developments on H. R. 12 through this House in the 1st session of the 84th Congress, and more recently the deliberation by the other body of Congress, both in the Agriculture Committee and when it was on the floor for amendment and debate. Also through the members of the conference committee I have kept abreast of the deliberations of the House and the Senate conferees in formulating the conference report now before the House.

I do not take the position that it is by any means a perfect bill, nor that it is a complete answer to the many agricultural problems existing in northeast Kansas. I do feel, however, that it offers the best possible opportunity for improving the agricultural economy in my district, and I am going to vote for the adoption of the conference report.

On the matter of parity, my colleagues from the Middle Western States are familiar with the provisions of H. R. 9861, which I recently introduced providing for what is known as a graduated parity on the basic agricultural commodities. I firmly believe that legislation providing for graduated parity as proposed in H. R. 9861, or others similar to it, would be for the best interests of the overall agricultural economy. I also believe that such provision is economically sound and I will continue to support such legislation. I further feel that such parity provision carries more of the benefit to the individual farmer than does rigid 90-percent parity, and at the same time incorporates the advantages of flexible parity now in effect by reducing the incentive on high production. I do feel, however, that supplemental income is mandatory for agriculture in 1956, and the provisions of the conference report now before us appears to be the only alternative.

I further feel that the conference report is remiss in not taking into account the voluntary reduction of basic crops that has taken place, especially on the smaller farms. This has had the effect of lower basic allotments than would normally have occurred, and which have been further reduced in view of our recent surpluses. On the small farms the resulting allotments have become so low that it is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain a sound economic farm unit. Continuing on this basis of allotments, we are penalizing the farmers who have adopted good farming practices and favoring the operator who continued to keep every acre possible planted to a cereal crop.

On the matter of domestic parity for wheat, I am willing to present the matter to the farmers for their approval as provided in this conference report, but I seriously question that it will work to the advantage of the First District of Kansas if it is approved by referendum.

Although the $100,000 limitation placed in the bill by the Senate on the amount of a commodity credit loan available to any one operator was not realistic, at least it was a step in the right direction. I regret this deletion was made by the conference committee, as it appears evident to me the program over the years has been most favorable to the big operator at the expense of the family-size farm. In my opinion the maximum commodity credit loan should not have exceeded $50,000, and more probably $25,000 would have been a realistic limitation.

As stated before, however, I am going to vote for the passage of the bill.

Inter-American Solidarity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, in celebrating this Pan American Day, we are celebrating the 66th anniversary of that day in 1890 when the American Republics united to form an association now known as the Organization of American States—an organization which constitutes the oldest international association of the world. In commemorating this event symbolic in the history of the Western Hemisphere—and indeed the whole world—Americans throughout the 21 American Republics may well take pride in the significance and importance of their continuous efforts in achieving the inter-American solidarity which exists today. For this deep-seated solidarity has many roots and has survived many difficulties.

Even before the end of the colonial period, during the last quarter of the 18th and first quarter of the 19th centuries, certain concepts were evolving throughout the Western Hemisphere which have provided a unique framework for the special relationship characteristic of inter-American relations from 1826

through modern times. This unique framework was compounded, first, from a feeling of distinctness from the Europeans, Asians, Africans, and others; second, from a heritage common to all peoples who have shared in chiseling out of a formidable wilderness a new way of life built upon courage, self-reliance, and determination; and, finally, from the mutual respect and understanding common to peoples who have freed themselves from colonial domination.

The history of inter-American relations which began in the early 19th century, falls essentially into three eras. The first, 1810–95, was highlighted by the evolvement in 1823 of the Monroe Doctrine—a doctrine designed primarily to protect the Western Hemisphere from European interference. However, during this period each of the republics was concerned with its internal affairs. In the United States attention was concentrated during the middle of the century on its Civil War and subsequently upon the mighty western movement. In Latin America in the early part of the 19th century, upheaval was rampant. Until 1825 when the last of the republics had freed themselves from European political domination, waves of revolution swept from the Isthmus of Panama to the Straits of Magellan. Following that great convulsion, the nations of the new free world were still concerned that European powers would return and reconquer their hard-won lands. To offset such a threat, Simon Bolivar, the great liberator of northern Latin America, convened a congress in Panama in 1826 to discuss measures for hemispheric defense. And out of this congress, came a treaty of perpetual union, league and confederation. The treaty related to means for common defense, peaceful settlement of disputes and the maintenance of the territorial integrity of the members of the confederation—a theme which in essence has permeated all subsequent conferences. However, the hopes envisioned in the purpose of that significant congress and its subsequent treaty were not quickly realized. As in the United States, the new republics were busy with their internal affairs, and the period from 1826 was punctuated with civil wars and intrahemispheric clashes. Nonetheless, still faced with the possibility of reconquest by Spain, the various republics continued to meet from time to time to consider defense measures, the peaceful settlement of disputes, cooperation in commerce and navigation, and, later, questions of law and the control of contagious diseases. Thus, the dream of inter-American cooperation was far from lost.

The second major era in inter-American relations began in 1889 when the United States invited the American Republics to the first International Conference of American States here in Washington. This conference—the first of the series of modern conferences—was called to consider peaceful means of settling disputes and means of improving commercial relations among the American countries. From this conference came a multilateral treaty for the arbitration of disputes and the establishment of that momentous "international Union of American Republics" which we commemorate today. This international union was not a political union, but, rather, a commercial one. A permanent bureau which constituted its secretariat was located in Washington. In 1910 this bureau was renamed the Pan American Union, and its terms of reference were expanded in keeping with the broadened scope of the cooperative plans of the international union which as the years passed had moved into the realm of economic, social, and cultural affairs as well as the purely commercial. All of these factors contributed to and were indicative of closer understanding and hemispheric solidarity.

However, the real high tide of inter-American relations was during the period 1933–1956, which constitutes the third era of these relations. Before this time, though there had been a steady development in the direction of inter-American solidarity along cultural and economic lines, there had been political difficulties which at times had been serious enough to threaten the International Union. But with the shift of position by the United States at the Montevideo Conference in 1933 concerning the question of intervention and with the conclusion there of a Convention on the rights and duties of states more in accord with th eviews of the Latin American states than had been our stand in the past, the good-neighbor policy was launched. In the subsequent period from 1933 to 1946 numerous conferences were held, each resulting in stronger declarations of solidarity than before. With the outbreak of World War II all but one of the Latin American nations contributed its full cooperation to the war effort. The Chapultepec Conference held in 1945 provided for continued joint defense of all the states of the hemisphere in case of aggression against any one of them, for steps to strengthen the inter-American system by increasing the authority of the Pan American Union, and for the establishment of an Inter-American Economic and Social Council. But the meetings in 1947 and 1948 not only put the cooperation which had existed during the war years on a permanent basis, but also reaffirmed the principles of inter-American solidarity which had been developing over the entire century. At the conference in Brazil in 1947, the American states adopted the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance which provided for permanent collective self-defense in the event of an armed attack or threat against the peace and security of any one of the signatories, from within or from outside the hemisphere. At the Conference in Columbia in 1948, they adopted the Bogotá pact which consolidated and coordinated the many earlier agreements on arbitration and other peaceful means for settling disputes among member states. It was also at this conference that the Inter-American system was given its new name—the Organization of American States. The new charter, in addition to tightening the administrative organization, reaffirmed the Organization's concern with cultural, social, and intellectual matters. The Organization of American States has already effectively proved its strength in times of crisis as exemplified by its swift action and dramatic success in connection with various controversies and threatening situations which have arisen since 1948.

But aside from the happy example to the world of a group of 21 nations living side by side, not always agreeing, but still managing to work our differences within the framework of an effective inter-American system, the influence of this remarkable system reaches far beyond the confines of its hemispheric borders in still other ways. It was upon the insistence of the Latin American countries that adequate provision was included in the United Nations Charter for the continued existence and operation of the regional organization system upon which so much emphasis has been placed in recent years. In fact, the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance was the first regional agreement signed under the provision of article 51 of the United Nations Charter. Moreover, it was upon this regional agreement that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization itself was later modeled.

In the area of technical assistance and economic cooperation, the inter-American system has also proved of particular significance. For the United States sponsored program of extensive cultural and technical interchange with Latin American countries under the aegis of the good-neighbor policy in which in effect served as a proving ground for the many successful technical-assistance programs which have since been launched throughout the world.

The impressive spectacle of 21 independent and individualistic republics quietly, steadily, and persistently working together in an atmosphere of dignity and harmony for the cause of peace and democracy, has always been a source of pride in the Western Hemisphere and a source of admiration in hemispheres other than our own. But today, with the threat of communism as great if not greater throughout the world than it has ever been in the past, we dare not rest on our laurels. We must, at every level of our international relations—the political, the economic, the cultural, and the social—rededicate ourselves to the service of that solidarity on which our splendid inter-American system stands, and in so doing rededicate ourselves to the service of the cause of world peace and progress.

Another Communist Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of the Members of Congres a most praiseworthy editorial.

The nullification of the sedition statutes of 42 sovereign States, in a recent decision of the United States Supreme Court, is a glaring example of devious legalistic quibbling.

The tortuous reasoning of the Supreme Court comes close to abolishing the sovereign power of the 48 States in the field of sedition. The will of the Supreme Court is imposed and substituted for the will of the people of the States and for the will of the Nation as represented by the United States Congress.

This decision deprives this Nation of the benefit of the investigations of communism, the enforcement of anti-Communist laws, and the cooperation of State and local police with the Federal Government in this most serious criminal field.

The implications of this decision are not baffling. Like many other recent decisions of the court, it clearly and unquestionably gives aid and comfort to Communists throughout the world. It's results are clear to everyone, including the members of the Supreme Court.

I commend the editorial department of the Buffalo Evening News for their editorial of April 4, 1956, which follows:

THE COURT LEGISLATES

We find it hard to follow the Supreme Court's reasoning in holding that the sedition statutes of 42 States are null and void because they conflict with the Federal laws on internal security.

The court concedes that Congress did not specifically assert exclusive Federal jurisdiction in the Smith Act or any other Federal law on the subject. In fact, as the 3 dissenters point out, the whole body of Federal internal security legislation is codified under a general provision that says the exact opposite: "Nothing in this title shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the several States under the laws thereof." The dissenting justices further note that throughout the period since the Smith Act was passed, many States have had their own sedition acts on the books, many others have passed such laws, and Congress, while voting many amendments and additions to the Federal laws, has made no move to discourage parallel State legislation.

Yet the majority of the Court, speaking through Chief Justice Warren, finds in the overall fabric of Federal antisubversion legislation a clear intent by Congress to occupy the whole field. So the States are told, in effect, to forget about trying to unearth subversive conspiracies and leave that to the Federal security agencies. Such conspiracies cannot be prosecuted any longer under State sedition laws.

In support of this position, the Warren opinion notes that the various State laws are in no sense uniform, that some are studiously drawn, while others are vague and almost wholly without proper safeguards. But the court wasn't ruling on the general validity of a multitude of statutes. It was considering specifically the Pennsylvania statutes. If that one was weak on due process it could be stricken down on that account, and other legislatures, with laws exhibiting similar frailties, would have to take heed. But this is far from justifying a finding that all State laws on the subject are in conflict with the Federal plan, especially in the absence of any clear congressional mandate to that effect.

What the court seems to be saying is that many State sedition laws are objectionable, so it might be better to leave the whole subject of internal security to the Federal Government. But if that is what the court had in mind, it was declaring what the policy should be, not what the law is. It is not the Supreme Court's function to make the laws, but to interpret them. And in reading the Federal laws which were cited in this case, we find it hard to see in them anything other than the three dissenters (Justices Reed, Burton, and Minton) did: that Congress has declared no intent to preempt the sedition field, and that until and unless it does, the various States should have the right to use their own police powers, under constitutionally valid statutes, to punish subversive conspiracies.

Reflections After the Washington Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, because I believe the thoughts contained in the following article are worthy of the attention of the Members of this House, I am inserting an item from the Bulletin of the Slovak National Council Abroad, written by Dr. Joseph A. Mikus, director of the Slovak League Press Bureau, Washington, D. C.

REFLECTIONS AFTER THE WASHINGTON CONFERENCE

(By Dr. Joseph A. Mikus, director of the Slovak League Press Bureau, Washington, D. C.)

The cold war has reached a new phase. As long as it had concerned itself with the ideological conflict between democracy and communism, and with religious persecutions and the imprisonment of ecclesiastics and of patriots somewhere beyond the Iron Curtain or in China, the average Englishman and the average American did not seem to be overly disturbed by it. "God's in His heaven, and China's far away," apparently summed up the attitude of the common man as he went about his daily rounds with quiet detachment.

Now, however, the world of the Soviets has its political position so strongly intrenched that it ventures to contemplate not only the psychological facets of war with the West, but certain practical expressions of its hostile attitude, too. It can indulge aspirations to economic rivalry; it can study access to Western markets and their control; it can attempt the export of arms and munitions to those areas where such armaments can endanger the points of opposition or of defense now maintained by the West. It can even manage loans at usurious rates negotiable by political notes. We awaken to a realization that this is no longer a mere abstruse metaphysical disputation as to whether man was created by God or whether he is just a biological accident of matter. This newest mode of encounter doubtless engages but little of the Western World's intellectual capacities but it strikes a superlatively more telling blow upon its very skin and bone.

Britain's position in the world is intrinsically dependent upon the freedom of the seas and on world trade. Once the ports and the free lanes now open to her merchant ships are throttled, there will be no more validity to the hypothesis that Piccadilly Circus in London is the umbillicus of the world. And it is possible that those lanes can be closed by the very weapons now being produced for Egypt by Communist-controlled Czechoslovakia.

This is the essence of the appalling realization which companioned the British Prime Minister on his recent trip to Washington. The President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain, however, could hardly restrict their study of conditions posed by these new developments of the cold war without surveying them in relationship to the growth of world communism as a whole; for, as matters stand, it happens that since 1917 bolshevism has created in the midst of the free world one mammoth concentration and labor camp. This preserve where communistic will dominates absolutely is not only an area sealed to the world and isolated for its own interests, but it is communism's politico-military platform by which it plots to overpower those nations which still remain free. Once they, too, are under the dictatorship of Moscow, it hopes to achieve its aim of a world proletarian state.

As long as the Red world is economically overshadowed by other nations, however, it stands to reason that it cannot engage in open warfare against the democracies; until it attains that hoped-for economic supremacy, it has no satisfying assurance of victory. For this reason, it is still content with organizing preliminary circumscribed or local strifes (China, Korea, Indochina) in the hope that in one or another country it may fall to the lot of communistic leaders there to succeed in gaining the ascendancy and in seizing the local government. In other countries where it has at least some foothold or some rooted operative agencies, it parcels out advice to its party members forecasting how, by means of the magic national front, they will in time be in a position to take over the entire machinery of government even with little or no resistance from within as this was remarkably demonstrated in central and in Eastern Europe after 1945.

And so we note that, as a consequence of these tactics, the world of concentration camps shows a steadily progressive growth. Its sentry posts, its lookouts, and its observation towers penetrate into more and more free territory. At the same time, speaking more or less figuratively, the reflectors and machineguns of the Communist police force keep all the inhabitants of this barbed wire-bounded world under nerve-debilitating control. For its subjected people to undertake any sizable movement in protest, apart from acts of individual despair, is an unthinkable venture. Let us try to understand why.

While this concentration empire is unable by dint of its slave exactions to balance its own economic needs and to furnish supplies necessary for even the bare sustenance of its dependents, it does manage to provide for basic necessitites by a peaceful exchange of commodities with the world of democracy. While internal order is enforced in this earthly purgatory-land by the machinegunners of the omnipotent MVD or, in the enslaved states, by officers of "national safety," the masters of Janus-like double-facedness and Soviet charm—Bulganin, Krushchev, Molotov, Zorin, et al.—preserve trade and diplomatic relations with the free world. They seem to be bent on outdoing each other in a contest of caviar-vodka parties, as they vouch to the western world that their intentions are all centered on peace, on universal diplomatic friendliness. At the same time, they are busy magnanimously signing non-intervention pacts and charters of human rights, denouncements of colonialism, documents guaranteeing the self determination of nations, etc. Blandly they will tell you that they ask nothing but co-existence.

And the guillible West, blind to the seamy side of these publicized manifestations of big-heartedness, actively contributes to the

very enslavement of that isolated and shackled world which is grossly denied its political birthright. This reprehensible attitude of the West is the only reason why communism has not only survived but has even thrived to the attainment of such dangerous proportions. The Red menace is indulgently warmed and fattened in the vitalnzing sunshine of the tolerance of the West. For this reason, too, the pressure of the yoked nations, though it might exert some centrifugal reaction on the inner walls of that concentration dungeon, finds itself likely to be spent and frustrated upon the torpid international structure of which the Soviet Union itself is an accepted member. Formal international recognition of the Soviet Union, its membership in the Security Council of the United Nations, its active partcipation in every significant international conference—all that serves but to advance the Soviets politically and helps externally to add prestige to Russia's position. Even if the poor Russian muzhik had a personal conviction that his Kremlin dictators are slave masters, he finds this judgment controverted by western statesmen who participate in frequent Potemkin-engineered "peace conferences" with personalities representing world communism. Moscow had need of the Geneva Conference in order to be able to produce for its Russian workers in industry and collective farming those news photographs of Krushchev and Bulganin in the company of the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain and the Premier of France; in other words, for the "appeasement" of its own native element. Similarly did Moscow find it highly expedient to use for its own advantage the news reports which were circulated about the peace messages sent by Bulganin to President Eisenhower.

After the sterile aftermath of so many previous conferences, what should have been the underlying motive for this Washington meeting? The Hamlet problem confronting the West today amounts to this: Are the democracies capable of evolving worldwide global tactics to defeat communism or will they themselves ultimately be absorbed by it? A second question evolves from the answer to the first: Is the defeat of communism possible without a resorting to atomic warfare?

We sincerely believe that it is. If the major powers of the West would sever diplomatic and economic relations with the Soviet orbit; if they would unanimously decree that the domestic crimes of communism must be pilloried even internationally; if they would direct to the organizers of the slave system of Moscow this message that they no longer have faith in meeting them at Geneva confabs and at similar seances at which the Communists summon before the eyes of the Western World the ghost of peace, a blessing they have long since consigned to the tomb—then assuredly, Moscow's dictators would shed not only the beaming smiles that wreathe their faces but also their swagger and their cocksureness in political maneuvering. And if the Western World would further draw itself up to its full honorable stature and declare that it has no more patience or interest in honoring the existence of the communistic system and that in every nation and territory it would choose to leave the fate of totalitarianism to the choice of the peoples themselves, expressed in free elections, then such a stand would undermine the hardness of the brutal overlords and encourage healthy resistance on the part of the subjugated nations more than has anything else inspired them heretofore. Given such a situation, definite internal action would be initiated and with psychological assistance from the West, it would culminate in the overthrow of these inhuman oppressors of mankind.

The subject of the Washington Conference has not been divulged. We do not know nor can we surmise what its practical outcome will be. There is as yet no indication as to whether or not the West will undertake a new mode of conduct. However, if Prime Minister Anthony Eden came to Washington merely to negotiate the export of goods from the West to China, then assuredly, this latest meeting has been a grand fiasco.

The pronouncement which President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Eden signed after the 3-day meeting and which is to be entered in the archives of the cold war as the "Washington Declaration" is truly a remarkable paper which, according to Eden, brilliantly summarizes the political philosophy of the Western democracies as they currently confront communism. An aching world, however, is surfeited with such fundamental declarations of the West against communism. There have been so many of them that it is time to wonder whether one additional one might not have the inflationary capacity in respect to all the previous ones. What the West needs today more urgently than salt is not hollow pronouncements but deeds.

The Scrap Trade and Steel Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial from the Waste Trade Journal of April 7, 1956, which sets forth the position of the scrap trade in attacks on the industry by steel mills:

STEEL MILL PROFITS SOAR DESPITE HIGHER SCRAP PRICES

Steel mills blame the scrap iron trade for almost everything, with the possible exception of the weather.

If the price of scrap goes up, the steel mills holler blue murder that the dealers are exporting too much thereby creating a domestic shortage and endangering the welfare of the Nation.

If the steel mills want to advance the price of their own products they claim that they are being forced to do so because of the high prices that they have to pay for scrap.

If some steel mills' profits are not larger than they are it's because so much more had to be paid for scrap iron.

These exaggerations, unfounded though they be, are proclaimed so forcefully and so frequently that those who are not familiar with the situation are inclined to believe them, and, believing them, they pass them on to others. For example, a recent issue of the Herald Tribune featured in bold display type on its financial page the following headline: "Small Steel Mills Hit by Scrap Price—Profits Cut by Spiraling Market Rises." And then the story went on to say:

"The upward spiral in price for scrap iron and steel is putting severe pressure on profit margins of many of the country's small, nonintegrated steel plants. These depend on scrap for basic material.

"Major steel companies do not have too difficult scrap problems. They obtain industrial scrap, rerouted to their furnaces from customer manufacturing companies' waste.

"On the other hand, the little fellows in the steel business must depend primarily on purchased or open market scrap. This is material collected by the scrap industry from automobile graveyards, farms, and other sources."

The scrap trade probably never realized the tremendous role that it played in the profit and loss life of the small steel mills. If only they sold their scrap for less, even at a loss, what great benefactors they would be to the steel companies. What greater profits the steel companies could make if they did not have to pay so much for scrap. The following table of steel mill earnings tells the sad tale of woe of how some of the smaller companies suffered in 1955 as compared with 1954:

	Net income for 1955	Net income for 1954
Wheeling Steel	$17,296,000	$9,595,740
Allegheny Ludlum	14,985,660	4,246,083
Granite City	12,611,000	4,012,000
Sharon	7,987,622	3,134,864
Pittsburgh Steel	7,515,000	2,170,000
Lone Star Steel	4,759,000	−1,009,000
Harrisburg Steel	4,387,922	2,779,960
Copperweld	2,365,459	703,150
Superior Steel	1,716,900	532,970
Scullen Steel	414,380	294,698

The Lukens Steel Co., of Coatesville, Pa., which never misses an opportunity to castigate the scrap-iron trade for exporting scrap had this to say in its annual report:

"Though beset by rising raw material prices, particularly iron and steel scrap, which increased costs about $4 million over 1954, net income for the fiscal year ended October 22, was $1,731,238." Profits for the interim period were $941,532, which, projected at an annual rate would have been $5 million, or 5.1 percent of sales.

"Despite scrap price increases and heavy flood damage, the company's working capital climbed $2,291,000, from $13,882,000, to $16,173,000, as of December 31."

Ernest T. Weir, chairman of the National Steel Co., recently criticized the State Department for permitting "unlimited" exports of scrap iron and steel. The effect of such exports, he declared was "not only to deplete the supply of an irreplaceable raw material but also to cause a steep advance in its cost to the steel industry."

Why are the steel mills picking on the scrap iron trade? It seems to be part of a pattern to justify higher prices for semifinished and finished iron and steel products. The Wall Street Journal in a recent issue said:

"Steel market events are adding up to one of the biggest steel price increases on record. It will come right after the steel labor settlement, possibly in early July, and by present indications will probably exceed the $9 a ton boost made in the summer of 1948, the largest of the postwar increase."

The Wall Street Journal goes on to say:

"Scrap iron and coal are the major ingredients of the steelmaking process. The new increases being marked up on them make more certain the prospect that steel prices generally will take a giant step higher within a few months."

If the steel mills feel that they must get more for their products why make it appear that they are being driven to take this step by the scrap trade? While we disagree with Mr. Weir when he flays the scrap trade for its exports, we commend and admire him when he comes out openly and forcefully for higher steel prices on the ground that they are needed to obtain the money for construction of new steelmaking facilities the country vitally needs. That's businesslike and good commonsense.

Of course scrap-iron prices have gone up, but so has the price of pig iron, iron ore, steel-mill extras, copper, lead, zinc, aluminum, and a host of other commodities. There is this difference, that scrap having moved up from depression levels makes the rise seem larger than in some of the other

commodities. The scrap trade has had to pay more for labor and for the raw materials that it uses as have the steel mills. Its profits are by no means commensurate with those enjoyed by the steel mills and yet no dealer has been heard to say that if steel mills were only willing to make a little less profit by paying more for scrap what a blessing it would be for the industry. The steel mills' argument is just as absurd.

The Overton-Red River Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a clipping from the Alexandria Daily Town Talk Times:

HARDIN AGREES WITH REPRESENTATIVE LONG ON CANAL STUDY

SHREVEPORT, LA.—Maj. Gen. John R. Hardin agreed with Representative GEORGE S. LONG Tuesday in suggesting a new survey of the proposed Overton-Red River Waterway.

General Hardin, Lower Mississippi Valley Division engineer of the United States Army Corps of Engineers, told members of the Red River Valley Association a reevaluation of the economics of the waterway would be necessary before it can be built.

"Great changes in the economy of the region to be served by the Overton-Red River Waterway and increased construction costs have made it necessary," Gen. Hardin said.

LONG NOT OPPOSED

Earlier, Representative LONG, an opponent of the canal project as now planned, told delegates from 4 States he was not opposed to the project in principle. But he said he wanted a new survey before giving it his full backing.

General Hardin further elaborated by saying, "When the initial report was made recommending the waterway, an economic study of costs and benefits, prepared in 1944, was a most important part of the supporting data. A comparison of costs and benefits arrived at 12 years ago must be recxamined before we can say that what was a good investment for our country then is still good in 1956.

"We are required, as a matter of long-standing policy, to demonstrate to the Chief of Engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, and the congressional committees that the project is sound before construction funds are requested," the general said.

BENEFITS VERSUS COSTS

"The economic analysis is a weighing of benefits against costs and comparing it to business studies for plant expansion or enlargement of sales territory," General Hardin said.

The study involves a survey of current potential transportation savings, drainage benefits, up-to-date detailed construction cost estimates, and a determination of the costs of relocating bridges, gas lines, power and telephone lines, roads, real estate costs for rights-of-way, and spoil-disposal areas.

On the profit side of the ledger is a commerce analysis. He said that a study is being made of existing commerce that might reasonably be expected to move into or out of the area by water.

Despite General Hardin's suggestion not to get too hasty in building was ignored by the meeting of the association.

EXTENSION SOUGHT

Ending its second day of work, the association called for a speedier release of an engineer's report on a proposal to extend the inland canal from Shreveport to Texarkana and Jefferson, Tex.

The Members also passed a resolution requesting a speedup on a final status report by the United States Corps of Engineers detailing the possibilities of the long-sought Overton-Red River Canal project.

Fred Webb of Shreveport was elected president of the association.

EXCERPTS FROM A SPEECH DELIVERED BY HON. GEORGE S. LONG, OF LOUISIANA, AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE RED RIVER VALLEY ASSOCIATION, SHREVEPORT, LA., APRIL 2, 1956

Mr. Webb, members of the Red River Valley Association, my colleagues in Congress, and honored guests, I am sure that I can safely speak for every member of the Red River Valley congressional delegation when I say that we Members of Congress look forward with great anticipation to this time in the spring when we have high hopes to be invited to the Red River Valley Association's annual meeting. It is indeed a high point in our life. So, Roy, let me insist that no meetings be held unless we are asked to attend.

Almost every one of our friends here today can be classified as expert on flood control and related subjects and we are bound by a desire toward a common goal—that is, protection from one of mankind's most relentless enemies—uncontrolled water. However, I believe the time is now when we can at long last, look down the road and see a glimmer of light shining on this protection. I believe the Congress, the Chief Executive, the Bureau of the Budget, and all other official agencies, and the heads of whatever party might happen to be in majority, has come to the conclusion that we can no longer afford to ignore the need for protection against floods. It is just this simple—floods are much too expensive to tolerate. I am sure that the members of Appropriations Committees who have ever visited the mighty Mississippi when it was bank full and rampaging; who have ever visited the Arkansas, the Red, and the other rivers in this great Southwest of ours in times of spring floods, cannot fail to be impressed with the absolute necessity for sufficient funds to protect this fertile valley which is indeed the breadbasket of America.

Now, my friends, much has been printed in the newspapers in recent weeks about the stand I have taken in connection with the Overton-Red River Lateral Waterway. I want to assure the assembled guests, the Corps of Engineers, and the Red River Valley Association that I have never made the statement that I am opposed to this project, or any other project which might bring industry and progress to our section. What I have said is this: I am opposed to this or any other project which cannot stand the light of day upon it; I am opposed to any proposal which will damage beyond estimate the many in order to benefit the few.

I have asked the Corps of Engineers to furnish me with certain information which, to date, they have not done. The data being used to justify the Overton-Red River Lateral Canal was put together in 1946, according to my information, not by the Corps of Engineers, but by another agency hired to do the work. Times have changed since 1946 and it could well be that reexamination will show a different picture altogether. So let me say in conclusion, my friends, that I want to endorse this project; by the same token I want the committees to have access to the data and evidence used in their survey. I want the findings presented to the newspapers and TV and radio in order that the people can be informed. I want a detailed estimate of what it will cost local interest and I want the cost-to-benefit ration well discussed and justified. Then my friends of the Red River Valley Association and of the Corps of Engineers, you will find GEORGE LONG in your corner. Thank you.

Name It the Walter Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Morning Call of Allentown, Pa., dated April 11, 1956:

NAME IT THE WALTER DAM

Within a few weeks—April 26, to be exact—ground will be broken for the construction of the vast impounding dam on Bear Creek and the practical part of the program for making the people of the Lehigh Valley and their property safe from floods will be gotten under way.

Of course it is merely a beginning in the construction program but it is the presage of greater things to come. It is the ray of hope for the many communities and their large populations that at long last the fight against the ravages of floods has left the talking stage. Instead of nothing but the results of surveys and sheaves of elaborate plans, there will be action to put up the physical defenses which are required to curb the violence of floods.

Like many other dams which have been constructed throughout the country, not alone in the interest of flood control but for the production of hydroelectric power, increase in recreational facilities, and so on, the Bear Creek Dam should have a name. We submit the suggestion that the name should be meaningful and that it should be bestowed as an honor upon an individual who has been conspicuous in the long and hard legislative and departmental battle to advance the flood control program for the Lehigh Valley to this important point.

That individual is Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER, of the 15th Congressional District which is made up of Northampton, Monroe and Carbon counties.

Mr. WALTER, who has been in the House of Representatives for more than 20 years and has increased his influence and effectiveness term after term, has been conspicuous at all times in efforts to advance flood control projects not alone for the Lehigh Valley but for the Valley of the Delaware as well.

Specifically, he worked hard to induce Congress to make the first appropriation for planning in 1946. He has been in the forefront in Washington in securing all the appropriations for planning which have totalled a half million dollars up to this time.

It will be remembered that a year ago when there was agitation for "make-work" projects in an area depressed by reason of unemployment, he saw a way to help that problem and at the same time advance the flood control program. He proposed—and an appropriation of $300,000 was secured to achieve both ends—to employ men and to begin a long needed job.

Every conference that has been held in this section of the State on the subject of flood control has been cheered by the knowledge that the idea had a "friend at court"; that Mr. WALTER, in Washington, would permit no stone to be left unturned in efforts to advance it. All the individuals and organizations associated with the idea

have been encouraged by the many steps that he has taken from time to time to make Washington sympathetic to the serious problems of the Lehigh and Delaware valleys.

It is from these groups that the impetus to give the name "The Francis E. Walter Dam" or some similar designation to the initial flood control project should arise and be pressed to successful conclusion.

They will honor themselves by such an expression of gratitude for persistent and consistent work by Mr. WALTER. He has never missed an opportunity to advance the general idea. His experience and great prestige in Washington have afforded him the opportunities of which he has availed himself at all times in the interest of the people of these two valleys.

Hon. A. M. Artajo, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Spain, Visits Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the city of Washington is playing host this week to the distinguished Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Spain, the Honorable A. M. Artajo, and to his charming wife and daughter. I join my colleagues on this occasion in expressing the hope that the distinguished foreign visitors will enjoy their stay in Washington, and that the official conferences between Foreign Minister Artajo and Secretary of State Dulles will aid in providing firm groundwork for cooperation between our two nations in coping with the menace of international communism.

I am certain that I need not recall the fact that the Republic of Spain has shown very realistic understanding of the nature and menace of Communism. Perhaps the most prominent evidence of this understanding has been the attitude of the Government of Spain toward the fate of the once-free nations of Europe which are today suffering under Communist domination. On repeated occasions, officials of the Spanish Government have declared their sympathy for the people of those captive nations, expressing their conviction that the principles of justice demand that they be freed from the bonds of Communist enslavement.

Indicative of the position taken on this issue by the Government of Spain is a statement made recently by Foreign Minister Artajo who, when asked to comment on the subject of coexistence with the Soviets, said:

> When Russia will liberate the subjugated countries, we will begin to believe in her good will of coexistence.

This was a forthright and farsighted statement, which offers an open and objective test of Soviet intentions.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that the exchange of views taking place this week between the representatives of the Republic of Spain and of our Nation will make a constructive contribution to our efforts intended to bring about an era of just and lasting peace in the world.

Only Americans Can Defend America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the following address was made recently in New York by Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers. It is timely, logical and should be considered by every thoughtful and patriotic American:

ONLY AMERICANS CAN DEFEND AMERICA

(By Bonner Fellers)

If world war III comes, the decision will come from the sky. It will come quickly. There will be no time to prepare. Trained troops, manning the weapons on hand when the fight starts, will decide our destinty.

A quick decision from the sky is a wide departure from long drawn out past wars. This new concept astonishes many people because it is not well understood. And it must be explained over and over.

SURFACE CONCEPT FALLACY

The Western Armies cannot defeat the vast armies of the Soviet Union. This fact has nothing to do with communism. It has been true for more than a century.

Napoleon defeated the Russian Army. He captured and sacked and burned Moscow. Then Russia's eternal allies, distance, winter and unlimited manpower turned on Napoleon and he escaped into Europe with 30,000 sick and hungry stragglers. Hitler attacked the Red army with 220 Nazi divisions. He lost 5 million men. And he failed.

Our fleet, larger than the combined fleets of the world, cannot deal a knockout blow against the Soviet Union. Even a complete blockade would not have a decisive impact. The Soviet Union is immune to this traditional form of pressure. Deep within her borders she has all the resources and industrial productivity needed for total war.

This is not to say that we no longer need a modern Army and Navy. They are both essential. But in the light of airpower, the missions of the Army and Navy—in a war against the Soviet Union—have changed.

Against the Red armed forces, neither the fleets nor the armies, nor the armies and navies combined of all the Western Powers can be decisive against the Red armed forces.

THE RED THREAT

The United States, thanks to ocean barriers, is safe from a major Red army attack. But the Red air force and submarine-launched guided missiles can strike the United States. These two threats are real, immediate, and inescapable.

The greater of these threats is from Red intercontinental bombers. These bombers—an estimated 1,500 in number—based in the Soviet Arctic, have the capability of flying over the polar cap and dropping nuclear bombs on our military installations, industrial areas, and population centers.

The second threat is from submarine-launched guided missiles carrying atomic warheads. The Reds have some 400 submarines which could surface off our coast and unleash an atomic assault against our coastal cities and harbors.

To meet these Red threats the United States instituted a number of defensive measures. Most of these, unfortunately, are excessively expensive and hopelessly inadequate.

THE NATO FALLACY

Our leaders have created widespread belief that European NATO forces are essential for the survival of the United States.

A one-time Army Chief of Staff has testified before the Congress:

"Our troops in Europe are not there simply for the defense of Europe. They are really there in defense of the United States."

And only 15 days ago the NATO supreme commander, our own General Gruenther said:

"Our participation in this enterprise (NATO) is a matter of our own survival."

But NATO as a military force, capable of defending Western Europe and thereby protecting the United States is a pure humbug. Red ground forces, facing the NATO defense forces, outnumber them some 10 to 1. The Red air force, thoroughly modern—and approaching our own in quality—has 5 times the numerical strength of the European NATO air forces.

We are attempting to hold Europe with a ground force too weak to meet the Red army. NATO ground forces are supported by a NATO air force in Europe too small to defeat the Red air force. So great are the odds in power ratio against NATO, that Germany's proposed 12 divisions and 1,300 aircraft—possibly available in 1959—cannot materially improve the situation.

Our leaders are giving us a distorted estimate of NATO strength. They represent NATO power as continuously increasing. The truth is our European allies have already passed the peak of their military effort. Content to receive lavish American aid, they rely on us to defend them should the Kremlin strike.

NATO in Europe is not a war deterrent because it is not feared by the enemy. Nevertheless, a successful NATO holding operation along the Rhine—were this possible—would not and could not prevent Red air attacks against the United States from Soviet bases in the Arctic. Nor would a success along the Rhine prevent submarine-launched missile attacks against our coastal cities.

The United States cannot look to European NATO even for partial security.

THE COLLECTIVE SECURITY FALLACY

Collective security sounds wonderful if one does not stop to think. This concept contemplates that each nation contribute what it is best able to contribute. Some are rich in manpower, others in natural resources, still others are industralized. The collective concept envisages that these resources, someway, somehow, will be integrated into a terrific striking force. In the words of General Gruenther, "collective security is the only answer."

Collective security was tried in Korea. And except for the South Koreans, the United States provided more than 90 percent of the forces and probably paid all the bills.

However, if world war III comes, decision will be reached from the sky. Manpower will not be the decisive element. And, if our leaders continue to force the manpower concept upon us, we shall lose, because Red manpower vastly outnumbers us. Of all our allies, only Great Britain has an appreciable air force. And this air force is not large enough to defend the United Kingdom.

Despite the weaknesses of the collective security concept, it has become the basis of our foreign policy. It appears that our foreign policy is induced by the herd instinct. Our top leaders believe that the more people we have on our side, the safer we will become.

The truth is, manpower, no matter how great, cannot defend us against Red bomber

and submarine-launched guided missile attack. Thus, in reality, our allies constitute an additional American defense obligation.

State Department alliances may have political and economic and psychological advantages, but in war we cannot and we dare not depend upon allies to defend us.

THE LITTLE WAR FALLACY

Ardent propagandists, and even high officials, attempt to resolve our defense problem by urging that we should fight little wars and thereby avoid the big one. There are five so-called little wars now on the horizon. If any one of them should start, we may depend upon Kremlin leaders to kindle the other four.

One little war may start in Palestine—possibly in March. The consequences of our participation would be disastrous. Aid to Israel would engender the hatred of 400 million traditionally friendly Moslems. Our participation might be the signal to the Red army to occupy Iranian and Arabian oilfields where lie more than half the known oil reserves of the world.

Our leaders must awaken to the gravity of this explosive situation. Let us pray that they will have sufficient character to stay out of this one—should it come.

A revolution rages in north Africa. American helicopters and French forces with American equipment from NATO in Europe are killing Algerian and Moroccan patriots who seek the independence we ourselves won in 1776. Here American air bases are endangered.

Another little war may be kindled in southeast Asia. There is fighting in Malaya.

A fourth little war is possible in Korea. On the 38th parallel, fighting could be resumed by either side. In either case the matter is out of our hands—but not the obligation.

A fifth little war could start in the Straits of Formosa. We are pledged to enter—and we should be—and the enemy would be the same Red dragon, with much stronger claws, which we failed to slay in Korea. If MacArthur had been permitted to win in Korea, much of our trouble today would have been ended.

In these turbulent areas, Communist propaganda effectively exploits the tension and turns the population against the United States.

It is possible that while trying to avoid the big war, we might be drawn into all 5 little wars. Meanwhile, the Red armed forces of the Kremlin, waxing stronger with not a single man committed to battle, might decide the time was ripe to strike the United States. By this time our own losses might have become so great and our effort so diffused that our utter destruction would be inevitable.

All this could come about by fighting little wars to avoid the big one.

THE CONSCRIPTION FALLACY

A 5 million trained United States Reserve is now being created. What this Reserve is for is unclear. But it is certain that it could neither stop nor influence attacks against us from Red bombers and guided missiles. Should the next world war come, the decision will be reached before the ground reserves could be mobilized. Let us not be deceived that our proposed 5 million reserve can defend our country.

THE BASE ENCIRCLEMENT FALLACY

Much publicity has been given to our ring of Allied air bases around the Soviet Union. Magazines publish attractive maps in color showing devastating massive arrows leading from these bases and pointing to the industrial heart of the Soviet Union. It is a graphic presentation of how easily and quickly our potential enemy could be destroyed.

What this map fails to show, is that the Red Air Force has some 20,000 modern combat planes, instantly ready, and that this is roughly 3 times the number of combat planes in the entire United States Air Force. There is also the dire certainty that this Red Air Force will strike first. And this air strike may well consist of a sudden and simultaneous all-out effort to drop nuclear bombs over each of the Allied air bases which encircles the Soviet Union.

After this initial air strike, we would be compelled to fight the war with the weapons which survive the first enemy blow.

Moreover, some of our air bases overseas may suffer damage from sabotage. Other overseas air bases will be denied us by powers which seek to remain neutral; others may be captured by the Red Army.

The nearer our bases are to the Soviet Union, the more likely they are to be destroyed. It is a certainty that they will suffer great damage. Even the vaunted and expensive floating carrier bases are vulnerable to Red Air Force attack. And they would be the natural prey of the Red submarine fleet which stalks them from underwater cover. Thus, the true value of close-in Allied bases is more apparent than real.

Nevertheless, we should retain our overseas air bases until we have a sufficient number of B–52 intercontinental bombers.

THE TRUE DEFENSE

If the Kremlin unleashes an air and guided missile attack against us, only our own Air Force, if stronger than the Red Air Force, and our fleet, supported by airpower, can defend the United States.

Only air power can deal a knockout blow against the Soviet Union. If war comes strategic bombers—if sufficient in numbers—can destroy Soviet industry and the Red air bases in the Arctic and elsewhere. And they can deny supplies and munitions to the Red Army. Thus, airpower is the true war deterrent because it can destroy the enemy.

Airpower can be decisive in war. The United States bombing survey, composed of our most eminent civilian scientists, objectively reporting on our World War II air attacks against Germany and Japan, found that "enemy planes enjoying control of the sky over one's head can be as disastrous to one's country as its occupation by physical invasion."

The foregoing is irrefutable. The power which possesses the better air weapons, which can strike the more deadly and quicker blow, can gain the decision, if the next war comes.

What we must never forget in America is that this decision must be won with personnel already trained, manning the weapons on hand, when the war starts.

WESTERN HEMISPHERE SECURITY

From our present bases in Alaska, Labrador and Greenland, our heavy bombers and medium bombers within-flight refueling, can strike and return from any target in the Soviet Union.

From bases in Labrador, in the United States, and in the Carribean, heavy and medium bombers can defend our Atlantic coastal frontier.

From bases in Alaska and the Philippines our bombers can dominate the Asiatic coast from the Bering Sea to the Straits of Malacca and thus defend our Pacific frontier.

Bombers of our Strategic Air Command can fly in bad weather and at night. With electronic aids they can hit and demolish their targets. If our Air Force possessed 2,000 bombers of the B–52 class, this threat would so impress the Kremlin that the chance of world war III would be very remote indeed.

And were war forced upon us, these bombers, together with ample fighter interceptors, would give us an invincible defense and a quick victory.

It seems evident that the only bases which can adequately be defended against bombardment, sabotage, ground attack and guided missiles, lie almost entirely within our own Western Hemisphere. And although contrary to foreign policy, our planners are being forced inevitably to come to the only solution to our survival in total war—a Western Hemisphere Defense.

Because of these facts, a gradual withdrawal of American troops from the Eurasian mainland is the only sensible course. This would enable us to reduce our Army and Navy.

A strategic reserve of some 10 divisions should be created. Based in the United States and streamlined to be air transportable, this modern air army could be flown where needed, in a matter of hours. Our air bases in Alaska, vulnerable to Red air borne attack, require this type of reinforcement which is not now available.

Our Strategic Air Force is the best in the world, but it is a one-shot air force, limited both by available trained personnel as well as bombers. The advantage it once held over the Red Air Force is now rapidly being lost. Our 1957 aircraft procurement is a continuation of the steady reduction instituted 3 years ago; it is a reduction of 20 percent over the 1956 budget.

Meanwhile the program for Red Air Force expansion is being tremendously accelerated. Unless our Air Force program is immediately expanded, we shall have lost our air advantage within 2 years.

To depend upon Western Hemisphere bases means that the Air Force must be allocated funds to procure an ample supply of intercontinental bombers. Planes of the B–52 type are admirably suited for this work but, for lack of funds, they are being produced at an exceptionally slow rate. We should have 2,000 of these superb bombers within the next 5 years. At present, the Air Force procurement funds permit the production of only 25 percent of this number.

This is no plea for increased defense spending. But it is a plea that no defense item should be allowed to take precedence over the creation of a greatly increased strategic Air Force. An Air Force which can withstand initial losses and have the numerical strength and capability of striking back effectively after the initial blow.

There must be a shift in the emphasis of defense spending. Since our surface forces cannot be decisive, Army and Navy budgets can safely be pared. Foreign aid now has an unexpended fund of $9 billion. No more should be appropriated.

Such a reapportionment of military spending would save billions of dollars. It would all but guarantee peace. It would guarantee the best possible defense and victory, should war come.

The hemisphere defense concept is not an abandonment of our European and Asiatic Allies. Without a strong hemisphere defense, we can support no allies anywhere. Without the assured survival of the Western Hemisphere, without a striking force based principally in North America and capable of atomic assault anywhere on the globe, the whole free world is doomed.

It is common sense, that before we can gamble on any overseas' military undertaking, we ourselves must have a strategy which will guarantee our survival here at home. This we have failed to do. Despite vast expenditures, we are not buying adequate defense.

The Soviet Union is the base from which emanate all activities dedicated to world communization. If it is certain that world war III will destroy this base, the Kremlin will scarcely dare to strike.

Only by the immediate creation of overwhelming American airpower can we prevent war—and, thereby, save ourselves and our Allies.

Only Americans can defend America.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, why do we continue to tolerate an alien idea that politicians in Washington can manage our private affairs better than we can ourselves? They now manage our corn, wheat, cotton, rice, butter, cheese, dry milk, tobacco, peanuts, et cetera, or one-third of our agriculture. It is a mess. Government housing at half rent, tax-exempt, is an outrage on the taxpayers and just as bad on the Government tenants. Government socialized power, like TVA, and irrigation projects at taxpayers' expense everywhere are blights on the people who take the money. Our foreign aid, now up to $60 billion, or $1,500 per American family on the average, does not satisfy the socialist governments to whom it is paid. They want it doubled. Our friends over there out of power scold us for financing their enemies and ours. They are nearly all mad at us. We have bought few friends. So, Government robbing of Peter to pay Paul weakens Peter and demoralizes Paul.

The very idea that our Government should ever exercise such powers was utterly repugnant to us for 140 years. It was thought impossible. We so feared the evil tendencies of government that we drastically limited its functions to its only legitimate sphere, namely, the protection of life and property, keeping law and order. Then, to make doubly sure, we had the politicians chained to these proper and limited functions—we specified in 1789 what Congress could tax and spend. We limited the functions and taxing and spending power of our cities and counties and States, too. Fortunately, we have kept and enforced those limitations and as a result we have not gone socialist, with few exceptions, in our cities, counties and States. Our socialism, viz: converting private property into public or government-owned and operated property, is confined almost entirely to Washington. We breed our socialists and Communists there.

After 25 years of their infiltration of one of the old parties in power, Congress is unable to repeal and wipe off the books the socialism we have already got. Unless we are able to somehow wipe it off the books completely, we must go on. For we must be all socialized or all free. There can be no coexistence—half-Socialist, half free. Obviously if we socialize corn as we have for 17 years, every living thing that consumes corn must ultimately be socialized. Farmers cannot buy Government owned and controlled corn and sell beef, pork, milk, and eggs in a free market. The burden of an average of $250 per year on every family taxed to pay the $10 billion our present socialization costs makes its extension inevitable. For example, you hear people cry out under this burden and you hear them say: "After we pay our taxes we have not enough left to pay for the care of our sick, our aged, the education of our children," and so forth.

So Mr. KELLEY, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, introduces the Kelley bill providing for Federal aid and control of education on a vast scale. It has already passed the House Committee on Education by a vote of 21 to 9. It will likely come before the whole House for action at this session.

It proposes to take from the taxpayers $400 million a year for each of the next 4 fiscal years, a total of $1,600,000,000, and redistribute that largess to some of the States at the expense of others for schoolhouse construction. Six industrial States in the North and West, that is, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, and California, would be compelled to put up 57.654 percent of the total tax moneys and get back but 35.747 percent of the benefits as grants for classroom construction in those States. They will pay approximately $928 million in taxes and get back approximately $576 million for the 4-year period. Besides, they will pay additional taxes to cover the overhead cost of the United States Government doing this utterly foolish job of taking our money from us, giving only about half of it back, and giving the rest to other States. Thus the unblushing scheme for the redistribution of the wealth started in 1932 goes on.

It works in detail like this: For example, for the 4-year period New York State will be compelled to give up $299,984,000 toward the $1,600,000,000 and will get back but $128,950,640. Thus New York will lose $171,033,360 in the transaction, plus its share of the overhead costs of the operation mentioned.

The city of New York would pay $134,454,320 and get back $72,480,000 representing a loss of $61,974,320 plus the usual overhead.

Westchester County residents would pay $13,777,920 and the county would get back $7,427,560 for building schoolhouses, a loss of $6,350,360.

And as for Putnam County, the smallest county, the Federal taxes would amount to $287,040 and the county would get back $154,740 in Federal aid, or a loss of $132,300 in the 4-year period. Thus you can readily see, based on the current cost of between $33,000 and $40,000 to construct a classroom, Putnam County will pay in Federal taxes enough to build about 8 classrooms in order to get the Federal funds back to build about 4 classrooms. The Federal Government will decide where to build the other schoolrooms with Putnam County's money.

These figures were compiled by the Empire State Chamber of Commerce at Albany, N. Y. They are available for every county in New York State.

Title II of this Kelley bill would put the Commissioner of Education in the investment banking business by creating a school bond purchase revolving fund with an original appropriation of $300 million and the further authority to purchase "obligations of local educational agencies" in the aggregate principal amount of $750 million. This is on the theory that the school district credit is so bad nobody else would make the loan to them. So, under the Kelley bill, the Federal Government just robs Peter and loans the money to Paul anyway. This so-called revolving fund is to have a life of 4 years. At the end of 4 years the headaches and uncollected balances, together with any cash remaining in the fund, will be transferred to the Treasury Department for them to worry about.

But, Mr. Taxpayer, these two little practice blows of the Kelley bill are just meant to condition you for the third blow. Otherwise title III of the bill would knock you cold.

Title III proposes that the Commissioner of Education may make Federal Government advances not to exceed $6 billion to some, but not all, of the 57,000 school districts. They would be selected according to his judgment as to need and other deserving qualities. So that those States that have sweated out their bond issues to build schools will get none because they no longer need them, while those that have dragged their feet longest, waiting for the Federal Government to take over, will get their loans. What a bonanza. Six billion to play politics with. But that's not all—the Commissioner of Education is authorized under the Kelley bill to "pay, compromise, waive, or release any right, title, claim, lien, or demand, however acquired or arising under title III."

So, if these borrowing school districts continue to drag their feet and say they "can't pay," why then the Commissioner can forget the loans. What politician wants to sue voters, especially school districts, anyway?

And section 313 (b) provides that the "financial transactions of the Commissioner in making advances pursuant to this title shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government."

This means that the Commissioner's acts are final. There is no appeal from his management even if he never collects a dime of the loans.

Now, all this adds up to $1,600,000,000 under title I, $750 million under title II, and $6 billion under title III, a possible total of $8,350,000,000. There are 40 million American families to pay it. That means that each American family will be taxed $207.75 on the average to provide this new form of Federal aid. Add to that $1,450 per family on the average each one pays now, and add $25 per family for each new billion dollars for new socialization to come, and you will get some notion of what we face.

Those families in New York State and the other States mentioned will get next to nothing under titles II and III because they are not so-called needy States. They can pay but can't take. Many other States will get back a mere drip at best.

Thus, the Kelley bill, sponsored especially by the National Education Association, takes us the first big step in social-

izing and controlling the school system, like other areas described above are already socialized.

Below are the losses six industrial States will sustain annually under title I alone. These are normallly Republican States outrageously penalized by every Federal aid program on the books, including this proposed new one.

The overhead is not shown below because it is well-nigh impossible to estimate Government overhead costs. It runs as high as 30 percent in most Government activities. Our 2,400,000 Government employees, their offices, rents, and expenses come high.

We must add to these costs of Federal management of our schools the Federal wage rates of the Bacon-Davis Act. School districts can't chip in and get volunteer workers, or workers of any kind if they accept Federal funds except generally unionized workers at union wages as determined by the Department of Labor. These additional costs are estimated at from 25 to 30 percent over and above what the school districts would pay without Federal intervention.

State	Pays in percent	Pays in dollars	Gets back aid dollars
California	7.620	$30,480,000	$27,545,819
Illinois	8.228	32,912,000	20,247,262
Michigan	8.711	34,844,000	17,058,887
New York	18.749	74,996,000	32,794,708
Ohio	6.734	26,936,000	20,236,416
Pennsylvania	7.612	30,448,000	25,105,737
Total	57.654	230,616,000	142,988,829

Subtracting the aid received back from what is paid out, the losses in each State are as follows:

California	$2,934,181
Illinois	12,664,738
Michigan	17,785,113
New York	42,201,292
Ohio	6,699,584
Pennsylvania	5,342,263
Total	87,627,171

Compare the losses in the 6 States with the gain in the State of Mississippi. Mississippi will pay in taxes $800,000 toward the Federal-aid program and get back $6,506,886, which is better than an 8-to-1 return.

In spite of that a committee of the Mississippi Legislature investigated and rejected some years ago the idea of Federal aid to education. Yet this proposed bill virtually forces the States to take it whether they want it or not.

There is great variation in the percentage of income which each State spends on education. There is not a single State but that can better afford its own education than can the Federal Government with its almost bankrupt Treasury. Some States spend twice as much as others. For example, Wyoming spends 3.99 percent of its income and Massachusetts spends 1.88 percent on public education. This makes no allowance, of course, for the private and parochial schools.

The following table shows the percentage of income spent for the school year 1953–54 by each State and the rank of each State on the basis of its current expenditures for schools:

State	Percent of income spent on current expenditures	Rank
Alabama	2.92	18
Arizona	3.14	13
Arkansas	2.49	29–30
California	2.87	19
Colorado	2.76	21
Connecticut	1.90	47
Delaware	1.96	45–46
Florida	2.57	26
Georgia	2.61	25
Idaho	3.18	12
Illinois	2.04	43
Indiana	2.26	33
Iowa	3.34	7
Kansas	2.77	20
Kentucky	2.14	40
Louisiana	3.12	14
Maine	2.25	34
Maryland	2.24	35–36
Massachusetts	1.88	48
Michigan	2.19	37–38
Minnesota	3.24	10–11
Mississippi	3.00	16
Missouri	2.07	42
Montana	3.45	6
Nebraska	2.66	24
Nevada	2.16	39
New Hampshire	2.41	31
New Jersey	2.30	32
New Mexico	3.90	2
New York	2.12	41
North Carolina	3.08	15
North Dakota	3.61	4
Ohio	1.98	44
Oklahoma	3.24	10–11
Oregon	3.25	9
Pennsylvania	2.19	37–38
Rhode Island	1.96	45–46
South Carolina	3.32	8
South Dakota	3.49	5
Tennessee	2.49	29–30
Texas	2.56	27
Utah	3.75	3
Vermont	2.75	22
Virginia	2.51	28
Washington	2.74	23
West Virginia	2.97	17
Wisconsin	2.24	35–36
Wyoming	3.99	1

In some areas two-thirds of the school-age children go to private or parochial schools. They are cut out of aid entirely although the parents must pay the taxes. The Federal Government would, if let alone, flatten out all differences, religious, economic, and political, between the States. Obviously when this process which is now on is completed there will be no taxpayers to pay for our socialized areas. And there will be no private or parochial schools for the same reason. Central governments just cannot endure variety and differences between people, between States, between communities. It cannot endure differences in effort and compensation. It would flatten out everybody and make the industrious look just like the lazy and indifferent—and call the program Federal aid. It no doubt would give all pupils the same grade. There would be no reward for extra effort and skill.

Column 1 of the following table shows the percentage that each State pays of all taxes collected, for whatever purpose; column 2 shows on that basis how much each will contribute annually to the $400-million annual fund; column 3 shows how much each State will get back, according to the United States Office of Education:

State	Percent they pay in	Dollars they will pay in	Dollars they will get back
Alabama	0.542	$2,172,000	$8,968,658
Arizona	.232	928,000	2,537,686
Arkansas	.226	904,000	5,313,957
California	7.620	30,480,000	27,545,819
Colorado	.897	3,588,000	3,611,322
Connecticut	1.841	7,364,000	4,782,562
Delaware	1.288	5,152,000	835,050
Florida	.967	3,868,000	7,623,902
Georgia	1.002	4,008,000	10,237,501
Idaho	.153	612,000	1,691,790
Illinois	8.228	32,912,000	20,247,262
Indiana	2.287	9,148,000	10,226,857
Iowa	.755	3,020,000	6,420,128
Kansas	.719	2,876,000	4,750,027
Kentucky	1.900	7,600,000	8,317,970
Louisiana	.744	3,096,000	8,090,229
Maine	.244	976,000	2,244,876
Maryland [1]	2.726	10,904,000	16,292,148
Massachusetts	2.719	10,876,000	10,573,691
Michigan	8.711	34,844,000	17,058,887
Minnesota	1.516	6,064,000	7,699,816
Mississippi	.200	800,000	6,506,886
Missouri	2.532	10,128,000	9,174,710
Montana	.167	668,000	1,594,187
Nebraska	.585	2,340,000	3,220,909
Nevada	.121	484,000	466,327
New Hampshire	.178	712,000	1,279,688
New Jersey	2.944	11,776,000	11,343,672
New Mexico	.152	608,000	2,320,780
New York	18.794	74,996,000	32,794,708
North Carolina	2.206	8,824,000	12,178,549
North Dakota	.091	364,000	1,724,325
Ohio	6.734	26,936,000	20,236,416
Oklahoma	.894	3,576,000	5,715,215
Oregon	.611	2,444,000	3,893,287
Pennsylvania	7.612	30,448,000	25,105,737
Rhode Island	.424	1,696,000	1,778,549
South Carolina	.361	1,444,000	7,005,748
South Dakota	.102	408,000	1,724,325
Tennessee	.729	2,916,000	9,174,710
Texas	3.120	12,480,000	21,982,431
Utah	.424	1,696,000	2,168,962
Vermont	.108	432,000	965,188
Virginia	1.539	6,156,000	9,207,244
Washington [1]	1.184	4,736,000	6,355,059
West Virginia	.419	1,676,000	5,747,750
Wisconsin	1.857	7,428,000	8,740,918
Wyoming	.081	324,000	780,826
Hawaii	.194	776,000	1,409,825
Possessions			422,000
Total	99.656	398,664,000	400,000,000

[1] Maryland includes District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. Washington State includes Alaska.

Such taking of private property without due process and transferring it into public or socialized property is, of course, pure socialism, according to the dictionaries.

The Kelley bill is not the administration bill, nor is it a Republican Party measure. It is the proposal of the National Education Association—a teachers union and lobby—and of the Socialist wing of the Democrat Party.

The bill sets up no formula to guide the redistribution of $8,350,000,000. It writes a blank check. It makes a commissar out of the Commissioner of Education to "do good" with other people's money as he pleases.

This Kelley bill is the last word in a Socialist bureaucrat's prayer.

Think of the reams and reams of regulations that can be written around every step in getting this $8,350,000,000 away from the places where it is and out to the favored districts of some of the 57,000 school districts where the Commissioner thinks it should be.

Then just think of the thousands of new bureaucrats that will be needed to administer this section of the bill, to settle and cancel the claims, and do all the other things necessary to satisfy enough of the voters to keep the plan alive and going beyond the deadline of 1960 set forth in the bill. All of this is supposed

to end then. But that too is only a part of the Government's deception.

For do we not know by now that a temporary measure in Congress to meet an emergency for schools or anything else becomes one of the most permanent pieces of legislation?

Mr. Eisenhower has said in a letter to me regarding Federal aid to education:

In my own mind I am perfectly clear as to the basic principle and have more than once made public statements to the effect that I definitely oppose every unnecessary intervention of the Federal authority and the Federal Treasury in what should be local business and local responsibility. * * *

I would flatly oppose any grant by the Federal Government to all States in the Union for educational purposes. Such policy would create an ambition—almost a requirement—to spend money freely under the impulse of competition with other localities in the country. It would completely decry and defeat the watchful economy that comes about through local supervision over local expenditures of local revenues.

That is the truth we all know.

Then he warns:

In short, unless we are careful, even the great and necessary educational processes in our country will become yet another vehicle by which the believers in paternalism, if not outright socialism, will gain still additional power for the Central Government.

And to indicate that he is aware of the evils of socializing our local school systems, Mr. Eisenhower had this to say:

If local communities do their job, then there will be no need for additional centralized revenues for nationwide subsidies of an essential local character, and we will avoid the pitfalls of extreme centralization.

Very frankly, I firmly believe that the army of persons who urge greater and greater centralization of authority and greater dependence upon the Federal Treasury are really more dangerous to our form of government than any external threat that can possibly be arrayed against us.

His fear, our fear, lies in the seizure or assumption of power by government over us. We all fear, indeed we witness, the corrupting evils of government promises to do for us what we ought to do for ourselves. It weakens the capacity and the will of the people to manage their affairs for themselves. All of our great leaders have warned us against the evils of the central government we are now embracing. Who is so dull that he cannot understand that the government has not a dime that it does not first take from the people? It corrupts us with our own money. It captures us and takes away our resistance by false promises of something for nothing.

All this adds up to a rule that whatever you add to the power of government you subtract from yourselves. So there is no such thing as Federal aid. For the Government to promise aid as though it has something to give apart from what it takes from the people themselves is a fraud on the people.

Of course, it is a bit natural that the professional schoolman should want the power of money from the Central Government in his hands. Some superintendents naturally want to be relieved of the slower, more hesitant, and more democratic processes, as well as the mistakes inherent in the exercise of local responsibility. He assumes that in the exercise of the people's responsibility by government, it will make no mistakes.

To maneuver the people into a willingness to put themselves under Government management and control, the Government itself controls the very thoughts of the people by its own propaganda. For example, the Government makes a survey to see if there is a classroom shortage. A Government agency, the United States Office of Education, gathers the information from school superintendents in the States, and not from the parents, taxpayers, or laymen who have no professional interest at stake. The professionals who gather, and those who provide the information for the Government are by and large already committed to Federal aid and have been for years. After they get the information all slanted the way they want it they arrange a White House conference. When the conference is over it is manipulated so that a committee of 2 is appointed, 1 a former president of the National Education Association, now a State superintendent of public instruction in one of the States, and the other the executive secretary of the National Education Association. Both are active—almost violent—crusaders for Federal aid. With some considerable difficulty with the stubborn facts growing out of the White House conference of 1,800 delegates, this National Education Association committee of 2 report what they wanted to think was a consensus of the 1,800 delegates at the conference. The Government itself picks up just the right lines and gives them the whole Government propaganda works. The delegates had no opportunity to vote and create news for their side of the case. No one knows how they would have voted. All we have is the above-described consensus report of two prejudiced persons. All the modifying, restrictive, and the downright opposition to Federal aid that was in the White House conference is buried. Even the great widespread opposition of the professionals themselves is buried at the bottom of the confusion of paperwork. What private citizen or group of so-called free citizens would dare to controvert even the false statements of Government?

The governmental propaganda machine picks out of the consensus report what the professionals who set it up intended for it to emphasize. So all officialdom beats the drums for the Kelley bill. The power of government smothers individual freedom. It's out already in the march now strongly under way.

While the President called the White House Conference in the best of good faith to study the 6 fundamental problems in our educational system, only 1 of the 6, namely Federal aid, got any serious attention. The best thinking of the professionals who manipulated the conference was that there was nothing wrong with education that more money from the taxpayers wouldn't cure.

The laymen, taxpayers, parents, businessmen, farmers, and laborers, a small minority in the conference, asked questions about improving teaching methods. What about the use of television? How about renting school buildings more scientifically built by private capital, just as all the post offices are now being rented instead of owned by the school board? They wanted to know why the inventive creative capacity of the local citizens were not more capable of meeting all their local needs than the Federal Government. They questioned whether the great teachers of unusual skill and ability might not be used through new techniques such as television to reach a greater number of pupils. Could not such teachers be helped by assistants or aids or apprentices at lower cost to free the great teachers of many chores incident to the real job of teaching? They wondered why no particular changes had been made in the teaching techniques and particularly in the number of pupils per class and the costs per pupil while in every other profession tremendous improvements have taken place increasing the number served and reducing the cost of the same. Why should teaching be static?

No answer to any of these questions came out of the conference. The professional and the governmental bureaucratic purpose is to bring down the number of pupils in the class and bring up the number of the classrooms, always at increased cost. Obviously the size of classes must be increased far beyond what has been standard for about a century in order to bring down costs. Many of our colleges are conducting classes of 100 or more. George Washington University has had classes of as high as 1,300. It must not continue to be easier for one of the biggest lobbies in Washington to lobby for taxpayers' money than it is to try to improve education and reduce the cost at the same time.

Our school buildings, highly expensive, are idle much of the time, the weekends and holidays. Their use starts at 8:30 or 9:00 a. m., ends at 4:00 p. m. When William A. Wirt started his plan at Gary, Ind., he pointed out:

We are handling three times as many pupils and giving each pupil more hours of education than is customary in a high school and that actually the cost per pupil is around 65 percent of the normal cost.

By starting his classes at 8:00 a. m., continuing them through the day and into the evening, 12 months of the year, he was able to give far more effective education at a lower unit cost. A similar plan might be suggested as one of the possible economies.

Local communities, if left alone, with their native American genius, intelligence, necessity, and financial capacity, will find a way to solve their problems. They alone can meet their necessities. They alone know what they are.

Fuller Brush Co. Golden Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, without fanfare an outstanding Connecticut citizen whose name and products are known

throughout the world observed the golden jubilee of his inventive genius.

I refer to Mr. Alfred C. Fuller, the originator and founder of the Fuller Brush Co., started in a shed on April 10, 1906, in Hartford, Conn. The success story of Mr. Fuller, a close acquaintance and friend of many years, is another American story of inventive genius, courage, determination, and ingeniousness to which we point with pride and great admiration. The great difference between the success of this industry and that of others lies in the fact that Mr. Fuller attributes his success to his novel use of advertising in newspapers in the so-called want-ad column. As the article from the business financial section of the New York Times for April 11 points out, the inventor of these useful brushes and other indispensable products of the home and industry made his brushes at night and sold them during the day, and, although the newspaper article does not say so, I know from my acquaintance with Mr. Fuller that his wonderful personality contributed as much to breaking down the sales resistance of those on whose doors he knocked, as did the fine product which he made in that shed he rented for $11 a month.

It is a genuine pleasure, Mr. Speaker, for me to include in my remarks today the writeup in the New York Times, which also included a photograph of this American genius, a picture of the original shed, and the newest home office in the company's modern building at Hartford, Conn.:

FULLER BRUSH, AT 50, THANKS THE WANT ADS—CLASSIFIED COLUMNS RECRUITED ARMY OF SALESMEN

A business built by help wanted ads celebrated its golden anniversary yesterday. That's the way Alfred C. Fuller, 71-year-old chairman, describes the Fuller Brush Co., which he started in Hartford, Conn., on April 10, 1906, in an $11-a-month shed.

Operating on an initial capital of $375, Mr. Fuller turned out brushes on a $15 machine he had designed. He made the brushes at night and sold them door to door by day. His first year's gross was $8,500, an amount that many Fuller Brush men clear now as independent dealers.

The company was strictly a one-man operation until December 14, 1909. On that day Mr. Fuller inserted a four-line ad in the Syracuse Post-Standard seeking salesmen. The response was so great that the company adopted a fixed policy of recruiting Fuller Brush men through the classified columns.

Mr. Fuller remarked yesterday:

"If it hadn't been for the newspaper classified ad I used in 1909, I gravely doubt that we'd be having our 50th anniversary today. The pulling power of those four lines set our consistent policy of using want ads over the years."

Despite his threescore ten and more, Alfred Fuller is still active in the company. His sons A. Howard and Avard E., are president and vice president, respectively.

Fuller Brush now operates 3 factories, 23 distribution stations and 109 branch offices. Some 7,400 dealers in this country and Canada sell each week more than $1,600,000 worth of brushes, mops, cleaning chemicals, cosmetics, and vitamins. Gross sales last year amounted to $91 million.

A good part of Fuller's business these days comes from the sale of industrial brushes. There are some 700 different kinds used in 4,000 ways. The industrial brushes do such things as card wool, process leather, roll cigarettes, and polish fruit and eggs. Not the least important: Fuller brushes remove sand from spinach.

The material going into these industrial brushes comes from all over the world. White, gray, and black horsehair is imported from every continent except Africa. Then there's istle (Mexico), palmyra (Ceylon, India, and Burma), palmetto (Cuba and the Bahamas) and bass (Africa and South America). The toughest brushes are made of steel, copper, bronze or nickel wire.

Fuller Brush also makes the machines that employ industrial brushes. Its equipment is used, among many other things, to polish mirror glass and clean the scale from hacksaw blades. In addition, the Hartford plant turns out precision hydraulic and electronic equipment. Output now includes castings and aluminum masts for yachts.

All this varied activity stems from the tiny shack in Hartford, one machine and a want ad. The Fuller Brush story has all the aspects of an American industrial saga.

Peacetime Application of Atomic Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, the current news about the experimental gas turbine test automobile now on a cross-country tour comes at a time when Members of Congress are concerned with another type of industrial development in which the Federal Government has become deeply involved. Apparently the new car is still so much in the research stage that it is impossible to predict what the ultimate results will be. What is important is that further scientific and research developments may lead to an actual revolution in the automotive industry, so far as the propelling force is concerned.

This turbine power engine in the automobile now on tour has been developed by the Chrysler Corp. without assistance from the Federal Government. It is an example of what can be accomplished under free enterprise through the courage of investors and the creative genius of America's technicians. How much longer it will be required to put this kind of motorcar on a practical operating basis is not known. The Chrysler Corp. no doubt has earmarked a special fund for this project, which will continue to be carried out on a schedule based on practicability and on budgetary considerations. Management know how much can and should be spent in this work.

Now let us look at the other industrial development to which I have referred: the peacetime application of atomic power. As everyone realizes, the Federal Government went into the business of putting the atom to use for defense purposes. With the realization that fissionable materials might be utilized in a number of ways other than for destruction, the Government began a research program to learn just what could be expected of the atom in a peacetime economy.

A great deal has been learned and a great many billions of dollars have been expended since the Federal Government undertook this program. We have, in fact, reached a point where the whole effort now needs to be reappraised. Through research, it has been determined that electrical power can be generated by using the atom as a fuel. That revelation is a welcome one. We are all enthusiastic at the possibilities opened through development of reactors which can be used to produce light and heat and power in contributing to a better life for all of us.

My question, Mr. Speaker, is this: Now that the way for atomic-produced electric power has been opened, how much more of the taxpayers' money should be expended in this field? It is estimated that reactors now in the process of construction will be able to create electric power at perhaps 10 times the price of what it would cost to do the same job through the use of coal. Our experts are convinced that this cost will be progressively reduced as more is learned about the atom and how to handle it. I do not think that anyone would challenge this conjecture. It is entirely possible that at some time in the future electricity from atomic plants will be competitive—pricewise—with that which comes from steam plants using coal. Perhaps America's public-utilities industry will be able to accomplish this reduction in price through their own research and development programs. In any case, I believe that it is time for the Federal Government to stop going to the Treasury so that such a program can be expedited.

Let us have another look at the Chrysler research car. That car is a creation of private industry. If the Government were to invest several billion dollars to bring about the consummation of the work envisioned in this developmental program, I am confident that the gas turbine automobile could be on the showrooms floors throughout the country within a very short time. Similarly, if the Government continues to invest more Federal funds in the reactor program, America is certain to get a good supply of atomic generated electricity much quicker than if the electric utilities were forced to run on their own resources. I therefore suggest that Congress hesitate before approving of any further expenditures by the Atomic Energy Commission in this direction. The electric power company in my district of West Virginia has done all that can be asked of it without resorting to Federal contributions. When demand for greater supply of electricity has arisen, the Appalachian Electric Power Co. has increased its capacity. It will continue to do so in the future.

We in the Fifth Congressional District are making every effort possible to attract more industry. Our vast coal reserves, which are the power behind electric power, are one of the inviting features of the area.

If the public utilities want to invest more of their earnings in the atomic energy program, the people of West Virginia are certainly not going to oppose the plan. We object, however, when the Government insists upon contributing to a project which actually will create un-

employment. I have come to the conclusion that it is time for private industry to withdraw the hand that is accepting—under the garb of free enterprise—these Federal handouts in the so-called participating projects. It is at least obligatory upon the Congress to object to the Atomic Energy Commission's continued use of public funds for this purpose.

I call your attention to a letter which presumably went to the entire membership of the House from Mr. Tom Pickett, executive vice president of the National Coal Association. Mr. Pickett, who distinguished himself in the House of Representatives as a Congressman from Texas, gave this brief explanation of the coal industry's position with respect to the commercial development of atomic generated power:

The Government should conduct basic and applied research;

Government sponsorship of the development phases of a power generation program is justified on the grounds that it may provide economically feasible nuclear power for underdeveloped or power-short nations;

There is no urgency for the domestic development of atomic-generated power—an adequate supply of coal reserves guarantees a continued adequate supply of low-cost electric power;

Government subsidies should not extend beyond the development stages, and the amount of such subsidies be made public information.

It appears to me that Mr. Pickett has gone just as far as he possibly could in accepting the proposals for Government experimentation in the commercial application of nuclear power. It may be, in fact, that the Atomic Energy Commission is allowed too much latitude, especially in the light of its ambitious attempts to push the electric power program beyond the bounds of reason.

In the latter part of November of last year, President John L. Lewis of the United Mine Workers of America, appeared before a Senate subcommittee and expressed this opinion regarding peacetime application of atomic power:

Atomic power, if, as, and when it comes, and if, as, and when we can survive its arrival, will only be able to produce energy for a very small percentage of our economic and industry requirements. As a matter of fact, I think it is a safe assumption that the amount of dollars that is being put in and will be put into the development of atomic energy is much more than atomic energy will ever render American industry. Because by the time they encompass all of the problems and make atomic power relatively efficient and learn how to coexist with atomic power—which has not yet been done—then some genius is going to harness the sun or harness the tides, or perform some other modern miracle that will render atomic power obsolete.

In the meantime, we have to keep warm and keep our economy functioning. So we will do it with coal. The coal industry for the first time for a long time is facing a clear road ahead. Modern mines, well designed, well managed, well financed with commercial outlets and credit are offering, today, as attractive opportunity for American investment as can be offered within the limitation of our economy.

Congress must take these views into consideration before giving the Atomic Energy Commission a free hand to invest taxpayers' money in what should be a commercial business enterprise. By contributing most of the construction and agreeing to provide the fuels for operation of atomic plants, the Atomic Energy Commission is in fact taking away traditional coal markets, whether or not these markets are within close proximity of coal-producing areas. Despite the encouraging increase in coal production for last year over 1954, we still have a very great number of unemployed miners in West Virginia. Some of them have not had employment for a long time, and their families have had to depend upon surplus food and upon other such items which they are willing to accept only because they have been deprived of an opportunity to earn their own subsistence. Government and private fuel experts have promised that consumption of bituminous coal in the United States by 1975 will be approximately twice that of the present time. Although output per man-day has been increasing steadily, it will still require a large force of skilled technicians to extract the coal necessary to meet rising demands; it is, therefore, illogical for us to permit the Government to follow policies that would discourage our mining families from remaining in the coal-producing areas. Our families have established their homes within working distance of the mines and they are quite naturally opposed to any Federal program that calls for using Government subsidies to drive them out of their jobs.

What also must be taken into account is that it is unfair for taxpayers to assume so much of the financial risk in this whole undertaking. If the Federal Government completes the research, builds the reactors, underwrites the risks involved, and provides other subsidies, then turns over everything—plants and know-how—to private companies, how can such transactions be conducted in the name of free enterprise?

Mr. Speaker, I ask that Members of Congress keep these facts in mind when they read more about the gas turbine automobile engine. As a creation of private enterprise, it will be produced if it is proven to be feasible and practicable; if not, the conventional motors will remain in our cars until some newer development comes about. If the electric utilities, through their own finances and ingenuity, are able to provide electricity from the atom at rates lower than those of coal-fired steam plants, America will welcome this progress. Until that day arrives, however, it is incumbent upon the electric power companies to use traditional fuels.

South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith one of the most beautiful addresses that it has ever been my pleasure to hear. The title of this magnificent treatise is "South Carolina." It was delivered by the distinguished director of the State development board of South Carolina, Hon. R. M. Cooper, on the occasion of the celebration of St. Patrick's Day by the Hibernian Society of South Carolina on March 17, 1956. In responding to the toast to South Carolina, Mr. Cooper delivered his splendid address. In words reminiscent of Henry Grady, over 60 years ago, Mr. Cooper spoke of the invigorating atmosphere that prevails in my native State—of the great excitement that pervades and permeates the air, and the faith the people have in the future of the great region from whence I come.

Mr. Speaker, my people are enamored of the work of making God's unsurpassed bounty to my section of the world attractive to the other people of the Nation.

Mr. Cooper treats with the great economic progress my State has enjoyed and is enjoying, and calls to mind the factors responsible for such progress. He speaks of its beauty and its progress in agriculture and education. His address is one which I want every Member of Congress to read. You will then be curious to visit my section of America where opportunity beckons to all men of good will.

The treatise is as follows:

SOUTH CAROLINA

(By R. M. Cooper)

There is excitement in South Carolina today. The air is charged. An invigorating atmosphere prevails everywhere. One word tells the story.

It's progress—stimulating, thrilling progress.

The people themselves, steeped in the glory and richness of a past that fills history books, find it a bit hard to believe. Even the statisticians must stay on the run to keep up with it.

Just one item: a keynote of that progress is industrial development. In 1945 there were barely $500 million invested in industry in South Carolina. Since then, over $1 billion more have been added, and that doesn't count the Atomic Energy Commission's Savannah River plant, estimated to cost one and a half billions more.

The same upward trend pervades agriculture, business, and social affairs, such as education. Yet visitors to the State (and they are beginning to come in thousands now) find the same atmosphere of gracious living, the same beautiful scenery and historic shrines preserved. Just a good bit of paint has been added, and perhaps the smiles of hospitality are a little more relaxed.

Right here at the outset, I want to add my testimonial to the many which have come to those whose broad vision and determined energy have made possible the Bushy Park project.

On a visit to Oak Ridge, Tenn., recently to attend an atomic-energy conference, I heard more enthusiastic discussion of Bushy Park than I hear right here in South Carolina. Don't you forget it—the informed industrial leaders of this country are well aware of the possibilities of Bushy Park, and they know how fortunate we are to have it.

This whole matter of water supply is a critical question in the United States. At Oak Ridge I talked with a leading economist who made some rather startling predictions about South Carolina because of our water. Dr. Harold F. Clark, professor of education economics at Teachers College, Columbia

University, had this to say (I later asked him to write it down for me):

"I can see no reason why such States as South Carolina should not become among the very wealthiest of the States. In fact, there is no reason why within a century South Carolina, Mississippi, and Arkansas should not become the three richest States in the Union. They are better supplied with water than almost any other States. This could easily become a decisive advantage in the period just ahead. A dependable supply of water is going to be crucial for agriculture. Many industries are already drastically limited because of the growing shortage of water. If you couple these factors with a climate mild enough for workers to spend their leisure time outdoors almost the year around, you have the basic requirements for an extraordinary economic expansion.

"Clearly, you are going to have two somewhat competing demands upon your water supply. They are the enormous advantage industrially and economically on one hand and the great advantage from the standpoint of the leisure time of the workers on the other. To get a satisfactory balance of the two things will naturally be difficult. Certainly the great water supply of the State is one of its most important advantages. Every State should capitalize on these resources."

Sometimes it takes an outsider to see and understand just what we do have.

Some say the Nation generally should join industry's leaders and take a second look at South Carolina. Not only to see the changes, but to reevaluate the great contribution she has made to America.

On June 28, 1776, fighting from a hastily built fort of palmetto logs, South Carolinians won the first great victory of the Revolution. Hence, the Palmetto State. About a year earlier, in what is now acknowledged as the first act of war by colonists, they had seized from the British by force old Fort Charlotte on the Savannah. And a century before that, South Carolinians had begun the first real opening of the West when her traders penetrated to the Mississippi to establish a brisk and long profitable Indian trade. Few history readers know these things.

They do usually learn of the great and pleasant plantation society which lasted more than 150 years and made South Carolina the richest of the colonies. Great houses standing today testify to the times when 1 or 2 Palmettans could have bought and sold New York City.

Under the calm graciousness, however, there lay a frown of economic uncertainty. Beginning with the exotic indigo, one crop after another met disaster in the State's agricultural society. Indigo went the way of encroachment by man-made dyes. Rice fell by the wayside when slavery went out. The next mainstay, cotton, was snatched from his throne by a tiny demon called the boll weevil.

Adding to these disasters, the Confederate war destroyed the State's wealth almost completely, even to the burning of its great buildings and homes.

The climb back was not a rapid one. Poverty has a way of begetting poverty. But the ultimate answer lay in the character of South Carolinians, which was enough to conquer hardships of decades past and which today is the key to the State's progress.

In the late 1920's when South Carolinians found themselves faced with 5-cent cotton and a ruined agriculture, a few thinking people realized that the State would never prosper again if it continued to depend entirely on the vagaries of farming.

They looked around for a balance, and found one in the infant textile industry. Here, they knew, lay the opportunity to achieve an economy founded on the twin bedrocks of agriculture and manufacturing.

Through the years, this idea dominated the thinking of South Carolina's leaders, and today the results may be seen in burgeoning per capita income, bustling business activity, a sound, stable businesslike government, a revitalized educational system, and in every other facet of the society.

One writer, touring the State with the agriculture committee of the American Petroleum Institute who came to see for themselves went away terming it a "fourfold pattern of progress": farm mechanization, better education, two-armed farming (crops plus livestock), and new industries. That's a good way to express it.

From 1940 to 1955 the number of tractors used on Palmetto farms increased 872 percent, highest in the Nation. In 1939 only 14 percent of the farms had electricity; today it's about 90 percent. Other modern practices are keeping pace, including extensive soil conservation and irrigation.

The role of education both implements this progress and complements it. In other words, better educated people can earn more money, which permits them to educate their children better.

The implementation part is best illustrated on the farm. Clemson Agricultural College through its resident teachers, experimental work, and extension service is the ring leader. Today over 55,000 youngsters are in 4–H clubs, 12,000 are FFA members, and about 800 owners or operators have enrolled in veterans' farm training. And the work of the Soil Conservation Service, State Agriculture Department, and vocational teachers have all had their effect.

Then, as to the "complementary" part: South Carolinians in 1951 were better off than ever, and they felt able to pass a 3 percent sales tax for educational purposes. This tax is dedicated to building better schools and to school transportation. It insures modern schools now and in the future for both white and colored. Ten years ago the same school problem existed, but a sales tax proposal would have been laughed out of the legislature because people were too poor.

On the farm, cotton and tobacco are still the king crops, but this rule is leavened by a strong "parliament" of livestock, grain, vegetables, fruits, and other staples. Even rice is coming back in the low country.

The pace is fact. In 1948 South Carolina farmers devoted 250,000 acres to improved pasturelands. In 1954, only 6 years later, the total was 1,407,000 acres. We're waking up to the fact that we can graze cattle 12 months a year and do not need the elaborate barns, winter feeding, and heavy equipment of colder States.

Georgia is still known as the peach State. Yet today, one South Carolina company alone (Spartanburg) ships more fresh peaches to market than the entire State of Georgia. In many other crops we have attained high national rankings.

In industry, the growth has been even more dramatic. Where cottonfields once gleamed white in late summer, the brick, steel, and glass of modern industrial buildings may be seen nestling quite naturally in their rural settings. From nearby farms Johnny and Jimmy drive to work in their new car, returning in the late afternoon to help Dad with the chores and bringing perhaps $100 or more home on Saturday.

These days industry prefers to be away from crowded centers. Thus South Carolina benefits by a trend which enables industry to fit comfortably and happily into the community. Sometimes one may actually see industry and agriculture dovetailed: one cloth manufacturer has a herd of whitefaces constantly grazing on the beautiful "lawn" around his plant near Clemson; another, now operating a wool-processing plant at Johnsonville has installed a herd of sheep.

Since World War II, over 125,000 new jobs have been created in South Carolina industry, with brand new payrolls exceeding $300 million. That's quite a hunk of cash for a State which had less than $70 million in industrial payrolls 20 years ago. Since 1945, about 1,150 new industries have been established in Palmettoland, and 1,200 substantial expansions have been made.

Not all of these have been textiles, although that industry has been completely integrated and diversified, and South Carolina is now the acknowledged textile State. In addition, industries such as sewing machines, builders' hardware, home ironers, paint, boat building, and many others have come into the State. There is even a maker of church-bell carillons at Greenwood.

Why do they come? People, mostly. People, and the conservative and efficient government they maintain.

South Carolina is fundamentally conservative. South Carolinians are virtually unanimous (they are 99.6 percent native born) in their conservatism, in religion, social life, and custom. This life-thinking creates harmony in industrial work. It also leads to an appreciation for the job, and exceedingly high production.

In government, South Carolinians have a habit of electing men who will run the State's affairs on a business-like basis. Their constitution, in fact, dictates that the budget must be balanced annually.

Despite this seeming hardheadedness, the typical South Carolinian forgets temporal affairs at the end of the day and turns to a gracious, hospitable life made easier by a gentle climate and the unrivaled beauty of his surroundings. Nowadays he is extending gracious hospitality to thousands who are discovering the vacation charms of the State for the first time.

South Carolina has long been known as a world leader for its beautiful gardens, both public and private. One of these, Magnolia, was listed many years ago by Baedecker as 1 of only 3 double-starred attractions, Niagara Falls and Grand Canyon being the others. There are now 13 public gardens of national fame, many lesser ones, and literally thousands of home gardens which are free for the street-side looking.

There are a dozen ocean beaches, which have often been described very seriously as the world's most beautiful. One of these, Myrtle, has attained national recognition.

But beyond these well-known assets there are myriad tourist attractions in South Carolina which have been largely overlooked by the Nation. For instance, over 140 battles of the Revolution, including several decisive ones, were fought in the State. An equally large share of the Confederate War took place here. (Sherman burned Columbia to the ground, and the marks of his shells may be seen today on the statehouse.) Charleston, described as America's most historic city, is said to be the best-preserved 18th century city in the Americas, and one of the world's best. Colonization attempts were started as early as 1526 at Georgetown.

Here are a few other things that perhaps you didn't know about the Palmetto State:

Near Salem is Whitewater Falls, highest cascade east of the Rockies in one of the truly awe-inspiring gorges in eastern America. You can drive your car up for a picnic, and fish for mountain trout in Sumter National Forest.

On Hilton Head Island, one of the largest sea islands on the Atlantic coast and recently opened to the public, you can see wild turkey tracks on the beautiful strand.

For off-trail trips, nothing could compete with a boat excursion from the wildlife refuge at McClellanville to lovely Bull's Island, where you'll see wildlife you didn't know still existed.

These, and many other attractions are bringing South Carolina to the attention of visitors, who are beginning to enjoy the exciting charm of this 300-year-old new South Carolina.

Money Backing for Hog Farmer Viewed by Banker-Agriculturist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New Castle (Ind.) Herald-Times of March 26, 1956:

PORK PRODUCT SQUEEZE—MONEY BACKING FOR HOG FARMER VIEWED BY BANKER-AGRICULTURIST

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the text of an address by J. Alvin Hardin, Knightstown, at the 12th Agricultural Clinic at Purdue University. Hardin, well-known Henry County farm leader, also is president of Knightstown's Citizens National Band.)

(By J. Alvin Hardin)

I, being a farmer as well as a banker, may give some of the farmers' viewpoints, but I believe what is good for the farmer on this subject is also good for the banker.

The hog situation for the past few months has been a much-talked-about subject, but still a rather unpopular subject to discuss at this type of meeting. During a 3-day agriculture conference of the ABA in Chicago last December, about every phase of agriculture was discussed but hogs and if hogs were mentioned they just smiled and changed the subject.

In order to give you the picture of the hog situation as I see it, it may be necessary to touch a little on other agricultural products and some on the economic situation.

WAR, PRICE SUPPORTS CONTRIBUTE TO PROSPERITY

Agriculture as a whole has enjoyed about 12 years of prosperity because of war and the effects of war coupled with the fact that we have had high guaranteed prices on grain. These prices made it profitable to sell grain with the result that the CCC now holds about 8 billion dollars' worth of grain and surplus crops.

Then as open-market grain prices dropped and hogs being a good price, the farmer increased his hog feeding operation with the result of an overproduction of hogs.

The answer is not too difficult—you make any agricultural product profitable and farmers will soon overproduce that product.

It is the old law of supply and demand. We may interfere with this law for a while through a regulated economy, but it will eventually crop out. There are some phases of our economy that can and have been regulated, but I don't think we have as yet found the answer to a successful politically regulated farm economy. I don't say it can't be done, but we have not yet found the answer.

We have enjoyed a good hog market for several years up until last year with the exception of the spring of 1952 when our market dropped to $16. That year we produced 101 million pigs which were just too many for the market. We usually produce from 80 to 90 million, of which 80 to 85 percent go to the market. Only 3 years in our history have we exceeded the 100 million mark.

Last year we went to 95 million pigs and the bottom dropped out of the market to $11 and $12. You as individuals have enjoyed lower prices for your bacon, but it certainly has not contributed to your banks' deposits.

DROP IN 1952 NOT SO SERIOUS AS NOW

The drop in 1952 was not as serious as the present one, even though the corn-hog ratio was almost as low, because the price of corn was higher and if the farmer raised his corn, his total income was much higher than it is today.

In fact, the hog farmer today is in just about as serious a shape as he was for a whole in the 1930's when hogs averaged about $4. A tractor then would cost about $1,000. Today that same tractor will cost over $3,000. Of course, it is a better tractor. But other costs are about on the same basis. Labor is four times as high as in the 1930's.

As a rule, the hog market moves in a 4- to 6-year cycle, depending upon the demand and the extent of liquidation during the low period. The longer and the greater the liquidation, the better the market usually recovers. Of course, this depends also on the buying power of the public, their likes and dislikes and the competition of other meat.

MEAT CONSUMPTION REACHES ALLTIME HIGH

In 1955 our total per capita meat consumption reached an alltime high of 161 pounds, up 8 pounds over 1954 which was 153 pounds.

The 1955 per capita pork consumption was 66 pounds, up 6 pounds from 1954 which was 60 pounds. Back in 1952 when we marketed over 100 million hogs, pork consumption was 71.6 pounds.

Beef in 1955 was 81 pounds, raising from 55 pounds in 1951 and 79 pounds in 1954, exclusive of veal. I give you these figures to show that we consume what we produce but usually with high production and consumption goes lower prices, especially to the farmer.

Other competition in the meat market is poultry and eggs. The number of commercial broilers produced in 1940 was about 140 million. By 1954 this had increased to over 1 billion. Turkeys had also doubled in this period. So you see that pork has competition from all sides.

Another contributing factor to lower hog prices has been the decline in the demand for lard, the use of which has been replaced largely by the much-advertised vegetable oils and fats. Hence through lack of research, education and advertising, we have lost our lard market.

When lard drops from 16 cents per pound to 8 cents per pound and accounts for approximately 20 percent of the live weight of the hog, we know that the popular cuts must carry the extra load.

RETAIL CUTS PRICED HIGH TO CONSUMER

There seems to be a tendency on the part of the processor and retailer to charge the consumer all he will stand on the choice cuts of pork, thus pricing the hog out of the competitive market of other meat. The farmer lives under the impression that he does not get his share of the pork dollar because of this situation.

To prove this statement, last December and January we had the lowest hog prices in 14 years and the greatest spread between the price of the live hogs and the price to the consumer in all time.

Incidentally, the Senate bill passed Tuesday requires packers to pay the farmer support parity or a fair price for meat purchased by the Government and certify a statement for same.

PROGRESS MADE ON BACON-TYPE HOG

Now going back to the excess supply of lard, it brings up the subject of the bacon-type hog which has been much talked about and on which much progress has already been made. However, the packer has been slow to encourage this progress because he has not been willing to pay much, if any, premium for this type of hog.

If the spread was greater between the lard and bacon type, it would definitely encourage the farmer to produce it and thus help to reduce the supply of cheap lard.

To produce the bacon type hog, the farmer has the added expense of buying boars bred for this type which probably take a little longer to finish. This is a subject that needs much consideration; and if the packers do not cooperate, we as bankers must still encourage the production of the meat type hog. We must, if possible, produce what the market demands. On my farm we have been doing this for the past 3 years.

Sometimes we get a 25-cent premium. This is not very encouraging when you have to pay high prices for boars of this type. But nevertheless I think we are going to be forced to do it to keep our hog market on a competitive basis with other meat. This subject deserves your attention and cooperation. The manufacturer will not stay in business if he produces something the public does not want.

WHAT BANKERS CAN DO ABOUT IT ALL

You, as bankers, may rightfully ask, "Well, what can I do about the situation? How can I advise a farmer what to do, whether to sell out and wait for better prices or stay in or cut down 10, 15, or 20 percent? And shall I finance him or turn him away?"

Now I realize that many of you own farms yourselves and are as well qualified to answer this question as I am. But here is my answer.

You as a banker in a rural community should keep yourself well informed on existing feeding ratios. A corn-hog ratio of 13.6 to 1 is about the average over the past years. Anything below that is not so good. Now we are on about 10–1 ratio, depending on how you price corn. You should keep posted on where we stand in our hog cycle.

In other words, keep yourself posted on changing conditions so you may discuss the problem intelligently with the farmer when he comes in. Encourage him in the control of disease. Never let him go without vaccinating hogs because of lack of funds.

You cannot say, "Well, I am sorry but your note is due. What are you going to do about it?" You must discuss it with him from a practical standpoint. He might be your future depositor.

FOUR CLASSES OF BORROWERS ARE CITED

There are four clasess of hog farmers who are borrowers. You have farmers who have made a success out of the hog business. They have proved their ability as managers. They know how to feed. They have the physical setup. They operate as economically as possible. If this man needs cash, I know you will go along with him. He will be your future depositor.

Then there is the other extreme—the farmer who could barely make it when hogs were a good price. To begin with, he may not be on a good hog farm, a farm with the correct equipment. He seems to have more than his share of disease. He is usually on the market at the wrong time. Things just don't click for him. He is already overobligated.

I think you would advise him to sell out while he still has an equity and find something else to do. I am sure it can usually be done on a friendly and cooperative basis. In a few cases I have already accomplished this. There might be one exception to this class of farmer.

If he is close to retirement age and can establish his social security by staying in a little longer, you will be doing him a good turn to go along for awhile, provided, of course, that the risk is not too great.

BANKERS AS CONSULTANTS FOR PROBLEMS

The above two illustrations are not too difficult. It is the farmer in between that is your problem. He has not made much progress and you feel a little uneasy about his future. Can you advise him, get him on a better farm if a tenant, encourage better feeding practices, extend him long-time credit, set up with small payments and eventually make a good hog farmer out of

him? This is where your ability as a banker come into play.

Fourth, there is the beginner, the young man who wants to get into the hog business. Will you advise him to start now or wait? Certainly there is no better time to stock up than when prices are low and ride the market up. It is partially your responsibility to help him decide when this low point is reached.

Of course, other things enter into this class of farmer. Does he have a farm background and the ambition and determination to succeed? And the size of his proposed operation must be econmical.

WHEN WILL MARKET GET BETTER

Now, when will the hog market get better and how high may we expect it to go. I realize I am on dangerous ground when I try to forecast the market, but I will say this much, a major rise will only come after we have had sufficient liquidation and I doubt if that has happened yet. We should have a reasonable rise in June or July, but next fall and early winter I do not expect much improvement over last year.

But by 1957, if demand holds up, we should have a better market, but it will not get back to the high prices we have been enjoying until our surplus grain has been disposed of.

HOG WILL CONTINUE TO BE MORTGAGE LIFTER

In central Indiana the hog has been known as the mortgage lifter and although we have our market cycles, I believe it will maintain that place because we are in the corn belt.

The hog farmer who knows how to feed efficiently, to manage well, will keep his place in agriculture.

I have purposely stayed away from feeding rations and cost of production because of a previous arrangement with the next speaker, N. S. Hadley. This is a very important phase of the hog business and I know he will cover it in excellent manner.

I am thoroughly convinced that we as bankers have a definite role to play in the next few years to carry out our part in the readjustment of agriculture whether it be hog farming or other types.

It is our responsibility to see that the good and worthy, reliable and ambitious farmers have sufficient credit to carry them over until our surplus is in some manner disposed of, or our population catches up with our supply of food.

A Definition of Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ORVIN B. FJARE

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. FJARE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article published in the January 26, 1956, issue of the Montana Standard, Butte, Mont., and reprinted in the February 17, 1956, issue of the Dallas Morning News, Dallas, Tex.:

We have been asked to define Montana. What is it, we are asked? What does it mean? Where did it come from? Who owns it? Where is it going? Who runs it?

Those are tough questions, when you attempt to answer them.

You might say: Montana is one of the biggest wheat piles in the world. It's one of the biggest copper piles. It's one of the biggest lumber piles. It's a million sacks of sugar.

It's potentially the biggest hydroelectric powerhouse in the world. It's a silver dollar. It's one State west of the divide and one State east of the divide. There's enough waste material left over to make a third State.

Montana is Robbers' Roost. It's the vigilantes hanging Henry Plummer. It's a million Christmas trees. It's Custer's last stand.

Montana is Lewis and Clark and Sacajawea. It's the world's largest giant spring from which flows the mighty Missouri and the turbulent Columbia.

Montana is Fort Peck Dam, the largest earth-fill dam in the world. It's a cattle ranch with the front gate 30 miles from the front porch. It's Old Faithful. It's Gunsight Peak. It's Going-to-the-Sun Highway.

Montana is Charlie Russell. It's the Richest Hill on Earth. It's Last Chance Gulch. It's a 50,000-mile trout stream.

Montana is Marcus Daly looking into the earth and seeing billions of dollars worth of copper.

Montana is Big Hole Basin with 10,000 haystacks.

Montana is a jewel-like mountain lake.

Montana is a miner, a cowboy, a lumberjack, a farmer, a dude rancher, an Indian, a cattle baron, a vigilante, a road agent, a fur trapper, a banker, an oil driller, an engineer, an artist, a soldier, a millionaire.

Montana is a pine tree.

Montana is a fat steer.

Montana is a gold mine, a silver mine, a copper mine, a zinc mine, a manganese mine, a lead mine. Montana is a ghost town. It's a Grasshopper Glacier. It's Yellowstone Park. It's Glacier Park.

Montana is a church spire. It's a school. It's a boy with a dog and a fishing rod.

Montana is a scenic wonder. It's a volcano. It's a geyser. It's Hell cooled off.

It's a cherry tree, an apple tree, a potato, a mustard seed, an alfalfa patch, a lovely flower.

Montana is all of these things and millions more.

It's home to some 600,000 people.

Some 2 millions of visitors come annually to drink in its beauty, enjoy its built-in air conditioning system, mingle with its friendly people.

These visitors spent some $90 million last year, according to Jack Hallowell, sales advertising director.

Mr. Hallowell thinks that if more people knew more about Montana the annual tourist crop would be considerably greater.

There isn't any doubt about Mr. Hallowell's being right. When you try to add up the total of what Montana is, the column is simply too long. It can't be added.

When you attempt to define Montana you have to say it's everything and then some. Who owns it? It belongs to the ages. Who runs it? It has 600,000 operators, and there is room for 600,000 more. And it's the greatest State in the Union, if anyone asks. Any more questions?

The Oregon Corrupt Practices Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, in the RECORD for Monday, April 9, there appeared in the Senate proceedings a letter published in an Oregon newspaper signed by the State chairman of the Democratic Party. The same letter was apparently submitted to many Oregon newspapers and printed in several of them. I saw the letter in the Portland (Oregon) Journal. It is a political effort but contained so many untruths that I thought it should be answered. The Oregon Journal very kindly printed nearly all of the letter I wrote in reply. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter I present the full text of my letter to the Journal which was printed in part in its The People Speak column April 3:

MARCH 28, 1956.

To the EDITOR, OREGON JOURNAL,
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR SIR: A letter to the editor which was printed in the Oregon Journal Sunday, March 18, 1956, signed by Howard Morgan, chairman of the Democratic Party of Oregon, impells me to call your attention to a paragraph of the Oregon corrupt practice law. It read as follows:

"260.370. Political criminal libel; penalty: (1) No letter, circular, poster, bill, publication or placard shall contain any false statement or charges reflecting on any candidate's character, morality, or integrity. The author and every person printing or knowingly assisting in the circulation of the matter described in this section shall be guilty of political criminal libel; (2) violation of this section is punishable, upon conviction, by imprisonment in the penitentiary for not more than 3 years."

The Morgan letter certainly contains false statements reflecting on my character and integrity, and I am a candidate.

The Morgan letter says: "Representatives NORBLAD, COON, and ELLSWORTH have spent the last 3 years parroting the private power line that the Federal Government has stopped building power dams."

No such statement has been made by any of us.

The Morgan letter says: "The record demonstrates that these men have dragged their feet on every authorization or appropriation bill for Federal dams in the Northwest."

That is totally an untruth. I introduced and secured passage by the House of the bills to authorize the Cougar and Green Peter Dams and the Talent irrigation project as Federal multiple-purpose projects, including power. I have vigorously supported all such authorization bills. I have battled consistently for appropriations for these projects for 10 years and am doing so this year. Written records easily available prove this statement.

The Morgan letter says: "They offered no help to Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER and Representative GREEN in last year's successful Democratic fight for three new starts on Federal dams in the Northwest."

That is an untruth. I appeared before the House Appropriations Committee strongly urging appropriations for those dams. The Democrat Members of Congress made similar testimony some 2 weeks later.

The Morgan letter says: "They tried to deauthorize every Federal power project so the private power companies, after endless delays, can try to get authorization for gravy-train partnership deals."

This is likewise a falsehood. There has been no attempt to deauthorize Federal projects by Oregon Republicans.

Those printed statemenis are clearly "false statements or charges reflecting" on my "character, morality, or integrity"—to use the language of the law quoted above.

It was obviously the intention of the Oregon Legislature in passing that law to protect the public against untruthful statements and to protect candidates against such character assassination as contained in the Morgan letter quoted here.

Apparently, our opposition will, in desperation, continue to make such attacks. This seems to be the New Look in Oregon politics. I hope you, and the other editors and publishers in Oregon will give most careful attention to all political material offered for publication to the end that the spirit as well as the letter of the Oregon law is not again violated.

Sincerely yours,

HARRIS ELLSWORTH.

Development Little River Basin, Ark.-Okla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, along with other Members of Congress, I was invited to speak to the annual meeting of the Red River Valley Association in Shreveport, La., Monday, April 2, 1956. It was my privilege to speak to the delegates of the Association that afternoon.

The Little River and its tributaries in Arkansas and Oklahoma are a tributary of the Red River, which traverses several States, including Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas and Louisiana. The development of the Little River Basin for flood control and water conservation is a part of the comprehensive Red River program.

There is a lot of interest in the development of this watershed and since the major part of the program would be in my district, I spoke to the association on this problem. Because of its importance and the interest of the people throughout the area, I presented a plan which I believe should be a basis to compromise the differences and get this development under way. As a matter of public information and because of its importance, I include the speech I made at that time in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY HON. OREN HARRIS BEFORE RED RIVER VALLEY ASSOCIATION ON APRIL 2, 1956

Mr. Chairman, members of the Red River Valley Association, distinguished guests of the Corps of Engineers, and friends, it is good to be back with you for this annual occasion. I consider it a signal honor and privilege to have the opportunity of this visit and to participate in this program. I appreciate the courtesy of your kind invitation.

This second session of the 84th Congress is about half over. These few days of respite gives us an opportunity to reorganize and reinforce our vigor and vitality, which we hope will be conducive to more formidable results toward the best interest of our Nation. We are hopeful that out of the maze of activity, we will experience the best possible decisions for the betterment of the American people.

I want to commend this Association for your efforts and continued progress toward the development of the Red River Basin. I know it appears some times that progress in this development is slow. It is sometimes discouraging but through the patience, understanding and determination of your officers and members, and with the drive of your able and forceful executive vice president and manager, Roy Matthias, you have achieved some very fine results.

It has been my pleasure to work with and cooperate with you and the people throughout the Red River Basin on those programs so necessary and imperative.

To be sure there are differences here and there which are only natural and to be expected in an area as big as Red River and which traverses some 4 or 5 States. The end result is the more important, however, as it always provides benefits and protection that bring advantages and economic opportunities to the people. We have worked together before the committees of the Congress in authorizing these important projects and obtaining appropriations for their development.

I have been an ardent supporter of the programs for flood control and to develop our rivers and streams, and in the conservation of our water resources throughout my years of service in the Congress of the United States. It means so very much to the protection and economic opportunities of our people and thus strength to our Nation. I have personally observed what it has meant to the localities and the areas affected by such development.

Permit me to say that we have the finest support in these justified and worthwhile projects of our Corps of Engineers. I am glad to see such a good representation of the corps here today. I want to commend them for the fine service they are performing for our country and to express my appreciation for the cooperation I always find them willing to give when at all possible.

We are deeply appreciative of the fact that we have been well received and had fine support and understanding from our congressional committees on this program for the development of the Red River Basin. The Public Works Committee and Appropriations Committee have both been quite considerate of our problem. Some of the major projects have been completed, as you know, such as, Bodcaw, Texarkana Dam and Ferrell's Bridge, which is now underway, and there are many others.

There are others to be developed. The major and most important ones necessary to the comprehensive Red River program are those in the Little River Basin, a major tributary of the Red River. The major part of this proposed development is in my district. In view of the circumstances and the importance of controlling and utilizing the waters of the Little River Basin, I feel it is appropriate for me to discuss it on this occasion.

In the first place, I want to make it very clear that I am not an engineer and do not claim any capabilities as an engineer. We maintain a Corps of Engineers for engineering data and information.

I also wish to say that I do not claim to know all the answers or to be in the position of determining myself what should or should not be done. It requires joint effort on so huge a task.

My mail has been exceedingly heavy, indicating the tremendous importance of this program. A lot of people, good people, with good intentions have contacted me about it. I am always glad to have such expressions of interest.

Also, let me say that I fully recognize the differences of opinion that prevail over the method of this proposed development. I am fully aware of the intense interest that exists and to the extent that many are apparently alarmed.

I cannot help but feel that some of the tension which exists is the result of some misunderstanding, some misinformation, and some fears of sophistry which in my opinion are not present, together with some prejudices in the minds of a few well-meaning citizens to the extent this has almost become an obsession.

I wish that I was capable of presenting the facts on which calm judgment would be exercised and just decisions made. I think I know most of the people affected and I know them well enough that they want to do what is right and best for all concerned.

I am going to undertake then to present this in a way, based on the knowledge and facts that I have, which I hope will be understood and considered accordingly. I want it perfectly understood that neither I, nor do I believe anyone else would want to do any injustice to anyone, or any area.

I have been quite familiar with this problem since its inception. I, therefore, believe I know something about the facts and the problems involved.

Let me give you something of the background of this matter for information. The Corps of Engineers reported some years ago a program for the comprehensive development of the Red River Basin below Denison necessary to protect the lives and property of the people throughout the basin and its tributaries, including the Little River in Arkansas and Oklahoma.

In 1945, we experienced the biggest and most devasting flood in recorded history of the valley. As a result, the Congress authorized a number of projects in the Flood Control Act of 1946. Millwood Dam in my area was one of those major projects. The major part of this program being in my district, imposes terrific responsibility on me as your Congressman, which I am glad to assume, I feel it my duty to do the best I can for my people.

It was authorized as a flood-control project only. There were no provisions made for conservation or water supply. In fact, there was no request for it at that time. I supported the authorization of the project, along with others then, and do not recall any serious objection being offered. This was in 1946.

In 1950, there was a budget request of $150,000 for planning funds of the project. The Appropriations Committee of the House approved the planning funds and it was included in the bill reported by the committee.

At this stage, opposition to the project as authorized began to show, and an amendment on the floor of the House was offered to strike the planning funds. It was defeated.

The bill went to the Senate and the opposition had become more forceful and came to a head before the Senate Committee. The opposition was based on a desire for the development of upstream reservoirs and a reduced facility in the vicinity of Millwood.

As a result of the controversy, the Senate Appropriations Committee provided an additional $200,000 and directed the Corps of Engineers to make a further study as to the economic feasibility and justification of developing a number of upstream projects.

Remember, this happened in 1950, and no further progress has been or can be made until the report of the engineers which was authorized at that time is filed with the Congress. The Congress has not yet had the benefit of the report from this additional study and now 6 years have elapsed.

In 1954, this question unfortunately was injected into a political campaign in my district. When you inject politics into one of these type problems, so often nobody wins and everybody loses.

I thought I saw what would be necessary if we were ever to be able to work out a solution.

I endeavored to obtain engineering data and information from our Corps of Engineers to be used as a basis for a decision which I believed to be best. Therefore, I took a definite position on the court house front at DeQueen, in Sevier County, and outlined a program that I would support, should it be economically feasible, as determined by the engineers.

I stated publicly then and unequivocally that I would support the development of

upstream dams with modification or reduction of Millwood making it a much smaller project. I had been advised by the Division Engineers Office that it might be possible and that such a program, if it could be worked out, would reduce the Millwood project by some 25 or more percent of its original authorized capacity. This was 2 years ago.

I have not changed my position since that announcement, as I have had no further information that any other plan would be more feasible, justified, or acceptable.

A year ago, the Red River Valley Association, included a request to the Appropriations Committee, $250,000 for planning of the presently authorized Millwood project. There was no budget request before us. I appeared with your group representing this association and opposed the request to the committee for planning funds at that time. I did so on the basis that the Congress had previously provided for and directed the engineers to make the survey of the upstream projects and report. I urged the committee then of both the House and the Senate to join me in requesting the engineers to get their report into the Congress.

Last September, the district engineers and the southwest division in Dallas submitted technical data and information to the Chief of Engineers' Office in Washington, with certain recommendations. This information will be on the basis of the final report. Some seem to think that the information and data filed, together with the recommendation of the field engineer is the final decision. This is not necessarily true at all.

Under established procedure, it is yet to be considered by the Board of Rivers and Harbors, composed of top officers in the Corps of Army Engineers. It is then submitted to the governors of the States affected for comment and the Federal agencies.

The Chief of Engineers will consider all of this information as he makes his decision, which will be final and which decision will be included in his report filed with the Congress.

How, as to the present status. The division engineer has announced the submission of their data and information, together with their suggestions to the Board of Rivers and Harbors in Washington. The announcement explains the recommendations of the district engineer. In addition, it invites attention that there may be further consideration given to the justification of including (1) Lukfata in Oklahoma, and (2) water supply at Millwood. It invites interested parties to present views on these two questions along with the other suggestions in the report. Comments are to be received by the Board of Rivers and Harbors by April 17.

Following this public notice, the Board has issued a notice of public hearing to be hld in Washington on April 25. All who are intersted or may be affected by the plan of improvement to be considered are invited to appear.

Now, as to the question of what should be done in the best interest of all who may be affected. I should like to give you what I honestly believe would be in the best interest and call on all parties today to consider it with reason, calm, sound judgment, and on a practical and realistic basis.

It is a compromise proposal which I submit as a basis of agreement and as a joint and united effort.

In considering this compromise proposal I wish to remind you that there are two proposed methods for the development of the Little River Basin. (1) Millwood Dam and Reservoir as authorized in 1946, which would require the taking over by the Government a huge reservoir area of 107,000 acres of land, and (2) the construction of some six upstream reservoirs with a greatly reduced Millwood in capacity and acreage requirement.

In presenting this proposal for your consideration, let me ask you to keep in mind three basic facts. These three basic facts from my information cannot be denied or refuted. They are the basis for determining the method of properly and adequately controlling the waters of the Little River Basin to better serve the interest of all the people.

The first basic fact we must keep in mind is that the waters of the Little River Basin will inevitably and ultimately have to be controlled as a part of the comprehensive flood-control program of the Red River Basin. This is recognized by most everyone familiar with this problem. It is an accepted fact.

To meet this problem and to provide adequate flood protection, water conservation and water supply I think the public would be better served by providing for the construction of upstream reservoirs to be supplemented with a reduced facility at Millwood.

Therefore, I think the upstream reservoirs should be authorized and constructed as a basic part of this program. I think all six of the proposed dams in the upstream areas should be included as a comprehensive program in the upper reaches of the Little River Valley. This would include Lukfata Dam in Oklahoma, about which there seems to be some close economic question.

I think there should be as much flood-control protection in these six upstream reservoirs as they can provide.

I think each of these upstream dams should have as much water supply as the reservoirs can provide for the use and benefit of any possible development in the areas affected. For this water supply the upstream reservoirs would have first call on the water that could be impounded in them for this use.

Many people have asked me in letters and through other contacts to support the construction of upstream dams. This is a part of my proposal which I believe should influence people in this area to accept this compromise plan and join me in getting it underway. To give assurances for the upstream dams and supply of water I would be favorable to specific provisions in the act as a safeguard, similar to the language contained in the authorization of Denison some years ago.

If the people of Oklahoma and in my area in western Arkansas affected want these benefits and heavens knows they need them, I will lend my wholehearted support to obtain them, just as I said I would 2 years ago.

The second basic fact which must be considered is that to economically justify and provide adequate flood protection it will be necessary to have modification of the presently authorized Millwood project. This is a fact confirmed in every report or statement of the engineers.

Some people have been led to believe and sincerely feel that it would be sufficient to satisfy the program by the development of these six upstream projects and thus make it unnecessary to have any facility at Millwood.

I am informed by the people who know, that is, the Corps of Engineers, that in the first place it is not possible to provide sufficient flood protection by these several smaller projects, and in the second place, unless there is a modified facility at Millwood, the Government could not justify the expenditure of the funds necessary for the construction of the upstream projects.

I am informed that in addition to the flood protection that can be provided by upstream projects, there should be a facility at Millwood sufficient to provide maximum flood protection of 1,666,000 acre feet. This would be a reduction in capacity of that facility by a little more than 25 percent from the original proposal.

With the construction of such a facility to provide this minimum requirement, some are fearful that it would adversely affect present highways, railroads, and some existing industry. I want to here and now allay any such fears.

Highway 71 would remain where it is. It would be raised slightly in varying amounts for a distance of 5.5 miles, I am advised.

The G. N. & A. Railroad from Nashville to Ashdown would not be relocated. It would be raised by varying amounts for a distance of about 14 miles. The service it provides would not be impaired or affected, in any way.

Neither would the Missouri Pacific Railroad or the Kansas City Southern Railroad be affected at all.

The town of Okay would not be affected because it is located above the reservoir area.

The Okay Cement Plant would not be endangered or affected. It would be adequately protected by a levee more than 8,000 feet long.

The town of Mineral Springs and the town of Horatio would not be adversely affected or ever be threatened in any way with floodwaters.

Another, thing, some of our Oklahoma friends are fearful that some of their lands will be submerged by a Millwood facility. With a modified Millwood, not 1 foot of land in Oklahoma would be flooded with even a maximum flood.

This is not my word as a layman, but it is assurances from the Engineers who know what the facts are.

Therefore, if anyone has any such fears on these questions let them pass from your minds.

Now, then, another important question is, how much area would be affected?

Under the original proposal which was authorized in 1946, 107,000 acres of land would have been subject to floods. That amount of property would for all practical purposes have been useless except for flood protection.

Therefore, the third basic fact is that with a modified Millwood complementing the upstream dams, the 5 year flood line would include an area of approximately 63,500 acres of land. This acreage would be required whether the project would be an open, so-called dry dam, or a closed, so-called wet reservoir.

This land would become useless for all practical purposes other than flood control. A small percentage of it could perhaps be usable for pasture purposes. This is a reduction of some 40 percent of the acreage involved as originally contemplated in the authorized project.

Nevertheless, this sixty-odd thousand acres of land would be necessary to the project as a necessary part of the overall program, regardless of whether it would be an open or closed dam.

Should, in addition, a water supply be included in Millwood for utilization in the area, it would require an additional estimated 7,300 acres of land, or less, depending upon the amount of water supply.

Therefore, whether there would be an available supply of water for municipal, industrial, and other purposes, or it would be a dry dam used only for flood protection involving only some 7,000 acres of land.

I think these are facts that ought to be understood by everyone in the consideration of this question.

Another fact, which is apparently misunderstood, if my mail is any indication, is that of the acreage which would be affected by the project, either wet or dry, only about 10 percent are cultivatable lands. A few acres, about 1,000 in fact, of this cultivatable land affected are located in Howard County.

Only 2,000 acres or less in Sevier County and some 3,000 in Little River County. The rest of it is wooded lands, with a goodly portion of timber already cut out.

I repeat that this will be the effect, whether the project would be open or closed.

Another question which has been so highly exaggerated and misunderstood to my mail, is the effect it would have on continuous timber harvesting operations. Some have been led to believe, and honestly feel, that there are enormous amounts of timberlands involved with the issue.

As it is in the case of the acreage, it would only amount to some 7,300 acres, or less, dependent on the amount of water supply. No one could seriously contend that this relatively small acreage could have any great effect on any large timber operation.

I am assured by the engineers that there is plenty of water for all the storage supply that can be provided by the upstream dams and an amount in Millwood depending on the acreage of storage supply available. Therefore, even if water supply were to be included in the Millwood Reservoir, it would not deprive the upstream projects of 1 gallon of water.

Thus, the entire issue hinges on a difference of only 5,000 to 10,000 acres of land involved, dependent upon the amount of water supply and most of this would be cut over timbered lands.

This to me, when all the facts are recognized, should not be of sufficient consequence to cause such grave concern or a proper and just settlement to fail.

Therefore, it is my intention to go before the Board of Rivers and Harbors, on the 25th of April, in support of a program based on these facts for the construction of all 6 upstream reservoirs for such flood protection and water supply as they will provide; as necessary to complement them, I will support and recommend a modified Millwood Dam with flood protection of 1,500,000 acre-feet capacity.

This is 166,000 acre-feet less than suggested by the District Engineer, which would be converted to and to provide for a water supply for municipal, agricultural and industrial purposes in the area.

If this were to be accepted, no additional acres of land would be involved by the water supply storage. The same number of acres of land would be required with this proposal as if it were to be a dry or open dam suggested in the data and information of the Division Engineer.

In my opinion, this would not materally affect, if at all, flood protection. In fact, it would provide over 600,000 acre-feet more of flood capacity than the original Millwood proposal would have provided.

If this recommendation is unacceptable to the engineers, as an alternate plan, I will suggest that the additional acres necessary of some 5,000 to 10,000 acres be included to provide such water supply depending upon the amount engineeringly feasible.

If, as has been established, this would not affect the highway, the railroads, the cement company, or these communities adversely, and would not deprive any of the upstream reservoirs of any part of their water supply, and thus not interfere with any opportunity for the development of industry, and would not involve but a few additional acres of land, if any, that would in no way impair or affect timber or mill operations, there could be no legitimate objection to this approach to the problem.

Again, I call on all of those throughout the area affected, to seriously consider this approach as a practical and realistic method of determining this question.

If we could have unity and united effort, we could get this to the Congress and authorize this year. If not, it will be most difficult and perhaps impossible to get it in this year's omnibus authorization.

If this or some similar approach is not accepted the alternative will be tragic to our area. We may very well be faced with a problem which would be beyond our reach.

As I have already said, Millwood Dam is presently authorized for flood control protection only. If we fail to reach some acceptable compromise there will inevitably be a budget request for this presently authorized project.

The Engineers, the Government and the Congress, no doubt would conclude that since we have not reached an agreement the presently authorized project at Millwood should be constructed. Certainly the Red River Valley Association will be urging it. Should a budget be submitted to the Congress to initiate its construction it would very likely be accepted regardless of our efforts. This is so, because as I have said, as a basic fact, the waters of the Little River Basin will inevitably be controlled.

Should this happen we would never be able to get any of the upstream reservors. We would in fact be barred forever of making them economically feasible.

Should this happen there would be no water supply in the Millwood Reservoir. The people throughout all of the area would be forever barred of any water supply so badly needed and necessary if we are to have any future development.

Therefore, you can see why I plead for some acceptable compromise in order that we will not lose the greatest economic opportunity ever afforded for the future of this area.

The only objection in my opinion that could be seriously entertained against this solution would be on the question of pollution. I cannot conceive of anyone advocating that this river be used as a sewer disposal. If so, they might as well change their thinking.

This river has been one of the finest streams for recreation in the country. The people are not going to permit it to be so destroyed. Our State and the Constrvation Department of Arkansas, in my opinion, would never permit.

In fact, industry throughout the country is fast coming to a full realization that polluting the streams must come to a halt and other methods of disposal adopted. There is urgency now for legislation to prevent pollution, both in the States and in the National Congress. This is a policy the country might as well in my judgment get ready for. I hope it will so be understood at the outset in this particular instance.

I earnestly solicit serious consideration of the members of the Red River Valley Association and of all those who may be affected throughout the area of this position which I take, and these recommendations; which I believe would do justice to all concerned.

There is no area anywhere in greater need of economic opportunities and development than the area affected by this watershed in Oklahoma and Arkansas. There has never been a water project developed anywhere that did not bring opportunities for economic development to it. I want to see some of these advantages brought to our part of the country, and I am thoroughly convinced that if the people throughout the area would join together with me in this development, it would enhance our economy many fold. It is our chance, let us take advantage of it.

The Greatest Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Tablet of April 7, 1956:

THE GREATEST CHALLENGE

(By Julius Epstein)

Nikita S. Khrushchev's desanctification of Stalin offers the free world its greatest break since 1917.

If the American Government does not avail itself of the tremendous possibilities which range from the propaganda field to the possibility to roll back the Iron Curtain, America will rightly have lost its claim as the leader of the free world.

Unfortunately, we have already lost most valuable time without having reacted in any to the earthquake in the east.

FREE WORLD WAS SILENT

Neither did the President care to make a statement to the American people and the whole free world, nor did any Member of the House or the Senate, not even Senator KNOWLAND, advance any suggestion.

Nor was a session of the National Security Council called to discuss the enormous opportunities, thrown into our lap by Khrushchev's and Mikoyan's speeches.

Our Secretary of State toured east Asia and our Ambassador to the U. S. S. R. chose to leave Moscow for a vacation resort in Western Europe.

This is the situation in a historical moment which calls more than any other moment in the history of American-Soviet relations since 1933 for the greatest vision, both initiative and swift action on various fronts of the cold and semihot war.

What are possibilities, offered American foreign policy by Khrushchev's and Mikoyan's exposure of Stalin?

SUGGESTS DIRECT APPROACH

The most important and the most promising possibility is the immediate and direct approach by the President to Nikita S. Khrushchev. The President and none else should most certainly address Mr. Khrushchev along the following lines:

"The whole free world, and particluarly the American people, are welcoming your destruction of the Stalin myth, the most mendacious myth ever forced upon a great people in modern times.

"While the free world has always known that Stalin—with the possible exception of Hitler—was the greatest murderer and megalomaniacal tryant modern history has seen, it welcomes and admires your courage with which you dared, even at the risk of a tremendous shock to the Soviet peoples, to destroy the legendary mask of the monster and to tell a part of the truth.

"But this, Mr. Khrushchev, is the moment to tell not only a part of the truth but the whole truth, nothing but the truth. Won't you do it?

"The whole truth is, of course, that Stalin, the insane tyrant, the curse of mankind, did not only commit the terrible crimes you revealed to your comrades, as the slaughter of the 5,000 officers which almost led to the de-

feat of Hitler and the unspeakable mass murder of millions of peasants during the man-made famines of the 1920's and 1930's, but that he had to act by nature with the same criminal insanity in the foreign field.

"You'll certainly not assert that Stalin while criminally insane in his domestic actions, conducted a wise and correct foreign policy.

"Stalin, as you know, violated by force almost every international treaty ever signed by the Soviet Government. (Von Ribbentrop, Hitler's foreign minister, was hanged for much less treaty violations than Stalin committed in his lifetime.) In violation of the most solemnly signed and ratified nonaggression and frienship pacts, Stalin waged war against or blackmailed his way into Finland, Poland, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, and East Germany.

QUOTES LENIN

"While nothing you can do, Mr. Khrushchev, will bring back to life the untold millions of victims of Stalin's great crimes within and without the Soviet Union, there is the moral duty, directly following your destruction of the Stalin myth, to undo Stalin's crime in the field of foreign policy and to go back to Lenin's principles, as embodied in his classical 'Declaration of Peace,' issued by the Soviet Government after it was unanimously passed by the All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Workers, Soldiers and Peasants, Deputies on November 8, 1917.

"The declaration is signed by Lenin, the head of the Soviet Government in which I. V. Dzhugashvili (Stalin) held the post of a chairman of nationalities. This declaration reads, in part, as follows:

" 'The just and democratic peace for which the great majority of war-exhausted, tormented toilers and laboring classes of all belligerent countries are thirsting; the peace for which the Russian workers and peasants are so insistently and loudly clamoring since the overthrow of the Czarist regime is, in the opinion of the government, an immediate peace without annexation (i. e., without the seizure of foreign lands and the forcible taking over of other nationalities) and without indemnity.

" 'The government interprets the term annexation or seizure of foreign lands, in the light in which it is understood by the democracy in general, and the working classes in particular, that is to say, every annexation by a large and strong state of a small and weak nationality, without a clear and voluntary expression of agreement to that act by the said nationality; regardless of the time when such forcible annexation took place; regardless of the cultural development or backwardness of the nation forcibly annexed or forcibly detained within the frontiers of a certain state; regardless, finally, of the fact whether said nation is in Europe or far away across the ocean.

" 'If any nation whatsoever is detained by force within the boundaries of another state; if it is detained against its will—whether expressed in the press, national assemblies, party decisions, or restlessness and uprising against national oppression—and is not able to vote freely, owing to the presence of troops of the annexing or stronger nation, and to determine, without the least pressure, its form of state life; then such an acquisition is annexation, that is to say, seizure by force.'

URGES FREE ELECTIONS

"If you really want to undo Stalin's betrayal of Lenin's principles, as you surely must if the world is to believe in the sincerity of your exposure of Stalin as the century's greatest megalomaniac tyrant who even overshadows by far the sinister monsters of the mad Caligula, Nero, and Vespasian, you simply have to give the oppressed satellite peoples of Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Poland, Albania, and East Germany the sacred chance Stalin took away from them: To freely elect their own governments.

"Only then will the world believe in the sincerity of your promised policy to do away with the one-man dictatorship forced upon the Soviet peoples as well as upon the satellite countries."

This certainly has to be the grand theme of the American approach to Khrushchev from now on. It has to be the grand theme of the whole free world, to be hammered out day and night, not for 1 month or 2, but if necessary for 1 or 2 years.

At the same time, the President should ask Mr. Khrushchev to tell the world the whole truth about the fabricated confessions of the Moscow trials of the thirties.

The President should invite Khrushchev to admit Stalin's and Beria's guilt in the massacre of 15,000 Polish officers during the war, of whom more than 4,000 were found in the mass graves of Katyn, a guilt established beyond the shadow of any doubt by the great investigation undertaken by a select committee of the House of Representatives.

WOULD RELEASE TESTAMENT

The President should invite Khrushchev to release to the Soviet press the whole text of Lenin's testament, in which Lenin warned his comrades against any further employment of Stalin.

The President should further invite Khrushchev to expose Stalin's instigation of the Korean war and the not-so-secret Soviet participation in it. Mr. Eisenhower should insist that the Soviet Government and the Soviet Communist Party use their tremendous influence upon Mao Tze-tung, Chou En-lai, and the North Korean Communists to allow free elections under United Nations auspices in North and South Korea.

Only such a program would electrify the masses before and behind the Iron Curtain, the Soviet peoples as well as the satellites. After Khrushchev has told them in effect that the West has always been right about Stalin, they would be extremely susceptible to the envisioned approach.

It would snowball into millions of voices all over the globe, the voices of the tormented millions as well as of the free ones. Ultimately, it could not fail to succeed.

But the President has to act now, not tomorrow.

Members of Congress and Members of Parliament Compared

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following comparison of Members of Congress with members of Parliament recently was written by editorial columnist Lawrence A. Collins, of the Long Beach Independent. It was interesting to me, and I think will be interesting to our colleagues:

BRITISH POLITICIANS

The members of Parliament in Britain when compared with our Congressmen appear to have about equal responsibilities. But the compensation and expenses of the two are vastly different. In a busy year the member of the House of Commons may get as much as $3,500 for his service. By comparison our Congressmen get $22,500 a year. But that is only a part of the difference in cost.

The member of Parliament in Britain is not furnished an office or secretaries as our Congressmen are. Neither do they get the franking privilege whereby our Congressmen can send out hundreds of thousands of letters without cost to himself. Neither is the British member of Parliament allowed to collect campaign expenses as is our custom here. This difference is stressed in the Senate investigation now in progress.

When the two systems of cost are compared we seem to be fabulously out of line. But there is a great difference in the responsibilities of the British members of Parliament and our Congressmen. In Britain some 600 members of Parliament represent about 50 million people. In our House of Representatives 435 Congressmen represent 166 million people. That means our Congressmen represent almost five times as many people as the average member of Parliament does.

It is in this respect that the elaborate office staffing and facilities are necessary here. It must also be considered that the British member of Parliament is rarely more than a few hours from his home district by train or automobile. Here our Congressmen on the average are far away from home. They represent much wider distribution of interests than is found in Britain.

On the average it is probable it costs each of our Congressmen $25,000 to run his campaign each year. In Britain it is unlawful for a member of Parliament to spend over $3,000. We have limits on congressional campaign expenditures here, but they are rarely enforced. But in Britain they are strictly enforced.

By these comparisons it would seem we are far out of line. But it should be considered that the average cost of living in Britain is about half what it is here. When the cost of living in Washington 6 months out of the year is considered, it is doubtful that our Congressmen are much better off than the British members of Parliament. When the cost per constituent of the member of Parliament and our Congressman is figured, and the cost of living considered, there is not the difference the dollar compensation implies. But there is no evidence that we get better men and women to represent us under our high costs than the British have on their austerity system.

Americans Will Not For Long Remain Immoral and Economically Ridiculous Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the House what I said in a speech before the Freedom Club in Los Angeles, Calif., on March 22, 1956, so am repeating for the RECORD what I said then:

AMERICANS WILL NOT FOR LONG REMAIN IMMORAL AND ECONOMICALLY RIDICULOUS TOO

Why do we continue to tolerate the pretense that politicians in Washington have any right or power to take our private incomes and manage them better than we can for ourselves? Slavery for a long time was tolerated because it was claimed by Government to be best for the slaves. In the

same way, and for the same reason, our Government now manages our corn, wheat, cotton, rice, butter, cheese, dry milk, tobacco, peanuts, etc., or one-third of our agriculture. It is a mess. Government housing at half rent, tax exempt, is an outrage on the taxpayers and just as bad on the Government tenants. Government socialized power, like TVA, and irrigation projects at taxpayers' expense everywhere are blights on the people who take the money. Our foreign aid, now up to $60 billion, or $1,500 per American family on the average, does not satisfy the socialist governments to whom it is paid. They want it doubled. The political party or parties out of power over there scold us for financing the parties in power and keeping them in office with the help of our money. Imagine how mad all Americans would be if Great Britain had spent $3 billion or $4 billion to help Harry Truman stay in power and keep the Republicans out. They've got too much sense to try it.

So, Government robbing of Peter to pay Paul weakens Peter and demoralizes Paul. It has bought us no friends.

The very idea that our Government should pretend to exercise such powers was utterly repugnant to us for 140 years. It was thought impossible because we had a contract with our Government specifically prohibiting all this. We so feared the inevitable evil tendencies of Government that we drastically limited its functions to its only legitimate sphere, namely, the protection of life and property, keeping law and order. Then to make doubly sure, we had the politicians chained to these proper and limited functions. We specified in 1789 what Congress could tax and spend. We limited the functions and taxing and spending power of our cities and counties and States, too. Fortunately, we have kept and enforced those limitations, and as a result we have not gone Socialist, with few exceptions, in our cities, counties, and States. Our socialism, viz: converting private property into public or Government-owned and operated property, is confined almost entirely to Washington. We breed our Socialists and Communists there.

After 25 years of their infiltration of one of the old parties in power, Congress is unable to repeal and wipe off the books the socialism we've already got. If we are unable somehow to wipe it off the books completely we must go on. For we must be all socialized or all free. There can be no coexistence—half Socialist, half free. We can't even be one-quarter or one-tenth Socialist and remain static at that point. For obviously if we socialize corn every living thing that consumes corn must ultimately be socialized. Farmers can't buy Government-owned and controlled corn and sell beef, pork, milk, and eggs in a free market. The farmers can't get enough for their products on a free market to buy Government-owned corn boosted far above the free market level. So, Government must give each buyer a subsidy so he can buy subsidized Government corn.

The burden of taxes on 40 million families is $10 billion, or an average of $250 per year on every family to pay the costs of the socialization already mentioned. Still more groups are asking to be brought under new areas of socialization. Indeed, every socialized area makes the socialization of all areas related to it inevitable. For example, you hear the people cry out under our present burden, saying, "After we pay our taxes we haven't enough left to pay for the care of our sick, our aged, the education of our children, etc."

So, Mr. KELLEY, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, introduces the Kelley bill providing for Federal aid and control of education on a vast scale. It has already passed the House Committee on Education by a vote of 21 to 9. It will likely come before the whole House for action at this session.

It proposes to take by force from the taxpayers $400 million a year for each of the next 4 fiscal years, a total of $1,600 million, and redistribute that largesse to some of the States at the expense of others for classroom construction. It's all done without taxpayers' consent. They are not permitted to vote on the question. Six industrial States in the North and West, viz: New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, and California will be compelled to put up 57.6 percent of the total tax moneys and get back but 35.7 percent of the benefits as grants for classroom construction in those States.

You may ask how can this redistribution of wealth go on and on as it has been going for so many years. Why do they take it without a fight? The answer is that it is done by the cleverest kind of government deception and organized votes of pressure groups. The individual, unorganized voter is made to feel helpless. In order to arouse the people to write their Congressmen they are told by the government propaganda machine for example that we have a dreadful shortage of classrooms and teachers. The people are made to feel inadequate for their responsibilities; unable to meet the cost. The Federal Government must. Washington is held out as the source of money and mercy and concern for the people. Washington admits that people used to manage themselves but asserts they can't anymore.

It should be obvious that no central government can know what the total needs for classrooms are in 57,000 separate school districts. Only each local school district can know what its needs are. If it pays for them itself all the needs will be at one figure. If some far-off giveaway Federal aid for free government is to pay for them, the needs will be at least doubled. The United States Office of Education survey of such needs got just such a result. It asked the superintendents of schools, "What are your new classroom needs, assuming, of course, that the Federal Government may pay for them or a part of them?" The answers showing the needs that came back to Washington were fantastic. The report of the Federal Government showed that there was not a single State in the Union on present tax structures that could pay for all the classrooms the professionals said were needed. Bear in mind, not a single school board or taxpayers' group or parents' group or citizens' group who are going to pay for the school buildings somehow, sometime, was consulted. The professionals scrapped a large part of our present school buildings as unfit. You should have seen the needs for new gymnasiums, auditoriums, cafeterias, and extracurricular facilities that showed up.

It was on just such shoddy, strictly professional, one-sided Government reporting that the President was asked to announce to the country that it needed 307,000 classrooms. Hardly a week went by before the Office of Education had to scale down the number by nearly half. While the Government was wrangling, the school districts were themselves building their own schools.

Now, my friends, I am not a pure anarchist. We have a legitimate area for Government functions. All others are illegitimate. Those illegitimate functions I hate as much as anyone.

There is just one legitimate area, and only one, where the central Government is honorable, and indeed admirable, and, on the whole, honest. That area has to do with the defense of the people's rights and property, the maintenance of law and order, and the sacrifice having to do with national defense.

These are not legitimate functions of Government merely because the Constitution or the contract with Government says so. They are proper functions because the moral and natural law made them so, long before the Constitution. They are in the nature of things. The individual has the same rights and powers with the same limitations imposed on him by the moral and natural law. He can use force to defend himself and his property. And that's the only time he can use force on another person without his consent. He can transfer that right and power to Government as his agent. And since all rights and powers come from the Creator to the individual, he can convey no different or higher right or power to Government than he himself possesses.

Even if people should vote by a majority to give more power to Government than they themselves possess as individuals, the transfer would be no good. When Satan offered to Jesus, in the hour of His greatest temptation, the powers and privileges of the kingdoms of the world, Jesus rejected them utterly. Satan had no such power as he pretended to have to transfer to Jesus. He had simply assumed to have an immoral and illegal power over the people which he had no right to convey.

When the Government goes beyond that restricted area which is the only natural and moral area possible for Government to occupy, then without exception it becomes dishonorable, full of misrepresentation and corruption. It exploits the people to do special favors for special groups in return for their votes. It pretends to be able to manage people and their property better than they can manage for themselves. It attempts to play God in the lives of the people.

But it is beginning to dawn upon us that using the force of Government to take other people's property to do good according to Government's notion of what is good is all dead wrong. The fact that the whole world is morally wrong by taking people's private property and making it Government-owned emphasizes the extent of the world collapse of morals. And, of course, what is morally wrong is contrary to the laws of God. The world violates them with contempt. When Government violates the laws of God by doing what no individual can morally do, then it is just as guilty of wrong as the individual would be guilty. What we have been doing has always been economically wrong. It is now both economically and morally wrong.

For example, a lot of our old neighbors, some of our children, fell in love with the mountains and deserts of the great West. They knew before they went West that there was no water in these deserts. They went anyway. They never dreamed of tapping every eastern family $25 for every billion dollars needed for water. Yet when they organized themselves into political groups they said to their Congressmen, "You go back there and take $25 on the average from every family in the East, or we will not reelect you to Congress." So, the Congressmen have done very well. They have already collected about $150 from each family, or about $6 billion altogether.

As another example of the immoral and ridiculous, take a look at TVA in Tennessee. That was our first planting of a socialist rose in a patch of weeds, otherwise called the free economy. All competition was killed off for its benefit. The rose has had to be artificially fed ever since 1922. And the feeding has cost us in recent years $190 million per year, a total of over $2 billion. That is another $50 per family Government has outrageously presumed to have the power to take from us. It sells power below cost so that 110,000 families heat their houses with electrcity at your expense. TVA never can earn a surplus at such rates to build new facilities for a growing population. And Government can never raise the rates and keep the votes of the people. There will always be a shortage of power so long as TVA has to depend on Congress for its life. Industry won't move into Tennessee because they can't depend on Congress to continue to carry such a weakling. Congress can't depend on itself either

in that regard. TVA doesn't pay a dime toward the national defense—it's exempt from all taxes. It has been a blight on the State of Tennessee that it has constantly fallen behind all the other 11 southeastern private power-producing States in agricultural products, in manufacturing, in retail sales, in growth of new business, in postal receipts. All this is in accordance to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States survey in 1953.

On all of our socialist project above described, the Government spends $10 billion annually, and loses most of it. That's $250 annually per family. And it's growing much worse. There is no restraint or reversal of the trend in sight.

What is the remedy for all this? Clearly the President can't stop it. When he runs for reelection this fall, he will be met by a committee at nearly every State line asking, one after the other, "How much, Mr. President, will you take from others to give to us for more power this year?" The President must say, "Well, boys, you've been getting along with about $190 million a year for a good many years. I guess we can't drop below that on this election year."

Then come the corn boys. And at the next State line the wheat boys. And the water boys; the irrigation boys.

On his way home the big city boys say, "How much, Mr. President, will you take from those awful corn boys to give us Government houses, tax exempt, at half rent? How much for Federal aid to education? How much for health and hospitalization? And how much, Mr. President, for our cousins and our uncles and our aunts abroad?" So, 1956 will turn out to be not an election year for a great statesman but the 25th anniversary of the great auction of the people's rights and their property in return for votes. The continued transformation by force of more and more private property into public ownership for the benefit of special groups and their political corruption.

Congress certainly can't stop it. Congress has tried and failed.

One day the corn boys, the stalwarts from Illinois, appeared in the House and said, "Our consciences hurt. We've got to reduce taxes. We don't dare go back home for election until we throw some group out of the public feed trough. Where shall we start. Which one shall we choose for confession of a sin and the sacrifice?" Which group of voters would you throw out if you were running for Congress on election year? It would have been a beautiful and encouraging thing if the corn boys from Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, and Nebraska had marched down to the Well of the House and sacrificed corn. But it never dawned upon them to do so. They have been feeding on billions of dollars for 17 or 18 years, so that by now they feel they have a vested right to continue to feed on the public. Their commodity is basic. If they should quit taking subsidies from the people that might cause such a shock as to seriously affect the whole economy. No, sir; we can't have that. You know we have $8 billion worth of surplus corn, wheat, and other commodities in cribs and bins, molding and wasting away. That's $200 per family the Government takes of your income to buy the votes of the corn boys. They constitute the very seedbed of conservatism—they don't want stealing in any case unless it would be corn.

So, corn decided to pick on peanuts for the secrifice. Peanuts were such a very natural selection. Few losses of Republican votes were involved. The Illinois boys led off with two days of debate. "Why," they said, "this country could get along if we never grew another peanut. They are sort of indigestible anyway."

By this time the Members from Virginia, the Carolinas, Georgia, and Texas were so furious and their wit so sharp, that they made the corn boys ashamed and they frightened all the other little groups feeding at the public trough. When the vote was taken it was 238 to 170 to keep peanuts in the trough with all the rest and forget the whole business of restoring the free economy and constitutional government.

Apples and other commodities were greatly encouraged. They said, "Why, we're basic commodities. An apple a day keeps the doctor away. We must have our subsidies too." And so it goes on and on.

We are now in somewhat the same position of our ancestors just prior to 1789. We, the people, must, as they did then, reassert and redefine, so that even the Supreme Court can't misinterpret, the constitutional limitations on the functions of government and the taxing and spending powers of Congress. We must first of all correct the dreadful mistake made in 1913, called the 16th amendment, which gave unlimited power to Congress to tax and spend. We much chain the politicians, as Jefferson said, to the limitations of the Constitution so they can't break away from them.

California would be a good State to lead off now as Virginia and Massachusetts were in the beginning. Many groups are forming, like the Campaign for the 48 States, the American Coalition of Patriot Societies, For America, We the People, to support the Reed-Dirksen amendment to the Constitution. It limits Congress to a top income tax, both corporate and individual, of 25 percent. The tax would start at nothing and go no higher than 25 percent, except in case of war or national emergency. Federal estate and gift taxes would be abolished. Estates should be a special source of taxes for State and local governments, instead of being liquidated by the Federal Government bureaucrats who have a theory that they should be liquidated anyway.

This amendment would reduce the spending powers of Congress by about $10 billion, almost exactly what our present socialism costs. It would dry up on our books our socialism which we can't or won't repeal. It would starve out our Socialists and Communists who must continue to breed faster than we can investigate them unless we quit completely operating our own socialism on which they feed.

The proposed 23d amendment would wipe off our books at once 7 or 8 illegitimate Government enterprises. They cover everything from housing, electric-power projects, irrigation, crop subsidies, down to coffee roasting, representing $50 billion, or $1,250 taken from the people per family here tonight. This amendment is a California product, proposed 11 years ago by the American Progress Foundation, 6413 Franklin Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif. It is now being actively advocated before the State legislatures. Illinois has passed it, others will do so soon, we hope. It's a perfectly splendid idea. So good that I was especially proud to propose it to the House of Representatives. When it is passed, as I am sure it or something very like it will pass, I shall be especially proud that it will be known as the Gwinn amendment. It provides: "The Government of the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial, financial, or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution."

There should be adopted the Byrd-Bridges amendment. It will force Congress to stay in session each year until they have balanced the budget. Congress must not spend any more than they are willing to tax the people to pay currently, except, of course, in case of war. That will stop increasing the debt and operating on borrowed money for current expenses.

The Reed-Walters amendment clarifies the Constitution and makes it possible for the States to amend the Constitution by initiating amendments themselves. The Constitution intended that they should have that power to amend.

These amendments should be presented to the State legislatures for action. When 32 of the States send identical resolutions to amend to Congress, Congress must resubmit them to the States. When ratified by 36 of the States, the amendments forthwith become a part of the Constitution.

Thus we can limit the Federal Government's power to tax and spend, just as our local political subdivisions are limited.

If we should elect a Socialist President, as we may, he could do no special damage in carrying off our property and violating our rights without limitations.

We should thus be able to look forward possibly to another 150 years of freedom.

The States reserved to themselves the power to amend the Constitution. They defined the powers of the Federal Government in 1789 just as they may redefine and clarify them now. We should by such amendments release again the inventive, productive, creative, even the atomic, energy which lies in the individual mind and heart alone. Government is never creative, or productive except as it protects the creative and productive powers of free men. It can only use force on mankind. We should, by these constitutional measures, take off our backs the unbearable burdens of our incredible Government that has broken out of bounds. It has illegally and immorally seized power over us. We have unwittingly permitted it to grow upon us.

We should make of ourselves a true example of freedom again in the world. It does not exist today. Thus we might hope to repeat the contribution which we made in the past against the police states of the world. Thus we could hope to reestablish peace at home and in the world.

Analysis of Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the agriculture bill of 1956 represents the combined judgment of 10 topmen on the Senate and House Agriculture Committees. They worked many days and nights diligently and carefully in order to produce a bill that would be acceptable to the administration. It is very difficult to write an agriculture bill that will fit all parts of our agriculture economy in the 48 States. There were conflicting ideas that had to be compromised.

I believe the bill the conferees brought to the House was brought by men who lifted themselves above prejudices and partisan politics. They tried to write a bill that would serve agriculture, but they naturally did not please all sections of agriculture. Indeed, the three great farm organizations do not see eye to eye on the question of accepting or rejecting the bill. I have listened carefully to the debate; I have read the bill, and I am of the opinion that there is more good in the bill than there is bad. There are some things that I would have liked to have taken out of the bill—there are

some things that I would have kept in the bill. It seems to be the best measure we can get.

I voted against recommitting the farm bill because the only provisions that would increase the farm income for 1956 would have been stricken from the bill had it been recommitted.

The President, in his message to Conress on January 9, 1956, set up a 9-point program and urged prompt action in order to increase the farmer's income this year. The soil bank would have placed about $1.2 billion in the pocket of the farmer. It is too late for the soil bank to take effect in 1956. It seemed to me that the only way to carry out the President's wishes to raise the income of the farmer this year would be by keeping parity prices up for 1 more year. Without this provision there would have been a reduction in the parity prices as well as in the acreage. You cannot help the farmer by taking land out of production, and at the same time reducing the prices he receives.

I feel there is more good in the bill than bad. The soil bank, which will go into effect next year, is designed to pay the farmer for taking land out of production. The present bill contains a domestic parity plan for wheat. This must be voted on in 1957 and carry, by two-thirds vote of the wheat farmers, in order to become effective. The bill carries a dual, modern price system for 1 year. This is designed to raise farm income until the soil bank can become effective. It contains a provision for $500 million to process surplus crops and get them into channels of relief both in this country and in foreign countries. It contains a provision for a commission to sutdy the proposition of converting surplus crops into industrial alcohol. It contains a provision to prohibit production of supported commodities on Government-owned land.

I am convinced that the buying power of the farmer is essential to the men and women in labor, industry, and business in all communities. Farmers find themselves in a price-squeeze situation which in many towns has severely affected all business.

Farm income was estimated in 1955 to be about $10.8 billion. That is down 9 percent from 1954. In 1954 farm income was less than it was in 1953. The 1953 income was less than in 1952. The President said in his January 9 message, "Farm prices and incomes are depressing; unless corrected, these economic reverses are a direct threat to all of our people." I believe this bill as enacted, with the dual modern parity system, will bring income to the farmer this year. Dual parity and 90-percent parity will be the only means for a year to assure the farmer additional income. This is the only way you can carry out the President's desire to raise the income of the farmer, because the soil bank, which would have cost $1.2 billion, cannot become effective this year. The 90-percent parity will cost less than the soil bank.

If the farmer approves the domestic parity plan for wheat by his vote in 1957, it will not cost the Government one thin dime. I think it is a good provision. There are some consumers who claim it will increase the cost of bread and flour, but the evidence shows that from 1948 to 1955 wheat prices declined 31 percent, while the price of bread went up 28 percent.

Under the present farm bill, wool and sugar are supported at about 100 percent parity; cotton, tobacco, and peanuts at about 90 percent parity. The only crops not being supported at near 90 percent parity would be corn and wheat.

When the soil-bank provisions become effective, there ought to be a revaluation and a restudy of the parity situation.

I repeat, you cannot help the farmer by taking land out of production or by reducing the parity price he receives. I trust the President will consider this when he decides the question of signing or vetoing the bill. I trust his advisers will point out that the soil bank cannot become effective this year, and that if he really wishes to keep the income of the farmer in balance, then the dual-parity and the 90-percent-parity provisions in the bill will be in existence this year. They are only for 1 year's duration.

There are some provisions in the bill that I do not particularly like; but when you consider that 10 earnest, sincere men worked many days on the compromise, you must conclude that there is more good in the bill than harm. It cannot please everyone. Each Member of Congress has a duty to perform to his district, State, and Nation. I have followed the dictates of my conscience. I hope the advisers to the President will weigh carefully the pros and cons of the bill, particularly in the light of the President's message of January 9 this year.

Our Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an address by Mr. George E. Stringfellow before the Scottish Rite reunion banquet at Duluth, Minn., on March 29 on the important subject of our Government. The comments by this outstanding American should be considered by every Member of this body. Mr. Stringfellow has spent many hours traveling about the United States discussing this important matter of our Government and its place in the family of nations. The address follows:

OUR GOVERNMENT

(By George E. Stringfellow)

I am complimented by your cordial invitation to speak to this fine assembly on the subject of Our Government. May I at the outset pay my respects to Illustrious Sir Clesson H. Wiles, distinguished potentate of Aad Temple, A. A. O. N. M. S., and his gracious and effective divan who honor us with their presence.

Brother Berg, I would have you and your associates know that this is one of the most inspiring banquets and reunions I have ever witnessed. It is, I am sure, a tribute to your organizing and executive ability and that of those who worked so closely with you in making this reunion banquet eminently successful. The entertainment has been of the highest caliber, therefore synchronized with this unusual and uplifting occasion.

Since the adoption of our Constitution 169 years ago, the important countries of Europe, such as France, Italy, Germany, and Russia have radically changed their form of government by violent revolution. Great Britain, the most powerful of them all, has during that period lost most of Ireland and all of India. Her great continental-sized colonies, such as Canada and Australia, while still sentimentally allied, have become independent of the mother country.

Despite civil strife in our country during the sixties, the United States has not changed its form of government since its inception in 1787. We have acquired a great domain west of the Mississippi, another bordering on the Rio Grande, and a third to our northwest. Let us, in all humility, ask why our form of government remained intact.

Are we of better human stock than our European cousins? Is not our stock their stock? Have we had better leaders, or wiser statesmen? Few of our leaders have attained the international stature of Gladstone, Bismarck, and Churchill—yet we have had the same kind of human material to draw from. Most foreign observers think we have not been successful in attracting our best specimens for the work of government. Most of our American geniuses have chosen other fields, in which America is preeminent.

We must find some other cause for the stability of our Government, and I'm afraid it is one for which we living Americans cannot claim credit. We were fortunate in 1787 in having as leaders in our several colonies, a small cluster of men whose like had not been seen before nor since. It was either extraordinary luck, or it was a providential intervention. Those men fashioned and handed to us what Gladstone termed: "The greatest document ever stricken off in a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

We agree, and we accept it as the nearest approach to perfection. However, we don't go along with Mr. Dooley who said, "If the Constitution hadn't been perfect the Democrats would have given us a better one," for on 22 occasions the people found, or thought they found, imperfections or inadequacies in that "greatest of all documents" which necessitated tinkering by the amendment process.

We even adopted one amendment to repeal another. And some amendments and even original clauses, are the current subject of efforts to amend or appeal.

Our Constitution, like every living thing, is still growing and changing. It will never be completed as long as we have Congressmen and Senators, and free men voting for or against them.

Our Constitution is like a certain great cathedral which will never be finished. They are always building on something new.

Pat and Mike were working at that cathedral one hot day. Pat laid down his shovel, mopped his corrugated brow, lit his corncob pipe and philosophically remarked: "Mike, it's a glorious thing us Catholics can build this magnificent edifice to the Lord."

"What do you mean, us Catholics? This cathedral is being built by the Episcopalians," said Mike.

"Ain't they Catholics?," asked Pat.

"Well they are, and they ain't. They're the kind of Catholics that vote Republican," concluded Mike.

At any rate, our Constitution has as one of its strongest points the separation of church and the state. In America, we have no Catholic, or Episcopalian or Presbyterian political parties. I think one of the features that explains our survival without revolution is our two party system. I direct your atten-

tion to France to illustrate my point. The French are a logical people. In fact they are so logical that even the slightest issue between one voter and another means they have to be in different political parties and thus they change their government every few months, or even weeks.

We in America get along with a party that embraces both Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, of Virginia, and Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota. Another party had Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, and Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon. The former passed on to his great reward, and the latter passed over the aisle to the opposing party.

In my State in 1954, two opposing candidates for the United States Senate, although representing two different parties, stood for the same things. They were like Tweedledum and Tweedledee. Both were endorsed by the Americans for Democratic Action group. These candidates were so much alike in almost every particular, many voters tossed coins to determine which to vote for, if either. Incidentally, the successful candidate did not receive the majority of the votes cast at that election.

However, illogical, our Government has survived all these and other inconsistencies and continues to function better than any other form known to man.

We Americans fight our battles inside the party instead of starting new parties as do the French. Each party has a wide fringe of moderates bordering on and even overlapping the other.

In earlier days the campaign talk was rough—really rough. For example, in the Middle West a man was given $1,000 damages by a jury because an editor called him a Federalist. The Federalists were considered nice, influential people in Boston, New York, and Philadelphia, but the word "Federalist" was a fighting word in the open spaces out here in the Middle West.

A little later the Democrats were unpopular in certain districts. For example, a Republican candidate for Congress from a small Vermont town, is alleged to have said: "I am, I hope, a fair man. Fair even to my opponents. I do not go so far as to say that every Democrat is a horsethief. But I do say, without fear of successful contradiction, that every horsethief is a Democrat."

And in certain sections of the South, the only thing that protected a Republican was the game law.

It's getting more refined now. "Rum, Romanism, and rebellion" and "malefactors of great wealth" were watered down to mere "boondogglers" and "economic royalists" and now to "giveaway men" and the "mink-coat boys."

While we still make faces at each other, we are as one in letting Comrade Bulganin and his gang of bandits know where we stand in regard to their godless ideology which proclaims that man exists for the state and that faith in God is an opiate of the people which must be exterminated everywhere before communism is safe anywhere.

If you want to get a picture of the working of our American Government, with all its remarkable virtues and its faults, I heartily recommend that you read The American Commonwealth by the Englishman Lord James Bryce. He was a Member of the British Parliament and of Gladstone's Cabinet, and Ambassador to the United States during the administration of William Howard Taft. Bryce's survey of our Government, made nearly 70 years ago, is as sound and accurate today as it was when he wrote it. Every one in our Government should, I think, read it and regard it as a bible on American Government at all levels.

Our system of government works because it is based, like a well-designed engine, on sound principles and lofty ideals. Our way of life, to a large degree, was conceived by members of our craft and the principles of Freemasonry, therefore, are in a very large degree reflected in our Government.

Freemasonry is premised on high ideals. Most of the great generals of our Revolution were Masons. Most of the signers of the Declaration of Independence and Constitution were also Masons. The Masons who founded our way of life were motivated by purest and soundest ideals.

An idealist is in our midst now—a gentleman who has offered us, without taint of partisanship or selfish interest, a practical program that would reduce the cost of our Government more than $7 billion a year. That idealist is Herbert Clarke Hoover, 31st President of our Republic. He is not a partisan. He is a practical idealist. He and his factfinders have shown us how to increase the efficiency of our Government and thus reduce the crushing tax bill $7 billion a year.

If Lord Bryce were living today I am sure he would concur with Mr. Hoover. Mr. Hoover is, I am sure you agree, outside the bias and turmoil and self-interest of our American political scene. He, theerfore, speaks as an idealist—hence, as a truly practical man. He speaks a language we Freemasons understand.

So, I cannot offer a better close than to enjoin you to get behind Mr. Hoover and the nonpartisan recommendations of his Commission. I urge you therefore to write your Congressmen, to write your Senators, and write our President and urge them to implement those recommendations of the Hoover Commilssion to the end that the cost of Government is reduced $7 billion a year. Our alternative to a reduction in cost of Government is confiscatory taxes and ultimate inflation from which dictatorship grows.

Obvious Lessons From the Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Deseret News, Salt Lake City, Utah, of April 6, 1956:

OBVIOUS LESSONS FROM THE FARM

It was well to have a favorite son of this area back with us Thursday night and even better to have him talking such basic good sense about farm problems—for good sense is one farm commodity not in surplus in Washington these days.

No matter how a politician may juggle them or hide them, there remain, as Secretary of Agriculture Benson pointed out in his talk in the assemby hall, these basic facts:

1. Rigid price supports at 90 percent of parity created the present tremendous surpluses.

2. Those surpluses depress farm prices; the decline in farm income has been almost entirely while 90 percent parity has been in effect.

3. Flexible price supports have not yet been given an adequate trial.

4. The dairy industry, the one place where they have been tried, has shown remarkable recovery, and now the Government is out of butter.

All this, one would think, should give pause to the farm bloc in Congress in its headlong rush to replace the administration's carefully planned and integrated farm program with a something-for-everybody hodgepodge. Since it hasn't, may we suggest two rather new and persuasive arguments that were developing almost as Secretary Benson was speaking.

One is a study released this week by the nonprofit, nonpolitical National Planning Association which concludes that "holding price supports at high levels works in exactly the opposite direction from that needed."

The NPA study represents, after all, merely expert, informed opinion, and the farm bloc in Congress has paid mighty little attention to such opinion.

But the second argument may be more impressive. It is the pall of dust that whirled over the western plains States this week and last.

Both the study and the dust storms say the same thing—that returning to the high price supports that were adopted to spur wartime farm production and then were continued because of political timidity is the worst possible course the Nation can take.

If the American farmers are to prosper by standing on their own feet, the NPA study shows, they must tighten up their operations. "They should cull out their poorest acres," the report declares, "and divert these to more extensive uses requiring lower inputs per acre—from wheat to grass, from corn to hay and forage, from cotton and tobacco to corn and hay and forage. The livestock farmers need to cull their poorest cows, sows, and hens and the like. These changes will all reduce the expense side of their ledgers more than their receipts."

The six-State Dust Bowl of eastern Colorado, southeastern Wyoming, and parts of Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico is even more eloquent. It is estimated that 75 percent of the winter wheat in eastern Colorado was blown out of the ground in last week's windstorm, with damage comparable elsewhere throughout the area.

Why? Because that land shouldn't have come under the plow in the first place. It is submarginal land, from the standpoint of wheat farming. Its sod was broken up only because Government wartime and postwar price supports made it profitable to do so. Nature is now showing the folly of continuing to plant it to wheat.

Tremendous surpluses, tremendous quantities of topsoil destroyed by wind and drought, tremendous economic loss to farmers (and ultimately to taxpayers and food consumers) these are the fruits of high price supports. The administration's soil bank intended to take poorer acreage out of production and plant it into soil-conserving grasses would go in the opposite—and proper—direction.

The soil bank is, of course, a tremendously expensive affair, with enough pitfalls of its own built in. To tie with it a return to higher price supports, as the Senate-House conference committee seems determined to do, simply cannot be accepted by the Nation or the President.

Arms for Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following letter on the Middle East situation, forwarded to me on March 26, 1956, by the Brooklyn Council of Pioneer Women is worthy of the attention of our colleagues:

BROOKLYN COUNCIL OF PIONEER WOMEN,
Brooklyn, N. Y., March 26, 1956.
Congressman ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MULTER: Thank you for your efforts to prevent war in the Middle East. May your conference with Mr. Dulles bring a much-needed change in our foreign policy.

Many Americans who saw Edward R. Murrow's program See It Now on March 13 (wherein the tensions between Egypt and Israel were explored) are now convinced that we are building on quicksand when we try to buy Arab friendship by sacrificing Israel. If Israel is destroyed or badly weakened, we lose our only reliable ally in the Middle East, the only country which understands and practices democracy, and which is politically mature enough to understand and guard against the menace of communism.

What about Premier Nasser and the other Arab leaders? Their statements on See It Now indicate their ignorance or deliberate distortion of historic facts, and their total disregard of aid received from the Western Powers.

Premier Nasser said, "The whole Western World has encouraged the Zionists and stamped down the Arabs. The United States, Britain, etc., arm Israel and give her economic assistance but deny assistance to the Arabs." And further on he said, "Britain and France have oppressed Arabs, so we fear them. Russia has never hurt the Arabs. We have no reason to fear them."

What are the facts? The Arabs owe their independence and their sovereignty to the Western World. The western allies freed them from Turkish rule in World War I and gradually created eight sovereign states. Arab States were admitted as charter members of the United Nations after a war they did not fight. They issued a declaration of war against Germany only a few months before Germany's defeat in order to qualify as charter members. The Jews of Palestine fought and worked with the Allies in both world wars. Only after 6 million Jews had been murdered by Hitler (many of whom might have been saved if any land had opened its doors to them), only then did the conscience of the world express itself through the United Nations' action in the creation of a tiny Jewish state.

One state of 8,000 square miles for Jews, 8 or more states of 1½ million square miles for Arabs—does that sound like favoring Jews and stamping down Arabs? Israel would have been even smaller if the Arab States had not invaded Israeli territory in 1948 and had not been badly defeated.

Britain and the United States have armed and given economic assistance to Iraq, Iran, Jordan, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, etc. We persuaded the British to vacate the Suez Canal and leave massive military installations for the Egyptians. Much of the arms have been given free of charge to the Arabs, while Israel is not even allowed to buy arms.

In spite of all this aid, the Western World does not have the friendship of the Arab States. Will fulther sacrifice of Israel appease Premier Nasser or make him aware of Communist dangers? It hardly seems likely in view of past performance and present attitude.

Would it not be good common sense to strengthen Israel and base our Middle East policy on the loyalty and friendship of the only outpost of western democracy in the Middle East? When the Arab leaders realize they cannot blackmail us into sacrificing Israel, they will gladly accept a guaranty of all frontiers against aggression. They will agree to the resettlement of Arab refugees in Arab lands with resulting benefit to all their economies. Israel and the Western World will help financially and in every other way. Peaceful development of the region will be assured. Refugees have been peacefully resettled in India, Pakistan, and elsewhere. Why not here? It can and will be done if the United States, Britain, and France adopt a firm policy and give adequate leadership to the forces of good will in the United States.

If we continue our present policy of drift—war, chaos, and communism will invade the Middle East.

Sincerely

ROSE S. BERKENBLIT,
American Zionist Affairs Chairman.

Will Eisenhower Veto the Farm Bill?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Roscoe Drummond in which he concludes that President Ensenhower "would impair the integrity of his administration—and lose farm votes as well" if he accepts the new farm bill as it stands:

WASHINGTON
(By Roscoe Drummond)
WILL EISENHOWER VETO THE FARM BILL?

WASHINGTON.—There hovers over President Eisenhower today one of the most difficult political and personal decisions of his administration. Unless the House of Representatives reshapes the farm bill on the floor vote this week, it will shortly go to the White House piled high with features profoundly objectionable to the President.

Mr. Eisenhower's dilemma is this: Whether to veto farm legislation (mostly of Democratic origin) which does violence to every economic principle this administration has stood for, or to approve it for fear a Presidential veto would seriously damage his party in the coming campaign.

Many of the President's political advisers are urging him to sign anything "because good or bad, we must have a bill." Most of his policy advisers are urging him to be ready to use the veto.

As the bill now stands—and the prospects of improving it significantly on the floor of the House are doubtful—it has built into it high, rigid price supports and other provisions which turn upside down the whole agricultural program the administration has advocated thus far. Secretary Benson says the bill "is not acceptable" to him. Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont, a staunch administration supporter, says that Mr. Eisenhower "won't sign it unless he has completely revised his character, his disposition and his knowledge of farm problems."

Mr. Eisehower hasn't said.

The President will have plenty of arguments to choose from. Here are the arguments that he should sign almost any farm bill which comes to him:

That, politically, a bad farm bill is better than none at all.

That many farmers in many key States would blame the Republicans, not the Democratic majority in Congress, if a Presidential veto means no legislation at all—which it probably would.

That while a veto might or might not cause Mr. Eisenhower to lose many votes, it might prevent the Republicans from regaining control of Congress.

That because of his respect for the independence of Congress, Mr. Eisenhower ought not to impose his views through the instrument of the presidential veto.

That a veto would kill the "soil bank." (The time for using it this year is fast running out.)

That, as some Republican politicians will argue, a bad farm bill wouldn't do the country as much damage as a Democratic victory this fall—hence the President should not risk a farm bill veto.

The arguments in support of a Presidential veto are these:

If Mr. Eisenhower and the Republican Party believed they were right when in 1952 and 1954 they campaigned on the platform of flexible price supports, they can't turn around now and assent to the opposite.

President Roosevelt's Secretary of Agriculture Henry Wallace President Truman's Secretary of Agriculture Clinton Anderson, and President Eisenhower's Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson, all agree that high rigid price supports will keep piling up unsaleable surpluses which will wreck the farmer, not help him.

Mr. Eisenhower has consistently contended that there is an issue of economic principle here, and if on grounds of political expedience he goes along with a program he deems wrong in principle and bad in effect he will stultify the moral basis of his administration.

By exercising a veto when he deems it necessary, a President is not showing disrespect of Congress; he is discharging a Constitutional duty.

The great majority of Republicans in Congress have opposed the present farm bill. If Mr. Eisenhower vetoes it he would be supporting the majority view of his party.

The administration might well lose some farm support in vetoing the bill, but it could gain support in the country as a whole by doing what it believed right in principle and frankly and forthrightly explaining why it did so.

My own judgment is that President Eisenhower feels more at home with the arguments for veto and that if he should accept the bill as it now stands he would impair the integrity of his administration—and lose farm votes as well.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Tribute to Admiral Byrd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, after a long and varied career in the Navy, Adm. Richard E. Byrd is in command of the naval forces engaged in operation Deep Freeze, a 4-year project in which the Navy is supporting the many United States agencies taking part in the International Geophysical Events from 1957 to 1958. This project is greater than all of his previous expeditions combined.

I have stated many times publicly my great admiration and high esteem of Admiral Byrd. What are the traits and characted that make a man great? Some of these have been set forth in an address by Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, United States Navy, Chief of Naval Operations, before the New York meeting of the International Rescue Committee. Admiral Byrd is now serving as honorary chairman of the International Rescue Committee, which has been responsible for rescuing many thousands of liberty-loving people from totalitarian oppression.

I ask unanimous consent to have the address by Admiral Burke, delievered in New York on April 3, 1956, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Duke, Admiral Byrd, Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of the International Rescue Committee, ladies and and gentlemen, it is a honor and a privilege to participate with you in this testimonial for Admiral Byrd.

Admiral Byrd is an outstanding public figure. In fact, he is the world's foremost living explorer. His reputation as a geographer, a philosopher, and aerial navigator is outstanding. He is also one of the Navy's most famous flag officers.

Many of us are fortunate enough to know Admiral Byrd personally. Others have read of his many accomplishments since the turn of this century. My own admiration for this pioneering naval officer goes back many years. It is a particular pleasure on this occasion to recall with you some of the highlights of the career of the fellow mariner, whom we honor here tonight.

Admiral Byrd graduated from the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis with the class of 1912. His class was one of those which supplied our country with a large number of outstanding officers.

As a midshipman, Admiral Byrd suffered a severe leg injury as a result of his enthusiastic participation in athletics. During his first 4 years of active commission this injury was aggravated. As a result he was transferred to the retired list. Prior to his retirement he had served admirably on six ships and was twice cited for bravery. Fortunately, his retirement was only a temporary loss to the Navy—because he came back to active duty immediately to train recruits in preparation for our entry into World War I. Here he demonstrated exceptional ability in organizing an effective training program.

In 1918, after completing a course of instruction at the Naval air station, Pensacola, Fla., Admiral Byrd was designated a naval aviator. Meanwhile, he began to develop plans for a transatlantic flight of the Navy's famous Curtiss flying boats, which were then being made ready. With this in mind, he began intensive study of the many new problems connected with aerial navigation. He developed the drift indicator and the bubble sextant. Improved versions of these instruments are still standard navigation equipment for oceanic flights. Admiral Byrd is recognized today as one of the greatest of the Navy's aviation pioneers.

The years immediately following World War I were lean ones for naval aviation. The times were so critical that Admiral Byrd had to forego the transatlantic flight because his talents were badly needed in the Navy Department. His efforts and influence in this new assignment were largely responsible for the creation of a separate bureau for naval aviation, which we now call the Bureau of Aeronautics.

Admiral Byrd organized and commanded the naval flying unit which in 1925 accompanied the polar expedition of another famous American Arctic explorer—Mr. Donald B. MacMillan. This achievement won him a commendation by the Secretary of the Navy for meritorious service.

In 1926, Admiral Byrd made the first flight over the North Pole. He was assisted in this great undertaking by Floyd Bennett, chief machinist mate, United States Navy. As a result of this history-making flight, Admiral Byrd was awarded the Medal of Honor and the Distinguished Service Medal.

Not satisfied with his pioneering achievements of 1926, Admiral Byrd prepared to conquer new frontiers. Only a few weeks after Lindbergh's historic crossing, Admiral Byrd made the first successful nonstop crossing of the Atlantic by a multiengined aircraft. For this notable and historic achievement, Admiral Byrd was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross.

In 1928 he organized and commanded another polar expedition—this time to the Antarctic. It has here that he established the now famous Little America base. On November 29, 1929, he made the first successful flight over the South Pole. For this extraordinary and hazardous achievement he was awarded the Navy Cross and the Byrd Antarctic Expedition Medal.

These successive achievements, each equal to or greater than the one preceding, fired the imagination of the entire world. In response to public acclaim, and on behalf of a grateful Nation, Congress promoted Richard E. Byrd to the rank of rear admiral on the Navy retired list. This was done in spite of the personal objections of Admiral Byrd who in all modesty believed that such a great honor was not warranted.

From 1933 to 1935 Admiral Byrd organized and headed the second Antarctic expedition. Most of you are familiar with some of his extremely hazardous experiences which he has recounted so skillfully in his numerous articles and books. For his achievements during this expedition, the second Byrd Antarctic Expedition Medal was authorized by Congress and awarded to Admiral Byrd.

In 1939 he returned to active duty and assumed command of the United States Antarctic Service. While serving in this cacapacity, he established two Antarctic bases 1,500 miles apart. For this great service he received a letter of commendation from President Franklin R. Roosevelt and was awarded a Gold Star in lieu of a second Distinguished Service Medal. He was also awarded the Antartic Expedition Medal for the operations from 1939 to 1941.

From this duty, he reported to the Office of the Secretary of War as a consultant for the development of all types of cold-climate, military clothing. In 1942, he again returned to the Bureau of Aeronautics and energetically analyzed the effectiveness of overseas base planning in all World War II theaters of operation. His tireless energy, unusual foresight, and superb leadership contributed immeasurably to the success of many phases of World War II planning. He was awarded a letter of commendation, with ribbon, by the Secretary of the Navy. In addition, he was awarded the Legion of Merit and a Gold Star in lieu of the second Legion of Merit.

Admiral Byrd commanded the 1946–47 Navy Antartic expedition which was under the tactical command of Rear Adm. Richard H. Cruzen. This expedition was the largest ever to go into the Antarctic. The purpose of this operation was to train naval personnel and test standard Navy ships and equipment under extreme conditions of cold weather. Valuable scientific information was obtained on this expedition for use in the Navy's development programs.

One of Admiral Byrd's important accomplishments was in the advancement of the science of weather observations. He was among the first to recognize that basic weather originates in the polar regions. His pioneering research in this field has been invaluable to the Navy and to the entire world.

Today, Admiral Byrd is in command of the naval forces engaged in Operation Deep Freeze. Rear Adm. George J. Dufek is his tactical commander. Operation Deep Freeze is a 4-year project in which the Navy will support the many United States agencies taking part in the International Geophysical Events from 1957 to 1958. The scope of this operation is greater than all of the previous expeditions combined. Under Admiral Byrd's experienced leadership, we can be sure that the Navy's missions in Operation Deep Freeze will be accomplished in an outstanding manner. The United States, and the United States Navy in particular, are extremely fortunate to have the services of Admiral Byrd for this gigantic, international scientific endeavor. We expect to obtain additional scientific material of vast importance, and we expect to explore the few remaining frontiers of the Antarctic, which constitutes an area almost the size of the United States and Europe combined.

Of necessity, only a few of Admiral Byrd's many citations have been mentioned. There are many, many more, both military and civilian—national and international. He

has received all of the highest awards that a grateful nation can bestow.

Admiral Byrd has already made his niche in naval history. His wholehearted devotion to duty, his rare combination of imagination, planning foresight, and his organizational ability make him one of the truly great officers in the history of our Navy. No officer has contributed more to the United States Navy than Adm. Richard E. Byrd. No officer has contributed more to his country. When the history of this era is written, there is no doubt that Admiral Byrd will take his place alongside the traditional heroes of the Navy—the Deweys, the Farraguts, and the John Paul Jones—to inspire the many generations of naval leaders yet to come.

Admiral Byrd's career is like the mighty oak tree—it has many branches. Its shadow passes over a large area. He is now serving as honorary chairman of the International Rescue Committee. This great organization has rescued many thousands of liberty-loving people from totalitarian oppression since 1933. You have aided more than 100,000 Iron Curtain refugees alone. Your appreciation of Admiral Byrd's further contribution to humanity through your great organization is evidenced by this testimonial dinner which you have sponsored.

Admiral Byrd has already completed over 30 years of active naval duty. It is therefore too late for him to change a habit of a lifetime. Hence, it is quite possible that as he sits here among us tonight, he is thinking of new frontiers to conquer. I shall not be surprised to see him commanding the first naval expedition to the moon. If he does command the expedition, we can rest assured that he will get there successfully, and accomplish what he sets out to do.

Tribute to Mrs. Fanney Neyman Litvin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news story from the Montana Standard, of Butte, Mont., of April 11, 1956, relative to a high tribute paid to Mrs. Fanney Neyman Litvin, who recently retired as an attorney for the Federal Communications Commission after 28 years of distinguished service. She has earned this tribute because her service has been outstanding and meritorious. We of Montana are very proud of Fanney Neyman Litvin and we join with the Bar Association of the District of Columbia in extending our best wishes and congratulations for 28 years of Government work well done.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATTORNEYS PAY TRIBUTE TO MRS LITVIN, FORMER BUTTE WOMAN

A former Butte resident and one-time Montana State College student, Mrs. Fanny Neyman Litvin, who became a career attorney in Federal Government, has been honored by the Bar Association of the District of Columbia. Mrs. Litvin was an attorney for the Federal Communications Commission for 28 years until her retirement.

The bar association, stanch stronghold of private practitioners, adopted this resolution, honoring Mrs. Litvin:

"Whereas Mrs. Fanney N. Litvin has recently retired from Government service after almost three decades of active and effective work which has included service as broadcast attorney and as hearing examiner of the Federal Communications Commission, and

"Whereas her high professional standards and her sense of fair play, in both her personal and professional life, have earned for her the respect and affection of the members of this association: Now therefore, it is

"Resolved that this association express its sincerest admination for her past work and its best wishes for her continued success."

Mrs. Litvin received the testimonial and a leather attaché case from Charles S. Rhyne, president of the bar association, at a recent meeting in Washington.

A native of Butte, she attended Montana State College in 1924–25 and is a graduate of George Washington law school. She joined the legal staff of the Federal Radio Commission in 1927, transferring to the Federal Communications Commission in 1934 when that Commission took over the radio work. When the Administrative Procedure Act set up the legal staff of the Federal Communications Commission Mrs Litvin transferred to that work, leaving her former duties of writing briefs, arguing cases, and work on rules. She worked there until her retirement.

Authorizing Construction for the Military Departments

SPEECH
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9893) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

(Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, there is a question in connection with the military construction bill which we are considering that is important to many of my constituents. I have asked for this time to secure an opinion from the very able chairman of the committee handling this bill as to the liability of the Federal Government for school bonds which cover part of the property to be acquired for the erection of a jet interceptor base.

Plans are under way to purchase or condemn a considerable number of acres at a village called Kansasville, which is in Racine and Kenosha Counties. At the present time the State and local school officials are concerned about school bonds affecting the property to be acquired.

The State superintendent of schools in a letter to me has stated there is no Federal law which would relieve outstanding bonded indebtedness for a local school district where the Federal Government acquired property for a Federal building.

To me this presents an inequitable situation in view of the possibility that the burden of the bonds would be shifted from Government-owned property to the remaining property owners in the school district. In view of that situation I would ask the chairman if that question has ever been raised in committee.

Mr. VINSON. That question never has been raised. I should not like to give an opinion on it. That is a legal question. That is, where there are bonds of a certain character on certain property and the Government acquires the property, the question raised by the gentleman is, Do those bonds continue to follow even though the ownership is in the Federal Government?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is right, sir.

Mr. VINSON. That is a very important question, but I am frank that I would rather not risk an opinion on it, because there are so many able lawyers present, such as my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY]. If he were not here perhaps I might venture an opinion.

I will say to the gentleman that we shall try to get some information on the question and advise the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. If the gentleman has no objection, I should like to submit a statement on the situation so that I may assure my people that the Committee on Armed Services is doing all it possibly can to settle the question satisfactorily to my constituents.

Mr. VINSON. We shall make inquiry not only of the Department of Defense but of the Attorney General.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

St. Thomas Home Remembers Its Young Charges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news story from the Great Falls Tribune, of Great Falls, Mont., dated March 27, 1956, entitled "St. Thomas Home Remembers Its Young Charges Need More Than Just a Place To Sleep and Eat." This home, which has been in operation since 1910, has performed outstanding services in looking after orphan children and children of broken homes. I am delighted to bring this news story to the attention of the Senate and, at the same time, to commend Sister Eileen Mary, Superior, Sister Martha Elizabeth, all the other sisters, and Father McHugh for the love, devotion, and understanding shown. May God bless them and the children under their care.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. THOMAS HOME REMEMBERS ITS YOUNG CHARGES NEED MORE THAN JUST A PLACE TO SLEEP AND EAT

Three-year-old Johnny's scowl changed to a crow of delight as Brer Rabbit scrambled out of the bramble patch and went bouncing away, lippity-lip, lippity-lip.

It was story day for the little folk at St. Thomas Orphans Home and Johnny was but one of a dozen or more to go sober and then chuckle at Sister Martha Elizabeth's tale of old Brer Fox and Brer Rabbit.

Listening to stories, watching television, outings, and playing games are just a few of the delights that St. Thomas provides for its charges, for it has many years of experience caring for the young.

Boys like cherubic little Chucky, and little girls too, first came to the home December 21, 1910, when 36 orphans were transferred there from Columbus and St. Clare hospitals.

During the years the number of residents has varied and now the home has 43 girls and 38 boys under its care. Ages of the children range from 3 years old to boys who stay through eighth grade and girls who remain until finishing school.

Eleven of the boys and girls are orphans, 18 have no mothers, and 3 no fathers. The remainder are from broken homes—homes where parents either cannot or will not take care of their children.

All elementary grade-school age boys and girls attend classes in a school at St. Thomas and from 1935 to 1950 a fully accredited high school was operated there. This closed when Central Catholic High School opened to all students and the space now is used for grade school pupils.

The home has 8 teachers, including the music instructor, all sisters except 1. They also have five supervisors or "little mothers" in the junior department, which consists of youngsters from 3 to 9 years old.

Most of the children realize their own mothers are gone or that they have no real home any more. But to them a "mommie" is someone who combs and curls your hair, washes your face and hands, kisses and doctors your cuts and bruises, provides nice food for you to eat and irons your dresses and shirts.

Mommie, or sister, the word is much the same here, also means someone who rocks you a bit, tells you stories, takes part in games, helps you lace your shoes, teaches you your prayers and tucks you in bed with a kiss and a God bless you.

A regular schedule is followed at the home, with all taking part. The youngest group goes to bed on schooldays about 7:30 p. m. and is up at 7 a. m. The older children end their days about 8:30 and rise at 6 a. m., with the exception of Sundays and holidays.

Children from all parts of the State may come to St. Thomas Orphan's Home, but about two-thirds of them are from Great Falls. A few of the children, especially the older ones, have trouble adjusting to their new environments.

"I cannot say we are 100 percent successful with all the children," Sister Eileen Mary, sister superior, said, "but with those who have difficulty we try to help them feel at home by talking with them, and with understanding and prayer."

Once in a while a boy or girl will run away from the home. One child from a broken home, about 9 years old, could not become used to the home life and finally was sent to Boys Town, Nebr.

But the majority of the little Johnnys, or Susies, and their older brothers and sisters find this 16 acres of playgrounds and buildings a haven.

On the sunny days the sandboxes, swings, outdoor playground equipment, and outdoor toys provide hours of fun that brightens eyes and cheeks. There also is a regular program of baseball, football, track, and basketball. There is singing, modern and square dancing too, and the reacting of plays and, for the little girls, the never-ending game of playing house.

St. Thomas Home, 3200 Central Avenue, was well out on the Montana prairies when it was first built and like all good farms it had a herd of cows and a yard full of chickens. But civilization crept up and all thoughts of agriculture have been abandoned.

The chicken coop is now a garage and a new gymnasium sits where the barn used to be. An infirmary, with a registered nurse always on duty, also has been built, and there is a chaplain's residence, a large chapel and auditorium as well as the convent and the front office of the main three-story building is being enlarged.

No attempt is made to change any faith of those residing at St. Thomas, but their spiritual and moral training is not neglected. Guidance is given to all. Each day begins and ends with a simple prayer and the oldest of the Johnnys and the Susies go to Rev. M. McHugh, school chaplain, for a practical answer to their problems.

Nuclear Weapons and Disarmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Thomas E. Murray, Commissioner, United States Atomic Energy Commission, before the Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Committee on Foreign Relations on April 12, 1956:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, your invitation to express my views on disarmament is most welcome. Your committee is dealing "with one of the few great central problems of our time. Today no nation or person on earth can have a reliable assurance of security when weapons exist which are capable of destroying all mankind." Mr. Chairman, these words of yours at the initial meeting of this committee demonstrate an awareness by you and your associates of the realism with which disarmament must be faced.

My purpose today will be to present some ideas that may help in forming a national policy so urgently needed in the nuclear age. This policy must be based on all the facts about nuclear weapons—our need of them, their usefulness, and the dangers connected with their misuse.

On February 23, 1956, I appeared in executive session before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. At this time I made recommendations pertaining to our nuclear weapons program and our nuclear power program. As the weapons program has the more important and immediate bearing on disarmament I shall limit my remarks today, within the limits of classification, to weapons.

What I have to say on disarmament may be put in one straightforward proposition. In the existent state of world affairs disarmament means rational armament, especially in the nuclear field. This is the difficult field and the dangerous field, in which rationality is of extreme importance.

Disarmament doubtless means much more than rational nuclear armament. But if it does not mean at least rational nuclear armament it means nothing.

Before developing my proposals I should like to comment on one central aspect of the past history of our nuclear weapons program. The fact is that from the outset we were primarily seeking the answer to one question: What can be done with nuclear energy in form of bombs The problems we faced were scientific ones. Questions concerning the development of a national policy with regard to the use of nuclear arms were not in the foreground. We were simply looking for results, always with some antecedent doubt about what the results might be. Ever since the first nuclear explosion at Alamogordo the specific and continuing major objective was to develop ever larger bombs. This was true of the H-bomb program, which achieved in 1952 a spectacular success.

Throughout my 6 years on the Commission I have strongly supported this mode of procedure. However, I long ago recognized the need of developing a national nuclear policy which could keep pace with scientific and technological progress and tried to help in developing it.

The Mike thermonuclear explosion on November 1, 1952, and our Castle tests in the spring of 1954 presented the nuclear weapons problem in an altogether different light. These tests reemphasized in a most dramatic way the urgent need for a national nuclear policy interrelated with the types of bombs to be produced. The major question no longer is, What can we do with nuclear energy in bombs? We know what we can do. We know that there is no upper limit to the size of bombs that can be made.

A new question therefore assumes the primacy. Should our future program proceed on the same basis as in the past, and with the same major objective in view—to keep on making bigger and bigger bombs? Would this, in our present circumstances, which are different from those of the past, be a rational course of action? I do not think so. I think that policies will have to be adopted that will set our nuclear weapons program on a basis more in conformity with the realities of the present day international life, more in conformity with certain principles of reason, and better calculated to fit into a new national policy on the use of nuclear weapons.

The new direction of our policies as I see them could be summed up in the phrase "rational nuclear armament." This phrase means that decisions with regard to the size and type of nuclear weapons to be placed in stockpile should be made in the light of two principles. There is the military principle that the weapons we manufacture should be demonstrably useful for the purposes of actual war. And there is the higher principle that the use of force in warfare is subject to the dictates of the moral conscience.

The moral norm is the more important. There is something in the atmosphere of the age of violence through which we have lived, in which, indeed, we are still living, that tends to dull the moral sensibilities. In a strange way the sheer brilliance of our technical achievements with nuclear weapons also tends to dull the moral sense. It is therefore necessary constantly to remind ourselves that a concern for justice in the use of force is an obligation upon a civilized nation.

As a nation under God we are obliged to act under the limitations of the moral law. The imperatives of this higher law bind us to a due measure of moderation and discrimination in the use of force. Within the Christian tradition to which we owe our national origins the duty of setting limitations on war and on the use of force in war has been a recognized moral obligation.

For instance, our moral tradition does not permit us to use nuclear weapons whose

effect is mass destruction on an indiscriminate scale. As the only historical examples of the use of nuclear weapons in warfare Hiroshima and Nagasaki are pertinent. The weapon used on Hiroshima, for instance, was 15 kilotons, or so, about 60,000 times more powerful than the largest conventional bomb of World War II. It destroyed 4 or 5 square miles of territory and killed or injured nearly 150,000 people. At our present distance from that disastrous event I do not think that the use of this bomb against this particular target, the city of Hiroshima and its multitudes of innocent people, could be justified on moral grounds.

The concept of a moral limitation is, I am sure, felt by the American people as a whole. However, we must beware of the false idealism lurking in the Soviet slogan, "Ban the bomb." In the discussions and negotiations looking to disarmament, it would be sheer folly to be maneuvered into making a blanket renunciation of the use of all types of nuclear weapons.

This brings me to the second principle of rational nuclear armament—the principle of military usefulness.

Wars in the future will be nuclear wars. This does not mean that they need be all-out nuclear wars. All-out nuclear war is no more acceptable than murder or suicide. It would be fatal to permit ourselves to drift into the habit of thinking about nuclear war only in all-out terms. The traditional moral effort of western civilization to impose limitations on warfare must be continued even in the nuclear age. A limited nuclear war is a possibility that our consciences can face and accept.

In the different kinds of limited war that might confront us certain types of nuclear weapons have a genuine military usefulness. It would, therefore, be wrong on our part to deprive ourselves of these weapons.

However, our stockpile should include only weapons that are actually useful in war. Moreover, it should include only weapons that we can legitimately intend to use. I am altogether opposed to any school of thought that would move on toward weapons of ever-increasing magnitude, while at the same time disclaiming the intention of using them. To say the least, this position is unrealistic. Under the stress of a threat to its survival a nation will use any weapon it has in hand, however recklessly, if there is any seeming advantage in its use.

It may be said that certain nuclear weapons, which we might not intend to use in actual warfare, are still useful as a deterrent of war, as a means of terrifying the enemy, or at least as a means of striking a balance of terror. For my part, I think it is time we stopped for an instant to take a hard look at this concept of deterrence and at the complementary concept, more recently added, the balance of terror.

I am particularly distrustful of the latter concept. There is no doubt that a balance of power is one necessary foundation, among others, of lasting world peace. Whenever this balance is upset, there is danger of aggression and of war.

This seems to be the lesson of history. However, it is by no means clear that a balance of terror furnishes an assurance that aggression even on a limited scale will not be undertaken and that it is in this sense a protection of total peace. A balance of terror is too easily upset. It is at the mercy of miscalculation. Such a balance may even put a premium on the moral cynicism that would not shrink from striking the first blow, from launching an atomic blitz.

On the other hand, the concept of deterrence is in itself valid. Force, whether in the form of the policeman's nightstick or in the form of atomic weapons, is certainly a deterrent of injustice, aggression, lawlessness. Yet force serves as a deterrent only when the mind of the world clearly understands the exact nature of the force and that the force will actually be used. The deterrent value of nuclear weapons is drained out of them when there is any doubt about their actually being used. In a word, the usefulness of nuclear weapons as a deterrent against war is exactly proportioned to the universally known certainty of our intention to make use of them.

Rational armament therefore should include the making and stockpiling only of such weapons as are demonstrably useful for the purpose of actual warfare. What kind of nuclear weapons, of what size, are usable and useful for the purposes of war? In other words, what manner of nuclear arms should be included in our stockpile?

The primary responsibility for answering these questions rests with the military. However, the military usefulness of a weapon cannot be evaluated apart from consideration of the moral law.

Moreover, it is my belief that decisions with regard to such questions should not be left exclusively to the military. A due measure of participation in these decisions should be accorded the Congress and other agencies of Government.

Moral judgments with regard to the measure and kind of destruction that may legitimately be wrought are often difficult to make in the concrete. Yet, I would emphasize the fact that the demands of morality control military action in the same way that they control all manner of human action. It cannot be maintained that man's obligation to act as a man, that is, in obedience to the moral law, ceases at the moment when he goes to war.

Furthermore a special problem presents itself in judging the military usefulness of large thermonuclear weapons. We now know a great deal more about the effects of nuclear explosions than we did a few years ago. For instance, we now know considerably more about the contamination of the atmosphere and soil by radioactive strontium. Yet knowledge of important aspects of the problem is still not complete. Our knowledge about the genetic effects of radiation is even more incomplete. When the military usefulness of a weapon is being determined all the knowledge that we do have must be brought to bear. Serious account must also be taken of the gaps in our knowledge; these gaps make it imperative to proceed with caution in evaluating the military usefulness of large nuclear weapons.

Here the chief question is this: How does the factor of contamination resultant from large thermonuclear explosions affect the military usefulness of these weapons? Surely it must limit their military usefulness. Indeed, in certain circumstances the factor of contamination might well cancel all seeming military usefulness. This is particularly true in view of the further fact that this contamination lingers for years and would affect life on earth long after hostilities had ended.

We come now to the question, What concrete conclusions result when these criteria of rational nuclear armament are applied? In my own mind I have reached the following conclusions. Taken together, they constitute the program of rational armament that I propose as part of the substance of disarmament.

My first proposal is that an upper limit should be set on the size of thermonuclear bombs to be placed in our stockpile. From the scientific and technological point of view there is, as I said, no upper limit to the size of bombs that can be produced. It is for us, as rational human beings, to set limits to their size, on the basis of moral principles and military usefulness. Concretely I know of no reason why we should develop bombs more powerful than those we now have. I would add that, when a full military theory with regard to a moderate and discriminating use of nuclear weapons has been evolved in the light of moral principle, the conclusion might be that the bombs we presently have are already too large.

This proposal that a limit should be put to the size of thermonuclear bombs seems to have been supported by the President at a press conference on March 21. He is reported as stating:

"While I have been told many times that there is no theoretical limit to the size of these instruments which can be made, there is, I think, a practical limit, as long as you are thinking of using it only against someone else, and there is size of targets.

"There is an old saying: 'You do not drive a tack with a sledge hammer.' So when you have gotten something of a, let us say, of a maximum tactical size, useful size, why I would think you would go no further."

My second proposal is that a limit should be set to the number of large thermonuclear bombs to be placed in stockpile. I have had the need of this policy in mind ever since November 1, 1952, when I witnessed the Mike thermonuclear detonation at Eniwetok. That event impressed me with a lasting sense of the menace to humanity inherent in an unlimited program of nuclear armament. Shortly thereafter I made a public statement that "mankind now has within the range of his grasp the means to exterminate the human race." For 3 years I have consistently and repeatedly tried to convey this fact to the American public. This same consciousness of ultimate danger appears in the testimony given by the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, before your committee. He said: "The destructive power of modern weapons is such that a major war with those weapons would inevitably destroy a great part of the human race." He also spoke about "the risk of doing nothing and allowing this menace to go on in increasing proportions."

The Secretary is right in speaking of the "risk of doing nothing." One thing that needs to be done is to put a limit to the number as well as the size of the large thermonuclear bombs to be stockpiled.

My third proposal is that increasing concentration should be set on the stockpiling of a wide range of very small nuclear weapons.

The reasons for this proposal are both military and moral. I have said that limited nuclear war is a possibility that the moral conscience can face and accept. It is also a possibility that is inherent in the present state of international tensions.

We have, of course, been preparing against this possibility by our program for small weapons. However, this program requires greater intensification, to the end that it will put us in possession as soon as possible of larger numbers of small weapons. When I speak of small weapons I mean very small weapons. When I speak of larger numbers I mean tens of thousands of weapons in this range. These tens of thousands of weapons could form a broad and solid base upon which could be superimposed a stockpile in the image of a pyramid of intermediate and large size weapons.

A stockpile of this composition will support a theory of moderate and discriminating use of force against all aggression, including aggression that may be minor in degree. With this diversified nuclear armament, possessed in abundance, American and allied military forces of reasonable size would be equipped to handle all the various wartime contingencies that might arise.

We shall have to face the fact that an intensified small-weapons program will be more costly in terms of fissionable material. This increased cost would result, not only from the larger total numbers, but also from the inherently less efficient utilization of material in smaller weapons. For this reason, if for no other, it will not be possible as has been suggested to restrict the future use of all new fissionable material to peacetime

uses. A continued flow of fissionable material into a very small weapons program should, for some time to come, be considered a matter of vital national policy.

My fourth proposal concerns the testing of atomic weapons. The testing of small weapons must, of course, go on, and even be greatly accelerated to keep pace with the intensified program that is necessary in this field. However, I propose that the tests of multimegaton thermonuclear weapons be stopped. My proposal that they should be stopped follows from the position I have already taken, namely, that the weapons we now have in hand are large enough. I am not recommending the cessation of these large tests on the grounds that they are dangerous to health and safety. The evidence presently available does not warrant stopping tests now for this reason.

The foregoing proposals suggest in outline a program of nuclear armament that I consider rational and necessary.

It will be asked, What effect would the adoption of this plan have upon our national security? I believe the effect would be entirely beneficial. The present nuclear superiority of the United States would be materially strengthened. In my testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on February 23 I emphasized the point that superior strength means flexible strength. And flexible strength means the fuller development of the capability for limited military use of nuclear weapons—their use in limited wars, and their use in combat for limited military objectives.

Tragic weakness would result if we were to build our nuclear strength with overemphasis on large nuclear weapons.

We should possess in sufficient numbers the kind of nuclear weapons that would be useful especially in so-called limited wars. Such wars are dangerous in themselves, and there is the further danger lest they develop into full-scale conflict. We must be able to take action against this kind of limited aggression, in such a way as to defeat it, and also in such a way as to prevent it from developing into something more formidable. It means the capability of a moderate and discriminating use of force. It means the capability of meeting the particular occasion with the measure of force it requires, and with no more than this. It means the capability of limiting wars to a rational scale.

I believe that my proposals for a limitation of the size and number of nuclear weapons and for an increasing concentration on a wide range of very small weapons will at least diminish the proportions of the menace to which the Secretary of State pointed in his testimony. This menace is inherent in a stockpile of nuclear weapons that are unlimited in size and number. It is also inherent in the mentality that sees no alternatives in between an uneasy hostile coexistence on the one hand, and on the other hand, an all-out nuclear war. This mentality betrays a bankruptcy both of sound military theory and of moral principle. The fact is that many alternatives are possible in between these two extremes. In proportion as these alternatives are seen to be real possibilities, and in proportion as we provide for them with a balanced arsenal of nuclear weapons the menace of the ultimate alternative, that is, all-out nuclear war—will diminish in the minds of men. Indeed, the menace itself will have been reduced to proportions that are manageable by political and military reason.

It may also be asked whether the plan I have proposed would further the cause of international disarmament. The realistic purpose of any disarmament plan should include limitations on the number and size of nuclear weapons. However, we should not wait for the establishment of an international disarmament control agency. In this present moment an obligation rests on our Government to make up its own mind about what disarmament should rightly mean. In other words, the United States must have its own program of rational armament.

I further believe that this program must be publicly defined and explained on the highest possible level. There must be no misunderstanding or ignorance about the diversity of our nuclear capabilities, about our intention to use these capabilities, and about the moderate and discriminating manner in which we would use them under defined conditions. This public statement of our capabilities and intentions is a duty that we owe both to our own moral integrity as a nation and to the cause of world peace that our armaments serve. We are further summoned to the fulfillment of this duty by that decent respect to the opinions of mankind which has always been a traditional motive of American public action. The community of nations, of whose peace we are the foremost guardian, has the right to know how we intend concretely to exercise our guardianship.

In this same connection there is another consideration. The United States has led the world in the scientific and technological development of nuclear energy as an instrument of war. We now have a further duty thrust upon us by our leadership in this field. Great power is always dangerous. But great power, without a right policy with regard to its legitimate uses, can be disastrous. I believe the time has come for us to establish for ourselves and to present to the world right concepts, military and moral, with regard to the uses of nuclear power in war.

If we do this, the progress of disarmament will be importantly advanced. What I propose, therefore, is not only rational action but independent action. Frankly independent action along rational and moral lines would do much to solve the present crisis of lawlessness in the field of armaments. America's call at the moment is to independent and rational action. Our response to this call of reason is a matter of duty, and to that extent an obedience to the will of God, as it manifests itself in the circumstances of human life.

Extension of Minimum-Wage Coverage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I received a letter from Mr. George Meany, the distinguished labor leader and president of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, concerning the problem of extending minimum-wage coverage to include millions of low-income workers in the country who do not have this protection at the present time.

Mr. Meany was also kind enough to send me a copy of the March 1956 issue of the AFL–CIO publication Labor's Economic Review which contains a detailed analysis of the subject. This is a very interesting and informative study.

Mr. Speaker, there are several bills pending before the House Committee on Education and Labor regarding the extension of minimum-wage coverage. Unfortunately, no action has been taken to date on any of these bills. Consequently, I have addressed a letter to the chairman of the committee urging him to set early hearings on these bills so that Congress could still take action in the matter before the end of the present session.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert Mr. Meany's letter to me and my letter to the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND,
CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D. C., April 6, 1956.

Hon. VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: When the Congress raised the minimum wage last year, it was generally recognized that only half the job of modernizing the Fair Labor Standards Act had been accomplished. This task will not be completed until the law's coverage is extended to millions of low-paid workers now denied its protection.

Extension of minimum wage protection is the responsibility of the Federal Government. There is not the remotest possibility that State action will provide adequate minimum wage protection for workers exempt from the Federal law.

In recognition of the urgency of this matter, the AFL–CIO convention unanimously called upon the Congress "as a matter of first priority, to extend the full protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act to all workers in industries engaged in or affecting interstate commerce."

You will find a detailed analysis of our proposals in the enclosed March issue of our publication, Labor's Economic Review.

On behalf of the AFL–CIO, I urge you to do everything possible to assure that hearings on extension of minimum wage coverage are held at the earliest possible moment so that Congress may act during this session to remove from the law all unnecessary and unjust exemptions.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE MEANY,
President.

APRIL 11, 1956.

Hon. GRAHAM A. BARDEN,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Many people throughout this Nation took note of the fact that on March 1 of this year an amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act went into effect raising the minimum wage from 75 cents to $1 an hour.

This is a considerable step forward, but it is still not enough. There are estimated to be at least another 10 million American workers who should be given the same protection. That means at least 10 million American families who live on substandard wages.

I believe we should not tolerate substandard wages in a country like ours. It constitutes economic injustice to millions of people and it is also injurious to the economy of the country. By extending minimum-wage coverage to include those who are not now covered by the law, we will help increase the purchasing power of these millions of our citizens, we will help to improve living standards, and it will also serve as a stabilizing factor in our economy.

I urge you, Mr. Chairman, to set early hearings before your committee on extension of minimum-wage coverage so that Congress may have an opportunity to act in the matter before the current session ends.

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

Organization of American States: Its 16th Anniversary

SPEECH
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, April 14, 1956, marks the 66th anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union. This oldest international association in the world has grown into what we now know as the Organization of American States. On this date we pause each year to contemplate the handiwork that built this union, and I think we may be pardoned for our pride. That such a union of 21 independent, sovereign nations of many races, and a diverse cultures and languages, should have been conceived of in the first place is remarkable indeed. That it has endured and grown stronger over the years in spite of occasional conflicts between its member states and the world shaking effect of 2 major world wars is truly extraordinary. I take this opportunity to congratulate the other republics of the inter-American family on another year of earnest work toward perfecting our mutual alliance. The existence of the organization should be an inspiration to the world that where good will and patience reign; international understanding and cooperation are possible.

All of us know, however, that the success of an international organization in promoting peace and prosperity depends, in the main, on the public support it enjoys. No matter how fine a building it occupies or how devoted are its employees, an international organization of sovereign states can do no more than reflect public opinion. We in Florida feel, perhaps, a particular concern for the progress and well-being of the OAS. Florida's historical and cultural ties with her Latin American neighbors have deep roots. Even the name of our great State reflects its Spanish heritage.

For this reason, Florida has made great efforts to promote inter-American relations on the level of individual citizens. The University of Florida, for instance, has become one of the major centers for studying all aspects of Latin America—political, economic, historical, geographical, and cultural. A new and novel project for getting the American people—both north and south of the Rio Grande—better acquainted is presently taking shape on Biscayne Bay in Miami. We are building an Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center, 1,800 acres of beautiful fairgrounds to house industrial and handicraft exhibits of the 21 sister republics. We hope it will become a meeting ground for exporters and importers throughout the hemisphere. We hope, too, that the fine products on display will help the many people who visit Florida each year to get some idea of the wonderful people we call our neighbors.

On this threshold of the 67th year of the existence of the union of Pan-American republics, it is fitting that we recall Bolivar's prophetic statement:

Freedom of the Americas is the hope of the universe.

For it is only by our working diligently and harmoniously together that our beloved freedoms can be secured. Let us, then, rededicate ourselves today to the lofty principles and high ideals embodied in the Organization of American States as we wish it a "Happy Birthday" and Godspeed in the year to come.

What I Owe My Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIVER P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, each year, the American Legion conducts an essay contest on Americanism among high school students throughout the country. I am very happy to report that one of this year's winners is Miss Linda Allen, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. William Allen, of Geneva, Ohio. Linda is a student at Ashtabula High School. Her essay on What I Owe My Country competed with 300,000 others in Ohio, and was selected as one of the 12 best essays in the State. I have read Linda's essay, Mr. Speaker, and commend it highly to your attention and to the attention of the Members of Congress. Under unanimous consent, I insert the essay in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHAT I OWE MY COUNTRY

What do I owe my country? At first, this question seemed impossible to answer. I could think only of what my country does for me, but now I think I have an answer to the question.

First, I owe my country duty. During time of war—if I were a boy—I would fight for my country in one of the armed services. Being a girl, though, my duty might lie in a Government factory or in a branch of one of the women's military services.

Second, I owe my country public service. There are many public services in which varied positions may be obtained. Doing a service for the entire country are the civil plane watchers. Doing a service for their towns are town council members. Doing many services for their communities are such people as the Red Cross workers and the gray ladies of the hospitals.

Third, I owe my country good citizenship. It is up to me to obey the National, State, township, and city laws and the law-enforcement officers. It is up to me to learn and obey the traffic laws of my country. In a few years it will also be up to me to obey my country's tax laws. As a good citizen, I should learn all rules and laws which might in some way concern me, therefore giving me no excuse for breaking them. I should love and treat the colored race as I do the white race, for it is written not only in the laws of our country but also in the laws of our Lord.

But most of all I owe my country allegiance and loyalty. These almost speak for themselves, I believe. And why do I owe my country these things? This is the reason why—because America is the best and most stable-governed country in the world; and also it is probably the freest country in the world. When I become of age I will gain the privilege of voting by secret ballot—one of the most precious privileges we in America have. America also has two other wonderful privileges—freedom of the press and freedom of speech. And, of course, from the very beginning of the United States itself, comes the heritage of the privilege of choosing our own religion—to worship God in any way we choose.

Norman Rockwell, the famous American artist of characters, summed up our freedoms very well by his four famous paintings—freedom of expression, freedom of worship, freedom from fear, and freedom from want. Should our country ever lose any of these freedoms, everything about America which we cherish would soon be lost.

Duty, service, citizenship, as well as allegiance and loyalty are owed to this country by every American citizen and must be given by every American citizen to keep America free.

American Doctrine for American Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on Tuesday, April 10, I had the pleasure of speaking in Los Angeles at the Rodger Young Auditorium, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks which I made at that time.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN DOCTRINE FOR AMERICAN PROGRESS

I cannot tell you how grateful I am to meet with all of you today. I am proud to be introduced by a distinguished American, Mr. Manchester Boddy, lifelong Democrat, and former publisher of a great daily newspaper in Los Angeles.

This is not a personal meeting. It represents, rather, a typical American opportunity for all of us—regardless of political party—to voice our agreement on some fundamentals by which we hope our Federal Government will be guided in the future, and through which we pray the cause of American freedom will be strengthened and the cause of a just and enduring peace in the world will be advanced.

We believe in the freedom of man. We are devoted to the American constitutional system whose goal is to preserve our free American society, and to guarantee to each citizen in our Nation the right to live his own life and do as he wishes with those opportunities which may present themselves to him. The civil rights written into our Constitution belong to each of us, and belong, also to our Nation. We decline to be pushed around as citizens or as a people. In the spirit of the Declaration of Independence, we intend to pursue happiness, to enjoy life as we may, all under the liberty which our Republic was founded to maintain.

Ours has been a magnificent history. I think we rather convincingly demonstrated in 1776 that Americans intend to be citizens and not subjects. That was the year, you know, when we first rejected colonialism and laid down the precept that Americans believe in the self-determination of peoples. And ever since the rebellious American colonists wrote a Constitution, and conceived the free society of the Republic of the United States,

we have overcome the dangers which new situations have placed before us. Each succeeding American generation has preserved American freedom, and has resolutely clung to the same self-evident truths which the patriots laid down at Philadelphia 170 years ago.

All in all, ours has been a history of progress, and we mean, under the providence of God, to continue that progress in the years and generations which lie ahead.

We are now well embarked into a new era on the globe. Unhappily, the struggle for freedom must continue. Almost entirely from the Red ideology of communism stems the current danger to freedom which our generation must overcome. This is the era of the atom and of thermonuclear energy. Men have discovered the secrets of unbelieveable physical power. It is available, on both sides of the Iron Curtain, for either evil or for good. It can annihilate the whole world and all its peoples, or it can be the source of a truly amazing new age of happiness. It can turn wheels, supply power, and wondrously contribute to man's health. One of our great challenges is to assure the use of it in the cause of peace and not in the cause of war.

It is in that background that we can assess our lot in 1956. Our country is at peace. The Korean war ended a little less than 3 years ago. We can be grateful that no American casualty lists are being published. And a very great man, a very humble man, is leading our Government in a dedicated search for the achievement of peace with justice among all nations.

There are many sorely troubled areas around the globe. The insidious policies of Communist Russia in the Middle East are an appalling and heavy factor in the strife and bloodshed in that unhappy area. Russia's aim is to become a power in the Middle East. A conflict of arms between the Israelis and the Arabs poses a most tragic danger to the cause of freedom everywhere. Positive steps must be taken to avert it.

The travail on Cyprus seriously disconcerts all of us. Greece and Turkey, as well as Great Britain, are all our friends, and are all implacable foes of communism. Now, to find them embroiled in a bitter conflict is almost unthinkable.

The Middle East and Cyprus, indeed, each sector of the world must have the closest attention of our Government. Through the United Nations, and also through arrangements with our free friends, which have been made and which are being made, all our actions are designed to bring about a just and enduring peace among all nations.

I sincerely believe that war was averted a year ago in the Far East by the bold leadership of our President, in which Congress, controlled by one political party, and the executive branch, by another, stood firmly together in approving an official American policy—the Formosa resolution—which made unmistakably clear our firm and inflexible decision that Free China shall not be overrun by communism. I mention this here because I hope, and I believe, that politics must still stop at the water's edge. And I hope, and I believe, that almost all the people of the United States are knit closely together in their desire to maintain a foreign policy free from partisanship—or from extremes—designed solely for our own people's security in a world of peace and justice.

Those are my views, and I feel assured that they are yours as well. Extremes and extremists, either left or right, must be avoided, as they are being avoided, in all our foreign policy decisions, and, for that matter, in our domestic decisions as well.

Every facet of our foreign policy must be determined on the basis of our own American self-interest, albeit an enlightened self-interest. We are a peaceful nation. We are a free nation. We intend, as Americans, not as partisans, to determine a course that is best for us, as Americans, to pursue. It is to our own interests to promote peace in the world and comradeship among free peoples. That is what we are doing, that is what we propose to do.

That is what this Nation was doing when President Eisenhower last year voiced his electrifying proposal for "open sky" reciprocal air inspection for both Communist territory and the free world. Just a few days ago at the meeting of the United Nations Subcommittee on Disarmament at London, and for the first time, the Soviet apparently announced some tentative acceptance of the Presidential plan. Their deeds, rather than their words will, however, still be the measure of their sincerity.

"What we are trying to do here," said a Western representative at the London Conference, "is to establish some common ground with the Russians. * * * In this nuclear age, if you can devise a sure guard against surprise attack, there will be no attack. And if there is no attack, there will be no war."

In the last 2 years, substantial progress has been made in our mutual-security agreements. Over the violent protests of Mr. Molotov and Russia, our Government led the way in granting sovereignty to the Federal German Republic and approved—with our fellow members—her entrance into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—a real achievement. How the Russians hate it and fear it.

Austria's sovereignty has been restored, not, it is true, as an active ally of the West, but certainly not a partner of Moscow. I feel reasonably assured that Austria's spirit and prayers are entirely with the free nations and entirely against the Communist nations. And on the other side of the world in southeast Asia, the multilateral mutual security pact continues to furnish the means for friendly cooperation and for agreement to stand firm against aggression.

So, I repeat, our generation continues making progress in determining and overcoming those modern dangers to the cause of our freedom. There are some deadly serious questions remaining with which we must deal, and deal firmly. But the basic hazards of Communist aggression and intrigue is not for one for the people of the United States alone. They are the concern of all free peoples, and it will be in concert with them that we shall continue to oppose the Communist ideology.

Meanwhile, the whole world now knows of the fantastic changes in the Communist line. Almost deified in his lifetime, Stalin now is reviled by the Kremlin as a sadist and a wanton murderer. I suppose we will have to wait some time before understanding the full implications of this abrupt change in Soviet philosophy.

There is one part in the Communist line here in California, which remains steadfast. I am proud to tell you that the Communist newspapers in California say a lot of terrible things about me. They are asking our people to defeat me. I can't tell you how glad I am that this is true. A man is known by the company he keeps. I never have kept company with communism and the Communist press in the past, and I promise all the people of my State I will not keep company with them in the future. We, all of us, Democrats, Republicans, and Independents, are agreed on our uncompromising objection to this godless creed. We shall together oppose communism and all those who fraternize with it.

I am not a witch hunter. I have voted in the Senate for the strongest kind of laws to stamp out all kinds of subversion. And subversion is being stamped out in this country, in my judgment. Our Federal Department of Justice and our Federal Bureau of Investigation are working steadfastly toward that end.

All I can say is that I shall continue, so long as I remain in the United States Senate, to vote for an enlightened foreign policy which, is in the best interests of the American people and which promotes the cause of a just peace among all nations. My vote will be free of political concern and partisan concern.

Closely alined with America's international relations is the question of the defense of our people. How have I cast my vote in the Senate on this important question? How have I discharged this obligation to my 13 million fellow Californians? I have done it by voting consistently in favor of the recommendations of President Eisenhower. Preeminently qualified himself in this important field, he has advising him a group of the foremost military men in our country. Chief among them is Adm. Arthur Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and a veteran of more than 40 years of military experience. Here is what he said last year:

"I feel as of today that we are better prepared to meet any emergency than we ever have been during my service in the Armed Forces.

"In fact the United States forces we plan to maintain are the most powerful, individually by service and collectively as a team, that our Nation has ever undertaken to maintain during a period when we were not actually engaged in a shooting war. These forces are fully adequate to perform all essential tasks in the initial stages of a shooting war, global or otherwise, and they constitute an ample base which will permit a rapid and orderly buildup when and if that should become necessary."

Ten days ago, in Washington, I asked Admiral Radford if his opinion was the same today. He replied that it is, with the continuing understandable proviso that world conditions do not materially change for the worse.

Here at home we have much to be thankful for. We enjoy the highest level of economy in all our history. More people are employed in California and in the Nation than ever before. Part of the responsibility of a United States Senator is to work to continue that kind of healthy, dynamic economy. I promise each of you I shall do just that.

These last 3 years I have introduced legislation, now the law, to construct irrigation projects, dams, storage reservoirs, and good flood-control works to improve the lot of our people. But they'll do more than that. They'll also provide jobs for our people.

The care of our disabled American veterans is a just responsibility of the Nation. America can never fully discharge it. I have interested myself in the welfare of our former servicemen. I am glad to tell you that I successfully urged the Senate to approve my request for an $8 million hospital at Long Beach for our paraplegic veterans. And for nortern California the Senate agreed to approve a new 1,000-bed neuropsychiatric hospital for veterans of our wars. These two new institutions will soon be a reality.

I am a coauthor of pending legislation to permit veterans to reinstate their GI insurance. This is of particular interest to Californians, with our country's second largest veterans' population. I shall work for early action on this in the Senate.

There continues to be the most urgent need for Federal legislation providing for the construction of a modern, efficient interstate highway system in America. Last year more people were killed on our highways than died in the entire Korean war. We need this legislation not only to deal with this monstrous problem, but also because of the military and defense needs of our Nation. I promise the people of my State to continue to work diligently for the passage of this long overdue and vital legislation.

Our tuna-fishing industry has suffered woeful deterioration by reason of what I believe to be unfair competition through unlimited and spiraling importation of foreign tuna. I do not quarrel with trade

between nations. Indeed, I have enthusiastically supported reciprocal trade legislation. But that very legislation provides for peril points to protect our domestic economy. It should be crystal clear that the peril point has long since been reached and passed as respects the American—the Californian—who makes his living farming the sea. I have cosponsored legislation to assist that industry in the Congress, and I have very much hope that we can receive legislative and Executive approval of it.

I had the honor to be chairman of a Senate subcommittee which wrote the Federal lease-purchase legislation. With appropriate safeguards to protect the public interest, this law permits the Federal Government to use its rental monies to buy necessary public buildings on a time-payment plan. A new custom house for Los Angeles is in the mill under this legislation. A $40 million Federal building for San Francisco is about ready for bids. Many other of our communities will be the recipients of new Federal structures built by private enterprise which thus will provide new avenues of employment.

Under this legislation, the Government will pay to construction employees the prevailing wages which obtain in the area of construction. This is a sound principle in my judgment. Thus, construction for Uncle Sam will not depress the market in those towns where Uncle Sam becomes a property owner. The theory of paying prevailing wages on public construction in each area of the country ought to apply, in my view, to all Federal undertakings.

Our President has said that there must be no second-class citizenship in America. You and I agree. And I here repeat what I said earlier in our State: I believe that we have made more solid progress these last 3 years in honoring the Biblical tenets of the brotherhood of man than in any comparable period since Abraham Lincoln's day.

Many other problems confront us in this year's election. I shall discuss them in detail in the days ahead. If California can unite, as I believe it will, on its hopes and aspirations for herself, our country, and the goal of a just peace in the world, we will contribute markedly toward their attainment in the city of Washington.

My father once said that one's successs in life is attained in great part, by the help of his friends. That is also true of principles. In the coming months, I shall wage a vigorous and an intensive campaign, and I shall do it on the basis of principles you and I share. But I will need the help of friends like you. I thank you for coming here today. I will keep your faith.

The Western Cattle Producer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON ALLOTT
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Mr. Farrington R. Carpenter, of Hayden, Colo., delivered before a meeting of the New Mexico Cattle Growers Association. Mr. Carpenter is one of the finest and most outstanding citizens of Colorado, and he is well known throughout the United States for his work in the agricultural field.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WESTERN CATTLE PRODUCER

(By Farrington R. Carpenter)

THE BEEF CATTLE PRODUCER IN 1956

As one who has been continuously in the cow and calf business for 47 years, I naturally am chiefly interested in the producer's part of the beef industry. But the producer's problems are so associated with the beef industry as a whole, and it, with farming in general, that I will say a few things about them first in order to have a background for my remarks on cattle raising.

THE AGRICULTURAL SITUATION IN 1956

A little more than 100 years ago, steam was harnessed as a new power for mankind's use. It was readily adaptable for industry and commerce and in the course of 50 years completely changed all manufacturing and transporting methods. The period in which this changeover occurred is called the industrial revolution.

Steam, however, did little or nothing to change the farmer's way of life. Steam propelled threshing machines was about its only use. The greatest part of the farmer's need for power, the manipulation of the soil was furnished by the horse and mule. As late as World War I, 95 percent of the power on American farms was furnished by horse power.

This great disparity in power between industry and commerce on the one hand with steam power, and agriculture with horsepower on the other hand, caused a widening gap between the productivity of an hour of labor in those pursuits. Today it seems ridiculous that as late as 1915 one of the leading agricultural journals was carrying a series of articles discussing in great detail the relative merits of the tandem hitch for horses as compared with the doubletree or horizontal hitch. Is it any wonder that the whole farm economy lagged far behind that of their city cousins?

Then all of a sudden between World War I and II, the rubber-tired tractor made its debut on the farm and gasoline and diesel started an agricultural revolution destined to be as portentous in its changes in farming as steam had been in industry and comcerce a century before. It is difficult for you and me, who are living in the midst of this change, to comprehend its impact. The first manifestations of the increase in production of farm labor with this new power indicates some of its possibilities.

In the past 15 years farm production shot up 40 percent without any increase in acreage, and with nearly 2 million less farms. The use of the new power increased 75 percent, and the output per man went up 89 percent, or 5.9 percent per year, as compared with 3 percent per year for the industrial worker.

The revolution has now hit its stride enough for us to trace certain trends which have been set up and which will continue for the next 15 or 20 years, or until the new pattern for farming becomes fixed.

Those trends are:

(1) Fewer farmers. The farm population is decreasing at the rate of 750,000 a year. In the next 10 years it will leave only half the number on the farms as are now on them.

(2) A corresponding decrease in the number of farms and an increase in the size of the average farm; from 138 acres in 1910 to 242 acres in 1954.

(3) A noticeable increase in specialty farming. Nineteen percent less farms have chickens as had them 5 years ago.

(4) The need for large capital investment for machinery. This now almost equals the real-estate valuation.

Summary

The agricultural revolution cannot be stopped any more than the industrial one of 100 years ago could be stopped. The hand loom workers in Manchester, England, rioted and destroyed some steam power factories, but it had no effect on the changeover.

Farming is fast losing its characterization as a way of life and is becoming a business in the modern sense of the word. Some may deny the change and call it "plowing the little farmer under," but they cannot stop it.

Bearing that fact in mind let's turn to the beef industry and see how it sizes up in company with other gigantic organizations.

The beef cattle industry

The industry itself is big and important. Cattle are produced on 4 million farms located in all 48 States. Only chickens are raised on a greater number of farms. The cash receipts from cattle and calves in 1953 were $4.9 billion. This is the largest receipt from any single farm product and amounts to 15.7 percent of the total cash receipts to farmers and ranchers.

The industry ranks with steel, automobiles, electrical equipment, and textiles as one of the largest in the United States. But it has a unique producing unit makeup.

Only 1 percent of all farms having cattle have 100 or more cows.

Only 5 percent have 30 or more cows.

And 75 percent have less than 10 cows.

In the 300 years of its existence on this continent there has never been a serious attempt to develop a trade consciousness to control its market. From the cow to the dinner table beef must be bought and sold four times to separate branches of the industry. The producer sells to the feeder, the feeder to the packer, and the packer to the retailer, and the retailer to the consumer. All of these pay toll to the transporter, railroad or truck. The last three of these agencies, the packers, retailers, and transporters, have labor costs fixed and protected by unions, so that drops in the price of beef have to be cushioned on the labor of the producer and feeder.

It is estimated that less than 90,000 persons control more than 50 percent of the production of quality beef cattle in the United States. In New Mexico the number would be in the hundreds. If these individuals could agree to regulate the flow to market of calves and yearlings, a beginning could be made on the most crying need of the cowman-trade organization.

Nearly all other great industrial units have a verticle organization which reduces the cost as the product goes through the various stages to the consumer. Thus the major oil companies themselves are producers, refiners, transporters, and retailers through leased gas stations. The accumulation of the many in-between costs which are thus saved amounts to a big saving in the industry and to the consumer.

Predominance in the specialty production of quality beef cattle lies in the 11 Far Western States and Texas. The ultimate fate of cattle producers will probably be decided by the action of operators in those States. A movement by any one State which met even with a qualified success would spread to other States and soon become of national importance.

Failing any concerted action to protect his branch of the industry, the cattle producer must rely upon his individual efforts to effect savings and increase the efficiency of his own setup. These efforts fall into three categories.

THE WESTERN CATTLE PRODUCER

The three ways a cow and calf man can help his income are: Better feeding, better breeding, and less losses.

BETTER FEEDING

If his principle feed is range and pasture grasses, he can look back at the progress made in the past 15 years in burning, spraying, and clearing brush. The development of stock reservoirs, concentrate and salt feeding, and many other improvements now common on most ranches. More recently the American Society of Range Management has been formed with branches in all the Western States and a monthly publication reporting all new discoveries and advancements in this field.

If cultivated feeds are part or all of the producer's ration science is just now beginning to lift the curtain of ignorance which has obscured the action which occurred in the cow's rumen when certain foods entered it. Hormones such as Stilbestrol which have entered the market within the past 2 years have already become standard ingredients in feeding. The use of corn cobs, corn stalks, straw, and other roughages when mixed with urea is just beginning to be recognized as a wonderful feed for growth, as are the ensilages.

The crying need for more research on the chemical action upon the feeds in the cow's rumen, is just beginning to be recognized.

After all the steer is merely a converter of carbon hydrates into a protein food and in competition with other converters, he certainly needs all the aid science can give him.

Professor Maynard, of Cornell University, is authority for the statement that the pig is by far and away the most economical converter of cereals into meat. Twenty percent of the calories fed a pig are returned in the form of pork. Next high to the pig is the milch cow whose milk returns 15 percent in protein food. Then comes the hen whose eggs are 10-percent protein return on the calories fed. Last and away down the list come the steer and the lamb who return only 3 percent of their feed in beef or mutton. This low rate of return, however, is offset by the fact that the principle food of the steer and the lamb is grass, brouse, and roughage which a pig or a hen could not eat. Also the pig and the hen eat principally concentrates like grain which brings them into direct competition with human beings, whereas the steer and the lamb garner what otherwise would be a total waste.

Less losses

Under this heading comes the whole new field of modern veterinary science. It taxes the efforts of a cowman today to even keep abreast of the new remedies and preventative serums and medicines which the laboratories of the great pharmaceutical firms are advertising. Many ranchmen carry a full line of such drugs and have learned to administer them themselves. Animal hospitals in most dairy regions and many beef cattle sections are reducing the cost of veterinary attention and multiplying the veterinarian's usefulness.

Insecticides are gaining on disease pests every day. Use of these drugs and facilities has already cut the oldtime customary 5 percent range loss to less than 1 percent in the better-managed herds.

Better breeding

Better breeding which is the top accomplishment of better management holds the greatest opportunity of anything else to bring prosperity to the producer. If you have read the report of Alan Rogers' research committee to the American National Cattle Association given in New Orleans in January of this year, you will be shocked to note the customary 20 percent loss in calving and the appalling lack of information about the breeding ability of herd bulls. The producer of tomorrow will not be able to continue any such wasteful practices.

Then comes the matter of increasing the rate of gain of an animal, i. e., his ability to make more economical use of his food and to convert a greater amount of it into flesh and at a greater rate of speed. All of these new developments have come so lately as not to be given any recognition in the show ring where the old standards of beauty, color, markings, finish, and type govern exclusively.

The result of this is that a demand has arisen for new standards for rating bulls.

The new American Beef Cattle Performance Registry Association which held a meeting in Denver this month is an attempt to meet this need. It will open its books to register calves of all beef breeds which can show a weight-gaining ability above the average. Since ability to put on flesh is inheritable, it is believed such a standard will do much to benefit beef cattle.

The United States Range Experiment Station at Miles City, Mont., has probably done more along those lines than any other station in the United States. They have been breeding for that objective since 1936 and have developed a long bodied, stretchy animal that shows an extraordinary ability to put on flesh and do it rapidly. They produce several hundred yearling bulls a year which they index for rate of growth. These are sold at a uniform price of $500 and are contracted for clear through the 1958 crop. Calves from such bulls are bringing a premium of 2 to 3 cents a pound over other calves. In addition to weighing their calves the Miles City Station has done a lot of measuring. They do not claim exact correlations between size and rate of growth but they do think there are three characteristics which are very important. Those three are: (1) Birth weight; (2) length of body; (3) length of hind leg from hock to point of hip.

And now in conclusion, let me ask your pardon if I tell you of my own brief experience in breeding for rate of gain.

Three years ago I read in the Farmers Digest about a California breeder who had weighed his weaner calves and kept records and by selling off his cows that brought in light calves, had in the course of 9 years raised the average weight of his weaner calves by 90 pounds.

I drove my pickup to his ranch and bought a calf that weighed 765 pounds when weaned at 8 months with no concentrate and only his mother's milk. Later I bought his half-brother a year older. Both were large bodied and long legged and not the show type, but they were smooth on the tail, evenly fleshed and fair heads. I am now getting my second crop of calves from these bulls and from two bulls loaned me from the Miles City, (Mona.) Range Experiment Station. The calves average 74 pounds at birth. Several have weighed better than 90 pounds this month. The cows do not have more trouble having big calves than they do with smaller ones if the delivery is normal. When assistance is required the bigger calves seem to take longer to get their full vitality.

Between the 2 California bulls, 1 of them had calves averaging 10 pounds more at birth date and those heavier calves averaged one-tenth of a pound a day more gain than the others. One-tenth of a pound a day is 3 pounds per month or 18 pounds in 6 months.

I might add that all this work is being carried on in a cooperative research experiment between the United States Department of Agriculture, the Colorado A. and M. College at Fort Collins, and a group of Yampa Valley ranchmen of which I am one.

I want to say from a lifetime of pleasure and experience in raising purebred Hereford cattle that I never felt the possibilities for improvement were so near at hand and so limitless in their possibilities as they are now in this year 1956.

Thoughts of a Farmer Upon Leaving the Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in the March 22, 1956, issue of the Reporter there was published a letter from Mr. Eldon "Zeke" Roberts of the National Farmers Organization, Corning, Iowa. I hope, Mr. President, that when President Eisenhower goes before the Nation to discuss the farm bill, he will have clearly in mind the agricultural picture so dramatically and vividly portrayed in Zeke Roberts' letter. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Roberts' letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO THE EDITOR:

I am one of those thousands of small farmers squeezed off the soil by a combination of conditions, most of them beyond our control. We of the National Farmers Organization are doing all in our power to get the legislation necessary to save American agriculture from passing into the hands of large corporations. We feel that this is a social problem, a dangerous social problem because this exodus of the small farmer from his land weakens the very foundations of our democracy. We realize, of course, that modern technology has inevitably made the smaller farm an uneconomic unit in a good many cases, but I feel that eventual decentralization of industry, specialization on the small farm, and on the whole a more sympathetic attitude from the Department of Agriculture can to a large extent keep that man and his family out in the country.

I am sending you some thoughts that I jotted down the night that I had my sale. They are entitled "As I Am Leaving the Farm." Perhaps they will give you an insight into the ideas and thoughts that run through the minds of us who have been or are being squeezed off the land:

"Today you sold out. Now the crowd has gone and you have loaded the last reluctant cow and stubborn hog out to their various destinations. As the last truckload pulls out of the driveway into the road, you lean up against the darkened, strangely silent barn and smoke thoughtfully.

"Somehow you dread going into the house; the kids, not too long home from school, will be noisily asking questions about the sale, questions you don't care to answer. The whole family will be discussing the move to town, a move you hate to think about. You pull your collar a little higher around your ears and hunker down on the lee side of the barn, out of the gusty wind—to think.

"A confused jumble of thoughts runs through your head. 'Where did I fail? Surely not from lack of hard work.' You think of the backbreaking years of toil you and your wife spent. Lack of management? Maybe you could have managed better, but you were always counted a good farmer. You loved the soil and tended it carefully.

"Your mouth twists bitterly as you contemplate the fate of those fields. The man who will farm your land next year has merely added your little 160 to his already extensive holdings, and a vision of your farmstead, deserted and weed-grown, flits through your mind's eye. The new operator is also a firm believer in straight rows; you sadly

contemplate the fate of your terraced fields and grassed waterways.

"What in the devil are you going to do in town? You can slop hogs and milk cows, but Omaha doesn't seem to have any demand for those skills. Also you have come to realize that you are a lot older than you thought you were. Seems like 45 is 10 years too old to be worth a darn for anything as far as getting a job is concerned. You think of the future with a deep, aching fear. You can't help it.

"You turn the yard light on. You feel that somehow it will make the silent barn and empty lofts less lonely. You make the rounds closing the open doors and widely flung gates. There's nothing left to get out, but habit is strong.

"You look across the driveway to the crib. In the glare of the yard light, the different-colored sale bills, tacked up there today, stand out strangely. There they hang, an even dozen of them, stuck up there by fellow farmers, each one bearing that pathetic heading 'As I Am Leaving the Farm * * *.' You gaze at those brightly colored scraps of cardboard. Some of the names on them are men you know, men like yourself, being torn from the soil they loved and have cherished, to be thrown into a strange and unfriendly environment. Men whose dreams and hopes withered with their crops the last two drought-stricken years, and who now, like you, will be walking city pavements when the bluegrass greens the hills next spring. You can't help but wonder about the bright boys; those boys whose heads are full of statistics rather than brains; whose answer to the farm problem is 'Get rid of the small inefficient farmer.' You wonder how they'd feel if they were in your shoes.

"You're getting cold so you start slowly toward the house. Under the yard-light pole lies one of your sale bills. Your own name in big letters at the bottom looks strange. You walk up to it and idly turn it over with your foot. A gust of wind grabs it and away it goes, across the driveway into the road to disappear in a cloud of dust—into the cold, windy dark."

ELDON (ZEKE) ROBERTS,
National Farmers Organization.
CORNING, IOWA.

Appraising Soviet Troubles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting editorial appearing in the Arizona Daily Star of April 8, 1956. It is written by Mr. W. R. Matthews, the editor of that newspaper.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPRAISING SOVIET TROUBLES

The outstanding fact made clear by the new domestic political troubles in the Soviet Union is that the revolution is over as far as the Soviet Union is concerned.

1. The Russian people, as a whole, accept the Communist society as an intimate part of their life. It is the only kind of society they know how to make work, because there are so few Russian people alive today who were adults when the revolution began.

There may be more changes in the palace guard; a new dictator may emerge, all of which would be a normal Russian development. There is little if any danger of any further revolutionary changes. Henceforth, they will be organic ones, such as modification of political and economic policies and practices now going on.

2. The present turn of events, the destruction of the "Stalin is God" legend, the emphasis on collective leadership, the glorification of Russian history, expresses a growing Russian nationalism which the Red Army finds strengthens its hand. Since the death of Stalin the Soviet leaders have been tapping a vigorous native patriotism and determination of the Russian people to take care of themselves—the Soviet Union—ahead of everything else. As such, it represents a natural growth which, despite temporary confusion, will strengthen rather than weaken the Soviet Union.

3. The unconcern of the Soviet leaders and the people about the effect of this new development on foreign Communist parties confirms that. These parties are left with uncertain direction as to doctrine; they are seriously discredited; their influence is weakened. As a result, they will have to put the soft pedal on the revolutionary program, and attempt to hold their own as participants in coalition or popular-front governments.

4. Of course, the Russian leaders and people will be confused for awhile. Political textbooks and histories will have to be rewritten; party personnel reindoctrinated; museums, like the Museum of the Revolution in Moscow, that were devoted to the glorification of Stalin, will have to be done over. What happens to the remains of Stalin, at present in the Red Square mausoleum, may give a clue to the future line. However ridiculous the contradictions of the official explanations may appear to Americans, they will not only make sense to most Russians, but come as a gleam of new hope.

5. There will be no fundamental change in Soviet international policy. Moscow will continue to make itself appear as the dove of peace. That is good domestic as well as good international policy. The Red army can be counted upon to see that future Moscow governments will keep close control over the satellites. Any Moscow government will have to support the historic policy of insulating Russia from the West.

6. Moscow will never cease looking after its interests, and quietly making trouble when it is to its interest to do so. It will shrink from getting involved in any war other than one clearly of self-defense. The Red army will see to it that Soviet military strength will be maintained, but that should not be taken to mean that the Red army will make a surprise attack on us or our allies.

7. In appraising Soviet intentions we should, at all times, bear in mind that the Russian people have suffered as no other people have suffered. They have memories not only of the invasions of 1914 and 1941 but of the civil war of 1917–21, of which the older ones speak with horror. Moreover, families of Russian political leaders shared the awful sufferings of World War II. Consequently, not until time effaces these nightmarish memories, does any Moscow government dare to risk war. To the contrary, it will go to great lengths to keep its country at peace because that is the best way it can win the support of the people. The people will never rise up to overthrow a government that maintains peace. That is the main reason why there will be no civil war at this time.

8. Behind these factors is another grassroot development. Within the Soviet Union economic conditions have improved rapidly, and are far ahead of what they were in 1937 and 1939. The gigantic experiment in socialism is beginning to tick. As conditions improve, the hopes of the people and of the leaders will grow. The leaders see the prospect of giving their country a successful economy with many new benefits to themselves, as well as the people. War would ruin most of this progress, and the prospects of being the builders of a successful socialistic society. Hence, this common objective will cause the people and the leaders to watch their step for some years to come.

Conclusion: The Soviet Union is destined to grow stronger economically, and its people to enjoy a constantly improving standard of living and a freer society. Its armament tempo will attempt to keep pace with ours, and will be stimulated by bellicose statements by our military and political leaders.

We must distinguish between Soviet intentions and ability to launch a war of aggression and its abilities and intentions to defend itself. Soviet leaders and Soviet people do respect American industrial technique and they fear our military strength. Their own self-interest will keep them for many years—possibly 10—from doing anything that would involve them in war with us. Such is the one great benefit of our action in Korea.

Behind all of this attitude, however, is the fact that the revolution within the Soviet Union is over, and that today the Soviet Union emerges as the new Russian Empire which, as it grows stronger, can be counted upon to develop the traditional Russian ambitions, particularly in the Balkans and the Middle East.

Paradoxical as it may be, the growing economic strength and prosperity within the Soviet Union will compel any Russian government to look for more fuel. That nearly one-half of the oil reserves of the world lie within the Persian Gulf area fits in with the traditional Russian interest in the Middle East, and forecasts clearly what we must be prepared to meet in the future.

Turkey Ponders United States Aid Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Constantine Brown, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of last Saturday, April 14. It is an extremely timely article, and I wish to call it to the attention of all who have not read it. I feel that we in the United States must consider very seriously making it possible to grant a loan to the Government of Turkey.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TURKEY PONDERS UNITED STATES AID POLICY—EAGERNESS TO HELP NEHRU AND TITO NOTED, WHILE A STANCH ALLY DRAWS FLAT "NO"

(By Constantine Brown)

ISTANBUL.—Turkey's reluctance to deal with Russia and her satellites is less ideological than practical—from the point of view of self-defense.

The Communist countries are offering on a long-term barter system industrial products which must now be imported from the West on short-term credit. But experts and technicians to service such mechanical equip-

ment would have to be allowed to enter Turkey.

Since the majority of such technicians are also MVD, intelligence, or subversive agents, the Turks are afraid to take even a calculated risk. Experience has justified their apprehension.

Recently Turkey yielded to the strain of foreign exchange and allowed a Polish firm to establish itself in Istanbul to sell adding machines. They were of fair quality and far less expensive than the western products. And they were sold on long credit, with the Poles accepting anything in payment, including copies of antiques.

Three of the technicians supposed to service the machines and teach Turkish mechanics how to handle them were caught by the Istanbul secret service preaching neutralism, the evil of capitalism, and saying that the United States intends to let Turkey go bankrupt because "the Turks are Moslems and the American Government is dominated by Jews, who hate Moslems."

The young Turkish mechanics may not have taken to heart the part about bankruptcy, but they were impressed with the story about the Jews and Moslems, and spread it. Officials "invited" the Poles to leave the country.

Despite Turkey's reluctance to trade with the Reds, she may be forced to do so unless Washington reverses its decision against a long-term commercial loan.

The Turks have committed some serious mistakes. They were overoptimistic in their gigantic industrialization program in the belief that they could meet their heavy short-term obligations. It is only recently that they changed their laws which prevented foreign capital from exploiting the vast mineral resources and possible rich oil fields which are believed to exist in this country. This change will in all likelihood get the country out of the hole eventually. But positive results cannot be expected for at least 5 years.

The United States must regard Turkey's tribulations from a political rather than financial viewpoint. We made the costly blunder of refusing to support Chiang Kai-shek when he was still holding the mainland of China but could not stop inflation without support from the United States. Cries at home of corruption in the Chinese Government and incompetence in handling economic and financial matters prevented further assistance to the Kuomintang Government. These were partially responsible for the loss of China to the Communists.

The Turkish situation is only partly comparable to the Chinese. Washington does not accuse Ankara of corruption. In fact Americans responsible for assistance told this reporter there are fewer sticky-fingered officials in Turkey than in any other allied country, with the possible exception of Britain.

But the State Department seems to look at the present situation with a view of teaching the Turks a financial lesson. This overlooks the far more important political angle—the keen interest of the U. S. S. R. in Turkish affairs and eagerness to "help out."

Russia's objective is not to dominate Turkey or take some of her territory but only to neutralize her.

The Turkish Government is in a difficult position. It may soon not be able to explain to its people why it refuses the apparently friendly hand of the Soviets when all the West is waltzing with the Reds. The man in the street wonders about the wisdom of his government turning its back on the Kremlin when the Istanbul press publishes pictures of Malenkov being kissed by two English girls, stories about the British plans to welcome Bulganin and Khrushchev, and American Senators and Representatives visiting Moscow.

Turkish leaders say that their country is at least on a par with Britain in its strategic importance to the United States. When Britain was threatened in 1947 with an economic crisis apparently less serious than the one here, the American Government did not hesitate to lend the Britsh Labor government $3.75 billion. The explanation was that unless the loan was forthcoming immediately we might lose Britain as an ally. Less than 10 percent of that amount, for the same period and at the same rate of interest, has been sought in vain by Turkey since last year.

It is strange, remark responsible Turkish officials, that after turning down the Egyptions for more than 2 years in their request for help on the Aswan Dam America rushed to give them all they wanted on conditions imposed by Premier Nasser himself as soon as the Russians showed up in Cairo. It is even stranger, they say, that the American Government is anxious to give $100 million to Mr. Nehru's India to help its backward people and is giving a similar amount this year to Yugoslavia's Tito without strings. Yet America is not willing to help Turkey which has proven itself a loyal friend.

The British, French, Canadian and Indian ambassadors at Ankara have been pressuring Turkey for the last 2 years to line up with them to recognize Communist China. The same counsel was given Foreign Minister Fuat Koprulu by the Arab governments, who are anxious to see Turkey join them in an anti-Western bloc. The answer so far is a definite "No."

The Turks who eagerly read Secretary Dulles' words wonder why, if "our help is unconditional," it excludes an ally who stands unflinchingly by America.

Conference Report (Farm Bill) No Help to the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, in December 1955, I submitted a questionnaire to the people of the 17th District. The newspapers, through the courtesy of their owners and editors, in our district carried this questionnaire, giving approximately everyone an opportunity to sign their name, their occupation, and their views. Many items were covered but I especially want to call your attention to the results of the voting on one particular subject—the farm program. I submit those results for your consideration:

THE FARM PROGRAM: WHICH PLAN DO YOU FAVOR?

(a) 100-percent price support with acreage control:

Total replies: 0.7 percent, 99.3 percent no.

Farmers voted: 23 percent yes, 77 percent no.

(b) Flexible price support with acreage control:

Total replies: 37 percent yes, 63 percent no.

Farmers voted: 17 percent yes, 83 percent no.

(c) Elimination of all price supports and acreage controls:

Total replies: 54 percent yes, 46 percent no.

Farmers voted: 63 percent yes, 37 percent no.

On April 11 the House Conferees on Agriculture submitted to us, and asked for our approval, a bill which is not fair, a bill that would hurt the majority of the farmers and give preferential treatment to a few. The bill would increase cost to dairy, poultry, and livestock farmers. It would help hold down prices on feeder cattle, lambs, and hogs, and without question it would tend to dry up markets for the very farmers for whom help is needed. I voted "no" on the recent conference farm bill, H. R. 12, for the following reasons:

It would put the American farmers more under Federal control and domination.

It would keep the farmers from growing wheat that is necessary for them to feed and use as seed on their own farm.

It would prevent all farmers from voting on a wheat referendum and crop control.

It would continue to permit a sky-the-limit program for loans and payments.

This conference report, as passed, is a one-crop big-farmer bill, helping only the Far West and South and would definitely be detrimental to the rotation farmers, which are so essential to our economy. Very little financial assistance is given to the small-acreage farmer. The Campbell Farming Corp., of Hardin, Mont., received $430,691. The Chandler Co., Saragosa, Tex., received $814,041. One king-size farm drew $1,292,475.25 on his 1954 wheat crop. Thirty-seven loans, Mr. Speaker, exceed $200,000. The records clearly show that the big one-crop farm operators of the South and West are able to get bigger by Uncle Sam underwriting most of the expenses while the small farmers of our State and area are paying the bill.

We want the equitable treatment and freedom, Mr. Speaker, that many of us fought for; which certainly is not contained in the conference report for the farm bill, H. R. 12.

Statement of Thomas E. Murray, Commissioner, United States Atomic Energy Commission, Before the Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Committee on Foreign Relations, on April 12, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I enclose a statement made by Hon. Thomas E. Murray, Commissioner, United States Atomic Energy Commission, on April 12, 1956, before the Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Commissioner Murray is one of the best versed men in the world on the subject he discussed before the Senate subcommittee. His views are worthy of profound consideration by

everyone; also, an editorial Point of Military Nonsense, appearing in the Boston Herald of April 14, 1956.

The statement and editorial follow:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, your invitation to express my views on disarmament is most welcome. Your committee is dealing "with one of the few great central problems of our time. Today no nation or person on earth can have a reliable assurance of security when weapons exist which are capable of destroying all mankind." Mr. Chairman, these words of yours at the initial meeting of this committee, demonstrate an awareness by you and your associates of the realism with which disarmament must be faced.

My purpose today will be to present some ideas that may help in forming a national policy so urgently needed in the nuclear age. This policy must be based on all the facts about nuclear weapons—our need of them, their usefulness, and the dangers connected with their misuse.

On February 23, 1956, I appeared in executive session before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. At this time I made recommendations pertaining to our nuclear weapons program and our nuclear power program. As the weapons program has the more important and immediate bearing on disarmament I shall limit my remarks today, within the limits of classification, to weapons.

What I have to say on disarmament may be put in one straightforward proposition. In the existent state of world affairs disarmament means rational armament, especially in the nuclear field. This is the difficult field and the dangerous field, in which rationality is of supreme importance.

Disarmament doubtless means much more than rational nuclear armament. But if it does not mean at least rational nuclear armament it means nothing.

Before developing my proposals I should like to comment on one central aspect of the past history of our nuclear weapons program. The fact is that from the outset we were primarily seeking the answer to one question: What can be done with nuclear energy in the form of bombs? The problems we faced were scientific ones. Questions concerning the development of a national policy with regard to the use of nuclear arms were not in the foreground. We are simply looking for results, always with some antecedent doubt about what the results might be. Ever since the first nuclear explosion at Alamogordo the specific and continuing major objective was to develop ever larger bombs. This was true of the H-bomb program, which achieved in 1952 a spectacular success.

Throughout my 6 years on the Commission I have strongly supported this mode of procedure. However, I long ago recognized the need of developing a national nuclear policy which could keep pace with scientific and technological progress and tried to help in developing it.

The MIKE thermonuclear exposion on November 1, 1952, and our CASTLE tests in the spring of 1954 presented the nuclear weapons problem in an altogether different light. These tests reemphasized in a most dramatic way the urgent need for a national nuclear policy interrelated with the types of bombs to be produced. The major question no longer is, what can we do with nuclear energy in bombs. We know what we can do. We know that there is no upper limit to the size of bombs that can be made.

A new question, therefore, assumes the primacy. Should our future program proceed on the same basis as in the past, and with the same major objective in view—to keep on making bigger and bigger bombs? Would this, in our present circumstances, which are different from those of the past, be a rational course of action? I do not think so. I think that policies will have to be adopted that will set our nuclear-weapons program on a basis more in conformity with the realities of the present-day international life, more in conformity with certain principles of reason, and better calculated to fit into a new national policy on the use of nuclear weapons.

The new direction of our policies as I see them could be summed up in the phrase "rational nuclear armament." This phrase means that decisions with regard to the size and type of nuclear weapons to be placed in stockpile should be made in the light of two principles. There is the military principle that the weapons we manufacture should be demonstrably useful for the purposes of actual war. And there is the higher principle that the use of force in warfare is subject to the dictates of the moral conscience.

The moral norm is the more important. There is something in the atmosphere of the age of violence through which we have lived, in which, indeed, we are still living, that tends to dull the moral sensibilities. In a strange way the sheer brilliance of our technical achievements with nuclear weapons also tends to dull the moral sense. It is, therefore, necessary constantly to remind ourselves that a concern for justice in the use of force is an obligation upon a civilized nation.

As a nation under God we are obliged to act under the limitations of the moral law. The imperatives of this higher law bind us to a due measure of moderation and discrimination in the use of force. Within the Christian tradition to which we owe our national origins the duty of setting limitations on war and on the use of force in war has been a recognized moral obligation.

For instance, our moral tradition does not permit us to use nuclear weapons whose effect is mass destruction on an indiscriminate scale. As the only historical examples of the use of nuclear weapons in warfare, Hiroshima and Nagasaki are pertinent. The weapon used on Hiroshima, for instance, was 15 kilotons or so, about 60,000 times more powerful than the largest conventional bomb of World War II. It destroyed 4 or 5 square miles of territory and killed or injured nearly 150,000 people. At our present distance from that disastrous event I do not think that the use of this bomb against this particular target, the city of Hiroshima and its multitudes of innocent people, could be justified on moral grounds.

The concept of a moral limitation is, I am sure, felt by the American people as a whole. However, we must beware of the false idealism lurking in the Soviet slogan, "Ban the bomb." In the discussions and negotiations looking to disarmament, it would be sheer folly to be maneuvered into making a blanket renunciation of the use of all types of nuclear weapons.

This brings me to the second principle of rational nuclear armament—the principle of military usefulness.

Wars in the future will be nuclear wars. This does not mean that they need be all-out nuclear wars. All-out nuclear war is no more acceptable than murder or suicide. It would be fatal to permit ourselves to drift into the habit of thinking about nuclear war only in all-out terms. The traditional moral effort of western civilization to impose limitations on warfare must be continued even in the nuclear age. A limited nuclear war is a possibility that our consciences can face and accept.

In the different kinds of limited war that might confront us certain types of nuclear weapons have a genuine military usefulness. It would therefore be wrong on our part to deprive ourselves of these weapons.

However, our stockpile should include only weapons that are actually useful in war. Moreover, it should include only weapons that we can legitimately intend to use. I am altogether opposed to any school of thought that would move on toward weapons of ever-increasing magnitude, while at the same time disclaiming the intention of using them. To say the least, this position is unrealistic. Under the stress of a threat to its survival a nation will use any weapon it has in hand, however recklessly, if there is any seeming advantage in its use.

It may be said that certain nuclear weapons, which we might not intend to use in actual warfare, are still useful as a deterrent of war, as a means of terrifying the enemy, or at least as a means of striking a "balance of terror." For my part, I think it is time we stopped for an instant to take a hard look at this concept of "deterrence" and at the complementary concept, more recently added, the "balance of terror."

I am particularly distrustful of the latter concept. There is no doubt that a balance of power is one necessary foundation, among others, of lasting world peace. Whenever this balance is upset, there is danger of aggression and of war.

This seems to be the lesson of history. However, it is by no means clear that a balance of terror furnishes an assurance that aggression even on a limited scale will not be undertaken and that it is in this sense a protection of total peace. A balance of terror is too easily upset. It is at the mercy of miscalculation. Such a balance may even put a premium on the moral cynicism that would not shrink from striking the first blow, from launching an atomic blitz.

On the other hand, the concept of deterrence is in itself valid. Force, whether in the form of the policeman's nightstick or in the form of atomic weapons, is certainly a deterrent of injustice, aggression, lawlessness. Yet force serves as a deterrent only when the mind of the world clearly understands the exact nature of the force and that the force will actually be used. The deterrent value of nuclear weapons is drained out of them when there is any doubt about their actually being used. In a word, the usefulness of nuclear weapons as a deterrent against war is exactly proportioned to the universally known certainty of our intention to make use of them.

Rational armament therefore should include the making and stockpiling only of such weapons as are demonstrably useful for the purpose of actual warfare. What kind of nuclear weapons, of what size, are usable and useful for the purposes of war? In other words, what manner of nuclear arms should be included in our stockpile?

The primary responsibility for answering these questions rests with the military. However, the military usefulness of a weapon cannot be evaluated apart from consideration of the moral law.

Moreover, it is my belief that decisions with regard to such questions should not be left exclusively to the military. A due measure of participation in these decisions should be accorded the Congress and other agencies of Government.

Moral judgments with regard to the measure and kind of destruction that may legimately be wrought are often difficult to make in the concrete. Yet, I would emphasize the fact that the demands of morality control military action in the same way that they control all manner of human action. It cannot be maintained that man's obligation to act as a man, that is, in obedience to the moral law, ceases at the moment when he goes to war.

Furthermore a special problem presents itself in judging the military usefulness of large thermoneuclear weapons. We now know a great deal more about the effects of nuclear explosions than we did a few years ago. For instance, we now know considerably more about the contamination of the atmosphere and soil by radioactive strontium. Yet knowledge of important aspects of the problem is still not complete. Our knowledge about the genetic effects of radiation is even more incomplete. When the

military usefullness of a weapon is being determined all the knowledge that we do have must be brought to bear. Serious account must also be taken of the gaps in our knowledge; these gaps make it imperative to proceed with caution in evaluating the military usefulness of large nuclear weapons.

Here the chief question is this: how does the factor of contamination resultant from large thermonuclear explosions affect the military usefulness of these weapons? Surely it must limit their military usefulness. Indeed, in certain circumstances the factor of contamination might well cancel all seemingly military usefulness. This is particularly true in view of the further fact that this contamination lingers for years and would affect life on earth long after hostilities had ended.

We come now to the question, what concrete conclusions result when these criteria of rational nuclear armament are applied. In my own mind I have reached the following conclusions. Taken together, they constitute the program of rational armament that I propose as part of the substance of disarmament.

My first proposal is that an upper limit should be set on the size of thermonuclear bombs to be placed in our stockpile. From the scientific and technological point of view there is, as I said, no upper limit to the size of bombs that can be produced. It it for us, at rational human beings, to set limits to their size, on the basis of moral principles and military usefulness. Concretely I know of no reason why we should develop bombs more powerful than those we now have. I would add that, when a full military theory with regard to a moderate and discriminating use of nuclear weapons has been evolved in the light of moral principle, the conclusion might be that the bombs we presently have are already too large.

This proposal that a limit should be put to the size of thermonuclear bombs seems to have been supported by the President at a press conference on March 21. He is reported as stating:

"While I have been told many times that there is no theoretical limit to the size of these instruments which can be made, there is, I think, a practical limit, as long as you are thinking of using it only against someone else, and there is size of targets.

"There is an old saying: 'You do not drive a tack with a sledge hammer.' So when you have gotten sometihng of a, let's say, of a maximum tactical size, useful size, why I would think you would go no further."

My second proposal is that a limit should be set to the number of large thermonuclear bombs to be placed in stockpile. I have had the need of this policy in mind ever since November 1, 1952, when I witnessed the MIKE thermonuclear detonation at Eniwetok. That event impressed me with a lasting sense of the menace to humanity inherent in an unlimited program of nuclear armament. Shortly thereafter I made a public statement that "Mankind now has within the range of his grasp the means to exterminate the human race." For 3 years I have consistently and repeatedly tried to convey this fact to the American public. This same consciousness of ultimate danger appears in the testimony given by the Secretary of the State, Mr. Dulles, before your committee. He said: "The destructive power of modern weapons is such that a major war with those weapons would inevitably destroy a great part of the human race." He also spoke about "the risk of doing nothing and allowing this menace to go on in increasing proportions."

The Secretary is right in speaking of the "risk of doing nothing." One thing that needs to be done is to put a limit to the number as well as the size of the large thermonuclear bombs to be stockpiled.

My third proposal is that increasing concentration should be set on the stockpiling of a wide range of very small nuclear weapons.

The reasons for this proposal are both miltary and moral. I have said that limited nuclear war is a possibilty that the moral conscience can face and accept. It is also a possibilty that is inherent in the present state of international tensions.

We have, of course, been preparing against this possibility by our program for small weapons. However, this program requires greater intensification, to the end that it will put us in possession as soon as possible of larger numbers of small weapons. When I speak of small weapons I mean very small weapons. When I speak of larger numbers I mean tens of thousands of weapons in this range. These tens of thousands of weapons could form a broad and solid base upon which could be superimposed a stockpile in the image of a pyramid of intermediate and large size weapons.

A stockpile of this composition will support a theory of moderate and discriminating use of force against all aggression, including aggression that may be minor in degree. With this diversified nuclear armament, possessed in abundance, American and allied military forces of reasonable size would be equipped to handle all the various wartime contingencies that might arise.

We shall have to face the fact that an intensified small-weapons program will be more costly in terms of fissionable material. This increased cost would result not only from the larger total numbers, but also from the inherently less-efficient utilization of material in smaller weapons. For this reason, if for no other, it will not be possible, as has been suggested, to restrict the future use of all new fissionable material to peacetime uses. A continued flow of fissionable material into a very small weapons program should for some time to come be considered a matter of vital national policy.

My fourth proposal concerns the testing of atomic weapons. The testing of small weapons. The testing of small weapons must, of course, go on, and even be greatly accelerated to keep pace with the intensified program that is neecssary in this field. However, I propose that the tests of multimegation thermonuclear weapons be stopped. My proposal that they should be stopped follows from the position I have already taken, namely, that the weapons we now have in hand are large enough. I am not recommending the cessation of these large tests on the grounds that they are dangerous to health and safety. The evidence presently available does not warrant stopping tests now for this reason.

The foregoing proposals suggest in outline a program of nuclear armament that I consider rational and necessary.

It will be asked, What effect would the adoption of this plan have upon our national security? I believe the effect would be entirely beneficial. The present nuclear superiority of the United States would be materially strengthened. In my testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on February 23 I emphasized the point that "superior strength means flexible strength." And flexible strength means the fuller development of the capability for limited military use of nuclear weapons—their use in limited wars and their use in combat for limited military objectives.

Tragic weakness would result if we were to build our nuclear strength with overemphasis on large nuclear weapons.

We should possess in sufficient numbers the kind of nuclear weapons that would be useful especially in so-called limited wars. Such wars are dangerous in themselves, and there is the further danger lest they develop into full-scale conflict. We must be able to take action against this kind of limited aggression, in such a way as to prevent it from developing into something more formidable. It means the capability of a moderate and discriminating use of force. It means the capability of meeting the particular occasion with the measure of force it requires, and with no more than this. It means the capability of limiting wars to a rational scale.

I believe that my proposals for a limitation of the size and number of nuclear weapons and for an increasing concentration on a wide range of very small weapons will at least diminish the proportions of the menace to which the Secretary of State pointed in his testimony. This menace is inherent in a stockpile of nuclear weapons that are unlimited in size and number. It is also inherent in the mentality that sees no alternatives in between an uneasy hostile coexistence on the one hand, and on the other hand, an all-out nuclear war. This mentality betrays a bankruptcy both of sound military theory and of moral principle. The fact is that many alternatives are possible in between these two extremes. In proportion as these alternatives are seen to be real possibilities, and in proportion as we provide for them with a balanced arsenal of nuclear weapons the menace of the ultimate alternative, that is, all-out nuclear war—will diminish in the minds of men. Indeed the menace itself will have been reduced to proportions that are manageable by political and military reason.

It may also be asked whether the plan I have proposed would further the cause of international disarmament. The realistic purpose of any disarmament plan should include limitations on the number and size of nuclear weapons. However we should not wait for the establishment of an international disarmament control agency. In this present moment an obligation rests on our Government to make up its own mind about what disarmament should rightly mean. In other words, the United States must have its own program of rational armament.

I further believe that this program must be publicly defined and explained on the highest possible level. There must be no misunderstanding or ignorance about the diversity of our nuclear capabilities, about our intention to use these capabilities, and about the moderate and discriminating manner in which we would use them under defined conditions.

This public statement of our capabilities and intentions is a duty that we owe both to our own moral integrity as a Nation and to the cause of world peace that our armaments serve. We are further summoned to the fulfillment of this duty by that decent respect to the opinions of mankind which has always been a traditional motive of American public action. The community of nations, of whose peace we are the foremost guardian, has the right to know how we intend concretely to exercise our guardianship.

In this same connection there is another consideration. The United States has led the world in the scientific and technological development of nuclear energy as an instrument of war. We now have a further duty thrust upon us by our leadership in this field. Great power is always dangerous. But great power, without a right policy with regard to its legitimate uses, can be disastrous. I believe the time has come for us to establish for ourselves and to present to the world right concepts, military and moral, with regard to the uses of nuclear power in war.

If we do this, the progress of disarmament will be importantly advanced. What I propose therefore is not only rational action but independent action. Frankly independent action along rational and moral lines would do much to solve the present crisis of lawlessness in the field of armaments. America's call at the moment is to independent and rational action. Our response to this call of reason is a matter of duty, and to that extent an obedience to the will of God, as it

manifests itself in the circumstances of human life.

[From the Boston Herald of April 14, 1956]

POINT OF MILITARY NONSENSE

The West cannot afford to reduce its atomic weapons stockpile unless there is a guarantee that the Soviet Union will follow suit.

But there is a point where the power and numbers of our atomic weapons go beyond any imaginable need, and our capability to use them falls behind the quantity.

Perhaps this should be called the point of military nonsense, where we build the elephant gun to hunt the mouse. And Thomas E. Murray, the "stormy petrel" of the five-man Atomic Energy Commission, thinks we have reached that point.

"There is no reason why we should develop bombs more powerful than those we now have," Mr. Murray told the Senate Disarmament Subcommittee.

He advised that the United States should limit the size and power of hydrogen bombs despite what Russia might do, that we should stop testing the big ones, and that we should develop instead "tens of thousands" of "very small" nuclear weapons.

At first glace the Murray plan appears to be a rather radical disarmament measure. But actually it has very little to do with disarmament and is, in fact, a new version of the old "bigger bang for a buck" idea, except this time the word is "better."

Mr. Murray is being realistic. "The deterrent value of nuclear weapons is drained out of them when there is any doubt about their actually being used," he said. There is certainly very real doubt that this country would, under any circumstances, use a 10 megaton bomb, which the London Economist recently described as being capable of almost totally destroying London. There just would not be any advantage to be gained.

And knowing that we would not use it, the potential enemy is not deterred by it. It may be better, then, to stockpile small nuclear weapons which we might conceivably use, keeping only a handful of the monsters because we already have them.

Mr. Murray's idea is attractive. It demonstrates a certain faith in humanity which many of the thinkers on military affairs do not seem to have, in that he does not seem to believe that we would ever uncork our suicide weapon. And yet he recognizes the dreary fact that some weapons might be uncorked and that we must be prepared accordingly.

Mr. Murray's suggestion should be studied hard by our policymakers. His slant seems eminently practical.

What Kind of Veto?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of April 16, 1956:

WHAT KIND OF VETO?

President Eisenhower's decision on the farm bill is extremely difficult because Congress seems to have left him only a choice of evils. If he should sign the bill, he would again write into law principles which he and a very large portion of the people (farmers, consumers, and economists alike) believe to be unsound. If he should veto the bill, it is said that he would deny the farmer any additional relief this year from what is admittedly a serious economic plight. No wonder the President is deeply perturbed by this dilemma. There is, however, another way of approaching the problem.

We think the country will not be satisfied by acquiescence in either of the two above-mentioned extremes. Despite the sharp division over support prices at 90 percent of parity, the country wants farm legislation. Specifically it wants the soil bank embodied in the present bill. This is evident from the widespread support given the soil bank in both political parties and the almost complete absence of opposition, although there are many differing views as to its effectiveness in reducing farm production. If the President vetoes the bill, therefore, we do not think he should accept the assumption that no other farm legislation will be passed this year.

This newspaper has already expressed the view that a veto is desirable. But the veto need not be merely negative. The administration has extensive authority to alter price supports within the 75 to 90 percent formula now on the books. The President could raise basic support levels for this year only without upsetting the principle of flexibility, and he could make such action contingent upon the passage of a new soil-bank bill by Congress. A simple bill for that purpose could be enacted within a week if Congress made the effort. The result would be constructive relief of the farmer's plight instead of mere political warfare to win votes.

To our way of thinking, such a compromise would be preferable either to the signing of a basically unsound bill or to a veto that would merely toss the problem into the lap of the next Congress. Additional aid to agriculture is urgent now. The President can return this unacceptable bill to Congress along with a powerful plea for enactment of the soil bank to which there is virtually no opposition. If the administration shows its willingness to meet Congress halfway, we cannot believe that Congresss would turn a cold shoulder to the only farm measure that has a chance of approval.

George E. Flood Memorial Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I enclose a resolution of the 1955 national convention of the American Legion in support of a bill I introduced today to change the name of the Seattle Veterans' Administration Hospital to the George E. Flood Memorial Hospital.

The resolution follows:

1955 NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, MIAMI, FLA., OCTOBER 10 TO 13, 1955

Resolved by the 37th Annual National Convention assembled in Greater Miami, Fla., October 10 to 13, 1955, That we recommend that the name of the Seattle Veterans' Administration Hospital be changed to the George E. Flood Memorial Hospital.

George Edward Flood was born at Boisfort, in Lewis County, Wash., October 12, 1893, and received his common, collegiate, and legal education in the State of his birth. He was a lifetime citizen and resident of the State of Washington, and except for his wartime service to his country and peacetime service in the American Legion, his life was spent there in devoted service to his family, his church, his political party, and his profession.

George Flood entered the service of his country in World War I on May 9, 1917, and was discharged July 29, 1919.

Upon returning to civilian life George became active and loyal member of the American Legion, in whose councils he was a respected leader. He served in various capacities in post, State and national organizations of the American Legion, including service on the National Executive Committee, and he gave freely of his time and energies in rehabilitation and veteran's service work. At the time of his death, George was a member of the National Legislative Commission of the American Legion. During the 9 years he served on the Legislative Commission he rendered valuable service to the American Legion and through it to all war veterans and his country; and he enjoyed the friendship and esteem of all other members of the Commission.

In 1925 George Flood married Virginia Claire Flynn, herself a Legionnaire; and to this happy union 5 children—George Gratten, Virginia Diane, Edward Thaddeus, Leo Timothy, and Brigid Claire—were born. Mrs. Flood died in 1940. In addition to his children, George was survived by his mother, Nellie M. Flood, his sister, Maude E. Williams, and his brother, Dr. C. R. Flood.

George Flood was an able lawyer and attained high stature in his profession. He was a member of the Washington State and the American Bar Association; he was admitted to practice in all his State courts and the Supreme Court of the United States; and he was a member of the law firm of Wettrick, Flood & O'Brien, Seattle, Wash.

George Flood was a consecrated member of St. Joseph Parish, Seattle Council No. 676, Knights of Columbus, the Holy Name Society; and he was active in the Republican Party, and in civic and charitable organizations.

George Flood attended the annual banquet of the Last Man Club of Seattle on Armistice Day, 1954, as was his wont; and while he was being praised for unselfish work in behalf of veterans, divine agency removed his name from that earthly roster and inscribed it in the eternal roll of the heavenly host to there await the coming of "the last man." What a fitting scene and time for the curtain to come down on a full and useful life. George would have wanted to make his exit that way when his destined work on earth was done. Even unto death he gave himself to comradeship and service of war veterans.

George had a warm heart, generous nature, and friendly manner, and for that his comrades of the American Legion loved him; he spent his energies and substance freely for the betterment of veterans, deceased veterans' widows and orphans, crippled and dependent children, and for that his comrades of the American Legion respected him; he abhorred sham, pretense and dishonesty, and for that his comrades of the American Legion admired him; in his private and public life he stood for the principles enunciated in the preamble to the constitution of the American Legion, and for that his comrades of the American Legion loved, respected and admired him.

George is gone, but departing he has left behind him "footprints on the sands of time."

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the national legislative commission of the American Legion in a meeting regularly held in the offices of the American Legion in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, this 23d day of March 1955 (being the first meeting after the death of

George Edward Flood), That the members of the commission will ever cherish the memory and feel the imprint of the character and unselfish service of George Edward Flood and will miss his wise counsels, good humor and friendly nature; that the American Legion is a better organization because George Flood was a member of it and gave so much of his substance and energy to it; be is further

Resolved, That this memorial resolution be incorporated in the minutes of this meeting and that copies of it be sent by the director of this commission to each of George Edward Flood's children, his mother, the pastor of his church, the law firm of which he was a member in Seattle, and to the adjutants of his post, his department, and the national organization of the American Legion.

Parris Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the incident of Parris Island recently in which six Marine lives were lost has not gone without attention from the people back home. The absurdity of having the Marine Corps investigate themselves is set forth in the following editorial. Under unanimous consent I am including an editorial from the Greensburg Tribune-Review of April 12, 1956.

I have written to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee urging that he conduct on investigation into this matter due to the fact a similar episode occurred 2 years ago at the Marine training base at Quantico, Va., where 2 men died and 1 was permanently physically disabled from 1 practice march.

The editorial follows:

CONGRESS SHOULD INVESTIGATE—

General Randolph Pate, Marine Corps Commandant, says he feels that the Marine Corps can handle the situation growing out of the drowning of six marine recruits during a forced night march. He was talking against a congressional investigation of the affair.

General Pate may feel that Marine regulations cover the case and that the corps will deal out the proper punishment to the sergeant blamed for ordering without authorization, the forced march into South Carolina swamps in which the six men died.

But Americans whose sons are about to become members of the Marine Corps—or for that matter any other branch of the armed service—should have more assurance than that of General Pate.

Discipline must be maintained in the armed services; no one will object to that. But when disciplinary action in peacetime is inflicted without authorization and when recruits are led into situations which might lead to their deaths, it's time that an investigation be made of the methods being used in the training camps.

Parents ought to be assured that while their sons are being adequately trained for war, they are not being subjected to the whims of any noncommissioned or commissioned officer who might decide that he wants to inflict "disciplinary action" such as took place in South Carolina.

Address by Former President Truman at Des Moines, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include an address delivered by former President Harry S. Truman in Des Moines, Iowa, the evening of April 11, 1956. In his effective address, former President Truman exposes the broken promises of President Eisenhower and the Republican Party to the farmers of our country.

[From the New York Times of April 12, 1956]

TEXT OF TRUMAN'S SPEECH AT DES MOINES

I am very happy to have this opportunity to come back to Iowa. It reminds me very strongly of what happened in 1948. The meeting we had in Dexter that year was the greatest farm meeting I ever saw—10 acres of people.

I estimated two to the square yard and you have 96,820—so for round figures I always said 100,000 were present. At that meeting I could tell that the Democrats were on the road to victory. We are on the road to victory again today just as we were in 1948, and for the same reasons.

In 1948, we had a Republican Congress—remember, it was the notorious do-nothing 80th Congress. That Republican Congress went all-out for big business and the special interests and cared nothing at all for the farmer and the workingman and the white collar worker and the small-business man. And that Republican Congress tried to block everything the Democratic President was trying to do for the people.

This year, the roles are reversed. This year we have a Democratic Congress and a Republican President. And the Congress has been trying to help the farmers, while the President has been putting roadblocks in its way. This year its a Republican President that's causing the trouble, instead of a Republican Congress but the results are just as bad—maybe worse.

With Presidential leadership we could have a good farm program. He deserves to be rejected by the people just as the 80th Congress was, because he is a do-nothing President just as that 80th Congress was a do-nothing Congress.

LOOK AT THE RECORD

Let's just look at the record on the farm situation. And remember, this is Ike's record just as much as it is Ezra Taft Benson's. Secretary Benson is merely the President's hired man, and Ike could fire him in 1 minute if he didn't like what he's doing.

I know what I am talking about. I had to fire some pretty important people while I was President. And if I had ever had a farm situation like the one General Eisenhower has now, I would have known how to handle Mr. Benson. It wouldn't take very long to do it, either.

But the President has been working hand in glove with Mr. Benson and his mistaken farm policies for 3 long years. General Eisenhower has personally been doing all he could to keep Congress from raising the support prices farmers get. This is one of the most amazing records of political betrayal I have ever seen in all my years of public life.

LOOK AT THE PROMISES

First, let's take a look at the promises. In 1952, General Eisenhower went all over the country handing out promises about what he would do for the farmers. Just remember that the next time anyone talks to you about honesty and sincerity. Just look behind the mask and remember those promises—remember how they were not only broken but deliberately denied.

Here are some of what the Republican candidate said in 1952:

At Brookings, S. Dak., on October 10, he said:

"The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of the 90 percent of parity price support, and it is pledged even more than that to helping the farmer obtain his full parity, 100 percent parity, with guaranty in price supports of 90 percent."

And down in Columbia, S. C., he said:

"I believe wholeheartedly and without any ifs or buts in Federal programs to stabilize farm prices, including the present program insuring 90 percent of parity on all basic commodities."

Now, let's see how these promises were kept.

When the Eisenhower administration took office, they began to reduce farm price supports just as fast as they could. Where the level of supports was discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture, he began to cut them in 1953.

He reduced the price of milk in 1954. From 1952 to 1955, the Eisenhower administration reduced the support price of milk by 17 percent, reduced the support price for soybeans 20 percent, reduced the support price for oats by 22 percent, reduced the support price for barley by 23 percent and reduced the support price for grain sorghum by 24 percent.

And all this time the administration—Benson and Eisenhower—were clamoring and complaining because the law wouldn't let them make the same kind of reductions in the support price for corn and wheat.

SUPPORT LAW TO EXPIRE

Unfortunately, the law providing mandatory 90 percent supports for basic commodities expires this year. Congress has been trying to extend it, but Benson and Eisenhower have been fighting the extension tooth and nail. The Congress has stood its ground, however. The Democratic Members have led the fight, and I hope they lay a bill to help the farmer right on the President's desk.

I don't know what Ike is going to do with that bill. He would like to veto it, of course, because it is directly contrary to his philosophy of reducing farm prices. However, this is an election year, and he may well decide that it's the better part of valor to sign this bill in an effort to get reelected. But if he is re-elected, you can be sure that next year he will go back to his efforts to cut support prices, because that is what he really believes in.

My advice to him is that if he wants to cut farm prices still further, he had better go ahead and do it now—because next year I don't think he will be in any position to do anything about it one way or the other.

In fact, this time next year I think he will be looking at these things from the viewpoint of a farmer in Gettysburg instead of a politician in the White House. You know, I think it is a very good thing for any President of the United States to have experience as a farmer, but it is much better for the country if he has that experience before the goes to the White House instead of after he gets out. It's too late then for it to do the people much good.

You may wonder why an administration, even this one, would want to reduce farm prices. I have wondered about that myself, and frankly, I don't know the answer. Some people have suggested that it is because they want to help the processors and the middlemen at the expense of the farmers.

We do know that the profits of the processors have been going up while the spread between producer and consumer has been increasing. We do know that Secretary Benson has been trying to stir up city people against the farm program by telling them it costs too much and talking as if there were something immoral about Government programs to help farmers make a decent living.

REASONING CALLED BAFFLING

We do know that, whatever the reason, the Eisenhower administration has fought day in and day out to cut farm prices. They have tried to tell us that lower prices would cut production, that lower production in turn would reduce the surpluses, and that the net result would be a healthy condition in which the farmers would be better off.

How in the world the farmer would be better off reducing both his prices and the size of his crops I do not understand and never will. And, in addition to that, Benson is completely wrong in his argument about lower prices resulting in reduced production. That was made abundantly clear in the last Republican farm depression from 1921 to 1923, and now Eisenhower and Benson have proved it all over again.

They have lowered farm prices and lowered them some more, and every time they lower farm prices, production increases and surpluses get bigger and bigger.

From the day Benson became Secretary of Agriculture, he never tried to make the farm program work. Instead, he tried to wreck it and, with Eisenhower's help, has done a pretty thorough wrecking job. What we have to do now is to throw them out and replace them with someone who will start back in the other direction. The first thing to do is to restore the 90 percent support prices and move on from there.

We need to do something about supports for livestock and other perishables. Charlie Brannan recommended a system of production payments for this purpose in 1949, and it was killed largely because of bitter partisan attacks from Republicans in Congress. They made all kinds of false and malicious attacks on the plan with no justification whatever. I think what they were really afraid of was that it would work.

These unbridled political attacks by the Republicans had their effect. They persuaded a lot of farmers and others that it was time for a change in 1952. Well, they got a change—and what a change. I think the farmer's memory is going to be a little longer this time. I don't think he is going to let the same people who deceived him in 1952 deceive him again.

BRANNAN PLAN CITED

Remember, it was the Republican candidate in 1952 who promised—yes, he was a very promising fellow—to find a way to support the price of perishable commodities and livestock without what he called the "normal bankruptcy of the Brannan plan." You all know how well he has kept his promise—which is not at all—with or without the Brannan plan or otherwise.

Ladies and gentlemen, if that is moral rectitude, I had just rather be in moral bankruptcy with the farmers. Most farmers are headed for financial bankruptcy anyway if this administration stays in control of the White House.

Eisenhower and Benson paid no attention at all to this promise until last fall, when the prices of hogs went so low they got scared for their political lives. Then what happened? They started a pork-buying program. But they bought from the processors instead of the farmers, and the processors' profits went up while the price of hogs kept on going down. That was a price-support program for the meatpackers, not for the farmer.

I'm just a political has-been, but I'm as stubborn in my way as Mr. Benson is in his. I thought production payments to support livestock prices were right when we recommended them back in 1949. I still think they are right and I think they ought to be enacted into law.

And I understand that one of your great farm papers published here in Des Moines has repeatedly polled the farmers on this question and found that they agree with us.

By now, I believe there are a lot more people who agree with us all the time. They are converting more Republicans into Democrats than we were ever able to do.

We are seeing history repeat itself. During the 1920's we had a farm depression under Republican administration. Those administrations paid no attention to the farmers' troubles. They talked about how well everything was going, and keeping cool with Coolidge, and two chickens in every pot with Hoover.

But things weren't really going well. Little by little the farm depression spread throughout the economy and then we had a big depression everywhere. And, finally, the people turned the Republicans out.

We all know what happened after that. You know how the Democrats under Franklin Roosevelt you got the country back on the track. You know how the New Deal and the Fair Deal carried the farmers and all other groups of our people to new and unprecedented heights of prosperity. And, finally, after more than a decade of great prosperity, another Republican President was elected.

SEES HISTORY REPEATING

Now the same thing is happening all over again. Another Republican depression has started on the farms. Farm prices and farm income have gone down. But the prices farmers have to pay for the things they buy have remained at high levels. The squeeze on the farmer has gotten worse. Farmers' bank accounts have gone down and their debts have gone up. Their farm machinery and equipment is wearing out and they are not able to replace it. They are having to give up thoughts of sending their children to college. This is bad, and it's not going to be confined to the farms.

Already the effects are being felt in the towns and cities that draw their major support from farm families. Already they are being felt in those industries that sell primarily to farm customers. Farmers are among the best customers of American labor and American industry. You good people here in Iowa know that very well. You know that a nationwide depression can be born on the farm under Eisenhower just as well as under Herbert Hoover.

The only question now is whether you and other people across this great country of ours have learned this lesson well enough to act on it. Are you going to throw the Republicans out now or are you going to give them 4 more years to finish busting the farmers?

I think I know the answer. I think the refresher course you have been getting for the last 3 years is going to be enough. I don't think the Madison Avenue advertising boys are going to be able to fool the American people again this year the way they did in 1952.

My friends, I have spoken to you tonight mostly about the agricultural situation. However, there is another matter which should never be absent from our thoughts—that is the question of foreign policy and world peace. I have spoken on this subject a number of times recently and I shall not dwell upon it tonight. But we should always remember that this subject is so important it overshadows all our other problems here at home. And in this field, unfortunately, the Eisenhower administration has made the worst mistakes of all.

They have made a mockery of bipartisanship in foreign policy. They have put politics first and the national interest second. The result has been to dismay our friends, comfort our enemies, weaken the position of the free world, and drive other nations closer to the Communist bloc.

HITS AT SERVICE CUTS

In the face of the growing military strength of the Communist nations, the Eisenhower administration has actually been cutting down on the size of our Armed Forces. In the face of growing economic strength of the Communist nations, the Eisehower administration tells us the Soviet policies have failed.

They have been withholding the truth from the American people because they fear the political consequences if the truth were known. But the truth is that they have drifted into a situation where the danger of Communist domination of the free world is greater than ever before.

This is a sorry record and a frightening one. This, above all, is the reason we must elect a Democratic President who can rally the free peoples of the world once again to work together to improve their economic conditions, to maintain their independence, and to establish a peace based on freedom and justice.

My friends of Iowa, I have spoken to you plainly and bluntly about the things that are in my mind and heart, because I conceived it to be my duty. We are faced with the election of a President of the United States, which is the most important exercise of the democratic franchise in all the world.

We are not going to find the right answers by pussyfooting. We need to get the facts out in the open and look at them for what they are so we can make the right decision. You talk about a mess in Washington. We have a real one there now—you farmers are a part of it—you are messed up, the foreign policy is messed up, Government finance is messed up, small business is being ruined. Really, the only people who haven't been messed up are General Motors, big business, and the stock-market gamblers.

It was in this state in 1948 that I first felt the tide running so strongly for the Democrats and the principles in which we believe. I sense the same tide running this year. I am convinced that our party is going to be called again to lead our Nation in these troubled times in this troubled world.

May God grant that we shall be equal to the task.

Finland's Ambassador Visits Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, on March 31, 1956, the people of my district were honored by a visit from the Honorable Johan A. Nykopp, Envoy Extraordinary and Ambassador Plenipotentiary from the Republic of Finland to the United States of America and the United States of Mexico.

This visit was arranged by the junior Senator from Connecticut, the Honorable WILLIAM A. PURTELL, in the interest of the National Finnish-American Marathon Committee, but unfortunately it was not possible for Senator PURTELL to be present on the occasion of Ambassador Nykopp's visit.

Upon the Ambassador's arrival from Washington, a small reception in his honor took place at my home in Pomfret,

where he also had an opportunity to be interviewed by members of the press.

The national chairman of the Finnish-American Marathon Committee, Otto L. Pussinen, is a constituent of mine, and one whose friendship I have long valued. He and his committee conducted the successful project for sponsoring and financing the visit to this country of two athletes from Finland, Eino Oksanen and Antti Viskari, who are to participate in the 30th annual Boston Marathon on April 19, 1956.

These young men have been living in my district since their arrival from Finland several weeks ago, and they have been doing their training for the Boston marathon on the roads in and around Plainfield.

A reception in their honor, attended by more than 1,000 citizens of my district, most of them of Finnish birth or ancestry, as well as by visitors from Massachusetts and elsewhere, took place on Saturday evening, March 31, in the town hall at Plainfield, at which time it was my privilege to introduce Ambassador Nykopp.

Ambassador Nykopp extended a greeting to the athletes from Finland, and from those who had gathered to honor them. After his return to Washington, the Ambassador made some interesting comments about his visit to Connecticut, which I am pleased, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, to insert at this point in the RECORD:

The marathon-benefit night at Plainfield town hall, March 31, 1956, offered me the possibility to learn about the splendid activities of the Finnish-American Athletic Club. For the past 4 years the marathon committee of the club has been raising funds to bring Finland's best marathon runners to compete against the world's foremost athletes in the annual Boston marathon.

The fund has not only made participation possible but also the opportunity for the Finnish sportsmen to arrive early before the competition, to get used to the conditions. The work of the committee, headed by Mr. Otto L. Pussinen, proves how strongly the sport spirit lives among the people of Connecticut.

In this connection I extend my sincere thanks to Senator WILLIAM A. PURTELL and Congressman HORACE SEELY-BROWN, who have warmly supported this good activity of Americans of Finnish origin.

In 1954 the Finnish runner Veikko Karvonen won the marathon, and I am sure that the Finnish participants this year, Eino Oksanen and Antti Viskari, will do their best to defend the Finnish marathon traditions.

At Washington, D. C., April 5, 1956.

JOHAN A. NYKOPP,
Ambassador of Finland.

Danger Ahead in Asia—1956 Could Be Decisive Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a news article by Mr. W. R. Hearst, Jr., which I think contains interesting and informative observations upon the Asian situation:

DANGER AHEAD IN ASIA—1956 COULD BE DECISIVE YEAR

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

This could be the year of decision for the United States in Asia.

Should we again lose or forfeit friendly ground, our fate on that fermenting continent could well be sealed by the end of 1956.

But if the year comes to a close without any further loss of face or free territory, there is reason to hope that a reaction—small at first but possessing the possibility of growth—can be set in motion against the Communist tide.

It would be an exaggeration to say we have lost the cold war in Asia at the present writing.

But there are precious few signs that we are winning it, or even that we are holding our own.

The Communist conspiracy to subjugate Asia by means short of nuclear war is being waged relentlessly and not unsuccessfully.

There appears no immediate danger of the Chinese Communist engaging in armed aggression, although we stand at rifle-point opposite them in Korea, Formosa and Vietnam.

Subversion from within is the sinister weapon through which the Red hierarchy plans to obtain its ends without goading the United States into an atomic showdown.

And uncertainty over American intentions toward Asia compounds the threat poised by incessant Communist infiltration.

Most of the nations on our side fear that we are prepared to write-off the area and not retaliate forcefully in a final test of will.

The small countries are afraid that they are expendable in deals and bargains between the big powers.

These are the chief conclusions of an extensive survey swing through the Far East that took a Hearst task force into 10 nations and encompassed 35,000 miles of steady traveling in the course of a 30-day trip.

Our factfinding party included my brother, Randolph, and my two colleagues of last year's trip to Moscow, Kingsbury Smith, general manager of International News Service, and Frank Conniff, the columnist and reporter who doubles as my editorial assistant.

In addition, my wife Austine made the long, wearying trip acting as hostess and contributed a woman's point-of-view to our discussions.

We talked to countless people, including the emperor and empress of Japan, the Japanese prime and foreign ministers, President Magsaysay of the Philippines, President Chiang Kai-shek of Nationalist China, President Rhee of South Korea, Prime Minister Nehru of India, President Diem of South Vietnam, Prime Minister Pibul Songgram of Thailand, Pakistan's first president Iskander Mirza, and even Soviet First Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan, who was cold-warring it in southeast Asia.

In order to touch all the bases on this survey, our party split into two sections at Hong Kong, with Frank and Randy peeling off and covering Vietnam and Pakistan, while Kingsbury Smith, Austine and I proceeded to Bangkok and New Delhi.

HIGH QUALITY UNITED STATES PERSONNEL

In addition to the foreign dignitaries, we talked at every opportunity with American military and diplomatic representatives along the route, visited United States installations, and had a first-hand look at several sore spots where actual shooting could conceivably develop.

At this point I would like to pay tribute to the high quality of the personnel we have thrown into the battle to save free Asia from communism.

We were all deeply impressed by the intellectual statute and moral fiber of those Americans who are ceaselessly striving to keep emerging Asia on the side of freedom.

Let's look at the plus and debit side of the ledger to see where we stand in Asia as of April, 1956.

These are the places and situations which sound danger for the American position in the Orient.

NEHRU SYMBOLIZES INDIA

The "neutralism" of India. (The quotation marks are used because India too often seems to Americans to be "neutral" on the side of Communist Russia.)

Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru is an impressive if enigmatic figure. There can be no doubt that he symbolizes the mood of India, and neither Nehru's attitude nor the feeling of the Indian people at this time bode much good for the American side.

Nehru is undoubtedly the outstanding political figure of the subcontinent and under his leadership several other countries have been veering deeper into neutralism.

But that is not to say that he speaks for all Asians. President Diem of Vietnam openly asserts Nehru has fortified his chance for moral leadership by his appeasement of Russia, while President Mirza, of neighboring Pakistan, scoffs at his pretensions.

Nehru, though extremely tough on Communists in India (realizing their threat to his leadership), seems perfectly willing to accept their statements of good intentions internationally.

COMMUNISM GROWING STRONGER

But communism is strong and growing in India. Mark this area as dangerous in your mental map of the cold war in Asia.

The wavering position of Japan, a Nation inclined more and more to sit on the fence although its present leaders voice strong support for close American ties.

Premier Hatoyama and Foreign Minister Shigemitsu are clearly sincere in their expressions of friendship for America, but there are compulsions within Japan that potentially can rip our alliance to shreds, or at least render it ineffective.

Another clear and present danger to America in Asia, although a psychological one, is the doubt eengendered by our apparently contradictory policies.

Leaders who have literally placed their lives and their sacred honor on the American side are puzzled when we spend most of our time wooing neutrals whose loyalty must remain questionable.

VACILLATION ANGERS FRIENDS

This seeming vacillation sometimes angers our friends without gaining the support of the so-called uncommitted nations.

Some nations are beginning to wonder whether they might not extract more from Uncle Sam in money and materials if they played hard-to-get instead of openly alining themselves with the free bloc.

The Egyptian Ambassador to a friendly country told the chief of state:

"Your handling the Americans all wrong. We'll get more out of them by being difficult than you will by being friendly."

True or not, the feeling that America takes its Asian friends for granted while concentrating on the uncommitted nations is widespread and deeply disturbing to good relations with these powers.

MAGSAYSAY FORCEFUL LEADER

The debit side of this balance sheet is of serious concern, but now for the plus factors operating for the United States in the Orient.

Here are the most significant causes for gratification discovered on our long trip.

The sturdy democracy of the Philippines Republic and the dramatic, forceful person-

ality of its president, 48-year-old Ramon Magsaysay.

Here indeed, is a beachhead for freedom in an area where freemen are sometimes inclined to despair of ever halting the Communist thrust.

Here, too, is the kind of leader who can kindle the masses of Asia into a belief that the future belongs to men of dignity and compassion and not to the robotlike creatures of the Kremlin.

SUREST FRIEND OF UNITED STATES

By all means and by any standards, Magsaysay is the most exciting personality and the surest friend of the United States we met on the entire journey.

He has tremendous problems, especially domestic, but he is bringing to their solution a dedicated conviction that the principles of freedom are the best agencies through which the aspirations of Asia can be achieved.

The emergence of Ngo Dinh Diem as a forthright pro-American leader in South Vietnam, an area written off to the Communists as recently as a year ago.

Not only has Diem refuted his detractors—who, unfortunately, included several high-placed Americans—but he has brought into being a state which may ultimately confound the entire Communist position in southeast Asia.

DIEM HEADS GOING CONCERN

Diem now heads a going concern, frail and untested to be sure, but nevertheless one firmly planted on the road to democracy.

South Vietnam is one place where the burden of responsibility rests on the Communists in 1956, because Diem has no intention of acceding to the appeasement agreement reached at Geneva in 1954, under which nationwide elections embracing both Communist and Free Vietnam were scheduled to be held.

The continued influence and determined spirit of those hardy old warriors, Chiang Kai-shek and Syngman Rhee, on the American side in the cold war.

Pakistan's firm adherence to its SEATO and Baghdad commitments despite terrific pressure from India and some other countries in the West, notably France.

NO OPEN WAR IN ASIA IN 1956

Naturally this question most interests Americans in their thoughts about Asia: Will there be war out there in 1956?

One of the most surprising conclusions of this survey is the opinion that there will be no open war in Asia during 1956, despite the tense and explosive nature of the questions facing that area.

It seems generally agreed that a formula will be found to avoid the direct use of arms although underneath the deep-rooted problems of Asia will be working toward their expression.

There are two possible incubators of a shooting war that might involve the United States in the next few months:

The offshore Chinese islands of Quemoy and Matsu; and

Indochina, where Free Vietnam and Communist Vietnam confront each other across the 17th parallel.

IKE MUST MAKE DECISION

As you are probably aware, Quemoy and Matsu are Nationalist-held islands a few miles off the Chinese mainland. Although we are on record to defend the main bastion of Formosa in the event of a Chinese Communist attack the decision as to whether we should go to the aid of Quemoy and Matsu under these circumstances has been left to President Eisenhower alone.

Chiang has garrisoned these islands with his best troops and has sworn to defend them to the last man. In the event of a Red assault, a decision of crucial importance would thus face President Eisenhower.

We are no more able to forecast the President's choice, of course, than anyone else, but we can say this:

Many influential Americans in the area believe that if we lost Quemoy and Matsu, American prestige and power will have suffered an irreparable blow. One high-ranking American in a position to know flatly stated:

"If we give up there, we might as well pull out of all Asia."

INDOCHINA CRISIS IN JULY

There is reason to believe that this is the kind of advice being funneled back to Washington by American officials on the Asian rim, and their advice could be decisive in helping Ike make up hs mind.

The Indochina situation will reach crisis proportions in July, when national elections were to be called under the Geneva agreements.

Diem has bluntly repudiated these accords, reached by Red China, England, and France without the participation of free Vietnam. He asserts that free elections are impossible in the Communistic north.

Will Ho Chi Minh use force to obtain the unification of Indochina under Communist rule that semed to be guaranteed at Geneva in 1954?

And what will the United States do if the Communists attack a country which openly asserts it is on our side?

FORMULA TO AVOID WAR SEEN

South Vietnam is a "ward" of the SEATO powers and it is to be expected that we would come to its assistance, but some doubt about our reaction lingers in the minds of Vietnamese leaders.

It is believed that some formula will be worked out which will avoid a test by arms during 1956, and this, of course, will represent a victory, however temporary, for the free world.

Let the word get around Asia that one of the smaller powers has defied the Communists and made it stick, and it could set free forces which might eventually develop into a major threat to the Communist program.

In concluding this opening article, I would like to stress that reaching conclusions about Asia is no easy matter, because of the complexity of the forces at work within the area.

VARIOUS COMPLEX PROBLEMS

There are wheels within wheels, hatreds within hatreds, and even enmities within the different countries which peril their progress for domestic reasons completely separate from the issues of communism versus freedom.

For instance, there are the scars left by World War II. The hatred, or at best suspicion, that still remains concerning Japan; the emotions of the Filipinos, the Chinese, the Koreans, and other victims of Japanese oppression.

Then there is the dislike of the Vietnamese for the French and the enmity existing between Pakistan and India.

ANIMOSITIES COMPLICATE TASK

Religious, racial, and cultural differences are also a primary cause of dislocation, jealousy, and fear in Asia.

These festering animosities complicate the task of policymaking, and they cannot be wished away.

They are very real forces in fashioning the destiny of Asia.

They bind Secretary of State Dulles' hands when he seeks to forge a unified, coherent policy for the entire area.

In ensuing articles, I will touch on these problems country by country.

Let's Talk Facts About Fibers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following article, "Let's Talk Facts About Fibers," presented as an advertisement in Newsweek magazine:

LET'S TALK FACTS ABOUT FIBERS

Today, with all fibers abundantly available, cotton accounts for nearly 70 percent of the total domestic demand for textiles—more than twice the total of all competing fibers combined. Particularly in the period since World War II, cotton has registered conspicuous advances in such important markets as dresses, sport shirts, shorts, and other clothing items.

Why? Certainly the foremost reason is simple and indisputable—it is consumer satisfaction. Objective analysis of 10,000 customer complaints in a typical large department store shows that the number of complaints reported on cotton, in proportion to the total amount of fiber used, is far lower than for any other fiber. Rayon and acetate, with less than one-third the fiber consumption of cotton, account for twice as great a number of complaints.

This table lists the percentage of complaints for which the analysis shows each fiber to be responsible, and the percentage of the total market for consumer items which each fiber supplies.

Customer complaints

Fiber	Percent of complaints	Percent of total fiber used in consumer items
Cotton	21.3	66.4
Wool	18.8	15.1
Linen	1.1	.1
Silk	4.5	.1
Rayon 18.2	54.3	18.3
Acetate 22.5		
All synthetics 13.0		

(Labarthe, "Ten Thousand and One Customer Complaints," Textile Research Journal 4, 328.)

At the International Congress of Man-Made Fibers in Paris, a representative of the man-made fiber industry, reported on a United States survey in which consumers were asked their dislikes about various fibers. The next table lists the fibers covered in the survey, and the percentage of dislikes each received. (The percentages add up to more than 100, in that some people disliked more than one fiber.)

Dissatisfaction with various materials

Fiber:	*Percent*
Cotton	5.5
Nylon	21.3
Silk	21.9
Wool	31.6
Rayon	55.6

(America's Textile Reporter, vol. LXVIII, No. 42.)

In view of the major share of the total textile market supplied by cotton, these figures are a noteworthy testimonial to the consumer satisfaction it gives. Nylon and silk received 4 times as much mention of dissatisfaction as cotton, wool 6 times, and rayon almost 11 times.

The cotton industry, through the National Cotton Council, maintains close contact with apparel and household markets through extensive programs of market research. Trained investigators have interviewed literally thousands of merchandise managers and buyers in both large and small cities. These retail executives, who obviously represent the most authoritative source of such information, agree that complaints on cotton textiles are negligible in relation to the tremendous volume sold. Complaints relating to the fiber itself are virtually nonexistent.

Nationwide Federal surveys of consumer preferences in apparel and home furnishings give further conclusive testimony. The latest (1955) United States Department of Agriculture survey shows cotton to be the overwhelming favorite in most items of clothing. In housedresses it is preferred by 94 percent of women customers, in sleeveless blouses by 82 percent, short-sleeved blouses by 50 percent, summer skirts by 77 percent, shorts by 89 percent, summer slacks by 73 percent, summer street dresses by 48 percent, anklets by 73 percent, and aprons by 81 percent. Moreover, preferences for cotton were found to have increased substantially as compared with findings made in a smiliar study conducted in 1946.

Let's look realistically at some of the qualities which consumers desire in fibers and fabrics. Where indicated, and where brevity is not violated, authoritative technical sources will be cited. These are not cotton industry opinion, but scientific facts. They are not stretched to prove a point. Today's consumers have become too discriminating to be long impressed by claims made for promotional effect without regard for scientific accuracy.

STRENGTH

Fiber strength is important to customers because it is closely related to wear. Cotton's strength is roughly 100,000 pounds per square inch, or about the same as steel; and it is the only major fiber that actually increases in strength when wet. The special significance of this latter quality is that apparel fabrics often are subjected to their most severe strains while wet from perspiration, laundering or rain.

Wet strength of common fibers

Fiber:	*Wet strength (percent of dry strength)*
Cotton	110–130
Viscose rayon (regular)	35–65
Acetate rayon	60–70
Nylon (regular)	84–90
Orlon	84–86
Dacron	100
Wool	80–90

Wet or dry, the strength of seams is of primary importance from the customer point of view. Seams of garments made from smooth-surfaced fibers tend to pull apart for the obvious technical reason that the yarns slip and slide easily over each other. Cotton does not have this weakness.

LAUNDERABILITY

"Cotton freshness" is no idle advertising slogan, for cotton is easily the most launderable of fibers. In service tests performed by the United States Department of Agriculture, cotton sheets have withstood more than 275 use-launderings. Government tests also have demonstrated that blends of rayon and cotton are inferior to all-cotton fabrics in both wear and appearance after laundering.

Cotton fabrics can withstand high temperatures, vigorous agitation in washing machines, and strong alkaline detergents, though some special finishes require milder treatment. Cotton is less likely to retain oily soil, and particularly odors, than are man-made fibers.

SHRINK AND STRETCH STABILITY

Every consumer wants a garment that will hold its size and shape. Woven cotton fabrics are the only ones which can be stabilized mechanically so that they will shrink less than 1 percent. Or they may be stabilized with resins which react with the cellulose and become part of the fabric.

Cotton is naturally resistant to stretching. In contrast, garments of manufactured cellulose fiber have been known to stretch out of size and shape as the result of simply hanging in a closet.

COMFORT

The comfort of cotton clothing is so outstanding that it has long been universally acknowledged as one of the fiber's major virtues. No other fiber feels so good, or is more certain not to irritate, in contact with the skin. One primary scientific reason is cotton's high absorbency. It readily transmits moisture away from the body, a characteristic important not only in apparel, but also in bed clothing and upholstery. Nonabsorbent fibers, such as nylon, orlon, and dacron, are deficient in this vital function. Their lack of moisture transmission, coupled with a smoothness that causes the fabric to lie flat on the skin, makes hydrophobic fabrics hot and sticky in warm weather, cold and clammy in cold weather, and uncomfortable in both.

COOLNESS

For coolness, garments should be porous, yet strong enough to withstand active wear. Because of its strength, and because its fabrics can be made highly permeable to air and moisture, cotton is a natural for hot weather garments. Its ability to absorb perspiration without weakening, and to release it rapidly to the atmosphere, makes it particularly cool and comfortable. Since cotton yarns do not slip and slide, they can be woven into open constructions which maintain their stability.

FREEDOM FROM STATIC

A major factor in the satisfactory performance of textiles is freedom from static. Probably everyone has been a victim of the unpleasant shock created by sliding across automobile seat covers made of plastics or nylon.

Suits, socks, and dresses which develop static charges have an undesirable tendency to pick up lint. Because of this tendency, such clothing may return from the dry cleaner looking little better than when it was sent. Static may also cause garments to cling to the wearer uncomfortably.

The following table gives the order of electrostatic susceptibility against synthetic rubber, and indicates which fibers build the greatest electrostatic charges:

	Volts
Cotton	50
Viscose rayon	100
Wool	350
Acetate rayon	550
Silk	850
Orlon	900
Dacron	1,025
Nylon	1,050

(Lehmicke, Static and Textile Processes, American Dyestuff Reporter 38, 853.)

CRISPNESS AND SOFTNESS

The cotton fiber occupies an intermediate position on the softness scale. By suitable construction, fabrics can be made either crisp or soft.

Crispness may be intensified by various treatments, the most familiar being the application of starch after laundering. Durable crispness may be achieved by parchmentizing with strong sulfuric acid, and by other chemical processes well known to the trade.

At the other end of the scale from crispness is the quality of soft drape. Cotton fabrics of excellent draping quality can be made by proper selection of construction, and by various finishing techniques. Again, the untreated cotton fiber occupies an intermediate position, subject to modification as the fabricator may specify.

WRINKLE RESISTANCE

Wrinkle resistance is the result of several different factors, some relating to the construction of the fabric, others to the inherent properties of the fiber. The crease resistance of cotton, while not normally equal to that of some of the other fibers, has been improved steadily in the past decade, and this improvement is continuing. Crease resistance treatments combined with larger yarn sizes and more loosely woven fabric constructions, are now being used in entirely new and attractive types of fabrics, particularly tweeds and winter cottons.

WEAR RESISTANCE

Cotton rates very high in resistance to wear in actual service. Probably the most extensive service tests on record are those conducted by the Quartermaster Corps of the Army. While wearing garments made from various fibers, soldiers crawled on the ground, climbed trees and walls, passed through brush barricades, and squeezed along narrow passageways between brick surfaces. The outstanding performance of cotton garments in these tests was a major factor in their adoption as the standard outer clothing used by the military in the field.

HEAT RESISTANCE

Heat resistance embraces resistance to melting, to changes in dimension, and to discoloration. There is no danger of melting cotton fabrics by using too hot an iron, dropping cigarette embers, or similiar failures to exercise proper care. Cotton retains its dimensions at ironing temperatures other fibres cannot stand.

COLOR FASTNESS

Cotton is especially adaptable to vat dyes, which are the most serviceable known today. Government-conducted studies of 1,000 apparel fabrics over a 7-year period, including women's and children's garments of wool, silk, viscose, acetate, and cotton, showed cotton to have the best all-around color fastness of all the fabrics tested. It had the best resistance to fading from laundering, dry cleaning, and light, and was particularly superior in resistance to fading from perspiration.

RESISTANCE TO SOILING

While accurate scientific evaluation of the soiling tendencies of fabrics is difficult, the evidence points to the conclusion that cotton soils no more easily than other fibers. It is commonly recognized, of course, that cotton has much less tendency than hydrophobic fibers to pick up and hold oily discolorations caused by contact with the skin.

The winning research paper in a contest conducted by the American Association of Textile Chemists and Colorists offers as a conclusion, "For the particular fabrics studied (cotton, rayon, dacron, nylon, acetate), cotton appears to soil less readily than nylon or dacron, while rayon and acetate are intermediate."

WEATHER PROTECTION

Recognition of tightly woven cotton fabrics as a weather shield is underscored in the following statement by a key Army official (S. J. Kennedy in American Dyestuff Reporter 34, 511): "The abandonment of wool in outer garments of Army combat clothing has been one of the most important changes in military textiles during the war. The fact that an overcoat itself weighs 7 pounds, and gains an additional 7 pounds when it becomes wet, was one factor contributing to this change. More important, however, was the fact that lighter weight cotton textiles showed themselves to be far superior in wind and water resistance in all controlled laboratory and field tests as well as in actual combat."

LUSTER

Cotton fabrics can be manufactured with almost any desired degree of luster, de-

pending upon the variety of cotton, type of yarn, fabric construction, and kind of finish. The normally subdued luster of cotton is usually preferred, yet where high luster is desired, it can be achieved without difficulty.

VERSATILITY

Any objective evaluation leads incescapably to the conclusion that no other fiber can approach cotton in adaptability to many and varied uses. From exquisite web-like sheers to heavy industrial belting, from elegant evening wear to rivet-reinforced overalls, the cotton fiber demonstrates almost unbelievable versatility.

To increase its natural versatility still further, cotton responds to science as fully as do the chemical fibers. Moreover, it has the advantage of responding to a field of science not applicable to man-made fibers, notably, the science of genetics.

In applying to cotton such scientific disciplines as chemistry and physics, the research worker starts with a basically superior raw material. Technical achievements thus far attained are proof positive that cotton is as truly at home in the laboratory as on the farm.

In no small measure, cotton's strong market position results from its inherent fiber structure. This submicroscopic, marvelously intricate structure of cotton cannot now be duplicated in the laboratory, and it seems quite unlikely that it will be in the foreseeable future. Herein lies much of the secret of cotton's launderability, high fiber strength, toughness, and general durability.

Herein also lies much of the secret of why cotton is far more popular than any other fiber, both with those who buy textile products and with those who sell them.

Trumanism Years Recalled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matters, I wish to insert an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of Friday, April 13, 1956, together with an article by David Lawrence appearing in the same issue of that paper.

It is extremely unfortunate that a former President of the United States should so insult the intelligence of our people as was the case in the speech by Harry S. Truman on his recent Iowa tour.

The editorial and article follow:

ROAD TO VICTORY

Former President Truman has told an audience in Iowa that the Democrats are on the road to victory again today just as they were in 1948, and for the same reasons.

If this is true, the former President has little reason to be proud of the road he is traveling. His speech was a typical performance—a mishmash of distorted facts and half-truths. Still, in its way, it was shrewdly calculated to have its desired effect.

To listen to Mr. Truman is to wonder how the farmers have escaped the concentration camps at the hands of this administration. One would think that the President and Secretary Benson have but a single thought in mind—to grind the last farmer into the dirt. Referring to the farm bill, if it can be dignified by that name, Mr. Truman declared: "I don't know what Ike is going to do with that bill. He would like to veto it, of course, because it is directly contrary to his philosophy of reducing farm prices. However, this is an election year, and he may well decide that it's the better part of valor to sign the bill in an effort to get reelected."

This is politics as Mr. Truman plays the game. If the President vetoes this bill, that will prove he wants to reduce farm prices. If he signs it, that will prove he is just another politician trying to get himself reelected. The former President does not concede so much as the possibility that his successor might act from a conviction as to what is best for the farmers and for the country. As Mr. Truman states the case, the President is damned if he signs and damned if he vetoes.

What Mr. Eisenhower will finally decide to do is any one's guess. That the political pressure on him is great is best evidenced by the fact that 48 Republicans in the House and 15 in the Senate deserted him on the final votes. The President may decide to swallow his distaste for some of the bill's provisions and sign it after all. Or he may decide that the bill, on balance, is so bad that he will have to take the political risk of vetoing it.

If he decides to take the later course, he can point to some Democratic support for his views. For example, Senator HOLLAND of Florida told his colleagues during Wednesday's debate that the bill, as it came back from conference, was a "vastly worse bill" than when it first passed the Senate. The 1-year extension of fixed 90 percent price supports on basic crops, he said, makes it obvious that we are "playing politics with this vital economic question of the prosperity of the farming population." All that this bill will do, he added, will be to "enhance surpluses (now amounting to $9 billion), fill up more warehouses and more ships, and cause them to overhang the market with even greater harm than results from the surpluses which now hang over it. After all, we know that the crux of the entire situation is the immense surplus which hangs over our heads and destroys markets."

In short, this is a bad bill. Its desirable features are overbalanced by the injury it promises to do to the farming population. But it is easy to picture it as a panacea for farm ills and to accuse those who oppose it of wanting to drive down farm prices and destroy the farmers. It will not be easy, in an election year, for the President to withstand the pressure from those who have no scruples about traveling this "road to victory."

TRUMANISM YEARS RECALLED—SINCERITY OF EISENHOWER IS SEEN AS OUTWEIGHING "GIVE 'EM HELL" TECHNIQUE

(By David Lawrence)

Eleven years ago to this day Harry S. Truman was starting his career in the White House. He was a humble man, awed by the responsibilities of his office. He reached a high degree of popularity because he seemed to be interested in the public welfare rather than in politics.

But ambition soon seized him, and he began to listen to and accept as gospel what politicians and organization bosses told him. He dispensed favors to his cronies and made a sorry record in allowing important officials in the Internal Revenue Service, which collects the Nation's taxes, to go unpunished for their misdeeds.

Out of this and other errors came the 1952 campaign cry of the "mess in Washington." One of the biggest complaints was about the corruption in the different departments of Government where favors were given to special interests—even to the point of quashing prosecutions.

Today, Mr. Truman is trying to come back. He has taken to the stump, assuming that the American people have forgotten why they voted so overwhelmingly against his administration in November 1952. For while General Eisenhower was popular, he never would have won the election if the people had not been deeply dissatisfied with the incumbent administration. It was a negative verdict—against the party in power. The country knew little about what the Republican policies would be, and cared less.

For 3 years, the Democrats have had a chance to divert the attention of the public from the mistakes of the past but now Mr. Truman, fortunately for the Republican strategists, is out making speeches stirring up memories of "Trumanism" and all that it connotes. Thus, the former President, in his latest speech, proudly boasts:

"I know what I am talking about. I had to fire some pretty important people while I was President."

Who were those "important people"? Certainly, Henry Wallace was one of them and the whole truth about that episode wasn't revealed at that time. Mr. Truman claimed he hadn't approved a speech by Mr. Wallace delivered in New York at Madison Square Garden. But Mr. Wallace now testifies that Mr. Truman heard the speech read to him paragraph by paragraph and did approve.

Another important person fired was Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Here was a man who had served his country brilliantly in World War II and was making a wonderful record in handling the postwar problems in Japan. This was apart from the matters in controversy in Korea. Yet such a distinguished servant of the people was fired without so much as the courtesy of an advance notification. General MacArthur found out about his dismissal from a radio announcement.

Nor was General MacArthur given a hearing. If even a minor Federal employee is accused of anything, he has a chance to learn the nature of the charges, so he or his attorney can have an opportunity to answer them. The so-called liberals of today make quite a point of this right. The other day the Supreme Court held that a teacher couldn't be fired summarily just for pleading the fifth amendment and had to be given a hearing. If General MacArthur was guilty of insubordination, he was entitled to a court-martial proceeding.

But the fact is that Mr. Truman was defiant of all rules of government as well as courtesy. He believed in one-man government. Early in 1952 he ordered the entire steel industry seized, although there was not a single statute permitting it. The Supreme Court later denounced the action as a violation of the Constitution.

Mr. Truman in boasting in his speech about how he fired important people was advising Mr. Eisenhower to fire Secretary of Agriculture Benson. But the difference is that President Eisenhower recognizes sincerity and honesty and doesn't feel that Mr. Benson should be fired for his policies unless they are proved wrong. The White House is supporting the Benson policies.

More speeches by Mr. Truman will be helpful to the Republicans, because they will awaken memories of what the Truman administration stood for. The President's press secretary, James Hagerty, speaking for Mr. Eisenhower, commented: "I don't believe that Mr. Truman by his own standards can recognize accomplishment when he sees it."

There was a time when Mr. Truman was humble, but today he believes in "give 'em hell" speeches. He misjudges the intelligence of the electorate if he thinks such a technique will be effective for the Democrats against Dwight Eisenhower, whose sincerity and honesty have so favorably impressed the American people.

Model Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the students of the social studies classes of the Genesee County high schools last month conducted a model congress at the Le Roy High School. Organized like the Congress of the United States, the committees of the model congress analyzed some 90 bills, of which 9 reached the floor and were acted upon in the plenary session.

Preceding the committee meetings, there was an invocation by the Rev. Herbert Cory; a welcome by Dr. Donald Horr, superintendent of the Le Roy Central Schools; a general orientation talk by Mr. Eugene Webster; and an address by our former colleague in this House, former Representative Donald O'Toole, of New York. Miss Mary Lou Smith acted as chairman of the plenary session.

This was the second annual model congress sponsored by the Robert Morris Social Studies Council, and it was an outstanding success from the standpoint of educational value and student interest.

I regret that the pressure of work here made it impossible for me to attend the congress in Le Roy, but it is a pleasure to call this commendable undertaking to the attention of my colleagues here in the House. It is a splendid example of valuable and imaginative training in the responsibilities of self-government, and the students and faculty who cooperated to make it a success deserve the warmest applause.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the text of the bills that were acted upon by the plenary session of the Congress, together with the names of the sponsors and the action taken on these measures.

Resolved, That a copy of the agenda of this plenary session of the model Congress held at LeRoy, N. Y., March 9, 1956, be sent to United States Congressman HAROLD C. OSTERTAG for the purpose of making it a part of the public record.

The titles of bills passed by this congress shall be included in this document.

Offered by Larry Richenburg, Elba, N. Y.

BILL No. 1

(LeRoy Central School; JoAnn Mangafrida, Virginia Peterson)

A bill to allow private industry to build a hydroelectric plant at Niagara Falls

Be it enacted, That private industry be given the right to build a hydroelectric plant at Niagara Falls, this plant to be subject to Federal regulation in matters pertaining to rates, issuance of bonds, and the table of the organization.

Yes, 50; no, 30.

BILL No. 2

(Elba Central School; Ronald Dziuba, Charles Zambito)

A bill to restore parity at 90 percent on basic commodities and provide for a soil bank program.

Be it enacted, That—

(a) The Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

The level of support to cooperators shall be 90 percent of the parity price for the 1956, 1957 and 1958 crops of any basis agricutural commodity with respect to which producers have not disapproved marketing quotas.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to formulate and establish a soil-bank program on crops of wheat, cotton, corn, and rice, under which producers shall be compensated for reducing their acreages of the commodity below their farm acreage allotments established under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

To be eligible for such compensation the producer (1) shall reduce this acreage of the commodity below his farm acreage allotment within such limits as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, (2) shall specifically designate the acreage so withdrawn from the production of such commodity, and (3) shall not harvest any crop from, or graze, the reserve acreage unless the Secretary determines that it would be in the national interest to permit grazing and gives consent thereto

(c) Producers shall be compensated for participating in the acreage reserve program through the issuance of negotiable certificates which the Commodity Credit Corporation shall redeem in the commodity or in cash in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

(d) The Secretary may terminate any contract with a producer if the Secretary determines that such termination would be in the public interest.

(e) The Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe such regulations as he determines necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Disapproved.

BILL No. 3

(New York State School for the Blind, Kenneth Cross)

A bill for the provision of economic aid to South America

Be it enacted, That the Treasurer of the United States be instructed to appropriate $2 billion, to be allocated at the rate of $200 million per year for 10 years, for the purpose of improving economic conditions of South American countries friendly to the Western powers.

SECTION 1. The expenditures made under this bill shall be supervised by a three-man committee to be appointed by the President.

SEC. 2. Not less than one-eighth of the money allocated to each country shall be utilized for the improvement of sanitation.

SEC. 3. Not less than one-third of the money contributed herein shall be expended for the improvement and development of industry.

SEC. 4. Within the next 5 years, the Government of the United States shall allocate to these countries a total of not less than $500 million worth of contracts for goods from factories thus built and improved.

SEC. 5. Any act by a country receiving aid from the terms of this bill which indicates communistic sympathies, as decided by the appointed commissioner and ambassador of that nation, shall render the provisions of this bill void, insofar as relates to that country.

Approved.

BILL No. 5

(Oakfield-Alabama Central School; Robert Harding Lee Breckenridge)

A bill to make life imprisonment and the death penalty mandatory to all persons convicted of selling narcotics

Be it enacted, That life imprisonment be mandatory for all persons over 21 convicted of selling narcotics to citizens 21 years of age and older and the death penalty be made mandatory for all persons over 21 years of age convicted of selling narcotics to citizens under 21 years of age. This law shall be put in effect in all of the United States of America.

Yes, 50; no, 37; abstention, 7.

BILL No. 7

(Alexander Central School; John Pautler, Steven Wiktorski, Jr.)

A bill to restrict interstate traffic

Be it enacted, That all commercial trucks be prohibited the right to drive all Sundays. The time prohibited shall be from 6 o'clock a. m. to 10 p. m. on Sunday. All trucks possessing a special license shall be permitted to drive all day Sunday and all week.

Disapproved.

BILL No. 8

(Batavia High School, Nancy Kibler)

A bill to decrease the amount of Government aid to veterans

Be it enacted, That the Federal Government confine the practice of free medical treatment for non-service-connected disabilities to 3 years after a veteran's discharge from the Armed Forces.

Disapproved.

BILL No. 9

(Le Roy Central School; Allen Cohen, Phoebe Call)

A bill to establish an armed space station

Whereas an armed space station would be the ultimate weapon in deterring aggression; and

Whereas the United States has the technical knowledge to achieve this: Therefore be it

Resolved, That a commission of top Army, Navy, and Air Force scientists, together with civilian experts, be set up to organize a program to build a manned (or remotely controlled) space satellite capable of firing guided missiles with nuclear or thermonuclear warheads anywhere on earth; and be it further

Resolved, That this commission (suggested name, Ultimate Security Commission) ascertain the amount of money per annum needed to build such a station by January 1, 1965, or prior to, depending upon intelligence and espionage reports regarding the success of the Soviet Union or other hostile countries in building such a station; and be it further

Resolved, That these required moneys would come from, or be a supplement to, armed services appropriations, as to be determined by the national economy or other economical factors; and be it further

Resolved, That although the primary objective of this bill is stated in section I, if this project meets the requirements of sections I and II, any other scientific instruments, measuring devices, or similar things may be placed on the space station to further scientific development.

Approved.

The Soviet Formula for Central America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by my friend, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs, and a member of the United States Special Diplomatic Mission at the inauguration of Brazilian President Jus-

celino Kubitschek early this year. The article is entitled "The Soviet Formula for Central America," and describes, in vivid detail, the deceit which was practised by Soviet sympathizers and Soviet agents in Guatemala. The same techniques of deceit and camouflage can be utilized by local dupes and traitors in other American republics. This article by Dr. Thorning is featured in the spring issue of World Affairs, a widely respected and nationally read magazine, which is published in Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SOVIET FORMULA FOR CENTRAL AMERICA

(By Joseph F. Thorning)

How was it possible for Soviet sympathizers in Guatemala, throughout 10 years, to deceive large sections of the local population and to keep a majority of United States intellectuals in the dark about what was happening in Central America? Was the establishment of "the first beachhead of the Soviet Union in the Western Hemisphere" a matter of accident, or of design? Were those who participated in this movement unaware of what they were doing, or were they subject to the discipline of the Kremlin? Who were the North American journalists, radio commentators, and university professors naive enough not to understand the true nature of maneuvers which, on other continents, led to the creation of Soviet Czechoslovakia and of Soviet China? It is in the answers to these questions that one may seek the "Soviet formula" for the conquest of all the republics of Central America.

Recently, in a masterly address at Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla., Ambassador José Luis Cruz Salazar of Guatemala gave a clear reply to the initial question proposed in this article. "Most of the Soviet agents and sympathizers in Guartemala," this leader of the Liberation cause related, "sailed under the false colors of liberals, or Marxian Socialists; the real Communists either remained in the background, or maintained the disguise of 'agrarian reformers.'" The truth was, as Col. Cruz Salazar added, that "men and women, some of them trained in Prague or Moscow, actively recruited young Guatemalan intellectuals and workers, organizing them into cells and giving them systematic indoctrination in Marxist principles and tactics." The prize example of this type of deceit was the description which Prof. Juan José Arévalo gave of himself as "a mystical Socialist." Dr. Arévalo, who paved the way for the well-night total domination of Guatemala by Kremlin agents, always spurned the title of "Communist."

Nevertheless, it was during the Arévalo regime (1945–51) that the notorious Mexican labor agitator (himself a product of Moscow indoctrination), Vicente Lombardo Toledano, arrived in Guatemala City in order to supervise the organization of labor unions. Lombardo Toledano's subaltern for this task was a youthful Marxist named Víctor Manuel Gutiérrez. The latter's comrade-in-arms in the labor movement was another local traitor, Carlos Manual Pellecer. The direct tie-in of these Guatemalan labor organizers and the Kremlin did not become apparent until the close of the Arévalo government in 1951 when Luis Saillant, of France, boss of the so-called World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU) came to Guatemala. Shortly after Saillant's arrival in Central America, lines of affiliation were established which subordinated the Guatemalan labor group both to Lombardo Toledano's "Latin American Workers' Confederation" (CTAL) as well as to the parent body (the WFTU). The chain of command was complete. By the time Arévalo left office, Soviet manipulation and control of the rank-and-file of Guatemalan plantation and industrial laborers were realities with which any local political figures had to reckon. And it must be noted that, although Professor Juan José Arévalo never was candid enough to claim that he carried a card, establishing his position in the Soviet hierarchy, he was an indispensable "front" for the Kremlin-dominated clique which took over Guatemala in 1951.

In the meantime, a brutal murder rounded out the success of "Operation Deception." Throughout the Arévalo administration, the local dupes and traitors were apphehensive about the national popularity enjoyed by Col. Francisco Javier Arana, the Guatemalan Army Chief of Staff. This officer, an ardent champion of freedom against the Marxist elements in his country, was a candidate for the presidency. Although history cannot be written in terms of "what-might-have-been," it is fair to assert that Colonel Arana was the only serious obstacle to the candidacy of the leftwing candidate, backed by Soviet agents and Soviet sympathizers, Col. Jacobo Arbenz Guzmán. The Soviet clique did not see fit to run the risk of a setback in free elections. In secret conclaves in Guatemala City, they recalled the amazingly simple direct action which had liquidated Eduard Benes and Jan Masaryk in what is today Sovietized Czechoslovakia. Colonel Arana was summoned to a meeting outside the capital. At a narrow bridge, where his car was exposed to a barrage of machinegun fire, the best hope of the moderate elements of Guatemala was ambushed and killed. As a result of this assassination, Col. Jacobo Arbenz Guzmán (now a refugee in Soviet Czechoslovakia) took office as the Constitutional President of Guatemala in 1951.

At this point, it is important to observe that, although many American newspapermen failed to emphasize the significance of the Arana killing, there were some good reporters, such as Edward Tomlinson, Jules Dubois and Clark Galloway, who stayed on top of the story and reported the facts. Journalists of the slick magazine set, however, failed to interpret the Central American scene to their huge North American public. A similar unawareness of history was evidenced among a number of State Department officials in Washington. One of these innocents was quoted, at the time of the 10th Pan American Conference in Caracas (March, 1954) as follows: "Those politicos in Guatemala aren't real Reds. They're either cynical thieves or half-baked theorists." Indeed, when I myself tried to alert one of the most responsible authorities in our capital to the progressively serious Soviet infiltration into Central America, I was advised that both Arévalo and Arbenz were "friendly to the United States of America." The next day, after this exchange of views in the State Department, I read in the New York Times that the leftist regime in Guatemala had sanctioned the reopening of the School of Marxist Studies in the capital of that nation.

It is sad to relate that the most horrible mutilations and tortures backed up the lesson of the Arana assassination. A few of the details of this butchery were revealed by Keith Monroe in an article in Harper's magazine (July 1955). His report, in part, reads as follows:

"Some men's tongues had been pulled up by the roots and left dangling from their mouths. Other men got treatment I had never heard of before, nor imagined. I will not describe it."

Eyewitness descriptions are available, it may be added. The techniques, familiar enough in Soviet Budapest, Warsaw, Belgrade, Bucharest, and Peking, had been transplanted to America; intense artificial light, day and night, focused upon the eyeballs of the victims; incessant tapping of scalpels upon the fingernails of those imprisoned without warrant or due process of law; and electric shock assaults upon the most sensitive organs of the human body. These tortures were applied, indiscriminately, to men or women. These were the devices utilized by mystical Socialists and Marxist philosophers in order to inflict Soviet slavery upon the freedom-loving citizens of Guatemala. Outwardly, the butchers and torturers acted like ordinary human beings: they showed their faces wreathed in smiles dedicating rural schools; they posed in front of child welfare clinics kissing babies; they provided picnics in the countryside with free drinks, tasty sandwiches, music, and dancing. In the absence of a Red army, as Ambassador Cruz Salazar has pointed out, the local dupes and traitors were obliged to rely upon guile, conspiracy, demagoguery, and subversion. Their standard practice, politically, was a clever mixture of the methods of Tammany Hall and bigtime racketeers. Soviet gauleiters, everywhere, know when to enact the role of smalltown bully boys and when to go into their act as good-time, vodka-drinking, roistering clowns.

This does not mean that the agents of the Kremlin did not know how to exploit genuine local grievances. In Guatemala the stage had been set for agitation by the long military dictatorship and vicious suppression tactics of the Jorge Ubico gang. Many of the coffee barons of the Republic failed to read the handwriting on the wall—either a reasonable, fair distribution of the national revenue was in order or the field would be open to Soviet revolution. Abuses in the old order of things furnished the basis of the success which Leonardo Castillo Flores, another Moscow trainee, had in forming the Rural Confederation of Guatemala. If the arms of the freighter *Alfhem* dispatched from Soviet Poland had ever reached the hands of Castillo Flores' farm militia, all the sacrifices and heroic leadership of Col. Carlos Castillo Armas, the liberator of Guatemala, might well have been in vain. Large sectors of the coffee and fruit workers would have been willing to fight for the apparent advantages that had been granted to them by the leftist regime. Righteous indignation about past exploitation also sparked the lightninglike progress which Soviet sympathizers had made in the whole educational system, from the elementary level to that of the so-called Democratic University Front in Guatemala's topflight institution of learning, San Carlos University. The glitter of the land distribution program also helped to mesmerize many foreign correspondents. Journalists, who would have been the first to identify and expose a Nazi-inspired reform movement in the American Republics, became as spellbound as some of the local dupes when they were shown throngs of happy villages taking over the estates of corporations or wealthy landowners.

Soviet collectivism, even today after the loss of millions of innocent people behind the Iron Curtain, has not been explained and elucidated as a system quite as inhuman and obscene as the Hitler terror. As long as Soviet sympathizers can ring the changes on the word "democracy" quite apart from its content, they may continue to dupe citizens of the free world as easily and as effectively as they did in Guatemala. Until peace advocates everywhere understand the nature, the techniques, and the record of Soviet colonialism in Guatemala, they will be exposed to the danger of Marxist collectivism on a world scale.

North Dakota Mother of Year Honors Go To Friend of Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO KRUEGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I present the following article from the Valley City, N. Dak., Times Record of March 27, 1956. The brief account of Mrs. Case just begins to relate the many services she has rendered and the work she did for so many years among the Indians of North Dakota. She has truly earned the honors that have come to her.

The article follows:

NORTH DAKOTA MOTHER-OF-YEAR HONORS GO TO FRIEND OF INDIANS

Mrs. Eva Case, 60, who spent 34 years as a schoolteacher and in missionary work among the Indians on Fort Berthold Reservation, has been named the North Dakota Mother of the Year.

Announcement of her selection was made today by Miss Vera Bollinger, Valley City, State chairman of the American Mothers Committee of the Golden Rule Foundation.

Mrs. Case is the wife of Rev. H. W. Case, director of Community Relations Ministry in North Dakota. The couple now reside in Bismarck.

Mrs. Case raised 5 children, 3 her own, a nephew, and a young woman of Indian descent, all of whom are living, and has more than fulfilled the qualifications for the American Mother—that she be a successful mother, as evidenced by the character and achievements for her individual children; that she be an active member of a religious body; that she embody those traits highly regarded in mothers: courage, cheerfulness, patience, affection, kindness, understanding, and a homemaking ability; that she exemplify in her life and conduct the precepts of the Golden Rule; that she have a sense of responsibility in civic affairs and that she be active in service for public benefit, and finally, that she be qualified to represent the mothers of America in all responsibilities attached to her role as the National Mother.

The five children brought to maturity in her home exemplify Mrs. Case's worthiness as State Mother of the Year. Harold W. Case is in Government service with the Bureau of Reclamation; Helen (Mrs. Helen Charles) lives with her family in Boulder, Colo., where her husband is in public service; Lois (Mrs. Charles Pratt) lives with her family in Fort Collins, Colo., where her husband is in business; Vincent D. Case in an architect in Los Angeles, Calif., and Dawnena Anderson (Mrs. Howell) now makes her home in the State of Oklahoma where her husband is in Government service.

As children the five had their grade-school education at the Elbowoods Grade School, however, no high school being available to them in that vicinity, further education work was taken elsewhere by each.

Mrs. Case was born at Lincolndale, Westchester County, New York State, and received her formal education at the Oneonta, New York State Teachers College, and the University of Colorado. She spent the major part of her married life working with her husband, who is now director in the Community Relations Ministry of North Dakota, in behalf of the Indian citizens of the State.

"Mrs. Eva Case has through the years contributed much of her time and interest to education through classroom instruction and participation in community educational activities.

"As a classroom teacher, Mrs. Case is an experienced and efficient worker who commands the respect of students and teachers alike. Her interest and concern for every child under her guidance, and the personal followup of encouragement and assistance where needed, has many times rewarded her effort through the successful ventures of former students wherever they now reside. Much of this success can without doubt be attributed to inspiration and courage instilled through the personality of Mrs. Case," says Education Specialist Richard B. Washington, now of Rosebud, S. Dak., and a former associate of Mrs. Case.

Although busy with the responsibilities of a mother and missionary, Mrs. Case has always been extremely active in all forms of community work as well as statewide and nationwide work on Christian Indian affairs. According to another of Mrs. Case's associates, Ben Reifel, Area Director of Indian Affairs, "Mrs. Case was truly a mother of nearly all the Indian people of that (Fort Berthold) reservation. Her home was always open 24 hours a day to the people of the reservation. No problem or trouble was too small or too great for Mrs. Case. She gave considerable encouraging and helpful assistance in all instances. I know of no one more deeply concerned for the welfare of the nearly 3,000 Indians among the Gros Ventre, Arikara, and Mandan Tribes."

A member of the Congregational Church, she has spent some 34 years as a coworker missionary with her husband on the Fort Berthold Reservation, where she has aptly demonstrated a spiritual influence over her family and community. She is a member of a number of organizations among which are the DAR, Order of Eastern Star, Federated Women's Clubs and several for Indian-American relationships, in all of which she works diligently.

Nominated by Mrs. Robert Pruitt of Beach, Mrs. Case was selected by a judging committee composed of Mrs. Gussty Fossum of Maxbass, 1955 North Dakota Mother of the Year, Mrs. Harold Belcher, Fessenden, Mrs. C. DeBoe, Jamestown, Mrs. Hans A. Hansen, Valley City, Mrs. E. A. Handy, Washburn, and Mrs. Margaret Kinner of Jamestown.

Mrs. Case is among 52 representative mothers selected by the 48 States, District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. She will travel to New York at a later date to participate in the presentation of awards and selection of the Nation's Mother of the Year.

Outpost of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, on this 8th anniversary of the establishment of Israel as a state, I wish to join with my colleagues in saluting the brave and beleaguered nation that stands as an outpost of freedom on the eastern shore of the Mediterranean.

Israel's history has been turbulent and harsh, but it has also been studded with inspiring accomplishments. With calm courage, indomitable will and prodigious industry, she has established herself firmly, against the hostile designs both of man and of nature.

While the future holds vast problems for her—both economic and military—Israel has proved that her spirit and morale are equal to the challenge. As a nation which experienced similar hardships and struggles in another century, we in the United States have every reason to feel the strongest bonds of sympathy with the Israelis, and to rejoice in each passing birthday.

It is a source of satisfaction and reassurance that the statesmen of the West, both within and outside the United Nations, are today bringing all the arts of diplomacy to bear on the problem of maintaining the geographical integrity of Israel and of her neighbors, as we are pledged to do.

While the intermittent hostilities along Israel's borders have created a high degree of tension in the Middle East, Israel, on her eighth birthday, has every reason to be proud of her past and confident of her future.

Distribution of Surplus Foods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the United States Department of Agriculture is making great strides in the distribution of surplus foods. Under unanimous consent, I include the following release by the Department in the Appendix of the RECORD:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOOD DONATIONS UP 65 PERCENT IN FIRST THREE QUARTERS OF FISCAL YEAR

Donations of surplus foods by the United States Department of Agriculture reached a total of 1,400,200,000 pounds during the first 9 month (July through March) of the current fiscal year, 65 percent larger than distribution in the same period of last fiscal year, the United States Department of Agriculture announced today. These donations of food are made to recipients in this country and abroad under the direct distribution program conducted by the Agricultural Marketing Service.

Eligible recipients in this country received $559,900,000 pounds of food, 42.9 percent more than in the same period of the previous year. Gains were made in distribution to all categories of recipients. Donations to schools, totaling 222,700,000 pounds, were up 25.4 percent; donations to institutions, at 80,100,000 pounds, were up 2.3 percent; and donations to needy persons increased 89.3 percent to a total of 257,100,000 pounds for the period. These foods are being distributed in this country to about 11,000,000 schoolchildren, to 1,300,000 needy persons in charitable institutions, and 2,929,000 needy persons in family units.

In addition, foods are being distributed to needy persons in 74 foreign countries through 19 private United States welfare agencies. The foreign donations are made after provision has been made for the needs of eligible recipients in this country. For the 9 months, a total of 840,300,000 pounds of food was distributed overseas, 84 percent more than in the same period a year ago.

The gains in distribution are the result of the intensified efforts being conducted

by the Department to make fullest use of surpluses acquired under price-support or bought under surplus-removal programs. Further increases were made during the period in distribution to recipients in this country, which were already at a high level, and substantial gains were made in foreign donations under provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act.

During the January–March 1956 period, the first sizable deliveries were made of canned and frozen pork and lard purchased under the Department's surplus-removal program. In that period, too, deliveries of wheat flour and cornmeal under Public Law 311—begun in the previous quarter year—were expanded considerably. The new law authorizes this distribution, strictly as a relief measure, to needy persons only.

The January–March figures also include the first deliveries authorized under Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson's announcement of December 14, making wheat, corn, rice, and dry beans available to both domestic and foreign recipients.

These figures also include deliveries to date under the program implementing President Eisenhower's offer of food to help the victims of Europe's severe winter.

Commodities distributed to users in this country during the current year are butter, cheese, nonfat dry-milk solids, canned and frozen pork, lard, sweetpotatoes, rice, dry beans, wheat flour, cornmeal, shortening, fresh prunes, corn, and wheat. Commodities donated for foreign distribution are butter and butter oil, cheese, nonfat dry-milk solids, rice, dry beans, shortening, corn, and wheat.

Domestic distribution of surplus foods is operated under a plan which follows the policy of full utilization of State and local government facilities. The Department delivers the commodities, free of cost, in carload lots to States after they have made satisfactory arrangements for distribution. States agencies determine the eligibility of recipients, and assume full responsibility for all distribution within the State.

After domestic needs have been provided for, efforts are made to use surplus foods to feed hungry and needy persons in foreign countries. The foods are donated to private United States welfare agencies and distributed by them in the foreign countries.

In this country, 38 States and Alaska are currently participating in the program of donation of foods to needy persons in family units. The following table shows the number of persons in family units certified as eligible to receive donated commodities, and the actual number receiving them as of March 1, 1955:

State	Number of persons eligible	Number of recipients
Alabama	266,548	244,472
Arkansas	270,702	248,793
California	37,354	22,249
Colorado	11,812	10,035
Connecticut	2,071	1,417
Illinois	70,307	64,221
Indiana	38,590	33,366
Iowa	94,330	78,718
Kentucky	254,926	223,234
Louisiana	194,266	133,669
Maine	34,238	30,332
Maryland	11,283	11,102
Massachusetts	12,277	4,904
Michigan	118,981	109,049
Minnesota	12,716	8,984
Mississippi	145,894	131,965
Nebraska	2,000	2,000
Nevada	992	703
New Hampshire	10,266	8,393
New Jersey	20,881	17,482
New Mexico	48,947	41,941
New York [1]		
North Carolina	12,662	12,488
North Dakota	14,687	11,833
Ohio	36,130	33,364
Oklahoma	269,096	251,696
Pennsylvania	909,272	789,065
Rhode Island	11,464	10,616
South Dakota	29,709	27,277
Tennessee	13,584	11,799
Texas	58,229	52,585
Utah	28,860	21,402
Vermont	5,210	5,165
Virginia	56,451	50,351
Washington	5,282	778
West Virginia	215,013	209,697
Wisconsin	9,613	8,573
Wyoming	1,711	1,711
Alaska	604	604
Total	3,336,958	2,928,973

[1] New York has entered the program, but actual distribution had not begun as of March 1.

The following tables show the quantities and estimated cost of surplus foods donated for domestic and foreign use:

Quantities of surplus foods donated for domestic and foreign use, fiscal year 1955 and estimated July 1–Mar. 31 fiscal year 1956

[Million pounds]

Commodity	Domestic								Foreign distribution		Total distribution	
	School		Institutions		Needy persons		Total					
	Fiscal year 1955	July–March fiscal year 1956	Fiscal year 1955	July–March fiscal year 1956	Fiscal year 1955	July–March fiscal year 1956	Fiscal year 1955	July–March fiscal year 1956	Fiscal year 1955	July–March fiscal year 1956	Fiscal year 1955	July–March fiscal year 1956
Beans, dry	27.0	23.1	10.8	9.8	37.2	31.2	75.0	64.1		13.3	75.0	77.4
Beef, canned	25.3		7.1		5.6		38.0				38.0	
Butter	48.8	46.0	27.4	22.2	33.0	23.1	109.2	91.3	78.3	93.5	187.5	184.8
Butter oil									[1] 49.8	[2] 96.0	49.8	96.0
Cheese	30.3	27.5	15.1	12.1	39.4	31.1	84.8	70.7	88.0	117.9	172.8	188.6
Corn										1.2		1.2
Corn meal						34.0		34.0				34.0
Flour, wheat						53.3		53.3				53.3
Lard		7.9		3.1		12.2		23.2				23.2
Milk, nonfat dry	22.5	20.3	13.1	11.1	43.8	33.9	79.4	65.3	271.4	337.1	350.8	402.4
Pork, canned and frozen		53.3		1.3		4.1		58.7				58.7
Potatoes, sweet		5.0		4.1				9.1				9.1
Rice	6.7	16.2	4.6	7.7	11.5	16.6	22.8	40.5		20.5	22.8	61.0
Shortening [3]	25.6	17.2	15.5	8.7	30.6	17.6	71.7	43.5	54.4	17.0	126.1	60.5
Wheat										143.8		143.8
Other [4]	9.5	6.2	1.9	(5)	.1	(5)	11.5	6.2			11.5	6.2
Total	195.7	222.7	95.5	80.1	201.2	257.1	492.4	559.9	541.9	840.3	1,034.3	1,400.2

[1] Butter equivalent of 39.8 million pounds of butter oil.
[2] Butter equivalent of 76.8 million pounds of butter oil.
[3] Includes cottonseed oil.
[4] Includes several commodities in limited amounts: Cranberry sauce, canned figs, honey, and Irish potatoes in fiscal year 1955 and fresh prunes, fiscal year 1956.
[5] Less than 50,000 pounds.

Cost of surplus foods donated for domestic and foreign use, fiscal year 1955 and estimated July 1–Mar. 31 fiscal year 1956

[Million dollars]

Commodity	Domestic								Foreign distribution		Total distribution	
	Schools		Institutions		Needy persons		Total					
	Fiscal year 1955	July–March fiscal year 1956	Fiscal year 1955	July–March fiscal year 1956	Fiscal year 1955	July–March fiscal year 1956	Fiscal year 1955	July–March fiscal year 1956	Fiscal year 1955	July–March fiscal year 1956	Fiscal year 1955	July–March fiscal year 1956
Beans, dry	2.8	2.3	1.1	1.0	3.9	3.0	7.8	6.3		1.3	7.8	7.6
Beef, canned	10.2		2.9		2.2		15.3				15.3	
Butter	32.3	29.4	18.1	14.2	21.9	14.8	72.3	58.4	57.7	59.8	130.0	118.2
Butter oil									36.9	62.2	36.9	62.2
Cheese	12.7	11.3	6.4	5.0	16.7	12.7	35.8	29.0	39.3	48.3	75.1	77.3
Corn										(1)		(1)

Footnotes at end of table.

Cost of surplus foods donated for domestic and foreign use, fiscal year 1955 and estimated July 1–Mar. 31 fiscal year 1956—Continued

[Million pounds]

Commodity	Domestic								Foreign distribution		Total distribution	
	School		Institutions		Needy persons		Total					
	Fiscal year 1955	July–March fiscal year 1956	Fiscal year 1955	July–March fiscal year 1956	Fiscal year 1955	July–March fiscal year 1956	Fiscal year 1955	July–March fiscal year 1956	Fiscal year 1955	July–March fiscal year 1956	Fiscal year 1955	July–March fiscal year 1956
Corn meal						2.6		2.6				2.6
Flour, wheat						4.0		4.0				4.0
Lard		1.2		0.5		1.8		3.5				3.5
Milk, nonfat dry	4.4	3.9	2.5	2.1	8.6	6.4	15.5	12.4	49.8	64.0	65.3	76.4
Pork, canned and frozen		30.4		.7		2.6		33.7				33.7
Potatoes, sweet		.2		.2				.4				.4
Rice	1.0	1.8	.7	.9	1.8	1.9	3.5	4.6		2.3	3.5	6.9
Shortening [2]	5.8	3.7	3.5	1.9	6.9	3.8	16.2	9.4	13.5	4.3	29.7	13.7
Wheat										7.4		7.4
Other [3]	1.1	.5	.2	(1)	(1)	(1)	1.3	.5			1.3	.5
Total	70.3	84.7	35.4	26.5	62.0	53.6	167.7	164.8	197.2	219.6	364.9	414.4

[1] Less than $50,000.
[2] Includes cottonseed oil.
[3] Includes several commodities in limited quantities: Cranberry sauce, canned figs, honey and Irish potatoes in fiscal year 1955, and fresh prunes fiscal year 1956.

Not Enough Politicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include an editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD. This editorial is from a recent issue of the Shelbyville (Ind.) News and pays a very fine and deserved tribute to my colleague Mrs. CECIL HARDEN.

NOT ENOUGH POLITICIANS

The old story of the one rotten apple in the barrel of good fruit is nowhere as appropriate as when applied to politicians and popularly held opinions of them.

Too many people today think of politicians as some sort of personification of all that is corrupt, all that is incompetent, and all that is evil in American Government.

The fact is that, by and large, a vast majority of our politicians are honest and hard-working people performing a good job of handling the public's governmental affairs.

Unfortunately, a comparatively small number are corrupt or incompetent—or perhaps both. These are the rotten apples who tend to spoil the reputations of the far larger number in the minds of the public. But there is a very simple way to reduce the number of bad politicians, and that is for many more average, decent Americans to assume more interest and a more active role in political party affairs and in government itself.

As Hoosier Congresswoman CECIL HARDEN declared only the other day, America needs more politicians. Speaking before a convocation at Indiana State Teachers College, Mrs. HARDEN said that not enough persons take part in political campaigns and elections, which is unhealthy, and our system of government would be strengthened if all Americans took an interest in politics. "There is room in politics for everyone * * * not only is there room but there is also a great need," Mrs. HARDEN said.

We agree with Mrs. HARDEN that there is a great need for more citizens to assume a more active part in politics, for if they did so, then there would be less need for complaint regarding the very few who fail to serve as they should serve.

The first and most basic action in regard to political activity is, of course, to vote in every election. But in addition, there also is an important need for every citizen to learn about political issues and something more than the mere names of those who seek public office.

Everyone cannot be a candidate for office, or an officeholder—nor can everyone be a political party official. But it is possible—and desirable—for every citizen to take an active interest in political party affairs and in Government. After all, the political parties and the Government belong to the people, and the people at large can have the kind of political organizations and government they want. But they can have neither by merely wanting them.

The Forgotten Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the following is a letter which I received from a constituent, Mr. Frank J. Shurtz, who is chairman of the membership committee in the Muskingum County Barracks No. 454, Zanesville, Ohio. His letter is as follows:

THE FORGOTTEN SOLDIER

Yes; the forgotten soldier, the boy of the First World War who marched away in 1917, with a prayer in his heart and a song on his lips that he would not come back till it's over, over there.

Yes; he marched away to fight and die for a cause he thought was right. Some never returned, but sleep eternally in Flanders Field.

It is now nearly 38 years since this same boy marched away. He was paid a dollar a day for his service. No, he didn't complain.

Now he is asking for an adequate pension to help sustain him in the remaining twilight years of his life.

Never before has Congress waited so long to take care of the soldier of pervious wars—he has become the forgotten soldier.

The veterans of more recent wars have received much under the GI bill and its related benefits. The years have taken their toll of many First World War veterans, so it is only right and fitting for those remaining that they should receive a pension after waiting for so many years. Many are now disabled and cannot work.

Congress certainly cannot be so busy with the confusion of world affairs that they cannot take time to consider the plights of the Doughboy of 1918—the forgotten soldier of 1956.

Salaries of all Government employees and of the Members of Congress themselves have been increased in recent years. Is there no help for the forgotten soldier? He does not ask for more than is due him—he asks only that he not be the forgotten soldier.

FRANK J. SHURTZ,
Chairman, Membership Committee,
Muskingum County Barracks, No.
454, Zanesville, Ohio.

The Oresteia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD H. POFF
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, Randolph-Macon Woman's College, Lynchburg, Va., recently completed a unique and pioneering project. The faculty and student body have produced a full-length color-sound motion picture of a classic Greek tragedy, The Oresteia, by Aeschylus. The language spoken throughout the film is ancient Greek, but there is a commentary in English. The original musical score was written by Dr. Henry Hallstrom of the Randolph-Macon faculty and the choreography was under the direction of another member of the faculty, Eleanore Struppa. The Washington premiere of the film is scheduled at the Dupont Theater on May 8, at 8 p. m. Its New York premiere was held last month. The review of the film by Dr. Antony E. Raubitschek, associate professor of classics at Princeton University, is a great tribute to Randolph-Macon Woman's College, which we in Virginia conceive to be one of the Na-

tion's outstanding educational institutions.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I quote herewith Dr. Raubitscheck's review:

Greek tragedy appealed to the eye as well as to the ear: dance and action were combined with music, song, and speech. All that is left to us are the scripts of song and speech, and these texts have been studied, interpreted, and translated by generations of scholars. Greek tragedies have been occasionally performed in the original language, but in such performances the spoken word has been emphasized; moreover, they were unique events witnessed by only a few. Randolph-Macon Woman's College has been the scene of Greek plays since 1909, and annually since 1925; they were all produced with music, dance, and song, directed by Miss Mabel Whiteside, professor of Greek. Finally in 1954, on the occasion of Miss Mabel's retirement, the three plays of Aeschylus' Oresteia were produced by her and her faithful pupils, and this performance has now been recorded on film as a living and lasting monument to a great teacher and as a permanent contribution to American culture and learning. In 1955, Miss Mabel's successor, Fordyce W. Mitchel, who also helped with the filming of the Oresteia, put on another play, and we all hope that he and the college's energetic president, William F. Quillian, Jr., will keep the tradition of Greek plays alive at Lynchburg.

Those who know and love Greek tragedy will enjoy the film most, for they will hear for the first time the immortal words of the poet spoken and sung in his language and by his characters, and they will see, as did the ancient audience, these characters dance and act upon the stage. This is not to say that the film presents a bookish and antiquarian imitation of what may have been an ancient play. Miss Mabel's Oresteia is full of youthful liveliness and creative enthusiasm, it is classical rather than ancient. Hence it is bound to appeal also to those who have never read a Greek play in the original or in translation. It will stimulate their interest in the mainspring of western drama, and thus contribute to their deeper understanding of our cultural heritage. To all of us will it come as a pleasant surprise and as a profound revelation that Greek tragedy is not a series of speeches and conversations but an artful combination of music, dance, song, and action; it is in the truth the Musikdrama of which Richard Wagner wrote and which he tried to revive in his own operas.

The film follows modern conventions in its frequent closeups. The narrator, Frank Groseclose, explains in English the action without interrupting or disturbing it. The plays have been shortened, especially in the dialogue sections, but the action remains complete and intelligible. The director and producer, Nicholas Webster, is to be praised not only for his skill and his competence but especially for his taste, his patience, and his modesty. He permitted the playwright to present his own play and let the actors do their assigned tasks. He enjoyed the services of the Capital Film Laboratories, Inc.

It may seem unfair to single out for praise the performance of the main characters since the entire cast acted, danced, and spoke superbly well. Nor is it perhaps an accident that in a play in which all parts are taken by young ladies (remember that the ancient plays were acted by men), the female characters are especially well represented, make a deep impression, and reveal the poet's genius and their own talent: Klytaimestra, Judith Weller; Kassandra, Elizabeth Scarff; Elektra, Jeannette Hume; and Athena, Julia Wolfe. The chorus of the Choephoroi (the second play of the trilogy) is thrilling in its graceful modesty, its colorful movement, and its dramatic fervor.

The most impressive thing about the whole performance is the fact that the entire production originated in the college. Eleanor Struppa (dance; assisted by alumna Helen McGehee), Henry Hallstrom and Violet Older Tears (music; the orchestral parts were performed by the National Symphony under Howard Mitchell), to mention but a few, are all members of the faculty. The students, alumni, professors, and administrators of Randolph-Macon Woman's College can be proud of their film, and they should be grateful to all those who helped them.

Miss Mabel's Oresteia is not only a document of the past brought to life by the devotion and energy of a great teacher, it is also a signpost pointing to the future. As this film goes out into the world, it will be an inspiration and an encouragement to teachers and students of schools and colleges. There is no better way to strengthen humanistic studies than to combine the efforts of various departments toward the active understanding of the great works of our civilization, especially in the field of literature. This has been done and is being done in Lynchburg and it can and should be done elsewhere.

North Dakota Republican Officials Unanimous in Opposing Benson Sliding Scale Philosophy—Endorse Farm Bill Passed by Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, just so no one gets the idea that North Dakota is divided on the Benson sliding scale proposals, I have the pleasure to present with these remarks several communications which indicate the strong feeling of Republicans in my State who had the choice of fighting against the administration on the farm bill or selling out the small, family-type farmers of North Dakota. I am proud that every single Republican State official and every congressional Representative from my State fought the Benson sliding scale program. The following communication are self-explanatory:

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Bismarck, April 12, 1956.

Hon. USHER L. BURDICK,
Representative in Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BURDICK: Enclosed is a copy of a letter sent to President Eisenhower today by telegraph.

I thought you would be interested in knowing that the State officials of North Dakota have taken this stand on the farm program bill.

With best regards, I am
Very truly yours,

BEN MEIER,
Secretary of State.

Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.:

I urge you to sign the farm bill that is before you now which has been passed by the Congress of the United States. North Dakota is dependent on farm income. Our farmers are in great need of help, and I urge that you give this your best consideration and approve this measure.

MILTON RUE,
Member, Republic National Committee for North Dakota.

APRIL 12, 1956.

Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

OUR DEAR PRESIDENT: We, the undersigned Republican State officials of the State of North Dakota, urge you to sign the farm bill as it is drawn. Our farmers need help and need it soon.

We feel that this bill is the best solution that we have at the present time. However, we do ask that Congress continue to work toward a bill that will take care of the farm problems in a satisfactory manner and on a long-range basis.

Again, We ask and urge you to sign the present farm program bill.

Very truly yours,

Norman Brunsdale, Governor; Leslie R. Burgum, Attorney General; Albert Jacobson, State Treasurer; Math Dahl, Commissioner of Agriculture and Labor; Ernest D. Nelson, Public Service Commissioner; Ben Meier, Secretary of State; Berta E. Baker, State Auditor; A. J. Jensen, Commissioner of Insurance; Martin Vaaler, Public Service Commissioner.

Capehart Challenges Democrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Liberty (Ind.) Herald in the Appendix of the RECORD:

CAPEHART CHALLENGES DEMOCRATS

Senator CAPEHART is not waiting until after the Republican and Democratic State conventions to meet the issue on the farm problem.

He is branding the Democratic program as espoused by Claude R. Wickard as outright socialism.

Wickard is unopposed for the Democratic nomination, as CAPEHART is for the Republican. It is probable both will win the respective nominations without difficulty, if not by acclamation.

Ordinarily a candidate waits until after the nomination to join the issues. Not so with CAPEHART. He accepts Wickard as the Democratic spokesman on agriculture and he is meeting him head on.

The Senator is performing a public service when he does so because it means that plenty of time will be taken for discussion in order that the people may thoroughly understand the question.

It marks a clean line of division between the two political parties.

CAPEHART claims that the farmer is on the verge of an era of unprecedented posterity unless the Nation goes off on the economic tangent advocated by Wickard.

Naturally, there will be no great farm prosperity if the Government takes over the program and pays the farmer a living wage. If the Government does this, the Govern-

ment will tell the farmer what he has to do to earn his money.

He will end up as a hired man, no matter what pleasanter term may be dreamed up by the Democrats to describe his status.

This is what CAPEHART means when he says the Wickard policies mean socialism with the Government telling the farmer what to raise and how to raise it. It means further the Government would follow the farm product on to the end of the route—the family dinner table.

CAPEHART points out that for years the Government has been spending billions to make the farmer produce more. Now he has produced enormous surpluses which menace the whole price structure of farm products.

Therefore the Government, in paying an exorbitant price for the solution of one problem, has only created another.

There is no overseas market for the surpluses because the Government has been spending more billions to teach foreign farmers how to produce more than thus eliminate markets for Americans.

If we try to give away the surpluses, we destroy the markets of the foreign farmers and arouse howls of protests from the recipients of our tax money.

As CAPEHART points out, any solution such as proposed in the compromise farm bill worked out by a Democratic Congress, merely delays the ultimate solution.

The real hope, and the one that will be forthcoming if Democratic politicans stop tinkering with the issue, is for new uses for farm products in industry.

This is where actual solution lies—in the natural field of supply and demand. And CAPEHART is confident the demand will exhaust the supply if the problem is approached from a scientific rather than a political standpoint.

Billion-Dollar Prescription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, recently Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH introduced a bill to provide additional funds for medical research, medical research facilities, and assistance to medical education. There appears in the current Saturday Review a short article giving a succinct, clear statement covering the situation as it now is and the grave need of assistance that exists. Trusting the House membership will take the trouble to read it, I am inserting it as part of my remarks:

BILLION-DOLLAR PRESCRIPTION

(By MARGARET CHASE SMITH)

We human beings act strangely. With the exception of our moral and spiritual values, the obviously most important thing to us is life—our own life and the lives of our dear ones and our friends. Yet we don't act that way. We pay little attention to our health. We take our health for granted. We don't get concerned about it until we have lost part of it. And sometimes that is too late.

Here in America last year we spent $10 billion for cocktails and other spiritous liquors. We spent $5 billion for tobacco. We spent $264 million for chewing gum. But when I advocated on the floor of the United States Senate that we spend an extra $200 million a year for the next 5 years on the better care of our health, some people were shocked.

"How could you possibly spend that much money?" these people have asked. "Why $200 million a year for 5 years is $1 billion." Indeed it is. One billion. Forty-nine billion less than our drinking bill during those same 5 years. Twenty-four billion less than our smoking bill. More than $250 million less than our bill for chewing gum.

Having made that comparison, I ask my questioners a question:

"Is $1 billion really a huge sum to spend to help protect and perhaps prolong 165 million American lives?"

I think most people will agree that it is not. And here is my prescription:

1. For medical research, spend $500 million.

2. For medical research facilities, spend $150 million.

3. For assistance to medical education, spend $350 million.

I believe that my prescription is unique in one very important respect. It is long-range medicine—something that we in this country have never attempted before.

As I am not a doctor, or even a nurse, I may be suspected of snap diagnosis. This, however, is not the case. I have been concerned with medical research for a long time. I do want to acknowledge, though, that my thinking was crystallized by an editorial in a great Maine neswpaper, the Bangor Daily News. The title the editorial writer chose was "How About $1 Billion for Health?"

The most thorough study to date of the impact of illness upon our national economy was made in a 6-month-long investigation by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in 1953 and 1954. I have leaned heavily upon my readings of those hearings in reaching my own conclusions. More recently, criticism of inadequate Federal support for medical research has come from the distinguished reports of the Hoover Commission. In these reports there is a recurrent plea for a 5-year program. I am frank to state that the arguments of the Commission have had a great influence upon me. But the detailed dosage that follows is my own formula.

1. MEDICAL RESEARCH

At present the research and training programs of the National Institutes of Health have a current budget of approximately $100 million a year. I would double this budget, making it $200 million a year, an added 5-year cost of $500 million.

Perhaps I should explain, for the benefit of those who are not so close to Government as I am, that the National Institutes of Health together make up the foremost research agency of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. They have extensive laboratories of their own, probably the finest laboratories in the world, certainly the best Government laboratories anywhere. But two-thirds of their funds are spent in support of research and training in non-Federal medical institutions. In this extramural research and training each institute (there are seven: cancer, heart, mental health, arthritis, and metabolic diseases, neurological diseases, and blindness, dental, and microbiological) is aided by a National Advisory Council. Council members are citizens outstanding in medical science, education, and public affairs. They review all applications for grants, and make recommendations on these to the Surgeon General, who in his turn requests appropriations from Congress.

Historically the councils have been hampered by our system of annual appropriations. Frequently they have not been able to attract the most qualified men to short-term jobs. And many research projects have been turned down because their continuance over the necessary span of time could not be guaranteed.

The more fundamental research becomes—and all the experts agree that it is fundamental (sometimes called "pure") research we need above all else—the less predictable is the time involved. Testimony before the House Appropriations Committee early in 1956 reminded us, for instance, that 33 years passed between (a) the time that the pancreas was found to contain the secret of diabetes and (b) the time when the secret was identified as insulin. Would anyone today begrudge the money spent in hunting down that elusive chemical, which, when finally discovered, saved millions of lives?

By making $500 million more available to the National Institutes of Health, I do not claim to solve the problem of basic research. But I do feel that the Institutes would be given a degree of flexibility in supporting long-range studies. It seems pertinent to note, at this point, that long-range investigation means most in the little understood metabolic diseases which have their worst crippling effects in our growing proportion of older citizens.

2. MEDICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

Early this year Senators Lister Hill and Styles Bridges introduced a bill to provide $90 million over the next three years to match construction grants for medical research facilities in medical schools, hospitals, and private foundations in all parts of the country. The Senate passed the bill unanimously and the measure is now before the House. Under my 5-year prescription I would extend this 3-year proposal to cover 5 years at the same annual rate of $30 million; a total of $150 million.

3. MEDICAL EDUCATION ASSISTANCE

Senator Hill also introduced, together with a dozen other Senators, another bill to provide $250 million to match grants for construction of medical-school buildings. This bill has been strongly endorsed by the American Medical Association and almost unanimously by medical school deans. I would increase this appropriation by $20 million a year—from $50 million to $70 million—for a 5-year total of $350 million. That total approximates two estimates made by the National Fund for Medical Education (of which Herbert Hoover is honorary president) regarding the needs of the Nation's medical schools.

My billion-dollar prescription is now complete.

I admit that $1 billion may appear to be a large amount for taxpayers to carry in addition to the burden they carry at present. But I call your attention to the fact that the American people unhesitantly footed a 1954 bill of $1,700,000,000 for research on military weapons alone. This is eight-and-one-half times the annual rate I propose for medical research expansion. May I point out that our national defense and our national security are no stronger than our national health, on which our Federal Government's research spending is less than 1 percent of the national budget?

Compare the current $100 million research and training budget of the National Institutes of Health with the $90 million appropriated at the last session of Congress for research activities in the Department of Agriculture. Add to this $90 million the sum of $250 million which is paid out to farmers for soil conservation. I do not want to imply that I am not heartily in favor of greatly expanded agricultural research. I know, of course, that much of such research benefits us in our studies of the diseases of man. And I have always supported farm-research activities. But I think it is about time this country brought research on human lives up to the level of research on animals and plants.

I referred earlier to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee hearings on the impact of disease on the national

economy. The committee found that four diseases alone—heart, cancer, tuberculosis, and arthritis—have resulted in an annual loss of 370 million man-days of work and that the annual cost to the Nation from all illnesses is roughly equivalent to the total income-tax revenue, or $30 billion a year. Alongside that enormous loss, my proposed expenditure of $200 million a year would seem a very modest investment.

Would it be a sound investment for a banker?

Over the last decade alone medical research has added 5 full years to the life expectancy of the average American. We all know something of the wonders of penicillin, streptomycin, isoniazid, cortisone, and a host of other battlers against disease. These miraculous products of medical research, along with new surgical techniques and blood plasma, have brought about these percentage reductions in the death rates of some of the major killers and cripplers:

	Percent
Influenza	77
Appendicitis	69
Acute rheumatic fever	66
Syphilis	56
Tuberculosis	50
Pneumonia	50
Kidney diseases	43

Now let us translate this into economic terms. The National Office of Vital Statistics reported that in 1954 approximately 350,000 Americans under the age of 65 died of cancer and heart disease alone. This is greater than the total of Americans who lost their lives in the armed forces during the Second World War and the Korean war together. Remember that those wars last not 1 year but approximately 7 years.

Those 350,000 deaths of 1954 occurred, as I have stated, among people under 65, people in their productive years who otherwise would have been at work, earning money, producing goods and services, and consuming as well. Moreover, these people would have been paying taxes which would have gone, in part, to pay for research which would have helped to preserve their own and other lives.

In an earlier year—the year 1951—a study of federally aided rehabilitation revealed that 8,00 people who were returned to work had been on public assistance prior to rehabilitation, at a cost of $5,700,000 annually. The cost of their rehabilitation was $4 million. These people are now employed. Instead of being tax-consumers they are taxpayers.

When we consider that chronic diseases account for 88 percent of the disability of the approximately 2 million physically handidicapped people in the United States, we can see that the economic benefits to be derived from medical research on disabling diseases would be vast. The research would more than pay for itself.

I have been asked whether my billion dollar prescription for our national health amounts to socialized medicine. I have publicly and privately stated for many, many years that I am opposed to socialized medicine. The 5-year program that I propose would have no aspects of socialized medicine. It is in keeping with recommendations and endorsements made by the Hoover Commission, the American Medical Association, medical-school deans, and such outstanding doctors as Paul Dudley White, the eminent heart specialist who treated President Eisenhower.

Perhaps because he is the heart doctor of the President, Dr. White's own words have a great dramatic and impressive meaning to the American people on the need for expansion of medical research. Dr. White has pointed out that current heart research is severely limited because of lack of money. Testifying before a Senate committee, as a member of the advisory council of the National Heart Institute, Dr. White said he had been forced to use his own money for research because there were not sufficient Government funds.

His was only one of a tremendous backlog of worthy projects, running into millions of dollars, for which the advisory councils have no money. As long as this backlog exists qualified people are being denied the opportunity to save life.

If one of the Armed Forces can build up a 25-year supply of hamburgers, and if another can spend hundreds of millions of dollars on a fighter plane that could not fly, I say we can afford to appropriate funds to give our children and our children's children the best in medicine.

Cleveland Clinic Doctors Develop New Heart Surgery Technique

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, surgeons at the Cleveland Clinic, by utilizing an ingenious heart-lung machine, have developed a promising new technique in heart surgery which involves complete stoppage of the human heart.

The Cleveland Clinic Quarterly, published today, reports that eight times recently these surgeons have caused the human heart to stop beating, drained it of all blood, and repaired serious congenital defects.

My city of Cleveland, which is pioneering in many phases of medical research, is immensely proud of this work by Drs. Donald Effler, William Johan Kolff, L. K. Groves and others, including Dr. F. Mason Sones, the cardiologist member of the team. The Cleveland Clinic, one of the outstanding medical centers in the Midwest, is typical of the organizations encouraging research in our area.

But I am especially gratified at the part played by Dr. Kolff, the inventor and developer of the heart-lung machine, since I was instrumental in arranging for him to come to the United States from Holland.

About 7 years ago I was informed that the Cleveland Clinic was interested in bringing Dr. Kolff from Holland to become associate professor of experimental medicine at the clinic. Inquiry into the Immigration Acts revealed that he could be admitted as a research professor. He arrived here in 1950, has subsequently become a citizen of the United States, and his family has followed him over. Since coming here, Dr. Kolff has worked intensively on this device and other research. He has succeeded in developing a machine which, for the duration of the surgery, substitutes for the human heart.

This is a notable discovery and will be listed among the many other contributions that have been made to the United States by people who come to us from other lands. We are grateful to those who, like Dr. Kolff, come here and do honor to their new land. And we may be proud that the United States offers an intellectual climate that stimulates and encourages such work. All the world is the benefactor of this discovery and the relief of human suffering that will derive from its use.

Under leave granted to extend my remarks, I am inserting herewith the full announcement by the Cleveland Clinic Foundation:

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CLEVELAND CLINIC FOUNDATION

A new operating technique involving complete stoppage of the human heart may open the door to more intricate and precise heart surgery than has ever before been possible. A description of the new technique was published today in the Cleveland Clinic Quarterly.

Eight times in recent weeks, Cleveland Clinic surgeons have caused the human heart to stop beating for as long as twenty minutes, drained it of all blood, and repaired serious congenital defects in its interior. Circulation and respiration in the patients have been maintained by a new-type heart-lung machine also announced in the same publication.

Unintentional stoppage of heartbeat has always been the most dreaded accident in any form of surgery. Yet, movement of the heart and active bleeding during cardiac surgery have been serious handicaps to the delicate work required. In working with any other organ of the body surgeons insist that the operative field be dry and immobile, so they can see their work clearly and use their instruments with precision. Doctors consider this a fundamental requirement.

Doctors have attempted in a number of ways to reduce heartbeat and blood flow to approach these ideal conditions. The most common method, hypothermia, involves "refrigerating" the patient, bringing the body temperature down to about 83°, with a corresponding reduction in body metabolism. This slows both heartbeat and blood flow. Complete stoppage has been opposed as a surgical technique because of the threat of oxygen starvation of the heart tissues (anoxia).

In 1954, an English surgeon named Melrose developed a technique for inducing complete heart arrest. After considerable research he applied this new method in a number of human cases. Exact data and the results have not appeared in scientific publications. In late 1955 Melrose described his procedure in a personal communication to Dr. Willem Kolff, a member of the research division of the Cleveland Clinic Foundation, and suggested its application.

Drs. Donald Effler, Willem Kolff, L. K. Groves and others at the Cleveland Clinic were conducting an intensive series of cardiac laboratory experiments when they heard of Melrose's work. The addition of the heart arrest technique to their operative experiments produced such striking results that they decided that its use on a patient was justified.

The first subject was a 4-year-old child. He had been born with a large opening between the heart's chambers. Diagnosis was made by Dr. F. Mason Sones, the cardiologist member of the team.

After by-passing the blood flow through Kolff's heart-lung machine, Dr. Effler injected potassium citrate into the patient's heart, and within seconds it was motionless and flaccid. The electrocardiogram attached to the patient registered a complete absence of heartbeat. An incision was made in the right ventricle of the heart and it was immediately drained of all blood. In the absence of bleeding and motion, the interventricular de-

fect was easily identified, and carefully closed with fine silk stitches.

When the heart was closed, blood flow was returned through the heart, and the potassium solution was immediately washed away. The heart promptly resumed rhythmical beating of its own accord, without massage, electric or chemical stimulation.

The heart arrest technique has been successfully employed by the Cleveland clinic team in eight consecutive cases, all published in the quarterly. Two patients died later in the post-operative period; the remainder appear to be doing well. No complications have been attributable to the arrest technique.

The new technique seems to reduce the hazard of fibrillation, or other abnormal rhythms. A frequent cause of death, fibrillation has been one of the most feared complications in all heart surgery.

Two significant developments have aided the clinic in their work on congential (birth) heart defects; a new diagnostic aid employed by Dr. Sones, and Dr. Kolff's artificial lung.

Dr. Sones, a cardiologist at the clinic, has been using a high-powered fluoroscope, called an image amplifier, which makes it possible to televise images of the heart on a large screen, and record them on film.

Until now only two heat X-rays per second could be taken, and the relatively weak and small fluoroscopic image could be seen only in a darkened room. The image amplifier, purchased with a grant made through the Cleveland Area Heart Society by the Cleveland Federation of Labor, creates a picture large and bright enough to be seen by a team of diagnosticians in a well-lighted room.

This new application of the image amplifier has proven of immense value in locating and charting heart defects, and in determining what surgical course, if any, must be followed.

Dr. Kolff's artificial lung differs in principle from the widely used bubble-type oxygenator.

In the Kolff lung, blood is redirected from the heart through a series of polyethylene tubes, which are exposed to a constant flow of oxygen. As in the human lung the delicate polyethylene membrane allows oxygen to pass through and replenish the blood. After being pumped through 7½ yards of tubing, the blood has gathered almost as much oxygen as it received normally from the lungs, and it can be sent through the arteries to nourish the body. Funds for development of the lung came from the Cleveland Area Heart Society and Cleveland Clinic Foundation research money.

Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to many previous appeals which our delegation flood committee and other members have made to the House Appropriation Committee respecting the flood-relief program for Massachusetts and the Northeast, we hereby respectfully again urge that the House Appropriation Committee take early action to expedite approval of various specific and general remedial and protective projects now under consideration.

Recent severe snowfalls in our area have increased our deep concern. The periodic recurrence of flood disasters requires expeditious action to set up comprehensive and appropriate flood protection.

As we have pointed out, delay in acting upon feasible measures proposed will merely serve to increase the risk of future damaging floods and thus constitute great peril to many communities already sorely beset by the heavy floods of last year.

We respectfully urge that the Appropriations Committee, in the exercise of its wise discretion, after considering the evidence, establish its own standards as to what may constitute adequate funds to inaugurate planning, construction, and general flood protection work on a basis of efficiency, speed, and generosity.

We further urge that the hearings be expedited as much as possible in order that suitable legislation may be reported to the House at an early date for consideration and action in order to accelerate the progress of vital projects in the area.

The pertinent recommendations follow:

The Massachusetts congressional delegation presents the following recommendations with reference to pending legislation and respectfully urges the adoption of the following program:

1. For construction, operation, and maintenance appropriations:

	Budgeted item, 1957 fiscal year	Recommended
Adams	$1,976,000	$1,976,000
Barre Falls	1,150,000	1,150,000
Birch Hill (maintenance and operation)	13,000	13,000
Buffumville	1,200,000	1,200,000
East Brimfield	340,000	840,000
Hodges Village	360,000	360,000
Knightsville (operation and maintenance)	16,000	16,000
North Adams	2,000,000	2,000,000
Tully (operation and maintenance)	13,000	13,000
Worcester diversion	840,000	840,000

2. For engineering and planning:

	Budgeted item, 1957 fiscal year	Recommended
Westville (authorized)	None	[1] $100,000
West Hill (authorized)	None	[2] 100,000
Littleville (State concurrence given)	None	[3] 100,000

[1] State concurrence given.
[2] Subject to State concurrence.
[3] Subject to authorization.

3. For the Army engineers snagging and stream clearance fund and section 212 projects for general operations in all Massachusetts river basins:

	Budgeted item, 1957 fiscal year	Recommendation
Snagging and clearing	$500,000	[1] $5,000,000
Sec. 212	1,000,000	[1] 5,000,000

[1] Subject to completion of current engineering studies.

Snagging and clearing projects, up to $100,000, are authorized by section 208 of the Flood Control Act of 1954. This section permits stream clearance, up to $100,000 on any one stream, without specific congressional authorization.

Section 212 projects are authorized by section 212 of the Flood Control Act of 1950. This section permits small flood prevention projects, up to $150,000, without specific congressional authorization. The project must be complete within itself, be economically justified and not be in an area intended to be protected by a larger flood-control project.

Snagging and clearing and section 212 funds would supplement Operation Noah rehabilitation measures already undertaken by the engineers in the flood-disaster areas of Massachusetts by providing permanent flood-prevention works in the following basins:

Connecticut, Thames, Blackstone, Merrimac, Charles, Neponset, Housatonic, Hoosic, Ipswitch, Mystic, Little, and other streams and waterways in the State where the Army engineers deem protective measures to be necessary.[1]

4. On the following navigation and beach erosion projects, your committee recommends:

	Budgeted item, 1957 fiscal year	Recommended
Fall River Harbor	$500,000	$1,000,000
Mystic River	1,500,000	1,500,000
Town River	302,000	302,000
Fore River (Weymouth)	500,000	500,000
Revere Beach shore protection	75,000	75,000

And we also urge upon the Appropriations Committee early favorable action on pending requests for appropriations for all other navigation and beach erosion projects in our State.

5. The delegation urges immediate consideration of H. R. 7870, introduced by Mr. McCORMACK, and companion bills, approved in principle by Secretary of the Army Brucker, and designed to give the engineers authority to complete urgently necessary projects costing up to $500,000 without further specific congressional authorization.

6. We favor the principle of disaster insurance and urge the Congress to continue its consideration of and report upon pending measures in this field so that action may be taken during this session.

7. For the various recommendations of the New England Governors' Conference, and the New England Council, we once again bespeak every possible consideration by the Appropriations Committee.

8. Thirty thousand dollars for survey of the Neponset and Charles Rivers (request of Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts).

[1] Merrimac Basin: $90,000 for removal of sandbar in the Merrimac at its mouth near Newburyport (request of Mr. BATES): $500,000 for local flood-prevention projects (request of Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and Mr. LANE).

Charles River Basin: Stream clearance of the Charles River near Newton (request of Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts).

Resolution Adopted by Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the Daughters of the American Revolu-

tion are holding their convention in Washington this week. I deem it fitting and proper that I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the resolutions adopted at the 58th annual conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution. Each and every item in these resolutions deserves the attention of every loyal American. But of course, I assure you that there is nothing in these resolutions that will give aid and comfort to that group of so-called intellectual, international minded one-worlders who so often are saying, "Patriotism and nationalism are the stumbling blocks that prevent America from assuming its rightful place as the leader in the world."

I know of no other organization that has done more to preserve America and its constitutional form of government than the DAR. It is the only organization that can draw a draft on me. I have never found them wrong—they are the elite corps of those who desire to preserve basic American concepts.

I commend these resolutions to my colleagues. Read them—ancient American doctrines that have stood the test of time. To those of you who live in a climate where the fogs of European socialism constantly blow in from the Atlantic and obscure our ancient American principles—read what these ladies from the high plains of Kansas are thinking about UNESCO, Federal aid to education, right to work, immigration, un-American activities, Bricker amendment, and peaceful coexistence.

These ladies of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution just do not believe you have to be a social radical to be fashionable.

The resolutions follow:

AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH

Whereas a true appreciation of American history is important to good citizenship and a bulwark against the infiltration of alien ideologies; and

Whereas a renewed and increased appreciation of great lessons drawn from studying the history of our country creates increased spiritual strength and wisdom; and

Whereas certain youth groups have become special targets of internationalism, one such well-known youth organization having designated February as International Month: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution urge its chapters to designate February as American History Month and urge the Governor of the State of Kansas and city mayors to officially declare February as American History Month to help build a durable heritage of faith, fortitude, and righteousness for future generations.

PATRIOTISM IN EDUCATION

Whereas national security depends upon the character of our citizens and a knowledge of the fundamental principles upon which the United States Government was established, and also an understanding of the forces working toward its destruction and

Whereas the training of our youth today determines the security of our nation tomorrow, presupposes the necessity of specialized instruction regarding the advantages of our system of government above others in order to build good future citizens and provide for the security of coming generations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution continue and strengthen its interest in the patriotic education of our youth by the support of laws requiring the teaching of American history, civics and the science of the American form of government in our schools; increased supervision in the selection of instructors and materials used; encouragement of more public meetings for the purpose of increasing interest in patriotic education, and other means for accomplishing the objective stated in this resolution.

UNESCO

Whereas the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, known as UNESCO, a specialized agency of the United Nations, has declared among other objectionable things that "nationalism is the major obstacle to the development of worldmindedness"; and

Whereas said UNESCO is carrying on powerful propaganda through the American school system and otherwise working toward destruction of the form of government established by the founding fathers with the thought of promoting a one-world pattern; and

Whereas UNESCO is a deliberate plan to create public opinion for world citizenship—especially directed to the schoolchildren of the Nation and is patterned exactly after the Communist teaching in Soviet Russia: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution go on record as supporting the action taken by the recent national convention of the American Legion at Miami, Fla., urging Congress to take appropriate action to completely disassociate the United States Government from the UNESCO program.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Resolved, That the 58th annual conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, reaffirm their adamant stand for control of education by the people through their States and local communities only and oppose Federal aid to education.

INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES

Whereas we have on previous occasions stated our approval of investigating committees devoted to protecting our country against the invasion of alien ideologies and the operation of subversive forces: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution reaffirm its previous stand in this regard and commend the efforts of those who are exposing subversive activities and request the Congress to appropriate adequate funds for the continuance of the courageous campaign by our duly elected legislators and their staffs.

APPENDIX 9

Whereas a special report prepared some years ago by the House Committee on Un-American Activities when Representative MARTIN DIES was chairman, known as Appendix 9 consisting of several volumes, has been for some reason taken out of circulation; and

Whereas said report is known to contain vital information designed to alert the American people to dangers of subversive activities: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual convention of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution urge the Congress of the United States to authorize the reprinting and circulation of this document and appropriate necessary funds required to complete the project.

THE FBI

Whereas the Federal Bureau of Investigation has by its integrity, courage, intelligent leadership and loyalty to the principles upon which the Republic was founded, helped insulate the American people against foes of many types and descriptions: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual convention of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution reiterate confidence in the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its able leadership symbolized by the person of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover.

KANSAS COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Whereas certain States, notably California, have found it advantageous to set up committees on un-American activities to cooperate with various law enforcement agencies and departments of the Federal Government such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the House Committee on Un-American Activities; and

Whereas the people of Kansas need to be kept informed regarding the mechanics and machinations of the Communist apparatus, and also alerted to the dangers of Communist infiltration among non-Communist groups, including schools, civic clubs, churches, labor unions and other bodies: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual convention of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution suggest that the Kansas State Legislature explore the possibility and advisability of organizing such a committtee in Kansas to function along lines comparable to similar committees now existing in other States.

FEDERAL JURY SYSTEM

Whereas the jury system is a fundamental of the American judicial structure and basic to a free society under law and must therefore be protected; and

Whereas recent attempts have been made to undermine and bring this branch of the judicial system into question and disrepute by secretly planting dictaphones in rooms where jurors were deliberating, thereby eavesdropping on their conversations dealing with the innocence or guilt of persons on trial in open court; and

Whereas Attorney General Herbert Brownell proposed on January 10, 1956, that Congress enact a law prohibiting such activities as being inconsistent with the purposes of the seventh amendment to the Constitution of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 58th Annual Conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution go on record as condemning said innovations and urge Congress to do everything possible to expedite enactment of the law proposed by Attorney General Brownell.

RIGHT TO WORK

Whereas the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights guarantees to its citizens certain freedoms including the choice of occupation, a fundamental right of the American heritage; and

Whereas totalitarian systems deny their citizens the rights of such choice thereby making those who labor and all others servants of the state: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 58th Annual Conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution recognize and approve the basic right of all Americans to choose their own vocations and at the same time commend those who are trying by legislative processes to preserve and uphold this sacred right.

IMMIGRATION

Whereas the Immigration and Nationality Act, known as the Walter-McCarran Act (Public Law 414), became effective on December 24, 1952; and

Whereas the act has been especially effective in the denaturalization and deportation of criminals and subversives and is operating in the best interests of the American people; and

Whereas pressure is being placed upon Government officials and Congress by certain groups to change this law: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 58th Annual Conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution reaffirm its approval of the Walter-McCarran Act and urge all patriotic Americans to resist any change, weakening amendments, or private bills which would destroy its effectuality.

REVIEW OF U. N. CHARTER

Whereas the 10th General Assembly of the United Nations passed a resolution on November 21, 1955, which calls for a review conference, and the Security Council voted its concurrence on December 15, 1955; and

Whereas a committee of the whole to work with the Secretary General of the United Nations in fixing a time and place for the conference, its organization and procedure, and said committee is to report its recommendation to the 12th Assembly in 1957; and

Whereas proponents of world government are seeking to propagandize the American people into support of converting the United Nations into a world government wherein the sovereignty of our Republic under constitutional government would be destroyed: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 58th Annual Conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution reaffirm its opposition to world government in any form and urge our Congress to carefully investigate charter review and resist any attempt to convert the United Nations charter into a world government.

SUPPORTING THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

Whereas treaties shall be the supreme law of the land and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby when two-thirds of the Senators concur; and

Whereas executive agreements may have the same prerogatives; and

Whereas the United States is one of the few nations in which a treaty becomes self-executing automatically; and

Whereas specialized agencies of the United Nations and other entangling alliances can pose special threats through these treaty-making powers; and

Whereas the supremacy of the United Nations charter over the United States Constitution has already become an issue in some court cases: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 58th Annual Conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution reaffirm its request that the United States Senate consider the advisability of further amending the Constitution, so as to require either a majority or two-thirds vote of the entire membership before any treaty can be adopted.

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

Whereas the 20th congress of the Soviet Communist Party recently declared it a part of their global program to work inside the capitalistic world under the slogan "peace," with Kruschev declaring there are only two roads, "peaceful coexistence or war," and at the same time stating that violent revolution is not necessary now to bring about a socialist state; and

Whereas the Select Committee on Communist Aggression of the House of Representatives concluded that the history of Czechoslovakia is the history of every government that tried to coexist or cooperate with the Communists; and

Whereas the Committee further concluded "that peaceful coexistence is a Communist myth which can be attained only through the complete surrender of our free way of life for one of slavery under Moscow-controlled communism": Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 58th Annual Conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution support a reexamination of the country's foreign policy by the Congress of the United States that America may not succumb to this poisonous formula of peaceful coexistence distilled by communism; and be it

Further resolved, That the 58th Annual Conference call upon our Government and its citizens to heed the warning: "When they shall say 'peace and safety,' then sudden destruction cometh upon them."

WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

Whereas the World Council of Churches has on its official roster leaders from the iron curtain countries, as, for example, Prof. Josef L. Hromadka, Prague, Czechoslovakia, a member of the executive committee; Dr. Jan Chadaba, of Czechoslovakia, member of the central committee; Dr. Victor Hajek, of Czechoslovakia, synodical senior of the Church of the Czech Brethren, member of the central committee of the World Council; Bishop Janos Peter, of Hungary, delegate to the World Council; and

Whereas such men are exercising a baneful influence on the Christian program through the world and Communists are known to use the church as a cloak to cover their teachings; and

Whereas Paul the Apostle said, "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers; for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness?": Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 58th Annual Conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution call upon its members to be alert and protest any contamination of the holy Christian faith which comes to their attention.

REDEDICATION TO RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLES

Whereas by the dispensation of divine grace we are favored to live in a Nation founded on a fundamental belief in God; and

Whereas the thought of mankind is today being invaded and poisoned by atheistic philosophies and doctrines designed to destroy faith in the supernatural content of historical and evangelical Christianity, in the name of socalled liberal theology, the brotherhood of man and related teachings: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 58th Annual Conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution rededicate itself to continued faith, sincere prayer, steadfast belief in the Bible, and greater participation in the field of Christian activities.

The Engineering Profession in the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I mentioned in the House 2 weeks ago the serious situation which faces us here in this country with regard to shortages of scientific and engineering manpower. Through overconfidence we are facing loss of world leadership in science and technology at a time when the Russians are taking massive strides toward scientific supremacy in the military and civilian fields.

Few Americans have had the opportunity to witness firsthand the progress which the Russians are making in the scientific and engineering fields. One of these is Dr. Weldon H. Brandt, of the Westinghouse Electric Corp., who recently completed a tour of Russia during which he visited a number of manufacturing plants and the University of Moscow. Dr. Brandt's enlightening observations on his visit are contained in an article entitled "The Engineering Profession in the Soviet Union" in the March issue of American Engineer magazine. Because of the interesting comments in the article on Russian technological development and methods of education, under unanimous consent I place the article in the RECORD so that other Members may have an opportunity to give this important information their serious consideration:

FROM FIRST HAND OBSERVATION: THE ENGINEERING PROFESSION IN THE SOVIET UNION

(An American engineer interview with Dr. Weldon H. Brandt, engineering manager, director systems department, Westinghouse Electric Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.)

Question. Dr. Brandt, we realize that your recent visit to the Soviet Union was primarily motivated by technical considerations—specifically, a study of automation in Russia. However, since such personal observation of the technology of a country also brings an association with the men behind that technology, we are sure that you have brought back with you a great many illuminating impressions about the professional status of engineering in the U. S. S. R. By way of general background, may we begin by asking you if Soviet industry conforms to the concept of a classless society in its overall organization?

Answer. By no means. Soviet industry certainly is not a classless society. The prestige factor is a very big thing, particularly where the managers are concerned. And I am sure that there is a much greater difference between the standard of living of the ordinary workers and that of the managers in the Soviet Union than there is here in the United States. In making this comparison, too, I think I should point out the extreme difference in standards of value between our economies. For instance, it may be a much bigger thing as far as prestige goes in Russia to be able to have oranges for breakfast than driving a high-priced car versus driving a low-priced car in America where both the boss and the worker can have the oranges if they want them.

Question. Did the engineers you met in the various Soviet factories seem to be on the management or oranges-for-breakfast side of the fence?

Answer. The engineers we met were on the management side. In fact, nearly all of them actually were managers.

Question. Did they seem then to have independence of judgment and decision?

Answer. They had some independence of judgment and decision as long as they operated within the framework of the preconceived plan of what their contribution to the Soviet industrial pattern ought to be.

Question. Is this an efficient method of operation?

Answer. There are no doubt some elements of efficiency in it. But I want to make it

clear that I have utterly no sympathy for the Soviet system as such in any phase whatsoever. As an overall thing it is just not right.

Question. Dr. Brandt, could you form any conclusions about the numbers of engineers employed in proportion to the other workers in the factories you visited?

Answer. The number of engineers is quite high. For instance, the Ordzhonikidze Machine Tool Plant, which we visited in Moscow, has 3,500 employees, including 450 engineering employees, of whom 300 have technical degrees while the others qualify as technicians.

This ratio is particularly high in view of the fact that no research and little of the sort of engineering work which we would class as development is done within the factories. Such work is carried out instead in the appropriate institutes. Research work is done in the research institutes which are connected with the Soviet Academy of Sciences. Development work, as we understand it, is done in other institutes reporting to the appropriate government ministry.

Question. Then how are the results of the research done in the institutes channeled to the factories for practical translation into products?

Answer. The results are channeled in two ways. First, in any cases, the development institutes apply the research know-how to the design of the first models. Then after the first model has been built and proven, it is sent to the factory for production. Secondly, certain straight information is also channeled through the development institutes. For example, ENIMS (which is the abbreviation by which the institute which translates to "Experimental Scientific Research Institute for Metal Cutting Machine Tools" is known)—ENIMS follows technical literature in Russia and abroad and disseminates it to the factories.

Question. In this channeling, Dr. Brandt, is there ever any confusion as to who will handle which newly developed product?

Answer. I am glad you asked that, because it seems to me that some very serious problems must arise when a product cuts across the lines of responsibility of two ministries. For example, I inquired at the Gorki Automobile plant as to how they would assign work on a new generator. And I was told that it would be designed in an institute coming under the Electrical Equipment Ministry and then built by a factory coming under the same ministry, but the specifications would be written by the Gorki plant, which comes under an automotive ministry. This means that in case of an argument or a difference of opinion, you must go on to a higher level than even the ministry in Moscow to get a referee for the problem. It certainly is an example of what I would call a monstrous bureaucracy.

Question. Well, coming back now to the number of workers in the factories, how does the ratio of engineers to regular workers compare with the situation in the United States?

Answer. The ratio is obviously higher in Russia than in this country. However, the word "engineer" seems to have a little different significance in the U. S. S. R. than it does here. The regular engineer's efforts in Russia are not channeled so much toward design as they are in the United States, but are directed more frequently toward production management. As a matter of fact, engineers and foremen are often mentioned together as a class. At the Stalingrad Tractor Factory, for one example, there was the director at the top, then the chief engineer, and under him came both the shop and the engineering department.

Question. We are interested in the working conditions which were provided for the Soviet engineers. Could you tell us a little about them?

Answer. Well, I cannot answer this as definitely as I would like to; but I would say that working conditions in industry and in many of the institutes are not as good as our own. Industrial housekeeping is poor. Lighting is not as good in the offices, which are also rather cramped. Desks are small, and many draftsmen work standing. Also, even the better laboratories seem crowded. And I think it was interesting to note that people inside the factories worked in hats and coats, well bundled up against the cold.

Question. Did the Russian engineers seem to be supported in their work by technicians, clerical aides, and so on? Or do they have to do all of the routine, as well as the specialized work themselves?

Answer. I would say that they seem to be fairly well supported by technicians and so on. We can improve our own situation in this regard, of course; but I do not believe that the Russians are ahead of us on it.

Question. What about salaries? Is there any comparison between the salaries being paid to Soviet engineers and the premium offers being made to engineers in the United States today?

Answer. The average Russian engineer in industry makes perhaps 1,400 rubles per month. If he works in a development institute, the average goes up somewhat—perhaps to 1,600 rubles. In a research institute he will get 1,800 rubles per month. Then superimposed on this there are bonuses, prizes, and royalties on patents so that the outstanding performer can do considerably better than the averages I have quoted. A man working strictly as an engineer in industry can reach a peak of somewhere around 2,500 or 3,000 rubles per month.

The exchange rate is four rubles per dollar, and this would not be bad, speaking in terms of salary comparisons, if that also represented the equivalent purchasing power. The purchasing power of the ruble, however, is more like 10 or 12 rubles to the dollar, the black-market rate—although, of course, there is not supposed to be any such thing.

The Russian engineer does not have a standard of living anywhere nearly equivalent to that of the engineer in the United States, though he does far better than his own compatriots of the ordinary working class. I would say there is some comparison between the two countries as to cost and availability of bare essentials, such as bread, for instance. But as soon as you get into even such items as shoes the cost-and-quality gap widens immensely.

Question. We understand that there are labor unions organized within the Soviet Union—although they never strike. Just what are the functions of these unions?

Answer. The functions of the unions seem to be the operation of certain benefit programs, rest camps, and children's camps. They are in theory also responsible for safety standards in the factories, but these standards are certainly not equivalent to those in America.

Question. Are the unions plantwide or countrywide?

Answer. I am not sure. However, in speaking of the unions, the directors of the various factories said nothing to indicate that they had to deal with them as countrywide.

Question. Do engineers belong to them?

Answer. I do not know whether or not they belong. The subject was never mentioned. There was never any mention of engineers as an organized group.

Question. Do the Russians seem concerned at all in regard to what we call the professional status of engineering? Do you know whether they have any professional societies or professional journals like the American Engineer?

Answer. This question also did not come up. It is a little difficult to see how it would, and I would be very surprised to find a professional organization in Russia devoted to developing the professional status of engineers. I doubt that there would be room for anything like this in the Soviet system. The Soviet engineers do have their prestige—which perhaps is their professional status—but they have it only because the Government feels they should have it. It is a matter of Government policy and can be turned on and off like a faucet.

Question. Did you learn whether the Soviet Union has any laws or regulations concerning the practice of engineering similar to the registration laws of the various States in this country? Is there any such thing as professional registration in Russia?

Answer. We did not hear of any registration laws or of professional registration in Russia. I think there is a drastic weeding out process in the educational system itself—much more so than here. Another interesting thing is that if a man is aiming for an engineering degree, he goes to school full time. There is no other way to qualify.

Question. What about the technical schools that are connected with the factories then?

Answer. These train technicans. They do not give degrees.

Question. This may be a superfluous and self-evident question in view of the political philosophy of the country—but did you note any evidence of any independent practice of engineering in Russia? Are there any organizations similar to our consulting firms?

Answer. We certainly saw no evidence of any independent practice of engineering or any organizations that could be termed consulting firms. I am quite sure they need all the engineers they have in industry and in the research institutes. They also need them—and have them—in the Government itself to assist in what we might call "management problems" in the administration of their various taechnological programs.

You see, everything is really a Government-owned monopoly. And I would say that about the only way a man might be in business for himself would be to have something like, say, a produce stand, where he would employ no one but himself.

Question. Dr. Brandt, in this Government-operated scheme is there any choice about the type of engineering job a man may take or the particular industry for which he wishes to work?

Answer. I do not really know how much choice they have. Many articles have been written in this country indicating that they do not have much choice. I would say from my own observation that their engineers are very specialized, and this, of course, would limit the choice that a man would have. But I would not be surprised to find that the really outstanding men have some choice as to where they go initially at least.

Question. We know that you have remarked since your return on the number of women employed in engineering in the factories you visited. Were these women working in the capacity of technicians, or as full-fledged engineers?

Answer. Actually, the comments in the report I prepared on my return were on the number of women employed in factories in general, rather than the number in engineering. They do employ women more than men in almost every civilian field you can think of. In the engineering laboratories which we visited, I am sure that some of the women were technicians while others were full engineers. Those we saw at the Institute of Standards, Measures, and Measuring Instruments, which corresponds roughly to our Bureau of Standards, definitely seemed to be full-fledged engineers. And I believe that they do have more women engineers in Russia than we have in this country.

Question. Are the engineers in Russia encouraged to undertake any advanced study?

Answer. I do not think that encouraged is quite the proper word. They either qualify

or they do not qualify for advanced study, depending on the record they have made in their undergraduate work. If they qualify, they get a very nice stipend for doing this graduate work—about 780 rubles per month.

Question. In doing this advanced work, are they ever advised to familiarize themselves with any subjects other than the strictly technical?

Answer. I don't believe that they are encouraged to study anything that is not strictly technical. Whatever general subjects they study are carried during the first several years of undergraduate work. From that time on they specialize.

Question. What about patents? You mentioned "patent royalties" previously in talking about salaries, Dr. Brandt. Under this strict organization for the development of products do they have a patent system?

Answer. Yes; they do. Developments are Government-owned; but any citizen may apply for a patent, and this gives him the right to collect a royalty on the profit—and may I stress this capitalistic word profit—that results from his invention.

Question. Does it make any difference as to where and how the work on the invention was done? Does this affect the patent rights?

Answer. As I understand it—no. The patent rights apply whether the person works in an institute, development laboratory, or on his own.

Question. Now how do you feel about the specific products you had the opportunity to inspect? Were they up to the standards of their counterparts in the United States?

Answer. As to quality, it seems to me that consumer goods are definitely below American standards. There are exceptions, of course, such as the little alarm clock that I had given to me as a gift. Without further adjustment, it is keeping time to within a minute per week, better than most American clocks of a similar type. However, as to heavy goods and industrial products—in many cases these are rather good. I won't say they are equivalent to United States standards, but they are quite close.

But there are many things that they just do not seem to know how to do. For instance, they don't seem to know how to lay a good wooden floor; or how to build a good, substantial building. And the women's clothes are pretty dreadful by American standards.

Question. Well, what about the general production rate? Does it match our standards?

Answer. Production of many items, at least in many of the plants we saw, is low by our standards. They are only producing 120 passenger cars per day at the Gorki Plant, whereas we produce by the tens of thousands. And, incidentally, I don't think that the ordinary Russian engineers will ever believe this if it is just told to them. They would have to be shown the United States production lines to be convinced. On the other hand, though, they are turning out machine tools at a very good rate.

Question. Did you find any of the specific products or processes you had the chance to examine to be of marked inferiority to those of the United States?

Answer. Well, after we returned to this country, I had some tests made on some ball bearings from the Kagonovich state ball-bearing plant. They were inferior to our best quality, but are probably satisfactory for ordinary commercial grades. I also had some tests run on a bicycle nameplate from the Gorki plant, and there the quality was quite poor. But then it isn't a serious matter if a bicycle nameplate doesn't stand up.

Question. Were there any places where you detected marked superiority in products or processes?

Answer. Let me answer that a bit lightly by saying that the only really superior products I found during my visit were the Russian ballet and Russian caviar. We did see some processes that were unique or showed better development, however. The storage element in use on the automatic ball-bearing line at the Kagonovich plant, for example, appeared to be better than any such device that I have seen in America. But such cases of superiority seemed to be few and far between.

Question. What about the question of obsolescence in the Soviet factory? Do they seem to be "on the ball" in incorporating the most up-to-date machinery and methods in their manufacturing processes?

Answer. In nearly every factory you can find a few spots in which up-to-date machinery and methods are in use. Generally this represents only a small part of their productive capacity. But the important thing to remember is that this clearly demonstrates that they do have the required know-how for using the latest methods. One sees more equipment that is obsolete by our standards than you see in America. And it is also interesting to point out that the "calculation of obsolescence" is one of the functions of ENIMS, so that they are obviously looking forward to the day when they can afford to retire a machine because it has outlived its usefulness even though it is still in running order.

Question. Were the machines you observed in action largely of Russian manufacture? Or were they of foreign make?

Answer. The newest and most interesting machines we observed in the Soviet Union are chiefly of Russian manufacture. We did see some machines that were foreign-made, and those that were in actual use in the factories were usually very old or else of East German manufacture. They are currently studying some machines of Swiss manufacture, though, and I got the impression that they are interested chiefly in machines of the highest mechanical precision. We didn't see any such precision machines of Russian manufacture, but I believe they are getting ready to fill that gap.

Question. Since your tour was immediately concerned with a study of Russian automation, Dr. Brandt, could you give us a brief word on how their development of automation compares with uses employed or being developed here?

Answer. In general, I believe that we could teach them a great deal more about automation than it would be possible to learn from them. However, they do have a somewhat different approach to some problems. They have developed good storage devices, as I mentioned before, in place of trying to synchronize machines on the same line. I believe also that they are making more use of precise schedules for the replacement of tools and adjustment of their machines. This latter, of course, in some cases replaces feedback mechanisms, which are still in their infancy in both countries but are somewhat better developed here. The really important thing to note here is that they have found ways to make an automatic line operate. They have the know-how.

Question. Turning from industry, Dr. Brandt, we know that you are most interested in education and that you had the opportunity to visit the University of Moscow. Would you care to give us some general impressions about what you saw?

Answer. Well, let me point out that the University of Moscow includes no engineering school, although it does offer science courses from which some students later go into engineering elsewhere. It does have the finest, largest single university building I have ever seen and it is, indeed, a showplace. At this university, with their other buildings, they have 22,000 rooms, probably including dormitory space, and so on, and about the same number of students.

Question. What about the university staff? Did you get any clear impression of the status of the educator in the Soviet Union?

Answer. A look at their salaries might help to answer this question. Instructors are paid 1,350 rubles or 1,750 rubels per month, depending on whether or not they have a candidate of science degree, which is roughly equivalent to our master's degree. A dozent is paid 3,250 rubles per month, and this grade is probably somewhere between an associate and an assistant professor as our university staffs run in this country. A full professor receives 5,500 rubles per month. This means that he is paid about twice what he could hope to make as an engineer in industry. And he occupies a position of considerable prestige.

Question. We understand that approximately 96 percent of the university students are paid some sort of stipend while attending school. Is this correct?

Answer. Yes. Undergraduates receive from 290 to 450 rubles per month, although higher stipends may be paid for outstanding scholarship. And we mentioned a while ago that the graduate students get 780 rubles, which is roughly equivalent to what they would receive as beginning engineers in industry.

Question. Did there seem to be much graduate work going on at the University?

Answer. Yes; there seemed to be a good deal going on. Eighteen hundred students, I was told, are taking post-graduate courses. And this was in addition to the 22,000 undergraduates.

Question. Could you draw any comparisons between the Russian students and typical American students?

Answer. No more so than you could draw between any other segments of our respective populations. One thing, though, that is rather remarkable is the lack of noise in Russia. The people go about their business very quietly. And when you see a group of people together, whether students or any others, you learn not to expect noise. The contrast was rather startling, as a matter of fact, when we left Leningrad and landed in Helsinki; you noticed right away how the people were talking and smiling. That doesn't mean that the Russians have no sense of humor. Our particular guide and translator had a very fine one. But things are still extraordinarily quiet there.

Question. Did you have the opportunity to visit any engineering schools while in Russia?

Answer. Unfortunately, no.

Question. Were you welcome in the Soviet Union?

Answer. We were treated with the utmost hospitality. Intourist (the Russian Tourist Ministry) handled all arrangements efficiently and with a minimum of effort on our part. Russian engineers seemed willing and anxious to talk over engineering problems with us, and we believe that they were really sincere in this.

Question. Dr. Brandt, these comments of yours have been very interesting, and we know they will be of considerable value to our readers. Before we conclude this interview, is there any highlight of your trip that we have missed in our questioning? Any particularly outstanding impression that you have brought back with you?

Answer. Well, for one thing, I got the definite impression that the Russians know a good deal more about what we are doing in industry than we know about what they are doing. Of course, we publish our results more freely than they do, and we mentioned this several times to various Russians. Their

only answer was that they didn't believe that the average American could read Russian anyway, even if they did publish more.

And, of course, as we have discussed before, the Government does a lot of their technical reading for them and sees that it is channeled to the interested industries.

One thing that made an impression on me is that we saw a lot of machine tools being manufactured, and the number being produced seemed to be far out of line with the number we saw in use. These machine tools are going somewhere, and one strongly suspects that it is into military effort.

Question. How do you feel about this exchange of Russian and American visits in which you have participated? Do you think it is a valuable program that should be expanded? Or do you have any reservations about it, in line, for instance, with some recent objections that we have been showing too much of our first-class industry to the visitors and that we should not be quite so helpful to them?

Answer. I think that the exchange of Russian and American visits is worthwhile, and I say this even though I believe that there is a great deal more for them to learn from us than they could teach us. I say this, too, partly because we are operating more in the dark about what they are doing than they are about what we are doing at the present time. I think we have been somewhat overly complacent about our ability to outproduce them in every line. Through these visits, the Russians may learn some things from us a little more quickly than they would otherwise, but in turn we will learn some things that we would never learn otherwise.

Question. What particular advice then would you give to the American engineering profession in the light of your Russian observations?

Answer. Well, my first piece of advice is that more American engineers should learn Russian. Then I believe we should not remain complacent about our ability to do a better job than the Russians; we must avoid any such "Maginot Line" philosophy. I think that right now we are doing a better job, but the gap is narrowing perceptibly. We are, I am sure, 25 years and even more ahead as far as general standards of living go, but the question of military production is another matter. Their military production is, of course, on a planned basis, so that they would not have to bother to convert in the event of a major war catastrophe.

I think that the greatest strength that the American engineering profession has, as compared to the Russian, is that we have people here who are broader—broader in the sense of knowing more about various fields of engineering and also in the sense that they have better judgment and knowledge outside the strictly technical field. We should not try to emulate the overspecialization of the Russians. But the thing that we should learn from them, and in which we should have the help of all engineers, is to rebuild the status and prestige of our educational system.

Taking an overall look, I would say that for the two economies to match each other in output, the Russians would need far more engineers than we would. Our economic system is the thing that will save us. We are so much more flexible here. The Russians, because of their strictly controlled system, simply can never be as fast on their feet with consumer goods as we can where the economy is flexible and an individual or a company can see a need and go into production to fill it. We need to develop more faith in ourselves, the superiority of our system, and our own abilities—without at the same time, as I have said, being overly complacent.

The Soviet Challenge and the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, recently there has been called to my attention an address entitled "The Soviet Challenge and the United Nations," which was delivered by the Assistant Secretary of State for the United Nations formerly chief of staff of the Foreign Relations Committee, Dr. Francis O. Wilcox, before the annual convention of the American Association of Junior Colleges, in New York City, on March 9, 1956. I am informed by the Public Printer that the address is estimated to make 2¾ pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $220, but the address is so much to the point with reference to some of the present discussion regarding the position of the United Nations in the world, that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SOVIET CHALLENGE AND THE UNITED NATIONS

We live in a time charged with dramatic developments. In such times it is especially hard to grasp the thread of history. It is even more difficult to determine which developments are transitory, which more permanent.

We have witnessed in recent days an event of unusual significance. We have seen another zigzag of Soviet tactics. The Soviet 20th Congress has rewritten some of the Stalinist dogma. The full import of the decisions taken by the congress will become clearer as Soviet policy evolves in the days ahead.

The change in Soviet tactics is, when you think about it, a logical development. The old line of violence and threatened violence became unprofitable and unworkable, largely because Soviet military might has been neutralized by the free world's defensive buildup. So the Kremlin has turned a new face to the world. No longer is war between the two systems considered inevitable. The frightful collisions Lenin predicted between the two systems do not have to take place, Khrushchev has told us, because the victory of communism can be achieved without violence—unless, he was careful to add, the "exploiters" are unwise enough to resist their own extinction.

But in general the termite is to take the place of the battering ram. There will be more emphasis on smiles and promises and less emphasis on brute force. The goal remains the same: The collapse of the foundations of non-Communist society. Thus the Kremlin has undertaken a new Soviet offensive. Political cooperation is being sought with leftwing Socialists, formerly the target of Soviet abuse. Great stress is being placed on trade and economic assistance. This new look is being directed by the leaders of the Soviet monolithic state, who control with an iron hand the people and the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. It poses a sharp threat to the United States and to the entire free world inside and outside the United Nations. It is a challenge which must be understood and met.

The new look in Soviet tactics became manifest at the Geneva summit conference last July. There Soviet leaders spoke in a spirit of accommodation toward the West. They spoke of an era of peaceful and competitive coexistence between the free and the Communist world. They expressed a desire to reduce tensions.

The more hopeful atmosphere engendered at Geneva was reinforced by a series of Soviet actions taken both prior to and after the Geneva conference. In May 1955, after 10 years of painful negotiations, the Soviets finally signed the treaty with Austria. This was followed by the remarkable visit of Soviet leaders to Yugoslavia to make amends for past deeds. The Kremlin established diplomatic relations with the German Federal Republic. It evacuated its military base in Finland.

The New Look also became apparent within the United Nations. In the General Assembly last fall the Soviet tone was, for the most part, more moderate, less contentious. They partially lifted their barrier to the admission of new members—for a price, of course. In their speeches they stressed the need for economic aid to underdeveloped countries. They made clear their intention to play a stronger role in the United Nations specialized agencies, some of which they had joined or rejoined only a short time before.

This does not mean that international communism has given up its ultimate ambitions or that it is not still the enemy of free governments. As Secretary Dulles said recently, the Soviets "have subordinated those elements of their old creed in the hope that, in a new garb, they could still persue conquest."

Witness the words of Mr. Khrushchev, speaking to the Supreme Soviet on December 29, 1955:

"If certain people think that our confidence in the victory of socialism, the teaching of Marxist-Leninism, is a violation of the Geneva spirit, they obviously have an incorrect notion of the Geneva spirit. They ought to remember once and for all that we never renounced and we will never renounce our ideas, our struggle for the victory of communism."

Witness the Soviet refusal to permit the unification of a democratic Germany and the renewed Soviet efforts to destroy NATO and other Western defensive alliances.

Witness also the arms shipments from Czechoslovakia to Egypt. This cannot be explained away as a simple business deal. In Communist countries the state controls all such transactions, and they are a part of foreign-policy strategy.

Witness finally the Soviet "good will" mission to India, Burma, and Afghanistan. On the one hand the Western Powers were subjected to vitriolic verbal attacks; on the other there were Soviet proffers of trade and aid to the Asian countries.

It is important to note that this offensive was being pursued in Asia simultaneously with conciliatory tactics toward certain strategically important countries in the West. A pattern clearly emerges: first, the U. S. S. R. is conducting a holding operation against Western Europe while seeking to destroy NATO; second, it is seeking to expand its economic influence in the Near East, Africa, and Asia; third, it is attempting to utilize the United Nations and the specialized agencies in support of these objectives and

in order to create the image of a peaceable, cooperative Soviet Union.

WHY SOVIET TACTICS HAVE CHANGED

Why have Soviet tactics changed? Has the strength of the free world made them necessary? Have past Soviet foreign economic policies been a failure?

I would answer both questions in the affirmative.

First, free-world strength. After the Second World War a new threat of Communist expansion developed. It was turned back in Iran, Greece, Turkey, and Korea only by prompt and determined free-world action. To deter further Soviet threats of aggression, nations of the free world joined together to exercise what the United Nations Charter calls "the inherent right of collective self-defense." Last year, in the face of the strongest Soviet threats and political maneuvers, the German Federal Republic became a full partner in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The change in Soviet tactics stemmed from about this time. Soviet rulers concluded that their approach to the non-Communist world must be changed. A new route to the old destination was needed.

Second, past failure of Soviet foreign economic policies. After the war the United States shouldered a major share of the task of rehabilitating war-torn countries. In the United Nations we championed the establishment of the specialized agencies and have consistently given them strong support. We took the lead in formulating programs of technical assistance to speed the economic development of underdeveloped countries.

By contrast the Soviet Union stripped the vanquished and provided assistance only to its satellites on its own onerous terms. In the United Nations, until recently the U. S. S. R. gave little, if any, support to the specialized agencies or the technical assistance program. Instead it attacked them as tools of Western imperialism.

This negative attitude did not go unnoticed and did not help the U. S. S. R. in its efforts to penetrate the underdeveloped countries.

The failure of old policies is not the only reason for the Soviet new look. For one, there is a new leadership since the death of Stalin which may be convinced that new tactics are required to reach the old goal of a communized world.

For another, the hydrogen bomb means that virtual disaster rather than possible victory may be the price of aggression.

For a third, the Soviet economy may now, for the first time, be in a position to provide goods and technical services for export. In many cases this will mean withholding consumer goods from their own people.

Whatever the reasons for the changed Soviet tactics they constitute, in effect, a shift in foreign policy. A recent Communist publication describes them as "prolonged coexistence and economic competition between the two systems."

This new strategy is the challenge. We must take it seriously. It is not sufficient to say that the Soviets may have seen the errors of their ways. We must look ahead and be prepared to meet this and other Soviet challenges in the foreseeable future.

WHAT THE SOVIET CHALLENGE MEANS TO THE U. N.

I am particularly concerned with how we meet this challenge in the United Nations.

There are 16 new members in the United Nations. Many of them are newly independent, proud of their sovereignty, and anxious not to become committed to any great power. They have swelled the ranks of the underdeveloped nations which constitute a majority of the United Nations.

They want to acquire rapidly the material attributes of developed countries. Industralization has become a magic word. People of Asia, Africa, and Latin America hope to find in quick industralization a cure for many of their domestic economic and political problems.

In Asia and Africa the new Soviet campaign has taken on various forms. It includes the barter of surplus arms in areas where tensions were already high. It includes the purchase of agricultural surpluses. The Soviets have given great publicity to these purchases. They have not made known, however, that some of these commodities have been reexported to markets which would normally have been supplied by the original sellers. The Soviets have also made low-cost loans in increasing numbers to countries important to them strategically. They are flooding the underdeveloped areas wth offers of experts, equipment for training centers, invitations and fellowships for travel and study in the Soviet Union.

In the expanded United Nations, the U. S. S. R. can be expected to champion the demands of the underdeveloped countries for a substantial United Nations fund for economic development, although it remains to be seen whether they would be prepared to contribute much of it. Indeed, the world may find, in time, that they are long on promises and short on deliveries.

In certain of the specialized agencies the Soviets have also made an about-face. In the past they have ignored, opposed, or sought to frustrate the economic and social activities of the United Nations. They ignored membership in the International Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the Food and Agriculture Organization, the International Labor Organization, and UNESCO. For a short while they did belong to the World Health Organization, but they withdrew in 1949.

During this period the U. S. S. R. was not content with merely boycotting the specialized agencies. They were the targets of Soviet attacks. The Soviets rarely missed an opportunity to describe the International Labor Organization as "an instrument of capitalist employers to enslave the workers of the world." UNESCO they described as an instrument of "American cultural imperialism."

Now this is changed. Since the death of Stalin, the U. S. S. R. has joined UNESCO and rejoined the ILO. They are renewing their membership in the WHO. They have contributed 4 million rubles a year or the equivalent of $1 million a year for the past 3 years to the United Nations Technical Assistance Program.

What does this mean for the United States? I remind you that there is nothing new about the United States engaging in economic assistance to the less developed areas. We have provided billions of dollars over many years. In doing so we have strengthened the foundations of the free world, which is clearly in our national interest. We have no imperialist designs. We are simply helping other countries maintain their independence and strengthen their free institutions. It is a compliment to our programs that the U. S. S. R. is trying to copy them. Current Soviet activities in the Middle East and Asia merely underline the importance of what we have been doing.

To meet the Soviet economic challenge, two things are essential: greater flexibility and greater assurance of continuity in dealing with economic aid problems. Without these two elements we run serious risks of a rigid policy which will not be able to cope with the variety and shifts of Soviet attempts at economic penetration.

We can continue and possibly expand our support for both the United States bilateral aid and the multilateral economic programs of the United Nations. From a dollars-and-cents point of view, economic and technical aid through the United Nations is less costly to us in many instances since it spreads the burden over many countries. Moreover, the multilateral approach is more acceptable for political reasons to some of the underdeveloped countries.

Much is being done in the field of international financing through the International Bank and the Export-Import Bank. Now that Congress has approved our membership in the International Finance Corporation, we look forward to increased efforts to encourage the flow of capital to underdeveloped countries. The early approval of this agency by the Congress has gone a long way toward stimulating other countries to ratify. We hope this new instrument of international cooperation will begin to function late this summer. Meanwhile, we must continue to review our economic programs, both within and without the United Nations, to make them as sound and effective as possible.

We must maintain our leadership in the specialized agencies. This is especially important in view of the new Soviet interest in these agencies. I do not agree with those who are apprehensive that Soviet membership will mean Communist domination or corruption of the specialized agencies. There are those, for instance, who think we should quit the International Labor Organization because the Russian employer delegates are in reality government officials and not employers as we use that term. Nothing could be more injurious to our national interest than for us to walk out and leave such organizations as the ILO to the Russians. The overwhelming majority of both the employers and the workers represented in the ILO are on the side of freedom.

Soviet participation in such organizations as ILO and UNESCO serves to bring into the open the fundamental differences which separate the free world and the Soviet world. We need not fear such comparison. I would be the last to claim that these organizations, or any other human institutions are perfect. But they serve our interests, and we are constantly alert to improve their programs.

WHAT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES CAN DO

Of course this new Soviet challenge cannot be met by Government action alone. It is a long-range problem. It must have the continued attention and understanding of our people. In developing such understanding, the colleges and universities have a vital role to play.

I believe the colleges should encourage by every means possible an interest in and understanding of world affairs. I do not mean merely the traditional study of ancient and European history but also the history of the newly independent and resurgent areas of the world. They are on the march toward political and economic equality with the most advanced countries. Your students were born into a world in which western concepts were dominant. They will exercise their responsibilities as citizens in a world in which western concepts must be reconciled and harmonized with those of Asia and the Middle East. This will require new familiarity with comparative economic, social, and political concepts and customs.

Our college and university students must be made fully aware of the developments of the last few decades to understand the demands of the new position of leadership into which we have been thrust since the war. They must understand the limits as well as the possibilities of leadership in coalitions of free states and in parliamentary organizations such as the United Nations. Only in this context can they comprehend the new forces at play in the world. Such education is essential to understand what we can do to meet the Soviet bid for leadership of newly independent states and those peoples still seeking self-government or independence.

I would advocate that all colleges teach their students the cold facts about communism. They should know the origin of the

Communist ideology, its evolution into an absolute dictatorship under the Soviets, its methods of subversion, its weaknesses and its strength, its spurious appeal in an era of vast social change.

I believe the junior colleges have a special responsibility in this regard. A great many of your students will complete their formal education with you. They will then go directly into business, industry, and trade. Others will continue preparation for their life's work. While you have them they should be exposed to a general course on world affairs. If this is done, they will be far better equipped to discharge their responsibilities of citizenship, cognizant of the strength of democracy and vigilant to the challenge of communism.

This responsibility of the colleges and universities becomes greater as the Soviet threat becomes more long range. It is not only a threat of military aggression to be met by military preparedness on the part of the free world, it is a threat for years to come. Continuing deterrent power is essential in the nuclear age. But this must be backed by an increasingly informed American public opinion in the field of foreign affairs.

Many of your graduates will be called upon to go abroad to represent the United States in one capacity or another. In the military or diplomatic services, as technical specialists, as recipients of study or travel grants, they will have the opportunity to speak and act for the American people. They should be equipped to discharge this responsibility in meaningful terms to the people of other lands.

Statistics, I realize, are sometimes misleading. But statistics show that the Soviet Union is training and graduating far more scientists and technicians than we are. The Soviet Union is determined to outproduce us in the scientific and industrial fields. They are not doing so now, but we have no grounds for complacency. The junior colleges, I believe, should provide the best in scientific and technical training for their students and encourage and stimulate them to go on to the university for higher training. American leadership and training is not self-perpetuating. It must be cherished and inculcated at every level of education.

I would venture to direct a word to the administrators of the great American junior college system. The teachers whom you employ are the caretakers of tomorrow's civilization. It is to them that we entrust education for leadership and understanding in this complex world. Only good teachers can do this. It takes good salaries to attract and keep good teachers. They should have at least the incentive and security which we provide for labor, for our armed services, and for the public service. Arnold Toynbee has written that societies have often been spurred to self-improvement in the face of external challenges. If the threat our society now faces teaches us to place a higher premium on our intellectual and educational human resources, it will have served at least one useful purpose. There is no doubt that a free society can meet and surpass any challenge posed by a society under dictatorship. But to do so it must both recognize and accept the challenge.

FACTS AND FALLACIES ABOUT THE U. N.

Of great importance in the teaching of international affairs is a study of the United Nations. This is not an ephemeral organization. It is a going concern affecting the security and well-being of nations on a day-by-day basis. We must know how it was created, what it has done, what it can and cannot do.

The United Nations has had strong bipartisan support from the Congress. But this support cannot be taken for granted. It must be based on an informed and sound public opinion. It is, after all, the responsibility of the Congress to reflect public attitudes on important matters of foreign policy. The public, therefore, has a heavy responsibility to keep itself accurately informed. With regard to the United Nations, this means that we must sift fact from fiction. Here a little misunderstanding goes a long way. Let us consider for a few moments some of the common fallacies about the United Nations.

It is said that the United Nations is a superstate with treatymaking powers. This, of course, is not the case. The United Nations is a voluntary association of sovereign states. It has no power to legislate, to levy taxes, or to make treaties. The members may propose conventions and treaties, but these are only binding on countries which subsequently approve them through their constitutional processes. In our case this means approval by the United States Senate.

It is said by a few critics that UNESCO interferes in and dictates to our American educational system. This likewise is untrue. UNESCO, which is also a free association of nations, does make recommendations to member countries regarding teaching about the United Nations and teaching to foster international understanding. It is entirely up to the member countries whether they want to follow these recommendations or not. And yet there is a small but vocal minority in this country which continues to regard UNESCO as some sort of threat to our educational system and to American youth.

Shortly after the inauguration of President Eisenhower, this administration undertook an independent appraisal of UNESCO to determine whether the charges against it were valid. The President appointed three distinguished citizens to study UNESCO activities. Let me summarize the principal findings of this group:

1. UNESCO does not advocate world government or world citizenship in the political sense.

2. UNESCO does not attempt, directly or indirectly, to undermine national loyalties or to encourage the substitution of loyalty to a supranational authority for loyalty to one's own country.

3. The official bodies and the personnel of UNESCO observe the provision of the UNESCO Constitution which prohibits UNESCO from interfering in matters within the domestic jurisdiction of member states. UNESCO does not attempt to interfere in the American school system.

4. There was no evidence of atheism or antireligious bias in any of UNESCO's work.

It seems to me that these findings should more than counteract the negative criticisms that have been made with respect to UNESCO.

But we must not be content with merely laying bare fallacies about the United Nations. We must understand why the United Nations deserves our support.

Since its foundation the United Nations has been the most effective mechanism available for settling international disputes. It has facilitated peaceful change where violence might otherwise have been the only course. We have the examples of the peaceful settlement of the Indonesian-Dutch conflict, the dispute between India and Pakistan over Kashmir, and the removal of the aggressive Communist threat to Iran and Greece.

We have the important example of the resistance to aggression in Korea in which the United States called for and got the material or moral support of the overwhelming majority of the United Nations members. This may well have prevented world war III.

The United Nations, at President Eisenhower's initiative, has promoted the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The historic peaceful uses conference held at Geneva last summer opened up vast potential benefits which the atom has made possible for mankind.

The work of the technical assistance program and the specialized agencies has raised standards of living and has brought prospects of economic and social well-being closer for millions of peoples everywhere.

These are some of the reasons why the United Nations deserves our continuing support. President Eisenhower has called the United Natons man's best hope to substitute to conference table for the battlefield. He has said, and I certainly agree, that if we did not have a United Nations we would have to create one to cope with the common problems of the world. In the United Nations we get a great deal for very little cost. It will prosper and serve our purposes and the purposes of the free world if we give it our continuing and enlightened support.

U. N. CANNOT SOLVE ALL OUR PROBLEMS

Understanding and support for the United Nations does not mean unthinking approval of everything it does. Nor should we look upon it as a cure-all or panacea for all the world's ills. The United Nations can only be a "center for harmonizing the actions of nations" to the extent to which each sovereign state is willing to cooperate for the common good. There are many issues which it has been unable to solve. For example, once again we are faced with mounting tension between Israel and the Arab States in the Middle East. The United Nations could resolve that issue if the parties concerned were more willing to cooperate.

This is no place to assess blame for what is happening in the Near East.

Neither the Israelis nor the Arabs are guiltless in the tense situation which prevails there. If the two sides would fulfill their obligations under the Security Council resolutions and would carry out the recommendations of General Burns, the U. N. truce supervisor, they could do much to lessen tensions in the area. However, aside from the responsibility of the Arab states and Israel for prevening hostilities, the other members of the United Nations have a serious responsibility—indeed an obligation—to keep the peace there. This cannot be done by irresponsible shipments of arms to the countries in that area, or by trying to maintain a precarious "balance of arms" between Israel and the Arab states. An arms race will magnify suspicions and tend to create the impression—if not the fact—of power alinements which can only lead to hostilities disastrous for the Near East and possibly the world.

We are vitally interested in the peace and welfare of the Near East, as a nation and as a member of the Security Council. We are convinced that early action in the United Nations is necessary on the problems that confront us all in the Near East.

The United Nations, through its members, is the logical focal point for remedying the dangerous developments which confront us. What the United Nations can and must do is something which, I can assure you, the United States is earnestly and prayerfully considering.

Similarly in the field of disarmament. Despite 10 years of negotiation, no safeguarded system of disarmament has yet been agreed upon. The threat of atomic disaster still hangs over man's head. From the very start in 1946, the United States has been squarely on record for a genuine program of safeguarded disarmament. The Soviet Union has consistently blocked progress, but the quest continues, for we cannot afford to slacken our efforts.

President Eisenhower has given world leadership in the search for ways to put the atom to the service of mankind. In his letter to Premier Bulganin last week, the President suggested concrete measures which, as he wrote, "if carried out adequately, would

reverse the present trend toward a constant increase in nuclear weapons overhanging the world. My ultimate hope," the President said, "is that all production of fissionable materials anywhere in the world will be devoted exclusively to peaceful purposes." This month the disarmament subcommittee of the United Nations will try again in London. The United Nations provides a forum where this problem can be solved, and solved it must be.

Let us remember this. Many important and difficult international problems are solved outside the United Nations. But the really tough ones, the well-nigh insoluble ones, come to the United Nations. It is, in a way, the court of last appeal. I don't believe the United Nations should try to shelve or dodge such problems. But let us remember that the United Nations doesn't create them. The organization mirrors the realities of the world. If the image is ugly it is not the mirror that is at fault.

CHALLENGE OF NEW SOVIET OFFENSIVE

In conclusion, the challenge of the new Soviet offensive faces all of us. It is not a short-run proposition. The Communists are not handicapped by any timetable. The cold war—with all its trickery and fraud, its subversion and sabotage, and perhaps even its peripheral outbreaks of violence—may run for 10, 20, 30, or 40 years.

This will call for firmness and determination and patience on the part of the American people, together with a willingness to sacrifice over a long period of time. It will call for flexibility and understanding.

Let us not waver in our determination to preserve our heritage of freedom and to create those conditions in the world in which the cause of free men can flourish.

To sum up—

We must understand the long-range nature of the Soviet threat and meet it with courage and imagination;

We must continue to support the United Nations and the high purposes and principles for which it stands;

We must work closely with our allies and not try to go it alone;

We must demonstrate to the uncommitted nations of the world the enduring values of democracy.

If, as a nation, we follow this course, then we can face the future with confidence that freedom will prevail.

Alcoholic Beverages on Airplanes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD T. MILLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I have received the following letter in behalf of legislation to prohibit the sale or gift of alcoholic beverages on airplanes being flown in the United States of America and throughout the world:

RISING SUN, MD., *April 10, 1956.*

DEAR MR. MILLER: I enclose petition against serving or giving alcoholic beverages on board airplanes and I believe everyone should sign this.

I appreciate your sending me the list of seeds, etc., our Government prepares for our use. And I wish to take this opportunity also to thank you for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as I have found it most interesting and I appreciate your kindness in sending it to me.

Very truly,

BERTHA M. TYSON.

P. S.: I'll appreciate your having this petition printed in the RECORD for others to see.

RISING SUN, MD., *March 15, 1956.*

We, the undersigned members of West Nottingham Presbyterian Church, Colora, Md., favor the Lane bill 7922, to prohibit sale or gift of alcoholic beverages on aeroplanes being flown in the United States of America and throughout the world.

Bertha M. Tyson, Sarah Greer, Mr. Calvert, Grace S. David, Mary C. Greer, Mrs. J. Otis Kennard, Lydia M. Cameron, Mrs. Joseph A. Gillespie, Louise M. Worthington, Miss Anna E. Garvin, Ella E. Tyson, Elizabeth B. K. Jones, Rising Sun, Md.; G. V. Morris, North East, Md., Marie L. Nichell, Port Deposit, Md.; Myrtle Hite, Rising Sun, Md.

Finish the Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend to the House of Representatives an excellent editorial which appeared in the April 14 issue of the Cleveland Plain Dealer urging that the Congress provide necessary funds to resume the construction of the Dillon Dam on the Licking River in Muskingum County, Ohio. The importance of the completion of this project transcends even the vital concern of the area immediately affected since what is done or not done at Dillon will be felt for many years to come in southeastern Ohio and in the Ohio and Mississippi Basins.

The present controversy to which the editorial refers far exceeds the prominence it deserves when the relatively few individuals who would be affected adversely are considered. I should like to point out at this time that the Dillon Dam was authorized by the Congress in 1938. Arguments against it have been considered by the Congress and rejected repeatedly in the past as the impressive total of $9 million was appropriated for the project. Construction was interrupted during the Korean war and a few vocal opponents have seized upon the suspension of work to recommend that the Dillon Dam be abandoned and that the millions of dollars already spent be allowed to rust and erode in the Licking River Valley. The recommendation, unfounded as it is, becomes the more incredible if it is allowed to influence congressional action beyond passing consideration.

The so-called facts presented as reasons by the Dillon Dam's opponents have been labored, studied, and found insufficient in the past. To resurrect these long-bankrupt arguments and outright myths now is to persist in fomenting misunderstanding for the immediate purpose of delaying the action which, as we all know, must come.

The Cleveland Plain Dealer editorial is as follows:

FINISH THE DAM

Not since the chants and war whoops of the Tuscarawas Tribe reverberated up and down the Muskingum Valley has downstate Ohio been the source of such an uproar as is now being expended over the unfinished Dillon Dam.

The Plain Dealer's Ted Princiotto has ably presented various sides of the debate. Already $9 million—a substantial chunk of the taxpayers' funds—has been spent on this flood-control project. It is the final link in a series of 15 dams calculated to bottle up spring runoff in the Muskingum watershed.

There is no gainsaying the fact that the 14 dams previously built, dating back to 1938 originally, have converted a not-too-fruitful part of Ohio into a section offering fine vacation and recreation opportunities. And the flood-control aspects have worked admirably.

It would, of course, fit more into our frame of thinking if the State could somehow finish the project. Some $20 million worth of work still remains. But no such State funds are available.

We would far rather see Federal reclamation funds stay in these environs than go, say to some remote area like the Sudan where the Egyptians will benefit. For example, both the water and power inherent in the Aswan development will undoubtedly be used both to grow more cotton and to run cotton mills. Each would compete with the American economy. Rather, let's keep that money for home consumption.

It is unfortunate that some people would have to be displaced if the dam were completed, but in this modern age of big construction developments the intersts of the few cannot be allowed to block progress.

The public interest, in the largest sense, would be served by completion of Dillon Dam. But whatever the decision, something should be decided and decided now. Further dallying only threatens to make the major investment to date quite useless.

Eighth Anniversary of Israel Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the people of Israel are to be congratulated on this eighth anniversary of their independence. The road has been rough and rocky and even at times discouraging, but Israel is making great progress with a united people, and is known as one of the strongest friends of the United States among the democratic nations.

We people with friends and relatives in Israel wish to encourage them with a friendly pat on the back at this time, and reassure them that United States Secretary of State Dulles has stated repeatedly that the existence of the State of Israel is one of the basic premises of United States foreign policy.

We hope that in this period of tension, that the threats to Israel's survival will disappear, and that both sides may be able with United Nations assistance to work out agreements by which each may live in peace for the economic progress

and development of the Middle East, in which both the United States and Israel can be such key factors.

Our warm regards go to you at this significant anniversary time, and with our hearty congratulations to the people of Israel on their courage and devotion to the cause of freedom.

Freedom of Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an address entitled "Freedom of Information," delivered by Mr. Guy Easterly, editor and publisher, LaFollette Press, LaFollette, Tenn., and the Advance Sentinel, Jellico, Tenn., before the National Editorial Association in Chandler, Ariz., January 21, 1956, and which I consider an excellent discussion of the subject:

Mr. Chairman, Governor McFarland, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen of the National Editorial Association, freedom of information, freedom of the press, freedom to put one's thoughts into words and to print these words and distribute them as a story or an editorial to the people, is the right of the people to know—to know particularly what their Government is doing. This is a right of the people. Let's make that clear. It is not particularly the right of the press. The press are only guardians of that right for the people.

Not only is the business of our Government the business of the people, who have this right to know. But the business or doings of individuals, cooperatives, and corporations, insofar as their rights interlock and/or intermingle, or conflict, with the rights of individuals or families, is also public business and the people have the right to know how all this does, or will affect them.

This freedom of information is guaranteed, we believe, in the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States. It is further guaranteed and strengthened in the 5th and 14th amendments, having to do with due process, and by the 9th and 10th amendments, which set out that all powers not granted to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the several States, are reserved to the States or the people.

The fact of the suppression of information—information which the people have a right to know—is not new. It has existed from time immemorial.

Perhaps the first recorded case of news suppression was when Eve ate the apple and suppressed the news from God. Another case in point would be when Cain slew Abel and denied to his father, Abraham, that he knew the whereabouts of his brother.

They tell us that most freedom of information is at a cocktail party. They tell us further that the people who are most against suppression of news are women—if you'll submit that women are people.

The suppression of news, and the attempted suppression of news, is not new to weekly newspaper publishers. We have it with us always.

Attempts to suppress information of the Federal Government have been made since the administration of Thomas Jefferson, and one such attempt is brought to light and reported in the case of *Marbury* v. *Madison* in public law. From this legal action stemmed what we believe to be the first public records law. This law sets out that public officials must keep public records, and, further, that the public has a right to access to such records.

Two restrictions were placed in this law. We believe they are right and just. One restriction is that public demands to see public records must not disrupt the orderly operation of the public office. The second restriction is that access to such records may be limited to persons of "proper interest," or persons, we may say, who have more than an idle curiosity to examine such records.

But newspapers, as such, have no more right to examine and print from public records, nor to attend and report procedures of public meetings of legislatures, and cases in court, than any other citizen "of interest." To make this positive, we might say newspaper reporters have the same rights under the law as any individual "of interest."

Newspapers, however, are persons of "proper interest."

Newspaper reporters are persons of proper interest because they are the ears and eyes of the greater public which is interested in the doings and procedures of law and justice. Reporters observe, hear, see, and then write the information for the larger audience of proper interests which audience cannot attent all legislative meetings, nor sit for long hours in a courtroom, nor be on the scene of every disaster or wreck. Newspapers have bargained with their readers to keep them informed on affairs affecting their welfare and government.

Newspapers, by their very nature, then, are only agents of that larger public. They are the eyes, the ears, and if you please, the servant of those we serve.

It is a terrible thing to have a job that you can't complete.

It is a more terrible thing to have a job which you can never complete,, but which, theoretically, is a losing fight from start to finish.

But such is the job of those who spend their time in working for freedom of information.

The work (and I do not like to use the word "fight") for freedom of information is a continuing work. It is a fight that will never be won. There will always be suppression and attempts at suppression of information that rightfully belongs to the people, at Federal, State, county, and municipal levels.

Win one fight (although, we suppose, Governor McFarland, that you have no suppression of information here) in Arizona, and another is begun in Tennessee. Set some misguided public official right in Wisconsin and another bobs up in Texas with suppression of some information of which it is the right of the people—the very people who are paying his salary—to know.

It would be great news to tell you here that the work of this committee is done—that the suppression of public information will be no more. But that story can never be truthfully told. This evil we will have with us always.

This being true, the battle for freedom of information must go on. Each succeeding generation will fight this seemingly losing fight, and then throw the torch from failing hands to the next.

Be it theirs to hold that torch high. And be it the privilege of every weekly newspaper to carry on that fight—not for its own selfish interests, but for the right and good and welfare of the people we serve, and for the welfare of this whole nation. For—take away the voice of the newspapers and you take away the voice of freedom.

The work for freedom of information rightfully begins with the grassroots newspapers, the country newspapers, the "county" weeklies, if you please. If we allow little bureaucrats at home, in the smalltown government, who suppress information and only give the public such information as they see fit, these, rising in power and political influence, will become big bureaucrats in Washington, in Phoenix, in Nashville. And they will carry on their nefarious habits and work in high places. This right to full freedom of information would have far more chance of being, if all weekly newspapers knew their rights, and pressed them, fairly and courageously. Freedom of information would have far more chance of being, if weekly newspapers gave the people all the information they're entitled to, at all times and under all circumstances.

Despite what we have said, your FOI committee chairman believes he is conservative on this matter of freedom of information.

We are against trying accused criminals in the newspapers. We are against trying any lawsuit in the newspapers. We are against the wholesale dissemination of information, regardless of how it may affect the military or political welfare of our country. We are against the invasion of the privacy of the individual in any way. We do not defend irresponsible reporting. We do not condone the dragging into public notice the life of an individual who is not guilty of a crime. We believe some information, printed as such, may not be information at all. And yet, we would fight for the publication of any news matter of importance to the welfare of the community or public.

We believe the fight for freedom of information can be carried to ridiculous extremes. We believe it can be carried to the hurt, not only of the medium itself, but of the public—even to the losing of our medium's influence and importance in the welfare of the people and the Nation.

That we do not wish to see. That you do not want.

"Why don't you keep irresponsible reporters away?" Representative CLARE HOFFMAN, of Michigan, asked, when we appeared before the subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee of the House in Washington last December. To this question answer was made that the irresponsible reporter has the right, under the law, to see, to hear, to view, to write. It is guaranted under the first amendment.

But Congressman HOFFMAN had a point there. That point is that publishers must police their own operation. They must hire responsible reporters, and charge them that information must be reported objectively, fairly, accurately, and without malice or color.

We believe that fully 95 percent of all cases of suppression of information is due to personalities. The personality of the reporter or the public official. In most of these cases, we believe, the reporter is the malefactor.

Suppression of information by officials is chargeable to many other causes, of course. Honest mistakes cause some suppression. A case in point is the recent vital statistics misunderstanding in Topeka, Kans.

Under a rule in Kansas, births may be reported, but illegitimate births must not be reported. Following the publication of a list of births, some of which were of illegitimates, the record was withheld from reporters. We assume that the reporting of the illegitimate births were honest mistakes. We were told that at any rate.

Ignorant government officials suppress information. These do not necessarily willfully withhold information. They do not realize in many cases the national necessity for the people to know, or they have the wrong interpretation of certain rules.

Such we believe to be the case in the Civil Service Department of the Federal Government when it refuses to release the names of the top three candidates for postmasters.

We believe the same applies to the refusal of the Civil Service to give out salaries of its employees.

Bad government officials do suppress information willfully and maliciously. And this is one cause of suppression that we should fight day and night. And when this kind of official appears, you can bet your bottom dollar he is the same bureaucrat we spoke of a minute ago. He began this practice in his hometown—at the grassroots. He retained this passion for suppression right on up as his political power and prestige increased. He grew up feeling that public information is none of the people's business.

Government officials are still the servants, or at least the employees of the people. We hire them. And we would not hire a worker and not have an idea of what wages we'd pay them. Should not the people (who hire them) know what salaries they pay their sheriff, their coroner, their court clerks, their mayors, their councilmen, their judges, their attorneys general? Shouldn't they know what they're paying their employees of the Federal Government? They're paying the freight in taxes. We believe those of interest have the right to know.

My Presbyterian pastor and a Presbyterian elder put at me to accompany them to presbytery in a distant city for 2 or 3 days. The elder was a sales tax official of the State. So, I was helping to pay his salary also.

"Certainly," they said, "if we can go, you can."

I reminded them that it was far easier for them to go than for me to go. I clinched my point by reciting to them that they could go and their salaries would go right on. For that reason I must stay at home and work so that they could be paid when payday rolled around. I won my point.

We have no quarrel with departments of the Federal Government which handle confidential information. We realize there is some information which cannot be made public, consistent with the welfare and security of the Nation. Freedom of information would be useless if we had no free Nation. We would not, by any manner or means, endanger our freedom, even to break the greatest story of the decade, the generation, or the century. We believe the President and Defense Department, especially, have "in process" information which should not be made public. We believe the same applies to the State and Justice Departments.

The work for freedom of information, to us then, represents a reasonable responsibleness to the people, whose right it is really to know. And this work is the work of every weekly newspaper, as well as the work of every small and large daily newspaper. But our fight (of weekly newspapers) is at the grassroots, the most important. It is in the small country towns and cities, where America really lives and where the people really understand freedom and liberty, that liberty may be saved or lost for our Nation.

But our fight also must be in Washington because rural America is not the distant hinterland it once was. The Federal Government is gradually touching more lives in every village and town.

A few years ago the Federal Government was something that came into our east Tennessee mountains and tore up our stills, or a man who came to bring our letter mail by rural free delivery.

Today the long fingers of the Federal Government reach us in many ways. The average weekly newspaper has to deal with the Federal Government in 10 to 15, or more, different departments, bureaus, and agencies.

Weekly newspapers today come not only in close touch with their local county and city government, but with the larger State government and with the sprawling Federal Government. We have its Federal Bureau of Investigation, its post offices, its national banks, its Census Bureau, its air bases, its game wardens, its recruiting offices, its Internal Revenue Bureau, its Selective Service System, its alcohol tax units, its Tennessee Valley Authority, its Oak Ridge, and numerous others.

In closing, let us say that the work for freedom of information is just begun. It must be aroused on our home front—in the small towns and cities—at the grassroots. You weekly newspaper publishers are charged with the work. Remembering that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty" still—let us go forward, ever working for the people, whose right to know, we but represent.

The Small-Business Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker and distinguished colleagues, I would like to remind the Congress that I represent an important congressional district in which there are numerous small business concerns. As we all know, the small-business man is the backbone of the American industrial system of free enterprise. It is the small-business man that is the very core of our economic life today—the man upon whom we have depended during the past century to elevate our Nation to a position where we now stand foremost among the earth's free republics.

Today, Mr. Speaker, quite understandably the small-business men of America are strongly concerned about their participation in the atomic-energy program on a prime contract level in the present race to develop peaceful uses of atomic energy. One of the very first spokesmen for small business to focus congressional attention on current problems of the small-business man was Mr. K. W. Van Eman, vice president of the Skinner Engine Co., of Erie, Pa.

Significantly, the Skinner Engine Co. has rendered outstanding service to our Nation since 1868 and is the builder of the world's largest marine uniflow engines. This great small-business enterprise has made outstanding contributions to the military and industrial life of our Nation now for more than 88 years.

In his testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on March 5, Mr. Van Eman made crystal clear the need for immediate action by Congress and the Atomic Energy Commission to move forward with all possible speed toward the application of nuclear power for merchant marine surface vessels. With all the emphasis at his command, Mr. Van Eman also urged the Congress to assist small business in realining our program for atomic power plants and insisted that small business be permitted to join the parade of progress in the development of peaceful uses of man's most destructive force.

However, Mr. Speaker, during the course of his testimony Mr. Van Eman also issued an important warning to the Congress, and his admonition should not go unheeded.

Listen to his sage advice which I quote:

(1) The arrival of nuclear power is making obsolete not a minor industry but a very large industry in the United States today.

(2) The use of nuclear power will mean the rebuilding of our merchant fleet due to technological changes, age, and obsolescence.

(3) Small business in the maritime and power plant industry will die on the vine because of lack of help and assistance to realine our program for atomic power plants and join in the progress parade of the atomic field. In other words, as we see it, we are in the living or dying era so to speak, and will perish unless the doors are open to us.

Referring to the strategic vessels on our Great Lakes, Mr. Van Eman also pointed out that: "207 larger vessels on the Great Lakes are over 35 years of age. It has been the custom and accepted practice in the maritime industry since its inception, to engage in prototype development. Herein lies the key to small business participation in the field of atomic development along commercial lines."

Much to the point, Mr. Van Eman further warned the Congress of the Soviet atomic race and quoted Mr. Kurchatov who heads the Soviet atomic development. He pointed out that an atomic-powered ice breaker is scheduled to be built before 1960 that is designed so that it would be refueled only once every 2 or 3 years.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I was gratified to learn that our distinguished colleague from Connecticut, the Honorable JAMES T. PATTERSON, a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the House Armed Services Committee, has also focused public attention on the problems now confronting small business in the current atomic energy peacetime program. I have read with great interest the article written by Congressman PATTERSON that appears in the current issue of the authoritative Washington Atomic Energy Report. So significant is this article by Congressman PATTERSON that I wish to here include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE SMALL-BUSINESS MAN AND THE PEACETIME ATOMIC ENERGY PROGRAM

(By JAMES T. PATTERSON, Representative in Congress from Connecticut and member of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee; written expressly for Washington Atomic Energy Report)

Arising from the new and glorious age in which man is transforming the most destructive force of nature into the most powerful source of energy for peaceful uses, is the problem of wider participation of American small-business men in the atomic energy program. Day by day, small-business men of America are intensifying their demands that our Government permit them to enter the current race to develop peaceful uses of the atom. We in Government cannot ignore these demands; for it was the small-business men who struggled unceasingly to elevate America to its present and unprecedented sphere of greatness.

As Representative of a congressional district that is largely industrial—and one in which small-business concerns abound—I am strongly concerned with the welfare of small business. Their economic welfare determines

the livelihood of thousands upon thousands of residents of the Naugatuck Valley of Connecticut that I have represented in Congress for almost 10 years. Of equal concern to me, of course, is the welfare of our entire Nation.

Participation of small business in developing peaceful uses of atomic energy gives rise to two fundamental questions: (1) Shall we liberalize present security policies of the Atomic Energy Commission, to facilitate the participation of small business, or (2) shall we continue to rely upon a comparatively small number of companies to carry on the peacetime program?

Concerning the question of liberalizing present security policies of the AEC, it is noteworthy that during World War II when a "crash" program was needed to develop atomic weapons, there was imperative need for top secrecy and utilization of a limited number of individuals to participate in the "Manhattan Project." Also, there was need to call upon our largest industries, for they were at the time better prepared to participate in such a "crash" program. However, the situation is somewhat different today with respect to peaceful uses of the atom.

For example, there is no longer any secrecy about the fundamentals of atomic energy. The basic theory was in fact known as early as 1906 when Albert Einstein wrote his celebrated theory: $E=MC^2$. Today the average high school student knows that controlled fission from a properly sized mass of uranium will produce almost incredible heat and energy. In fact, numerous books have been written for high school students since 1945 that explain in detail the fundamentals of atomic energy and reactors.

Top secrecy must be maintained with regard to the further development of atomic weapons. But in the field of peaceful uses of the atom, such secrecy is no longer necessary. It is my conviction that only through participation of small business in developing peaceful uses of the atom can the manifold applications of the atom be ultimately realized. To me it is obvious that the manifold peaceful applications of atomic energy cannot be enjoyed in their greatest extent so long as we continue to rely upon a comparatively small number of companies to carry forward the program of development. Further, in my opinion, many small-business concerns will be doomed if they are denied participation in developing peaceful uses of the atom. This feeling is shared by many small-business men.

Consequently, I believe that we must reexamine our policies and set a goal that will provide for early participation of small-business men in the program for development of peaceful uses of the atom.

Prospects for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include the summary of a speech delivered by my friend, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, before the Kiwanis International Club in Frederick, Md. Presiding on this occasion was the Honorable John Durr, mayor of Frederick, and Mr. Glenn Main, president of the Kiwanis Club. Earlier this year, Dr. Thorning served the United States as a member of the special diplomatic mission appointed by President Dwight D. Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles for the inauguration of Brazilian President Juscelino Kubitschek. Dr. Thorning was also one of the principal North American delegates and speakers at the International Congress on Christian Culture for the Peace of the World which took place in the Dominican Republic during the first week of March. Consequently, he thinks and speaks as a sincere champion of a true peace, "the tranquillity of order."

Speech of Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs and pastor of St. Joseph's Church, Carrollton Manor, Md.:

If peace consists in "the tranquillity of order," the prospects for such a peace, with security for all concerned, would quickly be improved by the following Soviet deeds:

1. Permission for 1 million Soviet citizens to travel, freely, outside the borders of the Soviet Union;

2. The issuance of 1 million visas to private citizens of France, the United Kingdom, the Scandinavian countries, Italy, Turkey, the Philippine Republic, the Republic of Korea, Vietnam, Spain, Portugal, the American Republics, and other independent nations to visit all the Socialist Republics during the coming summer months;

3. Prompt, effective fulfillment of all the agreements mentioned in the United States Senate Judiciary Subcommittee report entitled "Soviet Political Treaties and Violations" (84th Cong., 1st sess., Government Printing Office, Washington: 1955);

4. Free elections, supervised by the United Nations, in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, East Germany, China, the Ukraine, and Georgia;

5. Immediate suppression of arms shipments to Egypt and other countries of the Middle East;

6. Public, jury trials, open to uncensored reporting by radio and newspaper correspondents, of the most important accomplices of the onetime czar of all the Russias, Josef Stalin, now denounced by the Soviet hierarchy as a vicious butcher, although formerly described by no less a person than an American President, still living, as a likable person;

7. Genuine abolition of all engines of Soviet subversion in such nations as are still independent of Moscow;

8. Arrangements for a 1-year tour of inspection of all temples of religion in the U. S. S. R. by an international commission of 30 Protestant, Jewish, and Catholic scholars with a view to the preparation of a comprehensive, fair report about the Soviet attitude toward God and the conditions which affect the exercise of religious and civil rights.

Until action, not mere lipservice, is noticeable along these lines, Nikita Khrushchev and Nikolai Bulganin, like Josef Stalin and Lavrenti Beria, must be regarded as the lord high executioners, after torture, of human society. Although Khrushchev and Bulganin, upon occasion, know how to masquerade as rowdy clowns, they are, if anything, more deadly than Stalin and Beria. To imagine that there has been any change of strategy on the part of the despots of the Kremlin is to confuse overall planning with local and ephemeral tactics. The international gangsters are still at large; they are no longer worried about possible arrest or punishment by an international FBI; they are more active and more successful than ever.

What is the evidence? Never before in the history of the world have 500 million people been enslaved within 10 years. This is a fact as unprecedented as it is inexcusable. Khrushchev and Bulganin are making Adolf Hitler and Benito Mussolini look like amateurs. The Red Fascists in the Soviet Union are the Hitlerites of the contemporary world. The Neo-Nazis in the Kremlin can best be understood in their own words. Here is the description which Mr. Khrushchev gave in India and Burma about the British people who are soon to be his hosts:

"They are the dirty capitalist warmongers who have been sucking your blood for centuries and who will be wiped out by our peace-loving peoples."

What then is the meaning of the so-called new Soviet look? It is simply another adroit effort to soften us up for the Sunday punch. The Soviet tyrants need time, desperately. They need some years to consolidate their gains. Like the Fascists, after the conquest of Ethiopia, they are assimilating a huge expanse of territory and hundreds of millions of human beings. The present pause is digestive.

Furthermore, the Soviet chieftains are now convinced that it will be easier to work through their fellow-traveling dupes, the Marxian Socialists. Why should they wage war when all the plums are being placed in their laps by Soviet sympathizers? Once their current positions shall have been established to their own satisfaction and in their good time, the world criminals in the Kremlin will confront the rest of humanity with an ultimatim: "Surrender or die an atomic death." And, sad to relate, there are already voices in our own beloved land raised to suggest that slavery is better than annihilation. One hope remains: Under God, to recognize that this is the Soviet conspiracy and that there will be no peace until the Soviet conspirators shall have been exterminated.

Low-Yield Atomic Weapons: A New Military Dimension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, an article by Arthur T. Hadley in the current Reporter magazine contains a thoughtful and provocative study of the tactical use of atomic weapons. In considering our national defense plans, no one can escape some hard thinking on the revolutionary innovations in weapons that Mr. Hadley's article touches upon.

The article follows:

LOW-YIELD ATOMIC WEAPONS: A NEW MILITARY DIMENSION

On Saturday, March 3, the Joint Chiefs of Staff flew out of Washington secretly, to meet for a week at Ramey Air Force Base in Puerto Rico. The chiefs had gone into seclusion to give the United States military policy its most searching review since 1949.

The nature of this review, curiously, had been forced upon them by the superabundance of atomic military power that had become available to both the United States and the Soviets. The most pressing problem was not how to fight bigger and better wars. Instead, according to reports that have since leaked out, they were at last facing up to the question: What range of atomic weapons can the Nation use in this age of hydrogen-bomb plenty without risking total destruction? Has the growing power of the atom made it impossible to fight limited wars to back up specific and limited objectives of our foreign policy?

The potential of unlimited war has become so fantastic that it baffles even the military mind. Today the biggest fusion bomb (60 megatons) is 3,000 times more powerful than the atomic bomb (20 kilotons) dropped on Hiroshima. It represents as much increase in power over the Hiroshima bomb as that bomb did over the TNT bomb load of a B–29.

Even the atomic weaponry so far produced by Pentagon planners with a view to a limited war makes the word "limited" more than questionable. Last fall, during Exercise Sagebrush in Louisiana, the Air Force tested simulated (theoretical) 20-kiloton atomic weapons, which are toward the low end of the present destructive scale. They are at present standard Air Force tactical weapons for use in and around the battlefield and against enemy airfields. About 70 of these "bombs" were dropped on Louisiana in 1 day. The umpires ruled that all life had "ceased to exist" in Louisiana. For countries the size of Louisiana such as Greece or Portugal destruction on this scale could hardly be called limited war.

At the heavy end of the atomic destructive scale are the 60-megaton fusion weapons. These weapons are ready to be loaded into United States bombers today—they are probably ready to be loaded into Soviet bombers, too. Just one of these 60-megaton fusion weapons strategically placed could destroy all life on the British Isles, a fact brought sharply home to Sir Winston Churchill when he received data on the second United States hydrogen-bomb test in the Pacific. His moving speeches toward the end of his career as Prime Minister on the world's need for atomic peace were undoubtedly born of this knowledge. In an address to the House of Commons on March 1, 1955, he said that with the coming of the hydrogen bomb, "* * * the entire foundation of human affairs was revolutionized and mankind placed in a situation both measureless and laden with doom."

Moreover, the destructiveness of megaton warfare can affect friends or neutrals as well as enemies. Soviet atomic production is centered around Lake Baikal in southeast Siberia. From there the prevailing winds blow south. In an all-out war the United States would bomb the Baikal area with megaton fusion weapons. In the opinion of Pentagon experts, radioactive fallout from the presently planned attack would cause India and Burma to cease to exist as population centers. This is the price of unlimited war. The Pentagon believes that the Russians made the nature of such a war quite clear to Burmese Premier U Nu during his recent visit.

Although the tactical atomic weapons we now have in Europe for NATO are of a much smaller variety, ranging from 15 to 20 kilotons, they are scarcely suited for limited warfare either. The Army's 280-millimeter atomic cannon lacks mobility and range. The Air Force's Matador is just an improved German buzz bomb, too slow and inaccurate. The Army's Honest John rocket has the advantage of greater mobility but still packs too powerful an atomic explosion. The Army will have to rely on it until other, more manageable weapons are ready. Jet fighters are so fast their pilots cannot spot the target with enough accuracy, and their large fixed bases are wide open to enemy atomic attack. Clearly, present American atomic weapons are too imprecise and too destructive to be much use in a really "limited" war.

DOMESTICATED MILITARY ATOM

To destroy enemy targets without knocking out an area the size of Louisiana, the military is currently developing atomic weapons of from 4 to 10 kilotons' power for battlefield use. These are the low-yield atomic weapons in which all the fissionable material and gadgetry neceessary to produce an atomic explosion is packed into a sphere about the size of a lumpy softball.

The new low-yield atomic weapons are not yet available. They have been designed, and their atomic cores have been test fired in Nevada. Their prototypes indicate that in them the military atom has finally been domesticated. But how many will be built, and how soon, remain controversial questions among the military planners.

These new low-yield atomic weapons are designed to be used primarily against enemy troops on the battlefield. They are accurate and highly mobile, and their explosive power is distinctly limited. Furthermore, there is almost no fallout from them since they are engineered not to suck up a great deal of dust and debris from the ground into a radioactive cloud. Troops could battle through a city the size of Worcester, Mass., or Des Moines, Iowa, using such weapons, and large parts of the city would survive.

So far these low-yield weapons have been developed by the Army with severely limited funds. But if the present program is not cut back some of them could be in production by next January.

The most interesting of the group is the Sidewinder. This is a hand-carried Army atomic missile, rather like an oversized bazooka, that can be used by an infantry squad. The Moritzer, a completely mobile mortar mounted on a light tank chassis and firing an atomic shell, provides slightly heavier atomic fire support. Finally, for really hit-and-run "sky cavalry" operation the Army has designed a helicopter-mounted 155-mm. recoilless rifle firing an atomic shell.

In the dreams of some military planners, the possibilities for limited police action opened up by these new weapons are infinite. Suppose Iran were invaded by Free Kurdish forces backed by the Russians. Joint staff planners in the Pentagon estimate that one mechanized cavalry regiment with light air support and low-yield weapons could check an advance into Iran.

To do the job without low-yield weapons would require about 10 conventional infantry divisions. By the time these were mobilized and shipped to Iran by sea all would be over but the shouting—and the shouts would be in Free Kurdish.

The increased power of low-yield weapons reduces the number of men needed to a small ready force that could be moved by air. These, it, is believed, could permit the United States to meet localized aggression rapidly and successfully.

TWO-BILLION-DOLLAR FIRE BRIGADE

But what would these weapons cost? Counting the cost is not made easier by the fact that low-yield weapons make many of today's tactical weapons obsolete. Military rivalry comes into play—no service is inclined to admit it has spent or is spending large sums on tactical weapons that are now of secondary importance. The official opposition to the Army's development of low-yield weapons has come mainly from SAC, which feared its own weapons would be outmoded, and from the civilian brass in the Pentagon, which feared the change would increase the defense budget.

Various official groups have wrestled with the cost of creating a force able to fight limited atomic wars. Their estimates vary according to how much they make do with old equipment. During his last months at the White House, Nelson Rockefeller had an all-government team of experts probe the problem. Parts of Army G–3 as well as the office of the Chief of Naval Operations have worked up estimates. One recent staff study put the creation and maintenance of a fire brigade for limited atomic war at $2 billion a year more than the country now spends on defense.

According to this estimate, the $2 billion would be spent in three broad areas: military units, strategic transport and special weapons, and technical equipment. In the category of military units, three mobile air task forces of between eleven thousand and fifteen thousand men each are envisaged. The increased firepower of atomic weapons would permit these task forces to employ fewer men than the conventional 18,000-man division while doing a bigger job. Just how many fewer remains to be determined on maneuvers—with much of the testing being done by the 101st Airborne Division, recently remodeled as an 11,500-man unit. Of the 3 task forces, 1 would be based in the Middle East, and would be capable of acting in Europe also; 1 would be in the Far East; and 1 would be held in America as a replacement force. Unlike the present airborne division or the remodeled 101st, which lack mobility once they have parachuted in, the new forces would be modeled on highly mobile sky cavalry tested by the Army during Sage Brush.

NEED FOR MOBILITY

This desire for increased mobility is a source of continuing friction between the Army and the Air Force. The Air Force, which now provides the transports, has resisted spending its dollars on planes designed to move troops and supplies about the battlefield. Tactical transport planes have been cut back drastically at a time when the rest of the Air Force is expanding. As a result, the Army now has less tactical mobility than at the end of the Korean War.

Planes needed to give the task forces aerial mobility on the battlefield are not expensive. While the standard long-range Air Force transport (the C–124, which carries 200 men and equipment costs $1.5 million, a 12-man assault transport costs only $60,000. Creating and maintaining the three task forces, it is estimated, would require a total of $900 million a year. This figure is based on such known constants as $5,000 to maintain one airborne soldier 1 year, $280 to operate a helicopter or assault plane for an hour, and standard vehicle operating costs.

To move these mobile task forces long distances about the globe would require a great increase in strategic transport for resupply. Last fall, after 6 weeks of frenetic planning, the Air Force was just able to scrape together enough strategic air transport to move one Army regiment from the United States to Japan. A global airlift would have to be created that could move one of these task forces fully equipped. After the initial move, all but the most critical items of resupply would be brought in by sea. Inside the limited-war area, supplies would be handled by the task force's own land and air vehicles.

With the average strategic transport plane costing $1.2 million to buy and $350 an hour to fly, $700 million a year should produce the necessary long-range air mobility. For sea supply about 30 fast (30-knot) transports would be needed, possibly some of them atomic-powered. The annual cost of this sea force has been estimated at around $250 million, bringing the yearly total strategic transport cost to $950 million.

Special weapons and equipment account for the remaining $150 million of the estimated $2 billion. It is said that building the new low-yield atomic weapons in sufficient numbers would require $75 million a year, including the cost of the fissionable material. For the low-yield weapons to be used with maximum effect new technical equipment is necessary. The chief item planned is an electronic battlefield-surveillance system now being designed that uses infrared television and radar to maintain a continuous watch on the enemy's battle area—a great help in selecting the best atomic target.

Two billion dollars is a substantial sum to add to the nnual cost of the cold war, especially at a time when foreign aid and other costs are climbing. Yet by creating the capability to wage limited atomic war, the

$2 billion could add a whole new dimension to our military strategy. It could help restore to our foreign policy a degree of flexibility that is sadly needed.

A Bill To Be Vetoed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the following editorial appearing in the New York Times entitled "A Bill To Be Vetoed":

It would appear that the Democratic leadership in Congress has succeeded, with the stalwart assistance of a handful of Midwest Republicans, in accomplishing what it set out to accomplish with respect to farm legislation. It has succeeded in presenting President Eisenhower with a bill which, in the light of his known views on this question, it seems clear he has no choice but to veto.

Mr. Eisenhower called for stepped-up action on the farm problem in the very first week of the new year in his state of the Union message. Four days later, on January 9, he followed this with a special message on agriculture containing his specific recommendations. The heart of the program was his double-barreled soil bank proposal in which were combined a new and more vigorous attack on the surplus program and a strengthening of the conservation side of the long-term farm program. This legislative proposal, it is estimated, would have put from $1,200 to $1,350 millions in the hands of the Nation's farmers in 1956 alone.

Time after time in his farm message the President stressed the importance of speed in putting this measure on the statute books, so that the greatest possible number of farmers might take advantage of it before their planting season began. "Remedies," he said, "are needed now, and it is up to the administration and the Congress to provide them swiftly." And again, "I urge the Congress to approve this program with the least possible delay so that a significant part of the desired 25 million acres can come into the program in 1956." And the concluding words of his message were: "Again I urge upon the Congress the need for swift legislative action, on these recommendations in the interest of our farm people, in the interest of every American citizen."

There is no good reason why legislation containing the soil bank proposal could not have become law at least as early as March 1. In the first place, there has been no opposition in either House to the soil bank plan. In the second place, the House Agricultural Committee did not even have to prepare a farm bill, since its own contribution—its standard proposal for high, rigid price supports—had been passed during the first session of the present Congress.

If the opposition leadership had pursued this course it would have meant sharing credit with the Administration for voting aid to the farmer. It would have meant taking the farm problem out of politics and dealing with it at the economic level. And this was a challenge—coming, as it did in an election year—that was just too big for the politicians to face up to. So what happened?

First, the Senate Committee on Agriculture tried to sabotage the measure by writing into it a provision rejecting flexible price supports—the key to the whole administration farm program—in favor of high, rigid supports. When that provision was knocked out in a clearcut fight on the Senate floor the opposition shifted its tactics. By a shocking series of alliances of convenience it succeeded in achieving by indirection what it hadn't been able to achieve by more forthright action. It loaded the measure down with amendments calculated to nullify the purposes of the legislation just as effectively as it would have been nullified by the provision for high, rigid price supports. Then, just to guard against the possibility that the wounds inflicted on the Senate floor might not prove fatal—that the President might sign the bill even in the mutilated form in which it came before them—the Members of the Senate-House Conference Committee, in a final bellicose gesture, elected to reinstate high, rigid supports, just to make sure.

There is still a possibility that Congress will have one more opportunity to demonstrate that it is interested in aiding the farmer, and not merely preventing the administration from doing so. If the President vetoes the present bill it may be given a chance to vote on title II (the soil bank) separately, in the confident expectation that such a measure would receive the blessings of the White House. We do not see, however, how Mr. Eisenhower can conscientiously lend his signature to the caricature of his proposals that Congress, in its reckless effrontery, has seen fit to give him.

Eighth Anniversary of the Independence of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following letter which I wrote on April 9 to Mr. DeVere Kostoff, chairman of the Committee for the Celebration of Israel Independence Day in Saginaw, Mich., in connection with the eighth anniversary of the independence of Israel which was observed there last Thursday, April 12:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 9, 1956.

Mr. DEVERE KOSTOFF,
Chairman, Independence Day Committee, Temple B'nai Israel, Saginaw, Mich.

DEAR MR. KOSTOFF: I take pleasure in replying to your letter of April 5 in connection with the celebration of Israel Independence Day by the Saginaw Jewish community.

I have had occasion in the past to express to my Jewish friends in Saginaw my own feelings with respect to the question of Israel. It is, therefore, a real pleasure to reaffirm my own feelings which are to the effect that all freedom-loving people in this country and throughout the world should rejoice at this passage of another milestone in Israel's brief history of independence. I am confident that our own Government strongly shares this feeling and is making every effort to bring peace and security to the Middle East so that Israel may turn her efforts from defense to peaceful ends.

The continued free existence of Israel is a "must" in any consideration of the problems of this part of the world. Any negotiations with the opposing sides must accept this fact as a foregone conclusion—it should not be a subject for international discussion. If our position in this matter is made sufficiently clear to the Arab leaders, I hope that other differences can be ironed out providing that both sides are prepared to make honorable concessions for the sake of mutual peace.

The national security of this country would be imperiled were Israel to be defeated and overrun by her enemies. I am confident that the administration realizes this. I promise you that my own work on the House Foreign Affairs Committee will be guided along these lines.

With congratulations and best wishes to all in attendance, I remain

Sincerely yours,

ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
Member of Congress.

Constitution for the State of Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, on April 24 the citizens of Alaska will go to the polls to vote in their primary election. At that time they will have opportunity to accept the proposed constitution for the future State of Alaska. In this connection I desire to call to the attention of the Members of Congress an editorial which appeared on April 5 in the Seattle (Wash.) Times:

ALASKA WILL BE WELL PREPARED WHEN STATEHOOD FINALLY COMES

This April is an important month for citizens of Alaska. On the 24th, at the territorial primary election, the voters will ballot on ratification of a proposed constitution, to become effective when Alaska becomes a State. If the constitution is approved, the northern Territory will be in the same status of preparation for statehood as Hawaii, which adopted its constitution several years ago.

The constitution drafted by delegates to the State constitutional convention is, by general agreement, an excellent document. Its framers profited by the experience of many States whose constitutions were written long ago, when different conditions prevailed.

Though patched up by amendments, these venerable instruments still contain defects and anachronisms which, in many instances, could best be corrected by starting anew, from scratch, and drafting an entirely new basic State law, more applicable to the times. When and if Alaska attains statehood, it will have a streamlined State government which other States could well envy.

This has been attested by acknowledged authorities on the subject. The Alaska constitutional convention sought the advice of a corps of 15 expert consultants on government, including the assistant director of the National Municipal League of New York, an executive of a professional public administration service firm from Chicago and a professor of State government at Louisiana State University. The latter three agreed that the document drawn up by the delegates comes closer to "carrying out the pattern of separation of powers" laid down by the Nation's Founding Fathers than any State constitution now in force.

In voting on ratification of the proposed constitution, Alaskans will have two other propositions before them. They will vote on an old, highly controversial question and decide whether a clause prohibiting the use of fish traps in Alaska waters shall be included in the constitution. They will vote also on whether the Territory should follow the precedent set by seven of the States that were denied statehood overlong, as their citizens believed.

Thus the territorial voters will determine April 24 whether they will elect 2 Senators and 1 Representative in advance of the granting of statehood, and send them to Washington, D. C., as accredited Representatives of the State to be in Congress. It is said that each of the 7 States that adopted this procedure gained statehood within 2 years. Alaskans hope that by resorting to this dramatic gesture they, too, may expedite their own admission to the Union as a State.

Alaska citizens have not been unanimous on the question of early statehood, by any means; but some influential residents of the Territory formerly in opposition have been converted now to the statehood ranks. In any case, the decision cannot be made in Alaska, but in Congress. Meanwhile, adoption of the constitution would seem to be the part of wisdom and foresight. That will place the Territory in a position to function as a State, when Congress gives the nod, without further long delay.

The President Says He "Believes in Treating River Valleys as a Whole Thing"—His Words and Actions Sometimes Differ

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as the President signed the bill for the upper Colorado River storage project, he announced again that "treating river valleys as a whole thing" is something he "believes in." The words of the President are encouraging but some of his actions and deeds differ sharply from the words he expresses. I am reminded, of course, of his many friendly and favorable expressions with reference to the Tennessee Valley Authority, one of which has become famous—that TVA, under his administration, would be operated and maintained at maximum efficiency. We all know, Democrats and Republicans alike, that the President, the Budget Bureau and his administration has whittled away at TVA appropriations and endeavored to cripple TVA operations on every hand. The President's words are sometimes inspiring but his deeds, at least with respect to TVA, are the dagger deeds of a deadly enemy. The President's recent expression of his belief in treating river valleys as a whole causes some to wonder whether his belief applies only to the Colorado River rather than the Tennessee.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article by the distinguished columnist, Thomas L. Stokes, entitled "Word and Action Sometimes Differ":

WORD AND ACTION SOMETIMES DIFFER—EISENHOWER O. K. OF COLORADO RIVER BILL VIEWED AS RUNNING COUNTER TO POLICY

It's easy to understand how our people can be fooled about what goes on here. Often there's a difference in what is said about policy and what is actually done.

An example is what President Eisenhower said at Augusta, Ga., when he signed into law the bill recently passed by Congress for the mammoth upper Colorado River storage project to be developed by the Federal Government.

This, he said, "represents something I believe in." It follows his idea, he explained, of "treating river valleys as a whole thing—it goes from top to bottom—it recognizes that one thing is certainly true—water is getting to be one of our most valuable resources."

Such an aim first was expressed half a century ago by President Theodore Roosevelt. He told Congress in his first message of the need for great storage works to equalize the flow of streams which, he said, were too big to be undertaken by private interests, as is the case with the Colorado River project. In a later message to Congress, Theodore Roosevelt advocated integrated public development of our river systems for navigation, flood control, reclamation, and production of electric power.

It was not until many years later that his vision began to come true in great public projects—Boulder Canyon Dam in Nevada during the Hoover administration, later renamed Hoover Dam, and, in the Roosevelt and Truman administrations, a whole bevy of giant projects—TVA in the South, Bonneville in Oregon, Grand Coulee in Washington, Shasta in California, Hungry Horse in Montana, and so on.

But, if President Eisenhower believes in "treating river valleys as a whole thing," he either has not told the responsible officials in his administration or they have not followed his instructions. For, until the upper Colorado, in which special factors are involved, the administration's policy had been contrary to "treating river valleys as a whole thing." That's why conservationists have so bitterly attacked the administration policy.

In letter or spirit the principle now espoused by the President has been violated in numerous instances. Perhaps the most graphic illustration is in the case of another great river system like the Colorado—the Columbia, which spans our Pacific Northwest. Both Bonneville and Grand Coulee dams are on it. When built in the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration they were envisaged as part of a series to develop the Columbia system from "top to bottom." A grand plan for unified and integrated development of the Columbia Basin was completed by the Army Engineer Corps in 1950 after Bonneville and Grand Coulee were built.

But the Eisenhower administration has scrapped this in the so-called partnership of Federal Government with private utilities proclaimed by President Eisenhower in his 1952 campaign speech at Seattle and faithfully executed by Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay.

This violation of treating river valleys as a whole thing began at Hells Canyon on the Snake River, a Columbia tributary, along the Oregon-Idaho border. The Army engineers had recommended a high dam there to be built by the Federal Government to utilize the full potential of the river and fit Hells Canyon most effectively into the Columbia River plan. But Secretary McKay stopped this. He withdrew an application for a license for Federal development submitted by the Interior Department in the Truman administration to the Federal Power Commission to carry out the Army engineer plan. That opened the way for a private power company, Idaho Power, to put in its bid to build, instead, three small dams, which subsequently was granted by the FPC. This would mean piecemeal development that would throw the whole Army engineer plan askew.

Though this was represented as partnership with a local power company, that came to be a joke around here. For Idaho Power stock is owned mostly in the East, and stockholders were, in fact, holding their annual meeting at Augusta, Maine, the day that Secretary McKay opened the way for them to cut in on Hells Canyon by withdrawing the application for a license to carry out the Army engineer plan. In turn, this discarding of the Army engineer plan at Hells Canyon led to other private utility companies coming forward with plans for small partnership dams at other points in the Columbia system. That, if carried through, would prevent the building of larger dams called for by the Army engineers. It can only be stopped through a suit now pending in the courts brought by the Hells Canyon Association to invalidate the license of the Idaho Power Co., or by Congress acting on bills which have been bottled up.

Thus far the utilities have been successful in fighting the public development of the Columbia as projected by the Army engineers and are making a mockery out of the Eisenhower theory of treating river valleys as a whole thing. In the case of the upper Colorado, the utilities were not interested, as this is not to be utilized for power on the some scope and does not offer the rich profits of the Columbia, and so they were content to let the Government develop it.

People of the 15th District Express Their Views on Major Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I recently requested the people of my district to share their opinions with me on several of the vital and important issues under consideration by Congress. The response and interest in this questionnaire which was sent to all sections of the 15th District and to people in all types of business and professions as well as to wage-earners, housewives, and those on retirement was an amazing indication of the personal interest the people of the 15th District have in these major issues.

The great response to my questionnaire was an example of government of the people, by the people, and for the people, and convinced me that the people back home are seriously thinking and want to participate in the affairs of good government by expressing their opinions on these vital issues.

It was very encouraging to me to have this widespread opinion from the people of my district on these vital issues. In many cases I not only received the answers to the questions submitted, but additional opinions on many other subjects.

The satisfaction and gratification that I have received from the replies to my questionnaire is that the replies of the majority have confirmed my opinion and belief on these issues, and in the case of rigid or flexible farm supports, I voted as the majority indicated for flexible farm price supports.

The following are the results of the replies I received on my questionnaire:

[Percent]

	Yes	No
1. Do you favor a greater reduction in foreign aid?	79.0	21.0
2. Will the consolidation of the CIO-AFL be of greater benefit to the average wage-earner?	27.5	72.5
3. Should our public school system be left free from Federal aid?	74.1	25.9
4. Should taxes be reduced with a high public debt and unbalanced budget?	24.1	75.9
5. Do you favor rigid or flexible farm price supports?		
Rigid?	10.8	------
Flexible?	89.2	------
6. Should the unlimited power of the Federal Government to levy taxes be restricted by a constitutional amendment?	71.5	28.5
7. Do you believe that wire tapping should be made legal?	49.5	50.5
8. Should secret recordings of jury deliberations be outlawed?	75.8	24.2

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the above review of my questionnaire will be of great interest to the Members of the House of Representatives.

Israel's Critical Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD an editorial from the April 15 issue of the New York Herald Tribune entitled "Israel's Critical Anniversary."

The building of the new State of Israel, which started a mere 8 years ago by her citizens, is nothing short of miraculous. They were building for peace primarily rather than amassing strength for war. The United States has a great stake in the Middle East and a moral alliance with Israel which must be preserved, for the two countries have both had experience in the struggles for democracy and freedom. We should do everything within our power to restore the peace in this area because it is only in the atmosphere of peace that Israel can continue to provide the fruits of her labors for her people.

The editorial follows:

ISRAEL'S CRITICAL ANNIVERSARY

On the eve of its eighth anniversary the State of Israel confronts a crisis greater than any since those tense, grim days of 1948 when a nation was proclaimed in the face of apparently insuperable odds. Then, as now, there were divided councils in the United Nations and among the powers over the fate of Palestine; then, as now, there was hostility among the new state's Arab neighbors. But to complete the parallel there was firm determination in Israel itself to fulfill the dream of generations in a land which had been won back from the desert. As Dr. Chaim Weizmann, first President of Israel, wrote in his autobiography, Trial and Error, which was serialized in this newspaper: "The issue would be decided, as we were willing it should be, by the basic strength and solidity of the organism which we had created in the last 50 years."

To show how much of that old dream has been made real in Israel, the Herald Tribune is presenting with this issue a special section which does not deal with the threat of war but with the triumphs of peace, with the economic growth—the rapid industrialization, the discovery and utilization of oil and copper and chemicals, the expansion of agriculture and afforestation—that has accompanied the doubling of Israel's population in less than a decade. This is the substance of the dream, the physical stake which the Israelis have in their nation. It is a record of growth that is worthy of being celebrated even in the shadow of the ominous events that have clustered about the contested borders of the State. Those events are a matter of legitimate concern to the United States, since the fact of Israel as a State is one which the Arabs must accept if there is to be peace.

Israel's achievements also show what can be done by all the Middle East, if hostility gives way to cooperation, and if an area too long allowed to lie fallow is put to intensive use. A partnership of Arab and Israeli, of the Western nations and those of the Middle East, of the skills, the capital, and the energy that could be applied if the region were at peace, would make these ancient lands productive, prosperous and wholly free. That is the hope of the American people for the Middle East; they seek only peace and an opportunity to join in a cooperative effort to restore the full vigor of the cradles of faith and civilization.

A New Challenge for Negroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the March 15, 1956, issue of the Negro Statesman, a bimonthly publication edited by Joseph V. Baker, of Philadelphia, contains a thought-provoking article entitled, "United States Negroes Challenged by Eisenhower Decision."

As a consistent supporter of President Eisenhower's policies and program for racial justice and equality, I found this forthright statement of an intelligent Negro editor of great interest. It deserves to be read by all Members of Congress because, regardless of who the Democratic Party selects as its candidate for President this year, civil rights is bound to be a campaign issue with the voters. As for me, I do not believe that any longer the American Negro will allow his rightful aspirations to be killed by the kindness of Democrat lipservice. With the Negro from now on actions will count louder than words.

Under unanimous consent, I quote Mr. Baker's article in full:

The decision of the President to allow his name to be offered for another term in the White House gives America's Negro leadership one of the sharpest challenges of recent history. The President has proved that he is the foremost American in the matter of racial engineering. With a minimum of talking and a maximum of quiet, determined action, he has made the Central Government something to which all men may look and live.

Supporting the President is not going to be, in itself, a tremendous assignment for Negro leadership. However, that leadership knows, full well, that getting Negroes to give a shoulder to the Republican Party, per se, is another cut of the meat and calls for quite some digesting.

The cold fact is that the President did not carry a single Negro community when he ran 3 years ago. He did not, because few Negroes were prepared to believe that a man who refused to promise all of heaven and earth would deliver any appreciable portion of either. Therefore, they stood, not with Stevenson, but with the loud-talking Democrats who made more promises than they, themselves, could remember.

As of now, however, Negroes have been rocked back on their heels by the spectacle of a man re-writing the Emancipation Proclamation without fanfare. They know and can believe him. They understand his method of reaching for truth and daring to speak what he believes, once he feels he has the answer.

The job ahead of the Nation's Negro leadership is to try to interpret this man and his deeds within a framework of political reference. Rather or not, the Republican Party, per se, is one with Dwight D. Eisenhower in spirit, it can be wholly said that surely the dominant party of Mississippi and Alabama is not.

Rather or not, some Republican leaders are throwbacks to the dreary years, as far as race is concerned, even the worst one is an improvement by far on anything that can be produced behind America's own iron curtain. And if there was every any doubt about this, the present rebellion of the new confederacy should be enough for any thinking man.

In driving home the message, therefore, the Nation's Negro leadership will have to be honest enough to say to their fellow-Americans that it is a choice, not between the President and whomever the Democrats choose, but one between men who respect the Constitution and the courts and men who would again sever this country in twain with a sword of bigotry.

There is no middle road on this.

There is no ground upon which logic can be used to combat bigotry when that evil is in power.

A classic example of this is the sorry spectacle of Adlai Stevenson. In Los Angeles, operating on a rule of political thumb, he told Negroes to figuratively wait out in the kitchen until the South has had its meal of the land's fat; and then, in the fullness of that section's own good time, they could come in and get what may be left.

It is to the everlasting glory of Negroes everywhere that their fellows in Los Angeles branded Stevenson with the label he will wear: "a phony." That their assay was correct is witnessed by the fact that a week later he was trying to tell the North to get itself in shape before it "threw rocks at Alabama."

How utterly low can lust for an office reduce a human instinct?

What kind of a President would a man like that make?

It is not hard to vision EASTLAND, of Mississippi, making a deal with a President who wants another hundred years or so to pass before Negroes come out of the kitchen of things. Even EASTLAND would settle for that much breathing space.

And so, there is a new challenge for the Nation's Negro leadership. One that is not nearly so much political as it is moral. One

that is simple in its import: shall we have one Federal Government, paramount in its responsibility and power, or shall there exist within this Nation a confederacy of rebellion which makes this country a subject for laughter and derision wherever freemen stand for right?

He did not say so, but this threat must have been one of the persuasive reasons why the President refuses to retire to his tent and leave the Nation to darkness and rebellion. What else could a great man do?

It has been this refusal of the President to walk away from his duty, whether it was serving another term in a heartbreaking job, or saying a flat negative to pressure groups of any kind, even Negroes, that has begun to endear him to a racial group too long weary of many words and no action. The true worth of the man has even yet to be given the full light of truth; but it is on its way and when it fully dawns, bigots will do well to take to cover.

Lesson for Alaskans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to bring to the attention of the Members of the House and Senate an editorial concerning the Alaska Mental Act which appeared in the Fairbanks (Alaska) Daily News-Miner of April 4, 1956:

A LESSON FOR ALASKANS

On page 1 today there is a story concerning amendments to the Alaska mental health bill.

This bill passed the House, but it met a storm of strange protests in the Senate. Suddenly all over America people began writing indignant letters charging that the bill would set up a political Siberia in Alaska.

From some source the word was passed that this measure provided for the establishment of a million-acre insane asylum in Alaska, to which people might be sentenced from every State of the Union.

The charges made against this bill were utterly fantastic. The million acres of land was a part of the 99 percent of Alaska that the Federal Government owns. This land was to be given to the Territory to help finance a mental health program for which the Federal Government is financially responsible. But try and explain that to people in the States.

The mental health bill is absolutely sound and it is badly needed in Alaska. But misinformed people in the United States have attacked it and apparently almost beaten it down. The fact that these attacks are based on utterly false charges makes no difference. Those people have votes and representatives in Congress. When they yell somebody listens.

In our opinion, this entire episode illustrates the futility of any attempt by Alaskans to win their full rights as American citizens a little bit at a time.

People in the United States are busy listening to TV, traveling in the family car and deciding whether to vote for KEFAUVER or Stevenson. Alaska is a very distant and vague place to them. They aren't worried about the fact that Alaskans who become mentally ill are committed by a jury of laymen, to a hospital more than a thousand miles from the Territory. So what? "Who cares if a bunch of Eskimos have problems?"

Alaskans will get nowhere trying to win their basic rights one at a time. No matter how just the cause, we will be defeated by the first enemy that comes along who has representatives in Congress. Those people in Congress will listen to their constituents no matter how foolish these voters may really be.

What does the average Congressman care about voteless Alaskans? He'll sacrifice the hopes and ambitions of Alaskans any day to please a constituent who can vote for him or against him.

How can Alaska win a satisfactory mental health setup, control of its own resources, tax equality, and the right to shape it own destiny? By asking for these things "one at a time?" Absolutely not, for every request will be misconstrued and defeated by any "crackpot" organization in the United States that chooses to oppose the idea.

We have to fight for something the people of America immediately understand—statehood.

Americans will look up from their TV sets if we protest "taxation without representation." They remember that slogan because they read about it in their grammar school history books.

They will be sympathetic if we, as American citizens, demand the same rights they possess. They vaguely understand the value of American citizenship, and it won't cost them a cent to extend these rights to Alaska. They'll say, "go ahead. Have the rights. But don't be asking for $12 million for an insane asylum."

Once we are granted statehood, these simple things that we are fighting for "one at a time" will be granted to us automatically.

Statehood is a big step for Alaska. There are those in the Territory who fear we are not ready for it. Yet it is obviously impossible for us to get anything less than statehood. No group of citizens can have any influence in Congress if they do not have voting representatives there.

Alaskans have only one hope of achieving a measure of control over their own government, and that is to fight for statehood with all their might.

Yes; it is a big step. But it is a step that the people of the United States will understand. Nobody can smear this ambition with false charges. It is a completely American goal.

If we keep on fighting for our rights a little bit at a time, we will eventually end up with all the financial responsibilities of statehood but none of the benefits of statehood. Every step forward we try to take as a Territory will be turned against us.

Our sensible course of action is to forget about patching up the territorial form of government to make it a little more palatable and democratic.

Forget every ambition we have as a Territory and fight for statehood. When we are granted statehood, we'll have every right that an American citizen possesses.

When we fight for anything less than statehood, without the right to vote in presidential elections and without voting representatives in Congress, we are indulging in a colossal waste of time and effort.

Pauper-Prince Role Played by Tungsten

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important critical and strategic metals in the world is tungsten. There is a grave question as to whether or not the defense agencies are making adequate use of this metal. I understand that the Defense Department has limited the use of tungsten in jet engines because of a supposed shortage. The fact is, that the premium price program has brought out tremendous production of tungsten in this country, and we have a sizable stockpile. It would seem intelligent to revise the current uses of tungsten in the light of the demonstrated ability of the American miners to produce it. An article in the April 5, 1956, issue of Christian Science Monitor gives some interesting facts on tungsten and I make the article a part of the RECORD:

PAUPER-PRINCE ROLE PLAYED BY TUNGSTEN

(By Phil Elderkin)

A one-time seldom-explored, often-ignored metal called tungsten is today playing a vital role in key industrial centers and armament headquarters throughout the world.

Considered a nuisance by British mining interests in 1913 because it made tin extraction difficult, Britain was extremely happy when German industrialists began offering them 8 to 10 shillings a unit for tungsten—and the Germans always came back for more.

Thirty years later it was to prove invaluable in war, important in peace, and extremely difficult to wrest from nature. It is a metal unlike anything man had come to visualize as metal. It never occurs in nature by itself, but is always tied in with oxygen. Even when it is laboriously concentrated by complicated processes from reluctant ores, this trioxide must be further refined for commercial use in alloys or as pure metal.

CALLED HARDEST METAL

The name tungsten is derived from two Swedish words meaning heavy stone. It is all of that and, as a carbide, also very hard. In fact, in hardness it is second only to the diamond. Spoken of in units instead of pounds, it has a density 2½ times that of iron and equal to that of gold.

Experts call tungsten carbide the hardest metallic substance yet made use of by man with quality characteristics unequalled by those of any other metal.

Possessing the highest melting point of any metal known (6,152 degrees Fahrenheit), tungsten is just beginning to come into its own, despite the many lessons it taught the Allies during two world wars.

For example, it is finding many new jobs to accomplish in the field of electronics. The vacuum tube, experts say, is the heart of virtually all electrical devices. The filaments in these tubes must be able to resist extreme heat in order to be effective. Tungsten in the pure metal form does the job as no other substance yet tried and at phenominally low costs. Without such efficient filaments, there would be no modern electric lamps, no electric tubes, and few of the electronic wonders so commonplace today.

FIRST NAMED WOLFERAM

Tungsten, as a mineral, was first mentioned in scientific literature in 1574—but by the name "wolferam." However, it was not until 1771 that tungsten was isolated as a new element by K. W. Scheele. When Robert Oxland took a British patent in 1847 for a process of making sodium tungstate and tungstic acid, the metallurgy of tungsten began.

Its first practical application came in the form of steel rails made in France in 1868. A generation later, in 1900, tungsten high-speed steel was first brought to the attention of the general public. That also was at the Paris Exposition.

An exhibitor, the Bethlehem Steel Co., stirred considerable interest by demonstrating tungsten steel alloy as a tool steel. The general adoption of this product eventually led to the redesigning of machine tools and to great savings in production costs.

Today, virtually all types of high-speed tools are made of steel containing tungsten. The basic type contains 18 percent tungsten, 4 percent chromium, 1 percent vanadium, and from 0.50 to 0.80 percent carbon.

Tungsten-steel high-speed tools have meant savings of billions of dollars to industry and lower consumer prices.

Already established as a strategic military item in the munitions race of World War I, the demand for tungsten became astronomical during World War II when Germany suddenly introduced a tungsten carbide armor-piercing shell.

It was Germany's use of high-velocity, armor-piercing projectiles with the tungsten carbide core, military experts say, which almost made the north African campaign a success. British tanks were knocked out by the hundreds. The Germans had equipped their Panther and Tiger tank divisions with a projectile, the tungsten carbide core of which would pierce the wall of a heavily armored tank.

It was 2 years before the United States perfected similar projectiles and produced them in sufficient quantity to give the Allies victory in the Battle of the Bulge. In fact, United States military requirements for tungsten during the peak munitions production year of World War II were approximately 30 million pounds of tungsten metal, more than twice again the production of this country alone.

LARGE DEPOSITS IN CHINA

The largest known deposits of tungsten ore are located in Communist China. However, there is also a large deposit in South Korea, just a few miles south of the 38th parallel.

Prior to what some natural scientists call the electronics era, the chief use of tungsten was as a constituent of tool steels, especially high-speed steels. One man operating a lathe with high-speed tungsten-steel tools can do the work of 5 men, with 5 lathes, using carbon-steel tools. The savings probably run into the millions.

Tungsten was discovered in California in 1904. It was found next in Colorado. Then, in 1917, major deposits were discovered near Mill City, Nev. Until 14 years ago practically all domestic tungsten mining was confined to the Western States.

However, in 1942, tungsten was found in Vance County, N. C., on the home site of Jefferson Davis' grandfather. It turned out to be one of the richest mineral strikes in the history of the State and one of the rare finds east of the Rockies.

MOST MINES IN WEST

Currently, tungsten mines are operating in North Carolina, California, Nevada, Idaho, Utah, Colorado, Washington, Wyoming, Montana, and Arizona.

Unfortunately, the amount of tungsten ore produced in the United States is barely enough to meet present industrial consumption.

The nation with a huge tungsten stockpile, experts say, not only will possess military strength but also great political power.

A Just and Lasting Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I insert in the RECORD an address I made on Easter Sunday, April 1, over Radio Station WHK, in Cleveland, on a just and lasting peace:

A JUST AND LASTING PEACE

Today is Easter Sunday. For the whole Christian world, this means that Christ, the King, has arisen. This is a period of prayerful rejoicing. It is a time when all good Christians take renewed hope for a better future for all mankind.

This year the Jewish passover comes at the same time as the Christian Easter Holy Week. For the Jews, the season of the passover is a time of thanksgiving for relief from the persecution of King Pharaoh. For them it is a time to remember the plagues which struck Pharaoh for his cruel persecution of the Jews. It is a time when all Jews renew their faith in the fatherhod of God and the brotherhod of man.

I believe, therefore, this to be an excellent occasion for us to take an inventory and to examine the prospects for a better future for all mankind.

Most of the people of the world yearn for an era of genuine peace. The Christian-Judean world strives for a just and lasting peace, and that is a peace built upon immutable moral principles. Other religions of the world such as the Moslems, the Buddahists, and the Hindu, seek a similar goal.

On the other hand, the leaders of world communism continue their cruel warfare against all civilization. These same leaders proclaim the doctrine that if needs be, three-quarters of all mankind must perish in order that communism may prevail throughout the world.

Against this background, I am going to explore the prospects for a just and lasting peace. Last summer, all the world witnessed what became known as the meeting at the summit. There President Eisenhower, the leaders of France and Great Britain, and the rulers of Soviet Russia met in what was described as an effort to reduce world tensions.

At Geneva hundreds of pictures were taken of the Russian rulers with President Eisenhower and other leaders of the free world. These pictures emphasized positions and postures of warm friendship. At the climax point of this so-called meeting at the summit President Eisenhower announced to the world his belief that the Russian Communists were as sincere in their desire for peace as were the leaders of the free world.

From these events which were explained over and over again to all the people of the free world, there developed a great uplift in the hopes of the American people for that era of peace to which they so ardently aspired. There was talk about a spirit of Geneva which carried with it great promises of things to come. When the Geneva Conference at the so-called summit ended, people of the free world heaved a sigh of relief. There appeared to be an almost immediate relaxation among the nations which had found it necessary to rearm, to maintain large standing armies, and to build alliances in order to hold back the tidal wave of communism.

Upon his return to Great Britain, Prime Minister Anthony Eden announced at the London Airport that the cold war was over and that a new era for all the people of the world had been ushered in. He assured the British people of peace in our time.

Upon his return to France, Minister Pinay assured the French people that the danger of war had passed and that world tensions, many of which beset the French Empire, would soon settle down. The new spirit of Geneva held out for the French people hopes which they had not enjoyed since the days between the great wars.

Here in the United States, great optimism was expressed in the belief that the Russian Communists were prepared to amend their ways and to begin acting like responsible members of civilization. Here and there a note of caution was raised that we had best await the carrying into effect of the Geneva spirit by concrete deeds rather than the platitudes of promises which had been generated at the luncheons and the press conferences attending the meetings at Geneva.

It was but a few days after the breakup of the Geneva Conference that word leaked out from Russian-occupied East Germany to the effect that Communist Party boss Khrushchev, en route from Geneva to Moscow, had made it known to the Communist elite that there was no change whatever in fundamental Communist doctrine or policy. To some, this news was shocking because Khrushchev had been one of those who took part in the Geneva Conference. Still others brushed aside this startling news, charging it off to those elements of society who are unwilling to try to find a modus vivendi with the Communist rulers.

Shortly thereafter, the Foreign Ministers of the United States, Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union met at the historic summit of Geneva to work out the details of the spirit of Geneva in order that the dangerous tensions which gripped the world could be eliminated and the way opened to a just and lasting peace. It was soon discovered, however, that when the conferences moved from pleasant lunches and press conferences to the business of agreeing to specific methods for removing world tensions, the spirit of Geneva burst like a toy balloon in the hands of a mischievous child. The Russian Communists made it crystal clear that what they meant by the spirit of Geneva was that the West should accept their program of peaceful coexistence—their program of peaceful coexistence being nothing short of complete surrender on the part of the free world.

Thus the Communist leaders demonstrated their complete insincerity in their claims to support a program for relaxation of world tensions and for a just world peace.

Only a few months later on, the world was shocked when Communist Party boss Khrushchev and his traveling companion, Bulganin, both of whom had been the spokesmen for the Russian rulers at Geneva, engaged in a provocative propaganda campaign against the United States, Great Britain, and France.

This was done on the occasion of their visits to India, Burma, and Afghanistan. These same rulers branded the American people as imperialists and exploiters as well as warmongers.

But still the propaganda drums of the Kremlin beat out the dirge of peaceful coexistence. The protestations of the Kremlin leaders for peace and good will become louder with each successive attack they make against the sincerity and integrity of all the leaders of the free world.

In February of this year the 20th socalled congress meeting of the Communist Party was held in Moscow. At this meeting the official policy of the world Communist movement was set forth as well as the tactics to be employed in carrying out those policies. The decisions taken at that meeting serve as instructions to members of the Communist movement everywhere in the world.

The key policy speech was given by Communist Party boss Khrushchev, and I just want to quote one small part of Khrushchev's 6-hour speech because it clearly explains the true Communist intention toward the goal of a just and lasting peace:

"Intensify our efforts in Communist education of the masses and in eliminating the survival of capitalism in the minds of men, make fuller and more active use, to this end, of all the ideological media—propaganda, agitation, the press, radio, cultural and educational organizations and institutions, science, literature, and art."

In addition, instructions were given that steps of subversion and violence were to be increased in those nations which offered the greatest resistance to Communist take-over. Thus the leaders in the Kremlin single out the United States as aspecific victim of their new tactics to conquer the world for communism.

You and I can see from this summary of basic events which have taken place within the past 9 months that the Christian-Judean world is still a long way off from its goal of a just and lasting peace. It is becoming increasingly clear that the hope of all mankind which reached an almost unprecedented pinnacle in response to the proclamation of the spirit of Geneva, have been dashed upon the dangerous rocks of false promises.

It may be a bit too early to measure the full damage done to the hopes of all mankind for a just and lasting peace as a consequence of the meetings which took place at Geneva between President Eisenhower and other leaders of the West and the Russian rulers, but it is not too late for the free world to learn some valuable lessons from the broken spirit of Geneva.

In my judgment, the first lesson we must relearn is that basic Communist doctrine holds that peace in the world is only possible when all the world is under Communist rule. The Communist leaders have made it clear that they have not changed in the least this basic doctrine. Communist Party Boss Khrushchev stated that there is no more chance for change in the basic Communist doctrine than there is in developing a shrimp that can whistle.

The Communists will shift their tactics at any time in order to confuse and mislead their intended victims. Stalin once said that it is sometimes necessary to take 1 step back in order to take 2 steps forward. This is a typical example of the Russian strategy that was employed at the so-called conferences at Geneva.

The just and lasting peace which the Christian and Judean world so earnestly yearns and strives for, cannot be won by the simple utterances of high sounding phrases or by platitudinous promises sealed by a toast accompanied by the clinking of glasses filled with martini cocktails. That just and lasting peace can be won and maintained only by the acceptance of those moral principles which support civilized mankind everywhere in the world.

In the true spirit of Eastertide, we must find renewed hope for a better future for all mankind. Our faith in God demands that we never lose courage in the face of difficulties. On this Easter Sunday, man's spirits must be raised up and dedicated to the emancipation of all those nations which today still suffer the degradation of enslavement and tyranny by the Russian Communists.

With a firm faith in the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, we will somehow find our way through to that golden era of a universal, just and lasting peace.

Memo for an Election Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, these are days when once again the country is readying itself for the presidential nominating conventions. In the current Saturday Review appears a quotation assembled from a talk given by James Russell Lowell in New York on April 13, 1888, which I am inserting as part of my remarks:

MEMO FOR AN ELECTION YEAR

EDITOR'S NOTE.—Sixty-eight years ago this month James Russell Lowell, editor, poet, ambassador, interpreter of America to other peoples, spoke before the Reform Club of New York. The country was readying itself for the presidential nominating conventions, and Mr. Lowell had some pertinent comments to make. The material here is assembled from that talk.

In its least comprehensive definition, politics is an art which concerns itself about the national housekeeping, about immediate interests and workaday wants, the income and the outgo of the people.

But there is perhaps a higher and wider sense in which politics may fairly be ranked as a science. When it rises to this level we call it statesmanship. The statesman applies himself to the observation and recording of certain causes which lead constantly to certain effects, and is thus able to formulate general laws for the guidance of his own judgment and for the conduct of affairs. He is not so much interested in the devices by which men may be influenced as about how they ought to be influenced; not so much about how men's passions and prejudices may be utilized for a momentary advantage to himself or his party as about how they may be hindered from doing a permanent harm to the commonwealth. He trains himself to discern evils in their causes that he may forewarn if he cannot prevent, and that he may not be taken unawares by the long bill of damages they are sure to bring in, and always at the least convenient moment. He seeks and finds in the moral world the weather-signs of the actual world. He strives to see and know things as they really are and as they are related to each other. His vision is undeflected by the cross-lights of transitory circumstance, his judgment undisturbed by the clamor of passionate and changeful opinion.

I think there is a growing doubt whether perhaps we are not losing the power to produce such statesmen. The tricks of management are more and more superseding the science of government. How often do we not read in our morning paper that such and snch a local politician is dictating the choice of delegates to a nominating convention, or manipulating them after they are chosen? We should not tolerate a packed jury which is to decide on the fate of a single man, yet we are content to leave the life of the Nation at the mercy of a packed convention.

Parties refuse to see or, if they see, to look into vicious methods which help them to a majority, and each is thus estopped from sincere protest against the same methods when employed by the other. If parties will not look after their own drainage and ventilation there must be people who will do it for them, who will cry out without ceasing till their fellow citizens are aroused to the danger of infection.

Under every form of representative government parties become necessary for the marshaling and expression of opinion. When parties are once formed those questions the discussion of which would discipline and fortify men's minds tend more and more to pass out of sight, and the topics that interest their prejudices and passions to become more absorbing. What will be of immediate advantage to the party is the first thing considered, what of permanent advantage to their country the last. I refer especially to neither of the great parties which divide the country. I am treating a question of natural history.

Parties being necessary things, it follows, of course, that there must be politicians to manage and leaders to represent and symbolize them. The desire of man to see his wishes, his prejudices, his aspirations summed up and personified in a single representative has the permanence of an instinct. Few escape it, few are conscious of its controlling influence. The danger always is that loyalty to the man shall insensibly replace loyalty to the thing he is supposed to represent, till at last the question of what he represents fades wholly out of mind. The love of victory as a good in itself is also a powerful ingredient in the temperament of most men.

If the politicians must look after the parties there should be somebody to look after the politicians; somebody to ask disagreeable questions and to utter uncomfortable truths; somebody to make sure if possible before election not only what, but whom the candidate if elected is going to represent. What to me is the saddest feature of our present methods is the pitfalls which they dig in the path of ambitious and able men who feel that they are fitted for a political career, that by character and training they could be of service to their country, yet who find every avenue closed to them unless at the sacrifice of the very independence which gives them a claim to what they seek. It has been proved, I think, that the old parties are not to be reformed from within. It is from without that the attempt must be made, and it is the independents who must make it. If the attempt should fail the failure of the experiment of democracy would inevitably follow.

What we want is an active class who will insist in season and out of season that we shall have a country whose greatness is measured not only by its square miles, its number of yards woven, of hogs packed, or bushels of wheat raised, not only by its skill to feed and clothe the body, but also by its power to feed and clothe the soul; a country which shall be as great morally as it is materially; a country whose very name shall call out all that is best within us.

JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL.

APRIL 13, 1888.

LeMay Says SAC's Readiness Is Our Peace Insurance Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker—

For centuries it has been the job of a general to win wars. In the nuclear air age his job must be to prevent wars.

In a most interesting article on readiness as our peace-insurance policy, Gen. Curtis E. LeMay makes this statement about the new job of generals and explains how he is performing the job as commander in chief of the Strategic Air Command.

All training, all operations in the Strategic Air Command add up to one simple purpose—readiness for combat on an instant's warning anywhere in the world. SAC crewmen, flying from bases here and overseas, can find their targets with complete certainty. Once they have found them, they can destroy them effectively. Having destroyed them, they can get back to home base. As General LeMay says:

Today we have a combat-ready force in being, and I think there is good reason to hope it may never have to be used.

If we never have to use the power we have built into our Air Force and its Strategic Air Command, it will have justified its cost many times over.

We have to face, however, the fact that the United States no longer enjoys a monopoly on long-range nuclear airpower. The Communists now also have such a force. But the fact that they do in no way detracts from the deterrent power of our own Air Force in being.

Our task today is to preserve that deterrent power. We must provide long-range bombers and nuclear bombs in sufficient numbers and of superior quality as a national insurance policy. We must push forward our research and development programs on advance-type aircraft and guided missiles to guarantee future leadership in the air.

Mr. Speaker, both the airmen and the generals of today know the futility of war, and that the greatest job facing any of us is to keep war from happening. We can and must insure our security by our continuing efforts toward a peaceful solution to the world's problems, backed up with the type of military strength our potential enemies fear most.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great comfort to know that Gen. Curtis E. LeMay recognizes this task and this responsibility and can express his thoughts in ways to be such an inspiration to others. With the consent of my colleagues, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD General LeMay's own article from the special April issue of Air Force magazine, which follows:

SAC's READINESS IS OUR PEACE INSURANCE POLICY

(By Gen. Curtis E. LeMay)

For centuries it has been the job of the general to win wars. In the nuclear air age his job must be to prevent wars. There is good reason to believe that the military solution to the problem is relatively simple—superior long-range nuclear airpower and adequate defensive airpower in being combat-ready on a continuing basis. This airpower must be strong enough to win, beyond the shadow of a doubt, the decision in any global nuclear war. Without this kind of force in being we cannot expect to keep the peace. This is perhaps the most significant military fact of today.

Therefore, all training, all operations, in the Strategic Air Command add up to one simple purpose—readiness for combat on an instant's warning, anywhere in the world. If we are not ready—in terms of trained men, modern equipment, and effective organization—then SAC is wasting its time.

Military power, in any form, has always been a matter of men, and for the foreseeable future it will continue to be. The day of the pilotless long-range bomber and the guided missile is coming. As they become available they will augment the manned force and, very slowly, may even replace it.

But in SAC we can take no comfort in the prospects of being combat-ready 5 years from now, or 1 year from now, or even tomorrow. Our prime interest is in readiness today, this instant. To do so we need men of the highest caliber, trained to the peak of perfection, armed with sufficient quantities of the best equipment the Nation can supply them.

Among the almost 200,000 personnel of the command, motivations naturally vary greatly from person to person, yet there is one attribute that is common to almost all SAC people. This is the satisfaction they derive from knowing that the force they have helped to build, and which they maintain in a state of constant readiness, is vital to the security of the free world. They know that they are making a contribution toward the achievement of lasting peace. These people represent the finest in the military tradition—these who choose service to their country above all other considerations.

Building the Strategic Air Command to its present high state of readiness was, essentially, a matter of bringing the men and the aircraft together, and exercising them constantly on combat training missions which duplicate actual war requirements. Realistic training is our greatest continuing need, and many hundreds of hours of study are required to master today's highly complicated air equipments.

Consider, for example, the fact that 3 men in a B–47 bomber do substantially the same jobs that 11 men did in the World War II B–29. Their training has to be broader and more technical and the demands on each man are gerater. Not only must everyone achieve high standards of proficiency in his own job—he is often cross-trained to the other jobs as well.

Ever since the Strategic Air Command was activated, it has been necessary to work on the assumption that a war might start at any time. It is a fact that hours—even minutes—might spell the difference between victory and defeat. Therefore, there has always been a certain urgency to our operations. It is essential to be ready to go—not next week, nor tomorrow, but today—now, if the need arises.

It is our responsibility to know how well the combat crewmen of SAC can do their jobs. In determining this we have had to ask—and answer—three questions. We would like to give you both questions and annswers, for they bear on our conclusions.

First, can SAC combat crewmen, flying from bases here and overseas, find their targets with certainty? The answer is an unqualified yes. On celestial navigation alone, our crews can fly to within 15 miles of any spot on earth, and from there move on their targets with precision by means of radar navigation.

Second, when they arrive over their targets, can they destroy them? Again, the answer is an unqualified yes. By means of carefully scored bombing runs, each of these crews has proved its ability on hundreds of occasions. I should like to point out that their targets are not cities—they are often specific corners of buildings within military target areas. By a combination of radar and radio, we can tell with what degree of accuracy any given crew is bombing.

Third, having destroyed their targets, will these crews get back? Again, the answer is "Yes." In World War II, using mass formations of bombers, subject to massed attack, our percentage of losses was less than 2 percent. With many hundreds of jet bombers utilizing optimum tactics, in small formations or on single-plane penetrations, the odds are equally in favor of our bombers.

Today we have a combat-ready force in being—and I think there is good reason to hope it may never have to be used. The strength it poses to any potential enemy as of now is so great it is very probable that he will not risk its blows. There is no profit in aggression if it brings on self-destruction. Therefore, we may well regard the Strategic Air Command as peace insurance, and the premiums we must pay to keep it more modern than the strategic air force of any nation are not high. If we never have to use the power we have built into SAC, it will have justified its cost many times over.

We must face squarely the fact that the United States no longer enjoys a monopoly on long-range nuclear airpower. It was inevitable, of course, that the Communists would build this most potent type of force as quickly as they could. The fact they now have such a force, however, in no way detracts from the deterrent power of our own. It is not likely that any major attack could be made on the United States without the aggressor nation suffering disaster. As long as a potential aggressor is convinced of this, I do not think we have to worry about a major war. Our main job is to keep him convinced.

We are not a belligerent people. We prefer to devote our inventive natures and our industrial capacity to providing better lives for ourselves and for others. In the past this inclination has been mistaken for weakness, and as a result we have been drawn into two World Wars in a single generation.

I would not say to you that SAC is the ultimate of military tools. Today, it is our best and most formidable military expression, and for the foreseeable future it appears clear that the long-range bomber and the nuclear bomb will be required in sufficient numbers, and of superior quality, as a national insurance policy. We must keep it that way, at the same time pushing forward our research and development programs on advanced type aircraft and guided missiles to guarantee future leadership in the air.

The airman knows the futility of war and his job today is to help prevent war from happening. We can and must insure our security by our continuing efforts toward a peaceful solution to world problems, backed up with the type of military strength our potential enemies fear most. In such an atmosphere, with that strength behind our position of moral leadership in the world, we can look at the future with confidence.

Whose Side Is Nehru Really On?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following article from the April 13 issue of U. S. News & World Report entitled, "Whose Side Is Nehru Really On?"

At every turn, in the conduct of United States policy abroad, American diplomats are encountering the foreign policy of India as conducted by Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru.

United States concern about Mr. Nehru's actions and attitudes is rising rapidly. The Indian leader is scheduled to come to the United States as a guest of President Eisenhower in July. In preparation for this visit, United States officials are taking a new look at India's policies.

Inside story of India's behavior, as directed by Mr. Nehru, in diplomatic contacts with the rest of the world is revealed in these official studies.

One case history—the recent meeting of the United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, held at Bangalore, India—is of particular interest. United States officials call it a typical example of how Mr. Nehru's policy of "nonalinement" operates to place India on the side of the Communists—against the United States and its non-Communist allies.

Here, in substance, you get the developments at this meeting as is shown from records now under study by United States officials trying to analyze Mr. Nehru's role in world affairs.

Delegates from 27 nations, including the United States and Soviet Russia, met at Bangalore early in February of this year. Some nations were members of the Commission. Others, such as Communist Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia, sent observers.

An address of welcome, opening the conference, was delivered by the Indian Prime Minister himself.

"Customarily," said a United States official who knows the Bangalore record, "such addresses are made on a very high level and are largely free from controversial issues. Mr. Nehru's speech was a striking departure from this custom."

The Indian Premier expressed his regret that Japan and the People's Republic of Outer Mongolia had not been admitted to membership in the United Nations. This remark was in support of a membership deal offered by Soviet Russia, whose delegate blocked the admission of Japan when the U. N. refused to admit Outer Mongolia, a Communist creation recognized by few free governments.

Next, Mr. Nehru deplored the absence of Communist China, not admitted to the U. N., from the U. N.-sponsored conference. He urged that Red China's delegates be admitted—a proposal later rejected by a majority.

"We in Asia," said Mr. Nehru to delegates who included Americans, Britons, Frenchmen, and Canadians, "must solve our own problems for ourselves." And the Indian leader also denounced aid given on a bilateral basis—such as United States aid to India. He expressed thanks for such aid as India had received by this route, but said it could better be given through the United Nations.

Aid given directly by one country to another, Mr. Nehru declared, is without virtue because political strings are attached to it. If aid came "from a country which is in the happy position of giving it, the assistance could be accepted only if it were free from any strings," he said.

In addition, Mr. Nehru's address of welcome attacked the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization and the Baghdad Pact—both defensive alliances supported by the United States and its allies. He made no mention of the Communist alliances.

This Nehru speech, United States officials report, set the tone for the attitude of India at the conference. Communist delegates who spoke later also picked up phrases and whole paragraphs of Nehru's speech to quote in support of their remarks.

The presiding officer of the conference—D. P. Karmarkar—was an Indian. Ignoring normal procedure, according to United States analysis of the record of the Bangalore Conference, Karmarkar made little effort to stay out of the debate.

On the contrary, the record shows, the Indian chairman encouraged Communist observers to speak as though they were delegates to the conference. Bulgarians and Czechs, representing Communist regimes, spoke at length of the importance of trade with Red China and with Outer Mongolia. They were given full time to praise the Communist system as against free enterprise. When delegates from Korea, the Philippines, and Nationalist China sought to reply to the Communists, Karmarkar ignored them.

On one occasion, conference records reveal, the Indian chairman actually took the lead in speaking for the Communists. The Soviet delegate introduced a resolution against the embargo on trade with Red China. As other delegates spoke, it became obvious that the Soviet resolution would be defeated in a clear setback to the Communists.

At this point, Karmarkar asked the Soviet delegate to withdraw his motion. "I don't understand," said the Russian. The Indian chairman, in violation of the rules, thereupon spoke for 15 minutes giving the Soviet position. At the end he said: "That is the Soviet delegate's stand—now I ask him again to withdraw his motion." Smiling, the Soviet delegate agreed.

The executive secretary of the conference also was an Indian, P. S. Lokanathan. Under the rules of the United Nations, all officials of the secretariat including the executive secretary are U. N. employees with no right to enter the debate. But United States officials point out that the official minutes show frequent remarks by Lokanathan, most of them openly favoring the Indian or the Communist positions.

Under Lokanathan's direction, the secretariat quickly prepared copies of draft resolutions for Indian and Soviet delegates, but was slow in preparing copies of resolutions offered by other members. In the official summary record of the conference as compared by the secretariat, statements of Communist and Indian delegates were reproduced in full while statements by United States delegates and others were whittled to a minimum.

India's delegate, K. B. Lall, was outspoken in his attacks on the United States and in his support of the Soviet position. He left Bangalore for 2 days to consult with Mr. Nehru in New Delhi, and many delegates expected him to return with some kind words for the United States and its allies. Instead, when Lall came back, his attacks on the United States increased in fury.

"On virtually all controversial issues," one United States official said after studying the record of Bangalore, "the position of India was to support the Soviet Union or to lead the way for Soviet support of India's view. In very case the Indian attitude was in opposition to that of the United States."

Lall, United States observers report, made a far more vehement attack on the United Nations for its failure to admit Red China than the Soviet delegate did. Lall attacked bilateral-aid programs of the United States and United States trade policies.

Once, during a vote on a motion supported by the Soviet delegate, the Indian delegate told an American official: "If you vote against us you will force us to support the Russians. They're the only people who support our position."

The overall record, United States officials say, is not very different from that of Bangalore. Studies of India's position in recent diplomatic activities the world over show that Indian delegations, under Mr. Nehru's direction, almost invariably stand in opposition to the United States, on the Communist side. As American diplomats see it:

In south Asia, Mr. Nehru wants the United States to abandon its support of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, leaving the area to the Nehru policy of "nonalignment"—and to Communists.

In the Middle East, Mr. Nehru supports an Egyptian military regime which gets arms from Communists and wants to build an Arab empire under Egypt's leadership.

In the Far East, Mr. Nehru urges the United States to make friends with Red China, to abandon support for anti-Communist Nationalists on Formosa and for the Syngman Rhee Government of South Korea.

Even as to Europe, Mr. Nehru has expressed sympathy for Russia's position—opposing the rearming of West Germany, while ignoring the rearming of Red East Germany.

In question, as the result of American studies of the Nehru policy for India, is the whole policy of the United States toward India. And Mr. Nehru, on his visit to Washington, will be asked blunt questions about what some United States officials consider his "one-way neutrality."

Missouri's Care of Mentally Retarded Termed Blot on State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of July 25, 1955:

WE MUST PROVIDE FULLEST MEASURE OF HELP, EISENHOWER DECLARES

President Eisenhower said, in a letter to Martin Papish, president of the National Association for Retarded Children:

"In our Republic, in which we recognize the dignity and importance of every individual, regardless of physical or mental handicap, it will give serious thought to the needs of our more than 4,800,000 mentally retarded children.

"We must provide the fullest measure of compassion and constructive help to the end that retarded children everywhere may have the fullest opportunity to achieve the maximum development within their limitations.

"This is not alone in harmony with America's best humanitarian conditions. It can be, in addition, a definite contribution to the economic well-being of our Nation."

MISSOURI'S CARE OF MENTALLY RETARDED TERMED BLOT ON STATE

(By Morton Mintz)

(First of a series)

"The whole are a blot upon civilization, a reproach against our enlightenment and Christianity, an indignity upon the race, and a shame to our State and people."

In those enraged words an official commission denounced the care of the mentally retarded in New Jersey in 1874.

The same words hold true for Missouri in 1955.

The experts say that 1 of every 2 retarded children is born to families with no known inheritance of mental deficiency.

Missouri parents of normal intelligence thus will bear an estimated 1,400 such children in 1955.

The awful, numbing shock of having such a child is as great as any a family can suffer.

For countless Missouri parents, the initial stunning anguish will be needlessly prolonged by years of strain and torture. Sometimes the breaking point is passed, and the result is divorce, desertion, or attempted suicide.

Why?

Because Missouri does so little to meet the total need.

Most States do as little as Missouri, some even less. But some States do much, much more—and so could Missouri.

Institutions for the mentally retarded are a part—but only a part—of the answer. Only in this field has Missouri made a real effort through the years to grapple with the problem, and even here it is falling far short.

Missouri has two public institutions for the mentally retarded. One is the St. Louis State Training School at 10695 Bellefontaine Road in North St. Louis County. The other is the State School for the Mentally Defective and Epileptic at Marshall.

At the present rate of admission, it will take up to 10 years to have a child placed at Marshall. It will take up to 7 years at St. Louis State.

The waiting lists now include a total of 1,138 applications. But that is only part of the story:

1. The number of mentally retarded children who should be in Missouri institutions is reliably estimated at 6,100. The number actually in them is 2,336, and that is 358 more than rated capacity. Thus Missouri is providing for less than half the load.

2. The experience of some States has shown that the number of applications doubles when additional facilities are opened. Many Missouri parents, discouraged by the ever-increasing waiting periods, simply give up and don't apply.

3. Because of the long waiting lists, the two Missouri institutions do not accept children under 5 or over 20.

4. The population is growing and the retarded are keeping step.

5. Along with the rest of us, retarded children are living longer. One reason is the antibiotics. Some experts say these drugs may double the life span—and the length of stay in an institution—of some types of retarded children, for example, the mongoloid.

If the experts' guess proves correct, the admission of new patients will automatically be braked to a crawl.

The figures on the number of mentally retarded are little known. And they are staggering.

The National Association for Retarded Children says the evidence is that 3 persons out of 100 are mentally below normal. The Surgeon-General of the United States is one of the experts who agrees.

Let's apply this percentage to Missouri.

Missouri's 1954 population was 4,095,000 persons. The number of retarded among them: 123,000.

Another retarded child is born somewhere in the State every 3 hours. The number that will be born in Missouri in 1955: 2,800.

In St. Louis and St. Louis County, a retarded child is born every 8 hours. The city-county score for 1955 will be 1,050.

The national rate is 300 a day, or 1 every 5 minutes.

You are familiar with polio. It is a dread disease. You have given your dimes and your dollars to fight it. And miracles have been performed in prevention and treatment.

Polio struck 38,741 Americans last year.

Mental retardation crippled the brains of 120,000 children.

Most polio victims recover.

For mental retardation there is no cure.

Not all authorities go along with the 3 percent figure. Some say the incidence is 1 or 2 percent. But one Federal agency, the National Institute of Mental Health, sets the figure at 3.5. Spot surveys in certain areas have indicated 5 percent.

Likely there will never be an exact census. For one thing, some parents won't admit, even to themselves, that their retarded child is retarded.

Because there is no exact census the estimates of the need for more institional care, for example, must be inexact.

But the estimate that Missouri needs institutions for 3,800 more retarded rests on a firm footing:

1. Two authorities—Dr. Salvatore G. DiMichael, executive director of the N. A. R. C., and Dr. Lloyd N. Yepsen, former executive vice president of the American Association on Mental Deficiency—calculate that 5 percent of the mentally retarded require institutionalization at any one time. If Missouri has 123,000 retarded, then it should have institution beds for 6,142. It has beds for 2,336. The difference is 3,806.

2. Minnesota has provided institutions for 5 percent of its retarded. And it has not exhausted the demand.

Mental retardation afflicts St. Louisians and Missourians just as it afflicts mankind everywhere—impartially.

Almost as democratic as death, it cares not if the parents live in wealth or poverty, how they earn their daily bread, or if their ancestors sailed to the United States on the *Mayflower* or in the hole of a slave ship.

What is mental retardation, or mental deficiency, or feeble-mindedness? What causes it?

It is a condition arising from one or more of at least 70 different causes.

If it is hereditary, the transmitters of heredity, the genes, are in some way defective.

Half the cases are not hereditary. And here the causes are mostly hidden from man's eyes because the study of mental deficiency stands today about where psychiatry stood in the 1800's.

Certain infections, like German measles at critical periods during pregnancy, and certain injuries before, during, or after birth, can be responsible.

But retardation itself, even though it is often accompanied by one or a combination of physical handicaps, is not a disease. Nor is it mental illness, in which a mind with a normal potential goes wrong.

Retardation means that the brain does not develop as it should. No matter how old the body, the mental age is never higher than 12, and it may be only 1 or 2.

The victim is, as Author Pearl Buck said, "the child who never grew."

He does not have the natural intelligence and ability to make his way through life without help. He cannot compete on equal terms with normal people.

But most retarded persons are not severely so. And, with help and guidance, they can become useful, productive citizens.

Nine out of 10 retarded persons look like the rest of us. One out of 10 has physical traits obvious to the eye.

Retarded children are short on brainpower, but they are human beings with human feelings, human frailties, and human qualities.

They treasure affection and kindness. When they can give and receive these things, they are helped to develop to the limit of their ability—and that is all any of us can do.

They are the most innocent among us. They can be happy in their innocence, and they can be led into delinquency.

Even their limited minds can be balanced or unbalanced. The testimony to that is at hand in the State mental hospitals where psychopathic defectives can be found.

Mentally Retarded Must Wait 7 to 10 Years for Care in State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of July 26, 1955:

MENTALLY RETARDED MUST WAIT 7 TO 10 YEARS FOR CARE IN STATE

(By Morton Mintz)

(Second of a series)

In the basement of his St. Louis County home a man built a cage of chicken wire and wood.

Into it he put his 11-year-old mentally retarded son.

Dr. Curtis H. Lohr, superintendent of County Hospital, tells of this case.

"I know of others just as bad," he says.

The boy was one of the relatively few retarded children who are unmanageable and destructive.

The parents had tried to have the boy admitted into 1 of the 2 Missouri State institutions for the mentally deficient.

The answer was that they were filled beyond capacity and there was a waiting list requiring many years to accommodate.

For this family the cage was the only resort until they left the area about 3 years ago. Dr. Lohr has been unable to find out where they have gone.

He says bitterly, "The motto of Missouri, 'Let the welfare of the people be the first law,' is a meaningless platitude until our obligation to the feebleminded and their families is fulfilled."

The files of area institutions and social-work agencies include many cases in which the prolonged presence of a mentally retarded child in the home has led to the family's collapse.

To escape the problem, some families become refugees from Missouri. One such case is on file at the Washington University clinics.

Mr. and Mrs. X had a severely retarded son, Billy. They did their best to care for him at home.

But he required so much of their attention that his normal younger brother did not get a fair share. In an institution Billy might have been helped; but he did not benefit from the training and care Mrs. X was able to give him.

Day by day the relationship between husband and wife grew more strained.

Finally Mr. X threatened to divorce his wife and seek custody of the normal child unless Billy left.

The family had been almost impoverished in going from one doctor and institution to another in a hopeless search for a cure for Billy. So a private institution was out.

An admission to a Missouri institution at that time would have meant a 6-year wait.

Some States spend more and do more for the mentally retarded, and in their institutions the waiting period is much shorter.

Mr. and Mrs. X fled Missouri to one of those States, Illinois, where Billy could be placed in a reasonable time.

Said social worker Miss Catherine Jones, "My own opinion is that, had they not reached this solution, this family would certainly have broken up."

To the heads of the State institutions—and even to the director of the division of mental diseases himself—come the frantic letters and phone calls pleading for admission.

They do their best to admit the most urgent cases as quickly as possible. But with an estimated 6,100 patients who should be in their institutions, they now care for fewer than 2,400.

In the 1954–55 fiscal year the State school for the mentally defective and epileptic at Marshall was able to admit only 58 new patients, 7 fewer than in the previous year. The waiting period for admission is now up to a record 10 years.

The St. Louis State Training School in St. Louis County was able to admit only 33 patients in the last fiscal year, a drop of 5 from 1953–54. Its applicants must wait up to 7 years, also a record.

Dr. George A. Johns, superintendent at Marshall, says, "I never knew of one case that the applicants regarded as optional. They usually wait until the pressure becomes strong. Then the label ranges from must to emergency."

The birth of a retarded child in itself has caused mothers to suffer nervous break-

downs. But if placement of the child is quickly sought, this situation is found:

1. Adequate private care is expensive and far beyond the reach of most people. In this region it can be had for about $900 to $1,500 a year and up. The range nationally is usually $2,400 to $3,000. One private school, in Pennsylvania charges between $5,000 and $10,000.

2. The State, except in the rarest instances, cannot take in a child under 5 years of age. In most cases, then, the child must be at home at least 5 years.

"I wish we could admit tomorrow every child who needs care in a State institution," says B. E. Ragland, director of the Division of Mental Diseases. "The situation is heartbreaking."

Dr. Arthur A. Hines, superintendent of St. Louis State Training School, says of the need for facilities for infants and children under 5:

"The severely defective child, who is usually identified shortly after birth, requires care of a type that cannot be given without tragic cost to the family in money and emotional strain.

"Their continued presence in the home is not only inadvisable but often impossible. The lack of some public facility forces the use of types of care that cannot really meet the child's needs, and the eventual cost to the public is greater than it would be with a well-establish State facility for mentally defective infants."

Often a child is at home for a few years before the parents know, or are convinced, he is seriously retarded. Or they may not be table to accept the idea until he is several years old that an institution is the only answer. Or the variety of circumstances that require instutionalization may not become acute for several years.

But in any case the problem again is the waiting list.

Two Washington University psychiatrists testified before the President's Commission on the Health of the Nation about this problem in 1952. What they said then about the delay in admission is even truer today, for while 61 patients were admitted to St. Louis State in that year, only 33 were admitted in the fiscal year just past.

Drs. Edwin F. and Margaret C. L. Gildea said:

"The delay has many disadvantages.

"Out of it arise many cases of delinquency, sexual molestation, crimes and illegitimate pregnancies.

"If any serious attempt at training and education is to be made, the most trainable years may have already been lost.

"The whole family suffers. The normal children are emotionally handicapped. For example, many normal siblings of defectives refuse to have children of their own later in life.

"The defective child fails to get the help he needs when he can best use it. The parents and neighbors suffer in this situation, and the morale of the home and community is diminished or lost."

Institutional care is required at any one time for an estimated 5 percent of the mentally retarded, who are always children no matter their age. Missouri provides it for only 2 percent.

The lacks in the program for the other 95 percent and their families are in most ways as great or even greater. Subsequent articles will deal with these.

The National Association for Retarded Children believes that it should be up to the parents to decide if the child should be placed in an institution—but that there must be space and care available in institutions for those who want to put their children in them.

One mother, Mrs. Kean O'Bannon, told in Sign magazine what it meant to her to have a retarded child.

She spoke of the countless nights her tormented mind cried into the darkness: "Why? Oh, why did it have to happen to us * * * Who is God that He dare do this?

Then she described the "backwash lapping at moral impotence" and asked. "Who am I that I question?"

In Missouri, approximately 2,800 times this year, a father and mother will learn that their child is retarded. They will experience grief as shattering as Mrs. O'Bannon's.

For the sake of their child and their family, they may decide that a State institution—the only kind that will care for the child no matter what may happen to them or their income—is the only solution.

Missouri's answer is "You must wait up to 7 years or even 10."

State's Mentally Retarded Need Diagnosis and Guidance Clinic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of July 27, 1955:

STATE'S MENTALLY RETARDED NEED DIAGNOSIS AND GUIDANCE CLINIC

(By Morton Mintz)

(Third of a series)

A Richmond Heights man was recalling a day in 1951.

"My wife and I had taken our 6-week-old daughter to the pediatrician for a routine checkup.

"In the kindest way he knew how, he told us that 'something' was wrong. He wouldn't say what it was. He just urged us to take the baby to a specialist.

"The specialist didn't know how to tell us.

"Finally he just blurted it out.

"He told us, 'the baby isn't normal. It's mentaly retarded, a mongoloid.'

"Then the doctor said:

"'It happens in the best of families. Some people even think it's a mark of aristocratic breeding.'"

"I felt," the father said, "like I had been hit with a spiked glove."

Dr. Israel Zwerling, of the Cincinnati General Hospital, has studied the problem of "initial counseling"—how to break the news.

He wrote in the Journal of Pedriatics last year that few diagnoses cause so much anxiety in the physician as mental retardation.

He cited letters from parents who told of the superb job done by many doctors.

But he cited other reports that showed there are some people who do not know how to handle the heartbreaking job of telling a father and mother that they have suffered one of life's most brutal blows; that their tragedy will go on and on while even that of a child stillborn can be more often overcome.

Such reports highlight the need for diagnostic and guidance clinics.

The St. Louis unit of the National Association of Retarded Children says there is no such clinic in all of Missouri, public or private, that is set up and staffed for this particular need.

Such clinics assemble a battery of specialists, medical and others. They check speech, hearing, psychiatric, and other possible disturbances. They test intelligence and measure ability. They try to be as certain as humanly possible that what may seem like mental retardation is not actually something else. Possibly something that could be successfully treated or cured.

These things are vital, for only occasionally, as in the case of the Richmond Heights couple's child is mental retardation diagnosed quickly and easily.

The clinics provide more than diagnosis. Their staffs are trained in how to break the news, how to counsel the parents, how to analyze the problem, and above all, how to help.

There are parents who rush about the country, wasting their money to the point of bankruptcy, in a futile effort to find an expert who will say, "It isn't so," or "It can be cured." Sometimes they do this because they will not accept the diagnosis of 1 man, or 2.

But some of these parents will accept exactly the same diagnosis, and begin to adjust to their problem, if it is made by a team of specialists.

Missouri chalks up zeroes in other vital areas.

Let's start with the authoritative estimate than 95 out of 100 of Missouri's approximately 123,000 retarded do not need to be in institutions.

Their parents frequently want to keep their retarded child with them and are capable of doing more for them than anyone else.

Also in the group of retarded children kept at home are those who are there only because of the waiting lists at the two institutions for the mentally retarded. Their parents must keep them at home up to 7 or 10 years before admission.

The circumstances of 20 such families with applications on file at St. Louis State School were studied, for a sociology thesis, at St. Louis University, by Lydia J. Strand.

One mother told her, "He is getting too heavy for me to lift from the wheelchair, and my husband works long hours, and can't help much, and there's no one else to help. I am the only one who can care for him, and the doctor said I need an operation."

In some States there would be others to help her and others like her with a special home-training program.

New Jersey has such a program. It began 12 years ago with 30 families.

Twenty-eight of these families had children so retarded that the parents were considering or had applied for admission to a State institution.

At the end of that year, 26 couples had been so greatly helped and encouraged that they decided they could care for the children at home.

Miss Vincentz Cianci has headed the New Jersey program since it began in 1943. She has two associates. Together they handle about 150 cases a year.

The Saturday Evening Post called Miss Cianci a "one-woman rescue squad."

"She is daily engaged," the magazine said, "in snatching frantic mothers from the emotional whirlpools into which 24-hour-a-day care of a retarded child has drawn them. She effects the rescue not by taking over the care herself, but by showing the mothers how to teach basic living habits and simple tasks and amusements to those youngsters who had been regarded as hopelessly unteachable."

Miss Cianci herself wrote:

"Parents of retarded children can actually be as proud of the accomplishments of their retarded child as one of their normal children.

"The first trip to the grocer or barber alone, the first time the child completely dresses himself—these events can fill parents with the same emotion as when their normal child is chosen soloist in the school

orchestra or completely cooks the evening meal.

"* * * These accomplishments, no matter how small they may be, encourage the parents to continue with the training."

The annual cost to New Jersey is about $15,000. State officials say that, if these children had been in institutions, the cost would have been about $150,000 a year.

An estimated 75 out of 100 retarded children can find a job and be at least partially self-supporting if they have proper help from childhood on.

Missouri does not provide that help early in life with a home-training program. Or with the nursery schools and recreation programs that would also ease the parents' burden and, at the same time, the demand for more and more State institutions.

Nor does it provide later on another very important facility, the "sheltered workshop."

Several States have these workshops for two groups of mentally retarded who, unaided, cannot compete in the business world:

1. Those who need a "stepping stone" past their previous education so they can go out and be successful in a job.

2. Those who can be trained for permanent work in the workshop (an estimated 12,000 of Missouri's approximately 123,000 retarded).

The work they can do might not interest you and me. But many small, routine jobs that would be unbearably dull to us can give a rich sense of achievement to a retarded child, even if it is only putting metal tips on shoe laces.

The executive director of the National Association for Retarded Children says: "If we could help and train these people to the point where they can produce, partially support themselves, contribute tangible wealth to society, the value of workshops would be incontestable."

State Lacks Aid for Retarded After Release From Institutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of July 28, 1955:

STATE LACKS AID FOR RETARDED AFTER RELEASE FROM INSTITUTIONS

(By Morton Mintz)

(Fourth of a series)

MARSHALL, Mo., July 27.—In February, 1953, the State school for the mentally defective and epileptic received a big black eye.

A House Appropriations Subcommittee visited the institution here and its branch at Carrollton and took testimony.

The subcommittee reported that the 82-year-old superintendent, Dr. R. P. C. Wilson, testified he did not believe in patient rehabilitation.

It said he was alone among the seven superintendents of the State mental institutions in stressing custody.

It said that at Marshall "absolutely no steps had been taken toward the rehabilitation of patients."

It accused Dr. Wilson of using "slave labor"—keeping patients at work for a pittance though they were capable of being released.

It climaxed its charges with a demand that Dr. Wilson be fired.

While Gov. Phil M. Donnelly had the demand under advisement, Dr. Wilson died, in July, 1953, without making a public reply to the charges.

Before Dr. Wilson's death a Senate committee came here to make its own investigation.

It reported on March 12 that it had found no evidence to justify the charges.

It said it had found no "slave labor" and added, "Whatever employment as is now being afforded to inmates of this institution, in the opinion of the committee, greatly alleviates their condition."

In other words, working is better than being idle and useless.

It made no direct comment on the House subcommittee's demand that Dr. Wilson be fired.

But it did recommend that a psychologist be hired to begin a rehabilitation program and suggested that the legislature appropriate the funds to put it into effect.

Regarding the need for rehabilitation, then, the two committees seemed to be in general agreement.

Regarding "slave labor," they seemed to be far apart.

The real question boiled down to this:

If patients were being held at Marshall though they could succeed outside, was Dr. Wilson or the State responsible? or both?

Dr. Edwin F. Gildea, a Washington University psychiatrist, came up with part of the answer.

He was summoned to Marshall by the House subcommittee to investigate whether the stress on custody was justified.

He agreed with the subcommittee that certain patients were being held "in order to have cheap labor * * *. Dr. Wilson has administered an economical custodial institution regardless of how many patients were exploited."

He agreed that Dr. Wilson should be replaced.

Later, Dr. Gildeo made the full text of his report available. It contains this statement which stands out because of its last seven words.

"Out of 7 persons examined, at least 4 could earn their own living in the community and keep out of trouble if they had some form of supervision."

That's a big "if."

Yesterday's article told of Missouri's failures to provide help to the retarded and their families through diagnostic and guidance clinics and sheltered workshops.

Today three more zeroes must be racked up.

THE WELFARE WORKER PLAN

Missouri has no setup for providing continuing help and guidance to the retarded in finding jobs ad solving other problems after their release from an institution, or eve if they have never been in one.

An inevitable result is that some patients capable of release must remain in an institution, lengthening the waiting lists (now 7 to 10 years) and costing the State much more than if they were outside and working.

Minnesota has such a plan. In each of its counties there is a welfare worker specifically assigned to the job of helping the retarded get along in society.

THE COLONY PLAN

Missouri has no State-sponsored "colonies" for the retarded—supervised residence homes in which they live while earning money in private jobs.

Vermont has a plan like this.

THE FOSTER-HOME PLAN

Under this arrangement, certain retarded children, many orphans among them, are transferred from an institution to a private home and maintained there at State expense.

New York State has a foster-home setup. The cost to the taxpayers is about 20 percent less than if the child were in an institution.

Dr. George A. Johns, who succeeded Dr. Wilson, says the adoption of these plans on an adequate scale would enable him to increase his release rate "substantially." Each patient kept at Marshall costs the State $695 a year to maintain.

Dr. Arthur A. Hines, superintendent at St. Louis State Training School, estimates that the "colony" plan would enable him to release 25 to 30 patients and the foster-home plan 30 to 35 more.

Thus these two plans could open the way for a minimum of 55 applicants on his waiting list. That is 22 more than were admitted in the whole fiscal year just ended.

The two superintendents and other authorities agree that many patients who would qualify for the plans would be happier and more productive outside the institution.

But they also cite the risks that are run if release is attempted without adequate, continuing supervision.

One risk concerns retarded boys. If they lack adequate supervision, they can fall prey to unscrupulous persons who drag them into delinquency and crime.

Another risk concerns retarded girls. If they lack adequate supervision, in their ignorance and innocence they are liable to become illegitimately pregnant or otherwise exploited.

In Dr. Wilson's official reports to the director of the division of mental diseases he gave these figures on the number of patients discharged on parole:

In the 1952–53 fiscal year (his last), 5; 1951–52, 12.

These are the comparable figures reported by Dr. Johns, successor to Dr. Wilson:

In his first year as superintendent, 1953–54, 14; 1954–55, 56.

Overcrowding Is Plainly Visible at State School for Retarded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of July 29, 1955:

OVERCROWDING IS PLAINLY VISIBLE AT STATE SCHOOL FOR RETARDED

(By Morton Mintz)

(Fifth of a series)

MARSHALL, Mo., July 28.—Pearl S. Buck, the famed novelist who told the story of her mentally retarded daughter in The Child Who Never Grew, said in a letter to a St. Louis father:

"It's a lifelong responsibility for us parents to keep in touch with their retarded children, who are so helpless and so unable to protect themselves.

"It is not possible to put these children out of mind and to leave them as though they did not exist, unless the partents are monsters of cruelty, which I cannot believe most of them are."

Because they are not monsters of cruelty, parents come, on visiting days, from all of Missouri's 114 counties to see their children at the State School for the Mentally Defective and Epileptic here and at its Carrollton branch.

A visit here means for many parents a whole day of driving, for Marshall, a city of about 9,000 persons, is in the northwest section of the State. For St. Louis and St. Louis County parents, who have a total of 142 children at the institution, the round trip is about 360 miles.

This reporter came here—not on a visiting day—to inspect the institution.

What kind of care is given its 1,838 patients?

Has there been any progress since 1953, when a new superintendent, Dr. George A. Johns, took over?

This institution, Missouri's first for the mentally retarded, was opened in 1901.

It came late—New Jersey opened its first 13 years earlier—and has not been able to keep pace with the demand.

It is overcrowded. It has 246 more patients than were advised by an official State agency, the Section of Environmental Health of the Division of Public Health and Welfare.

The overcrowding is plain to the eye in many dormitories. You see beds jammed together and in the aisles.

You see it in dining rooms, where patients must eat in rigid shifts in order that all will be fed.

You see it in dayrooms, some of them cut in half to make room for more beds.

And you see it in the extra burden on the staff, which cannot devote ample time and energy to many individual patients because it must care, as best it can, for so many.

A Kansas City women's group that was here last year reported, "Facilities are inadequate for even simple custodial care."

Dr. Johns has 332 employes counting the 102 not on the medical staff.

That divides out to about one for every six patients, or one for every 16 patients on each 8-hour shift, not figuring time off.

Dr. Johns says he could discharge more patients if he had more people. He would like to have 100 more, including doctors, psychologists, dentists, nurses, attendants; teachers for home economics, manual trades, the blind, the deaf, the backward in speech, the cerebral spastics.

"If we had them," he said, "we would do as good a job as anyone else."

Adding to his problem is the fact that Marshall is getting more and more severely handicapped patients who require extra care; fewer than can be trained and discharged.

There are too many patients who could be learning things faster, even if only to care for their personal needs; too many who could be more speedily trained in more advanced ways—if there were the staff to do it.

Too many rock in their chairs or stay in their beds because there aren't enough employees to do for them all that could be done.

It is a tricky business to determine how much staff there should be.

For example, you cannot compare one institution with another unless you give fair weight to the number of patients in each who are totally helpless and must have everything done for them.

The American Psychiatric Association sets up precise staff-patient ratios for mental hospitals.

But the American Association on Mental Deficiency has not set up similar yardsticks for institutions for the mentally retarded.

Further, the APA now makes surveys of mental hospitals; the AAMD does not make comparable surveys.

This is one of the reasons why B. E. Ragland, director of the Division of Mental Diseases this year requested the National Institute of Mental Health to survey this institution and the St. Louis State Training School.

To his knowledge, the survey will be the first of its kind in Missouri by a Federal agency. He says he will ask that it be as broad as possible.

The Institute hopes to make the survey during or before November. It will make its report to the State and Ragland says he will release it as soon as copies can be made.

There is no doubt that Marshall has made definite progress in the past 2 years.

In 1953 suspicions were voiced aloud that normal children were being held here, children who were merely emotionally disturbed. No one could prove it one way or the other because there was no psychological retesting program.

There is a regular retesting program now that has checked the entire patient population. The psychologists say there are no patients of normal intelligence.

The staff has been expanded in vital areas.

Newcomers include a second part-time physician, 2 psychologists, its first social worker, 2 nurses, and, for summer work, a third psychologist, 2 recreation supervisors and medical, dental and nursing assistants.

One of Dr. Johns' "cherished desires" is to establish a connection with the School of Medicine and other schools and departments at the University of Missouri.

He says this would make possible consultation and other services for extraordinary cases.

"We hope," he says, "that such a liaison will be of mutual benefit; of teaching value to the university as well as of advancement to the children of the institution."

Dr. Johns discharged 56 patients on parole in the year ending last June 30. His predecessor discharged five in 1952–53.

Since January 1, Dr. Johns has released a total of 154 patients for visits home.

Patients work with the younger children. They sweep and clean, prepare and serve food, grow it on the farms, work in the laundry, the dairy, the bakery, the cannery.

If the percentage of them at work is very high, the question arises: Couldn't some of them do just as well or better in a job on the outside?

The percentage was 41 in 1952–53. It was down to 37 in 1954–55.

The State provides Dr. Johns with $695 per patient per year. He is proud of all that he and his staff do with so little.

There are children, many of them, who are happy here, much more so than if they were in their own homes, shunned by neighbors, teased and ridiculed by normal children, sometimes hated by their own sisters and brothers.

Dr. Johns doesn't believe defective delinquents belong here with the innocent retarded. But he has about 70 of them, and he says, "Many have become better citizens here."

He is proud of the school, which provides education up to the junior high school level; of the beautiful rugs and tablecloths made by his patients; of the regular religious services; the library; the music teaching (there are two patient bands), the TV sets donated by parents and civic groups, the canteen, the cleanliness that led the Kansas City women to say:

"We noted, even in the most backward wards, the extreme neatness of the rooms and beds, and the absence of any odor."

He is proud of the maintenance of the brick cottages and buildings and the tree-shaded grounds. Of the farms which will produce food valued at an estimated $235,000 in this fiscal year.

A typical day's menu picked at random:

Breakfast: Cereal, milk gravy, apple butter, bread, oleo, milk or coffee.

Dinner: Roast pork, sweet potatoes in broth, creamed corn, sliced turnips, oleo, milk, ice cream or peaches.

Supper: Chili-macaroni, bread, oleo, leftovers, chocolate milk, prune plums.

Now a new $1 million institution is being built at Higginsville. On the site of the old Confederate Home, it will be opened next year. It will have two 1-story modern cottages patterned after those at the Southbury (Conn.) Training School, recognized as one of the very best in the country.

It may make a dent in the waiting lists for Marshall. More likely, its opening will bring a stream of new applications.

But because it will be too small to merit a separate superintendent, Ragland says, it too will be under Dr. Johns.

Carrollton, which he also supervises, is 30 miles northwest of here; Higginsville is 30 miles north.

Dr. Johns has spent his professional life in this field. He works a long day, is on call at night, and puts in a 7-day week. He is Marshall's only full-time physician and its only psychiatrist.

It looks like he'll have to find an 8th day for his week.

School for Mentally Retarded Here Lacks Adequate Staff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of July 30, 1955:

SCHOOL FOR MENTALLY RETARDED HERE LACKS ADEQUATE STAFF

(By Morton Mintz)

(Sixth of a Series)

The State of Missouri bought the St. Louis State Training School just 7 years ago. The price: $1.

The city of St. Louis put up the original buildings in 1924. By 1948, the institution, which is at 10695 Bellefontaine Road, North St. Louis County, was valued at $1,600,000.

St. Louis was several million dollars in the hole at the time. And it was the only city in the Nation maintaining an institution like this for the mentally retarded.

So it was the city that requested the State to take over, for the nominal price of $1 each, the training school and the city sanitarium for the mentally ill as well.

Missouri now spends about $1,240 a year per patient at St. Louis State. It spends only $695 at the State Training School for the Mentally Defective and Epileptic at Marshall.

Does this mean St. Louis State is twice as good? No.

The gap is not as big as it seems, B. E. Ragland, director of the division of mental diseases, cites two chief reasons for the difference:

1. Civil service has three pay scales, metropolitan, urban and rural.

Employees at Marshall are on the rural scale. Hospital attendants (group 1) there earn from $140 to $187 a month.

At St. Louis State (metropolitan), the pay range for the same group starts at $187 and runs to $250.

2. Marshall has more than three times as many patients as St. Louis State. This, Ragland says, enables it to effect substantial savings on food and other items.

The staff-patient ratio is much higher at St. Louis State. It has 187 full-time employees for its 565 patients, a ratio of about 1 to 3. Marshall's ratio is roughtly 1 to 6.

But again the figures alone are not enough.

They don't take into account, for example, how much work can be done by patients. If a patient can't do the work, an employee must.

In the 1953-54 fiscal year, 39 out of 100 patients at Marshall were working; at St. Louis State, 34 out of 100.

They also do not take into account the extra employees needed when an institution is short of labor-saving equipment.

Like his counterpart at Marshall, Dr. Arthur A. Hines, superintendent at St. Louis State is convinced he could do more for the patients and discharge more if he had an adequate staff. The only job training now is on work details.

More could be done for purely custodial patients too.

For example, many children who are severely handicaped physically must be housed on the second story of dormitory buildings that are not equipped with elevators. If they are large and heavy, as some are, there is no practical way to get them down the steps and outside for fresh air. It is too much of a job for a woman attendant.

But there is a sizeable recreational program.

Each building has a TV set, radio and record player, often donated by parents and civic groups. Parties, dancing, games and movies are provided occasionally.

There's a swimming pool (converted in WPA days from the basement of a razed building). There are hikes, ball games, outings (to the Zoo, the Veiled Prophet Parade, the Police Circus, the Municipal Opera, Cardinal baseball games), and excursions on the Steamer *Admiral*.

Ninety-eight patients go to the nine-classroom school and are educated up to the fourth-grade level, higher in a few cases.

Protestant, Catholic and Jewish religious services are held regularly.

There's a canteen at which children buy candy and soft drinks with their allowances and learn to make change.

Just now being staffed and occupied is the first major new facility since the hospital-administration building was erected in 1939.

It is the $500,000, 76-bed Donnelly Building (named for the Governor) for mentally defective delinquents. It gives St. Louis State for the first time, an effective way of separating the delinquents from the innocent and easily-led retarded children.

Also new is a $12,000 cannery, a big cost-cutter for St. Louis State. The institution farms 450 of its 582 acres—grains, tomatoes and green beans are big items—and produces all its pork, nearly all its veal and beef; all its milk.

Here is a patient's menu for a typical day (last July 20):

Breakfast: Chilled fruit juice, cereal, fried eggs, bread and butter, coffee or milk. Dinner: Grilled pork chops, candied sweet potatoes, corn on the cob, fresh tomatoes, cranberry cauce, bread and butter, iced tea or milk. Supper: Cold boiled ham, buttered string beans, fresh tomatoes, ice cream, bread and butter, iced tea or milk.

The grounds are spacious and well kept. As you go around them, you see clusters of patients, and you hear many say "Hi, Dr. Hines!"

The brick buildings are well maintained. Paint is in good condition. New floors and matresses are bing put in.

There is a hospital, clinic, laboratory, pharmacy and dentist's office. Patients are given routine physical examinations and psychological testing as well as special care.

St. Louis State had on nurses for seven years; today it has two.

On the other side of the ledger:

St. Louis State is overcrowded. It has a state-rated capacity of 386 (not counting the Donnelly Building), or 179 fewer than actual.

As at Marshall, you see the overcrowding most dramatically in the dormitories, where beds are placed end against end.

The Donnelly Building, when it is fully staffed and occupied, will cut sharply into the allowance of $1,240 per patient. That sum is calculated exclusive of the new addition's requirements and the legislature made no extra appropriation.

Patients cannot be properly grouped by type.

Again, as at Marshall, there is no space and no provision for children younger than 5. And completely dependent children, those who require a great amount of care and can be trained to only a small degree, are a rising percentage of the population.

In his 16 years as superintendent, Dr. Hines' most difficult task has been getting the right kind of employees—kind, understanding, sympathetic, competent.

For years he was handicapped by the State pay scale, which was below that of other area hospitals and institutions. Last July 1, a new scale went into effect. Since then he has been able to compete on better terms. He expects to cut his annual turnover among attendants from 1 out of 3 to 1 out of 5.

His task is still aggravated by the distance of the institution from the city and the lack of employee living quarters on the grounds.

He says the "great majority of his employees are kindly and humane. Many times they develop affection and love for children who are not their own."

He says these employees "are faithful to their trust"—but he admits frankly that a very few are found from time to time who are not.

Complaints of mistreatment of patients are made from time to time against any large institution for the mentally ill or mentally retarded.

Sometimes the complaints are unfounded—a discharged, disgruntled employee seeks revenge; a parent is hysterical; a visitor cannot imagine that restraints must ever be used.

In spite of all precautions in screening applicants, Dr. Hines says "we occasionally select persons who do not make good employees and who are dismissed before they complete their 6-month probationary period.

"Even then, an occasional employee may remain in service and at a later date be found not too well qualified and unable to adjust to the assigned duties.

"Occasionally we find an employee violates rules, and it has happened that an occasional employee has been guilty of mistreating or striking a child. All employees are warned at the time of employment of the penalty for mistreating a patient.

"Consequently, when an employee is found guilty of mistreatment of a patient, dismissal or suspension is the result. According to the State law, an employee who witnesses or knows of the mistreatment of a patient and fails to report it, is considered as guilty as the employee who mistreats the patient, and the penalty is the same.

"Mistreatment of patients will never be tolerated by this superintendent."

Dr. Hines says he has to fire 1 or 2 employees a year, no more.

Complaints of mistreatment sometimes come to the St. Louis unit of the National Association for Retarded Children. Its president and immediate past president say they have been able to verify none of them.

A report made for the Mental Health Association, a community chest agency, reached this general conclusion: "St. Louis State Training School is doing a good job with what they have."

United States To Undertake Research Into Mental Retardation Causes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of July 31, 1955:

UNITED STATES TO UNDERTAKE RESEARCH INTO MENTAL RETARDATION CAUSES

(By Morton Mintz)

(Seventh of a series)

Research is the great frontier of mental retardation.

The Federal Government is about to explore it in force.

On President Eisenhower's desk today awaiting his signature, is the appropriation bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The bill, for the first time in the Nation's history, includes funds specifically designated by Congress for research into the causes and problems of mental retardation. The amount: $750,000.

The National Association for Retarded Children credits Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY, Democrat, Rhode Island, with being the most ardent champion of the appropriation in Congress.

He is chairman of the House Appropriations subcommittee that handled the new appropriation.

He made his feelings plain in a speech last month: "If the Federal Government," he said, "can spend $80 million or $90 million on research on plants and animals, they certainly ought to spend a few million on research on human beings."

Until a few years ago no State, so far as can be determined, earmarked funds for research in this field. Only a very few do today.

In the next 2 years, Missouri will spend a total of $5,649,000 at its two institutions for the mentally retarded. It spent $5,382,464 in the biennium just ended, $3,215,842 in 1951–53, $2,905,000 in 1949–51.

In the 8 years ending June 30, 1957, the State will thus have spent a grand total of $17,152,306 on its mentally retarded.

Not a dime of this was earmarked for research.

The New Jersey Commission To Study the Problems and Needs of Mentally Deficient Persons said in a report last year:

"Research is the most sensible and least expensive method for discovering new ways of helping the mentally deficient. Unfortunately, States are most reluctant to spend money on experiments that do not seem to produce immediate results.

"This attitude has boomeranged so that pennypinching States are saddled with huge costs that are hidden in the statistics of crime, ill health, poverty, and mental illness. It is 'pure' research which may cost money today that saves untold sums of money in the future."

The commission went on to make this recommendation:

"The legislature should allocate an amount equal to at least 5 percent of the total annual budgets for the institutions for the mentally deficient, the mentally ill, and the emotionally disturbed for the use of the bureau of research."

Research is no magic wand. You don't just say, "We'll spend $10 million or $100 million and that will take care of it."

Experts believe that hereditary factors are responsible for retardation in no more than half the cases, perhaps many fewer.

They point out that research through the years has shown that more and more types of retardation are not hereditary despite previous belief to the contrary.

They have found evidence that even certain hereditary types could be controlled. One example is retardation associated with the Rh factor in the blood.

Dr. Salvatore G. DiMichael, executive director of the NARC, thus hopes the day will come when research will show us how to prevent a large majority of all mental deficiency.

But, he says, continuing research on a big scale will cut down retardation by degrees as time goes on.

When could that large majority of retardation be eliminated?

Another top expert, Dr. Richard Masland, says it is theoretically possible to eliminate it "but it might take several generations."

But progress is being made even now and more is promised with the new appropriation.

Dr. Masland makes another key point: "In the long run, success depends upon getting capable people to do the job."

He is well qualified to speak on this problem. A neuropsychiatrist from Winston-Salem, N. C., he is spending 18 months, for the NARC, investigating what research is being done and what fields might be given priority.

He says there is a great shortage of qualified research personnel. He believes that one of the most important results of the $750,000 appropriation may be to alert investigators to the problem of mental retardation and to stimulate more of them to get into this work.

Dr. Masland says research aimed directly at finding the causes of mental retardation is vital to ultimate prevention; but at least equally vital is pure research aimed at understanding how the human body works—the blood, the brain, the cells, the genes.

He cites the example of research on the blood that led to this discovery: When certain antibodies are present in the blood of an expectant mother she develops an immunity against the child within her; and the child's brain can be damaged as a result.

One of the most fascinating speculations is that of a Cornell University embryologist, Dr. Alexis Lawrence Romanoff. Eugene Kinkead, in an article in the New Yorker, called him the world's leading authority on the bird's egg.

Kinkead reported that French scientists, experimenting with chicken embryos during the first 16 hours of pregnancy, were able to produce all kinds of malformed wonders.

Dr. Romanoff says the 16 hours correspond with the first 2 weeks of pregnancy in a human.

"He theorizes," Kinkead said, "that congenital malformations in human being originate during those first 2 weeks, before pregnancy has been detected * * * he cannot help but become excited when he speculates on the possibility of some day reversing the processes by which the French scientists created their nightmares"—to produce in this way a normal child from an embryo destined to be abnormal.

This, of course, may be relevant to only certain types of retardation.

There are at least 70 different causes, many of them unknown. They include certain infections during pregnancy, glandular disorders, toxic chemicals; injury during or immediately before or after birth, and brain inflammation resulting from certain childhood diseases.

Both the Washington University and St. Louis University Schools of Medicine are carrying on several studies that could shed light on the mysteries of retardation.

A starting point for one project is the fact that an infant may be short of oxygen during or immediately after birth. The infant's brain may be injured if the shortage is severe and prolonged.

A group of Washington University researchers is studying various techniques used in delivery. Circumstances indicate one technique should be used at birth; the researchers follow up to see how the child develops, both mentally and physically. Other circumstances require a different delivery technique; they follow up again.

The researchers' hope is that they will find clues to the safest techniques of delivery, those that will cut to the minimum any chance of either mental or physical handicap.

The Federal research appropriation allots $500,000 to the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness and $250,000 to the National Institute of Mental Health.

These agencies will make research grants in fields bearing on causes of retardation, to develop and train investigators and to teach persons to handle other problems of retardation, such as care and training.

One of the Nation's most distinguished pediatricians, Dr. Grover Powers, chairman of the NARC's National Scientific Advisory Committee, said 2 years ago:

"Mental retardation is still too low on the totem pole of medical respectability and of scientific concern."

Following is an excerpt of testimony befor Congressman FOGARTY's subcommittee. It indicates how low on the pole mental retardation has been:

FOGARTY is questioning Dr. Robert H. Felix, director of the National Institute of Mental Health:

"Mr. FOGARTY. Now, doctor, what are you doing in the field of retarded children, or exceptional children?

"Dr. FELIX. I wish I could say we are doing more than we are, Mr. Chairman. At the present time (February 15, 1955) we are working in this field to the extent of about $155,000 a year. We have about $120,000 or $121,000 a year in research grants in this field on various aspects of it—learning procedures, chemical causes, organic studies, and so forth."

Later, Dr. Felix testified he had a scientist working full time on the problem at the institute.

"Mr. FOGARTY. One scientist?

"Dr. FELIX. One scientist; yes, sir."

The "one scientist" was Dr. Leonard Duhl. He explained to Marsh Clark of the Globe-Democrat Washington bureau:

"Thirty to 40 years ago, there was a great interest in the retarded child among psychologists. Somehow, an attitude of complete pessimism swept in that said retardation is inherited and nothing can be done. Once that happened, professional interest dwindled.

"In recent years, however, there have been some important developments.

"Researchers have reported that things may not be as bad as originally thought, that something can be done after all.

"They have found many clues as to what is causing mental retardation.

"Along with this has come a great upsurge or parent interest which is probably the most potent force working for advancement against mental retardation today.

"Down through the recent years, the Institute has given research grants, but neither the quality, nor the quantity of the requests was too good until last year, when the whole situation improved tremendously. Not only are we getting worthwhile requests now for good projects, but they are coming in in increasing number."

Steel Firm Finds Retarded Persons Useful Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of August 1, 1955:

STEEL FIRM FINDS RETARDED PERSONS USEFUL WORKERS

(By Morton Mintz)

(Eighth of a series)

Can mentally retarded persons actually support themselves?

Do they make good workers?

Many firms employ them. Their answer to both questions—if they know how to employ them—is "Yes."

One firm that does know how to employ them is the Granite City Steel Co. in nearby Granite City, Ill.

It is an example of a company intelligently helping itself.

It is an example of what President Eisenhower meant when he said that helping the retarded can make "a definite contribution to the economic well-being of our Nation."

It is also an example of what CIO President Walter Reuther had in mind when he said:

"We believe that many mentally handicapped persons * * * can be absorbed by industry in useful functions which they can effectively perform.

"These, placed in occupations which are suited to their abilities, need not present a problem to either the union or the management.

"They offer no competition to the so-called normal worker if existing contractual obligations * * * are made applicable to them as well as to all others covered by the agreement."

Granite City Steel has 5,000 employees.

Approximately 400 are somewhat below normal in mental ability.

Their appearance is not unusual. You cannot go into the plant and pick them out by their looks.

Outside the plant their lives follow normal patterns.

Along with most of their fellow workers, they are members of Locals 16, 30, or 67 of the CIO United Steel Workers or of Local 50 of the AFL Chemical Workers.

It has been company policy for many years to employ both physically and mentally handicapped persons. The company feels its policy is good for the company, good for the handicapped, and good for the community.

For the past 8 years a 37-year-old Washington University business administration graduate, John R. Hundley, Jr., has been the company's director of industrial relations and personnel.

Now, in the foregoing perspective, this is what he says about the mentally retarded workers:

"We treat them as human beings, which they are.

"We respect them for the way in which they live up to their potential, whatever it may be.

"Under abuse, they would go backward. Some might have to go to institutions.

"They work in 87 different jobs. They do work that is routine and repetitious and which does not put them under pressure.

"They earn from $1.74½ to $1.98½ an hour.

"Generally speaking, there is no difficulty between them and the other employees.

"If they are placed properly, they are no problem.

"If they are placed wrongly, as in jobs beyond their ability, they lose interest, don't show up for work, become confused and frustrated.

"We do our best to see that they are placed properly.

"First, we test a man in six different areas. Mental ability is only one. We also want to know, for example, about his manual coordination (use of arms and legs in complex movements), whether he would be best off with a group or by himself, whether he is best fitted for routine work or work with some variety.

"Second, we acquaint the supervisor with the situation so that he will understand how to handle it.

"The mentally retarded make satisfactory employees and are usually superior to people with higher intelligence who would quickly become bored and dissatisfied with the work done by the retarded."

What happens when there are no such programs like Granite City Steel's?

This happened in Michigan:

Frank, a 20-year-old man who was moderately retarded, got a job as a car washer. The employer knew his limitations but he didn't follow through to be sure the other employees understood.

Jane H. Potts described the results in the American Journal on Mental Deficiency:

"They misplaced his sponge and washing cloths, they hid his hat, they turned off the hose while he was working; then mysteriously turned it on again when he tried to investigate.

"They called him 'dummy.' He was hurt, he was angry and he was altogether confused. It was not surprising that he stayed only 3 days."

Later, a rehabilitation counselor found Frank a job as an after-hours cleanup man in a restaurant. The employer patiently explains his duties, where things were kept, how to scrub. The employer impressed on Frank that it was his responsibility to keep the restaurant clean.

After 6 months, Miss Potts reported, Frank "is still successful and happy; he works alone, eliminating the question of competition and wisecracks."

The story of the Granite City Steel program and of Frank make two main points:

1. Most of the retarded can earn their own living and be no problem to society if society helps them with patience and understanding, if it forgets the wisecracks and the prejudice that can send a retarded person back to an institution to be a burden on himself and the taxpayers.

2. Missouri is hurting itself when it does not provide all the things that will help each of the retarded reach his maximum potential—the vocational training in the institutions; the "sheltered workshops" that provide the steppingstone to private employment or jobs for those who cannot go into private industry; the residence homes for those who must live under supervision; the welfare workers to guide the retarded in finding suitable employment and in adjusting to other problems.

The NARC estimates that 67 out of 100 retarded persons at any one time can become self-supporting, can manage their own affairs under favorable living conditions and with occasional counseling at times of crisis.

Frank and the retarded employees at Granite City Steel come from this so-called "marginal independent" group. Its members have, roughly, the mental ability of a child of 8 to 12. Most have the mental ability of a child of 10.

What about the other 33?

They, says the NARC, are "a continuing concern of society." This is the best breakdown the NARC can make because of the lack of precise information, the progress that is being made, the effects of individual circumstances, and the way in which retarded persons sometimes shift from one group to another:

Three out of the 33 need hour-by-hour supervision.

Ten could live at home or in an institution and take care of some of their physical and social needs but will not be able to earn money.

Ten would be able to earn some of their livelihood in "sheltered workshops."

Ten more could be self-supporting with very close supervision, both on and off the job, in the kind of "sheltered employment" provided by a member of the family, for example.

"The Golden Rule applies to them," said Helen MacMurchy in "The Almosts." "We are to do for them what we would others should do for us. Give them justice and a fair chance. Do not throw them into a world where the scales are weighed against them. Do not ask them to gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles. But give them one chance to bring out the best that is in them.

"This is but a fair request on behalf of human beings who are nevertheless permanent children and who will never grow up. Responsibility, except so far as a child understands it, is not their portion. The achievements of life, for them, are bounded by their mental makeup and character—just as our own achievements are, though on a little larger scale."

Qualified Teachers Needed for State's Mentally Retarded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of August 2, 1955:

QUALIFIED TEACHERS NEEDED FOR STATE'S MENTALLY RETARDED

(By Morton Mintz)

(Ninth of a series)

Mentally retarded children have been a part of mankind since the beginning.

Some primitive peoples looked on them as divine.

The Spartans are said to have thrown them into the river or abandoned them on the mountainside.

Not until the 19th century did science and the humane spirit join to help the retarded.

Not until the 1930's did a few organized groups for parents of the retarded spring up in the United States.

In 1951, the National Association for Retarded Children was formed.

Some call the great surge of parent interest that resulted in the NARC "the most potent force working for advancement against mental retardation today."

The NARC, which has its headquarters in New York City, has about 50,000 members today. It has about 400 member units in 46 States (none in Arkansas and Mississippi), the District of Columbia, and Hawaii.

Why was the NARC, or something like it, so slow in coming when mental retardation afflicts 3 out of 100 Americans and burdens their families with brutal problems?

Because, out of ignorance, the retarted were looked upon with fear and suspicion.

Because they were insulted, abused, shunned.

Because their parents, out of ignorance, often believed the retarded child proved their inferior heredity.

Because their parents were so often overcome with shame that the last thing they wanted to do was come out in the open.

Because from their ranks could come no hero who had dramatically triumphed over his affliction—no Franklin D. Roosevelt (polio), nor Beethoven (deaf), no Helen Keller (blind, deaf).

But there were many parents who awaited only a means of getting together, who were anxious to start reversing attitudes that had held on for centuries.

It would be impossible to list all the parents in St. Louis alone who have come out in the open; who are fighting for help for all the retarded; who have become ennobled rather than crushed by the tragedy of having a retarded child.

We would like to tell you of a few:

The four couples who in January 1951, worked night and day to found the Mentally Retarded Children's Council, the NARC affiliated now called the St. Louis Association for Retarded Children, are: Mr. and Mr. Albert C. Dillingham, 2423 Shirley Avenue, Jennings; Mr. and Mrs. Louis Price, 926 Jeanerette Drive, University City; Mr. and Mrs. John C. Milton, 10359 Florissant Drive, Ferguson; and Mr. and Mrs. Russell S. Wood, Jr., 3449 Evergreen Lane, Lemay.

The current president of the unit, Wendell H. Stark, 612 Norfolk Drive, Kirkwood, and his predecessors, Mrs. Price, Joseph Link, 3317 Sims Avenue, Overland; and Mrs. R. M. Foushee, 1107A Edward Terrace, Richmond Heights.

Mr. and Mrs. Harold (Pete) Reiser, 5740 Mardell Avenue, who were especially active in raising funds (rumage and bake sales, card parties, solicitations, auctions), and Frank Ackerman, 7384 Westmoreland Avenue, University City, chairman of the legislation committees of the local and State groups.

On the shoulders of these people as well as many others rested the hard jobs of organizing, raising money, winning public support, starting projects and keeping them going, letting dinners burn while they talked on the phone with freightened parents who had just discovered their child was retarded.

A few more are:

Mrs. C. P. Pei, 6311 Waterman Avenue, University City. Her first two sons were retarded. Her third was not. Her fourth was retarded. She has gone to the help of parents in the first stage of shock, has pleaded the cause of research into the causes of retardation before the President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation.

In 1951, with Mrs. Milton and Mrs. Albert I. Stix, Jr., 7526 Wellington Way, Clayton, she formed the Foundation for Mentally Retarded Children (now Retarded Children's Services) to operate a play school on a small scale for retarded youngsters between 7 and 12 who were ineligible for the public schools.

At first Mrs. Pei and Mrs. Wilton ran the school in their own homes, then, with the help of the nuns, at the Helpers of the Holy Soul Convent, and, since March, 1952, at Sherman Park Recreation Center.

The Social Planning Council, a Community Chest agency, has cooperated closely with both the St. Louis Association for Retarded Children and Retarded Children's Services.

The NARC affiliate now has 302 members, some of them not parents of retarded children.

For retarded children it sponsors, within its limits, nursery school classes and recreation activities. It collects clothing for the institutionalized and gives parties.

Until the four couples went to work 4½ years ago, the words "mentally retarded" were seldom spoken here, almost never seen in public print.

Only 2 weeks ago one of the most important developments took place: The United Fund of Greater St. Louis accepted the local NARC affiliate for membership.

Association officials now hope that funds may become available for the first time for two vitally needed facilities:

1. A diagnostic and guidance clinic.

2. A full-time office headed by a paid director.

The Missouri Association for Retarded Children, the statewide NARC affiliate, was formed at a meeting in Hotel Jefferson on March 27, 1954. It has 473 members.

Its president is Dr. C. G. Leitch of Kansas City. It now has affiliates in St. Louis, Kansas City, St. Genevieve County, St. Francois County, Perry County and Springfield. Dr. Leitch is hopeful that the six affiliates will eventually grow to 30.

Many St. Louis members actively assisted in the formation of the outstate groups.

The State and local associations scored in the educational field this year with an intense effort—phone calls, letters and personal talks with legislators.

The situation was this, as related by Frank Ackerman:

In 1948, a law was passed under which a school district providing special facilities for 10 or more "educable" retarded pupils would receive $100 for each from the State. It was optional that the district provide such service.

The law then and now refers only to the educable retarded; it defines these as children with an I. Q. of between 48 and 78.

An estimated 2,000 of these educable retarded of school age—6 to 20—are in full-time special classes in Missouri. An estimated 5,500 more are in limited classes, according to the State Department of Education.

House bill 27, passed by the assembly this year after many provisions of the original measure introduced by Representative Paul Canaday, Democrat, Greene County, had been cut away, provides:

1. That in districts having 10 or more educable retarded, special classes shall be established by the fall term of 1957.

2. That the State payment for each child in such classes shall be increased to $175, effective next fall.

By the 1957 fall semester, Ackerman predicts, the chief result of the legislation will be to provide full-scale special classes for 4,000 educable now receiving only limited help. He doubts that very many of the other 18,000 educable will be affected (one reason is the fact that Missouri has about 2,900 small, one-room school districts).

He believes it may be 5 years before there are teachers and facilities to accommodate a total of 12,000.

St. Louis has an estimated 2,400 educable retarded. About 900 of these are in full-scale special classes. There is a waiting list of about 200. The main reason: A shortage of qualified teachers.

In St. Louis County, some districts provide special classes. Ritenour, Normandy, University City, and Ferguson among them. Others, including Clayton and Affton, send educable retarded children to the private Egen-Tudor School or make other special individual arrangements.

The State Department of Education says that 37 Missouri districts, including 3 in St. Louis County—Berkeley, Parkway, and Riverview Gardens, will begin special classes for the first time this fall.

A committee of county superintendents headed by Charles J. Mesnier, of Affton, has been studying the problems posed by the educable retarded for about a year.

One problem is getting trained teachers for the retarded who meet special State requirements. Another is getting adequate psychological services.

Some county districts, Mesnier says, may decide to band together to solve some of these problems on a cooperative basis. And they may send qualified teachers to colleges and universities to take the required courses.

Mesnier doubts that there is half enough teachers now to meet the demand.

In Illinois, Lions Club recently announced a 5-year program to provide $50,000 in scholarships for this special training.

What is an educable retarded child? How can education help him?

He is a child who, with education adjusted to his specific needs, can be expected to be economically useful, an acceptable member of the community. Not only that: the need for or possibility of his ever going to an institution is tremendously reduced. These children form an estimated 2½ percent of the entire school-age population, or 22,000 in Missouri, Ackerman believes.

Another group is the trainable retarded, those with an intelligence quotient of about 25 to 50 (there is an overlap). These add another ½ percent, or about 3,500 in Missouri, Ackerman says.

School districts in this State have no legal obligation to accept these children, though other States, such as New Jersey and Massachusetts, make it mandatory. Even if they learn only how to read a street sign or how to get from one place to another, their chances of getting jobs and holding them are greatly increased.

In St. Louis and St. Louis County, the largest program not paid for with public funds is that in the Catholic schools.

Rev. Elmer H. Behrmann began this program in 1950. There were classes last semester in nine different Catholic schools and in St. Mary's special school, which boards children from outside St. Louis.

The State and local NARC affiliates are now planning a campaign to win adoption of a much broader educational program throughout the State. It would include raising the payment from $175 to $300, making the education of the trainable retarded compulsory, providing financial incentives to teachers to get into this work, and setting up of special school districts for the retarded.

Proper Rehabilitation Program for Mentally Retarded Is Costly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of August 3, 1955:

PROPER REHABILITATION PROGRAM FOR MENTALLY RETARDED IS COSTLY

(By Morton Mintz)

(Tenth of a series)

Eighty-one years ago a New Jersey commission said the mentally retarded "are a perpetual witness against us before God and man; and hereafter we cannot escape our responsibility by pleading ignorance of the facts."

For the past 9 days the Globe-Democrat has done all in its power that Missourians may not be ignorant of the facts about the mentally retarded and their families in our State today.

Here are the facts briefly summarized:

Missouri has an estimated 123,000 mentally retarded persons; 2,800 more will be born in 1955.

The institutions are overcrowded, can accommodate only 40 out of the 100 patients who need them and have waiting lists of 7 to 10 years; and even the waiting lists underestimate the actual need for their services.

The institution heads down through the years have requested more staff and more facilities with which to do a better job; down through the years their requests have gotten the ax.

What of the plans that keep children out of the institutions, prevent family disasters, help make it possible for retarded persons to be entirely or partially self-supporting?

The State does not have, and has no definite plans for, residence "colonies," "sheltered workshops," diagnostic and guidance clinics, foster-homes, welfare workers in each county specifically assigned to help the retarded. It has no facilities for children under 5. It has no research program. It is only now getting into a large-scale program of public education.

Many persons have written and phoned to tell of their rage that Missouri does not have these things, that some other States do. They ask, "What can be done?"

There are four key points to keep in mind:

1. The parents themselves, in Missouri as in most States, did not begin to come out in the open and organize until 1951 or later. So the public at large was little aware of the problem and little aware of the needs.

2. The extreme slowness with which this problem has penetrated the public consciousness was reflected, perhaps inevitably, in the failure of the State government to radically revise its traditional approach.

3. The condition of State finances. Missouri had a surplus of $33,785,883 at the beginning of this fiscal year. The 1955 legislature appropriated—for schools, mental hospitals, prisons, relief and a thousand obligations—an estimated $20,942,841 more than the State is expected to collect in direct taxes in the 2 years ending June 30, 1957.

Thus that surplus is expected to be down to $12,843,042 2 years from now—and no one knows if drought or other emergencies may arise to exhaust it.

4. Any adequate program for the retarded is expensive.

It is certainly true that you can have a home training program for $50,000 a year and other programs now lacking for relatively minor amounts.

It is certainly true, also, that these programs will reduce the number of family crack-ups, will be reflected in lowered rates of crime and mental and physical illness.

It is certainly true that these programs are vitally needed.

But it is also true that because the problem as a whole is so little met today that a full-blown program, particularly to expand the institutions or build new ones, will add millions and millions of dollars to Missouri's tax bill.

This series of articles found no whipping boys. The more the writer investigated, the more apparent it became that singling out for blame this public official, or that one, would be unfair, would do very little good, if any, and could do great harm. Finding a scapegoat seldom solves anything.

Some persons have tended to hold B. E. Ragland, the director of the Division of Mental Diseases, responsible. They say he has "the wrong background." Others say he has not "crusaded."

This reporter wishes only to cite a few facts in this connection:

1. Ragland is the administrator; he does not make basic policy. That is done by the governor and the legislature.

2. Ragland is responsible for the operation of 5 mental hospitals and 2 institutions for the mentally retarded. To do this job, which involves the spending of more than $32 million in the 1955–57 biennium, he has been given an office staff of only two to help him.

3. This reporter, during a long interview, asked Ragland for his opinion of the many progressive plans used in other States. His answer in every case was that he favors their adoption by Missouri. Among other things, he approves the idea of a bureau of mental deficiency to coordinate them, a means used in New Jersey and other States.

Now, what lies ahead?

1. Gov. Phil M. Donnelly has called for a $75 million State bond issue. The legislature did not fix a date for a special election, leaving that to the governor. He has not yet set it.

The bond issue, if approved by the voters, would finance a building program for State penal, higher educational and eleemosynary institutions. Into that last category—eleemosynary—fall the institutions for the mentally retarded.

Only if the bond issue passes will there be a chance in the near future to begin a long-range large expansion of institutional facilities for the retarded.

It will be up to the governor, after passage, to recommend how the $75 million should be divided. It will be up to the legislature in special session to accept or revise or reject the governor's recommendations.

In Ragland's office in Jefferson City are architect's plans for expanding the 160-bed branch at Higginsville that will be opened next year into an 1,100-bed separate training school of the most modern kind

Also in his office are requests for expansion of the St. Louis State Training School.

Here are some of the major ones for St. Louis State Training School submitted by the superintendent, Dr. Arthur A. Hines:

Building for 250 custodial patients	$1,000,000
Vocational training building	420,000
Recreational building	708,000
Four buildings for 304 trainable patients	2,200,000

2. The legislature will not meet again in regular session until January 1957. Likely not until then can there be action on the special programs, the larger staffs, unless the Governor should recommend such programs to a special session.

Before the legislature meets in regular session there will be an election. Missouri next year will nominate and elect, among others, a new Governor (in Missouri a Governor cannot succeed himself); all of its State representatives and half of its State senators.

It all adds up very simply:

If the people of Missouri want to give a better break to the mentally retarded and their families, they must be willing to pay for it in higher taxes.

If the people of Missouri are willing to do this, they must elect men to office who will carry out their wishes.

The people of Missouri have the chance to show whether they agree with these words of Archbishop Richard J. Cushing, of Boston:

"It is fair to say that the best index to the civilization of a community is what is done for 'exceptional' children, for they are unusually least in so many ways; least in years, least in endowments, least in privileges, least in all the things people covet for their children."

Missouri Far Behind Illinois in Care of Mentally Retarded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of August 4, 1955:

MISSOURI FAR BEHIND ILLINOIS IN CARE OF MENTALLY RETARDED

(By Morton Mintz)

(Last of a series)

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., August 3.—Not a river but an ocean separates the neighboring States of Missouri and Illinois in the way each attacks the problem of the mentally retarded and their families.

Missouri's program has been stunted by an abundance of inertia and a drouth of money, ideas, and determination.

Missouri spends money—not enough—for institutions and public education for the retarded, period.

The Illinois program is far from perfect. For example, its institutions, like Missouri's, are very overcrowded.

But there is a sense of excitement here. Illinois has put on the gloves, it's in the ring and it's slugging.

Illinois has long kept pace with leading States in certain phases of retardation. In others it is catching up fast. In still others it has taken the lead.

Illinois is a bigger State and a richer one than Missouri. That must be kept in mind.

But its greater population automatically means that its problem of the mentally retarded is all the bigger.

Missouri has an estimated 123,000 retarded, with about 2,800 more being born each year. Illinois, using the same estimate of 3 retarded persons in every 100 of the general population, has 262,000, with 6,400 more being born each year.

The per capita income in 1953 in Illinois was $2,088, compared with only $1,547 in Missouri. The average Illinois resident last year paid $636 in State taxes; the average Missourian, again on a per capita basis, $439.

Now for some comparisons in the ways the two States deal with mental retardation:

History: Missouri opened its first permanent institution for the retarded in 1901.

Illinois opened its first in 1877.

Research: Missouri appropriates not one cent for research into the causes and problems of retardation.

Illinois allotted for this purpose $250,000 in 1953 and $302,000 more in 1955, each sum for a 2-year period. In 1955–57 the Illinois research allocation for this purpose will be equal to 40 percent of that of the Federal Government itself.

Number of institution beds: Missouri provides only 40 percent of the estimated minimum number of beds needed for retarded persons.

Illinois provides 77 percent.

New admissions: Missouri admitted only 91 new patients in the last fiscal year, or 8 percent of the number of waiting applicants.

Illinois admitted 675, or 92 percent.

Insitution expansion: Missouri added a 76-bed building (at St. Louis State Training School) in the biennium just ended.

Illinois added 260 beds in that same period.

Waiting lists: Missouri's waiting lists are officially admitted to be greatly under the actual need. Yet even now applicants must wait up to 10 years for admission at the State School for the Mentally Defective and Epileptic at Marshall and up to 7 years at St. Louis State.

Illinois' State schools at Lincoln (chiefly for southern Illinois residents) and Dixon admit immediately all cases in which the department of public welfare finds a medical or family emergency. Others wait no longer than 18 months.

Age limits for admission: Missouri institutions, because of the overcrowding and waiting lists, do not admit children under 5 or over 20, except in the rarest instances.

Illinois institutions admit, and have admitted almost from the start, retarded children of all ages. Many are accepted immediately after birth. Lincoln and Dixon have a total of 787 patients under 6 years of age.

Institution staffs: Missouri's school at Marshall has full time and year round for about 1,800 patients: One physician (the superintendent), 2 psychologists, 1 social worker, 2 registered nurses. For the summer only it also has, among others, two full-time recreation supervisors.

Illinois' school at Lincoln has full time and year round for 5,200 patients: Fourteen physicians, 7 psychologists, 8 social workers, 21 registered nurses, 23 recreation supervisors.

Special programs: Missouri has none of the following programs.

Illinois has a foster-home plan.

It has home-training institutes for parents who have retarded children at home.

It will have in operation by 1957 four halfway houses.

These are comparable to the so-called colonies at which patients are given prerelease training before being fully discharged from the institution. Under trained house parents the patients learn various skills and often work in private jobs while living in the colony.

It also places about 200 patients a year under a wage-placement program. That is, patients earn their own way while working and living under State-supervised conditions in private employment.

It makes job and other guidance continuously available to patients after discharge.

It teaches in the institutions many vocational skills beyond those learned on the usual work details.

Cost sharing: Missouri charges parents of noncharity patients $20 a month (less in emergency cases) for care at Marshall, up to $50 at St. Louis State. One main reason for the gap is that it is up to the institutions themselves to investigate family finances.

Marshall has no practical way of doing this because its patients come from all of Missouri's 114 counties. So a flat fee of $20 is set.

St. Louis State is able to check much more easily because nearly all of its patients come from St. Louis and St. Louis County.

Some parents could pay more than $20 or even $50 without sacrifice.

Illinois has a standard schedule based on ability to pay. No one pays more than $60 a month. A mother and father with two children and a third in an institution, if they have no great financial obligations, pay $9 a month if the family income falls between $400 and $409 a month. Nothing is charged if a family cannot afford to contribute, and that applies to 85 percent of the families with children at Lincoln and Dixon. The average bill at Lincoln and Dixon is $31.70.

Use of family payments: Missouri puts them into an institutional earnings fund.

Illinois puts them into a special mental health fund. The money is earmarked for research, personnel training, mental hygiene services, extra services to patients, special grants and for certain types of administration, construction, and contingencies.

The plan is like that of setting aside gasoline taxes for road building.

The mental health fund provides about $4 million extra a year to fight mental retardation and mental illness. A total of $1,837,000 will go for research in the current biennium.

In 1957 Illinois will have a research and training authority financed by this fund. Dr. Otto L. Bettag, the 49-year-old, brisk, vigorous, plain-spoken director of the department of public welfare, believes it will be the only one of its kind in the Nation.

He says the vital thing about the authority is that it will be able to attract and keep top investigators. Why? Because it will have up to $1 million a year to spend for research into both mental retardation and mental illness.

The authority will thus be able to make long-term grants and assure researchers that they will not be cut off in midair. Some researchers are reluctant to go to other States with research programs for fear of being stranded by some caprice of the legislature.

Personnel training: Missouri has no full-scale system for training and upgrading its personnel in all its mental institutions.

Illinois mental institutions hold monthly and biweekly seminars for key employees that are addressed by both State and national experts.

They hold 3-month to 4-month in-service training programs for psychiatric aids. Some of these aids get an outside, expense-paid 18-month course.

They train occupational and recreational therapists, pay them while they are in training and give them, on a superintendent's recommendation, a raise of $10 a month for successful completion of the course.

Dixon State School this year will launch a program giving an 18-month course in practical nursing to 40 persons at a time.

The Department of Public Welfare is granting 200 3-year nursing scholarships. For each year of scholarship, a nurse is obligated to work a year for the State with full pay. In Missouri, it is believed, this program and certain others would require new legislation and possible constitutional changes.

In cooperation with the University of Illinois, a 6-week institute was held for teachers of the educable retarded."

Pay: Missouri pays its lowest category of hospital attendants in three ranges. The minimum pay is $147 a month (rural), the top $250 (metropolitan). Very few actually receive $250.

Illinois pays the comparable group from $160 to $230. But more than 60 percent get the maximum.

Costs: Missouri spends $1,240 per year per patient at St. Louis State and $695 at Marshall. It has been previously explained that these figures by themselves are very tricky to compare.

Illinois spends $803 per patient. Again direct comparison is risky in the extreme.

In Missouri the costs include very little for central administration. The director of the Division of Mental Diseases in Jefferson City supervises seven mental institutions, has only two office employees.

In Illinois the per capita costs do not include any of the projects financed by the mental health fund. Nor do they include the costs of the approximately 150 persons who supervise the mental institutions on a highly centralized basis from Springfield and Chicago.

It used to be that one institution would have, say, a 10-year supply of a certain drug. Another institution would reorder the same drug.

Central administration has coordinated inventories and reduced them by $1 million since 1953.

Dr. Bettag has brought strict cost controls to his entire department.

Stealing of institutional supplies once was discovered to exist on a large scale. Dr. Bettag has instituted strict security measures.

He and Gov. William G. Stratton say proudly that they are serving more food and better food (meats are United States Good and Choice only) to about 1,000 more patients than in 1951–53 at a 2-year saving of $3,500,000.

The Governor said last January:

"The day of the meatless meal for patients will soon be a thing of the past."

Dr. Bettag says meat is now served to all patients 14 times a week.

In the 20 years prior to the time the Governor and Dr. Bettag took office, deficiency appropriations for commodities total $33,524,041. None was asked for in 1955.

The Governor also said: "For over half a century patients in one or more of our State hospitals slept either on the floors or on mattresses on the floors. At the advent of this administration, approximately 800 patients were so involved. This practice has been eliminated as a policy and at present all patients are provided with a bed."

Education of the retarded: Missouri pays $175 a month for each educable retarded child in school districts providing special classes for them. It has no provision for the trainable retarded.

Illinois pays $250 a month in both categories.

Parent groups: Missouri has no formal associations of parents of children at either of its two institutions for the retarded.

Illinois has them at both. At Lincoln, the membership is about 1,000. In the last year the Lincoln and Dixon superintendents each received a plaque commending their devotion and work in improving conditions.

Retarded Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of August 5, 1955:

RETARDED CHILDREN

The Globe-Democrat has just completed publication of 11 articles by Staff Writer Morton Mintz on the plight of mentally retarded children in Missouri. They were the result of painstaking investigation and analysis, and notably well documented and objective. The author sought to pillory no one; merely to point out an appalling situation which is every Missourian's responsibility.

The list of indictments against the public's previous inaction was startlingly long. But these stand out:

Missouri has at least 123,000 mentally retarded children and at least 2,800 more are being born every year.

Existing State care capacity is so desperately short the waiting list of applicants already is 7 years long; only about 8 percent of the list can be admitted each year.

Missouri has no adequate program either for research into the malady, for training of patients and hospital personnel, or for foster homes. Therefore, the dismissal rate is unnecessarily slow.

So, as the hospital capacity remains stationary, the cure rate low and the birth rate high, the situation will grow steadily worse.

The computation excludes the mentally retarded under 5 and over 20 years of age, who have been barred in the stringency.

In a way, this is the greatest tragedy of all, for it insures that the other children in burdened families will needlessly receive psychological scars from the association. It insures that distraight husbands and wives will be thrown into a despair of futility likely to split the union and destroy the child victim's last chance at ultimate wholesome family association. And it all but insures that interim private care will ruin the average couple financially.

Meanwhile, until recent enlightenment, a secret sense of personal guilt or of shame has prevented parents uniting and fighting for the legislative consideration afforded victims of much lesser calamity. In short, the mentally retarded could not speak for themselves; the parents would not. In the stalemate the lives of normal children were being warped while the public stood by, uninformed.

There is one major hope for quick remedy. Governor Donnelly has called for a $75 million multipurpose State bond issue, the date as yet unset. If the voters will pass it, the Governor will be empowered to allot as much money as seems necessary to expand institutional facilities for the mentally retarded. If the Legislature in special session then accepts his allotment recommendations, Missouri can begin at once building for effective handling of an agonizing problem.

Will Missouri now manifest a resolute, continuing concern for its curable tots who wander helplessly in the darkness of mental underdevelopment? Or will it hear, gasp and forget? It remains to be seen. The next steps are up to (1) the Governor, (2) the voters, (3) the State legislature. May they all act with true humanity in their hearts.

Alaska Mental Health Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has recently prepared a point-by-point analysis of the Alaska Mental Health Act, H. R. 6376, which I believe will be of considerable interest and assistance to many Members of Congress.

Under leave to extend my remarks that anlysis is reproduced here:

ANALYSIS OF HOSPITALIZATION PROCEDURES INCLUDED IN TITLE I OF H. R. 6376 "AN ACT TO PROVIDE FOR THE HOSPITALIZATION AND CARE OF THE MENTALLY ILL OF ALASKA"

Under present Federal law applicable to the Territory of Alaska, hospital care is available only to those mentally ill of Alaska who have been committed as "insane" after judicial "trial."

As understanding of mental illness and possibilities of treatment has grown, the trend in State legislation has been to facilitate access to hospital care, preserving the right of access to judicial procedures when any compulsory action is involved. H. R. 6376 follows this trend and is patterned generally on the "Draft Act Governing Hospitalization of the Mentally Ill" recommended by the Public Health Service for consideration by the States in 1950.

This statement covers particularly those provisions of the bill to which objections were raised by witnesses in the hearings held before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

February 20 and 21. These may be grouped under the following headings:

I. Definition of the "mentally ill."

II. Procedures for hospitalization.

III. Transfer of patients from or to Alaska.

I. THE DEFINITION OF MENTAL ILLNESS—INCLUSION OF THE MENTALLY RETARDED AND DEFICIENT

Section 101 (1): The term "mentally ill individual" is defined as meaning "an individual having a psychiatric or other disease which substantially impairs his mental health or an individual who is mentally defective or mentally retarded."

Objection: The definition of the "mentally ill" is too broad. It covers many persons who should not be hospitalized, especially those who are mentally deficient or retarded.

Answer: It is correct that many such persons should not be hospitalized, and they could not be under the terms of the bill. The definition has significance only as it is used in other provisions of the bill.

The fact that an individual may be "mentally ill" as defined is not in itself sufficient to authorize his admission to a hospital under this bill. Exception to this is only in the case of an individual who makes a voluntary application and has sufficient capacity to act responsibly for himself in the matter.

Section 103 (a): In the case of such an individual it is enough if he has symptoms of mental illness. The purpose, of course, is to facilitate early access to care when the chance of effective prevention or cure is greatest.

The additional factors necessary in other situations for hospitalization upon an application made by others, when the proposed patient is either dangerous or lacks capacity to act for himself, are set forth in sections 103 (b), 104, and 108. They are discussed later.

The mentally defective or mentally retarded in Alaska are now hospitalized under the commitment procedure which relates to the "insane." Under this procedure, for example, there are reported to be a number of mentally retarded children who are hospitalized at Morningside.

Since there is no provision in the statutes of Alaska for the hospitalization of the mentally retarded and deficient, where need for institutional treatment is indicated, this group was included in the statutory definition. The bill would authorize hospitalization of such persons, however, only when there was shown a need for institutional care in a hospital which as defined in section 101 (e) could be an institution especially qualified for the care and treatment of such persons.

To exclude this group from the statutory definition of the "mentally ill" and provide separately for their institutional care would be a simple matter of legislative draftsmanship if felt desirable.

II. PROCEDURES FOR HOSPITALIZATION

Objection: In general, these were to the effect that individuals could be deprived of their liberty arbitrarily and without due process.

Answer: The bill provides careful safeguards at every point where liberty is involved. The more specific objections expressed by some witnesses need to be considered in relation to the four specific types of procedure provided by the bill. Of these only the judicial procedure authorizes compulsory hospitalization on other than an emergency basis.

The four procedures by which an individual in Alaska may be hospitalized are discussed in order:

Section 103 (a): (1) Upon voluntary application by the patient: An individual who is mentally ill or has symptoms of mental illness may apply for admission to a hospital and be admitted for observation, diagnosis, care, and treatment. Such application can be made, however, only by an individual "who has sufficient insight or capacity to make responsible application in his own behalf. In the case of an individual under 16 years of age, the application must be made by the parent or legal guardian.

Such an admission is not in any sense a commitment. As to the patient's right to discharge on request, see section 106.

Provisions for voluntary hospitalization are now found in the laws of most of the States. The compilation made by the Council of State Governments in 1949 showed 40 States having such provisions at that time, and the number is greater now.

The only objection made to this provision in the hearing was its authorization of voluntary admissions on application by an individual as young as 16 (in the case of a younger person, it is by his guardian). The age line is the same as that drawn in the Draft Act. The Draft Act commentary has this to say on this point:

"The specified line of division is necessarily arbitrary just as 17, 15, or 18 would be, and should therefore be considered only suggestive. However, the age of 21 which is used in a number of statutes is considered too high. Individuals in their later teens carry responsibilities which are often commensurate with those of older persons—responsibility for infractions of law, for example. Hence it is believed that they should not by reason of their age alone be denied the opportunity to apply for hospital care. It may be noted in this connection that, in cases involving the consent of a minor to the perfomance of surgery upon him, our courts have generally held the consent to be effective where the minor was over 15 years old and sufficiently mature to realize the dangers and benefits of the operation, although this fact has not been elevated to a rule of law."

Section 103 (b): (2) Admission for care and treatment on application by others.

Objection: Under this, a person could be put away simply on application of another person and a physician's certificate that he was mentally ill.

Answer: This is not so, as reading of the provision will indicate.

Section 103 (b) provides that individual may be admitted for care and treatment in a hospital upon written application (by an interested party, a health or welfare officer, the Governor, or the head of the institution in which the individual may be) accompanied by a certificate of a licensed physician. The certificate must state that, in the physician's opinion, the individual is mentally ill and because of his illness "either (1) is likely to injure himself or others if allowed to remain at liberty or (2), being in need of care of treatment in a hospital, lacks sufficient insight or capacity to make responsible application" for himself. The certificate must be based upon examination.

This provision is an authorization for admission not for confinement. It carries with it no authority to apprehend the individual and forcibly remove him to the hospital or to have the hospital detain him against his will after admission; his liberty is not curtailed.

As to the right of a person admitted under this subsection to be discharged on request, see section 106. As to emergency situations, see section 104.

Section 104: (3) Emergency hospitalization:

Section 104 (a) and (b) cover those situations in which it may be necessary to take an individual into custody and transport him to the hospital.

Objection: Specific objection was made to the exercise of police authority by other than police officers, and some objection was made to emergency provisions in general.

Answer: To protect both the patient and others, there must be authority to handle dangerous cases on an emergency basis. Since the individual is sick, however, handling by a health rather than a police officer may often be desirable.

Subsection (a). If the certificate issued by a licensed physician under section 103 (b) states a belief that the individual is likely to injure himself or others if allowed to remain at liberty, the certificate may be presented for endorsement by the governor or a United States commissioner. When endorsed it will authorize taking the individual into custody and transporting him to a designated hospital. Upon such endorsement any health, welfare, or police officer or any other person deputized for the purpose by a United States Commissioner may exercise this authority. The category of persons who exercise such authority is not limited to police officers.

This is in line with the purpose of the bill to take the handling of the sick out of the context of a strictly police action and to avoid unnecessary shock to an already disturbed person. (The Draft Act, however, does not provide for exercise of such authority by welfare officers.)

Subsection (b). This is designed for those more critical situations in which it appears that the individual is mentally ill and because of his illness is likely to injure himself or others if not immediately restrained pending the medical examination or certification or the endorsement provided by subsection (a). Any health, welfare, or police officer may act in such emergency situations but must state in the application for the individual's admission to the hospital the circumstances under which the individual was taken into custody and the reasons for the officer's belief.

As to the right of a patient under either of these emergency provisions admitted to a discharge on request unless commitment proceedings are instituted, see section 106.

According to the compilation made by the Council of State Governments in 1949, some 30 States had statutory provisions for emergency commitment without court order. The person authorized to take into custoday a mentally ill individual who is dangerous varies from any person to designated officers such as (in California) a peace or health officer. The common law, of course, recognizes that any person may take a dangerous insane person into custody and hold him temporarily until he can be safely released, arrested upon legal process, or committed under legal authority.

Section 106: Right to discharge.

Objection: No objection was made to these provisions in themselves, but some question was raised as to their sufficiency to assure due process in the case of patients not admitted under judicial commitment.

Answer: The safeguards in this bill are greater than are provided in many State laws which provide (as this bill does not) for true "commitments" without prior judicial procedure. The constitutionality of such laws is generally upheld when they provide (as this bill does) for prompt access to the courts for a judicial determination.

The following provisions of H. R. 6376 are designed to assure the prompt discharge of patients whenever the circumstances warranting either voluntary or emergency hospitalization or judicial commitment have ceased to exist.

Section 106: Any individual admitted upon his own suggestion, or that of others, including an individual admitted because likely to injure himself or others, "shall be forthwith discharged therefrom upon his request or upon the request in writing by an interested party." Section 106 (a). (The right

to discharge forthwith is stated more explicitly in this bill than in the Draft Act.)

Discharge is conditioned on his own agreement in the case of the patient admitted on his own application or the consent of the parent or guardian if the individual is under 16 years of age.

Exception to the right of immediate discharge is made only for the emergency situation, i. e., only if the head of the hospital files with the United States Commissioner within 48 hours after receipt of the request, a certificate that in his opinion discharge of the patient would be unsafe to the patient or others. In such case discharge may be postponed for such period not to exceed 5 (and under some circumstances 15) days as the Commissioner determines to be necessay to institute judicial proceedings. (The Draft Act makes this limit 5 days, but it has been indicated that 15 days may sometimes need to be allowed in Alaska.)

Section 105: The head of the hospital must in any event arrange for examination within 5 days after admission, by a designated examiner of every patient hospitalized upon application by others. The patient must be discharged if the conditions warranting admission are not found.

Section 107: Every patient, however hospitalized, is entitled to have the need for his hospitalization determined by judicial proceedings on his own petition or that of an interested party.

Section 111: Habeas corpus is specifically provided.

Section 123: The head of the hospital must cause the condition of very patient to be reviewed as frequently as practicable, and at least every 6 months, and must discharge the patient whenever the conditions justifying hospitalization no longer obtain.

Section 121: Provision is also made for conditionally releasing improved patients on convalescent status and for the discharge of such patients.

Section 108: (4) Commitment to a hospital, Judicial commitment: Commitment implies compulsory hospitalization with power to hold the patient for an indeterminate or a fixed period. Commitment is authorized by this bill only by judicial proceedings before a United States Commissioner as provided by section 108.

Objection: That the hearing may be held without notice to the patient. That the patient is not required to be present.

Answer: The first is not so. The second is true, but required attendance would in many cases be inhumane and damaging to health; the patient always has right to be present.

Orders of commitment under this bill may be made only after a hearing of which the proposed patient, as well as other interested parties as determined by the Commissioner, must be given notice with opportunity to hear, to testify, to present and cross-examine witnesses. Opportunity to be represented by counsel must be afforded to every proposed patient and if neither he nor other provide counsel, the Commissioner must appoint one. These provisions are found in subsection (f) of section 108.

Prceedings for commitment are instituted by the filing of a petition, accompanied by a certificate of a licensed physician stating that he has examined the individual and is of the opinion that he s mentally ill and should be hospitalized. The medical certificate is required unless the applicant files a written statement that the individual has refused to submit to an examination by a licensed physician (subsec. (a)).

Upon the filing of the application, notice is given to the patient, to his legal guardian, if any, and to other interested parties (subsec. (b)). At this stage, however, the Commissioner, if he has reason to believe that notice would be likely to be injurious to the proposed patient, may omit the notice to him and proceed to the appointment of two designated examiners (or one if he finds that two are not available) (subsec. (c)). If the examiners report that the proposed patient is not mentally ill, the Commissioner is authorized to dismiss the application (subsec. (e)). Otherwise, the date for the hearing is fixed and notice given to the patient, as indicated above, and to the interested parties, as provided in subsection (f).

The medical examination is held at a medical facility, at the home of the patient, or at any other suitable place not likely to have a harmful effect on his health. A patient cannot be required to submit to examination against his will unless the United States Commissioner has given prior notice to the patient and has ordered him to submit to an examination (subsec. (d)).

The United States Commissioner may order the individual's hospitalization based upon findings made upon completion of the hearing and consideration of the record. The finding must be not only that the individual is mentally ill but in addition that the individual is either because of his illness likely to injure himself or others if allowed to remain at liberty or is in need of custody, care or treatment in a hospital, and, because of his illness, lacks sufficient insight or capacity to make responsible decisions concerning hospitalization.

Jury trial is provided for on an optional basis at the request of the patient, his counsel or any member of his immediate family. (Since mental illness is not a crime, the constitutional guaranty of jury trial has been held not applicable to proceedings to determine mental condition. The Draft Act does not provide for jury trial because appearance before a jury of laymen increases the likelihood of harmful effects to the proposed patient and because the jury is a questionable instrument for the evaluation of the preeminently medical ingredients in such a proceeding.

Any party may appeal from the decision of the Commissioner to the District Court (sec. 112).

III. PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE TRANSFER OF PATIENTS FROM OR TO ALASKA

Objection: That people in the United States could be picked up and sent to Alaska for hospitalization as mentally ill. That the land granted to Alaska would be used as a place of confinement.

Answer: There is no basis in the bill for either charge. However, there are transfer provisions of a type customary under State laws for nonresidents and for patients, such as veterans, who may be entitled to care in Federal hospitals. The land grant (sec. 202) is to provide an additional source of income to the Territory to aid it in assuming responsibility for the care of the mentally ill in Alaska. These are explained below.

Outside of the provision for contract care of Alaska patients outside Alaska (sec. 102 (b) would permit, for example, continued contracting for care of patients at Morningside) the transfer provisions relate to two groups:

1. Individuals, such as veterans, who may be entitled to hospitalization at the expense of the United States.

2. Residents of States who become mentally ill in Alaska and residents of Alaska who become mentally ill while in a State.

(1) Veterans, etc.: Sections 109 (a) and (b) and section 118 (b) relate to the persons entitled to care by the United States. These provisions are derived from section 18 of the Uniform Veterans Guardianship Act which was developed by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform Laws and which has been in satisfactory operation for years in most of the States. The Commissioners on Uniform Laws have commented thus on section 18 of the Uniform Veterans Guardianship Act.

"Those provisions will facilitate the placing of patients in appropriate Federal institutions especially equipped to treat a particular type of mental trouble and save the patient distress and sometimes definite harm incident to a second adjudication experience in the State to which transferred. It will also save substantial expense to the various States, to the Federal Government, and to the patients."

(2) Nonresidents: Subsections (a) and (b) of section 119 resemble 48 U. S. C. 48 of the present law applicable to Alaska. They authorize arrangements by which a patient hospitalized under the judicial procedure in Alaska but who is not a resident of Alaska may be returned to his State of legal residence. A nonresident patient not hospitalized under the judicial procedures may also be returned if the patient or his guardian consents. Also under reciprocal arrangements, residents of Alaska who have been hospitalized in a State may be transferred back to Alaska.

Provisions such as these are commonly found in State laws relating to the mentally ill.

An added provision—subsection (c), which is not found in the Draft Act—has been the subject of the most extreme objection. It is not, however, a transfer provision at all, nor is it a commitment procedure. Its purpose is to obviate the need for transfer of the patient back to Alaska or the State of residence in situations where the interest of the patient would be better served by allowing his care to be continued where he is already hospitalized, the expense to be reimbursed by the State of legal residence.[1]

This provision is likely to be most useful in the case of Alaskan residents who become ill and are hospitalized while in a State where the facilities and type of care available, or other circumstances, are such that removal back to Alaska would be undesirable for the patient. If further clarification is needed, this provision could be amended to specify that it is to apply only "when it appears that transfer of the patient as provided in subsections (a) and (b) of section 119 would not be in the best interest of the patient."

[1] Personal liability for the expense of hospitalization is provided for by section 128 (a) which is derived from the present law (48 U. S. C. 48a).

We're Through With Benson and Eisenhower, Say Midwest GOP Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the feeling among farmers of our Nation concerning the present decline in farm prices is acutely pointed out in a recent article in the Christian Science Monitor. Because of this, I include a copy of this article in the Appendix of the RECORD under the unanimous consent of my colleagues:

"WE'RE THROUGH": GOP IN HOG BELT FACES VOTE SHIFT

(By Godfrey Sperling, Jr.)

DE KALB, ILL.—We're Taft Republicans, but we decided to go along with Ike in '52. Next fall, though, we'll vote Democratic na-

tionally, and so will a lot of our neighbors who have also been hit hard by farm prices."

This was Chauncey Watson, Jr., expressing his political views. He and his father farm 640 acres a few miles south of De Kalb. No two farmers in the county are better known or better respected than the Watsons.

The grandfather of Chauncey, Jr., was one of the pioneers here. Chauncey, Sr., has been a top official with Kiwanis International and is a former president of the Corn Belt Livestock Feeders' Association.

"Before Ike came in," Chauncey, Sr., commented, "we had our land all paid for. But in 1953 and 1954, we lost $100,000 on cattle. Now we have a $100,000 mortgage on this land, and we are no different from farmers all around us. We're all in the same fix."

Chauncey, Sr., stood by his tractor—he had been turning over land preparatory to planting corn. Adding weight to his words was Elroy E. "Al" Golden, county farm adviser, nodding his head as the Watsons talked.

"That's right," said Mr. Golden. "There were at least 6 farmers in this area who lost more than $40,000 last year on feeding stock.

"We know this because they participated in the Farm Bureau's farm management service program, so we've seen their records. They were good farmers, too. Only the most efficient take part—about 10 percent in this county.

"In fact, almost all those who participated in this program showed a loss for last year."

"See all those farms around us?" asked Chauncey, Sr., pointing to at least 20 farms that could be seen from the Watson holdings. "At least half of those are people who will do just as we do, vote for a Democrat in the fall for President. We're mad at Benson and through with Eisenhower."

HE HASN'T A CHANCE HERE

"That primary didn't mean anything," said Chauncey, Jr., referring to the recent Illinois vote.

"Sure, we voted Republican. And so did all the others who usually vote Republican. This is a Republican county and there were a lot of important local races where we wanted the Republicans to get the right candidate. After all, why vote for a Democrat locally? He hasn't a chance here in any general election."

Thus it was, according to the Watsons (and to other Republican farmers talked to here) that Mr. Eisenhower gained his impressive 6-to-1 margin over Adlai E. Stevenson. Those farmers who were angry enough to protest here could see no point in crossing over at this time—when they could use their vote to good effect in the local primary.

This we have found, was also true in Champaign County, Ill., where the Republicans had an exciting race for State's Attorney and county judge.

Did the Watsons like Mr. Stevenson? Not particularly.

They liked Senator ESTES KEFAUVER better, but neither could suit a Taft Republican. They merely were ready to vote Democratic to show their displeasure over the farm situation.

"Half of the Republicans around me here, half in my township, half in this county," Chauncey, Sr., declared, "are going to vote against the administration. I know. I've talked to them."

Later, Mr. Golden gave weight to these words, too, stating that Mr. Watson gets around the county a great deal and talks with lots of the farmers. He was not, therefore, merely seeking to supply support for his own sentiment.

LOSS ON HOGS FIGURED

"In De Kalb County last year," Mr. Golden said, "the average cost of feed to produce 100 pounds of pork was $11.50. And you know how the price was, around $11 at one point. A lot of farmers were paying for the privilege of keeping livestock.

"The return for $100 of feed fed in this county was just $100 on hogs. And that doesn't take into account the money the farmer had to spend for labor, interest rates, housing, etc.

"And the return for $100 of feed fed was only $102 on cattle."

"We'll vote for Stratton for Governor and the other local Republicans, but not for a Republican President," Chauncey, Jr. added.

"On top of the prices, look at this," Chauncey, Sr., said, picking up a dry stalk of corn. Opening the stalk between his fingers, he showed a worm inside. "A corn borer. They're everywhere."

"Yes," said Mr. Golden, "latest findings show that there are more than 500 borers per 100 stalks around here. Last year our average corn production dropped from 76 to 65 bushels an acre as a result of corn borer and drought. And that year there were fewer borers, 300 for every 100 stalks."

"I don't know what to do about this plowing if we don't get a rain," said Chauncey, Sr., "maybe I'd better just turn the land over with a disk, instead of a plow.

BANK DEPOSITS AT LOW POINT

"Did you notice our tile outlets? Not even dripping. Should be spurting out two-thirds full this time of year, and should be flowing almost all year. But it's been more than a year since we've got more than a trickle out of those pipes."

Later, in town, one banker confirmed that bank deposits for farmers were down, although he didn't indicate that this would be reflected in the fall vote.

Another banker agreed with the Watsons on the vote. And another said that the auctioneer for the area had told him that more farmers had sold out this year than in a long time.

Farm implement dealers and feed-sale outlets were having their troubles, too. Hundreds of farmers were working part-time in town, General Electric and Wurlitzer employing large numbers of them.

This is feeder cattle-hog country in northern Illinois, roughly equivalent to the area in southwestern Wisconsin which showed a farm protest vote in the Wisconsin primary. Apparently, a similar feeling is welling up among many farmers here. And unless some relief comes along soon, this unrest will be reflected in the November election.

The Farm Monstrosity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I desire to submit an editorial of recent date which appeared in the Chicago Tribune, pointing out its opposition to the farm bill passed by the Congress. This editorial makes out an irrefutable case against the farm bill which should be of interest to the Members of the House:

THE FARM MONSTROSITY

Congress has sent to the President a farm bill which is an unabashed effort to buy rural votes. Unless Mr. Eisenhower vetoes it, the ruinous process of piling up unwanted surpluses of cotton, wheat, corn, and other agricultural commodities will be continued for at least another year.

This is a Democratic measure, sponsored by a Democratic majority, and passed largely by Democratic votes. It is the Democrats who must accept the responsibility for a tax on bread, estimated at 2 cents a loaf, which consumers must pay wheat farmers for raising more wheat than the Nation can consume.

The bill ought to be vetoed and will be vetoed unless the White House palace guard can persuade Mr. Eisenhower that, to win the election, he must outpromise the Democrats. In fact, the President and his party stand to gain nothing if he lets the bill become law. The Democrats will claim credit for it; their principal motive in passing the conglomeration of absurdities, in fact, was to invite a veto.

The original Eisenhower farm program, a soil-bank plan under which farmers would be paid to take their land out of production and build up its fertility against the day when the Nation needs it, is dead. The various giveaway schemes tacked onto the bill would make a soil bank unworkable; even if it could be worked, Congress has dallied with the measure so long that it cannot be put into effect this year. Fields are already plowed and in southern areas many have been seeded.

There is little in this bill that would help the Republican Party in the fall, even if the Republicans were successful in claiming credit for a Democratic measure. The farm voting strength that the Republicans need for a national victory is centered in the Middle West and this bill continues and aggravates the practice of earlier farm legislation of encouraging other areas to compete with the Corn Belt in raising feed crops that compete with corn.

Illinois, Iowa, and other Midwestern States don't need crop supports. They need the abolition of a system of Government controls under which farmers in less-favored areas, who could not compete with them in a free market, are paid to do so from the Federal Treasury.

Under the courageous leadership of Agriculture Secretary Benson, the Eisenhower administration made a start toward reducing farm surpluses and restoring a free market in agriculture. A veto would continue that program. It would leave in force the flexible price-support plan, under which the inducement to produce any particular commodity is reduced and the unused supply of it increases.

Social-Security Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communications from the Commissioner of the Connecticut State Welfare Department:

HARTFORD, CONN., *April 6, 1956.*

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SADLAK: It is our understanding that the House Committee on Ways and Means has tentatively scheduled hearings to begin on Thursday, April 12, 1956, on H. R. 9120 and H. R. 10283, H. R. 9091 and H. R. 10284. Since it is our understanding that the hearings will be confined to the public assistance titles of the Social Security Act, we are restricting our comments accordingly. With the exception of one provision in these bills the State Welfare Department of Connecticut believes that they contain a num-

ber of improvements necessary in the public assistance provisions of the social security program. Several of these provisions will mean additional Federal financial participation for this State essential to the continuance and strengthening of the social welfare program. Other provisions contain desirable social legislation making it possible for those States who desire to do so to extend their programs for needy people.

The one provision which the department recommends be deleted, concerns the reduction of the Federal share of old-age assistance of 50 percent for those cases in which old age assistance payments are being made by States to OASI beneficiaries who are added to the assistance roles after the fiscal year 1957. This provision contains a number of administrative and policy defects which have been pointed out in hearings in the past and more recently considered by the Kestnbaum Commission on Intergovernmental Relations which did not recommend its adoption. It would require the States to set up a whole separate system of accounting for such cases. Of greater importance it singles out OASI beneficiaries for discriminatory treatment by the Federal Government. We, therefore, oppose this particular provision.

We urge the passage of the bills noted with the single exception indicated above.

Sincerely yours,

CHRISTY HANAS,
Commissioner, State Welfare Department.

Deserves Recognition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Springfield, Ill., has used extremely sound judgment in selecting Oliver J. Keller, Jr., as the most outstanding young man in the Springfield area. I have been personally acquainted with Mr. Keller for many years and have admired him for the work he has been doing in assisting the young people in the capital city. I feel that his contribution in combating juvenile delinquency deserves national recognition. This high honor that has come to him is certainly justly deserved.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following editorial from the Illinois State Journal:

DESERVED RECOGNITION

The Jaycees couldn't have picked a more deserving recipient for the award of outstanding young man of Springfield than Oliver J. Keller, Jr. His efforts in organizing Boys Farm alone would entitle him to this special recognition, we think.

But, in addition to having given the initial push to this laudable community project, Keller has donated hundreds of hours of time and energy to other youth activities, and to other community endeavors. He was one of the leaders of the Jaycees' "Saturday Night" dance project for teen-agers, has participated in YMCA youth activities, has aided the UCS fund drive, and at present is serving on the advisory board of the Illinois Youth Commission, a post to which he was appointed by Governor Stratton.

A young man with an easy-going manner and a sense of humor, Keller is popular among the teen-agers for his disc-jockey show over WTAX.

At a time when organization leadership is needed to help turn youths' energies to constructive activities, Keller has been of invaluable service to the community. The honor accorded him has been rightly placed.

Do Income-Tax Exemptions Make Sense?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Stanley S. Surrey entitled "Do Income-Tax Exemptions Make Sense?" which appeared in the March 30, 1956 edition of Colliers magazine:

The American taxpayer is a lucky man. Given the necessity of paying Federal taxes, he pays them in the fairest possible way—on the basis of his income.

Because the policy of relying on income taxes compares so favorably with any other yet devised for the financing of government, we all have a stake in protecting it and keeping it strong.

Yet this policy is being jeopardized by a trend that, unarrested, could ruin it. And ruin would mean that the fairest form of taxation would have to be replaced—by another less fair.

The theory—and the strength—of our income tax is that each man pays in terms of what he makes. If he makes what another man makes, he pays what the other man pays. If he makes more, he pays more.

But recent practice has strayed dangerously far from this theory. The United States Congress is itself creating ways for certain people to escape the very taxes it imposes. So persistent has this practice become that Congress and the country must now awaken to these consequences.

As special favors are granted, the income-tax system becomes unfair, and thus loses respect. As it loses respect, it loses effectiveness, until finally it does not work at all. Here is why:

From personal incomes, the Federal Government today takes income taxes of $32 billion. No matter what arrangement is made as to who pays how much, the Government must get that $32 billion to pay its present bills. If someone, somehow, escapes his burden, or even a portion of it, someone else must pay up for him. Every time Congress exempts a special group from the income tax, or a portion of it, the tax load becomes heavier for the rest of us.

Already a number of individuals have been shorn almost completely of their tax burden.

Already this trend is producing a deterioration in our tax morals and a psychology of contempt for our tax laws.

Already groups sophisticated in money matters are beginning to say, "Why pay high taxes when we can go to Washington and have our Congressman change the law for us?" As this attitude flourishes, taxpaying becomes a game of lobbying.

When some taxpayers receive favors from Washington, others are going to expect favors, too. Failing as lobbyists, they will seek out experts who, through the ardoit use of gimmicks, can ease them into tax shelters created by Congress with other groups in mind. And many an American taxpayer, angered by Congressional favoritism, will indulge in a bit of self-help as he makes out his return each year.

Our income-tax system rests to a great extent on the voluntary compliance of the taxpayers. Without honesty, enforcement becomes a vast impossibility. Without high taxpayer morale, the United States tax system is without value. Yet it is this very morale that is now being threatened.

How did such a system—where the concept of fairness is so basic to success—suddenly find itself becoming unfair, and in danger of failure?

The answer hangs on one fact: Ever since it adopted tax rates rising all the way to 91 percent, Congress has been acting as though possessed by an uneasy conscience.

A recent Harvard Business School study indicates what has been happening. According to the tax tables, anyone who make $1 million or more a year pays an overall tax of 87 percent. There are many millionaires in the United States, yet figures indicate that few of them pay taxes at the rate of 87 percent on their total incomes. The study shows that the average overall tax paid by our wealthiest groups is less than 50 percent!

A congressional hearing disclosed that one individual with a total income of $14 million from 1943 through 1947 paid taxes of only $80,000 over that period—a rate of less than six-tenths of 1 percent.

Ten other individuals, with a combined income of $62 million during the same period paid a total of only $14 million in taxes—an average rate of 22.5 percent for the group.

Each of these individuals simply took advantage of special provisions in the tax laws. Yet all of them, according to the tax tables, had sufficient income to be taxed above 90 percent for those years.

Here is a clear illustration of our current income-tax schizophrenia. In one moment, Congress sets high rates. In the next, it creates ways to escape those rates. Obviously, Congress must believe that the very rates it has created are too high. So, often when a special group vigorously complains about them, Congress listens sympathetically and almost every time grants the group relief.

Let us assume that each time Congress enacts a measure granting relief, it does so in the conviction that it is correcting an injustice. The trouble is that Congress is not reducing the tax for everyone, but only for those wtih sufficient pressures and skills to make their case appealing. Others whose problems are different in detail but just as acute—for everyone has problems under high taxes—get no relief at all.

An income tax is not the kind of tax that can tolerate many distinctions among persons of the same income group. Its basic principle is that a person with so many dollars of income is treated the same as any other person with the same amount of income. Arguments which seek to make distinctions among dollars that are earned from oil or dividends or salaries or interest are not—and should not be—sufficiently persuasive to produce a different tax for each.

Yet look at the numerous ways in which Congress has already made such distinctions:

A single person with a salary of $100,000 a year pays a tax of $65,928.

A single person with an income of $100,000 a year from oil royalties pays a tax of $42,829.

A single person with an income of $100,000 a year from the sale of stock-market investments held more than 6 months pays a tax of $25,000.

A single person with an annual income of $100,000 a year from interest on State or municipal bonds pays no tax at all.

Only the salaried person pays the tax at the rate prescribed in the tax tables—65.9

percent. The others pay in accordance with congressionally sanctioned exceptions to that table.

The holder of State and municipal bonds pays nothing, because Congress has exempted from taxation the interest received on those bonds. The stock-market investor pays at the rate of 25 percent on his profit, because Congress has established that capital gains shall be taxed at that rate, and no more. The holder of oil royalties pays under a law that first permits him to pocket 27.5 percent of his royalties before figuring his tax. His $100,000 of oil royalties thus becomes $72,500 for tax purposes. If his royalties are from uranium, he may subtract 23 percent of those royalties, and if from a host of other minerals, 15 percent. Oil-property investors may also deduct about 80 percent of the cost of drilling a new well—even though the well may be an income-producing success.

These preferments are quite different from personal and family exemptions which make tax laws easier to administer and which recognize the subsistence needs of the lowest income groups.

There was a time when the practice of granting special tax favors was confined largely to the upper income-tax groups. But now Congress has begun to play favorites among the lower income groups. For instance:

Persons over 65 are allowed two exemptions of $600 each, instead of the one to which we are all entitled.

Retired persons over 65, in addition to $1,200 of exemptions, need not pay tax on a second $1,200 of their income.

Congress may well have been acting from its heart when it granted these tax shelters for elderly persons. But many retired persons also have dividend income from stock investments, and dividends are themselves partially sheltered.

The total effect is to permit some retired couples over 65 to be free of taxes up to $6,100 yearly.

What of the young married couple with a salary income of $6,100 a year? Their $6,100 buys no more than that of the elderly couple. Yet the young couple must give $864 of their $6,100 to the Government.

So lenient has Congress become in granting favors to special groups that it has adopted preferences which are sometimes hard to fathom.

An author's royalties are taxed as ordinary income, just like salaries. If the royalties are sizable, so is the tax. But an inventor never pays more than 25 percent on his royalties, no matter what their size, because they are classified by Congress as capital gains. Both forms of royalties are the result of creative talent and personal effort, yet when it comes to taxes they are judged unequally by Congress.

Another distinction by Congress is in the field of rewards for top executives. This distinction has made a method known as the executive stock option, an extremely fashionable one in recent years. It works like this: The company tells the executive that at any time in the next 5 years he may purchase a certain amount of its stock at a fixed price. Let us say that the stock is now selling at $100 a share. The company gives the executive an option to buy 2,000 shares at $95 a share. If the executive buys right away, he makes $10,000. But assuming he waits and the stock improves to 145 and he then buys, the executive makes $100,000.

Why doesn't the company simply reward its executive with an outright $100,000 bonus? The tax distinction explains why. The outright bonus would be taxed along with salary at the regular high rates of tax, and the executive would pay anywhere from 70 to 90 percent of it in taxes. But if the $100,000 comes from a stock option, the tax rate is only 25 percent, and the executive saves anywhere from $45,000 to $65,000.

By comparison, this 25-percent tax paid by the executive on his $100,000 stock-option profits is 1 percent less than the 26-percent rate an unmarried clerk making $5,100 a year pays on a bonus of $100.

And corporations also seek to soften the impact of high rates on their executives by sending them on vacations at company expense—calling it business. Or by maintaining yachts, airplanes, and vacation lodges which the corporations write off to business and which their executives use for pleasure.

Many believe that the success of our economic system is linked to the rewards it can offer the men who work or risk their money. The smaller the reward—a reward shriveled by taxes, for example—the less the urge to work and invest. Thus, when there are high taxes, many feel that a special lower tax for income from oil wells is necessary to induce investors to allocate their money for oil exploration. Likewise, it is felt, a tax consession on dividend income and a low capital-gains tax is needed to stimulate investment. Stock options—with their benefits taxed at special low rates—are urged as a desirable method of providing executives with a more direct interest in the success of their corporation.

Knowing as little as we do about the long-run effects of high tax rates, we must recognize that high tax rates might have an adverse effect on work and investment. We must remember that while our present remarkable level of prosperity was achieved under such high rates, it was also achieved under a tax system in which investors, by holding their stocks 6 months, paid only a 25-percent tax on their gains.

And yet, no one can say flatly what the privileged taxpayer would have done if he had been required to pay the same taxes as everyone else; and as a result, we don't really know whether the tax concessions are really as vital as claimed. Further, what yardstick can one use in choosing among enterprises and industries to determine which is more valuable for the country and should therefore be given a preferential tax break?

Arguments for special privilege based on the belief that incentive will be harmed are inconclusive and difficult to weigh. Many a group pressing for a tax break is simply dressing up in high-flown economic terms the dislike for high taxes that we all share. And the need for fairness—for treating equal incomes equally—is so vital under our tax system that if a particular industry is really in need of governmental aid, a direct grant or subsidy, wholly apart from the income tax, is the more appropriate method of furnishing that aid.

Other tax privileges are defended as necessary for relief against hardship, as in the case of the aged. But here also an income-tax concession is not the fair way to relieve hardship. The greatest benefits to such deductions go to people with the most taxable income. But if the hardship is suffered by those whose income is low, the special deduction offers insufficient aid.

The strongest objection to special exemptions, however, is that when Congress grants one favor it is encouraged to grant another and still another until the basic fabric of our tax system begins to unravel.

The extent to which taxpayer cynicism has developed as a consequence of special congressional legislation was illustrated not long ago in a Federal courtroom. A woman was being cross-examined in connection with a partnership set up by her husband to include not only herself but their small children as well. Under the law, a partnership group pays a lower overall tax than a sole proprietorship.

"Now," the prosecutor asked the wife, "do you participate in the management of the business?"

"Well, no," the wife replied. She had been too busy recently to participate.

"Too busy doing what?" the prosecutor demanded.

"Producing partners," the wife said.

Congress should call a halt to this income-tax schizophrenia. If it really thinks that very high tax rates are needed in the upper brackets, then it should apply the rates to all in that class. But if, as it appears, Congress really believes that those high rates impair incentives to work and invest, then it should lower those rates for all—equally. This reform should be accomplished directly in the tax tables and not through the addition of still more escape routes for favored groups.

Let Congress then lower the top rates of tax from 91 percent to 60 or 65 percent. But at the same time it lowers the rates let it wipe out the existing tax shelters. And then let it stick to the new rates and resist all further requests for special tax relief, no matter how strong the pressures.

The results would be quite startling.

Rather than losing money, the Government would be money ahead. If the top rates were reduced to 60 percent, the revenue loss, according to Treasury Department figures, would be $461 million; if top rates were reduced to 65 percent, the loss would be $314 million. Revenues now lost because of tax shelters erected by Congress against high rates easily exceed either figure.

If the Government then overhauled the whole tax-shelter system, it would find itself in possession of so much new revenue that it could cut all present tax rates by a considerable margin.

To put the case in its extreme form: If Congress were to eliminate all present departures from the basic rate table, all of the various exemptions of special items and all of the deductions for personal, nonbusiness expenses, then the income-tax revenues from individuals would rise from $32 billion to at least $46 billion. Since the Government now needs only $32 billion from individual income taxes, it could therefore cut all existing income-tax rates by about one-third.

While it may be too difficult after all these years to change all of these special treatment provisions today, the decrease in rates if only a few were changed would still be quite startling.

Suppose that Congress were to eliminate the exemption on State and municipal bond interest, much of the preferential treatment of capital gains, the special treatment of oil investors, the dividend and retirement credits, the deduction for interest on personal debts, State and local sales taxes and for real-estate taxes on nonbusiness property. The total tax yield would increase by $3 billion; therefore Congress, in addition to lowering top rates, could lower all rates sufficiently to save every taxpayer at least $50 a year.

Can this be done? Would it be political suicide for any Congressman to take the first step and vote to lower directly the rates of taxes on our wealthiest citizens?

Certainly there are political overtones in the history of income-tax rates in the United States. In 1913, when the 16th amendment authorized the Federal Government to levy taxes on incomes, the rate on the highest incomes was placed at 6 percent. As recently as 1932 the top rate was only 25 percent. Then, in the 1930's, the rate skyrocketed to 79 percent, first because there was a great need for revenues, and second because the extremes of wealth and poverty created by the depression and accentuated by the general atmosphere of the New Deal generated pressures that could permit no other action. But the income tax was still a tax on the privileged classes—it affected only 4 million taxpayers in 1939. When World War II came, the income tax spread from the country-club district down to the railroad tracks, and then to the other side. By 1945, it covered 43 million taxpayers, and its rates started at 23 percent and rose to 94 percent.

The Korean war and defense expenditures have kept the tax at high levels ever since.

Apparently Congress has felt that the only way it could justify the high rate for the mass of voters affected by the tax was to preserve at the same time the fantastically high rates in the top brackets. But out of sympathy for people paying those fantastic top-bracket rates, Congress has time and again granted exceptions.

Thus the Congressman can be friends with everyone. He can prove to labor that he favors high rates of tax on the wealthy by pointing to the tax tables he has supported with their awesome ceilings of 91 percent. At the same time, he can respond to special pressures by voting for the complex technical jargon that the people don't read but which transforms the 91-percent bracket to 25 percent for this select group or that particular taxpayer.

Compromise is the life of politics, and a Congressman must live that life. And compromise he will, so long as he believes that any open, direct reduction of the top income-tax rates would result in political reprisals.

But would labor protest strongly against tax reduction for the privileged, thereby making the needed reform impossible? Or would labor realize that these high rates are steadily bringing the entire income tax into disrepute through legislative cynicism, administrative inability to enforce those rates and increasing taxpayer tendency to cut corners? Would not labor understand that the alternative to a hopelessly weakened income-tax system is a Federal sales tax on consumer goods that would hurt its own members more than it hurts the wealthy?

In its simplest form, whether labor would agree or not, the argument against the present top rates comes down to this: Tax rates are too high if Congress believes they are too high and will not enforce them. And if Congress, instead of enforcing these rates, permits them to be tunneled through, the entire system is menaced. If Congress stops granting privileges, we all someday may be able to enjoy appreciably lower tax rates. If Congress does not, that day may never come.

Only when we have lower tax rates will we be rid of the special privileges and tax dodging that high rates create.

Only when we have lower tax rates will management and investors be free to make decisions on the basis of business factors and not of tax lures.

The cost of government must be met by taxes, and we must pay those taxes. As long as the load is distributed fairly, we will. But when the load shifts to one side, look out.

The overriding consideration is that our tax system must be kept fair. Let us give Congress the strength to resist political pressures for favoritism by supporting a tax law that permits no favorites. Only in this way will our taxes be kept sensible.

President Eisenhower and Agricultural Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, the American people need no assurance from anyone of the complete honesty, integrity, and devotion to the public interest of President Eisenhower.

He has demonstrated again those qualities in his courageous and unanswerable message accompanying his veto of H. R. 12.

During recent days, he has been confronted with a tremendously difficult problem. Neither he nor anyone else doubted the complete sincerity of many who supported H. R. 12. The fact that most of those Members of Congress have not joined in the specious and shallow criticism today of his action is convincing proof that they recognize his candid approach to this important problem, just as he recognizes their conscientiousness in reaching their decisions.

Any fair-minded person who will read the veto message must concede not only the President's grasp of this perplexing problem but his determination to act, so far as he can, in the best interests of those engaged in agriculture and of this Nation as a whole.

One paragraph states concisely the basic defect of H. R. 12, which was recognized by Republicans and Democrats alike when the conference report on it was before this House last Wednesday. Before quoting this paragraph from the message, I commend to all those interested a reading of portions of the RECORD of April 11, from page 5475 to page 5507, and, particularly, the short, excellent statement of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] at page 5493. Certainly he expressed concisely and forcibly the overwhelming opinion of the farmers and consumers of New England and of the entire Northeast when he said: "Farmers do not want this bill; consumers can only be against it." There is every reason to believe that an increasing number of farmers elsewhere and the great body of American consumers will share emphatically that point of view as the President's veto message becomes more widely read and understood.

The paragraph to which I have referred is as follows:

H. R. 12 would not correct this situation. It would encourage more surpluses. It would do harm to every agricultural region of the country and also to the interests of consumers. Thus it fails to meet the test of being good news for farmers and fair to all our people.

It is depressing and regrettable that a few, who should know better, have indulged in personalities and have resorted to shabby tactics in commenting upon the President's message this afternoon.

But quite apart from these trival, self-seeking, and defensive comments by certain persons who were primarily responsible for the monstrosity which was presented to Congress and the President, the challenge is now quite specific and inescapable. In the hope that a reading of the RECORD will assist in spreading actual information as to the President's message, I want to quote the three concluding paragraphs, which were as follows:

I now request Congress to pass a straight soil bank bill as promptly as possible. It should be in operation before fall seeding for next year's crops. It is vital that we get the soil bank authorized in this session of the Congress. There is general agreement on it. I am ready to sign a sound soil bank act as soon as Congress sends it to me. That can be accomplished in a very few days if the leadership in Congress will undertake the task.

This combined program of administrative action and legislation enactment will begin now to improve the income and welfare of all our farm families.

Here is a challenge for both the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government.

The President demonstrated that the executive branch of the Federal Government recognizes both the problem and the challenge confronting it. There is an equal responsibility now resting upon the Congress, and both the farmers and the consumers have every right to insist upon the prompt legislative action recommended by the President.

The Alaska Mental Health Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from a letter addressed to me by an old Alaskan pioneer which, I believe, speaks for itself. In view of some of the misrepresentations about the Alaska mental health bill that are being deliberately fostered in certain dank quarters, it seems to me time to have on the record a few real facts. One of them is that this bill means a great deal to the Territory and has tremendous support in Alaska. I submit this letter as evidence of that fact.

EDITH GREEN: I'm a pioneer sourdough of Alaska and the Olden Golden Klondike. I went there in 1896, when I was only 17 years of age. I lived in the northland 36 years.

THE ALASKA MENTAL HEALTH BILL

If I still lived in Alaska, and became mentally ill I would like to be where my friends and family could see me and see that I had proper care and treatment. A half million Alaskans agree with that. Why should anyone be sent thousands of miles from home, Alaska, and family? Alaskans are. Why? Because the Government and the people of the United States have refused to let us have the facilities to care for them in Alaska.

At the present time, the Territory of Alaska has no facilities whatever to care for their mentally ill. If one has the misfortune to become mentally ill in Alaska he is taken to court, charged with the crime of being insane, and if found guilty he is then lodged in jail until such time as someone who has been deputized can take him to Morningside in Portland, Oreg. Morningside has had contract to care for the Alaska mentally ill for years.

Is it so unpatriotic to want to care for our Alaska mentally ill properly instead of treating them like criminals? Alaskans are after all American citizens who pay Federal taxes, whose sons are drafted into the Armed Forces, who eat, dress, and talk like Americans. In fact, most of us come from the United States. That is why it is so difficult for us to understand why we are treated as though we are subversial aliens whenever it is necessary for us to make a trip to the States.

It is time that people realized that Alaska is a land with a great potential, populated by half a million American citizens who stand between you and Russia. We Alaskans have poured millions in the Treasury of the United States, but we have to fight bitterly for every mile of road, every piece of land, and even for a mental hospital. We are not allowed to control our fishing industry, nor are we allowed to vote.

Before people in the States get wild ideas about Alaska and what she needs, they would do well to get their information straight and do away with such abysmal ignorance. There may be "no taxation without representation" and "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," but not in Alaska.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES RAYMOND LITTLE.

Mr. Speaker, I also include in the Appendix the following resolution concerning the Alaska mental health bill H. R. 6376, adopted unanimously by members of the Alaska Territorial Medical Association at its meeting, February 20–22, 1956, held in Anchorage, Alaska:

Whereas Alaska's mentally ill are now held in jails while awaiting treatment, to the detriment of their health and condition; and

Whereas the organic act governing Alaska's mentally ill is barbaric, antiquated, and inhumane; and

Whereas the organic act prohibits any improvement in the existing conditions, without special act of Congress; and

Whereas many thousands of dollars could be saved by using modern mental health practices in the Territory; and

Whereas much heartbreak and unhappiness could be spared the people of the Territory with more humane laws allowing prompt, modern treatment for their loved ones; and

Whereas the Alaska Mental Health bill contains provisions to remedy these existing conditions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Alaska Territorial Medical Association strongly recommends and urges the Senate of the United States that the Alaska mental health bill H. R. 6376, which is now before that body, be passed.

Red Ink Cancellation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Lompoc (Calif.) Record of March 22, 1956:

RED INK CANCELLATION

For far too many years, Government officials have complained about the deficit in the United States Post Office Department. Year after year, the taxpayers have been called upon to dig up money out of their pockets to meet these deficits. The laments have been loud and long, but nothing of real consequence has been done about it.

Arthur E. Summerfield, Postmaster General, has proposed a change. He doesn't believe it necessary that the Post Office Department lose $1,000 per minute, an amount which would build 1,000 new $10,000 homes every week of the year. He blames these losses on the fact that the Post Office is charging 1932 rates but is paying 1956 costs. And he proposes that rates be boosted to a level which would make the Department self-supporting.

In the past, there has been a reluctance to boost the cost of first-class mail from 3 to 4 cents because of the possible political reverberations. The fact is, however, that John Q. Public would scarcely know that an increase has been invoked because he is not a very big user of the mails. Seventy-five percent of all letter mail originates with business. For the average family, the increase from 3 to 4 cents would amount to only 10 to 12 cents per month.

The fact is that under the present setup, the ordinary taxpayer is subsidizing business by paying most of the cost of business mail. Mr. Summerfield, a man of business himself, believes there is something a bit impractical in this situation and he has not been afraid to propose a change.

This Is My Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John Maragon, entitled "This Is My Story," which appeared in the April 5, 1956 edition of Roll Call:

On Friday afternoon I received my first week's pay for my duties in the House folding room. I clutched the green slip of paper with only two figures on it as though it were a thousand dollar bank note. It was the first money I had earned since 1949.

This was the realization of my hopes and prayers of 19 months and 18 days in a Federal penal institution. I had been convicted of perjury on two counts. Though I considered myself innocent (and I will, in this story, present my side for the first time), I held no bitterness. I was resigned to my fate. I was determined that when I was released I would try to take my place in the working world like everyone else.

HARD WORK

I was put to work in the mangling room of the laundry. I figured if I could do this hard work under such conditions, I could earn my living on the outside in some other manual work. As a boy I was a waterboy for the Union Pacific Railroad. I worked as a laborer. I had a tough struggle for many years, and I could do it again.

But it wasn't easy. After my release I made every effort to get a job in private industry. My friends who had benefited from me in previous days, were not so cordial now.

I was an ex-convict.

I was never convicted on the charges brought against me (influence peddling). I was convicted on two charges of perjury, resulting from my confusion before a closed session of the Senate committee.

FIRST COUNT

Three weeks prior to the hearings of Senator Hoey's subcommittee, in executive session, I appeared in room 101 for interrogation for the first time. Chief Counsel William Rogers (now Assistant Attorney General) and Mr. Flanagan, his assistant, asked me to submit copies of my income tax returns for 1946 the following morning. I did. They showed income of $6,000 from the Albert Verley Co., and $1,809.19 from the State Department. I also brought my withholding statement from the State Department, and in looking it over now, I see I actually reported more than I earned, since the withholding statement shows I was paid only $1,507.66.

Rogers and his staff asked me what I did for the State Department.

I replied that on a special mission to Greece I acted as interpreter. They asked if I purchased anything for the Verley Co. while in Europe with the State Department. I said "Yes," and told them I had purchased some essential oils and other things.

Three weeks later, at the executive session of the committee, after being questioned for several days, and being before nine Senators, I was asked if I had worked for anyone else other than Verley Co. I said, "No." I had no chance to correct the record. For this I was indicted and convicted, although I disclosed this information 3 weeks earlier to the committee staff. At no time was I ever represented by an attorney on all interrogation meetings and executive sessions, now to my regret.

SECOND COUNT

At an executive session of the Hoey committee I was seated directly in front of Mr. Hoey's desk. Mr. Rogers was on the right, about 5 feet away with Assistant Chief Counsel Flannagan and a secretary.

I was asked at what bank I had an account. I replied, "Liberty National Bank." After my testimony, Senator Hoey shook my hand and thanked me. As I prepared to leave, Mr. Rogers motioned to me.

Within hearing of Mr. Flannagan, Mr. Rogers said, "John you are getting yourself in trouble. You did not tell us about the account you had in a San Antonio bank."

I said, "Mr. Roberts, I am sorry, that account was used while with the B. & O. Railroad (for which I was employed) to accommodate tours to Mexico." This bank account was inactive for 3 years.

Mr. Rogers directed me to return to his office at 9 a. m. the next morning with any records I had of that bank.

When I got home that night my wife and I went up to the attic. We searched for hours through papers and records. I found some canceled checks and statements.

At 8:30, a half hour early, I appeared in room 101 and surrendered these documents. Again I had no attorney with me. I was questioned for 2 or 3 days. I disclosed everything.

To my shock and surprise they submitted to the grand jury my earlier testimony to the executive sessions and I was indicted and convicted without a chance to change my testimony.

DIDN'T TAKE STAND

None of these facts were brought out to the court and jury by my attorney during my trial who was no choice of mine. He advised against my taking the stand.

Shortly after I was found guilty, and while my appeal was pending, my attorney was appointed Special Attorney General, and was sent 3,000 miles from Washington. My prosecutor, an assistant district attorney, was promoted to Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Criminal Division.

M'CARRAN WRITES

An idea of the justness of these decisions might be gotten out of a letter written to Justice Jennings Bailey, United States district court, on December 8, 1950, after my indictment and conviction.

"I fully realize that Mr. Maragon erred but I do believe that he knows he erred and is sincerely aware of the extent to which he did so. He has been punished a great deal already, and his whole demeanor reveals the sincerity of his intention to straighten himself and return to a decent way of life.

"Another thought I have about this case is that John Maragon stands alone when there are some others who might easily be standing in his shoes right now, but are not, and who have received not one iota of punishment."

This letter, asking for consideration of probation was signed by Senator Pat McCarran, of Nevada, then chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Well, that's the story, and to bring it right up to date here are the final details.

Last week I approached my friend Representative HERMAN EBERHARTER, of Pennsylvania, and asked him for help in getting some kind of work. He was more than happy to help me. He gave me a letter to Representative FRANCIS WALTER, of Pennsylvania, asking for consideration. I was given a job in the folding room.

Less than 3 hours after going to work, I was accosted by three prominent members of the press demanding an explanation for my employment.

I told them I was working like anyone else, and that no explanations were necessary.

ONE DESIRE

The story appeared in the papers. The following morning I was severely attacked by a Member of Congress, challenging my right to work and casting doubts as to my trust and loyalty to my Government.

I wish at this time to deny unequivocally these charges.

I was never convicted as a "5-percenter," as accused.

Official records show that the charge that I replaced another employee is untrue.

Identifying me with Alger Hiss is a charge too ridiculous to dignify. However, my loyalty and love for my Government would never be questioned even by my worst enemies.

I only hope that I will be free from further publicity and further accusations. My only desire is to join the ranks of American workingmen to earn an honest wage, so that I may fulfill my obligations to my country and to my family.

Appraising Soviet Troubles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, we need calm perspective and experienced guidance today in charting a course to meet the most recent policies of the Soviet Union. Our planning requires accurate answers to such questions as:

What is the meaning of the current political upheaval in Russia?

What are the paramount objectives of the new Soviet policies?

And what is the logical focus of the ambitions of the new clique of rulers.

Some careful answers to these questions were offered in an editorial written by Publisher William R. Mathews, which appeared last week in the Arizona Daily Star of Tucson, Ariz. Mr. Mathews has long been a student of foreign affairs and his views deserve wide readership.

The editorial follows:

APPRAISING SOVIET TROUBLES

The outstanding fact made clear by the new domestic political troubles in the Soviet Union is that the revolution is over as far as the Soviet Union is concerned.

1. The Russian people, as a whole, accept the Communist society as an intimate part of their life. It is the only kind of society they know how to make work, because there are so few Russian people alive today who were adults when the revolution began.

There may be more changes in the palace guard; a new dictator may emerge, all of which would be a normal Russian development. There is little if any danger of any further revolutionary changes. Henceforth, they will be organic ones, such as modification of political and economic policies and practices now going on.

2. The present turn of events, the destruction of the Stalin-is-God legend, the emphasis on collective leadership, the glorification of Russian history, expresses a growing Russian nationalism which the Red army finds strengthening its hand. Since the death of Stalin the Soviet leaders have been tapping a vigorous native patriotism and determination of the Russian people to take care of themselves—the Soviet Union—ahead of everything else. As such, it represents a natural growth which, despite temporary confusion, will strengthen rather than weaken the Soviet Union.

3. The unconcern of the Soviet leaders and the people about the effect of this new development on foreign Communist Parties confirms that. These parties are left with uncertain direction as to doctrine; they are seriously discredited; their influence is weakened. As a result, they will have to put the soft pedal on the revolutionary program, and attempt to hold their own as participants in coalition or popular-front governments.

4. Of course, the Russian leaders and people will be confused for awhile. Political textbooks and histories will have to be rewritten; party personnel reindoctrinated; museums, like the Museum of the Revolution in Moscow, that were devoted to the glorification of Stalin, will have to be done over. What happens to the remains of Stalin, at present the Red Square mausoleum, may give a clue to the future line. However ridiculous the contradictions of the official explanations may appear to Americans, they will not only make sense to most Russians, but come as a gleam of new hope.

5. There will be no fundamental change in Soviet international policy. Moscow will continue to make itself appear as the dove of peace. That is good domestic as well as good international policy. The Red Army can be counted upon to see that future Moscow governments will keep close control over the satellites. Any Moscow government will have to support the historic policy of insulating Russia from the West.

6. Moscow will never cease looking after its interests, and quietly making trouble when it is to its interest to do so. It will shrink from getting involved in any war other than one clearly of self-defense. The Red Army will see to it that Soviet military strength will be maintained, but that should not be taken to mean that the Red Army will make a surprise attack on us or our allies.

7. In appraising Soviet intentions we should, at all times, bear in mind that the Russian people have suffered as no other people have suffered. They have memories not only of the invasions of 1914 and 1941 but of the civil war of 1917–21, of which the older ones speak with horror. Moreover, families of Russian political leaders shared the awful sufferings of World War II. Consequently, not until time effaces these nightmarish memories, does any Moscow government dare to risk war. To the contrary, it will go to great lengths to keep its country at peace because that is the best way it can win the support of the people. The people will never rise up to overthrow a government that maintains peace. That is the main reason why there will be no civil war at this time.

8. Behind these factors is another grassroot development. Within the Soviet Union economic conditions have improved rapidly, and are far ahead of what they were in 1937 and 1939. The gigantic experiment in socialism is beginning to tick. As conditions improve, the hopes of the people and of the leaders will grow. The leaders see the prospect of giving their country a successful economy with many new benefits to themselves, as well as the people. War would ruin most of this progress, and the prospects of being the builders of a successful socialistic society. Hence, this common objective will cause the people and the leaders to watch their step for some years to come.

Conclusion: The Soviet Union is destined to grow stronger economically, and its people to enjoy a constantly improving standard of living and a freer society. Its armament tempo will attempt to keep pace with ours, and will be stimulated by bellicose statements by our military and political leaders.

We must distinguish between Soviet intentions and ability to launch a war of aggression and its abilities and intentions to defend itself. Soviet leaders and Soviet people do respect American industrial technique and they fear our military strength. Their own self-interest will keep them for many years—possibly 10—from doing anything that would involve them in war with us. Such is the one great benefit of our action in Korea.

Behind all of this attitude, however, is the fact that the revolution within the Soviet Union is over, and that today the Soviet Union emerges as the new Russian empire which, as it grows stronger, can be counted upon to develop the traditional Russian ambitions, particularly in the Balkans and the Middle East.

Paradoxical as it may be, the growing economic strength and prosperity within the Soviet Union will compel any Russian government to look for more fuel. That nearly one-half of the oil reserves of the world lie within the Persian Gulf area fits in with the traditional Russian interest in the Middle East, and forecasts clearly what we must be prepared to meet in the future.

Overnight Accommodations in the Everglades National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members the following editorial which points out the inconsistent position of the National Park Service of the United States Department of the Interior with respect to providing overnight accommodations in the Everglades National Park.

The position taken seems particularly strange in view of the recent release of mission 66 and the recommended improvement for facilities throughout the rest of our national park system.

The comments expressed by John Pennekamp in the editorial of the Miami Herald of April 13, 1956, which follows,

are not to be taken lightly. For many years he has been interested in conservation and park development and this the National Park Service has recognized on several occasions; he has served in public positions dealing with those subjects and has acquired in his years of study and service, an extensive knowledge and understanding of the park problem. He perhaps more than any other person was responsible for the establishment of the Everglades National Park. I am confident that he understands and interprets correctly the needs of our area and that park.

BEHIND THE FRONT PAGE

(By John Pennekamp)

Why did Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service, suddenly turn thumbs down on overnight housing facilities in Everglades National Park?

The question remains unanswered, and becomes more puzzling with each news release of the United States Department of the Interior.

Many of them tell of the installation of such facilities in other parks, or of the expansion of existing facilities.

One release says that present facilities in the parks care for 26,000 persons and they are to be increased immediately to accommodate 54,000.

"To help alleviate critical shortages of public accommodations and interpretative facilities," said a recent release, "the Service moved ahead on a $5 million building program in 8 park areas."

Wirth did his about face just about a year ago. Previously, he had prepared plans for concessioner bidding, which included housing facilities.

His decision came about a month after a meeting of American Automobile Association executives in Miami Beach. The AAA always has been influential with the National Park Service.

Following the Miami Beach meeting a representative of the AAA forecast Wirth's change of mind.

But, the AAA administrators insist they had no part in Wirth's turnabout. They exhibit a resolution passed at their meeting which does not suggest the course he took. The Florida chapter of the AAA this year sent Wirth a resolution urging the installation of accommodations.

Wirth, himself, firmly asserts that the decision is his own and that he was not influenced.

He has remained adamant in the face of requests for reconsideration from Senators Spessard L. Holland, George Smathers, Representative Dante Fascell, Gov. LeRoy Collins, and many others.

They have pointed out, among other things, that Wirth's reversal runs against the State's reasons for contributing $2 million for the purchase of inholdings in the park, and 900,000 acres of land and water.

He was assistant park director when the State's gift was made and took part in the negotiations.

Only last week the Department of the Interior put out a release calling for bidding by concessioners in Mount McKinley National Park in Alaska.

"A real opportunity for a potentially good business operation awaits some enterprising individual or company to provide visitor accommodations in Mount McKinley National Park in Alaska," the release begins.

Another release tells of a contract to provide concession facilities, "accommodations, and services at Mesa Verde National Park, Colo., for 5 years, adding, "Last year the company provided overnight accommodations for 30,000 visitors."

A release about Yellowstone said:

"Wirth explained that the proposed contract would require the Yellowstone Park Co. to spend not less than $3.5 million prior to 1961 on the new facilities.

"Of this, approximately $2 million, he said, would be used to construct a lodge, cabin units, and other facilities," And:

"The $1.5 million balance of the $3.5 million expenditure required of the company prior to 1961 would be used for motel and other concession facilities at lake and elsewhere in the park."

In Mount Rainier National Park, Wash., says another release, a 1-year concession contract will provide visitor accommodations.

There are several others, all leading to the conclusion that for some unexplained reason, the national park director has decided to treat our park as something apart.

Seattle Port Modernization Pays Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the following news item will be of special interest to Members of Congress who represent legislative districts in which are located seaports with shipping facilities. The article is taken from the Seattle Daily Journal of Commerce, of April 3, 1956, and one has only to follow its description of the program of the port of Seattle, which is a municipal corporation, to envisage progress and development on the local level which is most encouraging to those of us who are trying to prevent the scuttling of the American merchant marine.

A port development program on the local level is only a part of the picture. To have ships to use modern facilities it is necessary to have cargoes. That is where the Cargo Preference Act comes in, which provides for at least half of Government owned or financed cargoes being transported in American ships.

Another factor is the eliminaion of whipsawing in labor negotiations as between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. The common termination date of labor-management contracts, I feel, will help restore confidence in shipping and thus in due course our shipping industry may be able to survive and serve the Nation and its people in stimulating general prosperity.

The article follows:

SEATTLE PORT MODERNIZATION PAYS OFF

(By Edward P. Tastrom)

The port of Seattle is in the midst of a long-range modernization and expansion program that is beginning to pay off in rising foreign commerce and improved port earnings.

The allocation of approximately $5 million of a $9 million budget for 1956 for port improvement work comes on top of outlays aggregating $8,875,000 over the past 3 years for property acquisitions and capital investment in port facilities.

Port officials say these extensive outlays are beginning to pay off. On a tonnage basis, Seattle's foreign shipping last year was the greatest since 1927. Total volume of 1,249,382 tons was some 42 percent higher than the preceding year. The 1955 import tonnage was the heaviest since 1920 and exports the biggest since 1952.

These tonnage gains are reflected in net income earned by the Port of Seattle. In 1953 the port agency had a net loss of $35,000. But in 1954 the port's net income was in the black to the tune of $88,000. This improved further last year to $95,000.

PLANNED PROJECTS

Of the capital outlays scheduled for this year, the largest sum—$1,500,000—will be used at the Seattle-Tacoma International Airport to develop facilities to meet the area's rapidly growing air traffic and the coming jet age.

The remainder of the appropriation will be used for waterfront improvement. This includes an outlay of $962,000 to complete the $3 million East Waterway Terminal modernization; $300,000 for possible development of a rail freight car ferry terminal on Harbor Island; $900,000 for improvement and reconstruction of three waterfront piers and $300,000 for improvements to the Fishermen's Terminal.

During the past 3 years all of the port's facilities have come in for their share of modernization and improvement.

The biggest job was the Hanford Street grain elevator where $2,600,000 was spent on expansion and improvements. Work was started in the spring of 1954 and is now virtually completed. The addition of five new steel storage bins, each of 700,000 bushels capacity, has lifted the terminal's storage from 2,300,000 to 5,800,000 bushels.

Grain handling has been speeded up considerably through linking the new storage space with the present loading elevator; by construction of a new car dump; and by construction of a truck and trailer dump. The new dumps require considerably less manpower, while speeding up unloading time considerably.

The modernized elevator, leased to Cargill, Inc., is designed to offset the competitive advantage previously held by Columbia River elevators.

PROFITABLE ACQUISITION

An important addition made last year was the Ames Terminal which was purchased for $850,000 and brought the port's owned terminals to 23. The 24-acre area, together with 2 adjoining tracts which are to be acquired shortly, is being viewed for eventual use as a sea-train facility.

Ames terminal, used mainly for shipment of cargo to the Arctic for construction of the Air Force radar network, was the most profitable of the port's facilities last year, turning in a profit of $132,000 from March 1, 1955, when it was acquired through the end of the year.

Considerable progress also has been made on the East Waterway Terminal on Harbor Island. This program was started in 1953 with reconstruction of 56,000 square feet of wharf space at a cost of $392,000.

The following year an L shaped transit shed was built at a cost of $174,000, and last year the central portion of the wharf was constructed at an outlay of $500,000. A contract for $400,000 awarded recently will complete the work and provide East Waterway with a terminal having a 75-foot wide apron for handling all types of cargo at three 570-foot berthing spaces.

TANK FARM IN OPERATION

Also constructed last year at East Waterway was a $300,000 tank farm for non-petroleum oils such as fish, tung and linseed. Placed in operation last August, it is meeting the increasing needs of bulk-liquid industries in the Northwest. An unusual feature is the heating of tanks radiantly by hot water

coils below the container instead of the usual method of coils placed in the tanks.

Five tanks, originally at this location, have been retained for storage of molasses. Their capacity of 2.1 million gallons brings total storage at East Waterway to 4,553,600 gallons.

An additional 81 acres acquired north of the Seattle-Tacoma airport will permit lengthening runways to 10,400 feet to provide adequate landing and take-off room for jet airliners. Part of the extension was made last year and the job will be completed by 1957.

In order to facilitate handling of the steadily rising volume of air freight the port in 1954 completed the first unit of an air cargo terminal costing $350,000.

Total air freight and air express handled last year was 32,500,000 pounds, a gain of 14 percent over the preceding year.

A new project just recently undertaken is a multimillion dollar long-range program for development of the Duwamish Green River Valley into industrial sites.

The proposed undertaking would result in changing highway and railway rights-of-way, straightening out the winding Duwamish River channel, dredging it to permit barge navigation and ultimately transforming land now mainly used for agriculture into attractive industrial acerage. It is expected that approximately 36,000 acres can be developed for this purpose.

It is estimated that the program will cost $15 million and be financed through a special bond issue.

The operation and development of the port is under the government of a three-man commission. The commissioners, appointed for 6-year terms, are Clarence H. Carlander, president; E. H. Savage, vice president, and M. J. Weber, secretary. Howard M. Burke is port general manager.

Shortsighted Industrialist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Reading (Pennsylvania) New Era:

SHORTSIGHTED INDUSTRIALIST

Another big industrialist has teed off against labor. He is Cola G. Parker, president of the National Association of Manufacturers, who let go recently against what he called "union bosses." He also interpreted the AFL-CIO merger as being dangerous.

This kind of thinking is most unfortunate at a time when industry and labor should be moving closer together as partners in a free economy that is threatened by a dictatorial communism in which neither labor nor industry are free.

Parker objected to the fact that labor leaders are getting more and more politically active. He's wrong. It's not the leaders who are getting more active—it's workers themselves who, in many instances, must prod the leadership into action.

We often wonder why big business makes so much noise opposing labor's legislative programs. Would they repeal social security, minimum wages, bank deposit insurance, farm price props, subsidies for industry, Federal spending for atomic power, and all the other measures backed by labor?

If they wouldn't, then why all the howls about labor's political activity? Anyone studying economic facts of the last 2 decades knows that our present prosperity is based upon a widespread distribution of our wealth. And this came about largely as a result of liberal, labor-backed legislation.

Obviously, workers, and labor leaders who represent workers, are concerned about saving these gains and moving forward to greater prosperity. And Mr. Parker takes a shortsighted view when he objects to such use of democratic institutions as the ballot to achieve a better life for everyone.

It should be obvious by this time that when the masses are prosperous, industry automatically makes money.

Maybe one of these days someone in big business will be honest enough to admit it.

Pay for 6-Month Trainees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly explain the purpose of my bill, H. R. 8107, to amend the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended.

The Reserve Forces Act of 1955 authorized new special enlistment programs in the Reserve. One of these programs, made available to persons under the age of 18½, authorized enlistments in the Reserve for a period of 8 years. These persons are obligated to perform an initial period of active duty for training of 6 months and thereafter must serve in the Reserve for 7½ years. Section 262 (d) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended, limits the pay of these reservists to $50 per month. In contrast, other persons performing active duty for training, including members of the National Guard, receive the pay authorized for their individual grades, in any case, not less than $78 per month. The bill would equalize the pay received by persons undergoing the 6 months' training in the armed services so that all such persons would receive pay at the rate of $78 per month.

The bill also provides that persons who are disabled or die as a result of disease incurred while in training will be qualified for all of the benefits of Public Law 108, 81st Congress, which law extends the reservists and national guardsmen, who qualify thereunder, the same pension, compensation, death gratuity, retirement pay, hospital benefits, and pay and allowances as are authorized by law or regulation for members of the Regular components. Under this same law all persons will also be covered for disability and death as a result of injury received while in training for the 6 months' program.

The bill also is made retroactive to August 9, 1955, which is the effective date of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955, except that no additional basic pay shall be paid to any member of the Reserve for any period prior to the first date of the calendar month in which the bill is approved.

The reason these provisions of the bill are necessary is that the Comptroller General has held that because of the restrictive language appearing after clause 3 of subsection 262 (d) reservists undergoing 6 months of active duty for training cannot count this time in determining eligibility for retirement and for retired pay purposes of title III, Public Law 810, 80th Congress. The opinion implies that neither would this time be counted for longevity pay purposes. This produces an incongruous result since these reservists who enlist for a period of 8 years can count the remaining 7½ years, which they spend in the Reserve components, for longevity pay and retirement purposes. By virtue of the language of the bill all persons who have entered the program since its inception and all enlistees in the future will be entitled to compute the 6 months of active duty for training for longevity pay and retirement purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I fel that enactment of H. R. 8107 will give impetus to the 6 months' training program. Undoubtedly, the disparity in pay between reservists, national guardsmen, and others performing initial active training has retarded Reserve enlistments. Even so, I am happy to report that as of April 6, and since October 1, 1955, when the program was first implemented, 17,185 persons have enlisted in the Army Reserve in order to participate in this new training program. For instance, in the period of March 9 to April 6, 5,165 enlisted in the Army Reserve. In the past 2 weeks more than 1,000 trainees throughout the country have been graduated and have returned to their homes to take up training with their home units. The Army intends to graduate trainees in 2-week cycles, and I think we can look forward to young men completing this program and returning to their home units in ever increasing numbers.

They Are Our Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call to the attention of the Members an editorial which notes the 66th anniversary of Pan-American Day.

The solidarity of the Western Hemisphere is one of the great bulwarks of the free world and particularly for support of the United States. This unity should be expressed by us socially, culturally, politically, and, even more important, economically.

It is indeed tragic to view what is almost an indifferent attitude in economic matters which the United States exhibits toward the Latin American Republics. This apathy is alarming not only because it has a tendency to strain the links of friendship between us, in view of our expenditures and assistance

in other parts of the world, but because it points up our shortsightedness in not appreciating that the greatest potential consumer-market in the world outside the United States lies with the Latin American people. Our expanding economy, both agricultural and industrial, demands new markets. New markets for our products are essential for our own economic well-being. It seems only logical from the standpoint of good business and friendship to deal first with our closest friends and supporters.

Miami, Fla., is the largest gateway to South America, and the great Knight newspapers expressed very pointedly the feelings of the North Americans in south Florida who enjoy a spiritual as well as geographical closeness to their friends and neighbors in South America. The editorial follows:

[From the Miami Herald of April 14, 1956]

THEY ARE OUR RESPONSIBILITY

Today is the 66th anniversary of Pan American Day.

In these times when the possibility of another world war could easily be sparked by the critical Israeli-Arab tensions in the Middle East, Pan Americanism has tremendous significance for the people of this hemisphere. And that includes us in particular.

The American Republics united in April 1890 to form the association which is known today as the Organization of American States. It is the oldest international association in the world.

It has accomplished much as a peacemaker, especially in recent years when it prevented flare-ups in certain countries to the south from developing into full-scale war.

It has been the guiding spirit behind numerous treaties and agreements and agencies which have aided OAS in one of its principal objectives—safeguarding the peace and freedom of the Western Hemisphere.

OAS has had a hard road to travel in making its second objective fully effective—achieving just and decent living conditions for the peoples of America.

As the wealthiest Nation in the world, we have loaned and given away billions upon billions of dollars to all sorts and conditions of people in all sections of God's green footstool.

Our neighbors to the south, our friends and the suppliers of essential raw material—whether for peace or war—have gotten a niggardly sum by any comparison.

It is time that the United States woke up. Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS warned the Senate in a Pan-American Day speech this week that:

1. Latin Americans have awakened from apathy and resignation.

2. They are seething with discontent and no longer accept gnawing hunger and disease as their portions.

3. Every Latin nation is under constant, insidious attack from the Communists. We must be fluid to meet every new challenge.

This is not a partisan election-year speech. Senator SMATHERS has been telling both parties these facts in season and out.

Latin America has received only 2.5 percent of our foreign aid since World War II.

No sane-thinking North American will quarrel with the Senator's conclusion that "we cannot escape our responsibility. Those people are entitled to a better share."

Or have we forgotten the beachhead that the Soviets had established just a little while ago in Guatemala?

Or are we so stupid to think that the Communists gave up in Latin America when Castello Armas ran them out of Guatemala?

Containment Is Obsolete

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, in recent years few Americans have shown keener insight into the problems of Asia and the frame of mind of its peoples than Justice William O. Douglas.

A few weeks ago Justice Douglas delivered an address in Chicago in which he stated his belief that only strong political measures of an affirmative character can avert a serious debacle for American policies in Asia.

I know his provocative comments will interest those who are concerned about the future of Asia, I present herewith a summary of this address:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

CONTAINMENT IS OBSOLETE

It is almost trite to say these days that the world is in revolution. Yet the implications of that revolution are still not truly appreciated at the high levels of Government and have hardly percolated to the mass of the people.

We have oversimplified the problem by thinking of it in terms of communism and Communists. We have leveled our big guns of propaganda, public opinion, and law against communism and the Communists. We shaped our policy in negative terms—in anti-Communist measures, in anti-Communist strategy, in anti-Communist alliance.

We have saturated the public mind with anti-Communist attitudes and with loyalty oaths. We have put on one of the greatest hunts in history, looking for the subversive. And we have implemented this attitude with a foreign policy that is largely military in conception.

I do not belittle the Communist threat to the world. I think it is much more serious even than we have imagined. Its seriousness, however, is increased by our negative response to it. I go further, and maintain that with this negative approach which we have taken to date, we stand to lose the battle for the political balance in the world. Only strong political measures of an affirmative character can present a serious debacle.

GAME OF POWER POLITICS

While we thought that Russia and communism were safely contained, the Soviets changed their tactics. Under Stalin, the Soviets were darkly conspiratorial, not participating in the game of power politics. Today they are operating along broad political fronts on every continent, playing the ancient game of power politics with skill and suavity.

That single change in tactics has made the whole theory of containment obsolete and outdated.

A smiling, friendly Russia has now appeared behind all our ramparts. She now asks for peace, offering help to subjugated and impoverished people, and tendering her friendship without military pacts or alliances to all who will collaborate.

The balance of political power in the world lies, I think, in Asia. It has the bulk of the people of the world, and the bulk of the riches as well. Asia is the center of the great revolutions that were loosened on the heels of World War II.

Four main influences in Asian psychology indicate why the Soviets have been able to grow in influence and prestige in Asia.

ASIANS LONG FOR EQUALITY

The Asians' desire to be rid of feudalism, the desire for independence, the longing for equality, the dream of the socialist state—these have all been made powerful rallying calls by the Communists.

First, as to feudalism. The Russians have inveighed against the landlords, the oligarchy that controls a nation, the combination of ecclesiastical and propertied interests that own the wealth and run a country. The Russians are more clearly identified with this issue in Asia than we are, though we have done some good things in this regard.

Second, as to the independence movement in Asia. We actually have a splendid record on this issue, for we took the lead by granting the Philippines their independence at the end of World War II. But somehow or other, we never received much credit for it in Asian circles. And we opposed Indonesian independence so long that today in Jakarta we are often identified with the forces that tried to keep that nation under colonial rule.

Third, as to the equality of people. This is a firm article of the American faith; and we have done much at home and in the Philippines to extol it. But generally speaking, that has not been reflected in our Asian policy. Our attitudes have been conditioned by our outlook. Our outlook has been primarily military. Those who refuse us military alliances become suspect. And those suspicions are telegraphed to the sensitive Asian mind as arrogance stemming from a superiority complex.

Fourth, as to socialism. Russia, the Socialist state, makes great capital out of the fact that she already has the Socialist regime which the other Asian nations have only in blueprint stage. Russia poses as the model—as the inspiration for the new Socialist states that are emerging from feudalism.

MAN HUNT RESULTS IN TIMIDITY

We are protagonists of capitalism, not socialism. Moreover, we tend to be suspicious of Socialists. We condemn socialism at home. And the man hunt we have been under these long years since World War II has made us timid.

Those years have, I fear, made us wary of ideas. They have taught us that orthodoxy is the safest course. The reign of intolerance, which we have experienced, has narrowed our horizons and made us less daring and imaginative in our thinking. The result in official and public attitudes toward Asia has been near tragic.

I have mentioned mostly minuses. There are of course, pluses. We have had emissaries in Asia who have made us friends. We have had training programs and technical missions of talent, notably the Ford Foundation project in India and Pakistan, that have given impetus to democratic leanings and have helped the Asians master their own affairs. But by and large, American prestige in Asia has waned.

We enter the last half of the 20th century having lost most of the advantages we once enjoyed over Soviet Russia. But we still have one that is imperishable, one that can be decisive in the battle for the minds and hearts of the uncommitted people of the world.

THE CONCEPTS OF FREEMEN

That advantage is in the concepts of liberty, freedom, equality, and due process, which are deeply ingrained in our way of life.

These ideas of liberty mean freedom of expression, freedom of thought, and freedom of conscience that have no counterpart in Russia.

These ideas of liberty leave room for political, literary, and artistic idiosyncracies which Russia does not tolerate.

These ideas of liberty tolerate the unorthodox as well as the orthodox.

These ideas recognize true political equality of people of all races and creeds.

These ideas reject the Marxist philosophy of one master plan to which all men must bow.

These ideas constitute the one true advantage we have over the totalitarian world. They can bring us victory if we will only make them vital forces in our domestic affairs and translate them into affirmative foreign policy.

Progress to Chaos in Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial that appeared in the Monroe Evening Times on the subject of the farm bill. This is a timely editorial and has provoked considerable discussion in Green County which is within my congressional district. The editorial follows:

PROGRESS TO CHAOS

Day by day, step by step, the Democrats and the rigid price prop bloc in Congress are maneuvering agriculture closer to a position of no farm legislation which can bring relief this year.

In fact, the whacking and carving achieved by the Senate-House conference committee on the omnibous farm bill give every appearance of deliberately contrived moves to insure a veto of the final form of the bill when it reaches the White House.

It was interesting to note that on every case where pressure has been applied by special interest Members of Congress, the conferees caved in. Their excuse was that they had to yield to get any form of bill at all.

That certainly sounds like anything but wise and sincere attempts at writing proper legislation.

It also was interesting to hear our friend, Senator ELLENDER, a cotton State Democrat, declare offhandedly: "I think the President will sign this bill. He's getting about everything he asked for, including the big thing, the soil bank. Of course, there are a couple of little gadgets he doesn't want."

We are not sure what ELLENDER mean by "gadgets." If he was referring to the retreat from flexible to high rigid price supports, he was insulting the intelligence of the American farmers, the President, those who have worked for a genuine solution to crop surpluses, and those Senators who voted for flexible support.

The administration's farm program was presented as a studied proposal for trying to make supports realistic, for moving agriculture toward the goal of every farmer—100 percent parity in the market place. It was not whimsical, nor was it political in the sense of a bill to woo votes.

Had it been the latter, you can be certain there would have been plenty of "pie in the sky" promises and extra subsides.

It could be that the opposition strategists are being just a little too cute this time. By kicking the farm bill around in the hope that its battered final version would put Mr. Eisenhower in a vulnerable political spot, they have just about made certain there will be no farm legislation at this session.

We think the farmers deserve something better than that at the hands of Congress. We think Mr. Eisenhower would have been willing to sign any legislation which seemed to promise help for the farmers this year, even if the administration was obliged to accept various compromise plans and differences of opinion.

But when the main purposes of the legislation is killed, when the principal structure is destroyed in favor of a return to the very measures which put the farming industry in its present position, it scarcely seems possible that Mr. Eisenhower can avoid a veto. To approve such legislation without a fight would be a betrayal to the farmers.

Bulganin Assailed for Treachery in World War II—Polish Patriots Refused Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to direct the attention of the Members of the House to a very significant article that appeared in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald. It is an attack upon Premier Nikolai Bulganin for his utter disregard of a plea to help 50,000 Polish patriots during the 63-day Warsaw uprising against the Nazis in August 1944. Because these charges are leveled by one who was in a position to know, they cannot be passed off as irresponsible or false.

The reason behind Bulganin's refusal to help these courageous Polish patriots is not difficult to fathom. There is no doubt, and subsequent events bare this out, that the Kremlin was intent on carving up for itself the Polish nation. Bulganin and company did not want the uprising to succeed. The obstacles and difficulties they placed in the path of success doomed the uprising.

Mr. Speaker, this is the same Bulganin that today prates about peaceful intentions of his government. He is the same man, in company with his boss Khrushchev, who is now knocking on the doors of nations all around the globe holding out the hand of friendship. It is well to remind those who would clasp it that history records this same hand as one of cold-blooded, black treachery.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following statement of Sir John Slessor, wartime air marshal of England:

BRITISH LEADER ASSAILS BULGANIN ON WAR II ACT

KOENIGSWINTER, WEST GERMANY, April 15.—Marshal of the Air Force Sir John Slessor, one of Britain's wartime air chiefs, today lashed out at Soviet Premier Nikolai Bulganin for having "a leading responsibility for the coldest blooded, blackest hearted bit of treachery" of World War II.

"This was Russia's refusal to help 50,000 Polish patriots during the 63-day Warsaw uprisings against the Nazis in August 1944," he said.

Slessor, who retains his rank by courtesy although he has retired from the Air Force, was addressing the German-English Society here while Bulganin and Russian Communist Party Chief Nikita Khrushchev were on their way to Britain for a visit.

He recalled that in 1944 he was responsible for supplying the Polish resistance army led by Gen. Tadeusz Bor-Komorowski. This had to be done from Italy, 800 miles away, over enemy territory "when the other so-called ally was in the suburbs of Warsaw," Slessor said.

(At one time the Soviet Government, whose troops were outside the city, objected to British and American planes landing on Soviet soil after dropping supplies to the insurgeants because it said it did not want to associate itself in any way with what is called "the adventure in Warsaw.")

"The man who had a leading responsibility at that time in what in my view is the coldest-blooded, blackest-hearted bit of treachery in the whole history of war is a man called Bulganin," Slessor said.

(At that time Bulganin was Soviet representative on the Moscow-sponsored Polish Committee of Liberation which, unlike the exile government in London, condemned the uprising as premature.)

Discussing Russia's recent disarmament proposal in London, which he attributed to Bulganin, Slessor said: "There is only one thing we should carry in the foreground of our minds—never trust a Russian Communist further than you can kick him."

Pan-American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, Pan-American Day, the day before yesterday, should have reminded us of the reasons that bring together the various American Republics and cause them on this historic day to celebrate their solidarity and the common interests that bind them together.

One hundred and thirty years ago, Simon Bolivar gave impetus to the idea of pan-Americanism at the Congress of Panama. It was chiefly through his efforts, at this Congress, that the blueprint for inter-American cooperation was drawn.

Bolivar's dream became a reality at the first Inter-American Conference, held in Washington, in 1890; for it was at this assemblage of American States that the cornerstone of pan-Americanism was laid with the establishment of the Pan American Union.

Later Inter-American Conferences provided a firm foundation for the growth and expansion of hemispheric cooperation, and at Bogota in 1948, the Ninth Inter-American Conference gave permanent structure and authority to the already proven system of pan-Americanism by establishing the Organization of American States.

Each successive conference contributed positive achievements to the structure. As the system grew the American Republics have shown their ability to work together to promote peace and security; they have agreed that international law and good faith should govern their future relations; and they have provided for cooperative action for economic, social and cultural development.

It was appropriate that on the 66th anniversary of the establishment of the Pan American Union that the American Republics should express their confidence that this inter-American system, which is based on the equality of all American States and has promoted fellowship and mutual cooperation amongst its members for so many years, shall continue to progress and to contribute to hemispheric welfare and security in the future.

The Problem of Security in Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Edwin F. Schleifer of Milwaukee, Wis., has called my attention to a recent article by George E. Sokolsky entitled "British Take More Realistic View of Red Infiltration." Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article, as follows:

I am now reading the speeches that were delivered at the 20th congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which started all the hub-bub of making a bum out of Stalin. The speeches are long and tiresome. Khrushchev's speech runs 116 pages which is a lot of talk under any circumstance.

It is a labor to little real purpose, perhaps more valuable for a Ph. D. than a journalist, because no matter what was said, it brought important changes not only within Russia but in nearly all countries. These speeches are being used as an excuse for more intensive neutralism and have become an embarassment to such a government as the present one in Great Britain which, in effect, is being invaded by the topmost Russian officials in one of the most brilliantly planned publicity stunts designed to shape world public opinion.

Another document before me is the "Statement on the Findings of the Conference of Privy Councillors on Security." It is not the report that was made to the British Government but a summary of it issued to the public as a white paper.

The conference "pointed out that, whereas once the main risk to be guarded against was espionage by foreign powers carried out by professional agents, today the chief risks are presented by Communists and by other persons who for one reason or another are subject to Communist influence. The Communist faith overrides a man's normal loyalties to his country and induces the belief that it is justifiable to hand over secret information to the Communist Party or to the Communist foreign power. This risks from Communists is not, however, confined to party members, either open or underground, but extends to sympathizers with communism."

This has been the attitude of American Congressional committees since Martin Dies and is called by the Communists, McCarthyism. In the last sentence of the quotation it is assumed that the fellow-traveler is as wicked as the member of the party and the only way to establish a fellow-traveler according to nearly 20 years of investigation, has been by association.

While guilt by association always leads to great injustices, it is only right that a government should resolve some doubts in its own favor, what it amounts to is a decision that when in doubt, there should be no employment.

This report was prepared by members of both parties, including Earl Jowitt who wrote a book in defense of Alger Hiss; nevertheless its 15th paragraph contains a statement of the rights of the government over the rights of the individual which almost amounts to a constitutinal change in Great Britain:

"The conference is of the opinion that in deciding these difficult and often borderline cases, it is right to continue the practice of tilting the balance in favor of offering greater protection to the security of the state rather than in the direction of safeguarding the rights of the individual. They recommend that an individual who is living with a wife or husband who is a Communist or a Communist sympathizer may, for that reason alone, have to be moved from secret work, and that the same principle should be applied in other cases of a like nature."

The Russians sure have changed our world even against our wishes. No such statement would have appeared in an official British report two generations ago.

Address of Hon. Clair Engle at Annual Convention of National Wildlife Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, one of the biggest meetings in the conservation field is the annual convention of the National Wildlife Federation State affiliates. It is attended by delegates representing 3 million sportsmen and lay conservationists throughout the Nation.

This year's convention was held last month in New Orleans, just prior to the North American Wildlife Conference.

The keynote speaker at the 20th annual convention was our colleague, the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A distinguished conservationist, the Honorable CLAIR ENGLE, of California, advised members of one of the largest conservation groups to get behind an affirmative program of conservation legislation instead of concentrating on winning negative victories.

An audience of 250 heard his speech. Among them were delegates from State wildlife federations and sportsmen's leagues, together with the leaders of practically all the national conservation organizations—the Izaak Walton League of America; Wildlife Management Institute; International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners; the Wilderness Society; National Parks Association; National Audubon Society; the Wildlife Society; American Fisheries Association; Sport Fishing Institute; Nature Conservancy; American Forestry Association; American Nature Association; Sierra Club, and others.

I am sure my colleagues will be interested in this important and timely address, which follows:

Hon. CLAIR ENGLE. Thank you very much, Mr. Woodward, for that very complimentary introduction. I am not only flattered by that fine introduction but I am also proud and happy to be here.

I am not quite sure whether or not you are prepared for a serious discussion tonight but I am convinced that within the confines of this room there is a deeper concentration of real conservationists than you could get into a room of comparable size anywhere else in the country.

Of course, I hope that you ladies here do not mind listening to legislation for I have been informed by the toastmaster that the ladies are the real conservationisis—they not only believe in it but they have to put up with their husbands who believe in it and go out hunting and fishing and leave them as widows.

I am going to talk to you tonight as a legislator who deals in conservation. Eventually, in all of these problems, we have to get down to the point where somebody writes a bill. I always say to people who talk to me about legislation that I can aways give them the first line, "Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives," and that is where I stop and say that they can take it from there.

Many of the things you want to achieve as conservationists can only be achieved through legislation. It is important therefore that conservation-minded people be informed on legislation affecting their interests and skilled in the use of the legislative process.

I would like to start with the last session of this Congress and comment briefly on three major pieces of legislation which I know were of great importance to you. One was the mining bill. Another was the defeat of the Echo Park Dam and the third had to do with the Pittman-Robertson funds. I would like to mention each of those, not in detail, because I am sure that most of you are familiar with them, but because they teach a lesson about the problems of legislation.

With reference to the mining legislation, there are two things that I would like to say to you about that. The first is that in that legislation, for the first time, we took a step toward getting ahead of this mining-claim problem so we will not be constantly lagging behind as in the past. Over the last 5 or 6 years, the mining claims filed upon the public-land areas of this country in the national forests and on the public domain have increased from some 4,000 to over 166,000 claims. Quite obviously, if we did not do something about setting up procedures for knocking off the old and stale claims, we were going to fall constantly behind. We got started toward holding even.

The second thing that I want to mention about that legislation—and it is significant—is the kind of support that it had. I would like to read to you what the committee report said about the organizations supporting the legislation:

"The language of the bill, as reported, has been developed with the support and cooperation of both the Departments of Agriculture and Interior.

"Included in a long list of national, State, and local groups and individuals supporting this legislation are the following:

"American Mining Congress, American Federation of Labor, Independent Timber Farmers of America, American Forestry Association, Western Lumber Manufacturers, National Wildlife Federation, Sports Afield, National Lumber Manufacturers Association, National Farmers Union, Wildlife Management Institute, the Izaak Walton League of America, the National Grange, Northwest Mining Association, Northern Rocky Mountain Sportsmen's Association, Western Forest Industries Association, Western Forestry and Conservation Association, United Sattes

Chamber of Commerce, Society of American Foresters, and the American Nature Association."

This seems to me to set an example and a pattern for action for other and further successful legislation that should be followed in the future. When I get down to the next phase of this discussion, the problem still before us, I will further comment with respect to that.

I think this was the finest example of cooperative action among those interested in public land problems in the United States that I have seen in the 13 years that I have been in the Congress. This organization and all of the others that took part have a right not only to be proud of what they accomplished in getting it passed but they also can be proud of the unusual cooperation among the various users of the great public land area that they secured in getting it done.

I refer next to the defeat of the Echo Park Dam by deletion from the upper Colorado River project. This, of course, was a major victory for conservation; it did not occur because you convinced any of the sponsors of the bill that they ought to take it out of there on its merits. It occurred because they were convinced that they could not pass the legislation through the House of Representatives unless it were deleted. That bill passed the Senate Interior Committee by a vote of 11 to 1 with Echo Park in it. Then it passed the United States Senate by a vote of 58 to 23, better than 2 to 1, with Echo Park in it. But then what happened?

This is an interesting commentary as to how things are done legislatively. I walked up to one of my friends from Ohio one day and said, "Are you going to vote for the upper Colorado Basin project?" He said, "No; I cannot do it." I said, "Why can't you do it?" He said, "Because I have a stack of letters from the various conservation groups in my district and I cannot spend all of this next summer explaining to them why I voted for that bill."

It simply boiled down to this: He had no particular interest in the legislation—the project was not in his district—he was not going to gain anything by it for his district or his people; but if he voted for it he suffered a very definite detrimental effect in his area by having to go out and explain to all of the conservation groups why he did it. There were just enough people like that in the House of Representatives so that they could not pass the legislation with Echo Park in it and so it was taken out.

It is to the lasting credit, in my opinion, of those represented here and of the other conservation groups throughout the country, that after Echo Park Dam was taken out and language protecting the national parks was inserted, that these organizations withdrew their opposition.

That was clearly stated on the floor of the House the other day.

Why is it that conservation groups can show such significant power in one instance and then seem to completely spin their wheels in getting action in other instances?

The matter of the Pittman-Robertson funds is simply a lesson that we should not leave money lying around in Washington. We are lucky indeed that we got it in time and that somebody did not lay hands on it and make a distribution of it in other directions. We will not let so many years go by again, I hope, in letting that money pile up.

Now, I think that the conservation groups learned something about their strength in the preceding session of Congress. They have some solid accomplishments to talk about and in which they can certainly take real pride. This session that strength should be consolidated and put into affirmative action.

What do we have coming up in this session? We have legislation relating to funds for recreation in the national forests. Let me give you the history of that legislation going back for 6 years.

We had a Congressman from Arkansas who first introduced that legislation. That was in the 81st Congress, 6 years ago. It was called the Tackett bill and didn't pass. Then it was called the Baker bill and that bill died. Now we have a number of similar bills pending by METCALF and others. We realize the need for that legislation with 45 million recreational visits to the national forests in this land, an acceleration of 2 and 3 times since the end of the last war. We know that the budget for the Forest Service has been inadequate for recreational purposes even though it has been increased in the past several years from $611,000 to $1.6 million in the budget of 1956.

We have a mission 66 for the Park Service and I am sure that you people are familiar with that, too, if not with all of the details, at least with the general concept and objectives of that legislation.

Why is it that conservation organizations that can defeat the Echo Park Dam legislation and cause amendment to the 1872 mining law cannot move a simple bill calling for earmarking of a percentage of funds, not to exceed $5½ million for forest revenues for recreation?

I think that it is because we have failed to realize what the legislative difficulties are.

For instance, the Appropriations Committee sits there and says, "We don't like this business of earmarking funds for we then do not have any control over them." The members on the Agricultural Committee have also said that they are opposed to doing it. In addition, recreation is hard to sell in Washington. When we were running a thirty-five and forty million-dollar military budget, people thought that they had better get some of this money into the Treasury rather than putting it in recreation. Recreation is a hard program to sell. It is hard to sell to some of these hard-fisted Congressmen who are worrying about the budget and about taxes.

We need some self-help provisions (as I call them) in this legislation. I think that we have got to do two things—first, we have to get around the opposition of the Appropriations Committee and, second, then we have to put in some self-help insofar as the national forest users are concerned. If we get those two things put in the bill, then we might begin to move forward. My bill in this respect says that the money shall be earmarked but shall be appropriated each year by the Appropriations Committee. That is not quite as good as just slicing it off in a direct appropriation but it is going a half step. Our experience has been—and this legislation is drafted on the basis of similar legislation for the improving of grazing for I almost took the language right out of the statute and applied it to this situation—that if we ever get an earmarking of funds we are well on the way to getting them.

The history has been that money comes along because the earmarking acts as a mandate to the Appropriations Committee.

I think that we are going to have great difficulty in the self-help field with those provisions which would require a general license for the use of recreational areas in the national forests by all the users. That is something that is hard to administer in the first place and it is also going to get tremendous opposition, I think, from some of the sportsmen's groups.

I had a gimmick out in my area that the Forest Service will not go for but which is a good one. They issue the campfire permits and I said, "Why not charge a dollar for those?" The Forest Service said that they do not issue the permits in all of the States. I said, "So what? Forty percent of the visitations in the national forests occur in the three Western States and if we get that money in and earmark it for recreational activities, at least it will help." Those are just suggestions and there may be other ways of doing it, but in any case provision must be written which will require some user participation in the costs of recreation; that is what I call self-help.

With the Water Pollution Control Act expiring this year, we are going to have to get something done on that. The time is coming very soon when we won't have any game fish in the major streams in this country unless we stop the pollution of those streams. Mr. BLATNIK has that legislation. It is good legislation, and I feel sure that it will get through in some form before the present law expires. I am not so sure that he will get his hundred million annually for construction grants, but he will get something fairly close to it.

Now, in hurrying along I want to talk to you about another subject that will be before you and on which legislation has not as yet been drafted—that is the matter of military reservations on public lands. We have found out that military establishments are stepping out, especially in the Western States, and blocking out huge portions of our country for military uses and in some instances as special hunting preserves.

The Defense Department agencies have withdrawn lands which in total area exceed the States of Massachusetts, Maryland, New Hampshire, and Delaware combined. If the withdrawals of the Corps of Engineers are added, then the total acreage of the State of Connecticut could be added to that. If the present applications of defense agencies are approved, there will be added to the list of lands permanently withdrawn from multiple use and development an area totaling in size the States of New Jersey, Rhode Island, plus 50 Districts of Columbia. Therefore, if they keep what they now have and what they have applied for, they would have an area equivalent to a strip of land 14 miles wide from New York to San Francisco. I told them that if they couldn't hit that kind of a strip with their bombers, then I don't know how we were going to win any war.

We undertook to find out what kind of an operation we were up against with reference to these military withdrawals and here is what we learned:

We found out that a defense agency, by writing an application, simply by the stroke of the pen, can reserve various areas of lands in the western part of the United States out of the public domain area and that there is no other agency in the Government that has the power or the ability to pass upon the necessity for that military use. The Interior Department appeared before our committee and said they were in no position to weigh the question of military necesity. They said that they simply had to take the word of the Army, Navy, or Air Force for it.

In the hearings we pressed the defense agencies on multiple uses of the withdrawn areas. The Navy in particular began to concede concession after concession. In the beginning they claimed they needed the land forever and no one else could use it.

Now, what they have conceded to date is that withdrawal will not be necessary for longer than 10 years and that the reservations sought are really just for the use of airspace above the land and that grazing could continue on a 12-month basis. They would let the cattle in. If a cow gets killed they can pay for her. They will also allow special periods for spring and fall roundups, when the stockmen themselves can go in. They agree that established seasons for hunting and fishing can be observed under State laws; that game counts and related measures for game conservation can be carried out by responsible State officials in the area; that substantial mining operations can be continued; and that the area can be opened for recreation and prospecting puropses during the weekends.

The result of all this is that by this kind of investigation we have established the basis for multiple use of these defense areas even when they are taken over for defense purposes.

However, in my mind, that does not go to the real root of the problem and we are going to have to do something further. For that reason I am having legislation drafted which will do three things, and when it is drafted I am going to submit it to many of the leaders who are here at this meeting tonight.

The first thing that this legislation will provide is that when public land is taken over by an executive agency under a withdrawal and then thereafter becomes surplus, the lands will be returned to the department from which it was taken so that it can again become a part of the public domain. Most people do not know that after they take over these areas and then declare them surplus, the property then goes to the General Services Administration and is put up for sale. I say that this is a fine way to break up the public land areas of this country and it can also be the basis for some high and mighty finagling with reference to taking over valuable pieces of the public land areas of our country. We are going to stop that.

Secondly, the measure will provide that no land can be withdrawn from public domain status by any department or executive agency without approval of the Congress unless the area involved is 5,000 acres or less. The purpose of that provision will be to return and restore control of the public lands to the Congress of the United States.

As a third item, this legislation will require that whenever public land areas are taken over for these special purposes, such as the Navy, Army or for Air Force use, that publication in the Federal Register will be required to set for the other multiple uses that can be made of it, such as grazing, mining, lumbering, sports activities, recreation, and at what times and under what condition. The purpose of this provision is to require of the executive agencies, where they show a clear need in the public interest for a part of the public domain, that there be a sharing in use when such can occur consistently with the limited use for which the property is taken.

When we draft and pass that legislation I think that we will be a long way toward the settlement of some of these problems.

We are also doing something in connection with the protection of wildlife refuges. No sale or disposition of such lands should be made without the consent of Congress. We want to earmark a portion of the duck stamp funds in order to be sure that that money is used for the acquisition of additional refuges as was intended when the duck hunters supported the duck stamp tax.

Legislation has been drafted for a national wilderness preservation system. I have had an opportunity to examine the legislation in draft form and it will be introduced in one form or another. I am impressed with the importance of that because of a trip I made into the high Sierras this last fall. Even upon the very top of the Sierras there were jeep tracks. The jeep is opening up all of the areas of the public lands, national forests and otherwise, and unless some action is taken we are not going to have for very long a true wilderness area left in this country.

All of this legislation which I mentioned will operate in the same direction. The objective is the limiting of executive control over the public land areas of the Nation and placing the control of those areas more directly in the Congress of the United States. If we say that an area cannot be reserved for military purposes without the consent of Congress, or you say a refuge cannot be sold without consent of Congress, or that wilderness areas once established cannot be changed, abolished or reduced without the consent of Congress, then to that extent we have limied the authority and action of the executive agencies, and placed that discretion in the Congress.

Now, the problem is how far can we go in returning the control and restoring the control of the public lands to the Congress of the United States without destroying or improperly limiting executive freedom of action with reference to the administration of those lands in the public interest. We need a proper balance and in order to determine what that is we are going to have to, in the next few years, reevaluate the whole question of public land use. I am in hopes that some day we can write another piece of legislation which has been in my mind for a good long time which will set up the procedures for establishing the priorities of use of these public land areas for water conservation, recreation, lumbering, grazing, mining and whatever other uses may be made.

I have often said to my conservation friends that in my opinion they spend too much of their time in winning negative victories. I believe it is much more important to have an affirmative program that encompasses all of these things they seek to protect in negative victories. I would like to go one step further and say that I would like to see the conservationists tackle a real affirmative program such as set forth in the bills I have discussed and use your new found strength and unity in putting that affirmative program through Congress.

I would like to say to you, in connection with the 5 or 6 pieces of legislation that I have mentioned, that I hope that this great organization will undertake to follow through and help us in implementing these programs; that you will undertake to study the problems, to aid in drafting, introducing and supporting legislation which is designed to carry out those programs, and that you will continue to maintain an active and vigorous liaison with the other interested groups of all kinds. I hope that you will develop closer and more friendly relationships with the larger mining organizations, the livestock organizations, lumber organizations and water utilization groups with whom such excellent cooperation occurred last year on the multiple use mining bill.

I would like to take this occasion to again thank you for the opportunity of being here and to say to you that I am sure that we are in a position to move forward more constructively, more actively and more aggressively than we have ever done before in the field of consideration with the kind of leadership represented here and with the growing unity, strength and legislative know-how of this and other conservation organizations.

Greek Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein my own remarks, in part, delivered at the 135th anniversary celebration of Greek Independence Day at Fitchburg, Mass., on March 25, 1956.

This memorable event was arranged and very ably conducted by the Greek Orthodox Community at Fitchburg and was attended by the distinguished mayor of the city, Hon. Hedley Bray; the prominent and capable Greek-American leader and businessman, Mr. Charles Kotsilibas Davis; the beloved paster of the church, Rev. John Michalides, who gave the invocation; and a large number of representative citizens of the community and city.

I was most graciously introduced on the inspiring occasion by the able radio announcer and commentator, Chris M. Nikitas, of station WEIM, which carried my address on its facilities:

REMARKS IN PART OF HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN, OF MASSACHUSETTS, AT 135TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE AT FITCHBURG, MARCH 25, 1956

"The forcible removal, exile, and imprisonment of Archbishop Makarios, a great spiritual leader and prelate, who exemplifies the political ideals as well as the profound religious beliefs of millions of honest, law-abiding, democratic-minded people, is shocking to the conscience of the free world," said Congressman PHILBIN at the 135th anniversary celebration of Greek Independence held at Fitchburg last night.

"This outrage parallels the cases of Cardinal Mindzenty and Archbishop Stepinac, who were so shamefully persecuted by Red Communists. It is almost beyond belief that such ruthless persecution could occur in the free world," he said.

"It is most deplorable that our Government should have been linked to this disgraceful incident in any way, but recent events demonstrate that in the minds of many people overseas," he asserted, "we are sharing the blame with the perpetrators of this dastardly act, and other abuses of colonialism."

"The charge that communism is responsible for Cyprus is ridiculous. The Greeks have fought communism with great vigor and success. Cyprus is the product of a brave people's aspirations for self-government," said PHILBIN.

"It is not enough for our Government to express sympathetic concern. If we would promote peace and collective security in the Middle East, we should move vigorously to secure the release of Archbishop Makarios, and to urge that the Cyprus question be considered on a basis of decency and fairness, and that no further violence and brutality be visited upon religious leaders and others who are seeking by legitimate means to secure the historic right of self-determination for which many nations have struggled and sacrificed.

"I have urged the State Department not only to use its good offices, but to do everything in its power, to bring about the release of Archbishop Makarios and a peaceful solution to the Cyprus problem and also to strive for collective security so urgently needed in the Middle East," PHILBIN declared.

PHILBIN hailed the Greek people in this country for their "loyal citizenship and their eagerness to serve the Nation in war and peace." "You may well be proud of your fine contributions," he said.

"Greek Independence Day brings vividly to mind," PHILBIN continued, "the tireless and unselfish devotion of the Greek people to the cause of liberty and recalls the great debt which democracy and civilization owe to Greece for its imperishable benefits to every field of our way of life throughout the ages."

Tracing world history, the Clinton congressman said: "Take the Greeks out of history and there would be no civilization. Classic Greek culture developed and gave to the world the philosophy, the ethics, the science, the art and literature, the medicine, the astronomy, the mathematics, the principles of government and politics, and spir-

itual values that form an indispensable foundation stone of our modern society. You must ever be proud of this heritage of grandeur. The American people will ever be grateful for it."

Understanding the School Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Paul A. Freund, a distinguished member of the faculty of the Harvard University Law School, recently wrote two outstanding articles concerning the Supreme Court segregation decisions. In these articles, Professor Freund, who is one of the Nation's leading experts on constitutional law, presented in a dignified, scholarly manner the background of the Court's decision. I think he has hit the nail squarely on the head.

Professor Freund points out that every contention now advanced against the segregation opinion was presented to the Court in lengthy briefs and oral arguments, and that the Court repeatedly postponed its final decision in order to give all interested parties an opportunity to present their views.

I found especially gratifying his defense of the Supreme Court itself as an institution of our free government when he wrote:

> The Court interprets to us our own ideals implanted in the constitutional document as they have flowered in our national life.

The members of the Court should not be mere grammarians, who work out of the dictionary. Rather, they should be interpreters of principles of fact and value as they apply to problems of the moment.

Viewed in this perspective, one can see that the decision of the Supreme Court was entirely in keeping with the best traditions of that institution. The segregation opinion, as Professor Freund suggests, simply followed in the "line of growth" of interpretation of the Constitution.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the two articles, entitled "Understanding the School Decision," which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of March 26 and 27. I hope all Members of this body will read and ponder this fine analysis of the situation.

The articles follow:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of March 26, 1956]

UNDERSTANDING THE SCHOOL DECISION—I

(By Paul A. Freund, Charles Stebbins Fairchild professor of law, Harvard Law School, Harvard University)

Unanimous decisions of the Supreme Court are uncommon enough in ordinary cases, and especially rare in extraordinary ones. When, therefore, the unanimous decision in the school segregation cases provokes attacks on the Court for "judicial usurpation" and "naked judicial power," the lines of communication between the Court and the people have been badly tangled. The phrases just quoted are taken from the Declaration of Constitutional Principles issued by 19 Senators and 81 Representatives in the United States Congress.

This declaration (popularly known as the "Southern Manifesto") is only the latest and most dramatic item of evidence that we may be facing not only a crisis in race relations but—what could in the long run be even more shattering—a crisis in the role of the Supreme Court as the authoritative voice of our highest law. The latter threat, no less than the former, calls for the fullest possible measure of understanding.

One thing can surely be said of the segregation cases: they were not hastily or thoughtlessly decided. Every contention now advanced against the decision was presented to the Court in briefs, running to hundreds of pages, and in oral argument. The Court was exceptionally deliberate in its treatment of this litigation. The cases were originally set for argument in October 1952. Argument was postponed by the Court until December. In June 1953, the Court ordered the cases reargued at the following term, specifying certain questions, including historical inquiries, to be canvassed by counsel.

In December 1953, the reargument took place. The Court was assisted not only by the unusually thorough briefs of the complainants and the defendant States but by a full-scale brief submitted by Attorney General Brownell, in support of the complainants' position. On May 17, 1954, the decision was finally handed down; but even then the Court avoided precipitate action. Still another argument was ordered on the question of the form of relief.

The attorneys general of all States requiring or permitting racial discrimination in public education were invited to present their views and the representatives of six States—Florida, North Carolina, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Maryland, and Texas—were in fact heard, in addition to the States directly involved in the cases—Kansas, South Carolina, Virginia, Delaware, and the District of Columbia.

The judgment of the Court was announced on May 31, 1955, more than 3 years after the cases had been docketed there, and after every forewarning that a momentous decision might be forthcoming, but still with forbearance in the order for enforcement. The NAACP had asked for decrees effective not later than the opening of the next school year. The Attorney General's brief had suggested decrees requiring plans to be submitted by the States within 90 days, "for ending, as soon as possible, racial segregation of pupils in public schools."

The Court took the more moderate course of directing the lower courts to enter "such orders and decrees consistent with this opinion as are necessary and proper to admit to public schools on a racially nondiscriminatory basis with all deliberate speed the parties to these cases." The phrase "deliberate speed" is a term of legal art deriving from 18th century chancery practice, and not, as certain litterateurs surmised, from the haunting refrain in Francis Thompson's religious poem The Hound of Heaven: "Deliberate speed, majestic instancy."

The literary reference does, however, serve by contrast to underscore the judicious restraint shown by the Court. Majestic instancy would have been too heroic a demand for mortal men faced with genuine problems of school districting, allotment of facilities, transfer of teachers, grading of pupils, and similar administrative burdens. Nevertheless the opinion made it plain that delay for reasons of community nonacceptance would not be legitimate. "But it should go without saying," the opinion of Chief Justice Warren declared, "that the vitality of these constitutional principles cannot be allowed to yield simply because of disagreement with them."

Those who disagree with the decision on constitutional grounds argue that it is not justified by either the language or the history of the 14th amendment. The Congressmen's declaration, for example, states: "The original Constitution does not mention education. Neither does the 14th amendment nor any other amendment."

This, of course, is true. The 14th amendment provides that "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person the equal protection of the laws."

But the argument from the silence of the Constitution about education proves much too much. It is the very essence of the Constitution that it speaks in generalities like "equal protection of the laws," and it is the very essence of the judicial process that it must apply the generalities to the concrete facts of experience. Nowhere does the Constitution mention agriculture; are there then literalists who would conclude that Congress is out of bounds in debating Federal price supports for agricultural commodities?

Note, too, that the argument from the silence of the Constitution would rule out any Federal standard whatever for public education, the separate-but-equal standard no less than desegregation. In this respect the declaration is not free from ambiguity, for it quotes with apparent approval the separate-but-equal doctrine as an "established legal principle almost a century old." It is not clear, that is, whether the "usurpation" by the Court is throught to begin when any facilities at all are required for the public education of Negroes, or equal facilities in separate schools, or admission without regard to race.

The argument from the historical background, rather than the text, of the 14th amendment, is subtler, and it leads to some basic questions about the nature of constitutional interpretation. To quote once more the declaration of the Members of Congress: "The debates preceding the submission of the 14th amendment clearly show that there was no intent that it should affect the systems of education maintained by the States."

Here there is a further ambiguity. If the meaning is that there was no specific, calculated purpose to deal with education, the statement is undoubtedly true. If the meaning is that there was a specific, calculated purpose to exclude education, the debates are plainer to the signers of the declaration than they were to the Court or to the Attorney General. The word used by Chief Justice Warren to describe the debates is "inconclusive." This is hardly surprising, in view of the relatively minor role of public education at the time, and the correspondingly fragmentary attention it received in the spacious discussions in Congress over privileges and immunities of citizens and equal protection of the laws.

Most schooling in the South was private in 1868; for Negroes it was virtually nonexistent there; and throughout the country the public-school system and compulsory education as we know it were in a rudimentary stage. The Congress which approved the 14th amendment did not foresee the development in education which has taken place and did not foreclose the participation by Negroes in that development on a plane of equality, for equal protection of the laws was adopted as a standard without exceptions or exemptions.

Even if the legislative history had shown more evidence than it did of an intention not to cover public education, the interpretation of the 14th amendment would not necessarily be circumscribed by that sentiment. The Founding Fathers in the convention of 1787 voted down a proposal to authorize Congress to grant charters of incor-

poration. This negative vote did not later prevent such charters from being granted and upheld, under general language which the framers approved.

Very often, and very properly, the real intention of constitutional assemblies is to establish principles and to leave the hard questions of their applications to be worked out in the unknown future. Thereby trouble is not borrowed for the present, and the unfolding life of the future is not straitjacketed.

The process is misunderstood if it is thought to be peculiar to the 14th amendment. The sixth amendment, for example, provides that "the accused shall enjoy the right * * * to have the assistance of counsel for his defense." When this was formulated in 1789, the right of an accused person even to employ counsel to assist at his trial was denied in England for many types of crimes; not until 1836 was that right fully granted in England.

With us, however, the guaranty has come to mean more than the right to have the assistance of counsel who is employed. It has come to mean, as interpreted by the Supreme Court, the right of an indigent defendant to have counsel appointed for him by the trial court. This is simply an illustration of Chief Justice Hughes' pronouncement in the famous mortgage moratorium case in 1934:

"It is no answer to say that this public need was not apprehended a century ago, or to insist that what the provision of the Constitution meant to the vision of that day it must mean to the vision of our time. If by the statement that what the Constitution meant at the time of its adoption it means today, it is intended to say that the great clauses of the Constitution must be confined to the interpretation which the framers, with the conditions and outlook of their time, would have placed upon them, the statement carries its own refutation."

[From the Christian Science Monitor of March 27, 1956]

UNDERSTANDING THE SCHOOL DECISION—II

(By Paul A. Freund, Charles Stebbins Fairchild, professor of law, Harvard Law School, Harvard University)

Is there, then, no criterion of meaning for the general guaranties of the Constitution? Must the Justices do what they are accused of doing in the Congressmen's declaration, substituting "personal, political, and social ideas for the established law of the land"?

The answer is that as the function of a Justice is necessarily something more than to be a grammarian, it is decidedly less than to be a zealot. The Court interprets to us our own ideals implanted in the constitutional document, as they have flowered in our national life. Justice Holmes put a complex idea concisely, in speaking of the provisions of the Constitution: "Their significance is not formal; it is to be gathered not simply by taking the words and a dictionary, but by considering their origin and the line of their growth."

"The line of their growth" is a key to the understanding of the segregation cases. Whatever the purposes the 14th amendment may serve—and it has come to serve a good many collateral ones, such as the rule of "one thing, one tax" in State taxation—its basic aim concerned equality of rights for Negroes. The development of that concept is a story of successive applications of the principle to a widening variety of practices.

In 1880 the right to be included on juries was established. In 1917 racial restrictions in zoning laws were held invalid, despite the argument of the municipality that property values and public order required the discrimination.

In 1927 the all-white primary election was ruled invalid, despite the argument of the State that primaries are a private political affair. In a passage resembling some current protests, the brief of the State of Texas declared: "It must be remembered that nominating primaries were unknown at the time of the adoption of the Constitution of the United States and of the Constitution of Texas in 1876 * * *. The question of parties and their regulation is a political one rather than legal."

Although the 15th amendment deals with the right of suffrage, Justice Holmes said, for the Court: "We find it unnecessary to consider the 15th amendment, because it seems to us hard to imagine a more direct and obvious infringement of the 14th."

Then in 1938 a Negro applicant was ordered admitted to the law school of the University of Missouri, despite the State's offer to pay his tuition at a nondiscriminating law school in a neighboring State. Since Missouri had no separate (and equal) law school for Negroes, the color line had to be broken in the State university. Mr. Justice McReynolds, who dissented from the opinion delivered by Chief Justice Hughes, saw clearly enough the "line of growth" in education, and he did not like it. He said:

"For a long time Missouri has acted upon the view that the best interest of her people demands separation of whites and Negroes in schools. Under the opinion just announced, I presume she may abandon her law school and thereby disadvantage her white citizens without impairing petitioner's opportunities for legal instruction; or she may break down the settled practice concerning separate schools and thereby, as indicated by experience, damnify both races."

All of these cases had their sequels, in which the Court turned back attempts to circumvent the decisions or to blunt their effect by differentiating them from cases coming before the courts. Much of the progress was made before World War II. Since then, in Korea and in military posts around the globe, as well as at home, we have extended the principle of desegregation. The question before the Court in the school cases was whether the vital growth had come to an end in the educational sphere with the separate-but-equal doctrine or whether it carried through to desegregation.

The Court could have answered in any of three ways. It could have answered as it did, finding that the principle of equality was not exhausted by separate but equal facilities; that as a Nation we had moved beyond that stage in profession and to a substantial degree in practice; and that the real and painful difficulties of adjustment in certain areas would be given proper respect by allowing time for administrative changeovers.

The second possible choice for the Court would have been to leave the matter to Congress under the power to enforce the provisions of the 14th amendment. That course would have been the easiest for the Court to take, but it would not have been the most straightforward.

The advances already made in applying the principle of equality had been achieved through resort to the Court, not to Congress: zoning, primaries, university education. Congress was not in the habit of taking responsibility in this field, or indeed in any of the other ramifications of the 14th amendment as limits on the powers of the States. To have dropped the issue in the lap of Congress would have been extraordinary. Congress, on its part, could have been expected to regard the issue as a judicial one and to play an Alphonse-Gaston game.

The third possibility was to decide that education is not included in the guaranty of equal protection of the laws, or that the guaranty is satisfied by separate public schooling. This would have been a pronouncement that as people we do not recognize fellowship in the educational process to be a minimum standard for governments to observe in our common life, that the vital growth of the principle of equality has not carried to this point.

Would we have been satisfied with this reflection of our own better nature as a people? For it is just that better nature which we mean the Court to hold up to us in interpreting the Bill of Rights. A philosopher, Alexander Meiklejohn, once described the Court's function in this way:

"That Court is commissioned to interpret to us our own purposes, our own meanings. * * * And its teaching has peculiar importance because it interprets principles of fact and of value, not merely in the abstract, but also in their bearing upon the concrete, immediate problems which are, at any given moment, puzzling and dividing us."

If the Court was wrong in the school cases it is because the Court misjudged our present-day ideal of equality in law. To judge the decision, therefore, is to judge ourselves, all of us, for the Constitution sets a common, not a sectional, standard for the country. That is why it is supremely important that we understand the meaning of the decision and the role of the Court in reaching it. That is why it is important, too, that those who believe the Court judged rightly, as well as the critics, should let their voices be heard.

MacArthur and Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Richard H. Rovere appeared in the Spectator of February 17, 1956:

MACARTHUR AND TRUMAN

General of the Army Douglas MacArthur has for many years been addicted to the conspiracy theory of history. MacArthur is a true believer—not a rank-and-file one, but a commander, egocentric, messianic, a true believer in himself. Like others of the breed, he finds it necessary to ascribe his disappointments, which have been numerous, to base intrigue by the powers of darkness. This tendency is strikingly displayed in a recent ex cathedra bock on MacArthur by Maj. Gen. Courtney Whitney, of whom the great man says, in an endorsement of the work, "I know of no one better qualified than he intelligently to discuss * * * my role in the stirring events which have encompassed the Far East since the start of World War II." The book is called MacArthur: His Rendezvous With History, and it is illuminated by the view that not only the Far East but the world in general since 1940 has been a stage for a titanic conflict between Douglas MacArthur and Satan in manifold disguises. One page 5 we are advised that Frank Murphy, who in 1941 was High Commissioner of the Philippines and who later was one of the true ornaments of the United States Supreme Court, "betrayed his jealousy of MacArthur's stature in the islands by initiating a personal campaign of pressure on President Roosevelt to cause the general's removal." The consequences of this removal were enormous—American unpreparedness, Pearl Harbor, the loss of the Philippines, all the bloodletting from the Banda Sea to the Osumi Straits. Worse yet, life from 1941 on was just one betrayal of jealousy after another. Down they all go—all the large figures of the epoch: Roosevelt, Marshall, Bradley, Truman, Eisenhower, to name only the American traducers. And with them fall innumerable smaller figures.

lieutenants of the jealous ones, devil's disciples, chore boys in such institutional conspiracies as the United States Navy, "the anti-MacArthur coterie in the State Department," and the Communist Party, which, we learn, was plotting a public hanging of MacArthur on the Capitol steps as long ago as 1932. In the end, the entire United States is made to seem an instrument for the humiliation of General MacArthur.

There is tragedy here as well as high comedy, for the truth of the matter is that there are elements of greatness in Douglas MacArthur. He has served his country as a valorous and resourceful captain and as a gifted proconsul. He has at times borne himself with splendor and has shown himself capable of commanding intense loyalties. There has always been about him something of the "heaven-born" general, to use Pitt's phrase for Clive, whom MacArthur resembles in more ways than one. Yet the man insists on making himself ridiculous. Now, he has come up with a superplot involving Guy Burgess and Donald Maclean. In a statement prompted by the publication of Harry Truman's reminiscences of the Korean war, MacArthur has charged to the Burgess-Maclean account both the Chinese intervention of December 1950, and what Whitney calls the foul and shocking blow dealt by Mr. Truman in April 1951. MacArthur says he only recently became aware of the crucial part played by Burgess and Maclean in these towering events. For years, he writes in a commentary published simultaneosuly in Life and the New York Times, he "searched in vain for some logical explanation for my abrupt relief from command in the Far East." He could not, of course, be satisfied with such an explanation as that Truman was doing what he misguidedly believed to be right. Truman is not formidable enough to be the source of General MacArthur's mighty anguish. True, MacArthur detects, in addition to the conspiracy involving Burgess and Maclean, a subconspiracy involving Mr. Truman, Generals Marshall and Bradley, Averell Harriman, and Dean Acheson, all of whom, he says, had reason to persecute him. (Marshall and Bradley were "personally hostile to me" out of professional envy. Harriman developed "prejudice" in the course of an interview in Tokyo early in the Korean war. Acheson was against him, because he rejected "certain socialistic concepts" favored by the State Department.) But knowledge of this conspiracy did not put an end to MacArthur's search, which has only now ended, for a deeper one. "It was not until the recent exposure of the British spies, Burgess and Maclean, that the true facts began to unfold," he writes.

What facts? MacArthur's plot, which is shortly to be investigated by the Senate's Internal Security Subcommittee, is not a very tidy one, at least in his telling of it in his statement of last week. To credit it at all, one must share with MacArthur the assumption that the Peiping government in 1950 was being made privy to the discussions of American policy in the National Security Council and to the decisions emerging from these discussions. MacArthur has no difficulty in making this assumption, for he is persuaded that the Chinese would never have been foolish enough to engage him in combat if they had not "had definite advance information that my hands would be tied." "Only," MacArthur writes, "if he were certain that we would continue to protect his bases and supply lines would a commander have dared to throw the full weight of the Chinese Army into Korea." This much being taken for granted, it is necessary only to uncover the "links in the chain to our enemy in Korea through Peiping by way of Moscow."

Now to get Burgess and Maclean into the act: MacArthur make a broad leap from the enemy's knowledge of what was happening in Washington to his knowledge of what was going to happen in Korea. "General Walker complained constantly to me that the enemy was receiving prior information of his movements. We could find no leaks in Korea or Japan. Then suddenly one of my dispatches concerning the order of battle was published in a Washington paper within a few hours of its receipt." MacArthur is now convinced that Burgess and Maclean, "with access to the secret files," were responsible for this leak, and he takes this to prove that they must also have been responsible for the earlier decision of Peiping, and the later decision by President Truman.

In his own statement, MacArthur does not identify the published dispatch or the Washington newspaper responsible for the breach of security. But Courtney Whitney's book partially unlocks this mystery: "On December 30, 1950, at possibly the most crucial phase of the war against Red China in Korea, one of MacArthur's top-secret dispatches to Washington giving intelligence on the order of battle was in part published verbatim in the Washington Post under the byline of a prominent columnist." A check of the Washington Post of December 30, 1950, reveals that the columnist was Drew Pearson, whose work appears in hundreds of other newspapers; Pearson that day published part of what purported to be a report from MacArthur's intelligence section dated December 6, 1950. MacArthur's "few hours" turned out to be approximately 576, and it was not exactly one of his "dispatches concerning the order of battle," but this is quibbling—there was a leak to Drew Pearson, and somebody was responsible. Who? Burgess and Maclean, clearly. "If they did not report to their Kremlin masters fully upon our secrets in the conduct of the war against the Communists in Korea, what then could have been their treasonable purpose?" But was Drew Pearson one of their Kremlin masters? The question is not dealt with.

The Pearson incident is the central one. It proves, retroactively, that Burgess and Maclean told the Chinese they would have a romp if they entered the war. (It has also been alleged by MacArthur and others that the North Koreans started the war because they knew of our policy decision to abandon Korea. MacArthur does not speculate on why, having seen us throw one policy decision to the winds, they placed such confidence in another.) And it reveals, finally, the reason for MacArthur's removal. MacArthur says that when he could find "no leaks in Korea or Japan," he promptly recommended that "a treason trial be initiated to break up [the] spy ring responsible for the purloining of my top-secret reports to Washington." And he goes on: "I believe that my demand that this situation be exposed, coming after the Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White scandals, caused the deepest resentment * * * the case was never processed, and I was shortly relieved of my command."

Of such improbable stuff is MacArthur's plot made. It is not receiving any very serious consideration here.

Reds Seek To Force Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is much more than a coincidence that the plan and program of the Communist Party and the plan and program of the National Association of the Advancement for Colored People regarding the question of segregation are so similar.

It has already been pointed out on numerous occasions that the president, the chairman of the board, the honorary chairman, 11 of 28 vice presidents, the treasurer, 28 of 47 directors, the chairman of the national legal committee, the executive secretary, the special counsel, the assistant special counsel, the southeast national secretary, the west coast secretary, the director of the Washington bureau, and director of public relations and 2 field secretaries, of the National Association for the Avancement of Colored People are listed in the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities as being connected with organizations designated by the Attorney General as being subversive.

The connection of this great number of officers and directors of the radical NAACP with subversive organizations has heretofore been indisputably established. Now comes still further evidence of the influence of the Communist Party in stirring up racial strife and hatred through attacks upon the segregated system under which whites and blacks have maintained peaceful and harmonious relations throughout the entire history of this country.

Now comes the Attorney General of the State of Ohio and gives us the information that his office has intercepted secret directives from a Communist Party agency, seeking to enlist the young people of Ohio to join in the Communist Party's effort to promote racial strife in the United States.

I read with much interest an editorial in the March 28 issue of the Metropolitan Herald, Atlanta, Ga., calling attention to this effort on the part of the Communist Party to enlist American youth in the Communist Party program, and commending the Attorney General of Ohio for publicizing his discovery.

I include this editorial from the Metropolitan Herald herewith as a part of these remarks:

REDS SEEKS TO FORCE INTEGRATION

Newspapers, magazines, and leaders in other sections of the Nation have derided statements by Southern leaders and some Southern newspapers that Communists and radicals were responsible for much of the fanatical effort to force integration of the races in the South and for its resultant strife.

The warnings of our thoughtful leaders have been ignored. They have been held up to scorn and ridicule. They have been called racists, bigots, and un-American.

However, last Saturday, the Attorney General of the State of Ohio dropped a damaging time bomb into the laps of those who have been so outspoken in their condemnation of the South.

The Ohio Attorney General announced that his office had intercepted secret directives of the Communist Party's Labor Youth League for a drive called Operation Constitutional Rights, which seeks to enlist Ohio youths in a nationwide campaign to force Federal intervention against Southern States in the segregation issue.

The directive called on its youth leaders to mobilize every single member, together with their friends, neighbors, and fellow workers to flood President Eisenhower with

telegrams and letters demanding Federal action against the "Dixiecrat terror in the South * * * to uphold the Constitution * * * and to bring law and order to the South."

The official publication of the Labor Youth League is the New Challenge. Records of the Ohio un-American Activities Commission show that copies of the paper were first passed out to Cleveland's High School of this Communist organization to recruit high school pupils.

The Ohio Attorney General is to be commended for having the courage and patriotism to make this information public. It took great courage on his part for Ohio is one of the States where the NAACP wields great influence at the polls and usually is the balance of power between the two major parties.

In making public this information, the Ohio Attorney General has given the lie to those integration apologists who have vigorously denied that the Communists have taken a leading part in the effort to destroy the peaceful relationship between the races in the South and to force a mixing of the races.

When Georgia's Attorney General Eugene Cook presented documented evidence of Communist activitists in the integration fight, even some of Georgia's daily newspapers scorned his charges. We await their reaction to the evidence uncovered by the Ohio Attorney General's office.

Truth will out, despite the well-financed propaganda machines of the NAACP and other antisouthern, antiwhite outfits.

Can the New Look of Moscow Tolerate the Truth of 1,000 Years of Christianity in Ukraine?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the current propaganda line of Moscow and its collective leadership ascribes to the permanently silent Stalin the tragedies of mass murders, purges, and genocide. We know, of course, that the members of the present leadership, particularly Mr. Khrushchev, have engaged in like deeds. However, to counteract in a positive manner the obvious objectives of this line requires that we press with certain practical tests of the sincerity and supposed reasonableness of these men. There is one such test in connection with the largest non-Russian nation in the Soviet Union, namely, Ukraine.

It was under the Stalin regime that the Ukrainian Orthodox and Uniate Greek Catholic Churches were destroyed, thousands of the clergy murdered and the faithful deported. If this is what the present leaders in Moscow are deploring, then we can test the sincerity of their condemnation by casting the spotlight of world opinion on these tragic facts and urging the resurrection of these religious bodies in Ukraine.

The recent celebrations in this country of 1,000 years of Christianity in Ukraine provide both the tenor and spirit for such action. Senate Resolution 189 and a similar one now being prepared in the House are expressive of such positive action and deserve favorable consideration on the part of Congress. Action along these lines is also being taken by groups in this country in the United Nations. The basis and scope of such action are incorporated in a statement issued by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, who is a professor at Georgetown University and chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. This statement introduces some illustrative material that causes one to ask, "Can the new look of Moscow tolerate the truth of 1,000 years of Christianity in Ukraine?"

In the hope that Members of Congress will carefully ponder this question, I request that this statement and the accompanying data be printed in the RECORD:

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

(By Dr. Lev. E. Dobriansky)

The impressive messages that were received on the occassion of the solemn observance of 1,000 years of Christianity in Ukraine furnish eloquent testimony to the superlative thoughts of the eminent Catholic scholar and philosopher of history, Father Don Luigi Sturzo. In his classic work on "Nationalism and Internationalism," this world-renowned scholar conclusively observes that the three great ideas which have shaped the history of mankind are religion, national independence and liberty (p. 13). These three majestic ideas constitute a veritable trinity of thought predicating moral and political action that necessarily must encompass the manifestation of all three in the harmonious existence of societies, nations, and peoples. To contemplate and act upon one embraces correlative contemplation and action upon the others—in the natural spirit of Amor Dei et Patriae.

In Ukraine, which today in its state of captivity is the largest non-Russian nation not only in the primary empire constituted by the Soviet Union but also behind the European Iron Curtain, these fundamental ideas and natural drives have cast the very foundations of the sovereign existence of this nation. In their fixed interrelationship they have formed the essential source of strength and hope to the liberation movements of this freedom-loving people in different periods of enslavement under some imperialist foreign yoke. The contemporary struggle of the Ukrainian nation against the colonial and imperialist domination of Russian communism—highlighted by the gallant military defense of its independent state following World War I, the brave opposition of its intellectuals to the strangling centralization of colonial control by Moscow in the 1920's, the stern resistance of its hardy peasantry to the politico-economic collectivist measures of the foreign oppressor in the 1930's, the heriоc battles of the famous patriotic and nationalistic forces of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army against both Nazi German and Russian Communist totalitarianism in the 1940's, and the underground operations in political warfare against alien Moscow by all sections of its populace in this decade—draws its chief inspiration from the undying faith that Deo adjuvante, non timendum.

In the light of all this, it is little wonder that the religious institutions and clergies of Ukraine were the first and prime objects of attack and liquidation by Russian Communist totalitarianism. This sordid story of our times is partly described in summary form in the following petition addressed to the Secretary General of the United Nations. The several messages following this, received from the highest authorities in the Catholic church, were written in the intimate knowledge of this background on current Russian Communist policy of religious persecution and genocide.

The Ukrainian Catholic Church survives in the underground of Ukraine today. Its existence and free emergence are dependent on the reality of the three great ideas of history—religion, national independence and liberty. Priest and patriot are but one. In this country, hope and encouragement for the eventual liberation and freedom of church, nation and people in Ukraine are steadfastly sustained by the prayers and work of the Ukrainian Catholic Exarchate of the United States of America. Under the great spiritual leadership and guidance of the Most Reverend Archbishop Constantine Bohachevsky and the Most Reverend Ambrose Senyshyn, O. S. B. M., the faithful pursue this work in the certitude of its value to the basic national interests of our own country, the United States of America, and in the certain knowledge that for all nations, including Ukraine, Beata gens cujus est Dominus Deus eorum.

YOUR EXCELLENCY:

Whereas man, as an individual and as a member of society, is endowed by his Creator with certain, natural and inalienable rights that form the substance of natural moral law, and among which are the right to life and bodily integrity except in just punishment for crime; the right to serve and worship God in private and public; the right to religious formation through education and association; the right to personal liberty under just law; the right to equal protection of just law regardless of sex, nationality, color or creed; the right to choose and freely to maintain a state of life, married or single, lay or religious; the right to education suitable for the maintenance and development of his dignity as a human person; the right of association and peaceable assembly; and the right to assistance from society in distress of person or family; and

Whereas the United Nations are determined "to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person," and "to achieve international cooperation * * * in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion" (Charter of the United Nations, arts. 1, 3); and

Whereas "the General Assembly shall initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of * * * assisting in the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion" (art. 13, b); and

Whereas the Economic and Social Council "may make recommendations for the purpose of promoting respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all" (art. 62, 3); and

Whereas the Secretary General may bring to the attention of the Security Council any matter which in his opinion may threaten the maintenance of international peace and security (art. 99); and

Whereas in brazen disregard for articles V, X, and XI of the Declaration of Human Rights, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has for years violated, and continues to violate, with impunity the aforesaid basic human rights and freedom, by cruel and inhuman treatment of its victims, by denying them the necessary guaranties for their defense, by torture and mock trials on fabricated charges; and

Whereas in Ukraine alone, the Soviet Government has throughout the years of its misrule by brutal force, liquidated five Ukrainian Catholic dioceses; has unjustly imprisoned, condemned, or murdered 10 Ukrainian Catholic bishops; has imprisoned, executed, or

dispersed 2,950 of the diocesan, and 520 of the regular clergy; has in barbaric fashion dispersed and mistreated 1,090 women religious; has persecuted, and continues to persecute, nearly 5 million faithful of that church because of their religious and political convictions; has liquidated, or by force turned over to the state puppet church, 3,040 Ukrainian Catholic parishes; has suppressed, confiscated, or occupied for its own vile purposes, all Ukrainian Catholic properties, schools, associations, and publications (First Victims of Communism, White Book on Religious Persecution in Ukraine, Rome 1953, p. 64); and

Whereas in other Communist-dominated countries, in Europe and in Asia, the criminal violation of fundamental human rights and the persecution of religion continue unabated, to wit, within the last year:

In China, bishops with hundreds of native sisters, religious and priests, as well as thousands of laymen, have been unjustly arrested and mistreated without any regard for justice and dignity of the human person;

Hundreds of thousands of Catholics are being held against their will by the North Vietnamese to endure persecution and other evils of Communist tyranny;

In North Korea, not a single priest remains to minister to the spiritual needs of the country's 40,000 Catholics;

In the Baltic countries, the church is believed to have been almost wholly destroyed. The same is true for Albania, Rumania, and Bulgaria;

In Czechoslovakia, nuns are made to work in factories and mines; night raids are staged on parish rectories and homes of leading Catholic laymen;

In Hungary, Cardinal Mindszenty still does not enjoy full freedom, priests are held as hostages to compel farmers to labor for their Communist masters;

In East Germany, boys and girls are penalized for refusing to take part in pagan youth initiation rites (National Catholic Welfare Conference News Service, December 19, 1955),

Now, therefore, in the clear light of the enumerated commitments and provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration of Human Rights, the Providence Association of Ukrainian Catholics, having the moral support of the Slav Byzantine Exarchate in the United States of America plus the sympathy of Catholics the world over and of all civilized peoples everywhere, asks Your Excellency, the Secretary General who is rallying the nations of the earth to the principles of peace and freedom, to use the mighty authority of your office and to earnestly urge upon the United Nations the immediate necessity:

Of terminating at once the continuing, premeditated, criminal outrages against the dignity of the human person and the vicious violations of basic human rights and fundamental freedoms that are being perpetrated daily, in flagrant defiance of all law, human and divine, and before your very eyes, by the infamous, international enemy of world peace, the Government of the Soviet Union;

Of abolishing the infernal Soviet concentration camps and setting free the millions of innocent slave laborers, who are being tortured to death at the hands of a fiendish, inhuman regime;

Of liberating and restoring to rightful sovereignty the captive peoples of the Soviet colonial empire, that they may live their own democratic lives, free from the dictatorial whims and coercive action of a hated, foreign, tyrannical rule;

Of adopting and carrying out conscientiously prompt, certain, and effective sanctions against the said perpetrators of these heinous crimes, namely, the Government of the Soviet Union, the mastermind of a world conspiracy against enduring peace, democracy, and humanity itself, for the world cannot long live in peace, half slave and half free.

THE CHANCERY, DIOCESE OF BUFFALO,
Buffalo, N. Y., August 19, 1955.

The Most Reverend AMBROSE SENYSHYN, O. S. B. M.,
Stamford, Conn.

DEAR BISHOP SENYSHYN: May I join with you in rejoicing in the completion of a thousand years of Catholicity among the great Ukrainian people. A thousand years is a long time and the thought of this long period must arouse every Ukrainian heart to pride in the long years of faithfulness and loyalty to the Catholic Church. Not all of the years have been happy ones, but it was in her hours of suffering and sorrow that the Ukraine was closest to the Catholic Church, and her children closest to our Divine Saviour. The present hour is one of suffering and glory which will rank some day with the Ukraine's greatest hours of the past. May we who enjoy the liberty of this blessed land of America pray that our Catholic brethren in the old country will remain steadfast and loyal to our blessed Saviour and His blessed mother.

With every good wish, I am,

Sincerely yours in Christ,
JOSEPH A. BURKE,
Bishop of Buffalo.

ARCHBISHOP'S HOUSE,
Philadelphia, Pa., August 29, 1955.

The Most Reverend AMBROSE SENYSHYN, O. S. B. M.,
Stamford, Conn.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: Please permit me to join in spirit with Archbishop Bohachevsky and Your Excellency, with the priests, the religious, and the faithful of the Ukrainian Catholic exarchate of the United States in the prayers of thanksgiving that will mark your commemoration of 10 centuries of Catholic life in the Ukraine.

In the providence of God, the conversion of St. Olga and the conversion of her subjects through her apostolic zeal, exercised a profound influence on eastern Europe.

In these days when we recall the glories of those thousand years, we are painfully aware that the way of Christ is the way of the Cross. We thank God for the encouragement He gives us in the hour of triumph, but we pray for the grace to follow Him ever in His painful ascent of Calvary and in his crucifixion.

So, with my congratulations to Your Excellencies and your good people, I extend at the same time my assurance of prayers that God will sustain the persecuted in their bitter trials and will deign to shorten the time of their visitation. May Christ reign in the hearts of the sufferers and may He hasten the hour of their deliverance.

With sentiments of respect and esteem, I am, Your Excellency,

Sincerely yours in Dnc.,
JOHN F. O'HARA, C. S. C.
Archbishop of Philadelphia.

BISHOP'S RESIDENCE,
Scranton, Pa., August 17, 1955.

His Excellency the Most Reverend AMBROSE SENYSHYN, O. S. B. M.,
Stamford, Conn.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: I am honored in rejoicing with the Catholics of Ukrainian nationality on the occasion of the 16th centenary of the acceptance by St. Olga of the cross of Jesus Christ. The fervor of her faith has radiated throughout the intervening centuries into the innermost being of her people whose admirable achievements in behalf of the Kingdom of God place the whole of Christendom in their debt.

I shall be with you in spirit on the day on which you honor this great saint whose influence and intercession have so inspired her people throughout their history. I shall pray that she may give them solace and fortitude wherever they may be, so that their courageous sufferings may be offered to the Christ whose sorrowful way they traverse and become the seed of spiritual triumph both in this world and the next.

Sincerely yours in Christ,
JEROME D. HANNAN,
Bishop of Scranton.

THE ARCHDIOCESE OF ST. LOUIS,
OFFICE OF THE ARCHBISHOP,
St. Louis, Mo., August 22, 1955.

His Excellency the Most Reverend AMBROSE SENYSHYN, *O. S. B. M., Auxiliary Bishop, Vicar General, Ukrainian Catholic Exarchate, U. S. A., Stamford, Conn.*

YOUR EXCELLENCY: I am most happy to send greetings to the hierarchy, the clergy, and the faithful of the Ukrainian Catholic exarchate of the United States on the memorable occasion of the 1,000th anniversary of the conversion of St. Olga to the cross of our Lord.

The clergy and the faithful of the archdiocese of St. Louis rejoice with their fellow Americans of Ukrainian nationality or descent in the celebration of their rich heritage.

With sentiments of esteem and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours in Christ,
Most Rev. JOSEPH E. RITTER,
Archbishop of St. Louis.

A. J. Hodges Gardens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr Speaker, the opening of the A. J. Hodges Gardens in western Louisiana recently was an outstanding occasion for all of those who love beauty in the outdoors and in its natural state. The A. J. Hodges Gardens, located near Many, La., on Highway 171, 90 miles south of my home city of Shreveport, affords an opportunity to the people now for the first time of enjoying the pristine beauty of the pine-clad, clay hills of northern and western Louisiana. A huge lake, several islands, rose and azalea gardens, wildlife pastures and other attractions are most interesting to those who perchance pass in this general area on business or on pleasure.

Mr. A. J. Hodges, the owner of the Hodges Gardens, is a Shreveport, La., man. For years he has been accumulating forest areas in western Louisiana and several years ago he conceived the idea of developing a lovely park area nestled in an especially selected part of what has commonly been referred to as the cut-over pine area of Louisiana.

The gardens are not yet in a full state of completion but they, even at this hour, offer much to the visitor. One more full year's work will be required on the gardens. In the area of the garden park is a 225-acre lake and the forest areas have been stocked with deer, which were once native to that section, and with elk and wild turkey. The entire park area is composed of 4,300 acres and contains beautiful gardens exhibiting native and nonnative types of flowers.

Of great interest also is the area of the park devoted to the important pine tree experiments and an air-conditioned laboratory, kept at 70 degrees temperature the year round. All types of tests on pine trees are conducted in this air-conditioned laboratory. An arboretum containing 38 different species of pine trees, some from faraway Japan and Australia, is located near the center of the gardens and provides natural allurement to those interested in beautiful trees.

I am not a fortune teller nor am I a soothsayer. Louisiana is a lovely State but I will predict in the years to come one of the outstanding places for sheer beauty and loveliness—when nature does its best to outstrip even itself—the A. J. Hodges Gardens, with experimental areas, with game and wildlife refuge, will be known from far and wide as a natural utopia with its cloistered enchantment and its verdant beauty.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Public Warning by Food and Drug Administration of United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Against Hoxsey Cancer Treatment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act authorizes the dissemination of information regarding drugs in situations involving imminent danger to health or gross deception of the consumer.

Congress intended that this authority should be exercised intelligently and courageously in the administration of this important law. The American public has had good reason to appreciate the manner in which the law has been administered, but I know of no clearer instance of intelligent and courageous action in the interest of the public than the release issued by the Administration on the afternoon of Wednesday, April 4, 1956. Commissioner George P. Larrick and those associated with him demonstrated forcibly the great value of the service they are rendering constantly to the public.

This statement should be read and the advice and warning given should be followed. Therefore, I am including the full text of the statement in this copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC WARNING AGAINST HOXSEY CANCER TREATMENT

Sufferers from cancer, their families, physicians, and all concerned with the care of cancer patients are hereby advised and warned that the so-called Hoxsey treatment for internal cancer has been found by the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, on the basis of evidence presented by the Food and Drug Administration, to be a worthless treatment.[1]

The Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act authorizes dissemination of information regarding drugs in situations involving imminent danger to health or gross deception of the consumer.[2]

The Hoxsey treatment for internal cancer involves such drugs. Its sale represents a gross deception to the consumer. It is imminently dangerous to rely upon it in neglect of competent and rational treatment.

The Hoxsey treatment costs the patient $400 plus $60 in additional fees; expenditures which will yield nothing of any value in the care of cancer. It begins with a superficial and inadequate examination of the patient at the Hoxsey Cancer Clinic, Dallas, Tex., or Portage, Pa. The patient at Dallas is then supplied with one of the following "cancer medicines": Black pills, red pills, a brownish-black liquid, or a light red liquid. The black pills and the brownish-black liquid contain: Potassium iodide, licorice, red clover blossoms, burdock root, Stillingia root, berberis root, poke root, cascara sagrada, prickly ash bark, and buckthorn powder. The red pills contain potassium iodide, red clover, Stillingia root, poke root, buckthorn, and pepsin. At Portage the patient is given the same "cancer medication", although the colors of the pills are different. The light red liquid medicine is potassium iodide in elixir of lactated pepsin. There is evidence that potassum iodide accelerates the growth of some cancers.

The Food and Drug Administration has conducted a thorough and long-continuing investigation of Hoxsey's treatment. His claimed cures have been extensively studied and the Food and Drug Administration has not found a single verified cure of internal cancer effected by the Hoxsey treatment. In addition, the National Cancer Institute of the United States Public Health Service has reviewed case histories submitted by Hoxsey and advised him that the cases provided no scientific evidence that the Hoxsey treatment has any value in the treatment of internal cancer.

On October 26, 1953, Harry M. Hoxsey, the clinic, and all persons in active concert with him were enjoined by the United States District Court at Dallas, Tex., from shipping their worthless cancer medicines in interstate commerce with labeling representing, suggesting, or implying that the products are effective in the treatment of any type of internal cancer. While the Government intends to prosecute violations of the injunction, this warning is necessary for the immediate protection of cancer victims who may be planning to take the Hoxsey treatment.

Those afflicted with cancer are warned not to be misled by the false promise that the Hoxsey cancer treatment will cure or alleviate their condition. Cancer can be cured only through surgery or radiation. Death from cancer is inevitable when cancer patients fail to obtain proper medical treatment because of the lure of a painless cure "without the use of surgery, X-ray, or radium" as claimed by Hoxsey.

GEORGE P. LARRICK,
Commissioner of Food and Drugs.

I am also including a further statement issued by the Food and Drug Administration, which covers many facts of the greatest importance to all those unfortunate people who are suffering from cancer and who quite naturally look for any possible cure.

This supplementary statement follows:

FACTS REGARDING THE HOXSEY CANCER TREATMENT

The Hoxsey Cancer Clinic is disseminating, through articles in nationally distributed periodicals, radio addresses, speeches, and books, the claim that Hoxsey's medicines taken by mouth cure internal cancer without the need of surgery, X-ray, or radium. This claim has tremendous appeal to cancer patients, many thousands of whom are under treatment of competent physicians. The lure of a "painless" cure for cancer which may be taken by the individual in his home is almost irresistible. The claim is false.

The only known effective method of curing internal cancer are through surgery, X-ray, radium, and certain other radioactive materials. The prompt treatment of cancer by one of these methods is a principal factor in their effectiveness. Delaying competent treatment of cancer frequently is fatal to the patient. Great effort and large sums of money are being spent by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, American Cancer Society, Damon Runyon Fund, the American Medical Association, and scores of other scientific societies and institutions to emphasize the importance of early diagnosis and treatment. This effort is wasted for those patients who are diverted from competent treatment to a reliance upon false remedies.

WHAT THE HOXSEY TREATMENT IS

The Hoxsey treatment is started with a superficial and inadequate examination of the patient, which includes a few perfunctory diagnostic X-rays, blood and urine tests. Prior to November 1954 the treatment consisted essentially of the administration of a black or brownish liquid to be taken by the teaspoonful four times a day. If this was not tolerated, a pink liquid medicine was substituted. The black medicine consisted of sugar, water extracts of red clover blossoms, buckthorn, cascara, pricly ash bark, poke root, berberis root, Stillingia root, burdock, licorice, and potassium iodide. The pink medicine was merely elixir of lactated pepsin with a quantity of potassium iodide.

In November 1954 the use of a tablet was substituted for the black and pink liquids. In announcing the tablet as "the greatest development" in medicine in recent years, Hoxsey stated it was composed of the same ingredients as his black liquid medicine.

All the ingredients, both in the pink and black medicines, and their tableted counterparts, are well known to medical science. They are of no value whatever in the treatment of cancer of any type. There is evidence adduced by research that potassium iodide should not be used in the presence of some types of cancer, since it may accelerate their growth.

The Hoxsey Cancer Clinic operating at Dallas, Tex., is staffed with six osteopathic physicians, Drs. Benjamin A. Harry, Douglas C. Logan, Alfred H. Staffa, Donald Watt, Charles P. Barbaree, and William E. Stokes, and one medical doctor, Dr. Walter F. Pickett. At Portage, Pa., where a second clinic was opened in March 1955, the clinic is staffed with two osteopathic physicians, Dr. Newton C. Allen and Dr. Harold Galbraith.

Hoxsey claims to have inherited "the secret" of the cancer cure from his father, John C. Hoxsey, who in turn got it from Henry Hoxsey's grandfather, who learned of it, allegedly, when his horse grazed on certain herbs in a field and was thereby cured of cancer of the leg. Potassium iodide, the principle ingredient of the Hoxsey medicine, is not, of course, an herb.

HARRY M. HOXSEY'S BACKGROUND AND PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS

Harry M. Hoxsey has been selling his cancer medicine for at least 30 years. He has been convicted of practicing medicine with-

[1] The court decisions can be found in vol. 198, Federal Reporter, second series, p. 273, and vol. 207, Federal Reporter, second series, p. 567.

[2] 21 U. S. C. 375 (b). This authority has been delegated to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, 20 Federal Register 1998.

out a license on several occasions. He was associated with Norman Baker in a cancer institution in Muscatine, Iowa, but broke up with him in a dispute over the profits from the insitution. In the lawsuit that followed, Hoxsey lost because he had no license to treat patients and thus no right to collect money for treating them. Baker was convicted January 23, 1940, of mail fraud, fined $4,000 and sentenced to 4 years in Federal prison.

Hoxsey's convictions are as follows:

State of Illinois: (a) December 5, 1930, Fulton County, Ill., pleaded guilty and fined $100 and costs. Complaint No. 6818. Unlawfully treated human ailments. (b) November 29, 1927, Montgomery County, Ill. Complaint No. 6407. Unlawfully treated human ailments. Fined $100 and costs on a guilty plea. (c) March 17, 1930, Marion County, Ill. Information charging Hoxsey for holding himself up to the public as being engaged in making diagnoses and treating human ailments although he held no valid license to do so, to which charges he pleaded guilty on March 17, 1930, and was sentenced to pay $100 fine and costs.

Moreover, the State of Iowa obtained a perpetual injunction on October 15, 1930, issued by Judge C. L. Ely, which, enjoined Hoxsey from practicing medicine without a license.

Hoxsey set up his cancer clinic in Dallas, Tex., in 1936 and the growth of this clinic has been steady since that time.

HOXSEY ENJOINED BY FEDERAL COURT ORDER

Action under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act did not appear to be possible until court interpretation of the term "accompanying" in the definition of labeling under the act. Such interpretation was made by the Supreme Court in the case *United States* v. *Lelord Kordel* (335 U. S. 345 (1948)).

Action under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act was taken in November 1950 when the Government sought an injunction to restrain Hoxsey, his clinic, and his staff from shipping his internal cancer medicines with labeling representations that they were effective in the treatment of cancer. In December 1950 the district court refused to issue the decree of injunction.

An appeal was taken by the Government to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit at New Orleans, La., on the grounds that the judge's decision was contrary to the overwhelming weight of the credible evidence and thus clearly erroneous. After a review of the evidence, the court of appeals in July 1952 reversed the district court and ordered the injunction. The court of appeals held unanimously that the medicines are worthless for the treatment of internal cancer. The Supreme Court refused to hear an appeal. After further litigation, the district court on October 26, 1953, on mandate from the court of appeals signed the decree enjoining Hoxsey or his agents from shipping the liquid medicines or similar drugs in interstate commerce with any labeling suggesting or representing that they were effective in the treatment of cancer. This decree was again appealed by Hoxsey to the court of appeals and in May 1954 the court of appeals dismissed the appeal.

Since the effective date of the injunctive decree, Hoxsey has announced publicly that he is ignoring it and has greatly increased the promotion of his treatment by widespread publicity.

PROSECUTION WILL REQUIRE SEVERAL YEARS TO COMPLETE

The Food and Drug Administration is currently developing a contempt of court proceeding for violations of the injunctive decree which Hoxsey and his staff have already committed. This proceeding will of necessity be slow of adjudication. If conviction is secured, long legal delays and appeals are anticipated. In view of Hoxsey's determination to continue to market his treatment to cancer victims, action by the Food and Drug Administration may not result in a cessation of his activities for some time to come.

Among persons who have sponsored the Hoxsey treatment are Gerald B. Winrod, Allen Barnard, and State Senator John J. Haluska, of Pennsylvania.

Gerald B. Winrod is the publisher of the Defender magazine, Wichita, Kans. In addition to publishing monthly testimonial reports on Hoxsey's success in curing cancer, he also broadcasts over radio stations praising the Hoxsey treatment.

Allen Barnard is a writer for Man's magazine which has national distribution. He has written several articles which appeared in that publication lauding the Hoxsey treatment.

John J. Haluska is a State Senator of upper Pennsylvania who has been promoting the Hoxsey treatment. He is the former administrator of the Miners' Hospital at Spangler, Pa. Senator Haluska was discharged as administrator of the hospital after its entire medical staff demanded that he be ousted and that all plans for establishment of a Hoxsey clinic in the hospital be dropped. Senator Haluska then actively campaigned for the establishment of a Hoxsey clinic elsewhere in Cambria County, Pa. Such a clinic was opened on March 7, 1955, at Portage, Pa., with Senator Haluska as its administrator.

SEIZURE OF THE PILLS AT PORTAGE CLINIC

In March 1955 about 500,000 cancer pills and about 1,100 copies of the Defender Magazine and other booklets constituting the labeling were seized at the Hoxsey Cancer Clinic in Portage, Pa. The clinic and its medical director, Dr. Newton C. Allen, have filed an answer denying the allegations of misbranding and the action is now pending in the United States District Court at Pittsburgh, where the Government has pending a motion for summary judgment ordering destruction of the pills.

DEATHS CAUSED BY RELIANCE ON HOXSEY TREATMENT

The Food and Drug Administration has received reports of deaths which occurred after surgery was forsaken in favor of the Hoxsey treatment while the cancer was still operable and where surgery promised excellent prospects of cure.

MANY PEOPLE IN IGNORANCE OF THE FACTS

Many people are in ignorance of the facts about the Hoxsey cancer treatment. This is abundantly evident from a steady flow of letters of inquiry to the Food and Drug Administration. Unfortunately, many do not know where to inquire and many others inquire after they have gone to Hoxsey.

Reliance upon the Hoxsey treatment for internal cancer is imminently dangerous to those who suffer from cancer, and Hoxsey's continued representation that the treatment is of value for cancer constitutes a gross deception of cancer victims and their families.

COST OF TREATMENT

The standard charge is $400 for the Hoxsey treatment, plus about $60 in X-ray and examination fees. Since the patient gets a medicine that is worthless for the cure of cancer, the $460 expense is a total loss.

Date: April 4, 1956.

No Retreat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of Tuesday, April 17, 1956:

NO RETREAT

President Eisenhower has accepted the challenge of those cynically minded leaders in Congress who had handed him what can only be described as a travesty on farm legislation, relying with serene confidence on the impudent assumption that no President in an election year would dare to withhold his signature from any bill that bore the label farm relief, even though the label was counterfeit and the contents of the package a spurious and dangerous imitation of what they purported to be.

Yesterday Mr. Eisenhower brought the mounting speculation of the politicians and the public to an end by vetoing H. R. 12, designated as the Agricultural Act of 1956. But this veto was neither a hasty action, an arbitrary one nor a negative one. Few persons, we think, will question the fact that, as the President declared in a compact, but devastatingly clear, message to Congress, justifying his action, that he was acting "only after thorough consideration" and "after searching my mind and conscience." Nowhere does Mr. Eisenhower's message reflect any tendency to minimize the economic difficulties of the farm population or to question the need of an accelerated and generous program of constructive aid. On the contrary, the President notes: "It is with intense disappointment and regret that I take this action. Our farm families are suffering reduced incomes. They had a right to expect workable and beneficial legislation to help solve their problems." And he leaves no doubt where responsibility lies for failure up to now to provide such legislation.

The heart of the farm problem, the President points out (as he has done time and again over the last 3 years), is price-depressing surpluses. Any forward-looking sound program to meet the needs of the farm people "must remove the burden of these accumulations." But, he notes, H. R. 12 would not correct this situation. On the contrary, "it would encourage more surpluses. It would do harm to every agricultural region of the country and also to the interests of consumers. Thus it fails to meet the test of being good for farmers and fair to all our people."

The President's objections to H. R. 12 are best summarized in his observation that "to sign it would be to retreat, rather than advance toward a brighter future for the farm families."

But what is likely to impress most people reading the President's message is the fact that it isn't merely an exercise in dialectics, nor is it simply an effort to put the onus on Congress for not providing the aid to which the farmer is entitled. That, after all, would be of little comfort to the farmer.

The President is convinced that despite the long and unnecessary delay in framing this measure, and despite the fact that it is completely unacceptable as it stands, there is still much that can be done if Congress

is prepared to cooperate with the administration. He proposes that, acting under authority that it possesses under the legislation of 1954, the administration undertake a three-part program for temporarily alleviating the farmers' plight by voluntary increases in the support levels for crops and dairy products. He calls upon Congress, for its part, to "pass a straight soil bank bill as quickly as possible." He concludes:

"It is vital that we get the soil bank authorized in this session of Congress. There is general agreement on it. I am ready to sign a sound soil bank act as soon as Congress sends it to me. That can be accomplished in a very few days if the leadership in Congress will undertake the task. The combined program of administrative action and legislative enactment will begin now to improve the income and welfare of all our farm families. Here is a challenge for both the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government."

Addresses by Vice Adm. James L. Holloway, Jr., United States Navy, Chief of Naval Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith two addresses by Vice Adm. James L. Holloway, Jr., United States Navy, Chief of Naval Personnel. One is a statement before the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives on H. R. 6583, a bill to amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and the other an address made by Admiral Holloway before the Pilot International Club of South Carolina in Charleston, S. C., on Saturday, April 14, 1956.

Mr. Speaker, Admiral Holloway is one of the most distinguished naval officers of our time. He has been commended and decorated with almost every honor within the gift of the Department of the Navy. As a fighting admiral he has no superior. As an administrator of the tedious responsibilities of the Office of Chief of Naval Personnel, he has held this latter position longer than any other man in the history of the Navy. His well rounded and varied experiences in defense of his beloved country have eminently qualified him to speak for enlisted men and officers alike in our Navy of worldwide commitments. Admiral Holloway has a personal interest in all of the men and women ashore and afloat. His fatherly approach to all the problems of these men and women make him without a superior in the position he now occupies. I have a personal interest in Admiral Holloway. He married a Charleston girl from one of South Carolina's most distinguished families. She is a daughter of the late and distinguished Gen. John Hagood. Because of this and many other things, I have followed his career with a keen interest and I call it to the attention of the Congress with great pride and satisfaction.

The addresses follow:

STATEMENT OF VICE ADMIRAL J. L. HOLLOWAY, JR., UNITED STATES NAVY, CHIEF OF NAVAL PERSONNEL, BEFORE THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE ON H. R. 6583, A BILL TO AMEND THE UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE

Mr. Chairman and members of the Armed Services Committee, it is always a pleasure to appear before this distinguished group which has been responsible for so much wise and constructive legislation in the past. I particularly appreciate the opportunity to be heard on the important legislative proposal which you are considering today because, as Chief of Naval Personnel, I am directly responsible to the Secretary of the Navy for the technical administration of discipline throughout the naval service.

For centuries, nations have recognized that a practical and efficient code of conduct is the backbone of any effective military force. Thomas Jefferson and John Adams were, in 1776, appointed a committee of the Continental Congress to hear Colonel Tudor, General Washington's Judge Advocate General, as to the insufficiency of the then current Articles of War existing in the Continental Army, and to request a revision of them. The following is an identical excerpt from the Journals of the Continental Congress, volume V, 1776, and from the Works of John Adams, Second President of the United States.

"There was existant one system of articles of war which had carried two empires to the head of mankind, the Roman and the British; for the British articles of war were only a literal translation of the Roman * * *. The British articles of war were, accordingly, reported, and defended in Congress by me assisted by some others, and finally carried. They laid the foundation of a discipline which, in time, brought our troops to a capacity of contending with British veterans, and a rivalry with the best troops of France * * *."

The Articles for the Government of the Navy, as they existed prior to 1951, stem primarily from the Articles of War referred to above, and set forth concepts of engendered discipline, tenacity, and devotion to duty carried to the ultimate development. Many of their provisions came down to us virtually unchanged from 1776.

I mention the historic articles and their origin, as that code contained certain virtues in vouchsafing commanding officers authority for nonjudicial punishment, which we believe was effective over the years. The amendments hereinafter dealt with will incorporate similar authority in the present Uniform Code of Military Justice.

Discipline has been called the soul of the fleet (Douglas Southal Freeman, 1950). Discipline is far more than punishment. In the words of Webster, it is training which corrects, molds, strengthens or perfects.

Military discipline encompasses both instinctive obedience to commands on the one hand, and, on the other, the exercise of initiative, judgment and tenacity in the execution of orders. The key to discipline, to valor in battle, and to effectiveness and tenacity in campaign, lies in a code which inspires the full development of these qualities in joinder.

In speaking with you today on H. R. 6583, I consider that we are dealing with more than a proposed change in legal procedures. We are considering matters that vitally affect the youth of our Nation. There are over 800,000 young men in the Armed Forces under 21 years of age, with a large turnover every year. This means that a major part of the youths of our country will perform some military service. How they fare during their military service will determine, in large measure, how they fare thereafter and what kind of citizens they become.

A naval commanding officer is much more than a ship handler and seaman afloat or a dignified figurehead ashore. He must embody all the symbols of authority and moral guidance represented in civilian life by the father, the school principal, and the pastor. His stature and authority are important factors in the growth and development of the many lads in his command who are no longer boys but not yet fully matured. A commanding officer's strength lies for the most part in his character, the prestige of his office, and in his training and experience in handling men. An important element of a commanding officer's strength is his authority which we earnestly believe must be increased.

The bill you are considering helps to accomplish that purpose by expanding the present powers of the commanding officer in regard to nonjudicial punishment. As you know, nonjudicial punishment is that relatively minor punitive measure which the commanding officer can inflict directly at captain's mast. The important point here is that nonjudicial punishment, as the term implies, is not a result of judicial procedure, such as a court-martial, does not result in any form of discharge from the service, and is not recorded as a previous conviction in a man's record. Thus, a man sentenced at mast to confinement or extra duty does not suffer the stigma of having been convicted at a court-martial which makes him, legally, a man with a Federal criminal record. This is the heart of the matter—the proposed amendment will serve the interests of the youths of our country just as significantly as it will serve the broadest interests of the Armed Forces. We in the Navy have few criminals; we have, of course, our share of irresponsible juvenile offenders. We need the proposed amendment to handle our wayward lads in their teens with firmness and dispatch, yet with humanitarian understanding, and to help as many of them as possible to avoid the permanent stigma of a court-martial conviction. It is well recognized that corrective punitive action, particularly in regard to the training of youth, is of paramount importance in establishing clean habits and sound morals. Many educational authorities today recognize that some of our problems in juvenile delinquency stem from a modern, so-called progressive departure from the time-honored principle of "spare the rod and spoil the child."

Under the present code, a commanding officer may punish an enlisted man in one of several ways without resorting to a court-martial. He may restrict the man or give him extra duties for 2 weeks or he may reduce him in grade. These are the only punishments which the commanding officer may impose unless the man is attached to or embarked in a ship, in which case the man may be confined for 1 week. Our experience over the past few years has indicated that these measures have often proved of insufficient severity, either as a deterrent against the commission of minor offenses or as punishment for the offenses already committed. They provide very well for the handling of the first and the extremely minor offender; but when the man repeats or when the offense is a little higher on the scale of seriousness, then the command is put to the hard choice between measures which are ineffective and ordering a court-martial which is too rigorous. A commanding officer of a taut ship or station knows that quick and effective punishment is indispensable to discipline. Timeliness is often more important than rigor.

Not the least among the benefits to be derived is the salutary effect on the ship's company as a whole, particularly on the petty officers who require, and whose responsibili-

ties and loyalty merit, direct support in their important duties in regard to discipline. We must have the moral courage to be promptly firm with the one who is in flagrante delicto, in order to deter 10 other youths from spoiling good records.

I believe that the proposed bill moves toward a restoration of an optimum body of military law. It provides the commanding officer with somewhat greater authority by permitting him to confine any enlisted man up to 7 days or to fine him half a month's pay. This amendment will make it possible for a commanding officer to achieve the necessary correction and deterrence in handling his in between petty offenders rather than subjecting them to a court-martial as is too often now the case.

It should be emphasized here that military punishment, while necessary on a small scale to enforce discipline, is not conceived as just a punitive procedure, an eye for an eye process. Rather it is corrective in its application, with the primary objective of leading the minor offender back to a normal, productive, cooperative mode of behavior.

Those of us with sons or daughters have probably found that among our best disciplinary measures are the curtailing of spending money and limiting their activities outside the home. In essence, the bill under consideration gives commanding officers these same powers over his men that parents have over their children. Parents have always had without question the authority to discharge their responsibilities imposed by society; military commanders have the same need for authority to help them discharge the responsibilities imposed by law and custom.

Another aspect of H. R. 6583 that impresses me as being of major importance is that dealing with the reduction of paperwork and useless, time-consuming administrative procedure. This, in itself, will add to the effectiveness of our disciplinary system.

The code has been in operation now for nearly 5 years. It has not been completely effective because it has not only hamstrung the commanding officer with administrative minutia, but it has weakened his historic role at mast; that of a wise, just, fatherly mentor, quick to punish the sinners and equally quick to help a man redeem himself and start afresh.

The legal procedures of the UCMJ have been carried out, it is true, but with excessive delay and at a great unnecessary cost in man-hours. As a type commander in the Atlantic Fleet for 2½ years I was most impressed, by first hand experience, with the administrative expense of certian legal processes which are essentially routine matters of form and not of substance. In these times of grave personnel economies in the Armed Forces we must bear in mind that the Armed Forces are in being solely to provide an adequate national defense. They are not essentially judicial agencies, law enforcement agencies, or social security agencies. Each minute, each dollar, each man that we must devote to some function other than preparedness to fight leaves 1 minute, $1, 1 man less to devote to preparedness. Court-martial and legal proceedings are worth that price only when the primary end to be achieved, discipline, is improved. When the procedures of courts-martial and other related legal matters become so cumbersome that officers must neglect such primary duties as personal leadership, maintenance or training, then it is time that we take action to change the system. That is the purpose at which many of the sections of this bill are aimed, without reducing in the smallest amount the features of the UCMJ that protect the rights of the individual.

I shall not go into further detail on the bill under consideration since a number of witnesses will appear before you equipped to discuss at length the technicalities and effect of each provision. Before closing, however, I want to address myself in general terms to your overall consideration of H. R. 6583.

This committee may hear witnesses testifying on a number of bills relating to the armed services, bills involving new weapons, and bills throwing a new light on the technology of warfare. What sets H. R. 6583 apart from the rest?

This bill is set apart because it deals with the bone, the muscle, the sinew of the armed services; it deals with the man. Regardless of what technical advances we make and what weapons we develop, all of that progress is ineffectual if we do nto have behind it the superbly disciplined fighting man. When I think back to the seemingly unending months of World War II, I recall the quartermaster, the bosun's mate, the gunner's mate, the machinist's mate—the legion of fighting men, disciplined for peace and war. The weapons with which we fought have faded to a degree from my mind's eye, but not so with the men. Those men and the men who follow them give us real strength, the strength that makes our armed services great. And it is these men that are affected by the provisions of H. R. 6583. We feel that those provisions are equitable, that they aid the national defense, and that, above all, they assist our young men who, in assuming their military obligations, must recognize that they temporarily subordinate certain individual liberties, in order to cherish that much greater freedom—that of our way of life in this Republic.

REMARKS BY VICE ADM. JAMES L. HOLLOWAY, JR., UNITED STATES NAVY, CHIEF OF NAVAL PERSONNEL, BEFORE THE PILOT INTERNATIONAL CLUB OF SOUTH CAROLINA, CHARLESTON, S. C., APRIL 14, 1956

It is with extreme pleasure that I am here tonight, and I thank you for the kind invitation to address a few remarks to you. It is an honor and a privilege, all the more appreciated because I so rarely appear before women's organizations. As a matter of fact, the last time I made a similar appearance was in January of 1955, more than a year ago, when I spoke to the Women's Forum on National Security in Washington, D. C. Perhaps some of you were also present on that occation. At any rate, as Chief of Naval Personnel, it is usually true that I am fairly well surrounded by the officers and men and women who make up today's Navy. And while they are without question the world's finest, it is most pleasant to have a change of pace, and to meet with such a distinguished organization as the Pilot Club of South Carolina.

Alexander Poe, who lived a great many years ago, made a wise observation when he stated:

"Men, some to quiet; some to public strife
But every lady would be queen for life."

There are those who feel that a naval officer's life is to a large degree one of strife, as he endeavors to meet the manifold commitments imposed upon him in this uncertain world. But certainly there is no question but that each lady present tonight is indeed a queen, a title you have indubitably earned through the splendid work you are doing. Not only South Carolina but surely every area in which your activities are known has benefited and will continue to benefit from your magnanimity and your generous contributions to the betterment of our world.

It is said that magnanimity is truest wisdom. It is also said that there's wisdom in women, and who among us would disagree? It is upon this premise then, women's magnanimity and wisdom, that I should like to comment briefly, and then attempt to show what I believe is a close analogy between the things you stand for and work for and the things which we in the United States Navy seek to accomplish.

First of all, yours is an organization dedicated to service, civic and social—local, national, and international. Because your philosophy is already known to each of you, it requires no detailed accounting, but it does seem appropriate to observe that, in addition to a desire to be of service, one other quality is essential, and that is wisdom—wisdom to ascertain just where, and when, and in what amount a service should be rendered. Thus both motivation and intelligence are necessary for you to accomplish your objectives—or stated another way, magnanimity and wisdom are essential to your success.

Now, let us consider for a moment the United States Navy. Ours, too, is an organization dedicated to service, national and international. And like you, the Navy must give careful consideration to when and where its services are necessary.

To state it simply, the United States Navy is the guardian of our country. The Navy is responsible for maintaining control of the sea and is a ready force on watch at home and overseas, capable of strong action to preserve the peace or of instant offensive action to win in war. It is upon the maintenance of this control that our country's glorious future depends; the United States Navy exists to make it so.

But never before have we felt it necessary to exercise greater precaution, both to determine that we are capable of the proper control and to use this control in the right and most effective way. To do this requires real wisdom, for in today's world so much depends upon this vital force.

As is usually the case, where there are many and weighty responsibilities, there are also numerous opportunities. This is particularly true of today's Navy, which offers practically unlimited opportunities for education, travel, and adventure. And, perhaps greatest of all, is the privilege of performing an important job, and the knowledge that we are contributing a worthwhile service which will enhance the welfare of our country.

Subscribing to the theory that wisdom is derived, at least in part, from experience and education, the Navy endeavors to see that its personnel have a liberal amount of each. As a matter of fact, education for all of our personnel is a continuing thing throughout their careers, beginning with the day they begin service, and not even ending upon retirement. We believe we offer our personnel the finest and best education attainable, and we support this belief by having instituted an unprecedented program for training of personnel, both officer and enlisted.

For our enlisted personnel, there is education and training for over 60 ratings from the time-honored bo'suns mate to the new and adventurous guided-missile man. Each of these ratings offers the young men and women of today a challenging career with almost unlimited promotion opportunities. Many qualify for officer rank.

Some of the paths leading to a commission are, first of all, the United States Naval Academy, with which you are familiar. Then we have the Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps, with units located in 52 colleges and universities throughout the country. One of these units is located at the University of South Carolina, in Columbia, and perhaps some of your own sons or those of your friends are enrolled there. Also, we have the officer-candidate school at Newport, R. I., and the Reserve officer-candidate program for members of the Naval Reserve who are enrolled in college. For training in aviation we have the aviation officer-candidate school, and the naval aviation-candidate program, better known to some of you as the NavCad program. Training in these aviation programs is pursued at Pensacola, Fla.

Considering all these programs, it can be seen that training is only the first step in the broad educational system that extends through the career of naval personnel.

We would certainly not forget nor minimize the important role which women fill in our modern Navy, for theirs is a fine contribution. And they, too, enjoy educational opportunities, beginning with their initial training at the Officer Candidate School, Newport, R. I., for officers and the recruit training commands for enlisted women. Nor would we fail to mention that group of professional women, the Navy Nurse Corps, who are literally angels of mercy as they perform the many functions in caring for our sick and wounded. Yes, the Navy places very high value upon the valiant women who serve, and thus you see that we, too, endorse with enthusiasm the principle of equal rights for men and women.

I understand that your desire for service finds expression in the awarding of educational scholarships to worthy young women of other lands, that they may come to our country for study. Here, then, is evidence that there is a parallel in the emphasis which you, and the United States Navy, place upon education.

When these young women come to this country for an education, it also means that they must travel. Likewise, the Navy offers, besides education, an opportunity for travel, as well as interesting and exciting duty. It also offers as nowhere else a challenge to our young people. The opportunity to fulfill dreams and perform courageous and new deeds still lives. Your code of ethics states that visions and dreams are the seedlings of reality, and we in the Navy are pleased that you believe this, because it is upon this selfsame principle that we stand steadfast.

We believe that service to God and country is our special privilege, and, therefore, we serve with honor. "True course ever" might well be our motto, even as it is yours.

Service—surely this is a term equally applicable to the Pilot Club and to the United States Navy. Each exists for just that purpose.

What closer analogy could possibly be found than your project for the rehabilitation of Vimoutiers, and the Navy's recent passage to freedom operation in Vietnam? If there is a soft spot to be found in our naval personnel, it is in the heart of a sailor, who will give liberally of his time, his money, and of himself, to help those less fortunate than he. So, while you concentrate on making your community, and thus the world, a better place to live, your Navy man is putting into practice this pilot objective at his port of call throughout the world.

I know that in the almost twoscore years since your organization came into being you have accomplished a great many things of which you are proud. Yours has been a noble contribution to your country and your fellow man. The Navy likewise is a proud organization of people who cherish its ideals and principles. Like you, we earnestly desire to make a noble contribution to our country and to our fellow man. We believe that in these uncertain times in which we live that preserving the peace is our most important role. We want peace—a lasting peace—but not at the expense of our freedom and the integrity of our human liberties. We hope fervently to prevent war by assuring the world that we are resolved to maintain the strength to meet an attack from any quarter at any time. We further believe that control of the sea, the primary mission of the Navy, gives the United States her greatest advantage for the maintenance of peace and for victory if war comes.

Never have our opportunities and our responsibilities been greater. Just as you look about you and, with magnanimity and wisdom, decide when and where and in what amount a service should be rendered, so do we, your country's Navy, look about us and do our best to determine the proper course of action to follow.

This would be impossible to do were it not for persons such as yourselves who show a constant and considerate interest, not only in the Navy itself but, more particularly, in maintaining those same idals for which we stand.

And so, when I have the all-too-rare pleasure of appearing before such a charming and distinguished group as you, I am reminded of a favorite quotation from Browning, who once wrote:

"You're my friend.
What a thing friendship is, world without end."

What, indeed? To us it is that masterpiece of nature, for which we are grateful, without which the Navy could surely not exist.

Farm Bill Veto Praised as Example of Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the New York Herald Tribune of Tuesday, April 17, 1956:

FARM BILL VETO IS PRAISED AS AN EXAMPLE OF COURAGE

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, April 16.—President Eisenhower has given the Nation one of those examples of courage which come rarely in the history of American politics.

For, in vetoing the farm bill, the President was disagreeing not only with Democrats but with many members of his own party in Congress who have been prodded into taking position similar to that of their political opponents for fear of the advantage the latter might get on the stump in the coming campaign.

Plainly the bill has been publicized so widely as a bonanza to the farmers that many Republican Members of Congress in farm States fear they cannot overcome that impression by using statistics or economic arguments. There were those on the Republican side who urged the President to sign the bill and try to get a better one through Congress next time. The argument was that this would save Republican votes in November. But Mr. Eisenhower refused to yield to expediency. He took his position firmly on the basis of conviction and on what he and his agricultural advisers feel is sound economics.

It isn't easy to persuade farmers that a bill which is designed to bolster prices isn't good for them or for the country. But it so happens that the painful facts of what has been happening in agriculture are on the President's side. It is true that by artificially supporting high prices, the Government itself has stimulated the production of vast surpluses.

Today nearly $9 billion of taxpayers' money are tied up in an accumulation of farm products which the Government owns and does not dare to sell for fear that to do so will send prices still lower than they are. In fact, the very existence of the surpluses has all along had a depressing effect on the price structure. The surplus problem has hung like a sword of Damocles over the American farmer for many years.

EISENHOWER'S POSITION

Mr. Eisenhower at the outset of his administration took a strong position against any further accumulation of surpluses and notified Congress that he wanted a system of flexible price supports so that surpluses could be worked off gradually, or at least not accumulated further. But the politicians got busy and passed a bill which they dared him to veto. It was supposed to spell political suicide for the Republican Party in the farm States if not enacted.

Mr. Eisenhower pondered his course as between expediency and simple honesty. He refused to be dragooned by cries that he would lose the election. He declined to accept the suggestion from some Republican sources that it would be better to sign the bill and ask Congress to revise it next time so at least to get by the presidential election this year.

There is an interesting analogy here with what happened during the Republican administration of President William Howard Taft when a high protectionist tariff bill was passed by Congress in the face of demands for a reduction in the cost of living, particularly because of the high prices of manufactured goods then prevailing. Mr. Taft knew it was a bad bill and said so, but nevertheless he signed it. The country lost respect for him, his party became split, and the 1912 election saw Mr. Taft ignominiously defeated in his attempt at reelection.

"INTEGRITY CONSISTENCY"

Mr. Eisenhower has adhered to his conscientious convictions despite the pressure to get him to abandon them. That's what the people have come to expect of him—integrity and consistency.

As for the agricultural States, he will, of course, lose some votes, but there are administrative powers in the present laws which can operate to the benefit of the farmer, and the chances are that farm income will show an improvement by election time without running the risk of making high price supports a permanent part of the agricultural economics of America.

Mr. Eisenhower has played it straight—with firmness and consistency—and has saved the urban families today some substantial increases in the cost of food. And, of course, city dwellers vote, too.

Resolution in Support of H. R. 9566

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. A. THOMPSON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolution signed by officials of the Muller Co., Ltd., of Lake Charles, La., who favor immediate enactment of H. R. 9566 and restoration of uniform parcel post size and weight limits:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF H. R. 9566

"Whereas the existence of an efficient, economical parcel post system is essential to the pattern of life of our citizens and businesses in both rural and urban areas; and

"Whereas the present discriminatory parcel post size and weight limitations seriously

disrupt the service once enjoyed by all at great and unnecessary cost and inconvenience; and

"Whereas there is no nationwide substitute for parcel post that can and will serve all citizens regardless of address; and

"Whereas the present size and weight limitations have been both a financial and an administrative burden to the Post Office Department: Be it hereby

"*Resolved*, That the Muller Co., Ltd., comprised of 250 members and representing several businesses in Lake Charles, La., favors immediate enactment of H. R. 9566 and restoration thereby of uniform parcel post size and weight limits."

It is respectfully requested that Representative T. A. THOMPSON insert this resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and that he request the chairman of the Post Office Committee to schedule hearings now on parcel post size and weight so that the citizens of Lake Charles may have relief from the present law before the current legislative session is concluded.

THE MULLER CO., LTD.,
ADOLPH S. MARX,
President.
FRANK W. FOXX,
Vice President.
HENRY GREENWOOD,
Secretary.

Mid-America Jubilee on the St. Louis Riverfront

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a news release setting forth the concept and plans for Mid-America Jubilee on the St. Louis riverfront throughout the month of September 1956, which will be the first in a series of such expositions to be held each year in St. Louis, at that time. I am certain the great city of St. Louis and the surrounding area will present an outstanding event that will have major national, regional, and local impact.

The news release follows:

The outstanding civic, industrial, and agricultural showmanship project of the Midwest, Mid-America Jubilee, is an annual regional exposition to be held on the St. Louis riverfront throughout the entire month of September.

Conceived by the Chamber of Commerce of Metropolitan St. Louis and endorsed by Civic Progress, 26 voluntary committees representing every community interest have been formed.

With the objectives of dramatizing the interdependence of industrial-urban and rural-agricultural interests, stimulating business in the St. Louis area, and increasing pride in the accomplishment of the rich midwestern heartland surrounding St. Louis, the exposition, a miniature world's fair in scope, will occupy approximately 37 acres of the Jefferson Memorial Expansion Park site.

EXHIBITS AT THE JUBILEE

Contemporary in design, the exhibits area will include spectacular, animated displays of maximum visitor interest from a wide range of national, regional, and local industrial corporations. Forward looking in theme, these exhibits will feature many of the latest electronic, atomic, and automotive accomplishments of United States industry.

The military will participate through large-scale displays of the latest developments in aviation, guided missiles, and other defense equipment. A heliport with continuous daytime demonstrations by helicopters will be included. Federal, State, and municipal agenices, together with educational, religious, and welfare organizations, will display their vital contributions to community development.

AGRICULTURE

An extensive agricultural area will include a model Midwestern farm with crops under cultivation, exhibits of livestock and farm equipment, and a judging arena with a continuous cycle of agricultural and livestock special events.

ENTERTAINMENT AT THE JUBILEE

Approximately 100,000 square feet will be devoted to an amusement area featuring carousals, ferris wheels, a miniature railway, a pony ride, and other amusement devices of maximum appeal to youngsters and reminiscent of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition in design.

The exposition will also include a nostalgic 1904 "Meet Me in St. Louie, Louie" beergarden restaurant accommodating 500 at tables and 200 at a standing bar. A German band for waltzes and polkas, a menu featuring German-American and French Creole cuisine and the products of the major St. Louis breweries will be included.

Entertainment highlight of the exposition will be a huge spectacle show with a cast of 350 professional actors, singers and dancers aided by a star of national magnitude. Scores of horses, horse-drawn and automotive equipment will be included in the production to be presented each night throughout the 30-day operating period of Mid-America Jubilee. Presented on a multileveled stage to be erected in front of the historic Old Cathedral, this musical production will, in terms of popular entertainment, relate the romance of the development of St. Louis and the surrounding area. Special scenic and lighting effects, hundreds of costumes, and the efforts of a creative and technical staff of theatrical experts under the direction of Broadway producer-director James Vincent Russo, will blend their efforts into the production of the spectacle script by New York and Hollywood playwright-lyricist Norman Zeno.

In this same area, an afternoon program of continuously changing free special events, reflecting participation by every conceivable type of community organization, will be presented.

A conservative estimate of attendance the initial year indicates a minimum of 500,000 visitors. Front gate admission is 75 cents for adults and 35 cents for children 12 and under.

Sponsored by City Country Cavalcade, Inc.: Raymond R. Tucker, mayor, honorary president; Roscoe C. Hobbs, president; Stanley M. Richman, executive vice president; Arthur K. Atkinson, vice president; Wyllys K. Bliss, treasurer.

Alfred Stern, director of the department of community and industrial showmanship of the congressionally-chartered American National Theater and Academy (ANTA) is managing director, a former member of the production staff of New York's Radio City Music Hall at the New York World's Fair of 1939–40, served as managing director for such large-scale community celebrations as the Detroit Automotive Golden Jubilee (1946); Detroit's year-long 250th birthday festival throughout 1951; the centennial of Omaha, Nebr., in 1954; and the centennial of Flint, Mich., in 1955.

Factors in the Farm Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Krock in the New York Times of Tuesday, April 17, 1956:

THE FACTORS IN THE FARM BILL VETO

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, April 16.—Suppose the President had signed the farm bill, as a number of Republicans in the farm States, including governors, and most Democrats urged him to do:

He would have sacrificed to a cynical concept of political expediency an economic principle he repeatedly said was basic to the first steps toward improvement of the income of agriculture and to its ultimate stability on a prosperity level.

He would have discredited his Secretary of Agriculture, whose unwavering opposition to the continuation of rigid price supports the President steadfastly encouraged and emulated. If Secretary Benson had not resigned, he would have been set down as a man whose desire to stay in office rose above his deep conviction of what the fundamental public contribution of that office should be.

The President would, by signing the bill, have also rejected the views of another counselor on whose judgment in agriculture he greatly relies and with whom he has the closest personal bond: his younger brother, Milton Eisenhower.

In the ranks of the repudiated would also have been (a) the administration spokesmen in Congress, who warned their colleagues of a veto if the conference form of the bill was passed; and (b) the Members of Congress who voted against the legislation as an expression of confidence in the administration's farm policy, some at great political risk.

These are among the calculable debits the President would have contracted by signing the conference report. And to them would have been added a debit as much greater than the sum of them all as it is incalculable. This would have been the inevitable and sharp downward revision of an overwhelming public impression the President has created—that he lives by a set of principles, personal and political. By signing the bill he would have compromised both, and in a sector where they are mutually inclusive.

What many politicians urged the President to do, and Senator KEFAUVER confidently predicted he would do, was to sign legislation that further embedded in the farm economy the component which, above all others, he charged with responsibility for the depressed state of that economy. "It only extends rigid 90 percent parity for another year," was again the argument which, accepted annually by the President's predecessors, has piled higher and higher the agricultural surpluses that are largely responsible for the steady slump in farm income while the income of nearly all other groups has constantly been rising.

THE LOST MAGIC

On this argument Congress from year to year has deferred the institution of the flexible price support system it legislated some time ago. And on this argument the economic condition that is frightening the officeholders in the farming areas has been more and more deeply entrenched by those

same politicians. Though what the President referred to in his veto message as "the insatiable markets associated with war" shrank with the shrinking postwar demand, the 90 percent price system was constantly extended in changing circumstances where it lost whatever magic it may have had. This was demonstrated when, in every year but one between 1947 and 1954, farm income declined despite the congressional mandate for 90 percent parity.

In standing by his principle the President, however, recognized and served certain economic considerations with which political factors are plainly linked. By setting price supports on 5 basic crops at 82½ percent of parity he fixed national averages for a number of farm products that would also have resulted from the bill he vetoed. This undoubtedly will be as welcome politically to the beleaguered farm-belt Republicans as it will be economically to their constituents. The Democrats, and those Republicans who supported the bill the President vetoed, can claim credit for this move by the administration, contending that the passage of the farm bill forced the President to fix these averages. But the hand that feeds will be the President's. And it was evident today that this thought greatly comforted the Republican governors who went to the White House to advocate signing and left with the news of the new levels.

The economic interest of farmers in the United States is not the same in all areas. What helps one group does not help all. Moreover, despite the drive in Congress to pass the bill the President vetoed, and the activity of some farmers, organizations in its behalf, other organizations as actively opposed it. A large body of political, economic, consumer, and agricultural opinion stands with the President against those aspects of the bill that evoked his veto. It was not a case of General Eisenhower and Secretary Benson alone on the burning deck.

Congress may decline to rescue the soil bank from the veto, as the President requested in his message today, but that request, plus the new minimum support levels he fixed, puts him on the affirmative and Congress on the negative side of the equation. And on the moral test of standing by a principle he has all the best of it.

The Church Looks at the Nation's Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting an address delivered by the Honorable Alfred M. Landon, former Governor of Kansas. The address was delivered before the Topeka Ministerial Association, Topeka, Kans., on Tuesday, April 3, 1956.

Every Member of Congress is aware of the international issues and problems confronting the world today. This administration has made great strides toward the goal of everlasting peace. To achieve and keep our goal we must be ever vigilant. We must constantly appraise our actions and policies in light of changing global events. We must heed and consider the thoughts and wisdom of experienced statesmen, such as Mr. Landon. Mr. Landon's address merits the study and consideration of all Members of Congress.

The address follows:

THE CHURCH LOOKS AT THE NATION'S FOREIGN POLICY

(Address by Alf M. Landon before Topeka Ministerial Association, Topeka, Kans., April 3, 1956)

Three major events have occurred since Reverend Bennett asked me last August to speak today on this subject.

1. Rearming by West Germany.

I have frequently expressed the opinion that that would be the time if Russia was going to challenge Bonn.

Of course, that story may not be fully told as yet. The Kremlin may have other moves up its sleeve. But it can be said that the West German situation is more favorable than a year ago.

2. Selling arms to Egypt by a Russian colony.

That upsets the balance of power in the Near East where there are a lot of cocked and loaded guns.

If these guns are ever aimed and fired, their shots will be heard around the world.

Then the lights of H-bombs may blot out the sun of life and civilization.

3. The exhuming of two Russian men in February.

One from a deliberately ignored and forgotten grave. The other from a national shrine.

One—Dostoevsky—was exhumed as a national hero. The other—Stalin—was buried a national hero and demigod. But he was exhumed as a bestial murderer whose policy and acts were crimes against the Soviet state.

The contrast between the social and political ideals and philosophy of these two revolutionaries gives significance to the official restitution of Dostoevsky and the official degradation of Stalin by the Soviet. It can mean nothing or it can mean a lot.

Dostoevsky was unorthodox. He did not believe in dogmas and creeds.

Deviation from any of the Communist dogma and practices heretofore has meant sentence to one of the Communist slave camps—or death.

Dostoevski believed that the ills that affected Russia and life in general would be corrected through the applying of the teachings of Christ.

Stalin believed those teachings were an opiate. Therefore, the Church had to be crushed and a new generation indoctrinated against Christianity.

He had damned Dostoevski as "a lackey of the warmongers of Wall Street."

However, "beginning on February 9—the 75th anniversary of Dostoevski's death—a whole week was given over to resurrecting Dostoevski as a national hero—honoring him with celebrations—official publications of all his works—library and museum exhibits—documentary films—plays based on his novels—a government sponsored anthology and biography, and so on. He even had a street named in his honor."

The simultaneous timing of the reversal of official judgment on the nonconformist novelist and the Communist demigod evidences a change of some import is taking place in Russia—encouraging to intellectual freedom.

And intellectual freedom is the seedbed of religious freedom and political freedom.

Contrary to former precepts and examples, the "social usefulness" of questioning rigid dogmas and practices has been dramatized in a startling way to the Communist world.

If that be a play—drama—as an opiate to the free world—it is also fraught with danger to the Commintern in loosening its grip on the minds and souls of its subjects.

To exalt the unorthodox among the highly indoctrinated, zealous orthodox is a step backward, dangerous in any tyranny.

If the Soviet's new vision is designed as a trap for the free world—it is also of a design to trap the trapper.

The unmasking of a demigod means the loosening of the tie that binds his cult. Especially is that true when 75 percent of the Russian Communist Party are a younger generation that knows nothing of the spirit of martyrdom for their faith of the older generation.

Even if it be true that there is stability of a kind at the bottom in Russia and her colonies—it is certainly true that there is unrest at the top in the Kremlin and throughout the Communist world.

Another encouragement to the interchange of ideas is the raising of the Iron Curtain a wee mite permitting more travel and communication in and out of Russia.

Whether the new Kremlin tactics are a shift from armed force to increased economic competition, a strengthening of the highly privileged class in Russia and her colonies by relieving the relentless and fearful strains and pressures of terrorism and despotism, an attempt to woo neutral sentiment in the world, by repudiating the bestial cruelties and tyranny of communism, or whether it is a combination of all this.

It is a wise and sound policy to proceed on the basis that the Communists have not abandoned their objective of conquering the world and colonizing all countries for the Kremlin czars.

A highly competent authority—the Research Institute—recently reported the Soviet power is gaining.

It is true that serious differences—almost floundering—exist in NATO over the handling of the Greek-Cyprus issue, the Arab-Israeli disputes, the China policy, and the French policy in north Africa.

Not only have Cyprus and Algiers had a disturbing effect in NATO—they have become symbols to much of the world of the fight of former colonial peoples for political independence.

However, it is also true that NATO is undoubtedly stronger militarily, despite the Soviet's attempts to break up this free world alliance.

Both SEATO and NATO are growing in strength militarily. Whether they are politically stronger is something of a question.

The Formosa situation is greatly changed from a year ago when a Red offensive appeared imminent.

Today Chinese Communists are far better prepared for attacking Formosa than they were a year ago.

Today, however, the likelihood of an attack appears much less.

The parliamentary situation in Japan appears better today than a year ago. But that can be deceptive. The Japanese economy, although improving somewhat, is basically not much better than it has been since the war. They cannot go on indefinitely with a constantly expanding population and ever-decreasing resources.

The rearming of Spain is proceeding satisfactorily. The political situation in Spain after Franco is as uncertain as the political situation in West Germany after Adenauer.

England is suffering from inflation. However, the government is tackling that job with a firm hand and working toward sounder ground.

France and Italy continue to be weak spots both economically, politically, and militarily. There is not much improvement in either country during the past year.

There are powerful Communist forces in some of the South American countries, and some economic distress.

What does it all add up to on basic issues?

Generally, the free countries are stronger economically and militarily today than a year ago.

But that can change rapidly in different areas. In some countries, both Fascists and Communists are working hand in glove to prove that democratic government will not work.

There has been no real change in world policy by the czars of the Kremlin.

On the one hand they are skillfully appealing to neutral and peaceful sentiment, and on the other infiltrating Arab and other countries to stir up strife and bloodshed with other people's bodies.

Easter is 2 days past—when mankind should be thinking of peace, liberty, and progress.

But communism is thinking of anything but that.

Therefore, such concessions as have been made by Russia have been obtained through the increased strength of the free world. That's not a promising international situation.

America's strength and leadership must be directed toward:

1. Formulating a joint foreign policy that is sufficiently flexible to meet the tactics of the Soviet.

2. Energetically and skillfully working to unify the conflicting interests of the free world.

3. Obtaining agreement on the "open skies" proposal of President Eisenhower. I proposed 10 years ago the neutralizing of the key spots in the world. I think now would be a good time to bring that up in connection with aerial and ground inspection and disarmament.

4. Team work with other countries to fill empty pocketbooks and empty stomachs, not by gifts, but by development of health, resources, arts, and sciences.

5. Freer exchange of trade and travel, and communication.

Above all, in the words of Theodore Roosevelt, "speak softly, but carry the big stick," until real disarmament is achieved.

Also, I believe we should speak not only softly, but intelligently and clearly.

Lee De Forest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BOYLE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago today the "Father of Radio," Mr. Lee De Forest, invented the vacuum tube. His inventions helped make radio and TV possible, and he has won recognition as a leader in the field of electronic communication. Other inventions of his assisted in the development of the wireless telegraph in America. In the fields of wireless telegraphy, radio telephone, wire telephone, sound-on-film talking pictures, high-speed facsimile and picture transmission, and television, he has some 300 patented inventions to his credit. "Radiotherapy" for physicians is another of his accomplishments; the two-electrode—radio—tube which can be used as radio detector, radio and telephone amplifier, and as oscillator in "feed-back" or regeneration circuit, was developed by Mr. De Forest. The invention of "noiseless recording" positive prints in talking pictures, "glow-light" recording of sound on films, and so forth, are other of Mr. De Forest's many contributions. Broadcasts by radio of the voice of Caruso in 1910 and the first broadcast of radio news in 1916 are among his accomplishments. Time does not permit detailing the countless awards and honors which have attested his contribution to our society.

My district and I are very proud of the fact that the office of the American Television Co., with which Mr. De Forest is so closely associated, is located in the 12th Congressional District of Illinois. Mr. De Forest is today being honored by the Radio Pioneers of America, and from the floor of the House I also wish to salute him. The inventions and other work that he has done have helped make ours the great Nation that it is.

Small Firms Gain, It Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, along with other Members of the Congress, I received the other day the fifth semiannual report of the Small Business Administration for the 6 months ending December 31, 1955.

For the information of my colleagues, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD chapter I of that report, the covering letter to the President, and a comment on the report by Sylvia F. Porter, of the New York Post:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 26, 1956.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Pursuant to the provisions of section 215 of the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended (Public Law 163), I have the honor to submit herewith the fifth semiannual report of the Small Business Administration covering operations between July 1 and December 31, 1955.

Respectfully yours,

WENDELL B. BARNES,
Administrator.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The improvement in the position of small business which took form in mid-1954—after a decline in small business health over several years—continued through the second half of 1955. This gain is reflected in various economic indicators. Throughout most of 1955 the trend of business failures was downward. New business incorporations hit a new peak. There was sharp improvement in small firms' earnings, both before and after taxes. For the four quarters ending with the third quarter 1955, earnings of small corporations after taxes increased to $627 million from $442 million in the preceding four quarters. Net sales of smaller manufacturing corporations continued their recovery.

The various programs of the Small Business Administration designed to help small business registered notable gains.

During the 6-months period July 1 through December 31, 1955, the Small Business Administration approved 625 business loans in the gross amount of $30,332,390 to assist small firms. This was 20 percent greater than business loan approvals in the previous 6-months period.

The agency's financial assistance program is carried on in close cooperation with the banks of the Nation. As evidence of this, more than 66 percent of the agency's business loans have been in participation with banks.

The severe hurricanes and consequent floods in the late summer and fall of 1955 resulted in widespread damage to homes and businesses, particularly in the northeastern States. The Small Business Administration immediately classified the localities as disaster areas eligible for assistance under the agency's disaster loan authority. Through the cooperation of local banks and through the transfer of personnel from the Washington, regional and branch offices, the Small Business Administration was able to organize emergency offices in each of these areas within a few days after the disasters occurred. For the 6-months period from July 1 through December 31, 1955, the agency approved 2,056 disaster loans aggregating $29,290,391 to assist business and homeowners. This compares with 813 disaster loans for $4,733,423 during the similar period of 1954.

A significant development in the program of financial assistance was the inauguration of the limited loan participation program. This is designed especially to assist small retailers, wholesale distributors and service establishments. Under this plan the Small Business Administration will participate with a bank in a loan to a small retailer, wholesaler, service establishment or other business up to a maximum of $15,000 or 75 percent of the total amount of the loan, whichever is the lesser. The early experience under this program gives ground for belief that under this plan banks, with Small Business Administration cooperation, will be able to meet the financial needs of a considerably greater number of small-business concerns than has heretofore been possible.

There was marked progress in the joint-determination program, the program for reserving Government purchases for small-business participation. In the 6-months period since July 1, more than 2,100 purchases, amounting to approximately $192,800,000, were earmarked for competitive award to small firms. This compares with $173 million in the comparable period of 1954. The number of procurements awarded to small firms increased even more sharply to 2,028, compared with 854 for the 6-months period ending December 1954 and 256 for the same period of 1953. The Department of Defense has been able to increase total awards to small concerns; on the basis of new procurement, total share of small business in the defense dollar during the 6-months period July 1 through December 31, 1955, increased to $1,382,759,000 from $1,222,000,000 for the same period a year earlier.

There is a prospect for even greater participation by small business in Government purchasing as a result of 3 Department of Defense directives, 1 of which was issued in the last 6 months, calling for greater set-asides for small-business concerns. The Small Business Administration cooperated closely with the Defense Department in the development of these directives.

In the area of production and management assistance, much time has been given to assisting small businesses obtain raw materials in scarce supply. These include steel, steel scrap, aluminum, copper, nickel, newsprint, lead, plateglass and other materials. Shortages, bottlenecks and price increases are characteristic of the boom economy which we are experiencing.

The Small Business Administration will continue to expand its assistance to small business by broadening and improving its present programs.

[From the New York Post of April 16, 1956]

SMALL FIRMS GAIN, IT SAYS

(By Sylvia F. Porter)

"A steady improvement in the position of small business, as smaller firms continued to share in the overall national prosperity, was noted by Wendell B. Barnes, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, in the agency's fifth semiannual report."

So went the opening sentence of a recent press release from Washington—and since it was a terse, well-written handout, it was picked up and printed without change all over the country.

But since receiving the press release, I've also received a copy of the agency's 202-page report.

And since the evidence I see and hear all around me has made me exceedingly skeptical of optimistic appraisals of the small-business man's position today, I've taken the trouble to study the whole thing.

With due respect to Small Business Administrator Barnes, his agency's efforts to assist little firms and his understandable desire to emphasize the gains made during his term as SBA chief, I must confess my conclusions from his own report are hardly as optimistic as his.

The report says: In 1955 the sales and earnings both before and after taxes of small firms improved over 1954.

Comment: That's an empty boast if ever I heard one. Through a good part of 1954 we were in a recession. Through all of 1955 our economy was on the greatest nonwar upsurge of history. If the sales and earnings of small business firms hadn't risen over 1954, this would have reflected a squeeze on small business equivalent to a panic.

The report adds: The uptrend of earnings before taxes of small manufacturing firms brought the earnings index "to the highest point in nearly 2 years" although "the level of earnings, as might be expected, is still far below the peaks reached" in the Korean period.

Comment: But earnings before taxes of large manufacturing firms are far, far above the peaks reached during Korea. Why should it "be expected" that earnings of the smaller firms should be "far below"? Is it the assumption that small business is really fighting a losing battle?

The report boasts new awards to small-business firms under military contracts rose from 15.7 percent in the last 6 months of 1954 to 17.6 percent in the last 6 months of 1955, and the net value of awards to small business rose from 19.8 to 20 percent. A large part of the report and of the press release is devoted to this subject.

Comment: But when you dig into other figures on defense contracts, the complexities seem baffling, and the boast seems meaningless.

For instance, for the full 1955 fiscal year, the percentage of new contracts going to small business fell from 18.3 to 18 percent, and the percentage of net procurement slumped from 25.1 to 21.8 percent. The SBA itself points out the net figure is the one which reveals the share of defense dollars going to small business over a long period.

What's more, a just-released separate report by the Defense Department discloses that since 1953 the share of defense contracts going to the giants of America has been swelling.

The report admits small businesses do complain of various problems such as the squeeze on some raw materials, higher prices, such as for steel scrap, which they are unable to absorb, tightening bank credit, inability to compete with larger firms for skilled professional help. But, remarks Barnes, shortages, bottlenecks, and price increases are characteristic of the boom economy which we are experiencing.

Comment: This tendency to minimize the problems of small business is the most startling aspect of the report. Small business is finding it brutally tough to compete against the giants for steel, aluminum, copper, newsprint, etc., and the SBA knows it. Small business is finding its borrowing costs are soaring and its ability to get new money is shrinking, and the SBA knows it. Small business is finding the pressures from every direction are fierce and mounting, and the SBA knows it.

Perhaps it is a great achievement that the retreat of small business in our land was interrupted in 1955. But despite the press release, I find little in the report it presumably summarizes that arouses any huzzahs from me.

United States Is Sending $50 Million Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News of April 16, 1956:

UNITED STATES IS SENDING $50 MILLION ABROAD

(By Jack Steele)

The United States Government is sending abroad nearly $50 million a year in social-security benefits, veterans' compensation, and other forms of retirement pay.

The money goes to nearly 60,000 persons in 102 countries in every nook and cranny of the world, except behind the Iron Curtain. More than one-third of it goes to Italy.

Most of the recipients are aliens or naturalized United States citizens who have returned to their native lands to retire and live a life of ease on the benefits they earned in this country.

The facts and figures on this little-known foreign-aid program have been assembled for the first time by Chairman FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, of the House Immigration Subcommittee.

FIGURES

Mr. WALTER believes the figures show:

That many immigrants come to the United States without any serious intention of becoming permanent residents and citizens. As soon as they can collect "nest eggs"—in savings or social security and other benefits—they go back home where their money will stretch further because of lower prices and living standards.

That there is ample justification for a provision of the McCarran-Walter Act which cancels the citizenship of naturalized Americans who return to their native lands and stay more than 3 years. Loss of citizenship does not cancel social security and other retirement benefits earned in this country, but it deprives them of some other rights and protections which go only to United States citizens.

Chairman WALTER got most of his figures from the Treasury, which mails out the benefit checks every month to American consulates which, in turn, distribute them to recipients.

TOTALS

The Treasury figures cover only the month of February and do not include checks sent to Canada and Philippines. Here are the totals:

Type of benefit	Number of checks	Monthly payments
Social security	37,789	$2,235,377
Veterans' compensation	16,556	1,373,661
Government employees' compensation	231	17,803
Civil-service retirement	1,452	112,567
Railroad retirement	2,299	160,177
Total	58,327	3,899,585

This amounts to about $47 million a year.

VIEW

In Mr. WALTER's view, this money represents an indirect form of foreign aid. It helps build up the dollar balances of the countries to which it goes.

Italy leads the list of countries with 20,024 recipients who get $1,448,539 a month—over $17 million a year.

Next comes Greece, with 6,324 recipients who get $390,814 a month or nearly $5 million a year.

Here are the other countries in the top 10:

Country	Number of checks	Monthly payments
England	3,390	$219,541
Ireland	2,769	173,462
Mexico	2,469	166,318
Germany	2,242	143,371
Yugoslavia	1,822	125,661
Japan	1,913	115,777
Sweden	2,094	114,908
Norway	1,754	112,139

Israel has 245 recipients who get a total of $14,572 a month. Egypt has only 36 who get $2,041 a month.

Countries having only one recipient include Angola, Samoa, Tanganyika, and the Phoenix Islands.

Formosa has 11 recipients who draw $1,207 a month. The Ryukyu Islands have 122 social-security recipients who get $6,396 a month.

An Act of Courage and Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of Tuesday, April 17, 1956:

AN ACT OF COURAGE AND PRINCIPLE

President Eisenhower, in his veto of the conglomerate farm bill, has again displayed the courage with which he upholds the highest principles of his office. Leading Democrats, such as Senator Kefauver, Mr. Stevenson, and former President Truman, had indorsed the mongrel measure. Republicans from the farm States were urging the President to sign, and, as the President said, the farmers themselves, suffering reduced incomes, "had a right to expect workable and beneficial legislation to help solve their problems." In an election year, it has been argued, even a bad farm bill would be better politically than no bill at all. Mr. Eisenhower did not agree.

The bill as patched together out of conflicting philosophies would, as the President put it, "do harm to every agricultural region of the country and also to the interests of the consumers." Consequently, although "with

intense disappointment and regret," he has returned H. R. 12 to Congress without his signature.

The specific reasons for the veto were stated by the President in detail to Congress and to the people. They are familiar to those who have followed the strange course of H. R. 12 through the House and the Senate, as the sound administration program for reducing acreage and adding to farm income through the soil bank was gradually canceled out by the successive addition of high, fixed parity prices, dual parity for many commodities, mandatory price supports for feed grains and multiple-price plans for wheat and rice. This mixture is, in the President's words, self-defeating. It is thus, in effect, a fraud on the American farmer and the American people, compounded by "the long delays which this legislation encountered," which makes remedial action this session difficult.

The President has announced a series of administrative actions, including increased support prices on commodities and the use of Agriculture Department funds to strengthen prices of perishables, in order to help the farmer to the extent that the executive branch can do so. He has also asked Congress to "pass a straight soil bank bill as promptly as possible," to be in operation before fall seeding. The combined program, legislative and administrative, could "begin now to improve the income and welfare of all our farm families."

If Congress fails again to rise to the needs of the hour, the farmers, and the Nation at large, will know where the blame rests. They will know that the President has striven earnestly and conscientiously for a sound farm program; that the obstacles were raised by those, in Congress and out, who insisted on delaying action, on piling up contradictory clauses in a legislative monstrosity that would have been an administrative nightmare. And when the voters look to the heart of the matter they will, one can be confident, prove the best politics is what is best for the country, wholeheartedly endorsing the President's statesmanlike and courageous course.

Salute to Israel

SPEECH
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, April 16, 1956, marks the anniversary of the independence of the State of Israel. Eight years ago a new nation arose from the depths of despair and oppression to walk vigorously in a new light of hope, fulfilling a dream of 2,000 years. If we could persuade some individuals in this country to forget for a moment the envy, hate, and animosity indiscriminately hurled against the young nation of Israel, if we could remind them how similar are the struggles and sufferings undergone by Israel to those experienced by our Founding Fathers when they fled religious oppression and persecution to establish a peaceful haven in this country, if we could remember how much we appreciated the sympathies and help of some European countries in the struggle to secure our independence, we would all then be better disposed toward Israel. We would understand that she has only one desire—and that is to live peaceably alongside her hostile neighbors. Because there is this striking similarity in the history of our people and that of the Israeli nation, the American people have deeply sympathized with the cause of Israel and have given liberally to help her in every possible way.

Nevertheless, against this tangible and most generous proof given by a majority of the American public in support of the righteousness of Israel's aspirations, there stands the ill will of a few who nest themselves behind the shield of a Government agency, the Department of State. These do everything to promote hostility rather than peace. They have encouraged Arab belligerency over Israel's protests; they have rejected Israel's request for equal treatment—in short, they have done their best to provoke another war. Our Secretary of State has proved himself insensitive and insensible to the facts and moralities of the area.

How can they ignore the fact that at the very time that the representative of the United Nations was pleading in Cairo for peace, Egyptian murderers shot down in cold blood children at prayer in Israel?

Can we in good faith claim that the best interests of the United States are served by the few in the Department of State whose actions result in encouraging feuding among nations? Why should they be so anxious to appease the Arabs at the expense of Israel? If we agree to extend military assistance to one, we should in fairness grant the same to the other. Are we to have more faith in the Arabs than in Israel? Has not this young state clearly demonstrated how seriously and efficiently she has been working and progressing during the past 8 years?

Israel's record is proof of her aim for peaceful existence to carry on her programs of agricultural and industrial improvement. In her struggle Israel aspires to become again the promised land for thousands and thousands of refugees, so that all people can say, with the Prophet Ezekiel:

> This land that was untilled is become as a garden of pleasure, and the cities that were abandoned and desolate and destroyed are peopled and fenced.

Israel has become the most progressive and energetic state in the Middle East. In the last 8 years more than 400 new agricultural settlements have been created in a small area, compared to less than 300 in the 70 years prior to Israel's coming into existence. Every type of industry has bloomed; transportation and housing have flourished—but beyond this material success, Israel is today the symbol of courage and expectation for all humanity who secretly hope and pray that in this chosen land, the people of the earth, if God touches their hearts and enlightens their minds, might finally reach a mutual understanding and establish the foundation of a new era of everlasting peace for the entire world.

In rejoicing over the recurrence of the birth of Israel, we also voice the prayer that the relations between the United States and Israel will be strengthened and more closely bound.

We pray that the benighted officials in our executive department will open their eyes and their hearts and that they will lend the might and power of our great country, material and spiritual, to establishing true peace in the world.

Supreme Court Decisions Destroying States Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest constitutional authorities in the United States and a great American, Dean Clarence E. Manion, in his weekly broadcast on April 15, 1956, pointed out what the recent United States Supreme Court decisions are doing to States rights. Because he is acknowledged as one of our greatest present-day constitutional lawyers, I include a copy of his broadcast as a part of my remarks, for the benefit and enlightment of my colleagues and the people at large:

JUDICIAL LEGISLATION IS DESTROYING STATES RIGHTS—WEEKLY BROADCAST NO. 81

A few days ago, the Supreme Court took still another cut at the shrinking stature of States rights. Reversing the Pennsylvania State court conviction of Steve Nelson, a notorious Communist leader, Chief Justice Warren, for the majority of the Court, said this: "The conclusion is inescapable that Congress intended to occupy the field of sedition * * * therefore, a State sedition is superseded, regardless of whether it (such a State law) purports to supplement the Federal law."

Thus, in substance, the decision declares that since Congress has chosen to legislate against communism, the States of the Union are now powerless to take supplementary legal action dealing with the Communist conspiracy.

The very existence of this Federal anti-Communist legislation, says the Supreme Court, has the effect of depriving the States of any right to assist in protecting the country against any type of revolutionary subversion. Mind you, there is no statement in this Federal anti-Communist law which declares that the statute shall have this drastic, exclusive effect upon the State's legislative and judicial powers.

On the contrary, in the Federal Criminal Code of which this anti-Communist law, the so-called Smith Act, is a part, this appears: "Nothing in this title shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the several States under the Constitution thereof" (18 U. S. C. A. 3231).

Nevertheless, Chief Justice Warren and five of his associates, when Congress passed the law, concluded that Congress intended to exclude States from the field of communism. By this judicial discovery of an unexpressed congressional intention, 6 Supreme Court Justices effectively and immediately nullified the existing anti-Communist laws of 42 States of the Union.

This is good news for the Communists, of course. If the effect of the decision stopped there, it would be bad enough, to be sure. But, unfortunately, its evil implications go far beyond that point.

The Supreme Court's decision in this case falls into an established pattern for what is,

in effect, judicial legislation against the constitutional rights of the several States. By holding, in case after case, that congressional laws were intended by Congress to do more violence to reserved State powers than the laws themselves provide, the Supreme Court substitutes its own legislative mind for that of Congress. In this process, the Court goes beyond its power, which is to judge the congressional law, and effectively amends that law into something more than the language of the law says it is.

An outstanding example of this judicial legislation against States rights is observable in the history of congressional action on the subject of natural gas. That history was recently climaxed by a Presidential veto followed by a spectacular senatorial investigation of certain campaign contributions.

In his veto statement, the President criticized what he called arrogant and highly questionable activities of certain proponents of the rejected legislation. In its report, the Senate investigating committee severely censured the irresponsibility of certain people in promoting the late-lamented Harris-Fulbright natural-gas bill.

However, in this cascade of criticism, there was no official censure or condemnation of the Supreme Court. Nevertheless, it was the Court's judicial legislation on the subject of natural gas, and its gratuitous extension of Federal power at the expense of States rights, that brought the Harris-Fulbright bill to the floor of Congress in the first place. Here is the story of that judicial legislation:

In 1938, Congress passed the original Natural Gas Act. That law gave the Federal Power Commission authority to regulate the interstate transportation and sale of natural gas. Unquestionably, Congress had the power to do that, and the act expressly disclaimed any attempt to do anything beyond that. Local production and distribution of natural gas were exempted from the operation of the act in so many of its words.

This was congressional acknowledgment that production, local distribution, and local sale were beyond the power of Congress and within the reserved powers of the several States. Nevertheless, the Federal Power Commission soon began to encroach upon the reserved State jurisdiction. Congress took official notice of this violation of the 1938 act and passed the Kerr bill (1950), which reaffirmed the congressional intention to keep Federal control out of local gas production and local gas sales. But President Truman vetoed the Kerr bill.

The veto encouraged the Federal price-fixers to step up their encroachment upon the domain of the gas-producing States. Litigation resulted which finally reached the Supreme Court. In the now famous *Phillips* case (347 U. S. 672), the Supreme Court denied the congressional reservation of State jurisdiction over the local production and sale of natural gas. The Supreme Court did so, if you please, on the basis of its own private determination of what Congress intended, regardless of what the 1938 act clearly stated, and regardless of what the Kerr bill had reaffirmed.

Three Supreme Court Justices dissented from the decision in the Phillips case. One of these dissenters declared that, "This (decision) brings every gas operator from the smallest producer to the largest pipeline under Federal regulatory control. The Federal Power Commission is thrust into the regulatory domain traditionally reserved to the States" (Justice Clark, dissent, 347 U. S. 691).

After the Phillips decision, Congress prepared to reenact what it thought it had established in 1938, namely, local control over independent local production of natural gas. It is difficult to see why Congress should have to affirmatively deny its intention to invade what is clearly reserved to the States under the 10th article of the Bill of Rights. The 10th article says that powers not delegated to the Federal Government are reserved to the States or to the people.

One might think that the Supreme Court could be relied upon to keep Congress within this limitation, rather than try to invent circumstances calling for its violation. However, during the past 20 years the Supreme Court has given no important indication that it still regards this section of the Bill of Rights as a part of the Constitution. On the contrary, the Court seems bent upon extending every Federal regulation far beyond the letter of the congressional statute from which such regulation stems.

The history of the Federal regulation of natural gas shows that the will of Congress has been ground to powder between the upper millstone of Presidential vetoes and the lower millstone of judicial legislation. What little is left of States rights in this granding process may be absorbed by the imagination. The Supreme Court's excuse for using its palpable extensions of congressional statutes to rub out residual States rights is anchored in what is called the doctrine of "preemption."

The Supreme Court takes the position that where Congress has enacted legislation on any subject the States are then automatically deprived of all power to enact or enforce similar laws on the same subject, even though the State laws are not in conflict with the Federal act.

This doctrine asserts that where Congress regulate some phase of agricultural production, labor-management relations, food, drugs, or any other subject, all existing State laws on the same subject are immediately ineffective. By the same token, the power of the State to legislate on the same subject is automatically suspended during the existence of the Federal legislation. This is so, even where the congressional law is inadequate to protect life, liberty, and property in the federally preempted field.

The frequent result of this doctrine is to leave large blind spots of lawlessness in the area of the State's reserved police power (*Garner* v. *the Teamsters Union, etc.* (346 U. S. 485)).

In the Nelson Pennsylvania Communist case the Supreme Court has now held that this "preemption" doctrine applies to the criminal as well as the civil jurisdiction of the several States. Logically projected, this means that State laws against criminal traffic in narcotics, for instance, will be rendered ineffective and unenforceable in the face of Federal laws on the same subject.

When the Federal Anti-Communist Act was made an issue in the Pennsylvania trial of Steve Nelson, Congressman HAROLD SMITH, the author of the act, wrote the Attorney General of Pennsylvania as follows: This "is the first intimation I ever had * * * in the preparation of the act, in the hearings before the committee, in the debates in the House, or in any subsequent developments, that Congress ever had the faintest notion of nullifying the concurrent jurisdiction of the respective sovereign States to pursue also their own prosecutions for subversive acts."

Nevertheless the Supreme Court has just decided that it knew more about the congressional intention behind the Smith Act than Congressman SMITH himself did. This gratuitous judicial presumption is merely one aspect of the constantly expanding menace to our Federal system of balanced constitutional government. For many years it has been painfully obvious that the Federal Executive and the Federal courts are in an effective combination to destroy the constitutional integrity of the States by the centralization of power in the Washington bureaucracy.

Only a strong, self-conscious Congress and vigilant sacrificial self-reliance on the part of the States can now save the American Republic. The first constructive remedial step has already been taken. Congressman HOWARD SMITH, of Virginia, has introduced a bill in the House of Representatives (H. R. 3) providing that no act of Congress shall be construed to indicate an intent on the part of Congress to exclude or nullify State laws on any subject in the absence of an express provision in the act of Congress to that effect.

Senator MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, and 11 of his senatorial colleagues have introduced a similar bill in the Senate. If Congress is tired of seeing its purposes stultified by a combination of vetoes and judicial decisions, it will give these bills top priority.

Any Congressman or Senator who does not go all out for the speedy passage of this bill is either numb to the constitutional wickedness of judicial legislation or in league with those who are determined to destroy States rights.

In either case such Congressman or Senator is disqualified for service in this emergency and should be retired by the voters. Send your Congressman and Senators a copy of this broadcast and ask them what they think about the Smith-McClellan bill.

Israel's Eighth Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like at this time to join my fellow Americans in observance of an historic occasion—the eighth anniversary of the State of Israel.

This occasion which was officially marked yesterday, gives all of us who cherish freedom an opportunity to reaffirm our support for this great country.

Because we in America so strongly helped with the birth of Israel, we have a special stake in using our best efforts to maintain peace and stability in the Middle East.

Peace would not only benefit Israel, which is using every human and natural resource to provide a better life for its people. Elimination of the tensions which now threaten to erupt in full-scale war will be a source of rejoicing to all people and will allow Israel and her Arab neighbors to direct their energies to the needs of their peoples.

But so long as the explosive situation remains, this country should have no course but to pursue a policy which will prevent the destruction of Israel.

The loss of Israel would not only be a serious blow of itself, but it would set in motion circumstances which, at the least, would drive Western interests from the Middle East and at worst end in a major conflict.

The interests of peace are truly the interests of America. The bonds between this country and Israel are those of democratic people and related cultures.

It is a source of pride to salute Israel on this eighth anniversary of her independence.

And in this connection I wish to include in my remarks the following article which was published in the Detroit

News of April 13, 1956. It is a lucid discussion of the problems in the Middle East:

THE COMMENTATOR

(By W. K. Kelsey)

IF T. R. WERE PRESIDENT

There are various ways by which the United States might contribute to peace in the Middle East, besides the one we are pursuing—which is to keep the United Nations in the picture insofar as that is possible, through the efforts of its Secretary-General, Dag Hammarskjold.

One is the way Teddy Roosevelt might have handled the situation if it had arisen in his time. There was the Perdicaris affair in 1904. John Perdicaris, claiming American citizenship, and his stepson, a British subject, were kidnaped by a Moroccan bandit named Raisuli and held for ransom. The President sent the cruiser Brooklyn to Tangier and demanded through the State Department that the Sultan of Morocco deliver Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead.

The fact that Perdicaris was released before the sultan received the message did not alter the fact that about 99 percent of the people of the United States cheered the President for making the threat. Note also that 1904 was an election year, and Roosevelt was going after a second term. Well, so is Ike this year. Moreover, we have a fleet in the eastern Mediterranean.

Another approach that might be used is to intimate to the Egyptian premier that if he does not see to it that there is no war, not only will be get not a nickel of American money for the building of the proposed dam at Aswan, but the United States will see to it that the dam is not built with any other nation's money, either.

That may appear like irrational diplomacy, but behind it lie two facts. The first is that as a member of the U. N. Egypt is committed to peace; and a country that violates that pledge is not entitled to any benefits from the rest of the world. The second is that to prevent a country from getting negotiated aid is not an act of war, but rather falls among the penalties permitted by the U. N. Charter against a country that fails in its obligations.

INCLUDING RUSSIA

Another way of dealing with the situation would be to join with Britain and France in inviting the Soviet Union to participate in the declaration of 1950 by which the three powers sought to preserve peace in the Middle East by pledging action against an aggressor.

The probability is that both Britain and France would agree to such an invitation. It would relieve both Governments if the United States were to abandon the role of Don Quixote fighting a windmill of communism in Asia with no better weapon than loud and ineffective talk, which most trained observers who have visited that continent find is doing our cause no good while it advertises the Russian propaganda.

If the present Soviet rulers are so peace-minded, they ought to be glad to be given a chance of cooperating in the Middle East. It might take their minds off supplying the Arab States with arms. If they declined the invitation they would have to dig up some extremely plausible reasons of fall under suspicion in peace-minded countries.

But, as the British press is fond of pointing out, any brisk shift of American policy is not to be expected in a presidential election year. It seems to the commentator, however, that if the administration doesn't come up with a resounding success in the Near East it is going to incur a weight of blame that will endanger its success in November. That blame will not fall on the national hero, but on Secretary Dulles. He may yet become the principal issue in the campaign.

The United States Should Speak for Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, in these turbulent and troublesome times, it is to be expected that the people of America do not react to every miscarriage of justice and every instance of inhumanity and criminal conduct.

A pattern of barbarism seems to be engulfing a large part of the world. We have been conditioned for crime.

Yet at this time there is taking place in Indonesia an offense against basic human justice which should not escape the attention of the American people. In the city of Jakarta in Indonesia, a young man is on trial for his life simply because totalitarian fury must make propaganda and find scapegoats.

Crimes involving brutality, terrible torture, and unspeakable evil have become more or less commonplace over a period of more than a decade.

As a consequence, the reflexes of conscience have been dulled, but the crime against Leon N. Jungschlaeger seems to me to be one of the worst that has been perpetrated, for it is a crime against the intellect involving perversions of the fundamentals of justice.

With reference to this tragedy presently going on in Indonesia, I want to call to the attention of the House a moving editorial from the Hartford Courant of April 5, and I hope that every Member of this body will read it and reflect on the message which it carries:

THE UNITED STATES SHOULD SPEAK FOR JUSTICE

Probably no more than a handful of people in the United States ever heard of Leon N. Jungschlaeger. If told that he is a man undergoing trial for his life in Jakarta, Indonesia—more than 8,000 miles away by air—Americans would relax and say: "What has that to do with me?" If told that he is the father of a United States Army private they might express more concern. If told that he is the storm center of an agitation in the Netherlands that is hurting the United States, they might get the idea.

There is cause for alarm. The so-called Jungschlaeger case has aroused Holland more than any issue in recent years. Indonesia, as a new nation, has been asserting its rights in arresting and trying a Dutch citizen—in a trial that many European observers think is a travesty of justice. In doing so, Indonesia has been guilty of careless indifference to human rights. Dutch observers contend the trial has been run like a totalitarian courtroom scene in a Communist country. Yet, the United States has dodged the issue.

It is, in part, a problem of colonialism and the new revolutionary nationalism. Indonesia, made up of about 3,000 separate islands in the Malaysian area, was born in a revolutionary struggle after the defeat of the Japanese in World War II. It has tremendous problems in establishing and maintaining law and order throughout its area, problems with Communist infiltration, with headhunters, with people who have never known law. Its fierce pride leads it to chastise and make scapegoats of its former masters at every possibility. Indonesian leaders hide their own inadequacies by blaming them on the colonial powers.

As a result of the revolution, the Indonesians lost most of their trained technicians, administrators, and professional personnel. Some Dutch nationals stayed on. One was Jungschlaeger, 50-year-old manager of the nautical division of the Royal Netherlands Packet Steamship Co. It is charged that he has aided various rebellious organizations in plots against the Indonesian Government. On these charges, he has been held in jail almost 27 months. Evidence introduced against him has not been brought to appear. The trial has been made a focus of ill feeling against the former colonial power. Yet few of the Western nations, in particular, the United States, have protested. Convinced that the United States does not regard this as a case of human rights at stake, public opinion in Holland erupted. Anti-Americanism has been virulent.

This would have been avoided had we taken a determined stand that Jungschlaeger is entitled to a fair trial. Indonesia has its troubles—it has had more than 6 governments in 7 years—but it has no more right than anyone else to impose a wrong. Indonesia should be warned in clear and unmistakable language that because the death sentence demanded against Jungschlaeger seems unwarranted, the world expects a civilized and fair administration of justice from any people that aspires to recognition as an equal among nations.

Nickel Problem: "Almost Completely Insolvable," Weeks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions lately I have called the attention of this body to the black market situation which has developed with respect to nickel for manufacturing purposes in the United States.

I am placing in the RECORD an amazing letter which the Secretary of Commerce has written to Mr. Willard F. Rockwell, chairman of the board of the Rockwell Spring & Axle Co. Mr. Rockwell's company is one of the large users of nickel for plating purposes and he informs me that his company, last year, spent $750,000 for nickel in the gray market and this year spent $780,000 in the first quarter since sufficient 64½-cent nickel is available only to his company through black and gray market sources at some 300 percent of market price.

In response to Mr. Rockwell's complaint, the Secretary of Commerce on April 7 wrote to him and stated:

This in a general way seems to me to be the story and, as aforesaid, if you find yourself in Washington, we'll be glad to go through it with you to the *n*th degree and give you all of our thinking about a problem which is very difficult and, as I presently see it, almost completely insolvable.

This is an amazing statement in view of the fact that studies by the Secretary's own Department indicate that there have been diversions of defense-rated nickel and that his Department is studying as to what enforcement measures are nec-

essary. Amazing also is the fact that the Department of Commerce has responsibility to check the books of the producers and allocators of nickel to see that there is equitable distribution of this important commodity. It is also amazing that many business concerns are paying unconscionable high prices for black market nickel which seems to be abundant at such prices. It is also amazing to me that the Department of Commerce which has the responsibility to aid and foster industry is standing back contending that the nickel situation is insolvable at a time when businesses large and small are closing down, laying off employees or otherwise curtailing their activities because of inability to obtain nickel.

To my knowledge the Secretary of Commerce has not denied that he is one of the individuals responsible for solving this problem, nor has he recommended legislation which may be necessary to establish necessary controls.

The above-mentioned letter follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, April 7, 1956.

Mr. WILLARD F. ROCKWELL,
Chairman of the Board,
Rockwell Spring & Axle Co.,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

DEAR MR. ROCKWELL: I have just been through a long and exhaustive study of the nickel question this morning (Saturday, April 7) and if you would care to come down sometime in the near future, we'll see that you have the complete story and understand just how things seem to shape up. I think, however, that I must tell you that I'm afraid you'll be disappointed in the net result.

Generally speaking, the forecasted 1956 supply of nickel for the civilian economy is short—even short of what it was on an average for the 3 years preceding Korea—and if certain use developments take place in the defense area the situation may be even worse.

Currently, the civilian economy is paying three prices for available nickel—the so-called market price of 65 cents approximately, the price ranging from $1 to $1.35 for Government set-aside supplies, and say $2.50 to $3 for approximately 10 percent of the civilian supply. Most of this latter grouping is composed of nickel-bearing scrap alloys and foreign production—France, Japan, etc.

We find no evidence of importance of any misappropriation of Defense-rated nickel supplies. Our procedures for following Defense-rated orders adequately confirm this view, although despite this fact we are planning some procedural changes which should give us even closer supervision.

The end of it all is that there just is not enough nickel available to take care of Defense requirements and the civilian economy (the stockpile take will be substantially decreased this year). The controls which you urge will not get anybody any more nickel and the undoubted result of such controls would probably bring into operation use determinations and specifically might very well result in the complete elimination of the use of nickel for decorative purposes.

There is some further increase of nickel supply in sight for 1957. What effect it will have on civilian availability will largely depend on the military requirements at that time.

This in a general way seems to me to be the story and, as aforesaid, if you find yourself in Washington, we'll be glad to go through it with you to the Nth degree and give you all of our thinking about a problem which is very difficult and, as I presently see it, almost completely insolvable.

Most sincerely yours,

SINCLAIR WEEKS.

The Long Road Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN. J. FLYNT, JR.
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an address by the Honorable John Ben Shepperd, attorney general, State of Texas:

THE LONG ROAD BACK

(Address by Attorney General John Ben Shepperd to the 57th annual convention of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Tyler, Tex., March 13, 1956)

More than 180 years ago, while the Thirteen American Colonies were still in the throes of revolution, Patrick Henry uttered an admonition to his fellow countrymen which is now a part of the Constitution of the State of Virginia. It says, "No free government, nor the blessings of liberty, can be preserved to any people, but by a firm adherence to justice, moderation, temperance, frugality and virtue, and by frequent recurrence to fundamental principles."

Few organizations, if any, have done as much as the Daughters of the American Revolution to give Patrick Henry's words a real and lasting application. The DAR was founded in 1890, at a time when the industrial age, with its motorized transportation, rapid communication and mechanization, ushered in an era of modernism which has virtually slammed the door on our proud history and with a burst of speed left many of our sacred traditions behind, in a cloud of dust.

It has always been the purpose of the DAR to resist this frivolous neglect of the deep and vital wellsprings of our freedom, which could only tend to the destruction of our constitutional form of government. This motive underlies your organization's actions today, as you work 179,000 strong to preserve a knowledge and appreciation of American history, as you continue to operate some 12,000 Junior Citizens' Clubs throughout the country, conduct extensive programs for good citizenship through your almost 3,000 chapters, and strive to preserve and restore many historical landmarks and national shrines, in order that Americans of today may visit them and become imbued with a deeper knowledge of the origins of their liberties and a greater inspiration for their preservation.

The DAR was never more vitally needed than it is today. We are living in an age of superficiality. History is flowing past us like a mighty river under the ice, while we skate on the surface, too often oblivious to its force and direction.

Ours is an age of flippancy and arrogance, in which it is popular to debunk the great personalities of the past, as if to convince ourselves that they, after all, were not greater or wiser than we.

The old traditions are being tossed away, and mementoes of the past are no longer proudly hoarded in the attic, but are sold to the antique dealer. Here and there what used to be a treasured landmark is now just a relic, a job for the bulldozers; the rugged individualist is now called a reactionary, and the man or woman who declines to go along with the crowd is a rebel.

Ideals of long standing are nowadays ridiculed merely because they are old. Where did we ever get the idea that anything that is old is also quaint and funny? When did the expression "past history" become a derogatory term to be applied to everything that happened before yesterday, as though it had no value or meaning today? Foresight is born of hindsight, and without a profound understanding of our own history we cannot cope with our present-day problems. The nation that does not cherish its history must fear its future.

That is why Patrick Henry said we must recur frequently to fundamental principles; we must go back often to our own beginnings.

It isn't hard to go back. We can pick up a history book and in a matter of seconds be back to the year 1800, when Mrs. John Adams was hanging the wash in the waiting room of the new executive mansion in the town of Washington, where Congressmen were cursing because the inns were bad, the carriages and horses worse, the roads intolerable, and police protection almost nonexistent. Yellow fever and cholera had almost depopulated several of the larger cities, and hardly a member of the Government at Washington was not sick of one thing or another during any given month.

We can go back to 1775, when a handful of embattled farmers gathered on a road between Lexington and Concord and fired the opening guns of the Revolution. Or back to the Stamp Act, and the Quebec Act, the Boston Massacre, the tea tax, the Townshend policies and the tyranny of German George. It is easy to go back and look at the causes of the Revolution and applaud the heroism and statesmanship of our forefathers, because they wrote a crystal-clear page of history with bold strokes of a bloody sword.

But a principle is not an event in time. How do we go back to a principle? What were the principles that motivated the men who met in the Constitutional Convention of 1787 and launched a Nation on a course that was to revolutionize the forms of government of half the civilized world? What mighty undreamed-of concepts were born when Hamilton and Jefferson clashed and compromised?

Hamilton was a Federalist—the arch-advocate of a strong, centralized government, unified under an executive of almost unlimited power; and in that day and time, his views were not unjustified, nor were they unsupported among the rank and file of colonists who feared for the future of a Nation that did not have the central power to maintain its hard-bought freedom.

In total opposition to Hamilton were Jefferson and Madison, stanch defenders of state sovereignty, who believed that men can only be governed badly if governed from afar.

Hamilton's views were based largely on his keen insight into the future and his deep concern for the course of an infant Nation among old, imperialistic powers with armies poised for conquest. Jefferson's and Madison's convictions were based on hard experience; they believed that history was a guide book to the future, and they had been the traditions and ideals of three million self-reliant, locally governed, independent colonists triumph over the armies of the strongest despot in the world.

The belief in State sovereignty was strong in those early Americans. When the fire of rebellion first began to smoulder against British despotism Massachusetts began to shake its fist in the face of Parliament without looking around to see if it was supported by 12 other Colonies. And when the first shots of the Revolution echoed out of the forests of Massachusetts the British Governments in her sister Colonies collapsed—not in a single great coup d'etat, but 1 by 1 as the people pushed them down, hardly knowing or caring whether other Colonies were going to fight or remain loyal to the King.

There was yet no national Army. Each Colony has its militia, and nobody knew how many would send theirs into battle. Massa-

chusetts, for all those farmers at Concord knew, would fight alone. But from every Colony come men and boys, with muskets and fowling pieces and axes and knives. Militia commanders rode from cabin to cabin, farm to farm, village to village, to call men to arms, only to find that the men had already gone. Of the 396,000 men and boys under Washington's command, 164,000 had come out of the hills and the forests unrecruited.

There was no national obligation in this. There was no compulsory military service. This was no hireling army, and no military law compelled them to come, or forced them to stay when the battle grew hot and the winter cold.

There was no family allotment for the brave women—our great-grandmothers—who stayed behind to put their hands to a man-sized plow and level a man-sized musket in defense of their homes when they had to.

And few, if any, of these men, women, and boys had the vaguest idea that they were fighting for the freedom of a great Nation. They were fighting, one and all, for the freedom of their own firesides—against the whole world, if need be. It was not until the following year that delegates from the Thirteen Embattled Colonies—already calling themselves independent States—convened in Philadelphia and pitched their lot together in a unanimous Declaration of Independence.

Out of those 4 years of hardship and sacrifice came a united people governed by 13 sovereign State governments. The strength of their unity lay in the fact of their local autonomy—each colony being able to make its own laws and defend the rights of its own people.

That right of local self-government was very dear to our forefathers, and it was only with reluctance that they gave up even a little of it. For a decade they tried to achieve national unity under the Articles of Confederation, which did not even allow the Continental Congress any taxing power. There was no chief executive. It was Hamilton who told them that this would never work, and indeed, it finally fell apart. Then it was that Jefferson and Hamilton met with the delegates of the 13 States in Constitutional Convention, and with God as their partner, struck upon a compromise that gave us a Constitution without equal or parallel in history.

To the Federal Government were delegated a few transcendent powers, such as any national government must have. All the rest—all the rights and powers by which the people govern themselves at home, according to their own traditions and necessities—were reserved forever to the States and to the people thereof. This was a plan which even Hamilton, the arch advocate of central government, found acceptable and good. This became the principle which was to guide our Nation safely through a 169-year period in which other governments throughout the world crumbled and recrumbled in an agony of attempted imitation of our example. And this is the principle to which we must forever and often recur.

As you leave this place tonight, and go to your respective homes and lodgings, if you would turn a thought toward those by whose courage and suffering it was made possible for you to kneel before your own God, and lay your head on your pillow in peace and security and freedom, ask yourself what your forefathers would speak of, if they would call to you across the abyss of time. What is the question they demand of you, their own children's children, as blood calls to blood across the centuries?

Where, they ask, are those liberties which we wrenched from the hands of tyrants and reposed in the bosoms of humble, God-fearing men? Where is that freedom that we took out of stone castles with iron doors and buried safely under the hearthstones of America? Whose hand has carried it away and laid it among white marble halls on a hill by the Potomac? Is it forgotten, that it must lie among stone monuments? Is it dead, that it must rest in whited sepulchers?

Where is it written that the Government which sits on those cherry-blossomed banks is to be the sole and final judge of the extent of its own powers? We did not write it in the Constitution.

Where is it written that the law of the land shall be promulgated from the bench, instead of the floor of Congress? By whose authority is the Constitution changed without the consent of the people? By what devious means are the sovereign powers of the States overridden, their laws cut down like trees, and their righteous protests drowned under accusations of rebellion? Who delegated to the creature a preeminence over his creators? What freak of Frankenstein is this that rises up to crush those who made him?

This creature was 169 years aborning, but here he is. George Washington feared him and warned us of his coming. "Let the Constitution be changed by constitutional means," he said, "but let it not be changed by usurpation." Jefferson, too, saw this creature afar off, and gave us warning. He said:

"It is not by the consolidation or concentration of powers, but by their distribution, that good government is effected. Were this country not already divided into States, that division would have to be made, that each might do for itself what concerns itself, and what it can so much better do than a distant authority. If we were directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we would soon want bread. I do not charge the judges with willful and ill-intentioned error; but honest error must be arrested, where its toleration leads to public ruin."

That is what Jefferson said. He was speaking to his own generation, but his eyes were fixed across 17 decades of time, to a generation that knows the source of atomic power but does not know the location of its own government. For this Nation, of all nations, is the only one in which the seat of governmental sovereignty is in dispute.

It is questionable how long we can follow this uncertain path. Whether we go on down our present course, or turn and follow the long road back to the fundamental principles out of which our freedom burgeoned and flourished, this generation must decide. Uncertainty is a broad avenue to destruction.

You women are, indeed, Daughters of the American Revolution. You are children of an epoch in time which started the greatest nation on earth toward the fulfillment of its destiny. This country can mold its destiny, but it cannot escape it. This generation—modernistic, apathetic, and unconcerned—is your responsibility, as surely as the blood that courses in your veins is the same blood that turned hot at Lexington and Bunker Hill, endured the cold of Valley Forge, and sank deep and red into the soil of America.

In your hands is a generation of children with character unmolded—their minds not yet fully enriched with the history and ideals of their country. You can give them books and more books, as you are now doing. You can teach them government, as you are now doing. You can teach them citizenship, as you are now doing. If you and the children of this generation walk hand in hand, the road back is no longer than the distance up the courthouse steps, to where a county commissioners' court is in session, and where a man is on trial before a jury of his peers. And whether you walk together or alone, the road back is only as long as the distance to the polls. No expanse of years can separate us from those fundamental principles that transcend time. Their spirit fills the air wherever men and women still gather on public squares to hear a man in shirt sleeves campaign for public office. They are revived in that moment when a busy man or woman stops to read an editorial. They echo from the walls wherever men and women raise the voice of debate in a precinct convention. They speak in majestic tones wherever a church organ plays and a choir sings, and they are anchored firmly under the hearthstone of the family that kneels in prayer.

"Freedom is old, not young, yet it is born
anew in the first cry of a freeman's
son;
It is not a living thing, yet it dies if we
do not love it;
It is not weak, yet it must be defended;
It is light, but it weighs heavy on him who
is without it;
It is without price, yet it dearly costs the
one who sells it;
It is not small, but great; yet once lost, it
is never found again."

Our forefathers knew freedom, for it was they who gave it birth. They established it in the firm foundation of courage, sacrifice and faith. It is for you, their children's children, to match their legacy in this present hour, and to preserve by those means to which your noble organization is dedicated, the foundations they laid down for all generations.

In the words of Grace Noll Crowell:

"They placed their clear-cut landmarks for
our feet,
They upraised guards for safety as we go
Across the land, down lane and city street
On winding paths we have not learned to
know.
Remove them not—the marks our Fathers
set,
Keep them in good repair at any cost.
Lest in our harried going we forget.
What roads to take, and find that we are
lost."

Petition Regarding the Siler Bill H. R. 4627

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I have received the following letter from a group of my constituents, protesting H. R. 4627:

FRANKLIN SQUARE, N. Y., *April 10, 1956.*

Hon. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN.

DEAR MR. REPRESENTATIVE: At the present time the House Interstate Commerce Committee is considering recommending to the House the enactment of the Siler bill (H. R. 4627).

This bill, which would prohibit brewers from using television, radio, newspapers, and magazines to advertise their products in interstate commerce, is a direct attempt at preventing substantial and honorable manufacturers of a legal product from conducting their business in the accepted American way.

I would like to register my strongest protest against this bill and respectfully to appeal to you to urge the members of the House Interstate Commerce Committee to vote to kill this bill in committee. Also, if this bill should be referred to the Rules Committee, it is likewise requested that you exert every influence to urge the members of this committee not to approve this bill.

Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated.

Albert Barta, Helen Barta, John F. Engle, Florence C. Engle, Mabel E. Schleher, A. Daniel Schleher, Jr., Bianca Zier, Richard Zier, Beatrice Stappenbeck, Arthur Stappenbeck.

Farm Bill Fantasy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, Webster defines "fantasy" as "an illusion," and I can think of no more apt description that could be applied to the farm bill now reposing on President Eisenhower's desk, since any benefits that might accrue to the farmer from that ill-conceived piece of legislation are highly illusory, to say the least. It is understood, of course, that the bill was never intended to help the farmer but was promoted for no other reason than to help certain legislators in their effort to prove to the farmer that they are trying to help him. Like the draftee's new uniform, it hits him all over and fits him nowhere. Here is a legislative monstrosity that cuts back production to meet current needs on the one hand, and then on the other stimulates all-out production to further compound the surplus problem. The farmer who tries to live with this kind of a program will find himself in the same predicament as the youngster who inadvertently put his pet chameleon on a piece of scotch plaid and then yelled to high heaven because the creature had busted himself. For plain and fancy legislation, this one takes the cake; plain in its political intent, and fancy in the manner in which it undertakes to disguise that obvious purpose. I voted against the bill when it was reported to the House, and I am glad to see that opposition to it is supported by the following editorial taken from the Philadelphia Inquirer:

NOT THE FARM BILL THE NATION NEEDS

By passing a hodgepodge, backward-looking farm bill over the opposition of the administration, Congress has furnished convincing evidence that it is more concerned with this year's votes than with the real needs of America's farmers.

The Democrats may find they are sadly mistaken in their estimate of the political value of the measure they have passed. There can be no denying there is a serious farm problem; it can be questioned whether the farmers will swallow the line that this bill is in their best interests.

But politics aside, the arguments against the bill are numerous and powerful, and it can be taken for granted that the merits or demerits of the legislation, rather than its blatant effort to snare votes in the farm areas, will be uppermost in President Eisenhower's mind as he decides whether to sign or veto it.

For the measure takes one step in the direction of dealing with the root cause of the farm crisis—and then takes several steps backward. With one section—that establishing the soil bank as recommended by Secretary of Agriculture Benson—it would start to alleviate the overproduction which produces surpluses which in turn have brought about a lowering of farm income. With other sections—restoring rigid, 90-percent-of-parity price supports, a 2-price system for wheat, and alternative parity standards to boost supports—the bill would increase overproduction and eventually the woes of the farmers.

It is possible to find some excuses for the votes of Congressmen from the farm areas—both Democratic and Republican—who favored this bill. Lower farm prices, combined with continued high costs of the things the farmer buys, unquestionably have produced a squeeze on many farmers. Some may desire immediate relief even at the price of future trouble.

But the votes needed to hammer through the bill didn't all come from farm States. They came from representatives of metropolitan centers where wheat is seen only in the form of bread, and cotton in the form of clothing. They came from Congressmen seemingly less interested in the consumers who will be hurt by higher farm support prices than in the possible political gain in the agricultural States.

Here the heavy hand of the Democratic leadership was in evidence. It is obvious that the Democrats saw in the farm situation an issue—possibly the only issue—they could exploit in an election year. By promising the farmers cash payments in the form of higher supports, Congress could both make a play for votes in the farm areas and embarrass the administration.

To underscore the political aspect, two of the leading Democratic contenders for their party's presidential nomination, Estes Kefauver and Adlai Stevenson, backed up the congressional action by piously urging President Eisenhower to sign the measure.

We hope such maneuverings do not obscure the real defects in the bill, in the eyes of the farmers or of the rest of the people. The measure calls for the same old high and rigid support system which built up the present costly and unwieldy surpluses. It proposes a return to the system under which most of the decline in farm income took place. It would prevent—for a year and maybe longer—the operation of measures vitally needed to bring production into balance with markets and to produce stability, instead of harmful ups and downs, for the farmer.

The Nation needs a workable bill to deal with the farm problem on a long-range basis—and Congress has not provided it. As he deliberates his decision whether to sign or veto this measure, we feel sure that President Eisenhower will ignore the narrow—and debatable—political considerations and act in accordance with the best interests of the Nation and the farmers themselves.

Retention of Section 638 in Department of Defense Appropriations, 1957

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following statement made by me before the Subcommittee on Defense, House Appropriations Committee, April 16, favoring retention of section 638 in Department of Defense appropriations, 1957:

Mr. Chairman, if the Government were as careful in screening every small item of procurement contracts awarded to private industry as it is in determining the threat to private industry and the waste of taxpayers money involved in the employment of a civilian cobbler at X air base, what a wonderful world this would be.

The stated issue is that of alleged Government competition with private business. The general policy of this administration is that the Federal Government will not start or carry on any commercial activity to provide a service or product for its own use if such product or service can be procured from private enterprise through ordinary business channels.

To date a total of 56 facilities have been recommended for discontinuance by the Department of Defense. These would result in the displacement of 540 civilian workers.

The controversial projects number 7, covering 264 civilian personnel.

On the face of it there seems to be much ado about little.

It is the hidden trend that disturbs me. A little here and a little there gradually adds up to the practice of private industry taking over Government itself.

If that philosophy were carried all the way, we might just as well turn the Armed Forces over to private management, although how they could make a profit out of public service is hard to conceive at the moment.

I do not go along with the deification of private enterprise to the point where all public problems—including those involving national defense—are subordinated to it.

I reiterate that, although the facilities they want to discontinue are small in number and may appear to be unimportant, the precedent that may be established on this minor scale by its proponents will lead to further encroachments on the role of our defense services that would make them dependent upon mercenary interests.

We in Massachusetts are not only worried by the fact that they are trying to ease out the work done at the ropewalk and in the chain shop at the Boston Naval Shipyard to private interests, but by the fact that this subtle slide-away policy—unless arrested at the very start—will lead to the closing down of the Watertown Arsenal and the Murphy Army Hospital.

Even career officers in the Armed Forces appear to be knuckling under to pressure exerted by their civilian superiors in the Department of Defense to rubber-stamp policies against their professional judgment.

At the hearings conducted by the subcommittee early this year, the secretary of the Cordage Institute, in answer to a question regarding the 125-year-old ropewalk at the Boston Naval Shipyard, testified: "Yes; it has a fine record in terms of improved productivity and in terms of economy. It has a fine staff of skilled workers. It has been regarded all these years as an integral part of the Navy."

The question of integration is also important.

Experience has proved the wisdom of maintaining key bases and installations, and as self-sufficient as they can be, even during peacetime.

To be implemented by private industry only during emergencies.

The military have special responsibilities. For this they must maintain bases on which the smallest function or convenience has a present use and is in readiness for expansion to meet emergency needs.

We cannot afford to break up this integration.

If this attempt to transfer certain work over to private enterprise gains headway, the logical result would be for the military to discontinue the practice of supplying uniforms for Armed Forces personnel. Instead, they would be given an allowance to pur-

chase uniforms from merchants on the outside.

Under section 638 of Public Law 157 which must be retained so that Congress will have knowledge in advance of any plans by the Defense Department to discontinue facilities, or to transfer them to private enterprise, there is some dissatisfaction concerning the cooperation we are supposed to get from the Defense Department. Evasive tactics show through.

The Defense Department must justify such disposals or transfers of work that, for a period of 3 years or more, has been performed by civilian personnel of the Department. This must be done 90 days in advance of such proposals. Disapproval by either committee of the Senate or the House shall prevent such disposal or transfer.

The ropewalk and the chain shop at the Boston Naval Shipyard are representatives of similar facilities throughout our Defense Establishment that are scheduled for a gradual sellout to private industry.

This trend is dangerous to our national security and is unfair to the loyal workers whose skills will be missing in the event of an emergency.

I join with other Members of Congress in opposing any proposed transfer or disposal of time-tested defense functions.

The profit motive must not be permitted to take over the operation of the largest Department of the Federal Government whose responsibility is to protect our Nation and its people from potential enemies.

The opening wedge must be closed at once.

Self-Interest Should Dictate Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I am not alone in the weariness which I experience as I listen to the loud and raucous cries from pressure groups, both at home and abroad, who continue to demand that Uncle Sam take immediate and forthright action in every troubled area around the globe. I have no quarrel with American nationals who have blood relatives in some foreign country, since it is only natural that they would want this Nation to exert its influence on the side to which they are devoted. But I must insist that unless our national self-interest is to be served by such intervention, we should shun such demands as contrary to the welfare of the overwhelming majority of our citizens.

The fact that previous administrations have involved us in political deals abroad to still the clamor of partisans in this country is no reason why we are now bound to take action which would enlarge that involvement. We must always place ourselves on the side of right and justice; but inasmuch as we have ignored the plight of the Baltic States, Finland, and Poland, we can hardly justify taking up the cudgels in other controversies that should be handled by the United Nations. Indeed, I know of nothing that will contribute to U. N. weakness so much as will these unilateral end runs where we rush in singled handed to do the job that properly belongs to the entire commonwealth of nations.

As the following Saturday Evening Post editorial anticipates, this will probably be labeled neutralism and roundly condemned in certain quarters. I can only point out, however, that minding our own business had been traditional with Americans until these "one worlders" took over, and I for one would like to return to that happy state. This view is fully supported by the Post editorial which I commend to your attention:

ISN'T THERE ONE CRISIS UNCLE SAM CAN IGNORE?

When the Nation's policymakers hold their next conclave on what the United States should do about practically everything, it might be a good idea to search the global horizon for one area, however small or insignificant, of which it could be safely stated that its internal affairs were none of our business.

There are so many places in whose affairs we are forced to be concerned—places like some of those recently visited by Secretary of State Dulles with important results—that it would be soothing to the public if an area could be found whose crises we could calmly ignore. Possibly Tristan de Cunha might serve as a pilot project to provide practice for our statesmen in this unaccustomed field. With diligence our diplomats might eventually find themselves actually resisting the impulse to stick their necks out in areas where our national interest is at best remote. Too often the "For God's sake, do something!" bloc favors places outside our orbit of interest rather than posts held by essential allies, like Formosa.

In view of the dismal consequences of many of our well-meaning efforts to settle things all over the world, this suggestion for some new restraints on our meddlesome-Mattie impulses may not be so impractical as the apostles of American world leadership think. As to Cyprus, we appear to have kindled the hopes of the Greeks while enraging the British, who, while feeling free to rebuke us for failing to see the virtues of Communist China, simply loathe being criticized themselves. And the pressure to involve the United States of America in a possible police action along the borders of Israel poses grim possibilities which should be well explored before we edge closer to that melee. In short political realism seems to suggest a statement from high sources which might be summarized as "We deplore tyranny, oppression, and rioting. We are sorry that so many people are discontented and belligerent. But Uncle Sam has only two hands."

Such a policy would undoubtedly be condemned in certain quarters as a modified neutralism. Conceivably the description would be justified. However, even neutralism in matters beyond one's control or concern should not be condemned out of hand. Indeed, President Eisenhower, commenting on Cyprus, said that, while this country desired to contribue everything possible to a reasonable settlement, "the solution itself is going to have to be reached by the people most greatly concerned." Take the case of Nehru. The more neutral he becomes the more money he gets from us; and the more money he gets from us the more neutral he becomes, until finally, after a particularly vigorous denunciation of everything American, he is invited to come to Washington. The United States of America can hardly expect to duplicate Nehru's record, but we might venture "No comment" on at least one distant fracas.

Political Wildcatting in the Everglades

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, in order that Members might better sample the flavor of the Florida presidential preferential primary campaign, I am presenting herewith a news story filed from Miami last Sunday by Russell Baker, who is a reporter for the New York Times:

MIAMI, April 15.—For the first time in 5 days a Floridian could walk abroad today without the risk of having his hand gripped by a potential President of the United States. In the dead of night both Senator ESTES KEFAUVER and Adlai E. Stevenson slipped off toward Yankee land, taking with them their handshaking campaign for the Democratic presidential nomination.

Both will be back. The election is still 6 weeks away and the pundits, who have been treated almost as badly as Mr. Stevenson by the Tennessee Senator's refusal to dry up and blow away, are dodging all predictions of the result of the May 29 primary by telling you that it is still too early to discern a trend.

Early it is, and doubtless predictions will be hollow until after the State votes in a complicated four-way gubernatorial primary May 8.

The inescapable impression, however, from the reaction to Senator KEFAUVER's doggedly amiable trek through the orange groves, the quiet courthouse squares, and Miami's gaudy thoroughfares is that Mr. Stevenson had better watch his jugular vein.

The Tennessean's genius for projecting an aura of diffident sincerity, coupled with a strong pitch to the Dixie vote, has apparently gone down like corn pone and grits in the rural areas north of Miami.

In Miami, on the other hand, where the political spirit is more nearly akin to the North than to the wool-hat country, the Senator relies on his reputation for being liberal. This he reinforces by stumping for the spirit of the Roosevelt and Truman program.

PLAYS BOTH SIDES

In short, he has been playing from both sides of the court these last 3 days—as a true son of Dixie in the unadulterated southern communities, as an unreconstructed liberal for Dade County's transplanted Yankees.

Part of the Senator's strategy is to depict himself as a lonely friend of the people, fighting against the overwhelming hostility of the bosses.

The role requires him to play the underdog and he has insisted throughout the week that he was still running behind Mr. Stevenson for Florida's 28 convention votes. His aides, however, have been exuding a confidence that belies their pronouncements.

They have created the impression that they feel he is now ahead of Mr. Stevenson, and perhaps well ahead.

The outcome of the gubernatorial primary May 8 should give the first sound reading on where the trend goes. There are four contenders and the segregation issue has been unexpectly injected as a major issue.

The result will probably necessitate a runoff vote between the two top candidates on May 29, the day of the Presidential primary. This would produce a big turnout, which Mr. KEFAUVER believes would favor his chances.

SEGREGATION AN ISSUE

The contest May 8 also will provide a reading on the importance of the segregation issue. At first glance, a strong showing by the segregation candidate would seem ominous for Mr. KEFAUVER, for he has been widely publicized as more "liberal" toward the Supreme Court decision than Mr. Stevenson.

Offsetting this threat, however, is the Senator's new change-up pitch, unveiled in last week's campaigning. It consists quite simply of reminding his audiences that he is, after all, a Southerner himself and of striving at every stop to ram this point home.

In the back country, meanwhile, the voters are being asked whether they would prefer to entrust the integration problem to a man from Tennessee or to a Chicagoan like Mr. Stevenson.

PRAISES RUSSELL

The Senator also got considerable mileage from the good name of Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL. Mr. RUSSELL, a Georgia Democrat and the undisputed champion of States' rights in Florida, beat Mr. KEFAUVER there in the 1952 primary.

Last week, Senator KEFAUVER told audience after audience that he was among the greatest admirers of Senator RUSSELL. He now claims much of the support that went to the Georgian in 1952.

He also hit hard on a pledge to secure the South its proper place in the sun if he should win. Precisely what he meant by this phrase was never defined, although he used it repeatedly.

The delivery of the new pitch was calculatedly primitive for a man of Senator KEFAUVER's shrewdness and sophistication. At times his style seemed more appropriate to a campaign for county sheriff than the Presidency.

RECALLS COUSIN MARY

He chatted over and over, for example, of his warm affection for Cousin Mary Noel Moody, a relative who had migrated years ago from Tennessee to Florida.

And in speech after speech he told his audiences: "I grew up in a little small town, and I have the same ambitions, the same aspirations that most of you have."

Samplings of crowd reaction were inevitably favorable. One comment heard repeatedly, almost without variation, was: "He's such a sincere man."

To create this impression the Senator salted his vote pleas with such comments as "If you can't give me your votes, remember me at least in your prayers."

Northeast Airlines Entitled to Approval of Petition for Extension of Service From New York to Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following penetrating article from the Lawrence Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., April 12, 1956, regarding the vigorous attack by our majority leader against the recommendation that Northeast Airlines not be allowed to go into long-haul service.

The expansion of this service would be one more industrial asset to New England in our effort to assist local industries seeking to expand their markets and attract new industrial firms into our area. It would be a convenience to our people who travel South, and favorable consideration of the petition is a progressive step in the future of all New England communities.

SUPPORT FOR AIRLINE

It is very possible that Representative MCCORMACK'S vigorous attack on the recommendation that Northeast Airlines not be allowed to go into long-haul service will do some good. He makes out such a strong case for the point of view that New England needs Northeast as much as Northeast needs the extra revenue from the Florida run that it will have to be given consideration, as it should be.

What Representative MCCORMACK had to say rings rather ominously upon the ear. He charged, for instances, that the adverse decision of the examiner who heard Northeast's petition goes against "all the weight of evidence, policy, and testimony," and, if approved, "could well cripple New England air service instead of developing a sound system."

We do not need to point out that the interest Greater Lawrence has in this is the interest that it takes in Lawrence Airport as a tremendously valuable regional facility. Having regular airline service out of the airport is one of the amenities which Greater Lawrence has to offer. Representative MCCORMACK argues, as others have, that Northeast has worked hard to qualify, and is now entitled to participate in the long-haul competition in order to share the long-haul profits which would offset the losses its shorthaid network has been sustaining.

It is noteworthy that the interest Lawrence takes in Northeast is shared by 35 other New England communities, which suggests that in seeking to frustrate Northeast, the examiner responsible for the adverse recommendation is showing himself to be hostile to the wishes of a large and powerful segment of the country. In the light of this, it would only be reasonable to expect that the adverse recommendation may encounter rough going when it comes up for review before the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Israel Observes Eighth Anniversary

SPEECH
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, today one of the most ancient lands observes its status as the youngest of free nations.

Israel observes its eighth anniversary on this April 16, 1956, its indepenedence threatened by unfriendly neighbors. In this hour of trial I believe the great majority of American join me in the devout prayer that this new democracy will prevail.

Eight years ago the United States was the first to recognize the new nation of Israel. On this anniversary I am happy to see other Members of Congress joining me in an expression of reassurance to Israel that its people still have our friendship and support.

The threat to Israel's survival is a threat to all free nations, and the increasing tension in the Middle East is a threat to world peace. I share the disappointment of the people of Israel over our State Department's delay on Israel's urgent plea for defensive arms.

A Frenchman Finds Fault With United States Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article that appeared in the Sunday Star of April 15 by Mr. Earl H. Voss. In it he quotes the objections of a high-ranking French diplomat on the subject of our United States aid program:

A FRENCHMAN FINDS FAULT WITH UNITED STATES AID

A high-ranking French diplomat in southeast Asia who prefers, for reasons that will be obvious, to remain unidentified, passed through Washington recently and unburdened himself of some advice for America's foreign-aid administrators in the Orient.

Now that foreign aid is before Congress again, his thoughts are worth listening to:

"Americans send too many experts to administer their foreign-aid programs." These men, he says, annoy the local folk and remind them of their inability to take care of themselves. Americans insist on bringing too much of their high standard of living with them.

"Americans are too much concerned about corruption." Certainly there is graft in Asia and in most underdeveloped countries, he says. But this is inevitable, as all the older hands in Asia are well aware. We ought to learn to overlook most of this graft, he believes, instead of constantly complaining to the Prime Minister.

"Americans spread their aid too thin—too scientifically." United States aid administors try so hard to help all the people of the country, to prevent a privileged few from monopolizing the benefits, that they go to the other extreme, this Frenchman believes. As a consequence, the benefits of American aid are often not noticeable.

"Americans try to take too much credit for their work. They should stay more in the background and stop trying so hard to identify themselves with every dollar of aid they send into a country. After all, the main purpose of the aid is to prove to free countries that their own systems of government—not the Americans'—are better than the Communists'."

"India should be helped to build locomotive factories." One of India's most pressing needs is a bigger transportation system. Locomotives will be spectacular monuments to Indian progress. But it is important that the Indians be allowed to build their own locomotives. They want to say that they can build their own locomotives—and point to the evidence on the tracks.

"Americans would do better to concentrate their foreign aid efforts on one spectacular project per country. After all, the effect Americans seek is more political than economic." He gave an example, in Cambodia, a nation with a seacoast but no port. France, he said, has arranged to build a port for the Cambodians. The United States is building access roads, also expensive, but France will get most of the credit.

"Americans publicize their food surpluses too much." The United States' rice surplus is one of its most unfortunate disadvantages in the Orient, the French diplomat believes. Whenever any country in Asia is unable to sell its rice—or almost any other agricultural commodity—it can always blame America's dumping of its surpluses, whether we are guilty or not.

"Americans try too hard to make others over into their own democratic image." There ought to be more study of Oriental techniques of government and less preaching about how good the American system is.

"Americans are shortsighted in insisting on bilateral economic aid. They should try multilateral aid arrangements." It is easier for 3 or more countries to arrange trade and aid pacts than it is for any 2—especially when 1 of the 2 is the richest country in the world. Multilateral pacts would give participating countries more opportunity to contribute as well as receive. They would feel more of the dignity in the partnership, be less sensitive about the handouts.

Here's Some Agricultural Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I am indebted to our former distinguished colleague, my good friend Louis E. Graham, for calling to my attention the article by Mr. Hugh Fergus entitled "Our Frustrating Farm Problem," which appeared in the recent issue of the Pennsylvania Farmer.

Mr. Fergus brings more horsesense to the present agricultural situation than any other writer I have followed in recent months, and I am in agreement with him that if they will give Dr. Ezra Benson a chance to eliminate some of our agricultural dizziness caused by too much surplus the patient will come through in good shape.

Following the President's ringing veto of the politically inspired farm bill, it is good to have some down-to-earth comments such as are set forth in Mr. Fergus' article, and I would commend them to the attention of anyone who wants to consider the agricultural situation from other than a strictly partisan viewpoint.

The article follows:

OUR FRUSTRATING FARM PROBLEM

(By Hugh Fergus)

About 20 years ago I knew a young fellow who became ill with the flu and, along with it, dizziness. His doctor knocked out the flu but the dizziness persisted. So he made an office call at the doctor's. After an examination the doctor said, "You have low blood pressure and a leaky heart." He gave him medicine to cure the blood pressure. Still the dizziness persisted and the young man was getting lower and lower in spirits.

Finally his wife suggested he go to another doctor, which he did. The new doctor, after a good examination said, "As far as I can tell there is no leaky heart, and your blood pressure is O. K., but you do have liver trouble. That is causing your dizziness, so take these liver pills as directed."

Right away the patient felt better, knowing that his heart and pressure were all right. After due time he was well again.

A LITTLE SICK

To my mind that is about the situation agriculture is in today. We might be a little sick, but not as bad as we think. A lot of it is psychological like the case of the young fellow above. The politicians, particularly the outs, have been telling us how badly off we are until we are beginning to think our case is worse than it is.

Here at home we have a dog which one of my daughters left with us when she and her husband went overseas. It is a harmless friendly dog, half lap hound and the other half radiator setter. Every once in awhile at night she will bark to get out and after about 5 minutes rushing around outside and barking she will have things under control and will come back in.

One night she went out and barked for about an hour. Finally, thinking she might really have something to bark at, I went out. When air conditions are right, when some one goes out in the yard and yells an echo comes from the lower barn. Well that was what she was barking at—her echo. Just now our situation, Harrisburg in particular, is getting about as much accomplished at this dog was.

To quote figures: In 1955 our gross agricultural income in the United States was 33.7 billion dollars, compared to an average of $33.8 billion in the preceding 9 years including the Korean war boom years.

HOG SPREAD $2.35

Right now I am most interested in beef cattle. In spite of our crying about the present low prices—part of said crying due to paying too much for feeders—the average of native beef cattle prices at Chicago was $22.85 in 1955. Only 7 years since 1914 was this price exceeded, that is, 1947 to 1954 inclusive, when the average for the 7 years was $29.26. As it was, last year's price was good in spite of the highest beef slaughter on record, and even this would not have been so bad if it had not been for the greatest drop in hog prices on record.

Only 12 years since 1941 were hog prices higher than last year's $14.95 average, and 3 of those years were during the First World War. Even now, February 14, hogs have gone up several cents from December's $10.90 low average. Last year corn prices in Chicago were $1.26 per bushel; so, according to the 10 bushels of corn per hundred pounds of pork ratio, the hog feeder had $2.35 spread for his work.

Here in Pennsylvania I do not know of a single farmer taking advantage of corn price supports; but, to cite an instance where they are used, not long ago I read in a Pittsburgh paper where in Indiana the farmers are selling their corn to the Government for $1.62, then going out on the open market and paying 90 cents to $1 per bushel. I know of one man high here in a Pennsylvania farmers' organization who has a brother farming in Iowa. The Iowa brother was bragging about growing corn to sell to the Government.

A lot of our present economic trouble is not so much from low prices as labor's demands for higher and higher prices. Since this new AFL–CIO merger labor has become more than ever the politicians' sacred cow and can run about as wild as it pleases. No more can cost of living be given as an excuse for a rise in wages. Labor leaders demand it to perpetuate themselves in office. If they would ask John Lewis what has happened to the coal industry when the economic laws worked against artificially high prices, they might avoid the same mistake.

ABLE MEN

At the risk of being called politically biased, I think that in our President and in at least four of his Cabinet members we have as able men as we have had in Washington in a long time. Benson is devoutly religious, and my guess is that he asks for Divine guidance for every major move he makes. Let me hasten to say to appease you Democrats that my choice over all for President would be HARRY BYRD, Democratic Senator from Virginia. I could be very happy, too, under Ohio's Lausche. I think in agriculture CLINTON ANDERSON, former Democratic Secretary of Agriculture, is a great man, and his thinking is identical with Benson's.

You know how it is when you doctor a sick child or any of your livestock. They will fight you, but eventually you get the medicine in them and usually they get better. So it is with Dr. Ezra Benson. His medicine may be a little hard to take, but after a while we will be better. We are a little groggy maybe financially, but certainly not as sick as we were in the thirties.

No need of giving you the figures for the vast surplus of agricultural products we have on hand such as a year's supply of wheat, nearly a year's supply of cotton and so on. Now in face of this, here are some of the inconsistencies. In spite of this surplus and already having too much production:

From our latest United States Yearbook on Agriculture, we learn that from 1945 to 1950 an average of a million acres a year was brought into production in our Western States by irrigation, at the expense of all of us. Right after Ike got into office, the president of Mexico and he dedicated a dam along the border that brought into production by irrigation 4 million acres.

In another dam (feel like adding one letter) project a hole was bored 11 miles through the mountains to furnish water for an irrigation project. Travel where you will in the arid or semiarid parts of the West and you will see new irrigation projects.

Another inconsistency in this surplus thing is the soil conservation payments. In spite of the fact that ever since our agriculture extension began 40 or more years ago, our county agents have been preaching drainage, pasture improvement, contouring and so on, our $260 billion in debt Government makes these payments. Many farmers, myself included, are taking them because we feel we are helping pay not only for them but other subsidies as well that I will mention later.

Even though our conservative National Grange and Farm Bureau have recommended that the payments be curtailed, they make good political bait, particularly in the South. Congress passes an appropriation for more than is asked. Before these payments we put in by pick and shovel over 30,000 feet of tile that drained our worst spots. The land we are draining now is not too wet. I certainly would not pay the approximate $240 cost per acre, on land not worth $100 per acre, that the soil conservation people will give you.

COUNTRY SLICKERS

As I already mentioned, there are few if any Pennsylvania farmers taking advantage of borrowing money from the Government on sealed crops. Even where it is practiced, if it were the small farmer who was getting it, it would not be so bad. We quote from that controversial article, "Country Slickers Take Us Again," that Benson approved but did not read: "The Chandler Co., of Saragosa, Tex., is into the Treasury for $814,000 worth of cotton. Senator CAPPER HART, farmer of Indiana, is on the record for a $21,742 wheat loan. Adams Bros. and Co., of Odebolt, Iowa, got $179,127. The Louisiana Irrigation and Mill Co., of Crowley, La., turned its surplus rice over to the taxpayer for $486,227. The list runs on for page after page." Continuing, "They own only a little more than a third of the farms yet grow over 85 percent of the total farm output."

Going back to other years, when the economic laws of supply and demand, diminishing returns, profit and loss, etc., worked for 20 years we did not grow wheat. It was unprofitable. Under controls and par-

ity, 3 years ago when we were in Canada, a farmer here got $1.85 at the mill for wheat, the Canadians on the open market were getting $1.45 and still growing wheat. Ed Bayard used to tell of a group of farmers in a poultry section who were paid for not threshing their wheat. These farmers bedded their poultry houses with the unthreshed wheat.

In Iowa when they were required to cut corn acreage 10 percent the farmers used hybrid seed and increased their yields 25 percent.

A former preacher from here lives in Sheridan, Wyo., where they do dry land farming on a big acreage. As soon as they take the wheat off they plow the land, then harrow after every rain to hold the moisture. In this way they get only enough moisture to grow a crop every other year. This preacher told us one farmer got $10,000 for not growing wheat in the off year when he was not going to grow it anyhow.

Another story from the New York Times, April 9, 1936: "One Montana wheat grower received more than $50,000 from AAA for not planting wheat; this large scale operator received about $7 an acre on land which the Indian Bureau officials said could be rented for 50 cents to $1.50 an acre." I could go on citing many other cases.

FARMERS' SIDE

Here is the farmers' side of taking subsidies. When the farmer gets them and they are comparatively minor, the papers make them into headlines, but ones like the following get a little corner on an inside page. Here are a few:

During World War II the RFC paid through direct subsidies more than three billion dollars for the processing of such things as oil, lead, zinc, wood pulp, and many other commodities. Ocean shipping gets $150 million in subsidies per year when under United States flag. The airlines gets $129 million for carrying mail and direct subsidies. Our post office department in 1953 got $663 million dollars to make up the deficit. This year the Veterans Administration is asking for $4.5 billion, much of it loaded with "fat." The Army is asking over $35 million, which I think if run on a business basis could be cut $10 billion. How much of our overseas relief could be cut without hardship? Did you read the other day where British plumbers have chauffeurs to drive them from one job to the other? And that 500,000 men are needed in England for all the jobs available?

Right now in Washington our Congressmen are building more marblelined office buildings for their use, and are going to spend a few million on a new front on the Capitol building to better balance the dome.

Senator ELLENDER from Louisiana did get a Senatorial swimming pool blocked from being included in the plans.

I do no know where this will all lead. When we do send a good man to Washington and he tries to have our Government economize, a spender comes along, like the one in our congressional district, promises a lot of "gravy" and wins out over the good man.

All frustrating, is it not?

Woman's Congress on Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, it is my feeling based on careful consideration that the coming Woman's Congress on Housing will be very fruitful as I indicated in my remarks made on March 29 and found on page A2777 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. A compilation of the opinions of those in attendance will be of great help to all the home builders of America, because it will enable them to include features and make changes which will lead to greater convenience and better living.

I have learned with great pleasure that Mrs. Robert E. Owen, of 555 Acorn Drive, Dayton, Ohio, has been chosen as 1 of the 100 homemakers across the Nation to attend this home-planning meeting. Mr. and Mrs. Owen were married in 1946. They have 3 youngsters aged 6, 4, and 8 months. So the children play a basic role in her ideas about home planning. In her letter to Hon. Albert Cole, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, as reported in the Dayton Daily News and the Dayton Journal-Herald, Mrs. Owen pointed out that—First, basements are essential; second, increased space should be provided for eating; third, added indoor recreational space is essential; fourth, there should be more space for summer recreation space such as a porch and patio. Mrs. Owen also stated, "Whether it is a 1-story house or a 2-story house does not matter as much as the facilities it has—if I could find the features I like, I would take either type."

An enterprising reporter on the Dayton Journal Herald newspaper, Staff Writer Marilyn Floridis, interviewed 25 housewives in Dayton seeking their opinions. The story written by Miss Floridis is, by unanimous consent, included in these remarks and illustrates the opinions of these 25 homemakers:

DAYTON HOUSEWIVES ARE QUICK TO ANSWER GOVERNMENT'S QUESTIONS ON HOUSING

(By Marilyn Floridis)

The Federal Government is asking housewives for their ideas on modern housing.

Writers of the 100 best letters will be invited to a "Congress of American Housewives" late this month in Washington, D. C., where the women will talk with private industry experts and Government officials.

Armed with this practical knowledge, the Government hopes to guide builders in building the kind of homes the American housewives want.

What do Dayton housewives think about modern housing?

In an unofficial survey this week, 25 local women were definite in their opinions. The majority of them said they:

1. Favored a "family room" for informal living.

2. Wanted a utility room on the first floor.

3. Liked best an easy-to-care-for, ranch-type home of 1 story.

Briefed, their opinions about what they want in new homes include these:

Mrs. Elmer Will, 904 Ferndale Avenue: "A family room. We have 6 children and consider such a room important. I like the laundry room near the bedrooms, even if it is on the second floor—it's easier to handle all the clothes and linens that way."

Mrs. Herbert Cammerer, 125 West Peach Orchard: "Stainless steel, double sink, with a disposal on one side and a dishwasher are my favorites. Under-cabinet lighting in the kitchen and aluminum awning type windows are good modern innovations. I like a full basement, too."

Mrs. Louis Becker, 3525 East Third Street: "I like most a modern kitchen with wall ovens, built-in ranges, and automatic laundries. For my own use, however, I prefer a two-story plan."

Mrs. Glenn R. Walters, 4425 Maxlin Road: "Our family room with a washer-dryer-laundry-tub section curtained off and a lavatory to the side is just wonderful. I like a stone fireplace in the living room, too."

Mrs. John Tolnitch, 5681 Little Sugar Creek Road: "Adequate closet space. Well lighted and deep. And smooth walls are easier to take care of, especially in kitchen and bath. Having the oven level with the counter top and built-in burners eliminates a lot of cleaning problems."

Mrs. R. H. Paul, 1201 West Fairview Avenue: "My bugaboo is height of sinks and work areas. They should be higher so you don't have to bend over. I like a one-floor plan, without basement or attic, and a utility room convenient to the kitchen."

Mrs. James Pfeiffer, 2428 Wyoming Street: "A dishwasher and disposal. I favor a one-floor plan with a playroom. Every home should have a basement."

Ruth Hoecker, 322 Wiltshire Boulevard, career girl: "Plenty of storage space so you don't have to store things in the basement or attic, and windows that give outdoor light. I think a kitchen that's easy to move around in, with appliances close together and a waist-high oven is a big help."

Mrs. Manuel Begovich, Jr., rural route 1, Vandalia: "Labor-saving devices, like garbage disposals. I prefer the one-floor plan with a basement, and adequate space outdoors for the children."

Mrs. Charles Truax, 1021 Hollendale Drive: "Washer-dryers, dishwashers, and disposals are all important. All homes should have air conditioning. I think the dining room will return and replace the dining-living L."

Mrs. William Bombeck, 4748 Burnham Lane: "A dining room. Builders put up three-bedroom houses but don't have other facilities to match for expansion with growing children. They never provide a place for the big truck that Grandma gives."

Mrs. Mearick Funkhouser, 546 Garden Road: "I still prefer the gracious, two-story, center-hall house. Family rooms are wonderful for little children, and I wouldn't do without a garage-door lift. Eliminate excess halls."

Mrs. Garner Fanning, 1830 San Rae Drive: "First and foremost, rooms nowadays are too small. Especially kitchens and baths. We're buying a split-level home."

Mrs. Dwight Mikesell, Jr., 2406 England Avenue: "Ranch-style homes, but ones with a basement. I like the bath-and-a-half idea, and a basement for a family room."

Mrs. S. R. Passmore, 836 Harman Avenue: "Separate laundry room with space for a sewing machine. Dutch oven at table level, heating system that's dirt free and noise resisters like acoustic ceilings and wall-to-wall carpeting. I prefer two-story houses with privacy of bedrooms on second floor."

Mrs. Jack Stamper, 1833 North Main Street: "Much of house planning depends on whether you have small children. Trilevel homes are a blessing for watching over children. Including modern appliances in original cost of house makes more young couples able to afford them."

Mrs. Emerson Eschbaugh, 924 East Stroop Road: "I'd like a basement or family room. Important to have a place for hobbies. Separate dining room is good, so that you don't have to look into the kitchen. Louvered doors are too hard to clean and they don't keep the noise out."

Mrs. Sherwood Snyder, 7870 Normandy Lane: "A one-story plan. I think you eliminate clutter by not having a basement. Efficient kitchens, big ones."

Mrs. H. L. Strohmeyer, 601 West Nottingham Road: "Lots of cupboards with sliding doors, and a wall of closets in the bedroom. I'd give up a garbage disposal last of all.

Outdoor terrace living, convenient to the kitchen, is good.

Mrs. Clair Routsong, 652 Garden Road: "I like a patio for outdoor cooking in the summer. And our built-in Hi-fi set is wonderful."

Mrs. Art Rumer, Mad River Road: "Sliding partitions in the house so you can open it up for company. Sliding doors for closets, too, to save space. I think we should get away from steps and short window eaves that don't protect windows or interior fabrics from fading."

Mrs. Jeff Clevelle, Englewood: "A separate utility room. I think one on the first floor would be the most step-saving thing."

Mrs. M. L. Edwards, 1712 Richard Street: "All I want is space. Basement for a recreation room, and larger bedrooms. Area for laundry in basement, rather than utility room, is my choice."

Mrs. Charles E. Brennan, 297 Springbrook Boulevard: "A 1-level or 1½-level home. I like rounded corners, sharp corners are such dirt collectors. A garage that opens on side or back is better than the gaping hole in the front. Fenced-in area for privacy is a must."

Mrs. John H. Fox, 4292 Lefevre Drive: "More cabinet space in homes. I prefer a separate utility room. When the washer-dryer is in the kitchen it makes so much lint and steam."

If any other Miami Valley housewives would like to air their home ideas, to the Government, they can still write in care of House and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D. C.

The Challenges of Crime Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the House an outstanding address delivered by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, on April 10 before the National Parole Conference here in Washington, D. C.

In my judgment, this speech should be read by every Member of Congress and also by all of our citizens.

The thoughts expressed by Mr. Hoover in this remarkable address represent, I believe, his thinking over a great many years, and are the fruit of his long experience in law enforcement.

Mr. Hoover's speech is as follows:

THE CHALLENGES OF CRIME CONTROL

(Address of J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, April 10, 1956, before the National Parole Conference, Washington, D. C.)

Much has happened to all of us—and the world—since a conference similar to this one was held in Washington 17 years ago. That was in 1939. You will remember, as I do so well, that we were emerging from an era which had witnessed the overthrow of virtual gang control in community after community of our Nation. Then we had the international gangsters who attacked us and who were responsible for a second world war and the domestic upheavals that follow all wars. We won the war—but we found we still had the problem of crime and criminals with us—a problem that has continued to grow faster than our Nation's growth.

Even though crime increased there was hope that we could do better in the post-war world than we had in the past. That hope is always with those of us who have the duty of dealing with crime and with the problem of parole and probation.

I was hopeful that after the war that steps could be taken to make the worthwhile principles of parole and probation truly effective. This is a humanitarian task. This is a vitally important work and I believe in the objective which you, who are engaged in this work, are seeking and unless you succeed, then our work too often is made ineffective. I want to make that point clear to you—because it seems it has not always been clear to some people in the past, who have regarded me as an opponent of parole and probation.

I want to make it clear, too, that my criticism of the workings of parole and probation is for one reason only—to bring about more effective methods of crime control. Your objectives and my objectives can be reached only if probation and parole are worthy of the name and if law enforcement is worthy of its name. My criticism certainly is intended to be constructive for criticism designed only to destroy never helps anyone.

All of us have our dreams of achieving a goal. And to achieve a goal we must be practical. And to be practical we must speak frankly and face facts. As I see it, while progress has been made in many States and in many areas of the country—probation and parole in some areas are not worthy of the name. I say this without antagonism toward either probation or parole. The time has come for us to get together and try to find a solution to this problem which is a grave responsibility allied to law enforcement and to the rehabilitation of criminals.

As I see it, parole presupposes careful selection of those who will benefit by its application. It presupposes that those who are paroled will have careful and competent supervision. And the same principles apply to probation. I think all of us here subscribe to these principles. It is as obvious to me as it is to you that wrongdoers who have learned the error of their ways shoud be restored to a useful place in society and helped to recognize the values by which they can live at peace with themselves and with others.

From where I stand, parole and probation are only a part of the overall effort to achieve criminal justice. They are a part of our machinery of criminal justice which exists for only one purpose—the protection of society. This machinery fails when any part of it breaks down and leaves society unprotected. When such a breakdown occurs, then somewhere, someone has failed in his responsibility.

Society suffers when any unit of the vast machinery of criminal justice places the interest of the wrongdoer above the protection of society. Those of us who are assigned the responsibility of detecting and apprehending criminals are more and more coming to the view that our efforts, however essential, are but a temporary expedient. We arrest a wrongdoer today, present the evidence which establishes his guilt and bring about his conviction. All too frequently, within a short time thereafter, we are again hunting the same man because he has committed another crime.

Our work is only part of the answer. We know that the time-proven deterrents to crime are certainty of detection and arrest swift prosecution, and the realization that one must pay for his law violations.

I have condemned what I regard in some prisons as a country club atmosphere. By that description, I mean prisons which permit idleness and which neither punish nor rehabilitate the wrongdoers. Fuzzy and shallow thinking which contributes to maudlin sentimentality helps no one. We frequently hear about the plight of some criminal but little or nothing about his victims or the anguish and disgrace he has brought to his own loved ones.

The press accounts of the Boston prison riot last year are a perfect illustration of the misdirected concern in some quarters for vicious criminals which is inconsistent with our duty to protect society. Much was said about the participants in this riot, and their hope for freedom, but men and nations do not deserve freedom as a handout. They must earn and guard their freedom. In the talk of freedom for these men little appeared about their criminal background and their vicious crimes or whether the general welfare of society justified their freedom or whether they had earned their freedom. It is necessary to examine only two of the cases to make my point.

One of the convicts previously had been given the benefit of both parole and probation. He had been arrested for forgery, larceny, robbery and other crimes. He was serving a sentence of 15½ to 20 years, with a 25-year Federal sentence for bank robbery awaiting him. Another had been given the benefit of parole, probation and conditional release. He was serving time for assault, burglary and rape. His case was aggravated by the fact that he had committed a series of rapes and in his assaults had viciously beaten several of his victims. You cannot serve freedom on a silver platter to men like that.

One of the frequent arguments advanced for probation and parole is the overcrowding in prisons which exists today. But how valid is this argument when the population in State and Federal prisons has increased from 179,047 in 1939 to only 182,051 in 1954, an increase of only 3,000 in a 15-year period. To be sure, it is more economical to release convicts on parole or probation. But let us not put the system on the basis of the cheapest price tag. When you do, you get shoddy merchandise.

One of the most serious problems we face today in the field of crime control is that of the repeater. This problem is brought into sharp focus by looking at the background of the population in Federal prisons where in 1954 of those received under sentences of more than 1 year, 63.8 percent were repeaters. When our people check the fingerprints of arrested persons which are received in the Identification Division they find that 70 percent have records of previous arrests.

The only way we have at present of dealing with the repeater is to demonstrate to him that truly "he can't get away with it." But this is not enough in dealing with those who are unreformed and incapable of rehabilitation without extensive and prolonged mental treatment. If I can judge from the reports which come to my desk daily from every section of the country, there is a growing concern among law-enforcement officials over the increase in crimes by repeaters and those who have been improperly selected as beneficiaries of parole, probation, and other forms of clemency. I am certain you are just as concerned about this as we are. Parole upon parole and probation upon probation for those who have not reformed are unreasonable and unjustified. I appreciate the fact that for every flagrant mistake in parole and probation there are scores of cases reflecting dynamic reformation and rehabilitation. What I am saying is not that parole and probation are wrong—but that ill-advised parole and probation reflect adversely upon these methods of protecting society. It is the old case of a rotten apple tainting the whole barrel.

I can best illustrate my feelings by referring to a few cases which immediately

come to mind. One eastern gang of 11 responsible for a $2½-million holdup had received a total of 20 paroles and 17 probations, and 1 was pardoned, thereby blocking a deportation case. Another criminal had killed a policeman in 1932 and was given a life term. After the third parole, following the killing of the police officer, he was arrested burglarizing a safe. Another policeman was killed last fall by a criminal who had been paroled the previous month with a criminal record which dated back 15 years. Within the past few months, there was a nationwide manhunt for an individual who killed 6 persons following his parole less than 2 years ago. A group of parolees on a criminal spree, a little over a year ago, engaged in a gun fight with 2 policemen, and 1 of the policemen and 1 of the parolees were killed. Is this not enough to show that there is a need for improvement?

Since we established the widely publicized list of "10 most-wanted fugitives" in March 1950 a total of 95 criminals has been on the list. Fifty-two had received paroles on at least one occasion during their criminal careers. Of the 18 special agents of the FBI who have lost their lives in line of duty, 11 were killed by criminals who had previously received paroles, probation, or other forms of clemency. That errors have been made and are being made in the selection of persons to benefit from parole is a proven fact and a matter of grave concern. This is not merely the problem of law-enforcement officers—it is your problem also.

The mistakes in selecting the wrong person for release on parole might have been rectified with the type of supervision which the humanitarian principles of parole require. I do not say it is the fault of those who administer parole and probation. But it is the fault of those who permit these conditions to exist.

Politics, poor pay for parole and probation officers, lack of interest by city and State officials and the lack of uniform laws and practices all are involved. Parole supervision too often is a farce and exists in name only in too many cases. Those who have the most expert knowledge of parole hold that proper parole supervision requires a case load of no more than 50 to 65 for each parole officer. When you face the facts, it is a marvel that parole succeeds as well as it does. This is particularly true when you find parole officers carrying case loads of as many as 115. In a State where 45 parole and probation officers are required to supervise 2,800 persons on probation and 1,500 on parole it is clear that these overworked men cannot do their jobs properly. But that is only part of the picture. In addition, these 45 officers are required to make investigations in connection with granting of paroles and probation.

In one State, which boasts of an advanced parole system, maximum parole supervision requires a monthly visit to the parolee's home and place of employment. Minimum supervision requires a visit every 3 months either to the home or place of employment. It is no wonder that parole and probation fail so frequently. In one State, it is reported that 50 percent of those granted parole violate the conditions of parole. Figures vary in other States.

The picture is clear. The time has come for public indignation over the failure to give these men and women a chance to do their jobs properly. And, if it hurts some politicians, well, that is just too bad. At least, your conscience will be clear.

Justice is undermined and respect for constituted authority becomes a mockery when judges take it upon themselves to coddle hardened criminals by giving them undeserved probation. To illustrate, I refer to a case where a judge placed a criminal on probation on the charge of car theft and violation of the Federal Firearms Act. This man previously had been arrested for armed robbery and breaking and entering. For this he received a 10-year sentence in a State penitentiary. He escaped and was later arrested in a distant State. He resisted extradition on the grounds of cruel and inhuman punishment in the State penitentiary. The State made a careful investigation and subsequently the criminal's charges were disproved to the satisfaction of a Federal judge who ordered him returned. After serving 3 additional years of his sentence, he was paroled. When later arrested in a western State with a stolen car, he pleaded guilty but leveled the same old charges of the cruelty of punishment which had already been disproved. The judge placed him on probation for 10 years and told the criminal to behave himself and he would never have to serve the balance of the term for which he was paroled because, as the judge told him, he had "an umbrella over you now."

There can be no doubt that many judges are handicapped by not having complete details. Once a wrongdoer is arrested and brought before the courts, there can be no more important investigative function than to place before the judge the facts which will aid him in arriving at his conclusions as to what is best, both for society and the individual offender. We regard this as so important in our service that our various offices are under instructions to furnish all available case information to judges when so requested.

The Federal probation system does an excellent job of developing information to be submitted in its presentence reports. Likewise, some States do an outstanding job in this respect, but there are others where much improvement is sorely needed.

I want to express my deep appreciation for the splendid assistance and cooperation which our special agents are receiving from most parole and probation offices throughout the Nation. It has been a source of gratification to observe that in the past 20 years there has been a gradual improvement in the cooperation between the professional advocates of parole and probation and law-enforcement officers. It must continue to improve. The police officer on the beat, the county and State officer, and the Federal investigator are primarily concerned with the protection of society just as you are, and the old frictions should be removed. Fundamentally, there should be an even closer bond of cooperation between those charged with treatment of offenders and those charged with detection and apprehension. After all, our end objective is the same.

Under our legal system there is authority to act in most instances only after a crime has been committed. Somewhere and somehow, a new authority is needed—that of prevention. Let me illustrate. A policeman was killed by a 21-year-old parolee. He had been in and out of institutions on numerous occasions, having escaped and been paroled several times. After he had killed the policeman, the parolee's father disclosed that he had made efforts to have his son's parole revoked to prevent him from becoming further involved in serious crimes.

When parents appeal to authorities, not once but time and time again, to have their son on parole committed in the public interest, it is unbelievable that someone would not take action. Yet this has happened more than once. Last December, a 20-year-old parolee kidnaped a 3-year-old girl. The parolee was an admitted sex offender who had attacked girls ranging from 8 to 13 years of age. He had been committed twice to a mental hospital for examination. Paroles granted this criminal had been violated time and again. The parents saw that their son needed help—and he knew it himself. On the day before he abducted the 3-year-old girl, this sex offender had pleaded with his parole officer to come to see him; but for some reason, the officer did not see him. Cases like this cast a shadow, not on the principle, but upon the administration of parole.

More and more, we are finding the earmarks of crime long before the final act of violence occurs. Day after day, individuals who are mentally ill are committing serious crimes. They are bringing misery, not only to themselves, their relatives and their friends, but also to other innocent men, women, and children.

There are many individuals in America with backgrounds of emotional instability where the danger signals are clear and where the individual is clearly earmarked for crime. The time has come when some way must be found to take preventive action, and here is the proposal I hope you will consider: When a person has been convicted and sentenced to prison, the authorities today have the ability to determine in many cases whether the wrongdoer is capable of leading a law-abiding life. But when it is clear that due to mental quirks the likelihood of violence exists, then there should be some legally recognized machinery whereby such individuals can be isolated from society to receive preventive treatment.

These are days of stress and strain. Modern society is geared to a fast tempo. Pressures are heavy from all sides, thrusting vast burdens on us all. Nerves become taut, tempers frayed, minds blurred. Abnormalities appear, which, if recognized in time, can be treated and perhaps lives can be spared. If action is taken, mentally sick criminals might claim no more victims but, on the other hand, they may be made into useful citizens.

The rise in sex offenses is shocking. Last year, while the total number of crimes was leveling off, rape increased 5.9 percent, and this has been the case for the past 20 years when such crimes have increased 163 percent, according to reports on crimes received from local, county, and State law-enforcement agencies. You who have devoted your lives to treatment of offenders know that there are certain types of persons who are mentally and physically ill and need to be treated as much. You also know that there are types of individuals whose prognosis for normal adjustment is so remote as to be improbable. The time has come when society can better be protected by providing some means of enforced treatment for such people. Public health authorities may legally place a family in quarantine if they have a disease which is dangerous to others. The freedom of that family is restricted for the good of the community. If this is accepted as a proper health measure, then certainly there should be a quarantine for mentally ill criminals who should be released only upon certification of competent medical authorities who can also say when the facts justify it, "This man is mentally ill and we cannot approve his release until this illness is cured. He must be kept in quarantine."

Mental illness, emotional instability and abnormality are major problems in crime control just as certain diseases are problems in the health of a community. When official agencies receive information that a person convicted of a crime has a mental illness or abnormality which could endanger others, there should be a responsibility to advise proper law enforcement agencies of the facts. If the case is sufficiently acute, there should be a means, with all the proper safeguards for constitutional rights, whereby treatment could be enforced—even beyond the period of actual sentence, if necessary.

If, for example, the facts are known that a person has a proven record as a sex deviate, there is also a responsibility to see to it that proper authorities are notified so that they may be warned of a potential threat to their community.

If the present trend of fiendish crimes is to be reversed, there is a need for a new attitude and a determination to prevent such acts. It is already the experience of law enforcement that perhaps as many sex crimes

go unreported as are reported. If every sex offender knew that his name was on record, this in and of itself would be a powerful deterrent. If every sex offender knew there were ways and means by which he might get corrective treatment, the lives of potential victims as well as offenders and their families might be spared. A person suffering from contagious disease is removed from contact with healthy persons until the danger is past. So should the mentally ill criminal who endangers the safety of the community be treated. Law enforcement, of course, knows when an offender is placed on probation, but it seldom knows when one is placed on parole. It seems to me there is no valid reason why law enforcement officers should not know when a potential offender is released within their jurisdiction, just as health authorities should know when a typhoid carrier is around. The mere fact that a parolee knows that law enforcement has his identity could be another force of deterrence, and law enforcement could be of assistance in giving a helping hand to make parole more workable. This should be a cooperative effort.

Doubtless some of you already are thinking of reasons why this program I have suggested cannot be done. I could give you right now a dozen reasons why it would be difficult—but it is ridiculous to say it cannot be done to the everlasting benefit of the mentally ill and the community. It can be done if we work together and if you add your pool of ideas.

We complain about high taxes, but last year crime cost every man, woman and child in these United States $122, or a staggering estimated total of twenty billions of dollars. Perhaps this figure could become more meaningful if we realized that for every $1 spent on education, crime cost $1.46; and for every $1 which went to the churches of the Nation, $13 went to crime.

If we could but divert the waste of crime to constructive use—recruit and train the people so sorely needed in every phase of the administration of criminal justice and quarantine the mentally ill criminal until he is cured—the Nation would soon reap a marvelous profit. And there would be the added profit from a decline in sorrow, mental anguish and outright physical suffering resulting from crime.

The challenge in crime control is a challenge to all of us here this morning. We live with it. It is the responsibility of every citizen, of course, but it is our job—it is our basic responsibility, if we do not find the answers—they will not be found. We must provide the ideas and the leadership.

And we must work together in mutual understanding—or else we fail. We must not fail.

Grange and Farm Groups Show Great Interest in the Federal Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, correspondence which I am receiving indicates a great and growing interest in the passage of Federal interstate highway legislation this session.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution presented by a group of Washington State Granges indicating their support for such a program:

Whereas we are fully aware that our present systems of highways are far too inadequate to meet the constantly increasing burdens placed upon them by industrial and private use; and

Whereas it is imperative that we must have more, better, safer, wider highways to curtail the appalling, ever-increasing number of highway accidents of which last year alone saw 38,300 Americans (many of them children) killed in traffic accidents, while more than 1 million additional persons were injured, many of whom were permanently crippled; and

Whereas the proposed highway legislation, which calls for an additional spending during the next 10 years to build needed additional highways, will assure more employment and greater prosperity for years to come, inasmuch as it is reliably estimated that this program will create 200,000 additional, steady highway jobs: Therefore be it hereby

Resolved, That we, the members of St. Urban Grange, No. 648, and Adna Grange, No. 417, of Lewis County, State of Washington, in our annual gavel visitation meeting assembled at St. Urban Grange, Winlock, Lewis County, Wash., on this 12th day of April 1956, do hereby go on record urging enactment of highway legislation now in committee in the Congress of the United States, House of Representatives; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Lewis County Pomona Grange and to United States Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, United States Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, Congressman at Large DON MAGNUSON, Congressman RUSSELL V. MACK, Third District of Washington.

EMIL HOFMANN,
Master, St. Urban Grange.
JAMES J. BLAKEMORE,
Master, Adna Grange.
HENRY E. STEARNS,
Master, Forest Grange.

WINLOCK, WASH., *April 12, 1956.*

Address by Former President Truman at the Annual Awards Dinner of the Overseas Press Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include the following address of a penetrating nature delivered by former President Harry S. Truman at the annual awards dinner of the Overseas Press Club on April 3, 1956:

The role of the foreign correspondent is a difficult one. In the first place, he must be able to understand what is going on in a most complicated world, and that is not easy. Second, he must be able to explain and interpret this to an all too indifferent public, and that part of the job is more difficult still. I'm sure that I don't need to persuade this audience that a successful foreign correspondent needs to be a gifted person. But I just want to let you know that I agree with you about it.

Today the foreign correspondent's job has taken on a great deal of added importance because it is the only source from which the American people can get the truth about what is going on in our Nation's external affairs.

We are all aware of the importance of having a press that keeps the public fully informed. But have you ever stopped to think about the unique necessity for this, as well as the unique difficulty, in the field of foreign affairs?

It's hard to fool the people about what's going on in this country. It can be done sometimes, but usually not for long. That is simply because a man is likely to believe his own senses about the things that go on right around him every day. For example, take the American farmer. He is being told from Washington that the Benson-Eisenhower farm program is good for him—that it's just what the doctor ordered, and that it is really much better than the unprecedented prosperity he enjoyed under the previous administration. The farmer has been hearing this for 3 years now. At first he may have believed it. But as time went on—as farm prices went lower and lower—as the farmer's bank account got smaller and his debts larger—as he had to give up thoughts of sending his children to college—things became pretty bad in the farming country and the farmer began to see the light. Now the farmer is not being fooled any more.

TRUTHFUL REPORTS VITAL

With foreign affairs it is different. Few of us have any first-hand contact with events outside our own country. Those events all seem rather distant and strange to us. All we know about them is only what other people tell us. And if these people don't tell us the truth, we may have a totally false understanding of events. At the same time, the world has developed to a point where events that occur in other countries are of overriding importance to us. The great issues which today confront us as a Nation have their origins in other countries just as much—perhaps even more—than in our own.

I need not recite for you in detail the factors that make this true. You know them as well as I—the trade and commerce which binds us so closely to the four corners of the earth that we would be helpless if they were severed; the modern miracles of transportation and communication that make us the close neighbors of 3 billion people of every race and description everywhere in the world; the awful means of destruction that can be delivered by our enemies upon our cities and by us upon theirs. You know about these things. We all know about them. But most of us here at home are preoccupied with events closer at hand. We forget how important the rest of the world really is. And we don't search out the facts about it as we should.

That is why the job of bringing the facts about the rest of the world to the American people is doubly difficult and important. We must know the facts and act on them if we are to have peace in the world and preserve our freedom and independence. At the same time we have a tendency to shut these facts out of our minds or they are crowded out by day-to-day happenings in our own communities. Someone has to bring this home to us—someone has to inform us and make us understand what is going on in foreign countries.

Normally this is a job which is shared by our Government and by the press; and it is a job to tax fully the best efforts of both. Today I question—to put it mildly—whether the Government is doing its share of the job. The President tells us that he is trying to delegate many of his duties and says that his associates can perform them as well as he can. When it comes to giving the people the real facts about foreign affairs, it appears to me that the administration has delegated that function—delegated it completely outside the Government altogether—has turned it over to the foreign correspondents of the press altogether.

Notice that I say facts. To have a false picture is as bad as having no information at all.

The world we live in today is a hard and difficult world. The job our Nation has to do is a hard and difficult job. It will require much money, much work, and perhaps, much sacrifice. There is no reason to believe that the American people will support the massive effort that is required unless they are told the full truth about the urgency and danger of the Communist threat.

But this is not what they have been told by the present administration. From the President's first state of the Union message, where he "unleased" Chiang Kai-shek, to the Secretary of State's complacent report on his latest trip, they have been telling the American people only what seems to be politically expedient at the moment. Sometimes the facts happen to coincide with what they say. More often, they do not.

CONFLICT IN DATA FOUND

I do not have any Central Intelligence Agency. I do not have any sources that can keep me as fully informed about foreign affairs as I had when I was in the White House. But I can read, and I do. I read what your newspapers and magazines print about conditions overseas. I read the statements and views of people I knew and trusted when I was President. I read the stories that come from our foreign correspondents. The things that you are writing are so different from the things that the administration is telling us that both cannot be right. As between the administration and you, I have made my choice. I may be accused of irresponsibility, but I believe you.

I believe the Communist threat is more dangerous now than ever before. I believe recent changes in Soviet tactics are not signs of failure, but evidence of growing economic power. As the Alsop brothers put it, if I may quote them without their permission:

"Except for Dulles, expert opinion unanimously attributes the important changes in the Kremlin's policy line to a new self-confidence, derived from the great improvements in Soviet military posture and gains in heavy industry."

These changes may reduce the danger of immediate armed conflict, but they are no ground for complacency or relaxation. I think it quite likely that the Communists will not start a major war so long as they can make sweeping progress toward their objectives by less violent methods. After all, why should they? But this makes their poison not one whit less deadly. This makes our struggle with them not one whit less urgent. On the contrary, it calls for renewed and expanded effort on our part.

If the struggle to win the confidence and support of the uncommitted peoples of the world is now to be fought in the field of economics, that gives us a great opportunity. For this is the field where we excel. But this is not going to be any pushover. The Soviet system—whether we like it or not, and I don't like it—has shown they have a method, a very effective method, of forming the capital needed for economic development. They will use this ability to the utmost in their effort to achieve world domination. We all know how ruthless they are, and we can be sure they will stop at nothing. Truth and honor mean nothing to them. We might as well understand that this is a contest that we have a chance to lose. It would be criminal and shameful if we were to lose, but it could happen.

I never did believe in half measures and certainly not when our existence is at stake. We ought to put into our foreign aid program whatever it takes to do the job. I see that the administration has asked for some expansion in the program, and I think the Congress ought to give the administration as much as it has asked for. Indeed, I'm afraid the administration has asked far too little rather than too much.

In fact, it appears doubtful if the administration comprehends at all the magnitude of the Soviet economic challenge or has any conception of a program adequate to meet it. The only foreign economic program this administration has ever had is the one inherited from us. They have administered it badly and allowed it to wither away in some important respects. But they have tried—after a fashion—to carry on our old program. While it is said that imitation is the sincerest form of flattery, I wish with all my heart that the Eisenhower administration would stop flattering us and develop something new to meet new conditions.

EXPORT OF CAPITAL NEEDED

It seems plain that the United States is going to have to export capital on a very considerable scale if the peoples who live from north Africa to Indonesia are to achieve economic development as free and independent peoples instead of satellites within the Communist system. Today these people stand among problems which press on them from every side, like a man up to his neck in water—a ripple may drown him. They must have, and will get, help from some outside quarter. If we do not help them, the Russians will. But we must make it plain to these peoples that we do not seek to limit their freedom by commitments of any sort. Rather we wish to help them develop in ways of their own choosing and establish their independence even more securely. In short, we need a bold, new program for foreign economic aid—and we don't have it.

Moreover, I think the administration is likely to have trouble getting from Congress even as much foreign aid as it has asked for. And it is the administration's own fault, because it has not been frank with the American people.

The American people will not support a vigorous foreign-aid program if they do not understand the need for it.

But instead of explaining the need, the Secretary of State tells us that Soviet policy has already failed and is brankrupt. The fact is that Communist policy has never been more aggressive than it is now—in its new form of economic and political penetration. Not since the end of the war has the Communist strategy been more effective and more dangerous. But the administration can't expect us to understand this if it continues to insist that Soviet policy is beaten. The Eisenhower administration's premature claims of success may well be the bar that prevents the actual achievement of success.

Unfortunately the penalties for the failures of those in power are not visited upon them alone. The fantasies of the Secretary of State make it all the more necessary for others to see things through. That imposes a special responsibility on the Americans who write about foreign affairs in this year of our Lord 1956.

I'm sure you'll do your best.

In doing that you will render a service of great value to your country, the greatest Republic in the history of the world.

Have Our Economists Thrown Us a Curve?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in view of the attempt of the Department of Agriculture under Mr. Benson to drive the one-family farm out of existence, of Mr. Benson's obvious leaning towards the processor instead of the farmer, and of his propaganda to make the consumer think that the farmer is getting rich at their expense, it seems to me that the following article from the Holstein-Friesian World of April 7 is extremely pertinent. Being in the dairy business myself I know that the facts contained in this article are true, and that the author has a very good grasp of the subject:

HAVE OUR ECONOMISTS THROWN US A CURVE?

(By Roland Ramsay)

Two years ago when our Government withdrew its rigid 90-percent support of dairy products Mr. Benson took this action because he was convinced that (1) high supports were pricing butter off the American table and (2) that high supports were stimulating overproduction of dairy products. The records show that due to the lower prices on butter and cheese and to the splendid work of the American Dairy Association in advertising dairy products he was right in his first contention but the records of the past 2 years show quite clearly that he was wrong in his contention that a lower support price would discourage overproduction.

The average American dairyman isn't in the business because he hopes to get rich at it nor does he milk too many cows because he wants to create a surplus. The size of his operations is based primarily upon the standard of living each dairyman wants for himself and family. He wants to have a good, comfortable home—he wants to be able to educate his children properly, and he wants to be able to pay his taxes and bills, ride in a decent car, be able to afford some of the machines that will lighten his work and lay up enough savings so he and his wife will not be a burden on the children in their old age.

Individual farms and dairy families meet this problem in their own way and milk the number of cows they do in order to supply the standard of living they want. The overproduction that brought on the abandonment of 90 percent support was primarily caused by the fact that things the dairyman had to buy to supply himself and family had been gradually increasing in price while the things the dairy farmer had to sell were gradually decreasing in price. The average dairyman had little choice but to milk a few more cows in order to maintain his economy.

Now the economists and writers for our nationally circulated farm magazines began at once to advise the dairy farmer how to cope with this new situation. Collectively the story runs about like this: The first thing they do is write off the 12-cow, 100-acre dairyman as simply out of the picture economically. They advise that 24 cows is the smallest number of cows a dairyman can survive with. They usually advise the 24-cow dairyman to take steps to increase his milking herd to 36 and they contend that the ideal size of a good, sound dairy operation under our present conditions is about 50 cows.

The articles then go on to show pictures of dairymen milking 24 to 36 cows per hour in a shiny new walk-through milking parlor, complete with pipeline and bulk tank. Next they show pictures of the dairyman grinding feed—grain coming down from overhead bins into an electrically driven grinder that delivers the ground and mixed feed up to other overhead bins that supply the cows by gravity with metered grain in the walk through and elsewhere about the farm as needed.

Another interesting picture shows the dairymen pressing the button that controls the machine that throws down the silage into the long feed bunks with the conveyor

chains that automatically shut off when the silage reaches the far end of the bunk. Still another favorite picture shows the dairy herd around a large roof-covered structure that holds a season's supply of chopped hay which feeds down with very little attention and keeps the herd hay happy the year around (of course the area around the hay feeder and silage bunks must be paved as well as much of the lots as possible).

These articles are all very interesting to us as dairymen, and most of us agree that we could handle lots larger herds than we now have if we had all those work- and time-saving features. The writers never get around to talking in terms of capital outlay required nor of interest, depreciation and added taxes and operating costs which, of course would vary from farm to farm. I have operated a 12-cow 105-acre farm since the fall of 1928, have ample buildings to handle this size herd—a 12 by 34 silo—a rotobaler to handle hay and bedding—a sprinkler system to insure plenty of hay and pasture as well as grain for my herd—a comfortable modern home and two paidup life insurance policies.

Assuming I am free of debts and could get all the money I needed at 5 percent to modernize my buildings and buy additional cows to bring my herd up to the 24-cow size the experts tell us is the minimum—how much would I have to borrow and would it be a paying proposition? I won't go into the gruesome details other than to suggest that by the time I had my bulk, walk-through and pipeline milker installed—the necessary alteration made to the barn and lots and the 12 additional cows bought I would have spent at least $8,000.

I would have to provide more calf sheds and lots and housing for 12 more cows—I would need another silo and the chopped hay structure and since one can hardly risk being able to always get a custom-hay chopper at the proper time each cutting to insure top quality hay I would no doubt end up buying a hay chopper, wagons, blower and tractor to pull it (by also buying the row attachment I could also fill my silos, you know). I still don't have the automatic silage feeding deal or the feed-grinding set-up but my tractor-pulled grinder already has the feed collector in the roof of the barn so that part isn't too bad.

But, even though I might find that I could milk and feed the 24-cow herd in the same time I do my present 12-cow herd, that doesn't mean I still have a one-man farm. Twice as many cattle take twice as much bedding and make twice as much manure. Twice as many acres of hay and pasture would require twice as much irrigation (or around-the-clock pumping much of the time) so I add 10 or 12 more cows in order to afford a year-round man.

Now then, how much have I spent and how profitable will be the investment? Well, it all depends. A fellow could easily spend $30,000 if he really fixed things up right or, if he was a handy man with tools, did most of his own fixing up and bought a second-hand hay chopper, wagons, blower and tractor, he might get set up for $20,000.

So, for example, let's say that for $20,000 I have been able to transform my 12-cow, 105-acre farm into a 36-cow dairy. Boiled down to facts the problem is, Will the profit from 24 extra cows pay the interest on $20,000 or $1,000 plus the depreciation, taxes, repairs, insurance on this added investment? At only 10 percent this would mean $2,000 plus the wages of a year-around man at $300 per month or a total of $6,600.

If the 24 added cows were able to return an average of $275 each above feed cost, and all expenses were included in the 10 percent taken for depreciation, etc., I would just balance out, but after I got through paying the taxes, repairs, veterinarian, etc., chargeable to these 24 cows, there wouldn't actually be anything left of the $2,000, so I would have little or nothing to pay the principal off at the bank. Suppose I had invested $30,000, then I would have had to average $337.50 per cow over feed cost just to break even. Considering that the average DHIA dairy cow returns less than $200 above feed cost it's pretty hard to even project anything like a paying proposition.

Just how much change there is going on in the dairy business no one really knows. More than the usual number of small-dairy farmers have quit milking cows but a lot of the men that were milking 18 or 20 cows are fixed up to milk 40 cows. USDA officials report more and more milk finding its way to our markets, and as it will take 2 or 3 more years to feel the full effects of our dairy expansion program we can only hope that we do not find ourselves in the same position the pork producers were in this past year.

If in the next 2 or 3 years we find that increased consumption of dairy products has kept pace with the increased production of milk so that the price received for milk stays about steady most dairymen will manage to get along in pretty fair shape. But, if production runs ahead of consumption to any very great additional degree, dairymen will feel the tightening of the squeeze and those with heavy indebtedness will be in trouble.

The same economists and writers that urged dairy expansion as a way to cope with the removal of dairy products from 90 percent parity—the same guys that wrote off the 12-cow, 100-acre dairy farm and urged them to go to at least 24 or, better still, 36 cows can really write a swell article showing you why you are going broke with this 36-cow herd. We all know the story and know that it is true, you know, that in the average 36-cow dairy herd, if feed costs and actual average costs chargeable to each dairy cow were determined, the 12 least profitable cows would show a definite loss, the middle 12 would just about break even, and the top 12 were really making about what the poorest 12 lost. The writers would say to get rid of those cows that were losing you money. They would point out that it's the unprofitable cows that produce the surplus and while they would tell you that with the 12 losing cows gone you might be able to feed and care for the middle 12 to the point where they might show some profit, really the only smart thing to do was to cut clear back to the 12 cows that were really making a profit. Then they would go into ecstasy about the traditional family-sized farm.

The point is the American farmer has learned to rely on our great farm publications for sound advice and the question is just how sound is it to advise dairymen to increase production to counteract the effect of too much production.

I am not a pessimist or an alarmist. I am sure hundreds of dairymen have taken the advice of farm papers and have or are in the process of greatly increasing their dairy herds. However, American dairymen are a pretty hardheaded, straight-thinking class of people and I doubt very much if they allow themselves to be carried away by the program to the point where we will have milk running out our ears. I don't believe any economist can sit in an air-conditioned office and correctly tell a dairyman how large his farm should be and how many cows he has to milk to make a living.

The correct size of a dairyman's operations depends upon the size of his farm, the buildings he has, and, the amount of available dairy minded help he has, and with all this his success depends primarily on his ability as a farmer and cowman and the "dairy inheritance" of his cows. A good dairyman on a 100-acre farm with 12 or 15 cows that average $300 a year over feed cost is in a better position than the fellow with 36 cows that only average $200 over feed cost, or, the man with 50 cows that average $160. The size of a dairyman's monthly milk check is not a very good indication of his annual net income.

Why didn't our economists tell the dairymen that it's the unprofitable cow that is producing the surplus. Why didn't they preach the gospel of DHIA testing and show the dairyman where, by eliminating say 10 percent of his least profitable cows he could actually net more profit from his remaining herd than he realized from the whole herd under 90 percent parity, and in so doing would remove all surplus which would soon advance the price of dairy products to 100 parity on its own merits?

There is nothing wrong with walk-through milking parlors, pipeline milking and bulk cooling tanks or any of the many ways a dairyman can lighten his workload if he can eliminate a couple of $300 a month 44 hours a week men, or cut the family's working hours down to a reasonable time. I am a great believer in open-shed housing for my cattle, but I would hesitate to recommend all dairymen to adapt this system. In our great dairy districts there are thousands of big red dairy barns with 40 or 50 stanchions, mechanical gutter cleaners, two big silos at the end and ample hay storage overhead. Such barns just don't convert to loose housing very well. It would be lots more satisfactory to replace those old stanchions with as many comfort stalls as will fit in (the average cow will produce about 10 percent more milk in a comfort stall than a regular stanchion), go ahead and install a pipeline milker and you have a pretty swell layout. If the 10 or 12 cows you had to eliminate from your herd to make room for the extra wide stalls were low-profit or money-losing cows anyway you would be better off without them and if you could eliminate one man it would make all the difference in the world in your net income.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

Appendix

Disarmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on February 27, 1956, I addressed the Conference of Organizations on the United Nations, called by the American Association for the United Nations, on the subject of disarmament. I ask unanimous consent to have this speech inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, OF MINNESOTA, AT THE SECTION MEETING ON DISARMAMENT AT THE CONFERENCE OF ORGANIZATIONS ON THE UNITED NATIONS, CALLED BY THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS, FEBRUARY 27, 1956, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Chairman Bolte, Mrs. Roosevelt, Governor Stassen, and friends, it is a particular pleasure to be here today with you and to share this platform both with the President's personal representative in the field of disarmament and with the leaders of the great organizations throughout this country that are dedicating their talents and energies to these problems of overriding international importance. I see many friends in this audience; representatives from every area of American life—labor, business, agriculture, the professions, and our great organizations of fraternal and religious faith. Regardless of your particular interests, you are here because you believe that our country and its freedoms would not survive without a citizenship that was well informed. You are here to inform yourselves through your own deliberations and then to take that information back to the groups you represent. I know that you do not have to be recommissioned for that assignment, but it seems to me tremendously important that the flow of information to your constituency be most certain and most comprehensive. The job of our government would be far more difficult if it were not for people with a sense of community responsibility—people who are at work constantly alerting and informing the public. Just as you have helped to inform others, including Senators and appointees of the President, it is the obligation of your government to provide accurate and detailed information on all matters of foreign policy, national security and disarmament.

I say this in connection with all the manifold problems of national and international policy which now confront us. During the past few days you have been canvassing the broad issues of economic development, collective security, atoms for peace, and colonialism. Today we are turning our attention to the opportunity and the challenge of disarmament, but in doing so, I know we will not forget how interrelated all of these problems are.

This interrelationship was frankly recognized 10 years ago at the birth of the United Nations in San Francisco. The new world organization was dedicated not only to a peaceful world, but to a better world. Everyone acknowledged that security alone was not enough, even though progress in the long run would be impossible without it. Thus article 1 of the United Nations Charter spelled out the two major goals of the United Nations as follows:

1. "To maintain international peace and security, and to that end, to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace."

2. "To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural or humanitarian character."

Thus, there was an early admission that security alone was too hollow an objective. The delegates to the founding conference at San Francisco in 1945 knew in their hearts that security has meaning primarily for those who have something to preserve.

Therefore, as we concentrate on this subject of disarmament, let us never forget that there are other immediate everyday problems that are simultaneously stirring the hearts and hopes of men and women throughout the world. If disarmament itself is to make any headway, people everywhere must have a clear idea of the kind of world that a disarmed world might be. There must be a great incentive. If the net effect of disarmament would be to freeze the status quo, to stifle change, to prevent the correction of existing abuses, much of its attractiveness would fade away.

Actually the pathway to disarmament may very well involve utilizing the great international agencies such as WHO, UNESCO, FAO, the technical assistance programs, capital development programs—all of which have a way of firming up the economies of the nations of the world—so that our international mental health is more conducive to a sane, sensible discussion of the problems of disarmament.

We must always remember that we live and labor in a world of revolution. Protecting and enlarging the freedom of the two-thirds of the world which is still outside Communist control will take more than military alliances to which we seem to be unduly addicted. It will take more than a stockpile of bombs, and more than threats to use them. It is a false notion though widely held, that today's tensions and torments are entirely caused by the Soviet drive for expansion and that military deterrents, therefore, are the chief answers.

Aggressive Communist designs are, to be sure, in the forefront of our current foreign policy predicament, but this Communist threat occurs in the midst of a world-wide revolution for freedom and for material progress. In the underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa and South America, forces are now at work which will rank among the great movements of history, as important as the Renaissance and the Industrial Revolution.

More than a billion people are on their way to political self-determination, economic development, and human dignity. They are the so-called "underdeveloped nations" and many of them happen to be uncommitted to either side in the cold war.

The Communists have now recognized this Twentieth Century revolution and have sought to turn it to communism's advantage. They have sought to preempt it, to claim it, to own it, and to direct it. We, on the other hand, are today running grave risks of failing to take it adequately into account, and of failing to identify this revolution with our own historic tradition and continuing ideals.

Many of us have been deeply disturbed over the inadequacies of public understanding and of official policy on this new challenge now facing us. I am convinced, for example, that if we are to match the new Soviet political and economic offensive, we must reexamine and liberalize our approach to the underdeveloped—the uncommitted—nations of the world. In those nations the demands for self-government, human dignity, and economic progress are now irrepressible. We had better face up to that. Our own national history symbolizes these self-same demands. We will be faithless to our tradition if we neglect this new opportunity to help other nations reassert our common principles.

I am sure that the uncommitted peoples of the world have been impressed during the last few days with the President's dramatic step forward in sharing "atoms for peace." Let us hope, however, that our approach to peaceful atomic assistance to other nations will proceed within the framework of the United Nations. The President himself, in his famous "atoms for peace" speech to the General Assembly in December 1953, said that he "would expect that (an international atomic energy agency) would be set up under the aegis of the United Nations." We all know that bilateral arrangements may be helpful and at times essential. But I think it would be a mistake to concentrate on these bilateral arrangements as an exclusive pattern for atomic assistance. Too much bilateralism can detract from, and ultimately erode, the multilateral concepts which are the foundation of the United Nations.

The atoms for peace proposals are important to disarmament, too, because they foreshadow the kind of life that a peaceful, disarmed world would allow to mankind.

In turning to a discussion of disarmament itself, therefore, let us remember that neither it, nor the other problems that we have just mentioned, can be pursued in a vacuum. That is what is meant too by the warning which we frequently hear, that large-scale political settlements are the prerequisite to progress on disarmament.

It is a legitimate question to ask whether it is possible to think seriously of disarmament so long as the great powers find no ground for agreement on the basic issues that divide them. It is tempting, of course, especially after the many disappointments that we have suffered, to answer "No" to this question at the outset and let it go at that. We have had ample disillusionment in the past when disarmament negotiations have had to be broken off during the tension-ridden periods of the Berlin blockade and the Korean war.

It is quite true, therefore, that chances for disarmament may depend in part on the

climate of the world political situation. It may be true, as some say, that no disarmament agreement can possibly be negotiated without a political settlement of the German question or the Formosan Straits question.

But to this question, as to most important questions, there is no simple answer. Undoubtedly, the prospects for disarmament are curtailed by the presence of thorny, unanswered political problems. It is equally true, however, that there are crucial divergencies of interests, important diplomatic conflicts, that cannot be solved, either, as long as the armament race goes on. It can be argued that they in turn cannot be brought close to a solution until the framework of a disarmament agreement is firmly established. I know that every person in this room is acutely aware of the danger of war which continues to confront us. I think we know or sense that another war, if it comes, may well destroy our civilization. Is it any wonder that people in this country are united in a deep revulsion to war? This revulsion is shared by people in Europe and Asia and elsewhere. I believe that it is shared by the peoples of the Soviet Union. It may be that an awareness of this revulsion has even penetrated the walls of the Kremlin. Mr. Khrushchev's speech to the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party indicates that he is beginning to appreciate the fact—one which was not, may I say, recognized by his predecessor, Mr. Stalin—that it will not be capitalist countries alone which will be blown up in an atomic war.

This universal abhorrence of war gives us a base to build on. It does not, however, guarantee that we shall avoid a tragic conflict. We must come to grips with the specific problems which lead us to war. One of these problems is the rapid increase of armaments and the incredible increase in their destructive capacity.

It was a concern with this aspect of the problem that led me to introduce Senate Resolution 93, which set up a special Subcommittee on Disarmament. The challenge of this undertaking is enormous. I do not have any simple answers any more than do Mr. Stassen and the dozens of other people in the executive branch of the Government who are working on this problem. The work of the subcommittee has just begun. Certain fundamental principles, however, have already started to emerge. They are the principles which I believe should govern our approach to the problem of disarmament.

First, any disarmament agreement or proposal must, of course, protect the national security of the United States and other nations. It cannot have loopholes which give a potential agressor the advantage he needs to start a war and to win it. Each proposal must be carefully examined before we can be sure that our national security will be preserved. And what we do ourselves we must expect others to do. Protection of the national security is a function of all governments. We can expect others to pursue it at least as zealously as we do ourselves. I do not question their right to do so. I simply stress that we must be equally aware not only of our right but of our duty in this respect.

The protection of national security leads us directly to the second principle which must operate in disarmament negotiations. It is this: No proposal, no matter how good it looks and regardless of who proposes it, should lead us to let down our guard. Until the agreement or agreements are signed by all the necessary parties, until they can go into effect—and prove their effectiveness—the United States and its allies throughout the free world must maintain their proportionate defensive strength.

We cannot let the lofty words, our own or anyone else's, tempt us to think that now is the time to reduce essential expenditures for national defense when there is no armament reduction agreement. The time to disarm is after the agreement to disarm, and not before. No matter how appealing a balanced budget, it must not be pursued, as it appears to me it is now being pursued, at the risk of jeopardizing our capacity for defense or weakening friendly nations abroad.

I might add here that the actions of the United States in all of these areas—economic, military, and political—tend to set the pace. If allied nations see us thinking and acting primarily in terms of economy, they are likely to follow suit. If we shirk our responsibilities, they will do the same. Leadership imposes responsibility to lead—to set the pace—to establish the standards and the guidelines by clear and unmistakable policies and performance. I have yet to see the clear outlines of American policy on many vital subjects.

The third principle has to do with perhaps the most vital element in the maintenance of a democratic and self-governing society. This is the principle of an informed public. I know and you know that the men who are conducting disarmament negotiations, and planning military, atomic, and foreign policy are loyal citizens who have the interests of their country at heart. But they are not omnipotent. They are men with all of the limitations and weaknesses of men. They are not the sole judges as to what facts we should have and what developments might disturb us and discourage us from thinking that all is not well in the world. I have never thought that I needed to be spoon-fed by public relations men and neither do the American people feel that they need to be spoon-fed. Possibly we can't know everything that is going on, but we do need to know a lot more than we know now. There is a tendency here in America today, not only on questions of disarmament, but in virtually every activity of our Government to clamp the secrecy label on far too many items, to keep facts bottled up even after they are revealed and known in many other parts of the world.

The special Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament, of which I am chairman, hopes to conduct virtually all of its work in full public view. There are far too many executive sessions in this city, ladies and gentlemen. There needs to be more open discussion. As chairman of this subcommittee, I intend to do everything I can to see to it that the important facts, the legitimate information on all phases of this subject, are published and made available and understandable to all Members of the Senate, and through them to the American people.

The fourth principle which must guide our approach to disarmament is sincerity—sincerity of purpose. By its very nature, the Soviet system of communism produces men fanatically clever in the art of deception, hypocrisy, and duplicity. There is always a danger that as a result of our frustrating experience of trying to deal with them, some of those responsible for carrying out our policy may tend to take on some of these same characteristics. In our struggle against communism we must be careful not to ape the totalitarian. In our efforts to win this great struggle against forces of tyranny, let us not take on the manners and the habits of the tyrant. Psychological warriors are not going to win either a war or a peace. They may win skirmishes, but they do so at the risk of losing for us the great issues. I should not like to see the day when this country begins to use words in matters of life and death in the fashion of the advertisers. There is no brand name for peace; it can't be spelled backwards. The peace and disarmament proposals which this country makes must be supported by the full conviction that they are workable, plausible, and that they will genuinely contribute to a solution of the basic problem.

As I see it, therefore, the efforts for disarmament are being advanced on three fronts: In the United Nations, the executive branch of our Goverenment, and the Congress of the United States. All of these are essential, if our hopes for effective control and restriction of armaments are to be realized as a practical achievement. The details of what is going on within the first two fronts come to me, as to you, from published reports, statements of our official representatives, and through the newspapers. Many of you have also had reports from your own official observers at the United Nations and your legislative representatives here in Washington. So if I concentrate the rest of my remarks on the Senate work and my views of what we may do, I hope you will understand why, because you have possibly much more information about the first two fronts than I have myself. I would hope that my good friend, Governor Stassen, would see to it that the executive branch does a little more proposing for us and for the world in this field of disarmament. Because after all the executive branch conducts the foreign policy of the United States and the Senate would have little opportunity to dispose if the executive branch never proposed.

With respect to the role of the United Nations, I am saying nothing new to this group when I say that we would not know nearly as much as we do today about the problems of disarmament and the efforts required to attain it if it were not for the United Nations.

But I am here in my capacity as a member of the Senate. It is well to remember that even if the executive branch came forth with brilliant plans, unassailable in their logic, and even if they were accepted by all of the members of the United Nations, they could not come into effect without the participation of the Congress of the United States. Now this is not to try to overawe you with our importance. It is merely to point up an essential feature of our constitutional system. It is also to remind you that the Senate cannot act effectively unless it is fully informed and has sufficient information to render sound judgments. This is the principal reason why last June, I introduced Senate Resolution 93 setting up this special Subcommittee on Disarmament.

The Senate cannot do the negotiating with foreign powers on the subject of disarmament. But we are a vehicle to make certain that the agreements reached will fulfill the needs of the American people and meet the test of acceptability by them. Furthermore, we in the Congress are a means through which the American people have an opportunity to express their views, their hopes, yes, even, their doubts of disarmament, and through which they may learn how present disarmament proposals can affect their future lives.

Now, a few words about this special committee. It is bipartisan: 12 members, 6 Republicans and 6 Democrats. It would be premature to speculate now on the conclusions we may reach. But at the present time the subcommittee has three lines of approach.

First, we intend to have members of the executive branch discuss at public hearings the Government's policy on disarmament and to give us their appraisal of the possibilities of reaching a solution. Governor Stassen led the witnesses with his opening presentation on January 25. He will be followed on Wednesday of this week, February 29, by the Secretary of State, Mr. John Foster Dulles. On March 7, Adm. Lewis Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and Mr. Theodore Streibert, Director of the United States Information Agency, will appear. On that same day, one of my colleagues, Senator FLANDERS, of Vermont, will

testify before the subcommittee. He has, as you know, dedicated much of his life to the disarmament cause. On March 15, these gentlemen will be followed by Secretary of Defense Mr. Charles E. Wilson, who will bring to us the critically important views of the Defense Establishment.

Then the subcommittee's second line of approach will be to hold hearings both here and outside of Washington so that we may have the benefit of the views of experts and informed, interested private organizations and citizens. These hearings, I believe, will be somewhat unique. They will be in two parts. The first part of the hearing will consist of testimony from experts, largely men and women at our universities who have made a special study of disarmament. They will be asked to summarize the results of their research and study and pool their knowledge in an effort to assist us in our work. The second part of the hearings will be devoted to those individuals and groups who wish to present their views to the subcommittee. We need to have a good cross-section of the ideas of the people of the United States on this question in all parts of the country and we intend, if possible, to go out and get it.

The third approach of the subcommittee is to commission a series of staff studies. Each will present an aspect of the problem of control and reduction of armaments. We hope that these studies will assist us and other interested Americans to understand more clearly the dimensions of the disarmament problem and the issues which arise from it. The first of these studies has already been published. It deals with the organization of the executive branch to handle disarmament questions. That study itself revealed some of the problems.

For example, I came to sympathize with Governor Stassen in his responsibility. In addition to the Governor's office, 3 executive departments with numerous subbureaus, 2 agencies, 1 commission, 1 mission, 1 council, and 2 boards are involved in disarmament matters.[1]

I hope that while you follow the work of this subcommittee you will also help us. I hope you will make known to us the conclusions that you reach here at this meeting, and I solicit these conclusions and recommendations. As leaders of some of the most important organizations serving the public interest there are contributions you definitely can make to peace and security of the world.

First, you can help by continuing to keep informed. I want to emphasize again that there are no shortcuts. There is a good deal of homework that has to be done by the American people in these crucial areas of national security, foreign policy and disarmament.

Second, you can help bring a sense of realism to the consideration of disarmament by reminding your members of the real dilemma posed by this question. One horn of the dilemma is that we cannot hope to have real peace so long as we and the rest of the world race to build more deadly weapons. The other is that we must not be led or tricked into unilateral disarmament which leaves us and the other free nations defenseless against a potential aggressor.

A third contribution you can make is to caution patience. Disarmament is as hard a problem as we have in the entire field of foreign policy. We Americans have often tended to believe that each defined problem carriers with it a possible solution. In the disarmament field, that might not be true even if each nation would define the problems the same way. A difficulty with disarmament, however, seems to be that definitions are often as lacking as solutions.

Patience can be helpful in this process. Perhaps patience will help in connection with the President's aerial inspection plan. The Government first talked about this in 1946.[2] In 1952 our deputy representative on the United Nations Disarmament Commission, described the use of aerial survey in a working paper submitted to the Commission on "Proposals for Progressive and Continuing Disclosure and Verification of Armed Forces and Armaments." Now the idea has been brought back to life in a somewhat different context. Perhaps patience will gain acceptability for it. That remains to be seen.

But patience is not an excuse for inaction or indifference. You are going to be discussing disarmament later on in small groups. I'd like to pose some questions for you to consider. They won't necessarily be easily answered. Perhaps some cannot be answered at all at this time. But they are questions which I have been asking myself, which my mail reveals, and which I would like to share with you.

Take, for example, the President's aerial inspection plan.

Can aerial reconnaissance alone detect each and every military maneuver of another country? If it can't, are we in possible trouble by proposing it or our accepting it? Should aerial inspection include the entire area in which a potential enemy has control or has control or has bases or has aliances? Even if we reach agreement on the principle of aerial inspection, some commentators contend that it is not fool-proof since there is no ostensible difference between a flight or bombers taking off on a training mission and one taking off with a load of H-bombs in the bomb shafts.

It has been suggested that progress on an overall plan for the reduction and control of armaments must be suspended until a way can be found to detect nuclear weapons which have been previously manufactured and then hidden. Does this mean we have to give up on trying to reach agreement on armed forces and conventional weapons too? The aerial inspection plan is called a beginning. I believe it was said to be a gateway. Is this the only beginning that can be made? Are we to stand with this one proposal committing ourselves almost entirely to this one to the exclusion of others? We are told some of the best brains in the Government are working on this problem, but we have no plan except a proposal which is said at best to prevent a surprise atomic attack between two countries. And I want you to ponder that for a moment. The plan that we have today, which seems to be the core of the American disarmament proposal, if you can call it disarmament, is one merely of being able to ascertain what the participants may do to apprehend an attack.

The world applauded the President's initiative in making the open-skies proposal at the summit conference. But there have been indications since that the world is somewhat worried about our sense of followthrough. For instance, the distinguished French representative on the United Nations Disarmament Commission, Mr. Jules Moch, has flatly stated: "Never have I believed that a formula for control without disarmament would receive the unanimous support of the governments—any more than a formula for disarmament without control."

Mr. Moch himself has proposed a three-point objective for further disarmament conversations: (1) no control without disarmament; (2) no disarmament without control; but (3) step by step, disarmament over all activities that can be controlled.

It is my personal conviction that the situation requires a reexamination at least on the part of the western representatives at the new London conference, of all of the major proposals put forward by President Eisenhower, Prime Minister Eden, and the then Premier of France—Premier Faure—at the summit conference last July.

If we ever expect disarmament to come, we need the world working with us. We do not seem to have the world working with us now, as hard as it might. In all humility, I do not think we are pushing ourselves on this issue as hard as we should.

The Picasso peace dove symbolizes the beguiling success which the Soviet peace campaign has had in many areas of the world. Strangely enough among many millions of non-Communist people, the popular impression today is that the Soviet Union, not the United States, has been most insistent on halting the arms race. No impression could be more damaging to America's prestige abroad. And, of course, no impression could be more false. But, as one who has been in politics, I have found much—sometimes to my sorrow—that what people believe is not always the truth.

Since 1947 when the Soviet threat of aggression and subversion became fully evident to us, American policymakers have assumed that its nature and dimensions were equally evident to others. This led us seriously to underrate the effectiveness of Russian propaganda on peace and disarmament. The fact that much of the world has forgotten our own early imaginative proposals for atomic energy control and disarmament—and we were the first nation to make these proposals—is indicative of a major failure of our information program in recent years. It may also be indicative of the fact that louder and more strident voices have talked about dropping bombs and using massive retaliation rather than constantly emphasizing the potentialities of peace.

Let us reassert our leadership on this matter all along the line. We need the overwhelming majority of the members of the United Nations with us on this great issue of disarmament. I don't think we can make real progress without their help.

We are reassured that other nations are with us because they voted overwhelmingly in the United Nations General Assembly for the United States resolution on aerial inspection. But what are they themselves doing on this question? Have we encouraged them to make as full a contribution to the solution of this problem as we might? These questions are not rhetorical. They are asked in a most earnest search for help on this key issue. I shall be interested to see what your discussions produce.

In military language defense is often spoken of in terms of the long pull ahead. Well, I want to close on the theme of the long pull ahead for peace.

It is a mistake, in my judgment, to say that we are going to get disarmament this year or next year or the year after. It is a mistake to paint a smilingly optimistic picture of the prospects for peace. The disarmament problem, much less the total problem of peace, is not going to be solved either by wishful thinking by advertising or by half-hearted attempts. It will require hard work—sacrificial labor—at many points. It will require some fresh bearings for our foreign policy. I am confident, however, that if all of us in all sincerity devote our efforts to this question—if the people whose stake

[1] Departments of Defense, State, and Justice; Central Intelligence Agency; United States Information Agency; Atomic Energy Commission; United States Mission to the United Nations; National Security Council; Planning Board and Operations Coordinating Board of the National Security Council.

[2] Description of aerial inspection contained in the First Report of the U. N. Atomic Energy Commission, 1946.

in this matter is life itself, if you who represent so many groups who have devoted years to the problem of world peace, if Governor Stassen with the boards and agencies of the executive branch, if the Senate and last but not the least, the United Nations—if all of us pull together we can begin to frame our hopes for peace with the realities of peace. We can give substance to the words of a man with whom I have not always agreed, but with whose words I should like to close.

In his remarkable speech before an American Legion convention in Los Angeles a year ago, Gen. Douglas MacArthur forcefully stated the central challenge ahead. He said: "We are in a new era. Old methods no longer suffice. We must break out of the straitjacket of the past. There must always be one to lead, and we should be that one. We should now proclaim our readiness in concert with the great powers of the world to abolish war. The result might be magical."

Indeed, it might.

Can We Halt the Race for Atomic Arms?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on April 6 I delivered at the sixth annual conference on high energy nuclear physics, in Rochester, N. Y., an address entitled "Can We Halt the Race for Atomic Arms?" I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN WE HALT THE RACE FOR ATOMIC ARMS?
(Address of Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico)

A New England author reminded us many years ago that trouble is like hot weather: It sours milk and sweetens apples.

The power of the atom has its twin aspects: it can blow whole cities to bits; yet it might bind this frightened world together.

Somewhere between the blast of Hiroshima and the hoped-for dawn of such a millenium of perpetual peace lies the no-man's land we now so timidly explore—a narrow strip of neutral territory between the barbed-wire entanglements of the world's great armed camps. In it labor the men of science and religion and politices, the possessors of faith and hope, who believe that destruction need not be the destiny of our day and civilization, who know that it is possible to be secure as well by the majesty of what we do as by the might of what we have, and who trust that the intelligence which enables us to split the atom for a bomb will in time teach us to use the split atom for the advancement of man and the glory of his God.

My academic training gives me no right to speak at a meeting called to discuss problems of high energy physics. My purpose this evening is to ask if there is a role that you men of science may play in proposing an affirmative answer to the question: Can we halt the race for atomic arms?

Day by day in the Congress of the United States we are alerted to that question. It colors the debate on the size of our military establishment. It increases as our agricultural storehouses fill and overflow. It influences the volume of our foreign aid. It throws into sharp controversy the relative value of guided missiles and jet aircraft. It builds a nuclear Navy and equips an atomic Army. We know all about Nike batteries; we watch ground-to-air, air-to-ground and air-to-air encounters. But we find no peace.

And yet, through all our thinking runs the belief that the true significance and greater ultimate effect of atomic energy for the human race will come, not from its destructive capabilities but from its contributions to the betterment of man's lot upon this earth. The weapons of mass destruction are impressive, but so would be the fruits of peace. The difficulty has been that the power to destroy comes before and grows faster than the power to build.

Has that not been the story of mankind? Are not the destructive uses of power the simplest and those most likely first to occur when a new source is discovered?

Certainly man's first experience with chemical and electronic energy as released in an ordinary fire told him of its destructive character. When forests spanned this continent from the Atlantic to the Pacific, our ancestors saw fires originate in lightning, which itself was a source of terror and disaster, and then saw the flames reach up to topple the mightiest trees. They ran for their lives from the fire, and the wild animals of the field and forest ran with them. It took generations to learn how to tame the elemental force of fire, to bend it to their own purposes in the cooking of food, the refining of ores and the casting of metals. Likewise, even though our atomic age had its origin in the New Mexico desert, when a new ray, brighter than the New Mexico sun, lit up the landscape, even though the toll of human life that followed in Japan shocked the sensibilities of the warring world, we look forward to a new age of power and plenty with new servants to do man's work and to raise the standard of living throughout the world.

There is in this new atomic power one additional hopeful element. It took our aboriginal ancestors generation upon generation to learn to tame the energy of fire, but we in this great scientific era have a right to believe the acceleration which we see on all sides today in the growth of technology may be matched, at least to some extent, by an acceleration in the rate at which men of different national origins may learn to meet together in a common need to bring under control and put to beneficial use the immense forces of atomic energy.

This has been a harsh chapter in the history of our world. This new power which promises so much has thus far increased some of our problems and, if we look only at the surface, has made more difficult the eventual arrival of worldwide peace and the utilization throughout the earth of nuclear power.

The conviction is growing that disarmament, the sense in which it was proposed and may have been possible from 1945 to 1948, has now become impossible. There was once a day when a rigid system of inspection could have prevented the growth of dangerous stockpiles of fissionable materials for military use, but in the last decade the sizes of stockpiles held by the principal atomic powers have presumably grown large enough that substantional amounts could be secreted before any inspection system begins, and would be adequate for a devastating attack if one of the powers so chose. But wholly apart from this question of secreting materials before initiating inspection, it might be recognized that even if that did not occur and a rigid inspection system and control of materials were imposed, then still in the event of war, the facilities which have grown up for peacetime uses of atomic energy are of such productive capacity that it would not be long after the outbreak of war that adequate materials would have been produced for full scale atomic devastation.

Moreover, we should not restrict ourselves merely to consideration of hazards implicit in wars of annihilation with atomic weapons. In technology applied to military ends, novelty is ever a prime goal. Thus there is the probability that a war between major powers will lead to types of destruction of a nature and scope not yet conceived, much less demonstrated.

Modern war makes certain for all participants their near annihilation and makes military conquest utterly illogical and absurd. The great powers of today thus find themselves in a sort of uneasy stalemate. Each is concerned with maintaining heavy retliatory forces to insure that the other dare not risk the gamble of military conquest; but in turn dares not risk it on his own save as a result of monstrous blunder.

While much time will pass before we work our way out of our current military stalemate, certainly it is a hazardous stalemate which no one likes, and it may have merit only if we use the time it provides to take advantage of the evident value of peaceful collaboration on projects of common concern. Says the editor of the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, "Atomic deadlock can have positive value only if man uses the breathing spell it provides to develop a permanent foundation for peace without terror."

On the one hand we may strive to use this period for creating mutual respect for, and consent to use, the machinery of an expanded and strengthened United Nations to mediate international disputes, and to diminish tensions arising from international rivalries. On the other hand, we may move toward direct collaboration on technical projects for which the high level of modern technology makes such cooperation unusually productive and beneficial to all concerned.

Here I would like to mention several projects which seem especially appropriate for joint developments in world laboratories. But before doing so, let us look at some road blocks in that path.

Restrictions on free travel and free exchange of information have become increasingly irksome in recent years. These restrictions have fallen heavily on many scientists, on people in the arts, on businessmen, sometimes on religious leaders or other people whose interests and pursuits are not confined by national borders. The justification of these restrictions is the implicit argument that somehow they increase the national security and well-being of the Nation that applies them. But today with the rapid approach of the time when any country which launches atomic warfare can create untold damage at will, we need to examine whether we can remove many of our restrictions on free travel and exchange of information. We need to encourage, by whatever means we can, the spirit of international cooperation and openness which will minimize the chances of a misunderstanding—an accidental spark that would lead to disaster.

One step we can take in this direction is to remove our present restrictions on transmission of nonsecret scientific information between nations. The United States has helped to foster such restrictions but their contribution to our security is open to question. We know that such measures foster fear and suspicion rather than cooperation and understanding. They decrease the rate of gain of knowledge which is at the maximum only when free communication exists. Physical truths cannot be protected by such policies. They are everywhere the same—equally measurable in any laboratory.

We can break down barriers in communications still further by encouraging an expansion in our present system of exchange of teachers and students between nations. Most of our American universities do not

have visiting professors from other lands on their facilities but would be happy to have them. Many of our own scientists go abroad to study and teach in foreign institutions. They come back with new ideas, a fresher outlook on their own problems which cannot help but be of benefit to science as a whole. An increase in opportunities for exchange of faculty and students between our great institutions of learning would be an important integrating factor in our pursuit of knowledge. We have plenty of disintegrating influences; we need men and women who are concerned with mutal problems and prepared to dedicate themselves to their solution.

The importance of the international meetings of the kind being held here in Rochester cannot be overemphasized. Information exchanged between participants will hasten the day when science will understand the secrets of the nucleus and of fundamental particles, and move man another step forward in his understanding of the universe about him.

A further measure we might well undertake now to promote a spirit of international cooperation would be the establishment of a world passport, which would be granted annually to a select list of nominess from all over the world. Such a passport would permit its holder to travel freely in lands of all member nations. A list of nominees for this honor would be prepared by a committee of participating nations, and the honor would be conferred only on those who received a unanimous vote of approval from all member nations. The list might include, for example, Nobel prize winners, outstanding artists, leaders in religion, in government, in science, in education, and in business. It could become a highly coveted award all over the world—a suitable mark of distinction for our public servants in every walk of life. Above all, it could promote a degree of mutual trust and understanding that might in the end help to halt the race for atomic arms and forestall a war that nobody wants.

A world in which restrictions on communication and on the travel of individuals has been minimized is one in which the combined intellectual and technical powers of many nations can be brought to bear in unison on common problems. We are aware of many problems which can be and should be attacked by an international effort. Even under the imperfect conditions of international communication which exist today, significant projects are underway and important beginnings have been made on others.

There is the superb example of regional cooperation illustrated by Cern, set up by the European Organization for Nuclear Research. Here men of many nations gather together for a joint assault on the experimental and theoretical problems of nuclear physics. There is likewise the inspiring scope of the International Geophysical Year. When it opens, a great network of observatories will embrace the entire earth. Chains of weather stations strung out on three meridian lines from the Arctic to the Antarctic will chart the circulation of the atmosphere during the intense period of activity spanned by the International Geophysical Year. All of the modern instruments of meteorology and geophysics will be mobilized in a global accumulation of data which should provide the basis for years of analysis, speculation, and debate. The final reduction to conclusive findings will mark a new step in man's understanding of his global home.

There is the World Health Organization which through its many laboratories and agencies is waging successful war against the diseases of mankind, and is promoting in the less fortunate areas of the world new understanding of medical care for infants, for the aged and for the handicapped.

In the atoms for peace program, there are more than 25 bilateral agreements between the United States and countries less advanced in nuclear technology.

There is a multitude of activities supported by UNESCO: its educational training centers, its support of travel for scientific and cultural reasons, its contribution to the European Organization for Nuclear Research mentioned above, the creation of the International Computation Center at Rome, the conferences in arid zone research, and the many less noticed activities of the Field Science Cooperation offices. The UNESCO 1954 participation in the U. N. technical assistance programs amounted to 56 projects in 36 countries.

These are but some of the most evident international cooperative efforts bringing the benefits of modern science and technology to peoples around the world.

We have reviewed briefly both the positive and the negative steps toward increased collaboration among scientists of different nations, as they have developed in recent years. Now let us glance at a few fields in which joint efforts may prove especially beneficial.

As a prime example of a project which involves a subject that clearly has no relevance to national boundaries, we may think of climate control or world-wide weather modification. Recent advances in meterology suggest that efforts in this direction may produce useful results sometime in the future. Yet evidently the control of amounts of precipitation, directions of winds and like matters, are not properly planned by a single national power or even by 2 or 3 in regional collaboration. For instance, I believe that much of the weather of the United States is made along the coast of Alaska, in the Gulf of Mexico, or out in the Far Pacific, and my country has little or no control of the sea areas involved. Any regional effects on climate will have, perhaps, attenuated effects on climatic conditions in most distant areas. Moreover, such information as we now have strongly implies that the most effective weather control requires coordinated efforts over vast areas of the earth's surface, and the broader the cooperation, the greater might be the results.

Another example on a large scale which inevitably crosses national boundaries is the project to send a rocket into outer space. Purely from a geographical viewpoint, efforts to send missiles and ultimately passengers to the moon and the nearby planets are of worldwide interest. While the intensely nationalist feelings characterizing international relations on our planet at the present time suggest that we may even see, as a result of interplanetary travel, an extension of the competitive colonialism which the last century saw for the backward areas of this planet, the prospect of seeing different sections of Mars staked out by different national governments of this earth seems on the face of it ludicrous. Are we trying to play God and develop a new planet in our own image and likeness? A much more rational and probably more productive basis for the exploration and development of other worlds would be under an organization which properly reflects the common interests of all the peoples of this earth in such development. The Man in the Moon belongs to the children of every country, is a part of their dream world, and if reached by space ship, might better remain the property of all.

Returning now, however, from the fanciful and the future to the more immediate problems of initial efforts to get a space ship away from the earth, we recognize hazards of a rather severe sort which may arise as a result of the erroneous function of a space missile intended for the moon but which instead, through defective mechanism or planning, lands on the territory of another nation. If such a nation were at that time in an advanced state of tension in anticipation of a possible attack, this simple error might touch off the spark of world conflict.

Which brings me to the competitive race to develop an intercontinental ballistic missile. We in the American Congress have already learned that it would be a drain on all our budgets if that race should set a pattern in the whole field of space conquest. Russia and this country are working at high speed toward the attainment of an intercontinental ballistic missile, called by many "the ultimate weapon." Yet if the missile were to be attained almost simultaneously and prove to be as accurate as now forecast, if indeed it could carry atomic warheads with a striking power of several kilotons and place them within the area of a small circle, then no city in the world is safe, no jet interceptor can police the skies and no highway can promise egress from the affected area. In that day the people of the earth would banish the weapon as poison gas was outlawed in World War II, but only after the expenditure of fantastic sums of money, materials, and scientific skills.

Might it not be better to examine the chance to use space conquest as another project for an international laboratory? If we will never use this weapon once we achieve it, might it not be set aside as one segment of worldwide competition that could be surrendered to the effort to halt the race for a full arsenal of atomic arms in every land? Or must everyone carry his own six-shooter constantly strapped to his belt?

A third area might be research on the problem of controlling thermonuclear reactions in such a way as to produce useful power. Those of you in this audience know far better than I the great amount of energy which may be released in the fusion of the lightest elements to form helium. The great abundance of heavy hydrogen or deuterium the great quantities of this valuable isotope which are contained in the world's oceans, leads to a staggering picture of power availability to lift the yoke of labor from men's shoulders throughout all the world.

It has been estimated that the amount of heavy hydrogen in the oceans is sufficient to meet world power needs at 1,000 times the present consumption and for the next million years.

There seems to me to be no other field of technology today in which there is a more evident need for pooling all of the imagination and ingenuity which the world's scientists can bring together. The riches for mankind which must flow from the solution of these problems are without parallel. The history of science dramatizes again and again that problems of special difficulty are most usually solved by the cross-fertilization of ideas from diverse sources. The effort of any one country to develop controlled thermonuclear reactors in a unilateral manner under the secrecy required by an attitude of competitive nationalism must certainly have the effect of retarding the progress of such a country in this vital field.

As many of you have been saying again and again, science cannot flourish under secrecy. The essence of the scientific process is the exchange of ideas—the comparison of procedures and the development of new ideas and techniques in an active atmosphere of collaboration in which many people may contribute small parts of the solution to produce a whole far greater than the sum of the parts. No one can yet say that the immense problems associated with development of controlled thermonuclear power will be capable of solution. What we can say, certainly, is that if their solution is available to man, then it will be most readily available and perhaps only available in an atmosphere of vigorous collaboration built upon the genius of many people from many lands. It would seem that the enlightened self-interest of all technologically advanced nations would best be served by their contributing heavily to the creation of a joint world laboratory in which the solution of these problems is

sought jointly by scientists from many nations.

Some secrecy-minded individuals may object that the technology associated with each of these fields I have mentioned has possible military applications. This claim is perfectly true; however, it does not necessarily follow that the security of different nations will be furthered by developing these fields under the military security system which our competitive nationalism has imposed upon science in recent years. In fact, it may be just because of the possible military applications from these new technologies that we shall wish to develop them jointly with all principal powers participating in world laboratories created for the purpose. Perhaps we can learn an important lesson from our experiences in the development of atomic energy. The unilateral development of the field of nuclear technology has created the following dilemma. Assuming the universal desire of all peoples to achieve some sort of workable disarmament, we have nevertheless in the development of nuclear technology greatly accentuated both the need for, and the difficulty of attaining disarmament. Whereas modern atomic weapons raise the destructive potential of war to a new level, the suitability of atomic weapons for concealment and surprise use has at this advanced stage in the competition made disarmament by mutual inspection very difficult, if not impossible.

This experience in the field of nuclear technology suggests that similar potentialities exist in as yet undeveloped technologies. Research into the killing diseases of man with the objective of eliminating these diseases may bring us instead new ideas as to how we may visit death on opposing populations by new species of bacteria. Or we may find a new type of rust that will destroy his feed grains, or a virus that will kill his livestock. Successful travel in outer space will suggest new, more effective and even less detectable means of attack on other nations. Unilateral success in the field of climate control will suggest important new schemes for military action against the unfriendly powers. Project Sherwood for the development of controlled thermonuclear reactors provides the greatest promise on the horizon today of immense, cheap power sources. Yet in the event of success for this project, it takes no advanced military technician to realize that such power sources would have great applications in the engines of war. Thus we are led to feel that in every area in which the scientific method has enabled the intelligence of man to gain new mastery over nature, we face the possibility of an added complication in future disarmament efforts.

It is to that problem that I have directed these words. If the great powers find themselves in an atomic stalemate today—and I think they do—it is a carryover of patterns of national security which modern science has rendered obsolete. The military techniques which might emerge from the new areas of technology that I have been discussing can make the stalemate no worse. Already it is at a level in which any major power can precipitate almost total destruction upon an adversary (and in return upon itself) if it should make so tragic an error in judgment. Yet there is the danger that if these new areas of technology are developed in secret, some nation which at some future time is led by reckless rulers, may feel that it has gained so great a lead in some field of science that it may dare to launch an attack for world conquest. While this error in judgment will almost certainly be answered by mutual annihilation approaching totality, every effort must be bent while still we have the chance to prevent such dreadful miscalculations from occurring. Scientists, it seems to me, might suggest to the statesmen that modern technology could make the greatest contribution to the security of great powers if statesmen would move as far as possible from the secret competitive development of technologies under which we have largely operated in recent years. The scientists might urge, indeed, that the race for atomic arms could best be halted by having new fields of science developed jointly by all nations.

The responsibility for carrying forward the proposals here made for cooperative studies of weather modification and for world laboratories of science, must be placed with some international organization. A natural agency for this purpose is the United Nations. Such responsibility, such new avenues for accomplishing good, will strengthen and expand the capacity of the United Nations for reaching its goal of creating a world at peace.

The procedure for implementing ideas of this nature must fit the pattern of life in each land, and therefore what we will first need will be suggestions as to possible courses of action. I hope they will be forthcoming. For my part, I intend to discuss the question with my colleagues in the United States Senate.

I hope that the United States citizens in this audience, and elsewhere, will give me their recommendations. I hope that those of you from other countries will raise the question with your associates back home, and possibly lead to official proposals from your governments to the U. N. on how best to proceed.

If we do succeed, then no nation can make the fatal error of assuming that it has an overwhelming technical lead over a possible adversary. The recent Geneva Atoms-for-Peace Conference illustrated how similar the achievements were in different nations even though each had pursued its program of research and development in careful secrecy. Such similarity of development will no doubt be the case in the future in arms as well as peaceful atoms.

My own experience at Geneva persuades me that many nations know a lot about the atom. When India's Dr. Bhabha opened the pie of thermonuclear power, the blackbirds from 4 and 20 lands began to sing! What was secret at breakfast was table talk at lunch. Nations rushed to hold press conferences and attend activities. Isn't it possible that there might be a similar pattern in weapons, and that no one nation holds all the cards?

Something new seems to be needed in this disarmament business. The nations make little headway in finding grounds for agreement on reducing the size of armies or destroying parts of atomic stockpiles. Very well; why not try to think constructively about disarmaments in potential weapons, in "ultimate weapons." The problems here are simpler because no one nation has so strong a vested interest in the new field that it will be contributing much more than valuable scientific help. It would be a new try at disarmament, this "disarming the future," and it would lack some of the defects of proposals for present disarmament.

This is not a suggestion that all nations pool their efforts in the field of present atomic technology, nor a hint that the testing of atomic weapons be stopped by any of the great powers, and surely not a proposal that Oak Ridge, Hanford, Livermore and Los Alamos be levelled to the ground. It springs rather from the feeling that the new technologies may displace the old, and that a war-weary world might achieve in time a form of disarmament by obsolescence.

If and when that day should dawn, each new technology would no longer be a source of dread power to be somehow kept from destroying us in the convlusion of global war. Rather it would become what men of science have always intended—a means for opening up a new dimension in human life for defining a greater destiny for the forward course of the human spirit.

You men of science labor in that vineyard. May God add strength to your endeavors.

Eighth Anniversary of the Independence of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I would like to insert the following statement in the RECORD on the occasion of the eighth anniversary of the State of Israel:

I am happy to join in extending my heartfelt congratulations to Israel on the eighth anniversary of its proclamation as a state. Americans everywhere can be proud of their contribution to this achievement.

As we look back upon the events since May 14, 1948, when Israel again achieved statehood after an exile of over 2,000 years, we find a remarkable record of progress and accomplishment. Here is a country which has given shelter to hundreds of thousands of homeless people, most of whom were victims of the war, and provided them with a chance to live productive lives. On the eastern shores of the Mediterranean, the State of Israel was built, a great new outpost of Western democracy, on a foundation of freedom and liberty.

Israel is an example of democracy in action whose accomplishments for human welfare and civilization in 8 years rivals anything done in countries ruled by dictators. Israel has made this progress without paying the totalitarian price of slave labor and ruthless pressure.

The people of Israel have come from all parts of the world, speaking many languages and representing many cultures. Like the immigrants who came to this country, they have joined in a common endeavor, learned to speak a common language and helped to build a common civilization. This is in miniature a repetition of the great American experiment in creating a civilization out of a wilderness with men and women whose common heritage is their humanity. And, indeed, many Americans have recognized in the people of Israel a spirit that closely resembles that of our pioneers a century ago.

Today Israel is threatened as never before by the forces of dictatorship and oppression. Yet it has maintained the rights and liberties of its people despite the danger of invasion and has constantly sought and worked for peace. At the same time, it has realistically been compelled to provide for its defense against the growing arsenal in Arab lands.

The United States has done much to foster and encourage the development of

Israel, and the people of Israel have repeatedly demonstrated their appreciation. Our country has made a firm commitment to preserve the integrity of the State of Israel, and I am sure that we have every intention of standing by that commitment. Many of us in Congress, however, are convinced that one of the steps we must take without delay is to restore the military balance in the Middle East. We can do this by allowing Israel to purchase the defensive weapons she must have to discourage would-be aggressors.

The fact that Moscow has shipped modern weapons to Egypt and other Arab States in quantity makes it imperative that our country take the lead in helping Israel to defend itself. The press has reported that France, Italy, Canada, and other nations are ready to help this fellow democracy with jet fighter planes and other arms for defense, but I should like to see my country demonstrate its willingness to go further than others in releasing arms to a beleaguered ally. All the world looks to us for the example to follow, and we dare not yield our responsibility to any other nation.

I recognize, of course, that defensive arms to Israel are not a solution to the problem of achieving peace in the Middle East, but their deterrent effect can avert war and give us time to work for peace, time in which tensions may be relaxed and reason prevail. Let no one be deceived into thinking that this is an isolated conflict between the Arabs and Israel. It cannot be localized. Our civilization is so constituted that the problems of the Middle East reflect the worldwide conflict of ideas between the East and the West, and whatever happens between Israel and her neighbors will inevitably affect the lives of all Americans.

As Israel enters the ninth year of its existence, we hope and pray that a beginning shall be made toward the establishment of peace, not only in that troubled area, but for all people all over the world. With firmness and resolution we can defeat the Communist threat of war and bring about the initial steps to a lasting peace. On this anniversary we can bring to the people of Israel an assurance that they do not stand alone in their gallant fight to create a nation of free people under God and that we stand with them against the enemies of democracy.

Campaign Issues of 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 14, 1956, I had the privilege of participating in the panel discussion of the third annual conference of the Citizenship Clearing House for Southern New York. This year it was held at Brooklyn College, in Brooklyn, N. Y. A very distinguished member of the same panel was New York's secretary of state, the Honorable Carmine G. De Sapio.

The topic assigned to us was "What will be the major party issues in the 1956 presidential election?"

Mr. De Sapio's remarks were as follows:

I am very happy to participate in this panel discussion on the major party issues in the 1956 campaign. I am particularly delighted to be part of a program of the Citizenship Clearing House because I have long admired your purpose and your work, and I have been the beneficiary of your hospitality in the past.

I think probably the best definition of the issues in the forthcoming campaign can be found in the recent state of the Union address delivered by the President of the United States. It was, in every sense, an extraordinary message. It sought to be all things to all people, at the same time that it clearly spelled out Republican awareness of the fact that there are more Democrats in this country than Republicans. The Republicans can sometimes win by pretending to be like Democrats, as they successfully did in 1952, but you may be sure, my good friends, that the Democrats will never try to win by pretending to be like the Republicans.

The amazing thing about the message is that it was received without so much as a flicker of astonishment by such stalwarts of progressive government as Senators BRICKER, CAPEHART, GOLDWATER, and JENNER, those great liberals who would have yelled "socialism" had a Democratic President sent such a message but who applauded enthusiastically in Washington, secure in the knowledge that the words they were hearing were meaningless and empty, just as were the words in their campaign platform of 4 years ago.

But if the state of the Union message was nothing else, it was extremely enlightening. For it demonstrates with dramatic clarity the naivete of the nominal left wing of the Republican Party, and the callous inflexibility of its right wing.

We must assume that it was authored by both, because it was acceptable to both, and reflects the basic thinking of those Republicans who feel that concessions must be made—at least vocally—to the demands of the people for social advancement, as well as of those who hold that it is good politics to say anything, provided you do nothing.

And it was evident throughout the message that the GOP is not only mindful of, but thoroughly alarmed over, the elections which Democrats have won—since 1952—in Oregon, in Maine, in Pennsylvania, in Connecticut, in New Jersey, in New York, and all over the Nation—to say nothing of the election of a Democratic Congress—the Congress which was to have represented a cold war, but which, in fact, made possible the only progress which our Nation has achieved in the last 15 months.

Were it not for the Democratic Congress, the record of the Republican administration during its first 3 years in office—and undoubtedly to the end of this year as well—would have been one of unrelieved gloom to the people of the United States and of the democracies throughout the world. For it is indisputable—though heaven forbid that the Republicans should give credit where it is due—that not one of the major accomplishments in foreign or domestic affairs, which the President cited in his state of the Union message, would have been possible without the Democratic majorities in the House and Senate.

And it is equally true that much more would have been accomplished were it not for Republican obstructionism, sometimes in Congress and frequently in the administration itself.

It was the Democratic Congress—the 84th Congress—which supported the proposal to support Formosa and the Pescadores Islands in the event of a Chinese-Communist attack.

It was the Democratic Congress which ratified the Southeast Asian Treaty Organization as a bulwark against Communist penetration. It was the Democratic Congress which extended the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act for 3 years, and which simplified our cumbersome customs legislation. It was the Democratic Congress which provided for a trained manpower reserve program; for atomic energy research and peacetime production; for expanding aeronautical research; for constructing foreign military bases and housing; and for a billion-dollar Navy shipbuilding program. And it was the Democratic Congress which refused to bow to a GOP demand to cut the Marine Corps by 22,000 men.

I emphasize the words Democratic Congress not merely to describe the party's numerical superiority in the National Legislature, but—even more important—to underscore the fact that, without exception, the Democratic leadership in Washington was responsible for every step forward which our Nation has taken in the last year. But, even when the Congress was Republican controlled, invariably more Democrats than Republicans supported the administration's military and foreign policy matters * * * measures which implemented the principles which were first laid down by President Truman and which actually represent extension of Democratic Party programs.

It is in the area of domestic policy where Republican reaction particularly thwarted the efforts of the Democratic Congress to carry out the mandate of the people.

Where the administration proposed social legislation in keeping with the spirit of previous Democratic administration programs—such as increased railroad retirement benefits and better FHA mortgage-insurance coverage—these measures found overwhelming Democratic support. But when the Democratic Congress attempted forthrightly to come to grips with the labor, health, housing, education, highway, and other problems, it met either Republican timidity or outright sabotage.

The administration asked for an increase in minimum hourly wages from 75 to only 90 cents. The Democratic majority increased it to a more realistic $1. The administration asked for construction of a paltry 35,000 public housing units replete with bristling restrictions. Against diehard GOP opposition, the Democratic majority was able to increase the figure to 45,000 units and to liberalize the requirements. Under the last Democratic President, the authorization called for 135,000 units a year.

Disregarding the bogeys of socialized medicine and Government interference, the Democratic Congress put human needs ahead of pressure groups and authorized the funds necessary to get the Salk polio vaccine out to the Nation's children and expectant mothers.

The concern of the Democratic Party for human welfare was further illustrated by the fact that Congress appropriated $17 million more than the amounts requested by the administration for health, education, and social welfare.

This concern was also shown in the attempts by the Democratic Congress to liberalize the social-security program, to cut personal income taxes by $20 for each taxpayer and dependent, and to raise the pay of Government workers to a more realistic level than the administration was willing to concede. The first two attempts were thwarted by GOP opposition; the last attempt achieved partial success.

It was the Democratic Congress which acted to strengthen the Small Business Ad-

ministration. It was the Democratic Congress which spiked the administration's attempts to make a national highway construction program a happy hunting ground for profiteers. It was the Democratic Congress which exposed the malodorous Dixon-Yates deal, the "conflict-of-interest" cases and the administration's giveaway programs.

And again this year the Democratic Congress will be the protector of the peoples' welfare and the guardian of the peoples' trust. But Congress alone cannot decisively enunciate our national policy. A Democratic majority in Congress cannot change the basic philosophy of the Republican administration. It can only modify its effects.

And although the State of the Union message was in large measure a report on Democratic achievement and, in some measure, an echo of Democratic policy, it failed to recognize the basic truth that unless you move forward, you stagnate; that unless you progress, you retrogress.

But it had other vital failings. It gave no hint of recognition of the fact that the friendship of the uncommitted peoples of the world cannot be purchased by foreign aid alone. It contained no awareness of the futility of substituting slogans for intelligent, enlightened diplomacy. It showed no change in an attitude which is imperiling the very existence of a small but firm democratic bastion in the Middle East by the continuing denial of defensive arms for Israel. It suggested not a single constructive effort being made to counter the propaganda inroads made by the Kremlin chiefs during their tour of India and Burma.

It evidenced no change in the administration's "special interest" approach to Government. It offered no plan to meet the problems occasioned by the administration's chaotic security program. It treated with vague generalities the shameful problem of discriminatory immigration regulations. And, it finally conceded, after 3 years of vigorous denial, that a farm problem exists—offering a program much of which is simply a renaming of the much villified Democratic farm policies of the past.

In keynoting the Republican campaign of 1956 the state of the Union message carefully ignored the broken promises which were so glibly made in 1952 and which were so completely rejected in the years which followed.

But much of the significance of the message rests in what it does not say—in how it does not fix blame where it belongs for failure to loosen the Taft-Hartley shackles of American labor. It does not tell about the failure to press a program of medical research against mankind's chief killers, the failure to humanize social security protection, and the failure to meet the problems of the farmers. It does not tell about the textile and hard-coal workers in the Middle Atlantic and New England States who have suffered chronic unemployment in the past 3 years, of the thousands of small businesses which have gone bankrupt or have been swallowed up in monopoly mergers, of the millions of white collar workers caught up in the crippling tug-of-war between fixed wages and increased cost of living. And it doesn't once mention the failure to retain for the United States the world leadership which it enjoyed under Presidents Roosevelt and Truman.

Here, then, are the issues in the coming campaign. We will contrast the Republican failures with Democratic achievements in 20 historic years of progess, attainment and security. We will contrast the record of Democratic leadership with the Republican record of inaction, ineptness and indifferences.

And with these contrasts—and on the record—the Democrats will win.

Thank you very much.

Constitution of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an address by Adm. Samuel Eliot Morison at the 175th anniversary of the Constitution of Massachusetts on October 25, 1955.

Admiral Morison as historian of the United States Navy has just finished 10 volumes on the Navy's activities in the late war. He is a distinguished authority on the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and wrote the history of the constitution. He is the author of several books some of which are the Maritime History of Massachusetts, The Growth of the American Republic, Tercentennial History of Harvard University, Admiral of the Ocean Sea, History of the United States Naval Operations in World War II.

The address follows:

ADDRESS AT 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF CONSTITUTION OF MASSACHUSETTS, OCTOBER 25, 1955

I. THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION FRUITFUL IN CONSTITUTION

Over 40 years ago a striking tribute was paid to our constitution by the leading American political scientist, Andrew C. McLaughlin of Chicago. In his presidential address before the American Historical Association he said:

"If I were called upon to select a single fact or enterprise which more nearly than any other thing embraced the significance of the American Revolution, I should select—not Saratoga or the French Alliance, or even the Declaration of Independence—I should choose the formation of the Massachusetts Constitution of 1780; and I should do so because the constitution rested upon the fully developed convention, the greatest institution of government which America has produced, the institution which answered, in itself, the problem of how men could make governments of their own free will * * *."

What a remarkable thing, that the very people who started the American Revolution, the revolutionary radicals of 1776, should have shown such original and constructive genius in political science. As all modern history shows, it is easy enough to destroy a government when it has become obsolete and ineffective, but very difficult to re-establish the reign of law and order on a new foundation. How many nations in the present century have won their independence; how few have really secured their liberty. And it has almost seemed to be a law of revolutions that they go from one excess to another, and end in a new despotism. As Hosea Biglow taunted the ghost of his Cromwellian ancestor:

"You took to follerin' where the prophets beckoned,
An' fust you knowed on, back come Charles the Second."

The American Revolution developed very differently. The link with Britain was broken, but the Thirteen States remained united. Royal government was abolished, but republican government was established, and on a firm foundation. At the end of the war, 11 of the 13 States had adopted new constitutions; and of these constitutions, that of Massachusetts, whose 175th anniversary we celebrate today, has been the most enduring because it was the best. One hundred and seventy-five years is a short time in history, but a great age for a written constitution. How true was the characteristically tactless greeting of President Charles W. Eliot to Prince Henry of Prussia when he made a state visit to Boston in 1902: "Our ancient Commonwealth greets your recent Empire."

We all take this constructive aspect of our Revolution too much for granted. So I propose to inquire why we were so successful in establishing government under law.

In the first place, the leaders of the American Revolution were deep students of history and of politics, they not only knew what had to be done, but were eager for the task. Take, for example, two of our most flaming patriots, Thomas Jefferson and John Adams. Jefferson on 16 May 1776 when he was working hard in the Continental Congress to have independence declared, wrote to Thomas Nelson in Virginia that he regarded the making of a constitution for Virginia even more important that independence: "In truth it is the whole object of the present controversy; for should a bad government be instituted for us in future it had been as well to have accepted at first the bad one offered to us from beyond the water without the risk and expense of contest." And John Adams, even earlier in 1776, wrote to George Wythe who had asked his advice about a new Virginia constitution, "You and I, my dear friend, have been sent into life at a time when the greatest lawgivers of antiquity would have wished to live. How few of the human race have ever enjoyed an opportunity of making an election of government * * * for themselves or their children. When, before the present epocha, had 3 millions of people full power and a fair opportunity to form and establish the wisest and happiest government that human wisdom can contrive"

Prophetic words; for within 4 years John Adams had the opportunity to draft a constitution for his own beloved and native State.

The first reason, then, why Americans were able to establish government under law for themselves was the conviction of leading revolutionists that it must be done, and their knowledge of how to do it.

II. GOVERNMENT UNDER LAW A MASSACHUSETTS TRADITION

A second and perhaps even more fundamental reason was the long experience of Americans with self-government, and with government under law, before 1776. "We began with freedom," wrote Ralph Waldo Emerson. How true that is. The Virginia Assembly from 1619, the Mayflower Compact of 1620, the Massachusetts Body of Liberties of 1641, the Plymouth "General Fundamentals" of 1636. Almost a century and a half before the Revolution, the Old Colony adopted as fundamental law, annual elections, no taxes to be laid or laws passed without the consent of the freemen or their representatives, no person to suffer "in respect of life, limb, liberty, good name or estate" (and please note that "good name"); "but by virtue of equity of some express law of the colony," or the English common law, and by "due course and process of law." The Plymouth Fundamentals of 1636 guaranteed trial by jury, and declared that nobody should be found guilty without the testimony of "two sufficient witnesses * * * or circumstances equivalent thereunto." A few years later when (believe it or not) there was an outbreak of juvenile crime in Plymouth, Governor Bradford asked the ministers whether he could legally have torture applied to an arrested youth to force a confession; they all replied no, he couldn't do that because it was a maxim of English common law, nemo tenetur prodere seipsum—no man may be compelled to accuse himself. That is exactly the same provision

which in article V of the Federal Bill of Rights has become so controversial in our own time.

Because the people of Massachusetts had always enjoyed government under law, and a very substantial measure of self-government as well, they not only resisted the efforts of George III to govern them by arbitrary authority, but they insisted on securing government under law for themselves. That conviction was not only an intellectual one held by students of government; it went right down to the grassroots, as may be seen by a resolution passed by the small country town of Medfield in 1776:

"While we profess ourselves advocates for Rational Constitutenal Liberty we don't mean to patronise Libertinesm and Licenteousness we are sensible of the necessity of Government for the Security of Life Liberty and property and mean to vindecate and Submit to all Lawful Constiutanal authority."

III. THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION IDEA

And it was from the grass roots, not from some eminent leader of political thought, that the idea of a constitutional convention came. For the process of making constitutions was very little understood in 1776. In several of the states, a constitution was drafted by the legislature and placed in effect without consulting the people.

On 29 May, 1776, the town of Pittsfield sent a memorial to the General Court that laid down the following principles:

1. "The people are the fountain of power."

2. The colonial "Compact"—i. e., the Province Charter of 1691—was dissolved by George III breaking it; and the General Court has no right to assume that it is still in effect—as, in fact, they were doing. The State was governed from 1775 to 25 October 1780 by what one might call a decapitated Province Charter. The Royal Governor and Lieutenant Governor were regarded as "absent," so the Council of 28 members acted as executive board, and the House carried on as before.

3. The General Court should frame "a fundamenal constitution as the basis and frame-work of legislation" and refer it to the people for their "approbation," for only the consent of a majority can "give life and being to it."

Thus Pittsfield started the movement for popular ratification, but not for a constitutional convention. The General Court on 17 September 1776 requested the people of the State to authorize it, the legislature, to draft a constitution. The war was so hot in 1776 that only about half the towns voted on this proposition. Most of those that did so, said in effect, "Go ahead; but let us have a look at it before it becomes Fundamental Law." But three towns, in replying to this request, made the pregnant suggestion that a legislature was no proper body to draft a constitution, that a constitutional convention should be elected for that special purpose. The three towns that passed resolutions to that effect were: Middleborough, 7 October 1776; Concord, 21 October 1776; Acton, 4 November 1776.

Who started this idea we do not know. We wish we did, because these three town meeting resolves are the earliest suggestions yet discovered in America of a Constitutional Convention.

In Middleborough a committee of which George Leonard was chairman reported, and the town adopted, a resolve to the effect that they were willing to have the legislature draft a constitution, if submitted to the people for ratification. But, they added, "We think it would be rather preferable to select a body of men, some from each county, whose sole business it should be to strike out or plan a new constitution subject to the consent, the approbation or disapprobation, both of the court and people."

The Concord resolves, most explicit of the three, made a very persuasive argument for a specially elected convention as being the only proper body to draft a constitution. Concord also proposed that the convention be elected by manhood suffrage, not by the property qualification that still obtained in State elections; and it suggested the mode of ratification actually adopted in 1780.

These Concord resolves were drafted by a committee consisting of Col. John Buttrick, who had commanded the Minute Men in Concord fight; Col. James Barrett and his son, both farmers; Ephraim Wood, the village shoemaker; and Nathan Bond, a 24-year-old Harvard graduate who is described as a merchant. These men deserve eternal fame, for they set up one of the title pages of democracy.

The General Court disregarded the good advice of these three towns and itself drafted a very inferior constitution which, when submitted to the people, was rejected by a vote of about 5 to 1. The General Court then took up the suggestion of Middleborough, Concord, and Acton, and by a resolve dated 19 February 1779, requested the people to decide in their town meetings whether or not they wished to elect a constitutional convention. They voted for it 2 to 1; the 3 western counties of Worcester, Hampshire, and Berkshire being almost unanimously in favor. And those that opposed did so on the ground that we had better win the war first. Next, the General Court ordered the towns to elect as many delegates to the convention as they were entitled to send representatives; and it expressly declared that all free men 21 years of age and upward could vote.

IV. THE CONVENTION OF 1779–80

There was a general response to this invitation. Very few towns were unrepresented except those in eastern Maine, the island counties, and Cape Cod, which were pretty much cut off by the war. No fewer than 293 delegates from 190 different towns attended the first session, which convened at the meeting house of the First Church in Cambridge at Harvard Square, on 18 September 1779. The convention met at Cambridge because there was a rumor that the British were planning to attack Boston. Had they done so, and succeeded, they would have made a rich haul of Bay State patriots. Boston sent as delegates Samuel Adams, John Hancock, James Bowdoin, Samuel A. Otis, John Lowell, Dr. Charles Jarvis, Samuel Barrett, and Thomas Dawes—but not Paul Revere, who was then under a cloud for his part in the Penobscot Expedition. John Adams came from Braintree and Edward Hutchinson Robbins from Milton. Essex County had an equally distinguished delegation: Stephen Choate, Samuel Phillips, Henry Higginson, Benjamin Goodhue, George Cabot, Winthrop Sargent, and Samuel Holton, among others; and Middlesex sent James Sullivan, Nathaniel Gorham, and Ephraim Wood of Concord. Plymouth sent John Cotton. York, Maine, sent Judge David Sewall; from Taunton came Robert Treat Paine, signer of the Declaration of Independence. Worcester County sent no fewer than 63 delegates, including Levi Lincoln and David Bigelow. From Old Hampshire came William Pyncheon, Luke Bliss, Col. John Moseley, and Caleb Strong. Berkshire sent Dr. William Whiting, Col. Jonathan Smith, and William Williams, signer of the Declaration of Independence. All the Massachusetts signers were there except Elbridge Gerry, who with Artemas Ward and James Lovell was then representing the State in the Continental Congress. Almost every leading patriot of Massachusetts not then serving in the Army or Navy or in Congress was elected a delegate.

One advantage of the convention over the legislature for framing a constitution was the possibility of electing as delegates judges, clergymen, and others who were disqualified for the legislature. The convention of 1779 contained about 15 judges, including the then Chief Justice of Massachusetts, William Cushing, of Scituate, and a future Chief Justice, Theophilus Parsons, of Newburyport. There were also 12 or 13 clergymen, including such well-known figures as the Reverend Samuel West, of Dartmouth, and the Reverend Gad Hitchcock, of Pembroke, the Reverend Jonas Clarke, of Lexington, and the Reverend Peter Thatcher, of Malden. Among the delegates were a future President of the United States (John Adams), 5 future Governors of the Commonwealth (Hancock, Samuel Adams, Bowdoin, Sullivan, Strong), a future United States Senator (George Cabot), and several future Congressmen. John Lowell became a Federal judge and Cushing an associate justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. No debates in the convention were reported or published.

The first session, in Cambridge, lasted only a week. After organizing, and electing James Bowdoin president and Samuel Barrett secretary, the convention appointed a grand committee of 30 to prepare a draft, spent a day in "a general and free conversation which lasted until sunset," and adjourned on 7 September. The grand committee met shortly after at the old court house on the site of Boston city hall and delegated its duties to a subcommittee consisting of President Bowdoin and the "brace of Adamses." That subcommittee, following the precedent of the one that drafted the Declaration of Independence, delegated its functions to the one member most capable of executing them—John Adams, of Braintree.

V. JOHN ADAMS AND HIS BASIC PRINCIPLES

John Adams, now 43 years old, was undoubtedly the greatest expert on constitutions in America, if not in the world; if any proof were needed of this proposition, the age of our constitution is sufficient. Since his college days he had studied constitutions, ancient and modern, had read almost every book ever written on political theory, in the English, French, Latin, and Greek languages; and, what is more, he had thought deeply about politics. Moreover, John was no doctrinaire or egg-head, to use the current term. A practising lawyer for at least 20 years, he knew the good and the bad in human nature, and had no illusions about it. He had served in our General Court and in the Continental Congress, and had plenty of experience of practical politics and politicians. Ambitious, hardheaded, and irascible, rough and often rude in his manner, conscious of his own merit and contemptuous of intellectual inferiors, intolerant of weakness—qualities which you can discern in that magnificent portrait of him by Mather Brown, reproduced in your pamphlet—John Adams had an essential greatness that transcended all his qualities and defects. His cousin Sam and his friend Bowdoin were very wise to "let John do it," not only because John knew best, but because he never worked well in a team.

Adams' draft, and the finished constitution, are logically divided into two coequal parts, the declaration of the rights of the inhabitants of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, which we may call the negative part as it was largely a limitation on the powers of government; and the frame of government, the positive part, stating what the government's powers are, how they are to be exercised and distributed among the three departments, and how the officers exercising these powers shall be chosen.

If John Adams' Declaration of Rights has been less amended than any other part of the constitution, it is because the rights he enumerated were the result of the experience of centuries. These rights were, in brief, freedom of worship, free elections, freedom

from general warrants or unreasonable searches, equal protection of the law, habeas corpus, and not to "be compelled to accuse, or furnish evidence against himself"—again, old nemo tenetur prodere seipsum, which would be incorporated in the fifth amendment to the Federal Constitution. Several of these rights were taken from constitutional charters of English Liberty such as the Bill of Rights of 1689, and the Great Charter of 1215; many had already been adopted in the Virginia Bill of Rights.

The philosophical basis of these rights is the ancient theory of natural law, or the law of nature; that Almighty God dictated the fundamental decencies of human intercourse, which men and governments should respect. This concept is even older than Christianity; it goes back to the Greek civilization to which we are heirs. One of the finest experiences of it is in Sophocles' Antigone. The heroine of that powerful tragedy, Antigone, has disobeyed a law of the tyrant Creon, ordering the bodies of his political rivals to be dismembered and thrown to the dogs. One of the victims was her brother Polyneices; and in defiance of Creon's edict she has salvaged her brother's remains and given them decent burial. Brought before Creon, she is accused of violating the law, to which she replies:

"Yea for thy laws were not ordained of Zeus,
And Justice who sits high amongst the gods,
Has naught to do with unjust laws of men.
Nor did I think that thou, a mortal man,
Had power to declare both null and void
The unchangeable, unwritten laws of Heaven.
They were not born today, nor yesterday;
They die not, and none knoweth whence they sprang."

It is a long way indeed from ancient Greece to 1780, but John Adams' Declaration of Rights stems from the same source as Antigone's dramatic challenge to the tyrant. Our Declaration of Rights opens with thanksgiving to "the Legislator of the Universe" that he had afforded the people of Massachusetts this opportunity to form "a new constitution * * * for ourselves and posterity"; and a prayer "devoutly imploring His direction in so interesting a design." We can find few finer statements in modern history of the "unchangeable, unwritten laws of Heaven" than the Massachusetts Declaration of Rights.

VI. A "MIXT GOVERNMENT"

Now for the frame of government. Adams' draft, adopted in substance by the convention, was based on an ancient theory first made popular by the French publicist, Montesquieu. The theory of "mixt government," as it was called in the 18th century, is akin to but not exactly the same as our theory of checks and balances. In brief, it was this: Any pure form of government such as absolute monarchy, hereditary aristocracy or unlimited democracy, may theoretically be good, yet actually is bad because, owing to the corrupting influence of power, it always degenerates into some different and abominable form. Pure monarchy degenerates into despotism; pure aristocracy into a selfish oligarchy, and pure democracy into mob rule or anarchy. Hence a government, to secure the happiness of the people, should be given a form that is a mixture of the three. Thus, you should have a strong chief executive to represent the monarchical principle, a senate to represent the aristocratic principle, and a house of representatives to represent the democratic principle. Finally, as a balance wheel to the whole, there should be an independent judiciary to see that the constitution is observed, and that the rights of the people are protected against the government.

John Adams had come to believe in this theory of "mixt government" almost passionately. It was the theory behind the frame of government in the Massachusetts Convention of 1780, and the theory behind the Federal Constitution of 1787. Our constitution of 1780 did not set up a democracy, it was not intended that it should; but a mixed government in which democracy had a part, and an essential part, in the lower house and in annual elections. But this democratic element was balanced by giving the Governor a greater power than the first magistrate of any other State; by apportioning the State senators in districts determined by wealth, not population, and by a high property qualification for candidates—£1,000 ($3,333) real estate for Governor—and £300 ($1,000) real estate for senator; greater than in any other of the Thirteen States except South Carolina and Maryland. This method of apportioning State senators worked out in practice, during the first 20 or 30 years of the Constitution, so that the coastal counties except Maine had 25 senators and all the rest, 15.

Even without an absolute veto, the Governor of Massachusetts was the most powerful chief executive in the United States; and, so great was the fear of one-man power at the time, the convention could only be persuaded to set up a strong governor because he would be elected annually. For Montesquieu had written, "In every magistracy one must balance the greatness of power by the shortness of its duration. One year is the term that most legislators have fixed. A longer term would be dangerous, a shorter one, against nature."

The convention made no apology for this being "a mixt" and not a democratic constitution. The address which accompanied the printed copies of the constitution that were sent to the towns for discussion, stated: "The powers of government must * * * be balanced. * * * The house of representatives is intended as the representative of the persons, and the senate of the property of the Commonwealth." Each is given a negative on the other because "all bodies of men * * * united by one common interest * * * are liable, like an individual, to mistake, bias, and prejudice." Defending this system, the convention's address says, "when the same man or body of men enact, interpret, and execute the laws, property becomes too precarious to be valuable, and a people are finally borne down with the force of corruption resulting from the union of those powers." That is exactly what happened in the governments of Nazi Germany, Soviet Poland, and Argentina Peronista.

It has often been said that checks and balances were devised to prevent anything being done; to make government impotent. That is not true. Article IV of the declaration of rights expressly says that the people of this Commonwealth "do, and forever hereafter shall, exercise and enjoy every power, jurisdiction, and right which is not, or may not hereafter be by them expressly delegated to the United States of America." The frame of government, chapter I, section 1, article iv, confers on the General Court complete legislative power "as they shall judge to be for the good and welfare of this Commonwealth, so as the same be not repugnant or contrary to this constitution." And section ii d, chapter V, which John Adams said was his favorite article, enjoined the General Court "to cherish the interests of literature and the sciences, and all seminaries of them, especially the university at Cambridge, public schools, and grammar schools; * * * to encourage * * * the promotion of agriculture, arts, sciences, commerce, trades, manufactures, and a natural history of the country," as well as to "countenance and inculcate * * * sincerity, good humor, and all social affections, and generous sentiments, among the people."

John Adams was a stickler for traditional forms and phrases. He believed, like Hosea Biglow,

"Th' older a guv'ment is, the better 't suits;
New ones hunt folk's corns out like new boots:
Change jes' for change, is like them big hotels
Where they shift plates, an' let ye live on smells."

He studied the texts of the Old Colony Charter of 1629 and the Province Charter of 1691, and incorporated as much of them as he thought would suit new conditions. Elections were annual, not because Montesquieu recommended it, but because Massachusetts had had annual elections since 1630. "Where annual elections end, there slavery begins," was a favorite maxim of John Adams. The titles His Excellency and His Honor for Governor and Lieutenant Governor were those of the Royal Governor and Lieutenant Governor under the Province Charter. The name of our legislature, the General Court, goes back to the Massachusetts Bay Co. of 1629. The property qualification for the franchise—real estate worth £3 ($10) a year—is the old 40-shilling franchise of the second charter, which in turn was taken from the county franchise in England. If Governor Herter is surprised to read in chapter II section I article vii that he has power to "assemble in martial array and put in war-like posture, the inhabitants," and in his proper person "to lead and conduct them * * * to encounter, repel, resist, expel, and pursue, by force of arms, as well by sea as by land * * * and also to kill, slay, and destroy, if necessary, and conquer, by all fitting ways, enterprises, and means whatsoever, all and every such person and persons as shall * * * in a hostile manner, attempt or enterprise the destruction, invasion, detriment, or annoyance of this commonwealth"; it is because the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay had been granted these warlike powers and duties in those very words, in 1629.

Since the Declaration of Independence the body politic had officially been styled the State of Massachusetts Bay; but John Adams, following the precedent of Virginia, substituted for State "Commonwealth," a dignified rendering of the Latin res publica, and one with many historical associations. At the same time, he managed to defeat a proposal to change the name Massachusetts Bay to Oceana. Some pedantic member (a reader, doubtless, of Harington's great treatise of that name) proposed Oceana, and several members of the Committee of Thirty were in favor of thus renaming the State; but John Adams would have none of it. Massachusetts Bay this body politic had been for 150 years, and the only concession he would make was to lop off the bay, which satisfied members from the interior. The motion for Oceana was made and seconded at the convention on November 9, 1779, but passed in the negative.

I need hardly remind you that our constitution, while retaining the original separation of powers, "to the end that it may be a government of laws and not of men" (declaration of rights, article XXX), is no longer a "mixt," but a democratic constitution. By the process of amendment over a period now of 134 years, the governor's power has been clipped by depriving him of the power to appoint the attorney general and all county officers, such as sheriffs. The senate as well as the house is apportioned according to population, not wealth; all property qualifications have been abolished and universal suffrage prevails in all elections. Yet I think that John Adams would still recognize today's frame of government as his, because the chapter on the judiciary has been maintained intact. That is really the keystone of the arch.

VII. THE VOTE OF THE TOWNS

The second session of the convention, held at Cambridge between 28 October and 12 November 1779, was devoted entirely to a dis-

cussion of the declaration of rights. John Adams sailed for France in the *Sensible* to help Benjamin Franklin to negotiate a treaty of peace on November 13, 1779, and was not present at the third session when his frame of government was debated and amended.

This third session began 27 January 1780, and was held at the Old State House in Boston, which by that time was considered to be reasonably safe from invasion. The session opened 3 weeks late because of the hard winter. Many members from the interior could not get to Boston because the highways were completely snowed under. Transportation was almost as difficult as in October 1955. But by January 20 the post road from Hartford to Boston was open for sleigh traffic, and if you could get to Hartford on snowshoes it was only a 3-day sleigh ride thence to Boston. Only 60 members were present on 27 January; and in spite of frequent and vigorous appeals for better attendance, it never rose above 82. Possibly that is why such an unusually small quorum—60 members—was required in the constitution for the house of representatives. The convention naturally thought that if 60 men could adopt a frame of government, 60 men were enough to pass laws.

In this third and ill-attended session, the convention adopted the peculiar method by which the constitution was ratified. The resolution, drafted by a committee composed of James Sullivan, John Lowell, and Robert Treat Paine, followed the Concord recommendation of 1776, "that when the convention * * * have formed a constitution, they adjourn for a short time and publish their proposed constitution for the inspection and remarks of the inhabitants of this State."

The method was this. The convention adjourned on 2 March 1780, to 7 June. In the meantime printed copies of the constitution were distributed to every town and plantation, and the selectmen were requested to hold a special town meeting to discuss and vote on it, article by article. "And if there doth not appear to be two-thirds of their constituents in favor thereof, that the convention may alter it in such manner as that it may be agreeable to the sentiments of two-thirds of the voters throughout the State."

This method seems unnecessarily complicated; but one can see why it was adopted. Since the breakup of royal authority in 1774, the towns had acquired more power than ever before, and were jealous of it. The emphatic vote with which they rejected the 1778 draft constitution suggested that the same thing would happen to this one if it were submitted in a lump, as the town of Pittsfield expressed it. Giving the people an opportunity to discuss the proposed constitution and to present objections and suggestions to the convention not only pleased them, but gave the malcontents an opportunity to blow off steam. And the convention, by reserving to itself, at an adjourned session, the right to canvass the returns, amend and ratify, made certain that its work would not be lost; that a constitution would be adopted if not the constitution which they had drafted. Any particularly unpopular article could be modified or struck out, without jeopardizing the whole.

There was no public contest over ratifying the constitution. In an era when political pamphlets proliferated, only two against the constitution, and none for it, were published. The 6 weekly newspapers then published in Massachusetts (all but 1 in Boston) made little or no mention of it; their meager columns, crammed full of war and foreign news, found room only for 2 series of articles on the constitution, both confined largely to a discussion of article III of the Declaration of Rights. The series attacking it was written by a member of the convention who signed himself "Philanthropos," and whom I suspect to have been the Reverend Noah Alden, the Baptist minister of Bellingham, who was chairman of the committee that drafted article III. "Philanthropos" was answered by another member who called himself "Iraenius," who was probably Robert Treat Paine.

No members of the convention stumped the State, on snowshoes or otherwise, to argue pro or contra; but each member must have been a center of discussion in his hometown. Until I discovered the returns from the towns in Massachusetts Archives, historians had assumed that there was no contest; that the constitution went over easily. That is far from the truth. There was strong opposition to the constitution, and part of it can be definitely traced to two men who were not members of the Convention. These were Joseph Hawley of Northampton, the patriot leader known as the "Hampshire Cato," and the Reverend Isaac Backus, the Baptist minister of Middleborough and leader of the Baptists in New England. One of the two pamphlets attacking the constitution was written by the Reverend Mr. Backus, the other was a reprint of the "Philanthropos" articles from the Boston Independent Chronicle.

The towns had about 3 months in which to discuss the constitution, and they took full advantage of it despite the long, hard winter and the generally unfavorable war news. Returns were expected from 290 towns. No fewer than 188 are preserved in the State archives, I have personally unearthed about 40 more, and probably at least 25 others have been lost. These returns reveal an amazingly keen interest in constitutional subjects throughout the State, and a high degree of political intelligence among the people. The degree of interest varied, as we would suspect. It was highest in Boston, in Old Hampshire and Berkshire Counties, and along the Rhode Island border. In Boston about a thousand men turned out for town meetings that rocked the cradle of liberty for the better part of 3 days; and no fewer than 887 men voted. In Rehoboth 455 people voted; South Hadley held seven town meetings before it could come to a decision. But in some important towns very little interest was shown. At Plymouth, for instance, only 37 voters from a population of over 2,600 attended; and at Biddeford, Maine, only 10 out of more than 1,000. "We regret so few are met," reads the Biddeford return; but "10 men may save the city."

The tone of all but a few returns was respectful, even deferential. An exception may be made of Middleborough, the home of the Reverend Isaac Backus, and of several towns on the border of our otherwise-minded sister, Rhode Island. They did not like a piece of the constitution, but their principal target was article III of the declaration of rights, which they felt unduly favored the Congregational churches—as indeed it did. Freetown, for instance, found "many articles that appear inconsistent to that liberty that we think we have been so long contending for, viz, the third article of the declaration of rights for one, the power invested in the Governour for the second, the power invested into the house of representatives for the third, and the manner of laying excises or duties on manufactories." Freetown preferred to go on with the decapitated Province Charter "until this present unhappy contest is decided." Western towns where the Baptists were strong were of like mind. Westhampton objected to the Governor's military powers, "upon the supposition that wee may at some time be so unhappy as to have a Governour who may not aime at the good of the Commonwealth"; Shelburne objected to almost everything in these words: "Why we dont except of this article is because we dont (want) a law of three branches." That town was not alone in wanting a unicameral legislature immediately responsible to the will of the people. Many agricultural communities such as Greenwich and Washington objected to the senate representing the mercantile interest, and were alarmed at the General Court's power to lay excise duties on produce. Worcester, in a very well worded and carefully thought-out return, suggested that members of the house be guaranteed per diem salary and mileage. (This could be done under the constitution, but was not actually done until 1811.) Several towns wanted the judiciary to be elected, or appointed, for a term of years; and many demanded that every town be given a registry of deeds and a judge of probate. Boston and about 20 other towns thought that the right to a writ of habeas corpus was not strongly enough guaranteed. Chapter V, section 1, protecting the charter and privileges of Harvard College, naturally became a favorite target. Petersham, where the Harvard Forest is now located, thought that the legislature should be free "to curtail that rich and growing corporation lest it should endanger the liberties of the Commonwealth," and Bellingham proposed that the Harvard treasurer be required by the constitution to publish annually an account of the college funds and income. Bellingham little knew how embarrassing that would have been to the then treasurer of Harvard, John Hancock, from whom the corporation had been vainly endeavoring to obtain an accounting since 1775. Incidentally, the Harvard treasurer nowadays does make public his annual report of how poor the university is; in fact, it was headline news on this very anniversary.

Amusing as some of these objections were, they were not typical. On the whole, the townspeople showed great acumen in pointing out the weaker features of the constitution, and suggesting remedies. Dorchester and Northhampton made eloquent pleas for male suffrage. The Northampton return, drafted by Joseph Hawley, we would now regard as unanswerable. Every male aged 16 and upward paid the poll tax, he observed; and in those days the poll tax accounted for about 40 percent of the entire State revenue. Thus, to disfranchise men because they did not own real estate worth $10 a year, or other property worth $200, was taxation without representation. There was also a certain amount of opposition to the financial qualifications for office-holding; but not so much as one would suppose. Petersham insisted that "Riches and dignity neither make the head wiser nor the heart better. The overgrown rich we think the most dangerous to the liberties of a free state, and we object against a discretionary power in the General Court to alter such qualifications in future." Groton pointed out that the power to raise the financial requirements might result in some towns having no qualified resident to elect. And Middleborough inquired, with some humor, what would happen if the people's choice for governor turned out to be worth only £999 instead of £1,000? Seeing that the convention was elected by adult male suffrage, and that the constitution was submitted to adult male suffrage, it is amazing that these property qualifications for the franchise and for office-holding did not wreck it.

Several towns adverted to the low quorum for doing business in the House; Leverett even anticipated amendment XXXIII passed in 1891, that a majority of the members be required for a quorum. Newton was so forward-looking as to suggest the referendum which was not adopted until 1918.

The most numerous objections were preferred to the two articles which anyone would now agree to have been the most defective: article III of the Declaration of Rights on the relations between church and state, and the failure to include any method for amending the Constitution, except the call of a Constitutional Convention in 1795. Adams failed to include in his draft any method of amendment, not because he regarded it as perfect, but because he thought

that the amending power was covered by article VII of the Declaration of Rights, "* * * the people alone have an incontestible * * * right to institute government; and to reform, alter, or totally change the same. * * *" The convention itself added chapter VI, article X, to the effect that a new Constitutional Convention could be called in 1795 if two-thirds of those voting wanted it. Referring to this article, Roxbury observed that a convention should be made certain in 1795; others that the vote should be taken within 5, 7, or 10 years; Bellingham thought there should be a Constitutional Convention regularly every decade. There was a larger minority against this article than against any other in the Constitution.

When the time came to vote on this proposition, in 1795, only a bare majority was in favor of a convention. But a convention had to be called in 1820 (relying on article VII Declaration of Rights, owing to the separate statehood of Maine. It was the 1820 convention which drafted amendment IX, the regular system of amending the Constitution, which was accepted by the people in 1821 and which is still in force.

VIII. THE RATIFICATION

The fourth, last and ratifying session of the convention met on June 7, 1780, at the Brattle Street Church in Boston. At its previous session the convention resolved that the towns could elect new delegates, if they chose, to attend this session; 21 towns availed themselves of this privilege and sent 24 new members. Braintree, for example, sent Brigadier General Palmer to replace John Adams.

By the time it met for this last session, the convention was fairly desperate to get the constitution ratified and a constitutional government elected. Out in Berkshire a county convention was considering asking the General Court "to set them off to a neighboring State that has a constitution"—e. g., Vermont.

So the constitutional convention, on the day it met, appointed a committee to revise and arrange the returns. It was very difficult to get members to serve on this committee—and no wonder, for the towns' returns were in such form that not even an IBM machine could have coped with them. Hardly any two towns had followed the same system of expressing the views of their voters. Some, instead of voting for and against a specific article of the constitution, drafted a substitute and voted on that; and as no two towns suggested the same substitute for a given article, it was impossible to determine just what two-thirds of the people did want. On the church and state article, for instance, many of the objections were on the ground that it was too liberal, allowing equal rights to Roman Catholics; while the others objected that it was not liberal enough and gave the General Court the power to compel church attendance and collect taxes to support the Congregational ministry.

After checking up on the committee's mathematics, I am of the opinion that they did considerable juggling of the returns on the church and state article (Declaration of Rights, art. III) and on the 1795 convention article (ch. VI, art. X), to make it appear that two-thirds of all those voting were in favor of the entire constitution. But there was certainly a majority in favor of those two articles as they stood, and, in my opinion, a two-thirds majority in favor of all the rest. After all, many delegates were present from the dissident towns, and they had plenty of opportunity to check. They must have been persuaded that it was better to gloss over the two-thirds requirements for these two articles, in order to get the constitution in force, since the process had already taken 4 years.

On 15 June 1780, the committee reported to the convention and the question was put on every article: "Is it your opinion that the people have accepted of this article?" Which, upon every individual article, passed in the affirmative by "a very great majority." The convention then declared "that the people of the State of Massachusetts Bay have accepted the constitution as it stands in the printed form." Next it decided that the new constitution would go into effect on 25 October following, and set the 4th of September for the election of governor, lieutenant governor, and senators, and warned the towns to elect their representatives to the general court by October 15.

As it now appeared that the convention's labors were drawing to a close, a committee was somewhat hastily appointed "to wait on the Reverend Dr. Cooper" (minister of the Brattle Street Church), "requesting him to close the convention with thanksgiving and prayer." While waiting for the committee to wait on Dr. Cooper, the convention passed votes of thanks to Governor Bowdoin, Secretary Barrett, and the Brattle Street Church, but not, strangely enough, to John Adams. The committee appointed to wait on Dr. Cooper presently reported that it was unable to locate the reverend gentleman at such short notice, "whereupon it was moved, seconded, and passed that the Reverend Peter Thatcher," delegate from Malden, "close the convention with thanksgiving and prayer; which service being performed, it was moved and seconded that the convention be now dissolved; which being put, passed in the affirmative."

The elections were duly held in September; there were no party tickets, but John Hancock and James Bowdoin were candidates for governor, and the former won by a 10-to-1 majority. So on Wednesday, October 25, 1780, 175 years ago today, John Hancock was inaugurated the first Governor of the Commonwealth; and at the foot of His Excellency's first proclamation appeared for the first time the prayer in which we all may join, "God save the Commonwealth of Massachusetts."

Unity in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the House three press releases issued this week bearing fundamentally on the hard times that again have beset our farmers.

The first, from the Department of Agriculture, discloses in cold figures the dimensions of the disaster that has struck Midwest corn-hog farmers. Moreover, this release shows the great increase in the charges for marketing pork, at the same time hog prices were declining.

In the second release, Mr. Herschel D. Newsom, master of the National Grange, after a survey in the Corn Belt and Great Plains, voices alarm at the drop in net farm income, in terms of return for good management.

Mr. Speaker, the third release encompasses a new hope for agriculture. It gives an account of a fervent attempt to bring farm organizational efforts into harmony wherever possible, as Mr. Newsom says, "to gain strength in agriculture through unity."

In my mind there is nothing so desperately needed as unity among farmers to bring agriculture out of the recession that has grown tighter and tighter for many months.

A rather successful attempt has been made to divide farmers against themselves, organization against organization, commodity against commodity, region against region, so that the Nation has become confused as to what is good or what is bad for agriculture and the total economy. I firmly believe that unity among farmers will bring understanding among our friends in the cities, and then we shall see city people and farmers working together to establish a farm program to stop the disaster that constantly menaces agriculture and which, if not reversed, soon will endanger our whole economy and the well-being of all Americans.

I commend those farm leaders who are joined in this effort toward unity.

The press releases referred to above follow:

[From the Department of Agriculture]

Charges for marketing pork increased from 21.5 cents a retail pound in the second quarter of 1955 to a record high of 25.8 cents in the fourth quarter while prices to farmers for hogs were decreasing sharply. The United States Department of Agriculture made this comparison today in a research report on pork marketing margins and costs.

The decline in hog prices from June to December 1955 was the largest on record, both in dollars and percentage.

In the last quarter of 1954, the price spread between what the consumer paid for pork and what the farmer received for hogs averaged 23.1 cents per retail pound. The spread narrowed to 22.8 cents per pound in the first quarter of 1955, and to 21.5 cents in the second quarter; then widened sharply to 24.7 cents in the third quarter of 1955 and to 25.8 in the fourth quarter, the widest spread on record.

Prices for barrows and gilts at Chicago dropped from an average of $19.59 per 100 pounds in June 1955 to $10.73 in December. During the same period, marketing charges for pork rose by the equivalent of $2.50 per 100 pounds of live hog. This rise in marketing charges was due largely to a lag in passing on to consumers the sharp reduction in prices paid to farmers for hogs, rather than to higher marketing costs. It is not unusual for changes in retail prices to lag behind changes in wholesale and farm prices.

This study covered the period from January 1949 through January 1956. During the first week of April 1956, the average prices of barrows and gilts at Chicago reached $15.24 per 100 pounds, an increase of $3.77 per 100 pounds since January 1956. For the first quarter of 1956, the farm-to-retail margin narrowed by 2.6 cents a retail pound of pork. The slaughtering of hogs declined 7 percent below the fourth quarter of 1955. The improvement in hog prices in the first quarter of 1956 was also associated with an expanded pork and lard purchase program by the United States Department of Agriculture, promotional efforts, and publication of research data on price spreads and marketing costs.

The price spread between farmer and consumer has widened in most recent years, the Department reported. In 1947, the spread averaged 17.5 cents per retail pound, a record high up to that time, and it increased to an average of 23.7 for 1955, another record high average. Marketing costs have risen substantially during this long-run

period, and these costs are reflected in the increasing price spreads. Furthermore, hog prices have tended to be much more sensitive in recent years to increases in market supplies.

The report presents six detailed examples of the costs of marketing hogs and pork from farm to consumer, together with the distribution of the consumer's dollar among the farmers and the marketing agencies.

A copy of the report, "Pork Marketing Margins and Costs," Miscellaneous Publication No. 711, may be obtained from the Office of Information, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington 25, D. C.

[From the National Grange]

Net farm income, in terms of return for good management, in many areas of the Nation is off to an "alarming degree," according to Herschel D. Newsom, Master of the National Grange.

The Grange, Newsom reports, has been pulling together recent farm income statistics for use as a basis for determining its recommendations and activities in the field of farm legislation. A sample of Corn Belt farm income trends, as shown by official farm account records, is as follows:

Average net farm-management returns per farm by years in central Illinois

Type of farm	1953	1954	1955
20 grain farms	$7,836	$4,632	$1,161
20 hog farms	6,640	4,265	[1] 2,900
10 cattle farms	513	[1] 1,358	[1] 6,795

[1] Loss.

Net farm income return is a figure reached after all farm operating expenses are paid and after deductions are made for interest and labor. Interest is charged at the rate of 4 percent on capital invested in land, and at the rate of 5 percent for other capital invested. Family labor is calculated at the rate of $185 per month.

Statistics from other Corn Belt and Great Plains areas are equally alarming, although the situation is not as serious in the eastern and western farming communities, the Grange leader said.

"Our concern," he concluded, "is twofold: first, it is simply not fair nor right that farm people represent the only segment of our national economy that is not experiencing the greatest wave of prosperity the country has ever known; second, there is real danger of the agricultural depression spreading to other segments of the economy. It's only a question of how long farmers must remain poor before the unhealthy symptoms of a general recession begin to show up in the barometers that indicate the Nation's economic health."

It is the position of the National Grange that the Nation cannot afford to risk the possibility of a general recession—or worse.

[From the National Grange]

In a fervent attempt to bring farm organizational efforts into harmony wherever possible, the National Grange has joined with the other major farm organizations in suggesting periodic joint meetings of policy-level officials of these organizations.

The first meeting in a series of meetings just planned will be held in the Grange Building in early June. It will involve officials of the Farm Bureau, the National Grange, the National Farmers Union, and the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

Herschel D. Newsom, master of the Grange, says that this is an extension of the efforts of his organization to gain strength in agriculture through unity.

"It's impossible, of course, to reconcile many of the policies of the national farm organizations. This is because these policies are spelled out by the delegate bodies of these organizations. Still, if the farm minority is going to cope with the power of other groups it must present a united front wherever possible.

"The Grange," Newsom continued, "has been working hand-in-hand not only with the other general farm organizations wherever possible, but with numerous commodity and cooperative groups over a period of years and we intend to continue these wholesome relationships," the Indiana farmer concluded.

Bishop Jules B. Jeanmard Resigns After 38 Years as Catholic Leader in Southwest Louisiana

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the recent resignation of the Most Rev. Jules B. Jeanmard as bishop of the diocese of Lafayette, in the Third Congressional District of Louisiana, centers attention upon a long and distinguished service rendered to the Catholic Church and to the spiritual life of the historical Acadian area of southwest Louisiana.

Announcement that Bishop Jeanmard had tendered his resignation in the 38th year of his bishopric, owing to ill health, was made from Washington by the Most Rev. Amleto Giovanni Cicognani, apostolic delegate to the United States, following acceptance by Pope Pius XII.

Nearing his 77th birthday and entering his 53d year in the priesthood, Bishop Jeanmard has been in charge of the Lafayette see since bringing to the Evangeline country of Louisiana the first bishopric in its history when the diocese of Lafayette, proportionally the second most Catholic diocese in the United States, was created in 1918 by papal decree. He was the first Louisianian to be appointed to the high office of bishop in the Catholic Church and the second native son of the Evangeline country to be ordained as priest. After his ordination in 1903, and before reaching the canonical age of 24, he established an outstanding record in important posts in the archdiocese of New Orleans.

Bishop Jeanmard will be succeeded by the present auxiliary bishop of the Lafayette diocese, the Most Rev. Maurice Schexnayder, also a native of Louisiana, who was born at Wallace in the parish—county—of St. John the Baptist, and studied for the priesthood at St. Benedict in Baltimore and in Rome, Italy, where he was ordained in April of 1925 for the archdiocese of New Orleans. His first assignment was as assistant pastor at Plaquemines, La., from which post he moved to Louisiana State University where he became chaplain of Catholic students. After 17 years of notable service at the university he was named pastor of St. Francis De Sales Church, at Houma, La., remaining there until 1951 when he was consecrated as the first auxiliary bishop in the Lafayette diocese and was assigned to St. Michael's Church at Crowley, La., where he is presently serving as pastor.

Formal ceremonies are to be conducted at the Cathedral of St. John the Evangelist, at Lafayette, on May 24, at which time Bishop Schexnayder will take over the leadership of the diocese. Bishop Jeanmard will continue to reside at the bishop's house in Lafayette.

As southwest Louisiana, with great natural resources and so many other advantages, has steadily grown and developed, so has the diocese of Lafayette kept pace in religious growth under the direction and inspiration of Bishop Jeanmard. A few of the statistics which so well record this progress show that in 1918, when Bishop Jeanmard was assigned to the newly created diocese, it had a Catholic population of 152,000 while the figure for 1955 was 350,000. In 1918 there were 48 church parishes in the diocese, which number had grown to 123 last year, and the enrollment of students in the Catholic schools of the diocese increased from 5,628 to 19,875. Of special significance and importance has been the establishment of so many new institutions in the diocese under the guiding hand of Bishop Jeanmard—churches, schools, hospitals, orphanage, seminary, Catholic Student Center of Southwestern Louisiana Institute of Lafayette, monastery, retreat house, bishop's house—contributing to the spiritual and physical welfare of thousands of our citizens, both Catholic and non-Catholic.

Commenting editorially on the resignation of Bishop Jeanmard, the Southwest Louisiana Register, official newspaper of the diocese of Lafayette, said:

END OF AN ERA

They say "the hand that rocks the cradle rules the world." Certainly family-life lovers of southwest Louisiana confirm this. But if it is so, then even more surely does the hand that consecrates rule a diocese.

A bishop is the father, guide, shepherd, and friend to his people. He communicates life, he dispenses goodness, he touches every member of his flock, whether through the sacred oils of Holy Thursday rushed by runner to every parish for baptisms, the last anointing, or the like; or through the priests whom he sends out in his name, christed by himself, to knead the souls of the people into a likely dough, a new paste of the Lord; or through his teaching, in his letters and sermons, in his pouring on of the spirit of truth in confirmation; or just through his courage and consistency in face of terribly trying problems, vexing personalities, and contrary situations of every sampling.

Bishops have a crucifying lot. They suffer for their people. Not theirs merely the public appearances, the processions, the dinners, and the programs. They are lineal descendants of the Apostles, and all of these Apostles knew martyrdom. But as glorious as suffering is, a person gets tired and wants to rest and just live a bit.

Thirty-seven years is longer than most of Bishop Jules Jeanmard's spiritual children have been alive. He has been a bishop that long, a priest 53 years, and a child of God for 77.

Think of all the masses and psalms and absolutions; think of the decisions and plans; think of the joys and the disappointments of so many years in the life of a man who has been the bishop of a new diocese almost longer than any other bishop in the

country. Then consider how difficult it is for a man to decide to retire, and you will know how these years have weighed on the shoulders of one of the youngest men ever to be named a bishop in the United States of America. That, of course, was in 1918. Look around you and see the results of these nearly four decades of pastoral zeal.

Someone once said that when a man retires from being a pastor he can then become a priest. What they meant was that nowadays pastoral responsibilities for administration, office work, correspondence, finances, personalities, and pressing decisions make life extremely complicated. The priesthood itself would be far more direct, personal, and sacramental. Bishop Jeanmard has kept both facets of his priestly work on a high level and his flock has loved him immensely. "He is one of us," we have often said. It may be possible now for him to enjoy his priesthood, to administer rather than administrate, to pray rather than program.

Most of the residents of this diocese have been confirmed by Bishop Jeanmard; practically all of them have in baptism been anointed with oil consecrated by him; most of the native priests were ordained by him; he is known from the blessings of schools, churches, and other institutions. He is the father of a flock. The devotion and loyalty of a people remain with him as he relinquishes the reins of the diocese to another zealous son of the South. Ad multos annos, Bishop.

Tabulation of Public Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, in February of this year I prepared a questionnaire of public opinion on many issues and questions of national importance for circulation in the 15th Congressional District of Ohio, which I have the honor to represent. When I undertook the task, it was my desire to obtain a random sample of opinion which might demonstrate local feelings on these issues and questions. A total of 4,435 of the questionnaires were returned to me by April 1 and were tabulated.

The 15th Congressional District of Ohio is in many ways typical of America. Its interests are diverse. It has farms, large and small. There are located there many factories engaged in the production of a multitude of products. The area is a storehouse of natural resources. The people are thinking people, vitally interested in the affairs of the day. Since the people of these seven counties have such diversified interests, it is my feeling that the answers are those of typical Americans, free from the extremes of sectionalism and provincialism. I regard their answers as a source of valuable guidance on various issues as they are considered. Others in the Congress may also share my great interests in the results of this poll.

The tabulation is as follows:

	Total vote	Number favoring	Percentage favoring
1. Do you support the Bricker amendment to void treaties insofar as they would abridge the sovereignty of the United States?	3,692	2,916	79
2. Do you favor lowering the legal voting age from 21 to 18?	4,340	1,657	38.2
3. Do you favor a constitutional amendment which would prevent the Federal Government from spending more than it receives in revenues during peacetime?	4,237	3,132	73.9
4. Are you in agreement with the present foreign policy of the United States?	3,540	1,880	53.1
5. Do you favor the admission of Communist China to the United Nations?	4,222	340	8
6. Do you favor continuation of technical assistance to underdeveloped nations?	2,973	1,988	66.9
7. Do you favor continuation of military assistance to friendly nations?	3,875	2,847	73.5
8. If answers to questions 6 and 7 are "yes", where do you think aid should be concentrated?			
Increase (1,307—60.5 percent) or decrease (851—39.5 percent) aid to Asia.			
Increase (638—30.8 percent) or decrease (1,438—69.2 percent) aid to Europe.			
9. Should we continue the United States Information Agency which furnishes information about our Nation and its policies to other countries?	3,994	2,295	57.5
10. Do you favor the creation of an Academy of Foreign Service by our Government to train future diplomats?	3,797	2,341	61.6
11. Do you favor Federal aid to education for the construction of public school buildings to be supported by additional tax measures?	4,225	2,090	49.5
12. Do you favor Federal aid to assist in the payment of teacher's salaries and administrative costs of local schools to be supported by additional tax measures?	4,187	1,580	37.7
13. Do you favor increased Federal aid for new highways financed by increased taxes (on gasoline, tires, etc.) for highway users?	4,229	2,377	56.2
14. Do you believe the minimum wage laws should be extended to fields of employment not now covered?	3,986	2,474	62.1
15. Do you favor the administration's health reinsurance proposal whereby the Federal Government would encourage expansion of private health insurance by assuming exceptional risks?	3,891	1,542	39.6
16. Do you support increasing present old age and survivorship benefits under the Social Security Act?	4,255	3,022	71
17. Do you favor the reduction from age 65 to 62 for women to receive benefits under the social security law?	4,314	3,132	72.6
18. Do you favor the construction of additional public housing units?	3,889	1,307	33.6
19. Which farm program do you favor:			
(a) Price support program based on 90 percent parity with acreage restrictions		617	16.7
(b) Price support program based on flexible parity with acreage restrictions		1,276	34.6
(c) No Federal price supports and no crop controls		1,796	48.7
20. Do you support the elimination of Federal taxes on gasoline consumed by farmers in the operation of farm machinery?	4,215	2,495	59.2
21. Do you agree that we must abolish farm surpluses before the reduction in farm prices can be solved?	3,833	2,736	71.4
22. Do you support the President's proposal for a soil bank to transfer acreage from farm production to soil-improvement crops as a means to reduce surplus production?	3,909	2,647	67.7
23. Do you agree with the President's recommendation that family-size farms should receive greater consideration in crop price support payments than large commercial farms?	4,103	3,642	88.8
24. Do you favor legislation to remove acreage restrictions on wheat which is grown and used for feed or seed on a particular farm?	3,915	3,110	79.6
25. Do you favor increased postal rates on first-class mail as a means to decrease the deficit under which the Post Office Department has operated?	4,155	2,237	53.8
26. Do you favor statehood for Hawaii and Alaska?	3,359	2,904	86.4
Alaska only, 212 (6.3 percent); Hawaii only, 122 (3.6 percent).			
27. Do you favor a policy of lower tariffs even though it results in increased competition with domestic industry?	3,946	930	23.6
28. Do you favor a reduction in Federal income taxes without first balancing the budget and decreasing the national debt?	4,114	870	21.1
29. Do you favor a basic pension for all World War I veterans?	3,963	2,198	55.5
30. Is the Eisenhower administration doing a good job?	3,738	3,246	86.8

The Cyprus Question and the Banishment of Archbishop Makarios

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a thoughtful analysis of the significance of British action in banishing Archbishop Makarios from his native land on charges that he substituted for himself duties of a political leader in place of his religious responsibilities. The implications of this incident are a sharp reminder that the cause of freedom and democracy is constantly being challenged. We can little afford to take its universal appeal for granted or to turn a deaf ear and unseeing eyes whether it is imperiled at home or abroad. The statement, made by Mr. A. Nicholas Soufras, president of the Federation of Hellenic Societies, Inc., follows:

STATEMENT OF FEDERATION OF HELLENIC SOCIETIES, INC., DETROIT, MICH.

In arresting Archbishop Makarios, primate of the Greek Orthodox Church and national leader of the Greek Cypriots, and banishing him from his native land without trial, the British have committed an act which will forever remain a stigma in our civilization. No British excuse will ever suffice to justify or erase this opprobrium from the minds of civilized people. Former Prime Minister Clement Attlee aptly said in the House of Lords, touching off shouts of approval, "Hitler could do it. Stalin could do it. But Britain could not do it."

Even the Archbishop of Canterbury condemned the British action. Addressing the House of Lords, the archbishop, Dr. Geoffrey Fisher, shattered the Government's pretext that Archbishop Makarios was banished because he disregarded his religious duties and assumed those of a political leader. Said Dr. Fisher, "Archbishop Makarios was continuing a tradition of the past when once again he identified the leadership of his church with a struggle for political freedom." Indeed, the Archbishop of Canterbury shows a clear understanding, not yet grasped by

the Western World, of the role of the Greek Church in the political life of the Hellenic world.

The Western World does not usually understand that, in the black days following the fall of the Greek Byzantine Empire to the Ottomans in the 15th century, there was only the church to look to for leadership. The church kept alive the spark of freedom and the Greek spirit throughout the centuries, and finally, on March 25, 1821, it was Bishop Germanos who raised the banner of the revolution at the monastery of Agia Lavra. The struggle that began on that historic day ended 8 years later with victory and independence for part of Greece.

Similarly, during the long years of the occupation of Cyprus by alien powers, it was only natural that the Greek Church, true to its traditions and responsibilities, should provide leadership for the struggle to gain liberty for the people of the island.

The representative character of the church's role is clearly seen from the fact that the Archbishop of Cyprus, also Ethnarch (head of the Ethnarchy, which is the Cypriot National Council), is elected by democratic process.

For those well-meaning persons who would like to understand the Cyprus question, a very brief historical sketch may not be amiss.

When for the first time the name of Cyprus appears in history, it is mentioned as being a Greek island and part of Greece, having the same culture, the same religion, and the same traditions and sentiments.

The sovereignty of the island, particularly after the fall of the Greek Byzantine Empire, has had a checkered history. Cyprus was finally ceded to Great Britain by Turkey in 1878. The deal was then characterized by Gladstone as "a thieves' bargain." After Turkey entered World War I on the side of the Central Powers, Britain annexed the island in 1914, and Turkey recognized this annexation and relinquished all claims as to the ultimate status of Cyprus by articles 16 and 20 of the Treaty of Lausanne, signed on July 24, 1923. In 1925, Cyprus was made a British Crown Colony—the only colony in Europe.

From the earliest days of British rule, the Greek Cypriots, constituting four-fifths of the island's half-million population, never ceased demanding their right of self-determination.

Said Winston S. Churchill in 1907, then Colonial Under-Secretary, "I think it is only natural that the Cypriot people, who are of Greek descent, should regard their incorporation with what may be called their mother country as an ideal to be earnestly, devoutly, and fervently cherished. Such a feeling is an example of the patriotic devotion which so nobly characterizes the Greek Nation."

But Britain now contends that Cyprus cannot be allowed self-determination because of strategic necessities.

Is it not a fact that the Greek Government has openly stated that it will give Britain all facilities for defense in Cyprus, or any part of Greek territory? Is it not a fact that Greece is a member of NATO, and as such, the Greek Government is prepared to offer full facilities to other NATO powers also, besides Great Britain?

But then the British argue that Greece is unstable for complete confidence. Writes Francis Noel-Baker, MP, in the Manchester Guardian, October 2, 1954: "Surely the whole postwar history of the Greeks proves that we have no more reliable ally on the continent of Europe. There is no people less likely to turn neutralists, or to allow themselves to be drawn behind the Iron Curtain. If we cannot trust Greece, we might as well write off all our friends in Europe and turn neutralists ourselves."

As to Turkey's demands: One is compelled to be reminded of the traditional British intriguery: In their refusal to abandon the Northwest forts and trading posts, which had been ceded to the United States at the end of the Revolutionary War, were not the British savagely encouraging the Indians to massacre oncoming settlers? Turkey, despite British schemes and machinations, has no lawful claim on Cyprus because, whatever rights she might have had, she relinquished all her claims as to the ultimate status of Cyprus by the aforesaid Treaty of Lausanne.

In conclusion, how can Cyprus be used by the British for defense of the eastern Mediterranean in the proclaimed cause of liberty and democracy when the people of the island are consistently denied their own national liberty?

The fact is that in the name of imperial defense, a colonial dispute has been permitted by British obstinacy and diplomatic intrigue to develop into an international crisis, which threatens the very existence of NATO in the eastern Mediterranean.

Would our Government be true to our American traditions and principles if it fails to take a firm stand and support the right of the Greek Cypriots to self-determination?

Let us heed the warning of an early great American sage: "Those, who would give up essential liberty to purchase a little temporary safety, deserve neither liberty nor safety."

A. NICHOLAS SOUFRAS,
President.

University of Illinois Dedicates New College of Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, in a very impressive ceremony from April 11 to 14 the University of Illinois dedicated its new building which will house the college of law.

For some 20 years this building had been the dream of Dean Albert J. Harno, the college of law faculty, and many of its alumni, including this speaker. This dedication was the culmination of this dream.

All of us know that buildings in themselves do not make great scholars nor embryo lawyers. However, they do make possible more adequate background for the student and better conditions under which the faculty may teach and the student body study.

The University of Illinois needed this new building badly. It had been housed in the building which had been the University of Illinois Law School for almost 50 years. The school has expanded tremendously in recent years. The capacity of the school for additional students had become highly limited.

At this time I would like to pay tribute to Dean Harno, who has been dean of the law school for more than 25 years. There is no more highly respected nor able dean of a law school in the entire country. He has been meticulcus in the choice of those on his faculty. He has urged them to be scholarly in their teaching. He has urged the students to be diligent in their studies. This man has left an impact upon the university and the law school which will be remembered long after he has departed from the scene.

On Saturday, the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, Earl Warren, gave the convocation address and received on honorary degree of doctor of law, as did Judge Walter C. Lindley of the United States Circuit of Appeals for the Circuit comprising Wisconsin, Illinois, and Indiana.

Ths was a great occasion in the history of the University of Illinois. In recent years the university has had an intensive building program in the dental school, the medical school, and now the law school. It has become preeminent in the graduate school field. It intends to hold that position through the coming years.

Mr. Speaker, I append herewith the building dedication program for the new college of law building, beginning on Wednesday, April 11, and ending on the evening of April 13:

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, COLLEGE OF LAW, BUILDING DEDICATION PROGRAM, APRIL 11–14, 1956

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 11, 1956

6:30 p. m.: Seventh annual college of law recognition banquet, honoring student achievement for the year, ballroom of Illini Union Building.

THURSDAY, APRIL 12, 1956

10:15 a. m.–4:45 p. m.: Colloquium: The Advocate at Mid-Century, auditorium of the law building.

Morning session

The Advocate as a Counselor, Thurman Arnold, Arnold, Fortas and Porter, Washington, D. C.

The Advocate in the Trial Court, Joseph C. Hutcheson, Jr., Chief Judge of the United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit.

Afternoon session

The Advocate Before Administrative Agencies, Justin Miller, McClean, Salisbury, Petty and McClean (of counsel), Los Angeles.

The Advocate as a Lawmaker: The Advocate in the Reviewing Courts, Walter V. Schaefer, Justice of the Supreme Court of Illinois.

The Advocate as a Lawmaker: The Advocate's Role in Legislation, William L. Springer, Member of Congress.

6:30 p. m.: College of law alumni dinner, Champaign Country Club.

FRIDAY, APRIL 13, 1956

9:30 a. m.–3:15 p. m.: Colloquium: Law and Society, auditorium of the law building.

Morning session

Law and Social Change in a Democratic Society, Charles E. Wyzanski, Jr., judge of United States District Court, Boston; Roger J. Traynor, justice of Supreme Court of California; Denis W. Brogan, professor of political science, Cambridge University, England; George A. Miller visiting professor of political science, University of Illinois.

Afternoon session

Role of the Law School in a Democratic Society, Herbert F. Goodrich, judge of United States Court of Appeals, Third Circuit.

Law and the Growth of International Society, Alf Ross, professor of law, University

of Copenhagen, Denmark; George A. Miller visiting professor of law, University of Illinois.

4 p. m.: Final arguments in the Frederick Green moot court competition, before the Justices of the Supreme Court of Illinois; auditorium of the law building.

6:30 p. m.: Dinner for delegates of law schools, Illini Union Building; Speaker, A. James Casner, professor of law, Harvard University.

SATURDAY, APRIL 14, 1956

10 a. m.: Convocation: University auditorium.

Greetings: James G. Thomas, president of the Law Alumni Association; Thomas S. Edmonds, president of Illinois State Bar Association; E. Smythe Gambrell, president of American Bar Association; Maurice T. Van Hecke, president of Association of American Law School; Harry B. Hershey, chief justice of Supreme Court of Illinois; William G. Stratton, Governor of Illinois.

Convocation address: Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States.

Conferring of honorary degrees.

12:15 p. m.: The dedication: Procession to the law building.

Presentation of the building: Herbert B. Megran, president of the board of trustees.

Acceptance of the building: Albert J. Harno, dean of the college of law.

The Reluctant Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert in the RECORD an editorial of April 16 commending President Eisenhower on vetoing the grab-bag farm bill. It is reassuring and heartening to note the logic of this editorial coming from a paper that certainly is not politically motivated:

THE RELUCTANT VETO

President Eisenhower has done the right thing in coupling his veto of the grab-bag farm bill with a plan to improve farm income through administrative action and with a plea for prompt repassage of the soil bank. Obviously the Chief Executive did not reach a decision involving such turbulent political implications without a great deal of soul-searching. The farm income slump is serious, and it could easily affect the remainder of the economy. There were strong inducements for Mr. Eisenhower to wink at fixed 90-percent price supports and other obnoxious portions of the bill in order to obtain approval of the soil bank and assist farm income. Nevertheless, as he said yesterday, "because the good features of the bill are combined with so much that would be detrimental to farmers' welfare, to sign it would be to retreat rather than advance toward a brighter future for our farm families."

We cannot help feeling that the President's courage in sticking to principle will win him more respect than he would have obtained by yielding to expediency, particularly since he shows full awareness of the farm plight. His message makes clear his feeling that a reversion to 90-percent supports, in company with a mischievous dual parity system and mandatory support for feed grains, would have aggravated that plight in the long run. Many Members of Congress who voted for the omnibus bill out of desperation must recognize this. Certainly it is wise for the administration to take positive steps to alleviate the farm income squeeze. There will be considerable reassurance in Mr. Eisenhower's announcement that basic crops will be supported at a level of at least 82½ percent of parity in 1956, that the dairy support level will be increased and that $400 million will be available in the next fiscal year for support of perishables. Two-dollar wheat and $1.50 corn, which the President promises, are above present average prices. These guaranties are a sensible exercise of the discretionary powers under the 1954 act and do not involve writing higher mandatory supports into law.

At the same time it is well to recognize that such administrative measures for relief are a stopgap which does not get at the basic causes of depressed prices. The soil bank is one constructive means of removing lands from production so that the accumulation of surpluses may be reduced. It is a noncontroversial plan, and one which we hope Congress will consider again promptly and without vindictiveness. Mr. Eisenhower has sidestepped what added up to a political effort to put him on the spot with a bill which contained measures that legislators knew he would find unacceptable; he has taken steps to improve the farm income situation and has appealed soberly for passage of an unadorned soil bank that could come into operation in time to affect fall crops. We trust that this time Congress will forego the temptations of election year politics to permit a start on the sort of approach that will help relieve rather than complicate the agricultural dilemma.

Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT D. HARRISON
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the information department of the American Farm Bureau Association:

CHICAGO, ILL., April 16.—The American Farm Bureau Federation Executive Committee, meeting in Chicago today, declared that President Eisenhower's veto of the Omnibus Farm Bill provides Congress another opportunity at this session to adopt sound farm legislation.

The executive committee said:

"President Eisenhower's action in vetoing the farm bill is based on sound economic principles. Farmers recognize and resent obvious efforts to make farm program legislation a political football.

"Congress still has the opportunity and responsibility to adopt a workable farm bill that will carry out the objectives of adjusting production to market demand and of expanding markets at home and abroad.

"Farmers need a sound soil bank plan, free of counteracting production-stimulating provisions.

"This farm bill would have marked a return to the price-fixing policies that have played a major part in creating price-depressing surpluses. It would have made more difficult the expansion of markets for farm products in the United States and in foreign countries.

"Among the most objectionable features contained in the bill are: (1) Continuation of fixed 90 percent price supports, (2) double standard method of computing parity prices, (3) the mandatory three-price domestic dumping plan for wheat.

"Instead of helping farmers to get a high net income for their products, these provisions nullified other parts of the bill that might have helped adjust agricultural production to effective market demand. Farmers' incomes will not be in balance with the rest of the economy unless and until farm surpluses are removed and current production is in line with current demand.

"A principal objective of the soil bank is to shrink the overexpanded agricultural plant. In contrast this bill would have encouraged production of wasteful and market-breaking surpluses.

"The provision to dump wheat domestically would have adversely affected the price of all feed grains, as well as cattle, hogs, sheep, dairy and poultry products. This would have aggravated an already serious situation in this regard.

"Likewise, the multiple price plans might have caused widespread retaliation by other countries, loss of foreign markets, and created interntional ill will.

"To repeat and compound these errors would have foredoomed the opportunity to deal successfully with these problems in the future.

"In addition to income-depressing surpluses, farmers are confronted with increased costs of production, increased distribution charges and some loss of markets. There is a pressing need for vigorous efforts in all four of these fields of activity."

The executive committee of the federation is composed of Charles B. Shuman, president; Walter Randolph, vice president, Montgomery, Ala.; and board members—Herbert W. Voorhees, president of the New Jersey Farm Bureau, Trenton, N. J.; Hassil Schenck, president, Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind.; George H. Wilson, Clarksburg, Calif.; and R. Flake Shaw, executive vice president, North Carolina Farm Bureau Federation, Greensboro, N. C.

The federation has a membership of 1,600,000 farm families in 48 States and Puerto Rico and is by far the largest general farm organization in the Nation.

Letter to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, on last Monday forenoon, April 16, about 2 hours before I learned the President had vetoed the farm bill, I delivered to him by special messenger, the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 16, 1956.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am quite certain you will remember all that took place during the fall of 1952, when at your request, the writer was called to Denver, Colo., to debate the 90 percent of parity question vs. flexible parity with a member of the American Farm Bureau Federation in your presence. I need not remind you of your decision and of the outcome of that debate, but will only

say it was most gratifying to a great majority of our farmers, and was reflected in the election of 1952. Hence, as a humble Representative of the American people, I feel dutybound to again speak out on this subject which is of such great importance to every American, as well as to our farmers.

I sincerely hope you will sign the farm bill because:

1. The farmer's dollar is now worth only 80 cents at the counter, which our American economy cannot long endure.

2. The 90 percent of parity provision would immediately raise farmer income, hence their purchasing power and in turn would benefit industries and labor, now and over the long pull.

3. When the American farmer dollar buys 100 cents worth at the counter, he buys over twice as many dollar's worth of processed and manufactured goods on an average than do other Americans per capita.

4. Most everyone favors the soil bank provision, for obvious reasons.

5. The bill embodies about 90 percent of your own nine point farm program, both in principle and purpose.

6. The American people are today spending on an average of less than 24 percent of their income for food, which is less than at any time in our history, except when a number of foods were subsidized during World War II. We must weigh a slight price increase in finished goods against millions of jobs now in jeopardy.

7. When the threat of lower prices of raw products is eliminated, then the thousands of processors and manufacturers of raw products will know they can safely purchase a year's supply of their raw products needs (amounting to billions of dollars annually) without financial loss if the parity provisions now in the bill are maintained. For the past 3 years they have been buying from hand to mouth, either from the producer or from the Government surpluses, due to the threat of lower raw product prices under the flexible parity proposal, which is the primary cause for the piling up of surpluses in Government warehouses and grain bins, instead of being purchased and stored by private processors and manufacturers, as should be, and will be if the parity support provisions in the farm bill are made law by your signature.

Therefore, I plead with you to sign the farm bill.

Respectfully,

BEN F. JENSEN.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I say that I yield to no man in the high regard and respect I hold for our great President, but I, too, have a duty to perform and a conscience to satisfy and live with by voting my honest convictions on every question which comes before Congress, including this veto message. For these reasons and for the reasons set out in my letter of April 16 to the President, I cannot find it in my heart to sustain the President's veto of the farm bill.

Some Aspects of Law in the Atomic Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on April 16, the northeastern regional meeting of the American Bar Association asked me to discuss some aspects of law in the atomic age.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of that address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME ASPECTS OF LAW IN THE ATOMIC AGE

(Address of Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico)

I appreciate the opportunity to talk this morning to you members of the bar. It is hardly a unique experience for me as a layman to address a group of lawyers. Well over one-half of the Members of the United States Senate are members of the legal profession and I find occasion to talk with and to them at times. My task this morning, however, does present a novel opportunity, for I plan to discuss with you some of the problems which as lawyers you will face in the atomic age. I will be pleased if at the conclusion of my remarks you are convinced that a man cannot live for a lifetime as a business man, farmer, and public official without absorbing portions of the learned advice of his counsel.

Until the passage of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the interest of the organized bar in the development of the Nation's atomic energy program was almost nonexistent. With a few notable exceptions the legal profession gave scant attention to this most important matter, and the contributions which lawyers customarily make to public affairs here lagged behind that which accompanied other current developments. That atomic energy prior to 1954 had a limited impact upon the law is understandable in the light of the conditions of the predominantly Government-financed operations which then existed. Only the patent bar to a limited extent and the lawyers for the Atomic Energy Commission and its principal contractors had a real professional interest in the subject.

This is not the situation today. The 1954 act opened the door to private initiative and set the framework for the development of a complex atomic energy industry. Lawyers can no longer remain detached or aloof, and it is not surprising to find the bar now playing an interested and substantial role in the growth of the country's program for the peaceful uses of atomic energy. Thus, the American Bar Association now has a special committee on atomic energy, and at its last annual meeting received some one-half dozen papers dealing with atomic-energy matters. The organized bar associations of the cities of New York and Chicago have have active committees on atomic energy law. The Federal Bar Association last fall conducted a 2-day briefing session in Washington on atomic energy, attended to capacity by lawyers from all sections of the country. Leading law schools now conduct seminars on legal problems in atomic energy. The Bar Journals and Law Reviews contain an increasing number of articles on the subject. The current issue of Duke University's Law and Contemporary Problems is devoted entirely to legal problems in the development of atomic power. I have been informed that a forthcoming issue of the Texas Law Journal will also be devoted entirely to the subject.

Various approaches have been taken toward the subject of atomic energy and its legal problems. One extreme has been that atomic energy has brought about a strange "brave new world" with an entirely different set of problems than exist in any other field, and given rise to a separate body of atomic energy law capable of being understood only by an esoteric group of specialists. The other extreme is that atomic energy problems are no different from any others and can be dealt with accordingly under traditional patterns.

I prefer a middle course which recognizes pragmatically that there are some unique aspects present, but also recognizes the feasibility of applying and adapting traditional doctrine to these new situations. Thus, we may hope to approach the peaceful uses of atomic energy in the pattern of normal private enterprise, recognizing that there will be unique aspects in this field which give rise to an active role by the Government.

The uniqueness of atomic energy lies in its nature and in its sources in uranium and thorium metals. Here is a new natural resource of substantial proportions, capable of destruction in devastating proportions, but capable also of achieving the more abundant life for all mankind.

For reasons of national defense, the development of this resource became a national monopoly for bomb-production purposes. Federal ownership of fissionable material (or special nuclear material as it is now known) has been continued under the Atomic Energy Acts of 1946 and 1954 because of security and other considerations. Legally, therefore, we are dealing with a resource which is Government property. And I can assure you that the accountability for this material even transcends that to which normal Government-issued property is subject.

Seriously though, we are dealing with more problems than that of Government property in the narrow sense. We are dealing with a Government-owned, contractor-operated industry of very large proportions. We are also dealing with a parallel-growing, privately financed industry which will operate under Government regulation. At the present time we are in a transition stage with the Government acting as a proprietor, promoter, and regulator.

The legal problems of atomic energy stem from these Government roles. I want to emphasize this morning the newer problems under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, particularly in the privately financed development of atomic energy.

However, I would stress that a very substantial part of the atomic industry is still Government financed. The big money is still being expended here. From a legal standpoint, there are a number of unique problems in this neglected field of the law. We have a new institution called a "Government Prime Contractor" whose operations are a sort of hybrid between private industry and direct Government operations. We have rather unique types of contractual arrangements with these prime contractors and subcontractors that do not fit standard forms. But more of that some other time.

Of primary concern to the lawyer is the fact that privately financed atomic energy activity is a regulated business—necessarily so because of two principal characteristics: first, the potential hazard to public health and safety which is involved, and, second, the presence of a paramount concern for the interests of the common defense and security. The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 provides the broad outline of a plan for the control of essential materials and facilities. In general, the control scheme adopted has two main features: (1) A system of licensing which permits a review of proposed activities and the imposition of such conditions as may be deemed necessary, and (2) continuing supervision of a licensee through the conditions and terms included in the license, through rules and regulations, through inspections, and through reports.

Under the broad statutory power which it has over materials and facilities, the Atomic Energy Commission has issued a series of regulations and standards dealing with the detailed health, safety, and security aspects of the atomic energy business and with the rules of practice and procedure for those

who seek Commission action or who are subjected to Commission orders. Students of constitutional and administrative law are familiar with the legislative technique of delegating to an administrative agency the authority to prescribe the standards of a uniform regulatory scheme, when the field requires special knowledge, or the hand of an expert, but leaving that flexibility which is necessary or desirable.

There is nothing unique in this application of the general rules and principles of administrative law in the field of atomic energy. However, the atomic energy lawyer must be familiar, not only with the statute and the rules and regulations, but must also acquire, for complete understanding, knowledge of the technical implications which are involved. This, in turn, may require the acquisition of a new and somewhat strange vocabulary.

Another field of interest to the lawyer is that associated with international trade in atomic energy goods and services. American industry, with the lead given by the Manhattan project in the war years and by the Government's research and development program since then, should enjoy a competitive advantage in the world's atomic market place. This is particularly true with respect to the manufacturers of reactors, reactor components, high-level radiation sources, control devices, and instruments of all sorts. It is also true of architect-engineers and others who may be employed to perform consulting services for foreign countries or their nationals.

Here the lawyer will need more than an acquaintance with the rules of international trade generally. To serve his client well, he will need in addition a knowledge and understanding of the United States program for cooperative assistance with the free world in atomic energy matters. Among other things, this will involve knowledge of the bilateral agreements for cooperation which we have with other nations, the substance of their provisions, and the limitations which are imposed in the interest of the common defense and security. It will require an understanding of the important matter of supplying fuel for foreign reactors, the allocations which have been made, the policy and procedures which are applicable, and the type of private international arrangements permitted. Comprehension of these matters cannot be acquired through the traditional sources of law but must be derived through a selective use of nonlegal materials.

Particularly apt for discussion in the city of Hartford and of special interest to me as an insurance man are the problems of legal liability and insurance.

The basic device used in the production of atomic energy—a nuclear reactor—is potentially a dangerous instrument. The major hazard involved is not heat or blast, as commonly assumed, but radiation emanating from the highly radioactive fission products accumulated within the reactor as waste during periods of operation. These fission products are more toxic than any substance heretofore known, and more insidious. They can neither be seen nor felt. Exposure beyond tolerable limits may bring no sensual reaction, and it could be some time before the effects of exposure become apparent.

A major reactor accident could result in the release of large quantities of these fission products into the atmosphere, contaminating a wide geographic area.

Widely publicized statements describing the theoretical effects of a major reactor incident in graphic terms have contributed greatly to the fears and doubts of the public and of potential members of the atomic energy industry. It must be carefully noted that these statements are designed primarily to plead the cause of care and caution in atomic energy activities. Proper perspective must be given to the theoretical data presented and the conclusions reached. At the present time it seems reasonably certain that inherently safe reactors can be designed and constructed. Engineering data assures the essential integrity of containment, or the placing of reactors in protective, gas-tight envelopes. Constant and extensive research in reactor safety and radiation protection has provided a basis for increased understanding of the problems involved and for the development of standards and health-safety regulations. The published operating history of 25 reactors in the United States over a period in excess of 12 years shows no accidents involving radiation injury sufficiently serious to cause lost time of personnel during 606,686 operating hours and 17,799,000 man-hours.

Nevertheless, in spite of this remarkable safety record, the catastrophic incident remains a possibility. Regardless of design, location, or isolation, there is no such thing as an absolutely safe nuclear reactor—just as there is no such thing as an absolutely safe chemical plant or ore refinery. There is always present a finite possibility of the occurrence of an event, or series of events, the result of which would be the release of unsafe quantities of radioactive material to the surrounding area. What is frightening about this possibility, however remote it may be, is that the potential damage—the maximum conceivable damage—which can be caused by such an accident is far greater than that which can result from other industrial accidents.

Questions of legal liability and insurance thus are of immediate and significant interest to the growing atomic energy industry and its lawyers. The latter also foresee that it is inevitable that nuclear accidents will give rise to unique legal problems involving statutes of limitation, workmen's compensation procedures, techniques of proof and the introduction of evidence, the conflict of laws, Federal-State relations, and other conceivable technical questions.

The rules of legal liability are a matter of concern not only to the future owner and operator of a reactor but also to the manufacturer and supplier of component parts and to the architect-engineer who may be responsible for the design of a reactor and the supervision of its construction.

The owner and operator is faced with the possibility of being held liable for damages caused by a reactor accident without regard to the question of negligence because of the alleged ultrahazardous activity involved. The manufacturer of reactor parts and equipment, cognizant of Justice Cardozo's famous opinion in *MacPherson* v. *Buick Co.*, and faced with a likely application of the doctrine of strict liability, must assess his potential liability in terms of every project for which he has manufactured and supplied parts and equipment. Under recent cases, the same appears true of the architect or design engineer.

The only way in which all segments of the industry can protect themselves, in the absence of prohibitive indemnity clauses in commercial contracts, is through insurance. The availability of such insurance in adequate amounts remains a major problem in the effort to develop a private atomic energy industry, and is held by many to be a serious deterrent to large-scale nuclear enterprises.

Under the 1946 act, the atomic-energy program was financed almost wholly from public funds. Accordingly, the Government assumed directly all risk of loss under its general policy of self-insurance on Government property and through indemnity provisions in contracts covering third-party liability. As a result, the private insurors of the country had only a limited knowledge of the hazards involved in atomic-energy activities, no real basis upon which to evaluate those hazards, and no need to develop and make available private coverage in the field.

It is a great credit to the insurance industry that it has recognized a public responsibility in the premises and has indicated, in the short time that has been available, its readiness to provide liability insurance covering nuclear activities in unprecedented amounts. I have no hesitation in saying that the work of the insurance study group has been one of the most encouraging indications of the willingness of private enterprise to be self-sufficient in atomic-energy affairs.

However, in spite of the $65 million, third-party-liability coverage which the private insurors have indicated they will offer, the atomic-energy industry—almost unanimously—has indicated a reluctance to proceed without assurance that they will be financially protected to the full extent of their potential liability. This may be beyond the combined capacity of the insurance industry. This poses a very serious problem. The unwillingness of the industry to get on with the job without open-ended coverage is a serious and immediate threat to the public interest in the rapid development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy and raises a question concerning participation by the Federal Government in the insurance problem and in the reactor program generally.

No one is very happy over the prospect of the Government entering the atomic-energy insurance field. Yet the Government does have a basic responsibility to do everything possible to develop an atomic-energy industry as rapidly as possible and, at the same time, to make certain that in the course of such development a risk of unprecedented loss is not thrust upon the public without adequate provision for relief. It would seem, therefore, that if the reluctance of the atomic-energy industry is well-founded, this Nation may face this alternative: either some form of Government assistance must be provided in the insurance field, or the Congress may decide to proceed with Government-financed reactors under normal-indemnity provisions covering third-party liability in order to keep the program rolling. That problem now faces the Atomic Energy Commission and the Congress, and insofar as it is the burden of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, we intend to determine our policy as promptly as we can.

Several bills have been introduced in the present session of the Congress in an attempt to meet the problem, and recently the joint committe held an executive seminar to hear the views of both the atomic energy industry and the insurers. This proved to be a very valuable experience, and the committee is considering holding open hearings on the insurance problem in the near future.

I should point out at this point that the recent survey made by a committee of distinguished public citizens, known as the McKinney Panel on the Impact of Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, concluded that the time had not arrived to consider the need for a Federal atomic insurance program covering peaceful uses. Rather, the panel suggested that the efforts of private insurance companies to deal with the problem should be encouraged, and expressed the opinion that at least 2 and possibly 3 years remain in which to conduct research and accumulate knowledge and experience before any substantial private activity would be delayed or stopped because of the inability to obtain adequate insurance. The panel concluded that a Federal atomic insurance program constituted a threat to private atomic enterprise, not a benefit. It is, the report states, "a last resort not yet called for and one which may not be needed." I would hope that the forthcoming hearings will thoroughly explore the entire field of insurance and test the soundness of the panel's conclusions.

In addition to questions of liability and insurance, the nature of the hazards con-

nected with atomic energy work suggest the possibility of other legal problems.

Consider the question of the statutes of limitation which require the commencement of an action for damages within a prescribed number of years after the cause of action occurs. In most jurisdictions, the period of limitation begins to run from the date of the alleged wrong—in the case of radiation injury, from the date of exposure. But, as I have pointed out, the insidious nature of radiation is such that the fact of overexposure and its effects may not be manifest for many years. By that time, the statutory period may have expired and the cause of action barred. This seems to me a legal problem which will require careful thought in the interest of preserving the rightful claims of the general public. Some modification of the statutes is indicated in order to extend the period of limitations in actions for damages caused by radiation, or to recognize that actions involving radiation injuries present a special case of public policy which outweighs the general desirability of requiring that lawsuits be brought to trial with a minimum of delay.

Similar problems are presented in the field of workmen's compensation in connection with the general requirement that notice of a compensable injury be given the employer within a short time after its occurrence and that claims for compensation be made within a limited period after the injury or disability becomes apparent. It seems certain that a reconsideration of local workmen's compensation laws by State legislatures will be necessary unless the atomic energy worker is to be severely penalized. Indeed, many of the legislatures and industrial commissions now have the problem under consideration.

I have previously referred to the wide geographic area which quite possibly could be affected in the event of a major nuclear accident. This may include at least two adjacent States. In such case, there will be a problem in what lawyers call the conflict of laws: What law will govern in the event of a so-called "interstate tort"—the law of the State where the radioactivity was released or the jurisdiction where the exposure took place? It is obvious that legal imagination and boldness will be required in solving unusual questions such as this.

Let me give you a few legal brain twisters:

1. How do you prove or disprove negligence in the atomic-energy industry if the operations are shrouded in secrecy?

2. If radiation damage appears, how do you prove which of several possible radiations caused the damage?

3. If radiation damage appears after a long period of time and you can prove where the damage came from, how do you collect if the organization responsible is not longer in business?

4. If radiation causes damage to the genes in a parent, to whom does the right of action belong—the parent or the deformed child?

5. If it takes an Einstein to understand the theory of relativity, how can a jury decide whether a reactor is run negligently or carefully.

In this brief time, I have tried to outline for you what I believe to be some of the legal problems which will exist in the transition period of the atomic age. That some of the problems will be unusual or unique is apparent, and their solution will require legal pioneering of a high order. This, however, is a common experience attending the growth of any new industry, particularly when it widely affects the activities and conduct of the general public and is dependent upon continuing technological advance. In addition to the unusual problems, there will be the everyday, run-of-the-mill questions of adaptation to these circumstances. This will require high standards of craftsmanship. The history of the legal profession has been a dynamic one, and I am confident that the lawyers of the Nation are capable of meeting any challenge which may be presented by this new scientific and industrial force—the energy of the atom.

Cotton Cannot Go It Alone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] at the annual meeting of the Western Cotton Shippers Association, in El Paso, Tex., on April 12, 1956. This is one of the greatest agricultural speeches which has ever been delivered.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COTTON CANNOT GO IT ALONE

(Address by Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico)

This is a difficult time to be talking about farm problems and particularly about cotton. The Senate took weeks to pass a farm bill. About a year ago the House of Representatives passed a farm bill also. The two bills were far apart. Now the conferees have spent two weeks trying to bring them together into something that will receive Presidential action. You will notice I did not say will receive Presidential approval. I have not been able to determine accurately for myself whether the program was to produce a bill that the President would veto in the hope that some slight political value may result, or whether it was planned to work out a bill that the President could sign.

Today I want to review what the Senate tried to put into its farm bill and what has happened in the cotton picture which seems to make the action taken by the Senate the proper one for the industry as well as for the country.

We had long hearings on the new farm legislation. I commend the Senator from Louisiana, Mr. ELLENDER, for traveling across this country trying to find out what the farmers wanted. After I studied the hearings I became convinced that farmers were not unanimous in what they wanted. In one part of the country there seemed to be quite a bit of approval for a program of flexible price supports. In other parts of the country the committee was assured that farmers would settle for nothing less than 90-percent rigid price supports. There was a good deal of testimony indicating that they would take 100 percent if pressed hard enough.

When the hearings were over, our committee tried to write a farm bill. We had before us all the suggestions that had been developed, boiled down to what the committee felt might be considered in a final bill.

When we came to our final votes, my first motion was to strike the price provisions from the bill on the theory that we should be seeking to shrink agricultural production, and that the soil bank which had been proposed by the President to do that, had a chance for early enactment, possibly as early as the middle of February. I thought we could then proceed to fight over the price question at our leisure. Further there was then in the bill a surplus disposal provision based upon a resolution which I had submitted the first day of the Congress, and I wanted to see it passed.

I have said repeatedly that there are two ways to help the American farmer. The first is to dispose of the burdensome surpluses which hang over the market and depress all agricultural prices—not only for cotton, corn, wheat, and rice, but for livestock as well. Therefore, I felt it necessary to make sure that the Secretary of Agriculture came back to the Congress within 30 days and reported what he was going to do to get rid of these surpluses. That resolution, in my opinion, could have been acted upon by the Senate Agriculture Committee in the first 2 weeks of the new session, and the Secretary would have been before us by the middle of February telling us how he proposed to get rid of surpluses. We could have either taken that medicine or we could have stirred up a new batch, but we could at least have been on our way. Now, 60 days later, we are in the process of trying to pass agricultural legislation which has, to be sure, a surplus disposal provision in it. It still requires the Secretary to report, but gives him 60 days from the date the bill is signed, if it is ever signed. In my opinion, that frees him from any responsibility whatever of coming before the Congress and telling us what he proposes to do.

That was important, because the very first thing that is going to be of interest to the cotton producers and the cotton shippers of this country is whether or not the Secretary intends to dispose of about five million bales of cotton per year in some sort of surplus-disposal program. If he does not, we will continue to accumulate oppressive stocks of cotton. If he does,, you will see cotton markets stiffen and cotton prices reflect the result of his program of stepped-up disposal.

The second problem is to bring our expanding agricultural production under control. Let me say to you that we now know enough about the production of cotton so that we have the technology to raise the average yield per acre across the United States on a harvested-acre basis to 700 pounds per acre. Do not cross off that figure too lightly. The average for 1950 and 1951 on a harvested-acre basis was a yield of 269 pounds; 1952 was 379 pounds; 1953 was 324 pounds; and 1955 was 416 pounds. We are on our way and 700 pounds per acre is not an impossible yield. Therefore, if we are to have high cotton production per acre we have to have some device to bring our expanding agriculture production under control. The soil bank, since it was first advocated by Henry Wallace in 1937 and as it was again advocated by President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson in 1956, is the best single device that can be used to bring about that result.

These then were the two things which I thought needed to be done first. Facing that situation, what did Senator EASTLAND, who was the leader in our cotton legislation this time, seek to do? In the first place, he wanted to see a large export program. He talked with the Secretary of Agriculture steadily and effectively, and the newspapers of February 29 carried a story that the Secretary of Agriculture would put all the Federal-owned surplus cotton on the world auction block effective August 1, and that in return for support of the administration's flexible price-support system he had offered Southern Senators a somewhat higher support price on cotton than they might otherwise have had in view of the large stocks we had on hand.

I was tremendously interested in the story, because I thought it was important to start moving cotton. The Secretary set the export goal as "somewhere in the neighborhood of 5 million bales a year as our share of the

world market." That was a very big step in the right direction. We were able to do other things if he could have an export program that moved 5 million bales of cotton.

What were those other things? First of all we put into the bill a provision that we would price cotton on average grades and staples rather than on Middling ⅞-inch. That on the face of it would reduce cotton prices a couple of pennies a pound. We had a long discussion of that in the committee. I took hard work on the part of Senator EASTLAND and me to bring about the adoption of that proposal. We felt that cotton was losing markets at home and abroad and that a reduction of 2 or 3 cents would be desirable. Senator EASTLAND took the position that he would be willing to accept this reduction in price if the Secretary in turn would not reduce the acreage for 1957 and 1958.

I want to comment on that because it is of real importance. If the Secretary used a planted-yield-per-acre basis for the last 5 years, he had the authority, under the law, to reduce cotton acreage to a 1957 allotment of 15,841,000 acres as against the 1956 allotment of 17,400,000 acres. If, however, he used the harvested yield per acre, he would find the average for the last 5 years to be 326 pounds per acre and that would give a 1957 allotment of 14,724,000 acres. I think the Secretary can use either the harvested yield or the planted yield as his yardstick. I think in view of the enormous cotton surplus he would be well advised if he used the harvested-yield basis. Therefore, the cotton economy of this country faced a shrink from 17,400,000 acres to 14,724,000 acres, which was too large.

Furthermore, the Secretary, under the flexible price support program, if he had so desired, could reduce the price level to a figure in the seventies instead of a figure in the eighties. It was indicated by the Secretary that he would be willing to hold the price level at about 86 or 87 percent of parity if Congress would change the provision on grades and staples to average from Middling ⅞-inch and would also be willing to freeze cotton acreage for 1957 and 1958 at 17,400,000 acres.

The effect of that program would have been substantial. It would have said that America was going into the business of regaining a fair share of what historically had been its part of the world export market. That did not mean to go all the way because at one time we had 50 percent of the world's export market—yes, at one time we had 60 percent. Recently we have been down to as low as 20 percent. But 5 million bales would be a reasonable share for the United States to have, and the Secretary could slowly have begun whittling away at the surplus. Meanwhile the price would have dropped a little bit so that cotton would have stayed in competition domestically and worldwide. All of that, I think, would have made a fairly well-rounded program.

However, it didn't work out that way. We were able to get the bill through the Senate with the provisions for average grades and for freezing the acreage still in the bill. But when it went to conference, the conferees took the sweet and rejected the bitter. They kept the provision which would freeze the acreage at 17,400,000 acres, but added to it 90 percent price supports, which means that American cotton will not move domestically as rapidly as it should, will in fact continue to lose its domestic markets to the synthetics, and will not move in world trade without subsidy. It meant, to put it bluntly, that we were going to produce cotton for the Treasury of the United States and sell it to the Commodity Credit Corporation in exchange for drafts on Uncle Sam. No greater damage could be done to the cotton farmer of America than to have that sort of philosophy prevail.

Therefore, my message today to you is that cotton can't go it alone. Cotton as it grows in the field in the United States is going to have to have some help from the Congress and from the trade if it does not face extinction. The supply in the United States for the current marketing season, 1955–56, has touched an all-time high of 25.7 million bales, higher than the previous record of 24.6 million bales in 1939–40. During the time that this huge stock was accumulating, cotton has had 90 percent price supports. As a matter of fact, due to the use of Middling ⅞ inch as the grade when the average growth was better than that, cotton has had about 94 or 95 percent price support and has enjoyed a more favorable position than most other crops. The result has been to price cotton out of the market at home and abroad.

The production of synthetic fibers has been increasing with great speed. It is only 15 years ago that 81 percent of the total fiber used in the United States was cotton, and only about 10 percent was rayon and other synthetics. In 1954 it had gone to 69 percent use of cotton and last year to 66 percent. Just how far do the so-called friends of the farmer want it to go? How far are the advocates of 90-percent price supports in the Congress of the United States willing to have rayon and other synthetics take over before we have a realistic approach to the cotton problem?

But we cannot consider only cotton at home. The production of cotton has been increasing all around the world. The only thing that has changed is that the United States has not been able to share in the new markets. Our exports have been gradually decreasing. They averaged 5.3 million bales from 1935 to 1939, but less than 4 million bales from 1950 to 1954, and dropped to 2.4 million bales in 1955. If we want to throw away our world markets, we can. But when we do we jeopardize cotton farming as an industry in the United States.

Cotton can't go it alone. It needs help from Congress, not only in its pricing but in its marketing. The Department of Agriculture, during the latter part of the year 1945 and early 1946, made a very intensive study of the need for research and marketing methods. Material that was accumulated filled a whole wall of filing cabinets in the Department of Agriculture. It took weeks to analyze the uses that were being made of cotton and the possibilities for research in cotton as well as other crops. After that long study, we sent to the Congress a research and marketing bill which was enacted into the Research and Marketing Act of 1946.

Just a few days ago, Senator CAPEHART proposed that we spend a hundred million dollars a year for agricultural research and facilities. I called his attention to the fact that the act of 1946 would have authorized $9½ million in 1947 but nothing was appropriated. It would have authorized $19 million in 1948 and $9 million was appropritaed. It would have authorized $48 million in 1950 and $19 million was appropriated. It would have authorized $61 million in 1951 and only a tiny fraction of that was appropriated. It would have authorized almost unlimited appropriations in every year since 1951 so that today under the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 we could be spending $100 million on research for agricultural commodities.

We saw in 1946 the problem that has now arisen in 1956. We saw that cotton was going to face competition from synthetics at home and abroad. We were trying hard to provide the necessary basic research so that cotton could find new markets. Instead of that, the cotton producers of this country have been denied their chance for a fair share of trade in this country and in other parts of the world. The great producers of synthetics can afford to take from their treasury millions of dollars each year for research. But farmers of this country can't spend it individually and they can't spent it collectively very well.

To be sure, the Supima cotton producers have done a good job in marketing and are on their way to a very creditable demonstration but over the country, generally speaking, no one can sign up the man who has a mule and a few acres of cotton to a fund promotion. Therefore, we have felt that the combined force of the Government might be able to do for all the farmers what a great industrial organization like DuPont might be able to do for its product. The very fact that these research and marketing appropriations have not been made shows that cotton and other commodities have not had the things to which they were entitled and I say to you that cotton can't go it alone. It needs help fighting through the right kind of research and marketing appropriations in the Bureau of the Budget and in appropriation bills before the Congress of the United States.

And now, some words more directly aimed at the western cotton shippers.

A most important factor in farming is what to do with the harvested products. In your membership, we assuredly have a trade group who are truly valuable in the marketing of harvested cotton. That great commodity of streaming white gold plays an important part in the commodity economy of the great Southwest and West.

I think that the cotton pricing structure of the merchandising system is the most sensitive merchandising operation of any I know. Price reactions or fluctuations occur, by reason of a multitude of variable circumstances. The recorded price changes, occurring by seconds during the market hours of your great cotton futures exchanges, are flashed in a matter of seconds to the four corners of the world—equaling the mechanism of a fine jeweled watch.

Members of your organization offer a complete worldwide marketing service. You buy the produced cotton right at the gin or warehouse and merchandise it out in quantities desired by the spinners worldwide. Your finance system is a marvel—your word is your bond—you make a verbal offer over the telephone for $10,000, or $100,000 worth of cotton, and many times no bilateral contract is ever signed, yet the seller never worries that there will be any hitch. Too, you phone the spinner and the same is true. Very few organizations have a record like that. I congratulate you for this.

Foreign consumption of synthetics today is equivalent to 8.9 million bales and domestic consumption is at the annual rate of 4.5 million bales. Those rates have grown rapidly and attention must be given to the vast inroads. The synthetic producers are a most aggressive group of people. The capacity for producing man-made fibers is increasing every year and new mills are scheduled to be built during this year that would permit the expanding of output to the equivalent of another 1 million bales of cotton.

I hope I can give you some good news. I think you as cotton handlers can make plans for a good business this coming season. I look for close to 9½ million bales, or better domestic consumption, and 4 million export, a total of 13½ million versus 11¼ million for this current season. You fellows should share in a greater percent of those increases than some of the other areas. Therefore, I would make plans for full steam ahead.

Some apprehension may exist that the present export plans would be unreasonable on the cotton trade in this area, but I would like to believe that you men have enough inventiveness to make up for some of the misgivings of the sales program. Surely the CCC, with its past experience in selling vast amounts of cotton to the trade, will be fair in its treatment, and not be so restrictive as

required in the recent 1-million-bale program. I think that the quality of the cotton favors you manifestly—your area has improved its quality to such a high level that you now have cotton as fine as is grown anywhere, worldwide, and a good product never is at the bottom of the totem pole. You have the finest of qualities; therefore, I have faith your cotton will move to the spinners where you have established its reputation.

Now let us take a closer look at the export situation. The production of cotton in other countries has been climbing steadily since the war, and this year rose to an all-time high of 25.3 million bales—an increase of 7.5 million bales over the 1934–38 level and 12.3 million bales over the 1946 level.

There is no denying that our price policy has been the most important single factor in encouraging this competition. There is no denying either that if the price policies of the past are continued that the United States will be completely out of the cotton-export business in a few years' time. This is not to say that price is the only factor. Some of the foreign countries are following policies of economic nationalism designed to encourage production of both cotton and rayon for self-sufficiency and to provide a means of earning foreign exchange. In such countries price is a secondary consideration, but, fortunately, this situation is not general. It is also true that the shortage of dollars has been, and still is, a factor limiting our exports, but the purchasing power of the rest of the world is improving every year, and the ability to finance imports is less of a factor. Also, the United States is continuing to provide special financing to aid countries in balance of payments difficulties through direct economic aid, sales of local currencies, loans, and the like.

The most important effect of the new export program will be to set a price for cotton that will remove the incentive for expansion of production of both cotton and rayon abroad. Once the fibers are produced we can assume they are going to be sold because other countries simply aren't in a position to hold their stocks off the market for long.

It is necessary that this price be low enough to discourage competing production, if we are to be successful in rebuilding our exports. At the same time the United States cannot afford to engage in price wars to the extent that we break the economies of friendly countries and thus create new economic, political, and even military problems and impair our international security objectives. Our sales will have to be orderly. We must recognize that our surpluses will have to be liquidated over a period of years.

The policy will have to be essentially long range in its nature. Unless some confidence is reestablished in cotton prices the foreign mills may be frightened away from cotton and encouraged to go more and more to the man-made fibers, the prices of which are relatively stable. At the present time the increased use of man-made fibers is coming largely through blending a portion of these fibers with cotton primarily in an effort to reduce the raw material cost. If cotton prices are lowered to a realistic level, and if there is a reasonable assurance that these prices will be fairly stable, I am confident that the use of these blends can be discouraged and that cotton can regain many of these markets. On the other hand, the uncertainty of price and of supply will make this objective very difficult indeed.

While the foreign market is the most important aspect of the cotton marketing problem at the moment, and while it undoubtedly offers a large opportunity for expansion given a reasonable export price policy, we cannot afford to take the domestic market for granted either. Although the cotton farmers of this country do not have to face the competition from foreign-grown cotton in the domestic market to any significant extent except in the field of extra long staples, the competition from man-made fibers in the domestic market is very real. At the present time the price advantage of rayon over cotton is from 5 to 9 cents per pound in the various end use markets. The quality improvements that have been made and are being made every day in the man-made fibers, tend to increase this competition. The uncertainty of the cotton prices is an additional factor that plays into the hands of our competitors in this market and encourages the mills to use the man-made fibers, prices of which are more stable.

Over the long range the price to which the cotton supports can be lowered must be geared to the cost of production. We must redouble our efforts in research and education to employ all of the resources which modern science can command to find new and improved ways of cultivating, harvesting, and merchandising cotton in order to cut these costs.

If we are successful in our efforts to reduce cost and if we develop a realistic long-range pricing policy, I have no doubt that cotton can and will be able to meet its competition and that our production can continue to expand.

At the same time, we cannot afford to neglect the opportunity for expanding consumption and stimulating the demand for cotton products on the part of the ultimate consumers. There is a real opportunity in this country and throughout the world to increase the use of cotton not only as a percentage of the total textile fibers consumed, but also by increasing the use of textiles by encouraging people to be better dressed and to make their homes more comfortable and more attractive. The programs in research and sales promotion that have been developed in this country have proved their effectiveness. These can and should be expanded. In the rest of the world the opportunity may be even greater. An addition of only 2 pounds of cotton per person per year—the equivalent of 1 pair of overalls or 1 bed sheet—in consumption in the free world would require an addition 6 million bales of cotton and would leave the average person in the free world consuming only one-fourth as much cotton as the average person in the United States. With the rapid increase in the standards of living around the world, the possibility of these objectives is improved. The increase in the population throughout the world is a further factor. I have no doubt that the demand for cotton can be increased, that the production of our farms can be increased, that the income of our cotton farmers and those who handle cotton can be protected and improved if we face the situation and have the courage and the imagination to adopt the policies that are necessary to maintain cotton in a strong competition position from the standpoint of price, quality, and sales effort.

Our Supima producers are setting a fine example of meeting the issues. They are matching the finer world-recognized qualities of the Egyptian cotton through research. They are setting aside $3 per bale for promotion. They have set their support levels at 75 percent of parity. That is what I call a forthright program designed to meet the situation head on. The Supima people who are our neighbors and friends have the cotton spotlight of the world on them. Washington was dazzled when they came forward not too long ago to sell their program. The spinners over the world, too, have taken special note, and the Egyptians are really watching.

The sales promotion of Supima, too, is moving with vigor. Just think, a small group of producers moving in breeding and developing in a few short years such an outstanding quality and now producing some 45,000 bales currently, with prospects of some 100,000 bales. Imagine what the results would be, if just half of the Cotton Belt would take on the same amount of vision, fire, and enthusiasm of the Supima growers. Let me tell you, we would be moving 15 million bales annually in a short 3 years. The cotton business would soon be out of the Government's hands and freedom of merchandising would be enjoyed to the fullest extent.

I want to close on that note of hope. God still helps those who help themselves. Cotton farmers, ginner and shippers will be in need of help unless all join to put King Cotton back on a throne by programs of courage and vision in which you may take the lead and in which, I hope, the Congress may give you effective support.

Texas Exports More Than Half of Gas Output

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an Associated Press article which appeared in the Dallas Times-Herald on Sunday, April 15, 1956.

This article sums up the facts on the natural-gas situation in Texas. It also cites the opinion of a leading student of the industry that Texas would receive much more for its gas if the gas were kept in the State and converted to petrochemicals.

These facts and figures are well worth the study of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXAS EXPORTS MORE THAN HALF OF GAS OUTPUT

HOUSTON, April 14.—Texas last year exported over 50 percent of the natural gas it placed on the market.

Twenty-eight companies moved a total of 2,416 billion cubic feet of gas out of the State.

Texas' 1955 output—48 percent of the Nation's production—was 5,740 billion cubic feet, of which 4,454 billion was marketed.

The Texas Railroad Commission reports the balance was used for pressure maintenance, repressuring, and cycling or was burned in the field for lack of a practical market outlet.

Of the 270 billion cubic feet of gas vented or burned in the field, 231 billion was casinghead gas produced coincidental with crude oil. Some 111,644 Texas oil wells produce casinghead gas. The commission prohibits venting unless there is no market outlet that would be practical economically. Numerous Texas oil wells are far removed from gas pipelines, construction of which would not be justified by the amount of gas produced.

Of the gas marketed, 3,869 billion cubic feet went to transmission lines, 432 billion was used as plant fuel and on the leases, and 152 billion went into the production of carbon black.

An oil editor this week suggested that Texas would receive greater return for its gas if it would keep more of its production at home.

Thomas C. Ponder, petro-chemicals editor for Petroleum Refiner, told an oil recovery conference at Texas A. & M. College that

unit value of natural gas increases 12½ times when used to make petrochemicals.

He said the increase is only 2½ times when used as fuel.

Ponder said Texas' exported gas last year had a value of $496 million.

"If that gas had been kept in the State and made into petrochemicals its value would have jumped to $6,200,000,000," he said.

Ponder said the average petrochemical sells for approximately 9½ cents a pound.

"In 1955 over 32 billion pounds of petrochemicals were produced and were sold for more than $3 billion," he said. "The average petrochemical requires about three-quarter cents worth of natural gas to manufacture. This is increasing the value of the gas 12½ times."

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by David Lawrence at a luncheon at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, in New York City, on April 16, 1956, on receiving the award for outstanding pro-American accomplishment, presented annually by the American Jewish League Against Communism.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the address is estimated to make 3⅔ pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $294.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY DAVID LAWRENCE AT THE WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, APRIL 16, 1956, ON RECEIVING THE AWARD FOR OUTSTANDING PRO-AMERICAN ACCOMPLISHMENT PRESENTED ANNUALLY BY THE AMERICAN JEWISH LEAGUE AGAINST COMMUNISM

We stand here today not as Protestants, Catholics or Jews, and not as Democrats or Republicans, but as Americans of all faiths and political beliefs.

We have come here to express our uncompromising opposition to communism in all its forms—Communist despotism which enslaves the individual, Communist imperialism which carries on wars across the world, Communist colonialism which keeps in bondage states once independent and free, and the Communist conspiracy in our midst, engineered, directed, and financed by our enemy, the government in Moscow.

But today I wish primarily to draw attention to Communist treason inside America.

All Americans ought to be against treason—and most of them are.

But there are some who do not understand the word "treason." They do not seem to realize why treason was singled out in the Constitution for special mention as the worst crime that can be committed against the United States. Those who do not understand the scope of the word "treason" fail also to perceive that the paragraph in our Constitution denouncing treason supercedes any claim to individual license. For if traitors should succeed in overthrowing our Government, then the Bill of Rights and the rest of the Constitution would become worthless.

In section 3 of article III of the Constitution, we find these words:

"Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort. No persons shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or on confession in open court.

"2. The Congress shall have power to declare the punishment of treason."

It will be noted that there are two clauses in the definition of treason itself—that which condemns treason as levying war and, separated by a comma, there is an alternative clause which defines treason as adhering to our enemies, and giving them aid and comfort.

Is there any doubt what is meant by adhering to our enemies?

And do we wait until treason has consummated its conspiracy and then try to punish traitors, or does the Congress have the right by law to adopt measures which will prevent the successful execution of plots of treason?

Our courts have given us a clear answer.

If was Judge Learned Hand of the United States Court of Appeals in this city, who on August 1, 1950, rendered a famous opinion that tells us what constitutional measures can be taken to avert treason. He wrote:

"The American Communist Party, of which the defendants are the controlling spirits, is a highly articulated, well contrived, far-spread organization, numbering thousands of adherents, rigidly and ruthlessly disciplined, many of whom are infused with a passionate utopian faith that is to redeem mankind. It has its founder, its apostles, its sacred texts—perhaps even its martyrs. It seeks converts far and wide by an extensive system of schooling, demanding of all an inflexible doctrinal orthodoxy. The violent capture of all existing governments is one article of the creed of that faith, which abjures the possibility of success by lawful means. That article, which is a commonplace among initiates, is a part of the homiletics for novitiates, although, so far as conveniently it can be, it is covered by an innocent terminology, designed to prevent its disclosure.

"Our democracy, like any other, must meet that faith and that creed on the merits, or it will perish; and we must not flinch at the challenge. Nevertheless, we may insist that the rules of the game be observed, and the rules confine the conflict to weapons drawn from the universe of discourse.

"The advocacy of violence may, or may not, fail; but in neither case can there be any right to use it. Revolutions are often right, but a right of revolution is a contradiction in terms, for a society which acknowledged it, could not stop at tolerating conspiracies to overthrow it, but must include their execution.

"The question before us, and the only one, is how long a government, having discovered such a conspiracy, must wait. When does the conspiracy become a present danger? The jury has found that the conspirators will strike as soon as success seems possible, and obviously, no one in his senses would strike sooner. Meanwhile they claim the constitutional privilege of going on indoctrinating their pupils, preparing increasing numbers to pledge themselves to the crusade, and awaiting the moment when we may be so far extended by foreign engagements, so far divided in counsel, or so far in industrial or financial straits, that the chance seems worth trying. That position presupposes that the amendment (in the Constitution) assures them freedom for all preparatory steps and in the end the choice of initiative, dependent upon that moment when they believe us, who must await the blow, to be worst prepared to receive it. * * *

"True, we must not forget our own faith, we must be sensitive to the dangers that lurk in any choice; but choose we must, and we shall be silly dupes if we forget that again and again in the past 30 years, just such preparations in other countries have aided to supplant existing governments, when the time was ripe. * * * We hold that it is a danger clear and present."

That is one of the greatest legal opinions rendered in our times. It warned us that we must not wait until a conspiracy has been effected before we take measures to protect ourselves.

This contingency is precisely what the Congress of the United States has had in mind in enacting during the last 15 years various laws on espionage and subversive activities.

But what has been the reaction to such legislation? Who has opposed it? Many misguided Americans who have not been able to see through the Communist conspiracy have been in the forefront, and many loyal Americans who have been duped by this conspiracy have opposed such legislation. They, of course, always vaguely say that they favor some sort of protection against disloyalty, but their general opposition to the principle involved is unmistakable.

It is our duty to make clear to those who have been deceived by Communist tactics that they unwittingly give aid and comfort to the enemy when they endeavor plainly to frustrate their own Government in its effort to protect itself against Communist treason.

What is the nature of the treason in our midst? I will read you a vivid description of treason in our times—treason within the last several years, treason as defined by the man who was commander in chief of our allied forces during World War II and later was called back to duty when the Communist menace became so clear to the nations of the world that they formed the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as a measure of defense against Communist aggression.

It was Dwight Eisenhower who, in October 1952, said to an audience in Wisconsin:

"I have come to Milwaukee tonight to talk with you about communism and freedom.

"These two plain words—we all know—bespeak two distinct worlds. They signify two titanic ideas, two ways of life, two totally irreconcilable beliefs in the nature and destiny of man.

"The one—freedom—knows man as a creature of God, blessed with a free and individual destiny, governed by eternal moral and natural laws. The second—communism—claims man to be an animal creature of the state, curses him for his stubborn instinct for independence, governs with a tyranny that makes its subjects wither away.

"These two ideas are as opposed as danger is to safety, as sickness is to health, as weakness to strength, as darkness to light.

"Great truths can, at times, be startlingly simple. This one is of that kind. It is so simple a truth that it seems almost too obvious, almost stale.

"But let not our memories be too short. Only a few years have passed since many moved among us who argued cunningly against this plain truth. Their speech was persuasive, and their vocabulary clever. Remember? It went like this: 'After all, while we stand for political democracy, they stand for economic democracy. Fundamentally, these are but two slightly different roads to the same goal. We both believe in freedom.'

"We all must remember that sophisticated lie. We will never forget it. For it partly poisoned two whole decades of our national life. It insinuated itself into our schools, our public forums, some of our news channels, some of our labor unions, and—most terrifyingly—into our Government itself.

"What did this penetration into Government mean? It meant contamination in come degree of virtually every department, every agency, every bureau, ever section of our Government. It meant a government by men whose very brains were confused by the opiate of this deceit. These men were

advisers in a foreign policy that—on one side of the world—weakly bowed before the triumph in China of Communists hailed as 'agrarian reformers.' On the other side of the world this policy condoned the surrender of whole nations to an implacable enemy whose appetite for conquest sharpened with every victory. This penetration meant a domestic policy whose tone was set by men who sneered and scoffed at warnings of the enemy infiltrating our most secret counsels.

"It meant—in its most ugly triumph—treason itself."

Those were the words of Dwight Eisenhower—and he went on to say:

"These years have, indeed, been a harrowing time in our history. It has been a time of both honest illusion and dishonest betrayal—both terribly costly. It has been a time that should have taught us, with cold finality, the truth about freedom and communism.

"Most of us, young or old, wise or naive, have learned. An important few have not. They have learned very little—and they admit nothing. They are men about whom there is nothing great except their vanity and their complacency. They are the proud prisoners of their own mistakes.

"Who are these men?

"They are those who cheered the blithe dismissal of the Alger Hiss case as 'a red herring.' They are those who applauded two weeks ago when an administration servant grandly declared that Communists in our national life were 'not very important,' and that we should not waste time chasing 'phantoms.' They are those who slapped their sides with laughter when the same man dismissed the quest for Communists in our Government as a kind of silly game being played in the Bureau of Wildlife and Fisheries.

"Do you think these fish stories, ghost stories, and animal stories are really very amusing? Such comedy touches do little to relieve the tragic knowledge that we have been for years the gullible victims of Communist espionage experts. These experts in treason have plundered us of secrets involving our highest diplomatic decisions, our atomic research. Tragically, we do not know how much more our security may have been jeopardized.

"This, I repeat, has been a calamity of immeasurable consequence. * * *

"You can never cure malignant growth just by a hearty bedside manner: I must be blunt, for this is a serious matter. I speak not as a partisan or as a candidate but simply as an American citizen—moved to honest anger by this persistent, gnawing threat of Communist treason in our national life. I know that millions of both parties today are moved to anger and to action. * * *

"Perhaps my deep concern is sharpened by personal experience and personal knowledge. I know what fifth columns can do to a free nation. I know the awful effectiveness of Fascist fifth columns before and during World War II. I know what Communist fifth columns have done in East Germany, in Poland, in Czechoslovakia, in East Austria, in Rumania, in Hungary and Bulgaria. At first hand I saw some of these nations struggling desperately to maintain their independence of the Kremlin. The name of Cardinal Mindszenty symbolizes all those gallant men and women who led that struggle and the bitter fate which overtook them.

"I know how close these fifth columns came, in postwar years, to forcing their way to power in some countries of Western Europe. And I know personally what alertness was required—both in our wartime operations and in our NATO planing—to guard against espionage. I learned that national secrets and national security can be guarded, and that there are ways to defeat the cleverest of spies—whether Nazi or Communist. * * *

"Armed with a clear and uncompromising respect for freedom, how then shall we defend it?

"To begin with: all of us—citizens, jurists, officials—must remember that the Bill of Rights contains no grant of privilege for a group of people to join together to destroy the Bill of Rights. A group—like the Communist conspiracy—dedicated to the ultimate destruction of all civil liberties cannot be allowed to claim civil liberties as its privileged sanctuary from which to carry on subversion of the Government.

"At the same time we have the right to call a spade a spade. That means, in every proved case, the right to call a Red a Red. The time is past when we can hide our heads in the sands of stubborn ignorance or spend our days in the leisurely indulgence of abstract argument.

"As we clear our own minds, we can go on letting others speak theirs. Our system entitles every political voice to be heard—but let each voice be named and counted. Let every political medicine be offered in freedom's market place, but let it be plainly labeled—especially if it is poison. Let every person or organization distributing political literature through the mails be made to disclose its source of funds and its membership. Let every organization affecting our political life be compelled to make public its finances, membership and affiliations. In short, let us use every legal resource to insure that all groups which enjoy the right to free speech extend that right to talking about themselves—plainly and publicly.

"Having done this, let us make one more fact plain: To work for the United States Government is a privilege, not a right. And it is the prerogative of the Government to set the strictest test upon the loyalty and the patriotism of those entrusted with our Nation's safety.

"Every official of Government must bear clear reponsibility for the loyalty and fitness of his own immediate subordinates. And every official of the Federal Government—on every level—must ever be ready to answer any question from appropriate sources touching upon his loyalty and devotion to the United States of America.

"If we add candor to our fidelity to freedom's principles, I sincerely believe our attack on the Communist threat will be well under way."

Now, does anybody think that, since that speech was made in 1952, the Communists have abandoned their efforts to penetrate America? Does any one think the goals of Communist infiltration are being sought with less vigor than before? The passage of the Communist Control Act by Congress just 19 months ago indicate that the menace has by no means been removed.

Perhaps the most up-to-date information that we have on the activities of the Communist Party and its stooges in the United States was given before a subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee on February 1, 1956, by the Director of the FBI, J. Edgar Hoover. The hearings were released for publication on the 20th of last month. In his testimony Mr. Hoover says in part:

"The membership of the Comunist Party at the present time is estimated to be 20,289. These are the so-called hard-core Communists of the country.

"There is no question from the investigations we have conducted that the party takes its orders and directions from Moscow. * * *

"The number of persons engaged in front activity has been estimated by Communist leaders themselves to outnumber the actual Communist Party membership by a ratio of 10 to 1, or better. * * *

"There is no question but that the Communist Party in this country is a fifth-column potential. The hard-core membership of the open party is aided by a reservoir of concealed members, the underground, which is engaged in such activities as colonization of strategic defense industries—supposedly being done on a secret basis. We have been able to keep abreast of those efforts and are aware of their activities in that field.

"They have utilized the Communist-front groups and the so-called pseudo liberals, as I am inclined to call them: Individuals who are not members of the Communist Party and who quite vociferously deny any sympathy with communism but who, through being duped by Communist contacts, espouse causes sponsored by the Communists.

"They oppose security programs and sponsor liberalizing security measures; they oppose urgently needed internal security measures; and they advance the theory that the menace of communism is a mere myth or hysteria.

"They contend that the Communist Party is a political party just like the Republican and Democratic Parties and not a conspiracy designed to overthrow the United States Government by force and violence. It has been held by courts that the Communist Party is dedicated to the overthrow of the United States by force and violence."

Now treason is not a matter of harboring abstract beliefs and keeping them secreted in one's mind. The so-called liberals have raised a smokescreen on that issue. They are trying to make the American people believe that many of us are seeking thought control or that we wish to interfere with the expression of unpopular beliefs. The so-called liberals ignore the fact that the late Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes of the Supreme Court of the United States told us that the right of free speech does not mean the right to shout "fire" in a crowded theater.

For there is no right to preach treason. There is no right to teach or advocate treason. Congress has specifically prohibited it. There is no right to hold a Government job and at the same time participate in any movement which constitutes an adherence to the cause of our enemies. Acts—not thoughts or beliefs—are the criteria.

The essential point is that our Government is not obligated to take any risk of acts of treason. Hence, the security regulations in our governmental departments are concerned with the prevention of criminal acts—acts that have been manifested all over the world by Communist imperialism, which uses infiltration as one of its principal weapons.

Congress has repeatedly used the phrase "Communist conspiracy" in the preamble to the many laws designed to protect the national security. The Communist Control Act of 1954 declares "that the Communist Party of the United States, although purportedly a political party, is in fact an instrumentality of a conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States" and that "its role as the agency of a hostile foreign power renders its existence a clear, present, and continuing danger to the security of the United States." For we are dealing with a plot organized, instigated, planned, directed, engineered by a foreign government which is our enemy.

Why do I use the word "enemy"? I have lately read a speech by an industrialist in this country who naively says we should not use the word "enemy" with respect to the Communist regime—it might offend them. Yet, please note that in the 1954 law Congress uses the phrase "a hostile foreign power" in referring to the Soviet Union.

Let us be realistic. We have already met the Communist imperialists on the battlefield. We lost more than 33,000 boys in Korea. Their mothers and fathers grieve for them today because they were the victims of the shells or the bullets, or the bayonets of the Communists of Soviet Russia.

As a matter of fact, we still are in a state of war with Communist China. Our armies in Korea are stationed on an armistice line with ammunition in their guns. Our armies are alert 24 hours a day as they face the possibility of sudden attack by the Chinese Communists. While we have a cease-fire agreement, we do not have a peace treaty.

Although for a little while the Communist government in Peiping disavowed responsibility and called the Chinese armies in Korea volunteers, this camouflage was later abandoned. We know now that the Communist regime in China made war upon the tens of thousands of American boys who had been drafted for military service.

And where did the bulk of the munitions come from to kill 33,000 of our boys and wound 103,000 of them in Korea?

The bullets, the munitions, the weapons came from Soviet Russia. The late Andrei Vishinsky, in a speech before the Political and Security Committee of the United Nations General Assembly in March 1953 confessed, admitted, conceded that the munitions of war had been supplied to the Red Chinese armies in North Korea by the Soviet Government.

To the discredit of the United Nations, it must be recalled that on hearing this statement, it took no punitive action in the Assembly.

The United Nations has had plenty of opportunity ever since to denounce the Soviet Government for its complicity in this crime of the century. But it has not done so.

Those of us who espoused the cause of the League of Nations in the 1920's, and those of us who were enthusiastic about the United Nations when it was founded in 1945, and those of us who still believe that the United Nations can be the greatest moral force for peace in this world that has ever been mobilized, are disappointed that the United Nations failed us at a crucial moment. It evidently did not possess the courage necessary to deal with reality and truth.

Precisely because the United Nations failed to denounce Soviet Russia and expel its gangster government from membership for its acts of treason to the United Nations, we are today being misled into believing that "peaceful coexistence" with such criminals is a practical possibility.

Why are we now involved in many international commitments around the globe to furnish military and economic aid? Only because the United Nations as an instrument of collective security has failed us. We have found it necessary to organize regional pacts and make regional commitments to assure our safety as against a common enemy.

For the enemies of peace today in the world are the Communist government in Moscow and the Communist government in Peiping.

Why do we not have a peace treaty in Korea today? I was in Geneva in May 1954, when the Four-Power Conference was held. Chou En-lai, Foreign Secretary of the Red China Government, in a formal address to the conference, denounced the United Nations when the United States proposed that a peace treaty that would unite Korea be drawn up under the auspices of the United Nations. Chou En-lai said a commission of neutrals—his kind of neutrals—should be appointed to negotiate, but the commission must not have any connection whatsoever with the United Nations. The position of Red China has not been modified since.

Yet we hear some well-meaning citizens in our ranks talking today about admitting Red China to a seat in the Security Council of the United Nations.

Of what avail will the United Nations be if it condones treason, if it takes its enemies to its bosom without the slightest sign of their repentance, if it allows conspirators to enter its councils and sit as equals alongside of free nations?

We are against the Communist imperialism of today because it has not divested itself of its cloak of treason in the society of nations.

We are against Communist imperialism today because it means despotic colonialism. For Communist colonialism has imposed slavery upon the peoples of Soviet Russian and upon the peoples of the satellite countries.

A true liberal is against tyranny everywhere. A true liberal is against enslavement. A true liberal is against imperialism and against every form of colonialism that means enslavement of the people.

There are among us those who misuse the word "liberal." Many who call themselves liberal are not liberals at all. There are men who have been deceived into believing that liberalism means the protection of the right of conspirators in our midst to advocate and to practice treason.

We who believe in freedom for all peoples, we who believe in the right of self-determination for all peoples, we who believe in the right of every individual to think as he pleases, would limit individual rights only by the superior right of all the people in a nation to be protected against conspirators—those who would by force or violence overthrow a free government or aid an enemy to conquer us.

Lately we have been hearing much about the Bill of Rights and due process. A whole cult has grown up in America which preaches that individual rights are unlimited, and that the general phrases of the Constitution can be ambiguously interpreted to protect traitors in our midst.

Let me read you here a brief extract from a speech made in the House of Commons less than a month ago by the Secretary of State for the Home Department of Great Britain, Major Lloyd-George—son of the former Prime Minister. He spoke on March 21 as follows:

"I should like to make three points in reply to those who may still feel that such measures are unnecesary. First, however distasteful were the measures which successive governments over the last few year have had to take, we cannot sit back and do nothing while our security is imperiled by a menace, the existence of which is accepted on all sides.

"Secondly, while some of our countermeasures, it is true, are alien to our liberal traditions, so is the menace which they set out to circumvent. That is a point that we must never forget. As my right honorable, friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer said in the November debate, communism has set progress back 3 centuries. We are now, thanks to Communist activities, back in the age when a man who holds this new creed thinks it loyal to be disloyal and has no scruple about betraying his own country. We are, therefore, driven into adopting steps which we take only because of protecting the liberal traditions that we in this country hold dear.

"Thirdly, while I do not for a moment underrate the hardship of those who, because they are adjudged to be the dupes of the Communist creed, are moved to other work or, if it is impossible to find nonsecret work for them, lose their appointments in the civil service, I should like to make one comment on that. Hard as their lot is, we can all make a shrewd guess as to what their lot would have been had they been employed in the civil service of a Communist power, and it had been discovered that they belonged to or sympathized with a movement holding views about communism analogous to those which Communists hold about democratic government."

Have some of us in America already forgotten the fifth columns in Western Europe prior to 1939? Have we forgotten already the traitors in recent years in America who abused our institutions and transmitted to other governments documents and secrets of great importance to them in guiding them in how to frustrate our policies in the world as well as in making atomic bombs?

The word "treason" does not mean merely the conveyance of information of a military character. Burgess and Maclean were intimately familiar with the diplomatic policies of the United States Government. They were able to inform the Communist Government because they had access to the inner councils of our Government by reason of the messages sent to our allies. Burgess and Maclean were able to asist the enemy in conducting their maneuvers in the cold war. There is every reason to believe, moreover, that Burgess and Maclean, in the fateful month of November 1950, were able to tell the Communists what was being discussed among the governments, particularly Great Britain, concerning the use of our maximum military power in Korea.

During that month of November important messages were being exchanged between our Government and the other governments which had military forces in Korea. It was important for the Communists to know whether we would apply maximum military power. They learned that our allies would not go along with us on that decision. Hence, the Chinese armies poured into North Korea, confident that their supply lines in the rear would not be bombed.

Burgess and Maclean now have appeared in Moscow. They have adhered to our enemies and given them aid and comfort. They are traitors to Great Britain and the entire Western cause. Burgess and Maclean sit in Soviet Russia today advising Bulganin and Khrushchev how to dupe the West—how to foster weakness and how to encourage the appeaser in our midst. Burgess and Maclean can tell them in detail what happened in November 1950.

There is no chapter in all our history more revealing of the weakness of free nations than what happened in the 5 months after our intervention in Korea in 1950—when the word went forth to our military commanders that they must not use all their weapons to defend themselves and that they must acquiesce in the murder of our boys rather than allow our own airplanes to bomb the supply lines which were bringing weapons of death to kill our troops.

We heard in 1950 and we have heard ever since the cry that the use of maximum power would have involved us in a third world war. None of us wanted a third world war in 1950 and we don't want one now, but the chances of becoming involved in a third world war have been immeasurably increased by our failure to win a clear-cut victory in Korea. It may be said that the failure there led to defeat in southeast Asia and open defiance of us today by Soviet Russia in the Middle East.

Do we have to reread the pages of history to learn that appeasement leads to war, that the real warmongers of today are the appeasers, that their lack of courage, their willingness to accept the blandishments of the enemy—anything to get peace, peace at any price—is increasing the danger to our country today and could conceivably drag us into a third world war?

It is, of course, in the nature of democracies to be restrained, to hesitate, to procrastinate, to do everything possible to prevent the outbreak of war. When we actually enter a war, there is no justification for any softness or cowardly hesitation.

I remember clearly the night of April 2, 1917, when I heard a President of the United States who had tried by every possible means to prevent war, saying to the Congress that the United States must "formally accept the status of belligerent" which had been thrust upon us.

Woodrow Wilson, during the war, called again and again for "force, force, to the utmost, force without stint or limit." The phrase, "force without stint," electrified America, for Mr. Wilson knew that, once we had decided to defend ourselves, there were no limitations we could impose upon our fighting men if we intended to act in good faith toward them.

When war does come—be it a little war or a big war—we must keep faith with those whom we are drafting for military service. We must tell the mothers and fathers of today that, when their sons get up to the battlefront, they're not going to be asked to take the bullets of the enemy and the bombs from airplanes without hitting back at the enemy's supply lines—just because some people back home speculate about a possible enlargement of the war.

We are today the victims of a strategy of terror. Again and again, public men talk loosely about the possibility that the whole human race will be destroyed by atomic weapons. There have been invented weapons of destruction which can wreak havoc on many places in the world, but the mere existence of terrible weapons that could be used against them has never prevented nations from defending themselves when attacked. The impression we are conveying today is that we will be afraid to defend ourselves if we are attacked by an unscrupulous enemy who uses nuclear weapons.

There comes a time when the risk must be calculated and when the risk must be taken. The big question is whether today, by means of the strategy of terror, we are being pressured into avoiding the taking of the risks that we should take to prevent world war III.

I do not mean to imply that this Nation should at any time initiate a war but, when attacked, we must recognize a state of war thrust upon us and defend ourselves.

It is pertinent to read here a passage from the Gathering Storm, a book by Sir Winston Churchill, which expresses that thought more clearly than anything I have read anywhere. Sir Winston was describing the events leading up to the outbreak of World War II in 1939. He wrote:

"In this sad tale of wrong judgments formed by well-meaning and capable people, we now reach our climax. That we should all have come to this pass makes those responsible, however honorable their motives, blameworthy before history.

"Look back and see what we had successively accepted or thrown away: a Germany rearmed in violation of a solemn treaty; air superiority or even air parity cast away; the Rhineland forcibly occupied and the Siegfried Line built or building; the Berlin-Rome Axis established; Austria devoured and digested by the Reich; Czechoslovakia deserted and ruined by the Munich pact; its fortress line in German hands; its mighty arsenal of Skoda henceforward making munitions for the German armies. President Roosevelt's effort to stabilize or bring to a head the European situation by the intervention of the United States waved aside with one hand, and Soviet Russia's undoubted willingness to join the Western powers and go all lengths to save Czechoslovakia ignored on the other; the services of 35 Czech divisions against the still unripened German army cast away, when Great Britain could herself supply only two to strengthen the front in France—all gone with the wind."

"And now, when every one of these aids and advantages has been squandered and thrown away, Great Britain advances, leading France by the hand, to guarantee the integrity of Poland—of that very Poland which with hyena appetite had only 6 months before joined in the pillage and destruction of the Czechoslovak State.

"There was sense in fighting for Czechoslovakia in 1938 when the German Army could scarcely put half a dozen trained divisions on the Western Front, when France with nearly 60 or 70 divisions could most certainly have rolled forward across the Rhine or into the Ruhr.

"But this had been judged unreasonable, rash, below the level of modern intellectual thought and morality. Yet now at last the 2 western democratcies declared themselves ready to stake their lives upon the territorial integrity of Poland.

"History, which we are told is mainly the record of the crimes, follies, and miseries of mankind, may be scoured and ransacked to find a parallel to this sudden and complete reversal of 5 or 6 years' policy of easy-going placatory appeasement, and its transformation almost overnight into a readiness to accept an obviously imminent war on far worse conditions and on the greatest scale.

"Moreover, how could we protect Poland and make good our guaranty? Only by declaring war upon Germany and attacking a stronger western wall and a more powerful German army than those from which we had recoiled in September, 1938.

"Here is a line of milestones to disaster. Here is a catalog of surrenders, at first when all was easy and later when things were harder, to the ever-growing German power. But now at last was the end of British and French submission. Here was decision at last, taken at the worst possible moment and on the least satisfactory ground, which must surely lead to the slaughter of tens of millions of people. Here was the righteous cause deliberately and with a refinement of inverted artistry committed to mortal battle after its assets and advantages had been so improvidently squandered.

"Still, if you will not fight for the right when you can easily win without bloodshed; if you will not fight when your victory will be sure and not too costly; you may come to the moment when you will have to fight with all the odds against you and only a precarious chance of survival.

"There may even be a worse case. You may have to fight when there is no hope of victory, because it is better to perish than live as slaves."

The appeasers of yesterday brought on World War II. Let not the appeasers of today force us into world war III. We must oppose communism in all its ugly forms—Communist aggression in so-called little wars around the globe, Communist colonialism in enslaved nations, Communist infiltration of the free governments of the world, Communist subversion of the institutions of democracies. For communism is the generator of war.

Iowans Are Cool to Veto Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to commend to the attention of the Senate a very able article that appeared in the New York Times this morning. It was written by Seth S. King, a reporter who has obviously taken the trouble to talk to the people who are most directly affected by farm legislation—the farmers themselves.

The outstanding impression gained from his article is that the veto message and the President's subsequent television address completely ignored the people most directly affected. Instead, they were aimed at other sections of our population.

Mr. President, the President's message did not get through to the Nation's farmers because it did not face up to their problems. Instead, it was designed to meet the problems of next November.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IOWANS ARE COOL TO VETO MESSAGE—MANY FEEL PRESIDENT DIDN'T GIVE ENOUGH DETAILS—SOME BACK ACTION ON FARM BILL

(By Seth S. King)

DES MOINES, IOWA., April 17.—Many Iowa farmers were disappointed today over the way President Eisenhower explained his veto of the farm bill.

Reaction to the veto itself was mixed. A number of persons said they were bitterly disappointed that the legislation had been killed. Nearly as many others said they thought the President had little choice in the matter because several provisions in the bill probably would have done more harm than good.

But many of those holding both views said that the President's presentation was not detailed enough for the farmer.

"It probably was all right as an explanation to city people, but he left too many questions unanswered," one said.

Another complaint was directed at the lack of details on the price increase programs the President said he was ordering.

Roswell Garst of Coon Rapids, one of Iowa's largest seed corn growers, said that the President had not made clear how the veto would prevent further crop surpluses if the Department of Agriculture was planning a new support for corn.

GREATER THAN EVER

"If the soil bank had gone through, we'd have made 300 acres on our farm idle," he said. "But now if corn, planted in excess of the allotments, is going to be supported, then the surplus will be greater than ever."

Ernest McNamara, who farms near Winterset, said he did not favor the farm bill.

"But I think his explanation was not very clear. He didn't explain what difference it would make if supports are going to be at 86 percent on corn instead of 90 percent. I think a lot of people around here would want to know."

A newspaper editor in northwest Iowa said several farmers had called him today to discuss the veto.

"They did not think the President called the farm bill a bad bill, but he really didn't make it clear why it was. As a Republican, that is the thing that worries me most. I was disappointed in the veto message and the radio and television explanation. That's been our party's problem out here. The party people in Washington just are not getting through to the farmers."

The same editor said the farmers in his area already were asking why the Department of Agriculture had waited so long to develop a soil bank program if it had been clear last year that one was needed.

STATION HAS OPINIONS

Radio station KICC at Spencer, in the heart of Iowa's richest farm land, invited farmers to call in last night and express their opinion, for use on the air, of the President's veto.

During the hour before the President's radio address was carried 29 called. Twelve were opposed to the veto, thirteen were for it and four were undecided.

In a half-hour period after the President had spoken 17 persons called the station. Nine were against the veto, four approved and four gave qualified opinions that were undecisive.

Some of the Midwestern reaction to the veto and the President's message was governed by the type of farming operation.

Wilbur Goodhue, who raises livestock and the crops to feed them on a farm near Carlyle, Iowa, said he approved of the President's plan for price supports for all corn.

"This sounds better than a lot of corn with no price floor under it," Mr. Goodhue said. "The allotments we now have are too rigid, and too many farmers won't comply. That would mean a lot of cheap corn produced, and cheap livestock would follow. But if there are supports under all corn, a lot of it will go into storage and there will be fewer hogs raised in Iowa because there will be less corn available. It won't help the surplus any, but it will probably help the livestock farmer some."

SOME CALL IT UNFAIR

But in the Spencer area, where most of the high-yield corn is sold commercially, some farmers thought the new support plan was unfair to them. They said they would have been satisfied with this year's allotments if price supports were raised to $1.50 a bushel, as the President announced. But they said if other farmers overplanted their allotments, the total corn produced would skyrocket and the open market would be further damaged.

In Kansas, the livestock raisers, who are becoming as numerous as wheat growers, were reported to be satisfied with the veto. The bill passed by Congress would have raised price supports on feed grains and would have increased their feed costs.

"But I'd guess that the eastern half of Kansas, where the big wheat farmers are, is plenty mad today," one observer said. "They thought they wanted the domestic parity plan in the bill passed by Congress. Even the President's home county of Dickinson around Abilene wired him to sign. They think they'd be left out."

In recent weeks Iowa's rainfall has been far below normal. The ground has been unfavorably dry during spring plowing.

One farmer expressed the thoughts of many other Iowa farmers when he said today: "I'd rather see some rain than either the farm bill or the veto."

The Farm Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two GTA daily radio roundups.

There being no objection, the roundups were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 4, 1956

Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association is the Nation's biggest grain-marketing cooperative. Its territory is the Midwest—Montana, the two Dakotas, and Minnesota. Each year more than 100 million bushels of grain flow from these States through the cooperative marketing channels operated by GTA. That's a quarter of all the grain that goes through the Minneapolis and Duluth Grain Exchanges.

No business grows that big—least of all a cooperative—unless it's got the know-how, the facilities to do the job, and the backing of its customers. GTA's got all three, and more to boot. Look at it this way: GTA has the welfare of its customers—the farmers—at heart. Because GTA is a cooperative, those customers are its owners. They determined long ago that GTA should do more than just market their grain. Run-of-the-mill buying and selling was not enough. They decided at the beginning that GTA should also be their voice in the legislative halls of the Nation and help fight their battle for fair incomes and decent living on the farm. That GTA is doing.

These farmers knew that co-ops content to meander quietly along the channels of commerce usually sink in the first storm. In the fullest meaning of cooperation, dealing in pins and prunes isn't the answer. The brutal truth about cooperation—and most farmers can vouch for this—is that it becomes larger and stronger the closer you get to it, and smaller and weaker the farther you get away from it.

And the moral for farmers in that is simply this: Stick by your co-ops. Patronize them. Attend their meetings. They are your businesses, so make them work. We heard one old farmer, a veteran cooperator, who had pioneered a number of co-ops and had gone through many bitter economic battles in his younger days, explain it this way: He said that farmers sometimes are beyond understanding. They seem to realize that it pays to belong to a co-op. There's nothing to pay in, and they get money back. They know that. But still they hang back, maybe just figuring that nothing can be that good.

But, then, somebody crosses them up—takes advantage of their rugged individualism. As the old farmer put it, "makes 'em buy at retail and sell at wholesale." Then, he says, you can't hold them back with a five-plow tractor. They build a co-op, no matter what time, trouble, or cost it takes.

Well, that's human nature. That's the way people are. There was no holding the farmers back when they set out to make GTA a working reality. Look at it now. Built in adversity, GTA has weathered good times and success without changing its original purpose—to get farmers a better living. Why don't you join up with GTA? It's easy. Just see that your grain goes to market GTA, the co-op way.

MONDAY, APRIL 16, 1956

What is a surplus? That's a good question, because it seems to be one thing when we are talking about agriculture and entirely another one when we are talking about manufactured goods. We want enough food to go around, but the Minneapolis Star editorial writer calls a 3-month supply of corn, and less than 1 year's supply of wheat, a surplus. All the food reserves held by the Government—and that includes food the Government owns outright, as well as food that it has loaned money on—are valued at about $8 billion to $10 billion, depending on who does the figuring.

This reserve is for everything accumulated and unsold over a long period of time—the whole kit and kaboodle. It is a big supply of food, worth a considerable sum of money. It is desirable to reduce the supply to a manageable reserve. No one quarrels with that desire—not, that is, when it is a careful and sensible reduction, planned with the welfare of farm people and the real requirements of the Nation taken into consideration.

But did you ever hear about the billions of dollars worth of manufactured surpluses that the Government owns? Do you know, for example, how big this surplus is now? Here's a statement from a publication called the Government Surplus Weekly. It prints only information about how to buy Government surpluses. The publication advertises: "Government surpluses—$10 billion—billions, not millions, but billions of dollars—$10 billion inventory—top quality. Thousands of items, all types of products—a clean sweep—your bid sets the price—bargains—savings up to 94 cents on the dollar."

Yet the newspapers and radio do not complain. Have you heard any indignant outburst from the price flexers in or out of Congress? Have you heard businessmen complain about these manufactured surpluses? Some may have, but if so, we've missed these complaints. It is all a part of the prosperity merry-go-round. The reason is suggested in the Government Surplus Weekly, which states: "The big money is in Government surplus. Bargains, profits galore in Government surplus. New, top-quality merchandise is being sold daily by hundreds of Government surplus-disposal agencies for only 6 percent to 15 percent of the original cost."

These are manufactured surpluses, turned out by factories. And according to the Government Surplus Weekly, "This business of surplus is a fast-growing permanent industry. This year's Government surplus sales will triple—yes, triple—last year's record-breaking sales." That's how a $10 billion inventory of Government surplus factory items—not farm supplies—are being sold for as little, often less, than 10 cents on the dollar.

So let's take a fresh new look at surpluses—not just farm supplies but all kinds of surpluses and decide what is best for the people. Let's have a policy from the Government that draws a line between abundance—which is a blessing we all enjoy—and surplus. That's a fine line to daw, but we've got to have it if consumers are to live with plenty and farmers are to be justly paid for their labor, management, and investment. This is GTA, the co-op way.

Solicitation of Proxies From Holders of Securities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me by J. Sinclair Armstrong, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, on the enforcement of the Securities Exchange Act, with particular reference to the controversy relating to the question of raiding as practiced in connection with the solicitation of proxies, about which we have heard so much recently.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN,
Washington, D. C., April 10, 1956.

The Honorable EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DIRKSEN: In your letter of February 6, 1956, you mention the question of raiding, presumably having in mind the Libby-McNeill & Libby proxy contest. You ask whether the Commission has taken any action or submitted any recommendations to Congress for amendment to existing law.

The problem with which the Securities and Exchange Commission is concerned involves the solicitation of proxies from holders of listed securities registered under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and listed on a national securities exchange for the election of directors, with respect to which the Com-

mission has jurisdiction under section 14 of the act.

The problem has been of major importance to the Commission in administering the Exchange Act in the past several years. There have been contests for representation on the board of directors and for control of corporations under the Commission's proxy jurisdiction numbering 22 in 1954, 17 in 1955 and 7 to date in the current 1956 proxy season. Some have aroused great interest, such as the contests for control of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., the New York Central Railroad Co., Montgomery Ward & Co., Libby-McNeill & Libby Co. and Fairbanks, Morse & Co.

These contests for control have been of great interest to the Congress. Senators and Congressmen have expressed interest individually and various committees of the Congress have been concerned. The subject was gone into extensively in the hearings held during the spring of 1955 by the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate. A good deal of data was furnished to the committee by the Securities and Exchange Commission, both as a basis for the committee's staff report (84th Cong., 1st sess., S. Rept. 1280, pp 141–142, July 30, 1955), and as direct testimony by our Chairman Ralph H. Demmler (hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency, U. S. Senate, 84th Cong., 1st sess., on factors affecting the buying and selling of equity securities, March 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, and 23, 1955, pp. 930, 931, 942, 943, 955, 956, 959, 960, 961, 978, and 979). In the committee's report dated May 26, 1955, the following recommendations appear:

"Proxy regulation: Section 14 of the Securities Exchange Act, which deals with the solicitation of proxies, simply provides that it shall be unlawful to do anything 'in contravention of such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors.' This blanket authorization to the Commission is the subject of rather comprehensive rules regarding the solicitation of proxies.

"Senator CAPEHART has introduced a bill (S. 879) which would require certain additional disclosures from persons seeking to control issues listed on a national securities exchange. This question, together with the whole subject of modern methods of corporate control, and effective corporate democracy through the exercise of the right to vote share in importance. A subcommittee under the chairmanship of Senator LEHMAN will shortly hold public hearings on these subjects."

Also I have recently testified on behalf of the Commission on this subject before the Subcommittee on Government Information of the Committee on Government Operations. (The printed transcript is not yet available.)

The Commission has not recommended any particular legislation. However, we have commented favorably on a bill, S. 879, introduced by Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART which would expand the statutory requirements for reporting their holdings by large stockholders, and on a bill S. 2054, introduced by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT which would extend our jurisdiction over the proxy soliciting of security holders of about 1,200 companies not presently under our jurisdiction as their securities, though enjoying wide public ownership and trading on the over-the-counter markets, are not registered or listed on a national securities exchange. No action on these bills has as yet been taken, however, by the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate. A counterpart, H. R. 7845, to Senator FULBRIGHT's bill has been introduced in the House of Representatives and is pending in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Our Commission expects to make further recommendations with respect to S. 2054 and H. R. 7845 within the next several weeks.

The Commission's enforcement responsibilities for violations of its proxy rules are exercised not by administrative proceedings within the Commission but rather by actions for injunctions in the Federal courts. In the Libby-McNeill & Libby case, we brought such a suit and were sustained by the courts, including the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit which rendered a fine opinion sustaining our powers under section 14 of the Exchange Act against attack on a number of legal grounds including the argument that our rules violate constitutional guarantees of freedom of speech and press. It was particularly pleasing to me to have this decision sustaining our rules against this challenge because of fears expressed in the press, which I believe have now been allayed, that the act of the Congress imposing standards of fairness and accuracy of disclosure with respect to certain corporate acts, such as proxy soliciting, in some way impinged on these traditional and deeply cherished constitutional liberties. I am enclosing a copy of our litigation press release on conclusion of the Libby case.

During the past 3 years, the Commission has been actively engaged in administering its proxy rules and has recently made a comprehensive revision of the rules as they apply to contests for election and removal of directors (Securities and Exchange Act release No. 5276, effective January 30, 1956). I will now describe this in some detail.

Section 14 (a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 provides that it shall be unlawful for any person to solicit such proxies in contravention of such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors. The Commission's rules, as they existed up to their recent revision, were designed primarily for the typical uncontested proxy solicitations. Generally speaking, the type of information required under the proxy rules, both before and after the recent revision, provides the security holder with a broad basis of financial information about the company and specific information about the persons seeking to be elected directors, their business experience, their remuneration and contractual relations with the company, if any, and bonuses, stock options, and other emoluments of office. However, within the last several years, experience with the proxy rules in a substantial number of proxy contests indicated the desirability of spelling out more specifically and of broadening the disclosure requirements of the rules in the context of contests for corporate control.

In January of this year, after an original amendment proposal (August 1955) and a modified proposal (December 1955) had been published and circularized, the comments thereon carefully considered, a public hearing held by the Commission, and study of the proceedings of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and its Subcommittee on Securities with respect to this general subject, the Commission adopted a revision of its proxy rules, contained in Securities Exchange Act release No. 5276, enclosed. The rules as now amended deal with many of the problems which have created difficulties in past contests.

The revised rules spell out precisely the procedure to be followed and the information to be filed with the Commission and furnished to investors by all participants. The term "participant" is defined to include, apart from the issuer and any director of the issuer or nominee of management, any other committee or group which solicits proxies, any member of such a committee or group and any person (whether or not named as a member) who acting alone or with other persons, directly or indirectly, is concerned in the organization, direction, or financing of any such committee or group. It also includes any person who finances or joins in the financing of the solicitation of proxies (except persons who contribute no more than $500 and who do not otherwise come within the very broad definition of participant). Finally, participant is also defined to include any person who lends money, furnishes credit, or enters into any other arrangement (pursuant to an understanding with a participant in a contest) to induce the purchase, sale, holding or voting of securities of the issuer for the purpose of supporting or opposing any other participant in the contest. Certain exclusionary provisions are designed to remove from the broad scope of the definition persons who act in a ministerial capacity or who, in the course of business, effect transactions with participants such as, for example, an attorney whose activities are limited to the performance of his duties in the course of his retainer and who is otherwise not acting as a participant.

The revised rules specifically provide that no solicitation may be initiated by any participant in an opposition solicitation unless a detailed informational statement is first filed with the Commission, the substance of which must be included in the proxy statement used by the participant. This informational statement, which the Commission has denominated as schedule 14B, a copy of which is enclosed, requires that there be on file with the Commission prior to any solicitation by an opposition group information of the following character:

1. The name, residence, and business address of the participant, his current principal occupation or employment, and all of his material occupations, positions, or offices during the previous 10 years.

2. Any participation by him in other proxy contests within the past 10 years with an identification of the persons involved and the subject matter of the contest.

3. Information as to the convictions in criminal proceedings within the past 10 years.

4. The amount of each class of securities of the issuer and of a parent or subsidiary owned beneficially directly or indirectly and the amount owned of record but not beneficially; the amounts of such stock, held beneficially or of record, which were acquired within the previous 2 years indicating the dates of acquisition and the amounts acquired on each date; if any of such securities acquired within the previous 2 years were obtained by borrowed funds, this fact must be stated including an indication of indebtedness as of the latest practical date and a description of the borrowing transaction other than a normal margin purchase or regular bank loan.

5. A statement whether or not participant is a party to any arrangement or understanding with any other persons with respect to securities of the issuer including joint ventures, loan or option arrangements, puts or calls, guaranties against or division of losses or profits, or the giving or withholding of proxies, and, if any such arrangements exist, the details must be furnished.

6. A statement of the amount of the securities of the issuer owned beneficially by associates of the participant; the time and circumstances under which a participant became interested in the contest, and the nature and extent of his activities or proposed activities must also be stated.

7. Information must be furnished as to the participant, and any associates of his, concerning any material interest in any material transaction with the issuer effected in the previous fiscal year or in any material proposed transaction with the issuer or any of its affiliates; finally, statements are required as to any future employment of the participant or any of his associates by the issuer or any of its affiliates, including a description of any arrangement or understanding and an identification of the parties thereto.

The Commission believes that this amendment of the proxy rules represents an important step forward under the Federal Securities Exchange Act for protection of investors in securities listed on national securities exchanges.

Sincerely yours,

J. SINCLAIR ARMSTRONG,
Chairman.

Answer to Attack on the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, many organizations which are doing a great deal to aid in keeping America as our Founding Fathers intended it to be are being harshly criticized.

A short while ago a metropolitan newspaper published an article with the headline "The Greedy Legion." The article stated that the American Legion was wrecking America.

My own Legion post, the Edwin Scott Linton Post, No. 175, in a communication to its members, made a very good statement in answer to this criticism. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Of course there are those who think we are selfish or are trying to set ourselves up as a privileged group. They should take a trip through one of our VA hospitals and after looking at some of the patients, I am sure those with a conscience would change their minds. Then someone should ask them this question. What would be the plight of these men if there were no veterans benefits? There is one big reason why we must keep fighting for these benefits. Every time our Government starts to economize in peacetime you will find recommendations made to do away with this responsibility.

An attack of this nature brings out the fact that we have been very lax in our publicity. Do they ever mention any of the following of our activities? We have spent better than $125 million in the field of child welfare work. More than 4,000 Boy Scout troops are sponsored by Legion posts. We sponsor a Boys' State camp and Boys' Nation program teaching the fundamentals of good government to the youth of our land. Over 20,000 school medal awards are given annually in recognition of good citizenship on the part of our school children. We sponsor essay and oratorical contests, through which more than 300,000 high-school children each year learn more about the Constitution of the United States. We participate in a program of flag education. We sponsor a Junior Legion baseball program with good sportsmanship as its theme. We carry on a back-to-God program with emphasis on religious training. We have been aggressive in combatting communism and all un-American activities. We have been fighting continuously for an adequate system of defense for the Nation. And these are all national programs and do not list the accomplishments of individual posts in carrying on our work at a community level. Can all of this also be interpreted as wrecking America? Comrades, it is time to start blowing our horn a little and make the public aware of some of these activities. Did you know about them?

There is one point that you should bear in mind. Any attack on the American Legion will certainly be joined by any force advocating the overthrow of our form of government, since the pattern of our activities is so definitely nationalistic and to preserve the way of life we fought for.

Winning Citizenship Essay by Pauline Webster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an essay written by Miss Pauline Webster, of the First Congregational Church of Braintree, Mass. Rev. John P. Robertson, minister of that church, delivered the prayer upon the convening of the Senate today. Miss Webster is one of his parishioners. This essay won not only the local, but also the regional contest, and is well worth reading.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LETTER TO MY CONGRESSMAN

Please, Mr. Congressman; will you listen to me? Will you hear my words? I have something to say.

Who am I? I am a teen-ager. There are millions just like me.

You see me everywhere: at the corner drugstore—drinking a coke; in school assembly—saluting the flag; at the football game—scoring a touchdown; in the sickroom—fighting back tears; at the supermarket—waiting on trade: and in Sunday services—bowing in prayer.

Yes, you know me. I am a 20th-century edition of American youth and I speak for Christian citizenship. The kind of citizenship that makes my home and your home, my community and your community, my country and your country the places we love. The kind of citizenship that makes me stop and realize and be grateful. Grateful to every man who sailed on the *Mayflower* and built a colony, signed the Declaration of Independence, and wrote the Constitution that we might have a country under God. The kind of citizenship that makes me look back and remember—remember and be thankful.

Thankful to every pioneer who crossed a river or climbed a mountain, cleared a path or cut down a forest, blazed a trail for a new frontier that we might have communities in which to live, love, and be happy. The kind of citizenship that makes me look at today—look and be aware. Aware and mindful of the U. N. delegate as he strives for peace, the Congressman as he introduces a new bill, the labor leader as he fights for his cause, the politician as he wrangles for lower taxes, the lawyer as he preserves justice, the doctor as he mends broken bodies, and the minister as he builds faith that we may maintain our belief "that all men are created equal."

What does Christian citizenship mean to me—a teen-ager?

It means a lot of things—things both big and small.

It means taking a stand for Christ—being put on a spot.

It means fighting—fighting against vandalism and juvenile crime, drinking and lawlessness, prejudices and discriminations so that we youth of today will be stronger for tomorrow.

It means making decisions—asking myself questions. Questions like these: Am I to be my brother's keeper? Do I respect the faith of my neighbor? Is social drinking the thing to do? Does a Christian carry arms? Do I mind the color of another man's skin? Can I, a youth, fight communism? Questions like these—and more.

Christ challenged his disciples with this command. He said to them, "Go ye into all the world and preach."

I hear this challenge; I hear it well.

As a Christian I hear, as a Christian I accept. Accept it too, for that lad in the city and the one on the farm, the girl in the slums and the other across town. Accept it for the youth working at school or dreaming of marriage, planning a career or serving abroad, building a business or helping at home, knowing well that when I serve others I also serve myself.

So, Mr. Congressman, I speak for Christian citizenship because as a teen-ager I've been taught as a citizen I understand, and as a Christian I believe that "except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it."

Federal Tax Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, at the request of a prominent Chicago attorney, who has specialized in Federal taxation for 37 years, and under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter expressing to me his considered answer to statements made in the report on Federal Tax Policy for Economic Growth and Stability:

HUGHES & HUGHES,
Chicago, April 5, 1956.

Hon. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. CHURCH: The 930-page booklet entitled "Federal Tax Policy for Economic Growth and Stability" and the staff report entitled "The Federal Revenue System," issued by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, trespass on the province of the Ways and Means and Finance Committees in that these documents are mainly devoted to assailing provisions of the Internal Revenue Code adopted by those committees after most exhaustive and thorough consideration.

The graduated progressive income tax, as pointed out by the American Bar Association in its advocacy of the Reed-Dirksen amendment limiting it to 25 percent in peacetime, is the second point in the Communist Manifesto and such is heartily advocated by all followers of Karl Marx. The value of private property consists in what it will earn and when the Government in income tax alone takes 52 percent of the earnings of our corporations, plus an additional income tax taken on their dividends, it certainly owns more of them than anyone else. It takes much more in other taxes. To

give one example, the annual report of United Airlines for 1955 states its net earnings were $11,244,577 and its income tax $12,748,000 (in addition to this, its shareholders paid income tax on dividends) and on page 4 states, "more than $52,300,000 was paid to or collected for Government in 1955." In other words, the 52-percent income tax was less than 25 percent of the Government's take as a result of United's yearly business.

The committee papers fail to go into or consider the basic question what this tax situation is insidiously doing to and where this ill tax wind is blowing the American economy and way of life.

The Treasury has spent the billions it has collected in social security taxes in past years and at present rate of increase, its social security annual payments will, before many years, exceed its annual social security tax collections. Where will the difference come from? If the total national wealth is $700 billion, how long can it stand an annual tax take of $70 billion? Questions such as these should have been considered in the report.

The committee report assails alleged allowances such as depletion. Indicative of its authors' state of mind is the fact the staff reports devote 1½ pages to the arguments for oil depletion and 4 pages to the arguments against it.

The terms "allowance" and "subsidy" applied to depletion, deliberately adopted as weapons of attack by former New Deal professors, are false and can only proceed from a communistic attitude that everything belongs to the Government and by allowing one to keep his own property it thereby subsidizes him. Typical of the arguments is Professor Gray's parroting, at page 437, of the Truman Treasury's statement that "three-fourths of the total benefit accrues to large corporations." This ignores the fact it really accrues to their hundreds of thousands of stockholders, including widows and orphans and our large insurance companies in which almost every American family has a stake as well as all our leading privately financed colleges who own thousands of shares in these companies.

If depletion were a bonanza, oil companies would have earned much more than other companies, but at page 456 of the papers, it appears they did not. Eight wildcat wells in nine are dry. The domestic oil companies at present rate of consumption have on the average only enough reserves to last less than 14 years. Consumption is annually increasing and if they are not encouraged and stimulated to discover more oil, what will happen to our present mode of life with its great dependence on oil?

While devoting pages to the alleged discrimination of the 25 percent tax on capital gains (England and Canada do not impose any tax on capital gains) the committee panelists lightly pass over the biggest discrimination in the tax law in that over 24 million people on farms are allowed to raise their food and enjoy shelter tax free, whereas all other workers must pay on the money they earn to pay for food and shelter. I would not change this because the essence of taxation is that people differently situated cannot be taxed alike without causing gross discrimination and, unlike the committee, I am not seeking ways to increase anyone's taxes. The failure of over 90 percent of the committee panelists to object to existing exorbitant tax rates and their efforts to increase people's taxes speaks for itself.

Military expenditures are money down the drain if Russia does not intend to attack and thousands share the writer's views it has no more intention of attacking us than we have of attacking it. The blunt fact is that unless our Government expenditures (giveaway to foreign nations to date amounts to over $10,000 for every person in Illinois) and taxes are cut soon and sharply, the second point in the Communist Manifesto will have become a conquering Communist army and change our way of life to Communist ownership of all property. Citizens can no longer sit supinely in sight of this process.

Faithfully yours,

JOHN E. HUGHES.

The Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune of April 18, 1956.

It precisely and concisely states the situation with respect to the farm bill. It points out how once again the Democrat Party has made the farm problem a political football at the expense of the farmers.

I am also inserting the statement I released to the press on the veto message:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of April 18, 1956]

THE FARM ISSUE REDEFINED

When the Democrats in Congress cooked up their vote buying monstrosity in place of the workable farm program that the President submitted early in January, they must have thought they were dealing with another Dewey. They expected that if Mr. Eisenhower did veto their bill, he would thereafter sit quietly while they told the farmers about all of the wealth that would have been poured on them if it had not been for a callous Republican President.

The Democrats miscalculated. In his speech to the Nation, explaining why he had to veto the farm bill, President Eisenhower demonstrated that the moral courage that prompted the veto is fighting courage as well. He brought forth a sound alternative program, salvaging what he could from Democratic sabotage and delay.

Now the burden of action has been shifted to the Democratic majority in Congress. If its members do not enact the President's recommendations, it is they who must accept responsibility for failure to provide relief for American farmers.

Mr. Eisenhower said he would call a special session of Congress to meet after the national conventions if an acceptable farm program is not enacted before that time. The proposals he put forward Monday evening have been thoroughly discussed. They were, in fact, embodied in the farm bill he vetoed, but were rendered unworkable by the discredited high price-support plan that the Democrats tacked onto that bill.

Twice on Monday, in his veto message and again in his address to the citizens, President Eisenhower exposed the fraud of the high price supports that the Democrats seek to perpetuate. They are the source of the unmanageable surpluses that are depressing farm prices and driving American agriculture toward socialism.

His soil-bank plan was designed to reduce these surpluses and still support farm income by paying farmers to rest and improve acres that are not needed for present production. Because the Democrats paltered so long with the farm bill in Congress, the time has passed when that plan can be put in effect this year, even though the vetoed bill provided for it.

The President proposed that he be authorized, nevertheless, to pay 50 percent of the soil-bank benefits to any farmer who signed to observe land conservation practices next year. These payments could be made any time after July 1, and as Mr. Eisenhower pointed out, would enable farmers to buy the seed, trees, fertilizers, and new machinery they might need to start preparing their land for soil-bank use.

All that is required is that Congress pass the soil-bank bill, unencumbered by the nostrums that evoked the veto on Monday. If the Democrats fail to do this, it is they who must answer to the farmers for the callous disregard that candidates Stevenson and Kefauver have been piping about.

This is by no means the best possible farm program. It will defer for a full year the job of cutting farm surpluses. But it is the best that can be achieved at this time after the Democrats have played politics with the problem for more than 3 months.

STATEMENT OF HON LESLIE C. ARENDS, REPUBLICAN WHIP, 17TH DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, ON FARM BILL VETO RECORD

It is obvious from the President's veto and his message that he is thinking solely in terms of what is best for the welfare of our farmers and the country as a whole.

The bill sent the President by the Democrat-controlled Congress, after long, costly delay, is purely a political measure, not a cure to the farm problem but a political narcotic to try to fool the farmers.

President Eisenhoyer recognized it as such. He will not play politics with the welfare of agriculture. Once again by vetoing this bill President Eisenhower demonstrated his statesmanlike greatness. I am sure his action has the overwhelming approval of the majority of our farmers.

If an attempt should be made to override the veto, I am sure it will fail. I, for one, will vote against any motion to override.

It is now the duty and the responsibility of the Congress to act immediately on the soil-bank proposal. As the President points out this can be done in a few days, if the Democrat leadership will permit, and stop all this political maneuvering.

Opposition of the American Flag Committee to the Alaska Mental Health Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by the American Flag Committee, expressing its opposition to H. R. 6376, the Alaska Mental Health Act.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN FLAG COMMITTEE IN OPPOSITION TO H. R. 6376, THE ALASKA MENTAL HEALTH ACT

I. INTRODUCTION

On January 18, 1956, the House of Representatives passed by voice vote H. R. 6376, the Alaska Mental Health Act. It is now before

the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, whose chairman is Senator JAMES E. MURRAY.

Careful examination of the provisions of this measure has convinced us that its adoption in present form would gravely impair the most cherished constitutional rights not only of the residents of Alaska for whose benefit the act is proposed, but of all citizens of the United States coming under its jurisdiction.

We have no wish to prevent or delay the construction, within Alaska, of hospitals, clinics and other facilities for the diagnosis, care and treatment of its mentally ill. We sincerely deplore the fact that such accommodations are presently lacking, and that Alaskan patients must now be hospitalized at Portland, Oreg., more than a thousand and possibly 2,000 miles from home and loved ones. We wish to see this injustice corrected, and we pledge our support to any legislation exclusively directed toward this end.

We regret that the framers of the Alaska Mental Health Act saw fit to inject controversial provisions into what could have been a simple and wholly unobjectionable measure of relief for the people of Alaska.

Among our most serious objections to the act are the following:

II. BROAD DEFINITION

The present Federal statute for Alaska limits compulsory asylum commitment to those judged to be insane. The Alaska Mental Health Act repeals this statute (48 U. S. C., sec. 47) and authorizes forcible hospitalization of any "mentally ill individual" whose detention is requested. Section 101 (i) defines such a person as one "having a psychiatric or other disease which substantially impairs his mental health or an individual who is mentally defective or mentally retarded."

In terms of modern psychiatry, such a loose definition could be interpreted to almost every living human being. Many authorities high in the profession regard strong personal religious experience as one symptom of a psychotic personality. Some relate intense patriotic feeling to paranoia, a grave mental disorder. Americans holding extreme political views, whether to the right or left, have been called crackpots and collectively described as constituting a lunatic fringe. Personal idiosyncrasies are coming more and more under the scrutiny of "experts," and the random speculations and remote theories of the psychiatrists have been so popularized among the lay public as to encourage us all to become amateur diagnosticians.

It is one thing to seek psychiatric advice and treatment on one's own volition, but quite another to live in the shadow of a law which relatives, associates, or public officials can invoke to bring about one's compulsory hospitalization. Under the all-inclusive definition which the Alaska Mental Health Act applies to mental illness, literally hundreds of emotional, mental, and physican conditions which pose no danger to the public could be cited to compel a citizen to suffer detention and unwanted treatment in an insane asylum.

Instead of expanding those areas in which the psychiatrist is permitted to assume judicial authority in relieving a citizen of his freedom, it is our belief that Congress should inquire into the advisability of enacting legislation to more clearly define and limit the circumstances under which due process of law may be compromised at the foot of the psychiatrist's couch.

III. APPLICABILITY

In line with what has gone before, we object to the act on the ground that its commitment features are the same for persons who have broken no law as for those carrying out violence, destruction, and other acts indicating possible derangement.

In cases of overt misconduct which can be shown to have resulted from obvious psychological disturbances, it might be beneficial both to the wrongdoer and the public to have legal machinery by which the offender could be offered hospitalization and a possible cure, rather than imprisonment as a willful criminal. Even under these circumstances, we believe that compulsory commitment to an asylum should be limited to the violently insane and to those who are obviously incapable of intelligent behavior or of refraining from doing physical harm to those about them.

The Alaska Mental Health Act contains no such stipulations. Its sweeping language exposes a citizen to compulsory hospitalization whether he has or has not committed a wrongful deed. Armed with a physician's written opinion that a person is mentally ill under the broad definitions which the act sets forth, almost anyone can cause the individual to be seized against his will and spirited away to an asylum. The physician in question is not required to substantiate his opinion by the presentation of facts which conform to any standard of evidence, nor is he held in any way responsible for his action if the individual whom he has caused to be hospitalized is later proved to be mentally sound.

We object to the basic structure of sections 103 and 104 of the act, which by the ease of their application would encourage guardians, parents, husbands, wives, adult children, relatives, friends, policemen, health officers, and welfare officials to bring about the hospitalized confinement of an unwilling citizen.

We object to the fact that, upon the strength of the unsubstantiated opinion of a single doctor (secs. 103 (b) and 104 (a)) or of a policeman, health or welfare officer acting as an amateur psychiatrist (sec. 104 (b)), a citizen may be seized on the street, at work, or in his home, and forcibly transported to a mental hospital, where his plea for release may be ignored (sec. 106 (a)) for from 5 to 15 days.

Also, one of the most serious objections which we raise is to the lack of any prohibition against administration of drugs, use of hypnosis, or commencement of any other treatment authorized by section 115, during the period the individual is detained against his will, and pending judicial review of such detention.

In our opinion, sections 103, 104, and 106 (a) would greatly encourage those who, through malice or for reasons of personal gain, intimidation or a wish to be rid of a burdensome dependent, seek commitment of one not in need of asylum care. This conviction is strengthened by the fact that a provision carrying penalties for causing such unwarranted commitment was removed from the act by an amendment which the House adopted prior to final passage.

IV. COMMITMENT PROCEDURES

Section 106 (a) allows the head of a hospital to delay the release of an unwilling patient for as long as 15 days, to permit a United States commissioner to begin formal commitment proceedings under section 108.

Just in case an intended victim has somehow eluded hospitalization under section 104, any interested party may commence proceedings for his commitment under section 108 (a), simply by filing a statement that he has refused to submit to examination by a licensed physician.

Section 108 (b) allows the commissioner to withhold notice to the citizen that application for his commitment has been filed.

Section 108 (c) authorizes the commissioner to name two physicians appointed by the Governor of Alaska to examine the unwilling citizen. If 2 physicians are not available, this section allows the commissioner to settle for 1.

Section 108 (d) allows the commissioner to compel the unwilling citizen, to whom notice of impending commitment has been withheld, to submit to examination.

Section 108 (e) is especially vicious. It permits the commissioner to ignore the reports of examining physicians if they indicate that the citizen is mentaly well, and to schedule a commitment hearing in the same manner as if he had been declared insane. It also authorizes his continued detention for an additional 15 days.

Section 108 (f) is highly ambiguous and subject to contradictory interpretation. It states that the proposed patient shall be "afforded an opportunity to appear at the hearing, to testify, and to present and cross-examine witnesses." Later, however, it states: "The proposed patient shall not be required to be present, and the United States Commissioner is authorized to exclude all persons not necessary for the conduct of the proceedings." Now, if the presence of the proposed patient is not required, it is obvious he is not necessary for the conduct of the hearing. If it could not go on without him, the act would so provide. Since it does not, the conflicting language of this section could well be interpreted to empower the Commissioner to exclude the proposed patient from the hearing.

Beyond this, section 108 (f) modifies the present Federal law which grants all persons a right to testify at a commitment hearing. By the new provision, only those "necessary for the conduct of the proceedings" are permitted even to attend, and the Commissioner is apparently the sole judge of who is and who is not so qualified.

Another departure from present law is the stipulation that the Commissioner, who acts as a trial judge, is not bound by rules of evidence regarding the citizen's mental condition or his place of residence. Thus, every idle gossip, every prejudicial or otherwise irrelevant statement made about the "proposed patient" by those seeking his commitment, may be accepted by the Commissioner in reaching his decision. Suspension of the rules of evidence is particularly destructive of a fair hearing in commitment cases, where unsubstantiated charges of irrational behavior may constitute the sole argument for compulsory hospitalization.

Section 108 (f) impairs still another guarantee of justice. By present law, no citizen may be committed in Alaska except a jury of six men unanimously find him to be insane and so declare in writing. The Alaska Mental Health Act "modernizes" the procedure by allowing the Commissioner to act as both judge and jury unless the "proposed patient" or his counsel or a member of his immediate family requests, in writing, that a jury be selected.

We strongly object to this perilous innovation. We have noted in other areas—notably in the field of accident cases in New York City—attempts to convince the public that juries are costly, inexpedient, obsolete, and unnecessary to a just verdict. We deplore such appeals to abandon one of the most vital safeguards to life, liberty, and property which our Federal Constitution and those of our several States provide. Any act which compels a citizen to request in writing a protection which the Constitution treats as an absolute right is wrong in principle and should be rejected.

V. BASIS FOR COMMITMENT

Section 108 (g) defines the basis on which the proposed patient may be committed to an asylum. He need not be judged insane, as under present law, but merely "mentally ill; and * * * in need of custody, care, or treatment in a hospital and, because of his

illness, lacks sufficient insight or capacity to make responsible decisions concerning hospitalization." Under the act's loose definition of mental illness, this language would apply to anyone disagreeing with the necessity for his own commitment.

Stripped of its confusing legal phraseology, the Alaska Mental Health Act is a measure to provide means for compelling a citizen to undergo unwanted psychiatric and medical treatment. The indignities it could force upon sane, law-abiding citizens are far more hazardous than those which its proponents say are being suffered by the truly mentally ill who, by present law, must be committed as a result of trial by jury.

VI. OTHER HAZARDS

Commitment under section 108 (g) may be for an indeterminate period, and section 109 (a) allows the commissioner to transfer the patient, without his consent, to any agency of the United States certifying his eligibility for care and treatment at its expense. So transferred, the patient comes under the combined rules and regulations of the claiming agency and the authority of the Governor of Alaska and the head of the hospital relinquishing him, which authority is delegated to his new custodian.

Thus, while the chief aim of the act is claimed to be that of keeping Alaska's mental patients in Alaska, close to family, relatives, and friends, it really provides for handing many of them over to Federal agencies which are authorized to lodge them in asylums or hospitals which they may operate anywhere in the United States, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, the Canal Zone, or, in the case of the armed services, in a foreign country.

Section 119 (c) carries such transfers much farther still. Here, the Governor of Alaska is empowered to make an agreement with any of our 43 States for the physical transfer of Alaskans to hospitals within their borders. Once again the purpose of keeping Alaska's patients close to home and family is defeated. These folks are currently lodged at Portland, Oreg., 2,000 miles away. Under section 119 (c), they could end up in Miami, Fla., more than 4,000 miles from the hospital which the act authorizes for their care and treatment in Alaska.

But, the real mischief of section 119 (c) lies in its stipulation that the transfer pacts must be reciprocal in application. That is, States receiving Alaskan patients are entitled to ship their own mentally ill to hospitals in Alaska, where they will be hospitalized and come under the full authority of the Alaska Mental Health Act.

It should be obvious to anyone reading H. R. 6376 that it is not a territorial bill for giving the people of Alaska their own hospitals. This is Federal legislation in the field of mental health, establishing and encouraging the application of the principle of the inter-transfer of mental patients between the several States and Territories of this Nation. The act gives Federal sanction to State laws which would expose their residents to compulsory removal to States and Territories thousands of miles from their homes, and establishes a precedent for further legislation for the imposition of Federal control of Americans alleged to be mentally ill.

Section 117 allows the head of a hospital to restrict the patient's right to communcate with family, friends, legal counsel, or others, including his representatives in Congress, if such restrictions are held to be "necessary for the medical welfare of the patient." No restraint is permitted, however, upon sealed mail directed to the Governor of Alaska or the Commissioner who ordered the patient's detention.

Why should this be? If the patient's condition is such that he would be harmed by the effort involved in writing to members of his family, to friends, associates, an attorney or a United States Congressman, will the harm be less if the object of his correspondence is the Governor of Alaska or the Commissioner responsible for his detention? We question the basic motive of this provision which, while permitting control of the patient's contacts with sources he may feel to be friendly to his release, encourages him to communicate his thoughts, feelings and plans, if any, to the officials charged with supervising his enforced hospitalization.

VII. UNQUALIFIED LAND GRANT

Section 202 (a) transfers 1 million acres of Federal land in Alska to the Alaskan Government, to facilitate the program set forth in the act. This is a vast area to be given over to the support of Alaska's mentally ill, since there are but 359 patients at Morningside Hospital in Portland, Oreg., which presently lodges all of those committed in the Territory.

Sponsors of the act say that only a fraction of this land will be used to quarter patients, and that most of it will be sold, leased or invested to provide Alaska with the funds needed to make the program self-supporting. The act, however, fails to fix the number of acres to be devoted to each such purpose. Although it is claimed that Alaska's needs have been studied and accurately determined, the act does not designate hospital sites nor in any way restrict their area. As far as its language goes, the acreage could be divided equally, half to be sold, leased or invested, and half for a modern installation which might be used to solve the hospital shortage problems of our 48 States.

We approve the principle of a land grant of sufficient size to provide and maintain adequate facilities and services for the diagnosis, care and treatment of the mentally ill of Alaska. We insist, however, that the area conveyed should bear a reasonable relation to that actually needed for such purposes.

VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of the foregoing objections, to which we could add substantially in a more detailed analysis, we recommend that H. R. 6376 be discarded, and that a new bill be drafted which will provide Alaska with facilities for the diagnosis, care, and treatment of its mentally ill within the Territory, while leaving the present commitment procedures unchanged. In view of the fact that the Federal Government owns in excess of 93 percent of the area of Alaska, we believe that a land grant to the Territorial Government, both for use as hospital sites and as a source of revenue for maintaining their upkeep, is justified and proper. In conveying such land, however, the area to be put into hospitals and hospital grounds should be clearly specified and defined, and the area to be sold, leased, and invested for revenue, by similar specification and definition, should be so restricted by law.

We believe that legislation following these recommendations would solve a substantial part of Alaska's mental health problem, and in a manner which could provoke opposition from no responsible quarter.

As for modifying the present law regarding commitment in Alaska, changes designed to remove the necessity for incarcerating the violently insane in a prison might be effected by separate legislation. Under no circumstances, however, should the law be altered to permit the compulsory hospitalization of a person who has committed no act of violence or destruction, who is rational, and who is capable of distinguishing right from wrong.

The fantastic commitment features of the Alaska Mental Health Act highlight a crying need for long and careful study of the basic concepts of modern psychiatry as they relate themselves to American jurisprudence and its standards for protecting the rights and liberties, as well as the property and physical safety, of the individual. There is certainly a place for the psychiatrist in our society, but that place must not be occupied in the robe of a jurist or the seat of a legislator. To enact laws which compel an American to be treated for an emotional disorder which has caused no harm to the public is to set the precedent for later laws forcing him to undergo unwanted treatment of other, and perhaps more serious, physical afflictions.

The danger signal is up. It should be heeded.

Nation of Softies?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, all of us are concerned about the fact that 35 percent of young Americans fail for military service because of physical unfitness. A very interesting editorial entitled "Nation of Softies?" appeared in the Sunday Star of March 11. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATION OF SOFTIES?

Dr. Paul Dudley White, the most celebrated of the President's heart consultants, seems to have exaggerated a bit in recently declaring to a House Appropriations subcommittee that ours is "one of the unhealthiest countries in the world today." Yet, although his statement does not square with statistics showing that average life expectancy in America is considerably higher than in most other lands, there can be little doubt that we are in danger of becoming a nation of softies.

A fairly alarming indication of this is the fact that about 35 percent of the young Americans called for military service are rejected because of physical unfitness. Another warning sign can be found in studies showing that our boys and girls compare poorly with European boys and girls in tests measuring the strength and flexibility of abdominal and back muscles. There is a large amount of additional evidence along the same line, all of it too disturbing to be shrugged off as it were inconsequential.

What accounts for the trend? Many factors are involved in the answer, but certainly the technology and comforts of our way of life play a key contributing role. As Dr. White has said, "We now have so many push buttons that we have stopped the use of our muscles. * * * Also our diet has become richer and richer." Further, as other experts have pointed out, great numbers of American children, if not pampered, are physically too inactive in this age of automobiles and spectator sports. All too often, for example, they spend their after-school hours indoors watching the dubious wonders of TV.

As far as city children are concerned, all this is largely understandable. Our automobile traffic is potentially too murderous for today's youngsters to ride bicycles, or play street games like punchball, the way their elders did in an age when nobody had to worry much about being run over. But this is only one aspect of the problem—a big and important problem requiring action of the

sort contemplated by President Eisenhower last summer when he scheduled a national conference to deal with it.

What the President had in mind at that time was the drafting of a countrywide program to encourage our young people to build up their bodies with systematic physical exercise and direct participation in sports. The conference was called off because of his heart attack, but the idea behind it ought not to be dropped. The signs of growing softness in America plainly indicate that some such meeting of experts is sorely needed.

Address by Governor McKeldin, of Maryland, Before Philadelphia Fellowship Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, today, more than at any other time for almost a century, a careful reappraisal is being made of the factors in our country which have forced many of our citizens to follow a segregated way of life. As a border State between the North and the South, Maryland is in a position to feel the strains which have unfortunately developed on both sides of the Mason and Dixon Line during this period of transition. Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, of Maryland, recently gave a clear picture of the current situation in our Free State when he said:

In Maryland the Constitution of the United and the statutes made in conformity thereto are the supreme law of the land.

His words were delivered in Philadelphia at a dinner during which he was presented the National Fellowship Award, sponsored by the Philadelphia Fellowship Commission. In addition to discussing Maryland's position, Governor McKeldin also pointed out that the goal of right-thinking men is not "equality" in itself but the excellence which can result from a respect for the rights of all Americans regardless of race or color. Because the Governor's speech is so thought-provoking and timely, I ask unanimous consent to have it included in the Appendix of today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Because the State of Maryland lies below the Mason and Dixon Line men from Maine cannot see it as anything but a southern State. Because it lies above the Potomac, men from Mississippi cannot see it as anything but a northern State. Both are wrong. It is a border State. Skeptics say this means that it belongs to neither, but Marylanders say it means that it belongs to both.

The position of a border State is not always a happy one. In great crises it may mean being caught between the upper and the nether millstones, in danger of being ground to powder. That was Maryland's fate in the most terrible crisis that has afflicted the Nation, from 1861 to 1865. A dozen times it was literally the battlefield on which the armies of the Union and the Confederacy came into collision. Early's cavalry burned the house of a Governor of Maryland and occupied ground that today is within the city limits of Baltimore.

During the entire 4 years it was a spiritual battleground, with brother arrayed against brother, engendering hatreds, traces of which have lingered down to our own times. One of the most hideous tragedies of the fratricidal struggle occurred at the battle of New Market, Va., when by the fortunes of war the First Maryland Infantry, USA, was thrown against the First Maryland Infantry, CSA, and in sober, literal truth kinsman fell at the hands of kinsman.

But by way of compensation, moments come when the border State, may, if its wisdom is sufficient to the task, act not as the dividing line, but as the connecting link between regions of our common country. This I count as a happy circumstance, for he who has the opportunity to act as mediator between brethren is fortunate among men.

I need not remind you of the gravity of the crisis that has recently developed in connection with the effort to eliminate anything that smacks of second-class citizenship among men loyal to the United States. The position of my own State on the issue can be stated briefly. In Maryland, the Constitution of the United States and the statutes made in conformity thereto are the supreme law of the land. I do not say that they will be enforced because I do not need to say so. I say that they will be obeyed, so the question of enforcement will never arise except as a matter of police routine, not serious enough to cause any grave anxiety to the Governor of the State.

I mention this because I would not have you think that I am here to plead the cause of Maryland exclusively, or even primarily. But because of Maryland's intimate connection with States farther south we are keenly aware that our own problem is relatively small, and so we are not disposed to praise our own wisdom and virtue in handling it with comparatively little trouble. Our own difficulties have been just great enough to enable us to appreciate the magnitude of the task that our neighbors face.

Some of them are obviously going about it in the wrong way. In every large population, including the population of the South, there are dark forces, forces of prejudice, ignorance, and passion, constantly straining at the leash of civilization. They must be restrained with a strong hand, and no failure to restrain them can be condoned. This problem cannot be solved by mob rule and wherever and whenever mob rule is tolerated the solution is postponed and made more difficult than ever.

But I venture to remind you that the element that makes mob rule poisonous is the fact that it is based on prejudice and passion, not on justice, truth, and devotion to the general welfare. And I remind you that it is possible for grave citizens, not in a street mob, but sitting in orderly council, to be ignorant of the truth, swayed by prejudice, and neglectful of the general welfare. I submit that any man who assumes that the problem facing the South is simple and easy is a dangerous counsellor; for his assumption has no relation to the facts.

The Supreme Court of the United States was keenly aware of this truth when it struck down the policy of segregation in the public schools. It has proceeded, and it has ordered the inferior courts to proceed, with great caution in putting its order into effect; and any man who believes that the Court was motivated by race prejudice is too great a fool to merit serious attention.

The Court holds that equality before the law is the right of every American regardless of race or color; and it has found that the policy of segregation is inseparable from legal inequality. But the Court has never held, indeed no thinker worthy of the name has ever held that equality is an end in itself. Equality may be attained as readily by pulling down the excellent as by raising the inferior. The end is excellence, and equality is desirable only to the extent that it is a means of attaining excellence.

Less than a hundred years ago both the economic and social systems of the Southern States were overthrown and utterly demolished by war, invasion, and conquest followed by 10 years of military occupation. There is no modern parallel to this catastrophe. Germany is not a comparable instance, for only the economic system of Germany was destroyed and that kind of damage can be rapidly repaired. It was repaired in the South. Fifty years after Appomattox the South was vastly richer than it had ever been before the war.

But a completely new social system is not so easily constructed. Much, very much, has been accomplished. I believe that future historians, with a better perspective than we can have, one day will be astonished, not by the slowness, but by the speed with which a formerly subjugated race was integrated in a new social system; and they will divide the credit between the Negro South and the white with great praise for both.

It is folly, however, to ignore the fact that both races have worked hagridden by a gnawing anxiety from which the rest of the country is happily free—anxiety as to the strength of the social fabric they were creating. There was no precedent to reassure them for their aim was to achieve something that has not yet been successfully accomplished anywhere in the world—a society in which a very large minority can live on amicable and equal terms with a majority of a disparate race.

It is a magnificent ideal, one of the greatest that has ever been cherished by mortal men; but it is as difficult as it is magnificent. Southerners, white or colored, would have been less than rational if they had not been aware of the dreadful ease with which they could slip back and plunge the South into such rancorous and bloody hatred as subsists between Moslem and Hindu in India, between Arab and Jew in the Levant, and between Afrikander and "native" in South Africa.

No doubt this fear has frequently been exaggerated, especially by apprehensive whites; but to say that it is baseless is to ignore the immense difficulty of the task and the frailty of mortal men as they strive toward an ideal.

Worst of all is to ignore the existence of the ideal. Of course, it has been betrayed by the debauched, and never glimpsed by the stupid. Far be it from me to deny that the South has any lack of either villains or fools. Their presence is all too evident and the damage they have done is known to the whole world.

But villains and fools we have everywhere, and nothing but trouble can be expected of them. Wise men waste no time on the hopeless in any situation but search carefully for those elements from which something of value may be won. I submit that we have in the South a large number, an inspiringly large number, of able and trustworthy men in both races. They do not always occupy conspicuous positions; indeed, men whose idealism is stronger than their personal ambition come rarely; and then usually by chance, into conspicuous positions. But these relatively obscure leaders' importance is out of all proportion to their numbers.

What I fear in the present situation is not the clamor of the reckless demagogs. They have always been noisy and they always will be. Much more dangerous is the possibility that slow and silent discouragement may creep upon those southern leaders, and especially those Negro leaders, whose work of a lifetime is threatened with destruction.

We cannot go backward on their account, and I think none of them would have us do so. The Court has spoken. The case is decided. But it is utter folly to think that on that account there is no more need for careful procedure, for tolerance, for sympathy, above all for patient hearing of the evidence, all the evidence, and a scrupulous

rendering of exact justice as far as that is humanly possible.

Bear with me while I repeat that I am not pleading for myself or my State. In Maryland we are doing fairly well, much of the credit for which is due to the wisdom and integrity of our Negro leadership, but much also to the fact that our problem of race relationships never has been among the most difficult. I am arguing the case of men and women who have a much harder task than ours and are therefore entitled to greater consideration.

Let us never forget the loftiness of their aim. It is easy enough to be tolerant where there is no temptation to intolerance. It is easy to be free of race prejudice where there is nothing to excite race prejudice. But to create a society that will be tolerant in spite of pressure, that will be fair when unfairness would be profitable is as difficult a work as can be undertaken by man. Yet think of what success would mean. It would at once set the American Republic on a level attained by no nation since governments were instituted among men, it would vindicate the theory of self-government finally and forever.

The most formidable weapons that our enemies have ever raised against us are not made of fire and steel, but are forged out of our own frailties and follies. To establish on our shores a biracial society in which equal justice under law is a condition and not a theory would shatter those weapons in our enemies' hands. Men who are honestly and diligently striving to accomplish this are worthy of our sympathy and support, for in a very real sense the chastisement of our peace is upon them. Instead of denouncing them for not doing better, we should regard their existence among us with lordly pride.

Government Responsibility in Labor-Management Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent address by Joseph F. Finnegan, Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, which was delivered at the 1956 industrial-relations conference at the Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kans.

The topic Mr. Finnegan chose was Government Responsibility in Labor-Management Affairs. His address is an outstanding one on some of the current problems affecting labor and management, and I commend it to the Senate.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the address is estimated to make 2¼ pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $180.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Westinghouse Strike Settled." Your newspaper, the morning of March 21, 1956, carried such a headline. This rang down the curtain on our longest major strike in more than 20 years. Some 55,000 men and women in more than 40 plants of one of America's major corporations had been on strike for 156 days—nearly half a year. Direct losses in wages to employees were somewhere around $100 million. The company lost some $300 million in sales. The direct and indirect effect on families deprived of income, communities deprived of purchasing power, consumers deprived of products, suppliers deprived of market, and accumulative losses to the company, are beyond the possibility of computation.

A few discordant ripples marred the smooth surface of the formal settlement of the strike, due to local problems at individual plants and localities; but these local difficulties were almost anticlimactic. So we can now take a fairly objective look at the Westinghouse strike and try to assess its effect and meaning. What, particularly, can we learn from it in terms of the Government's responsibility in labor-management affairs? What does the Government conceive its responsibility to be? Did this bitter, long-drawn-out strike demonstrate that our governmental principles, laws and procedures are sound or unsound? Did Government measure up to its responsibilities or did it evince weaknesses that demand reappraisal and possible change?

The fundamental responsibility of Government in labor-management affairs emerges clearly from the turbulent and fluid labor scene only if we correctly understand our American philosophy of free collective bargaining. It seems to me that free collective bargaining, operating in a free and competitive economy, can mean only that when labor and management meet at the bargaining table are not only free to bargain, but are charged with joint, direct responsibility for working out their own problems without Government domination. As free men, employers, and employees should not, under normal, peacetime circumstances, be required to submit to decisions of the state concerning conditions governing their relationships. Any other answer would be in derogation of man's inherent dignity, be he worker or employer. Any other answer would be a negation of the enacted philosophy of free collective bargaining, which is the keystone of our national labor policy.

Obviously, however, Government does have definite responsibilities in making free collective bargaining work; in fostering and improving a favorable climate or atmosphere, with the minimum of legal restrictions, under which labor and management will have the best possible opportunity to enjoy harmonious relationships. Over the years the Federal Government has sought to discharge its fundamental responsibility in labor-management affairs by establishing legal ground rules governing the parties' relationship, through legislation such as the original Wagner Act which, as amended, is now commonly referred to as the Taft-Hartley Act. Other legislation has sought to establish at least some measure of social consciousness and responsibility for the conditions under which men and women earn their living; for example, minimum wages, maximum hours, and matters affecting health and safety.

How effective has governmental policy been in helping make free collective bargaining work? If we consider the Westinghouse strike dispassionately, against the backdrop of our total national industrial experience in collective bargaining, it seems to me that this strike, far from indicating a failure or weakness in our governmental approach to labor-management affairs, tends to demonstrate the inherent soundness of both the doctrine of free collective bargaining and the present administration's concept of Government's role with respect to the labor and management relationship. It is true that this labor dispute resulted in the loss of millions of man-days of production, and countless millions of dollars in wages, sales, profits, taxes. It commanded national attention, caused waves of indignation and produced much head shaking and dire prophecies of national calamity; yet statistics on the cost of this landmark strike are meaningless unless considered in relationship to the overall, national picture of our productive industrial economy.

The estimated $100 million lost in wages by the Westinghouse workers represents only some eight one-hundredths of 1 percent of the income from wages of all other workers in this country during the strike period. The $300 million lost by the company in sales is hardly a drop in the bucket of nearly $200 billion of our gross national product for that 5½ months. The strike cost some 8½ million man-days lost to production; but during that same period, our national economy was absorbing about twice this number of man-days lost through avoidable industrial accidents, and more than 20 times as many man-days lost by unexcused absenteeism. I do not mean that any of these things are unimportant. I call them to your attention only to emphasize that when we take a look at the whole picture, we find a remarkably sound relationship existing nationally between management and labor. Out of the 75,000 to 100,000 collective bargaining agreements negotiated in this country each year, there are relatively few instances of active labor-management combat. I think that the Westinghouse strike, because we have all unconsciously accepted it as being a radical exception to the normal company-union way of life, proves that our fundamental governmental approach to the labor-management relationship has been sound and constructive.

What I have said up to now may make it sound as though responsibility of Government in labor-management affairs is quite simple and clear cut. This is not true. It is often rather easy to agree upon general principles. The trouble comes in the day-to-day application by the Government of those principles: in remaining nonpartisan and unbiased while resisting pressures, influences and impulses that may be violative of the long-range national objective; and in persuading both labor and management to approach the bargaining table with a mature and responsible attitude which will underwrite the premise of free, voluntary collective bargaining. This is the keystone of our democratic approach to the vexatious problem of trying to strike a proper balance between labor and management, the two segments of our country upon which our national safety, prosperity, and welfare depend.

Government nonpartisanship and resistance to pressures and influences are easier to talk about than to carry out. As the Westinghouse strike dragged on month after month, its effect spread and snowballed. As was to be expected, the hue and cry mounted for some sort of governmental action to "lower the boom" on either the company or the union, or both of them—depending upon whether their respective public relations were high or low at the moment. Mayors, governors, and Federal officials—all were deeply concerned. Civic, religious and other groups organized to "do something" about this major strike. Numerous forms of legislation and mandatory intervention were discussed or proposed by these inteersted and deeply concerned pressure groups, mainly with the idea of forcing a settlement. I am glad to be able to tell you that none of those pressures or proposals, based on partisanship or expediency, prevailed. They were not only resisted—they were rejected.

Another facet of Government responsibility in labor-management affairs that was dramatically emphasized by the Westinghouse strike is the principle that the parties control their own destinies and must discharge their responsibilities to all segments of society through collective bargaining. Labor and management must accept the fact that

freedom to bargain is inextricably linked with the responsibility to decide and to reach agreement. The Government can and should make available skilled and effective mediatory assistance, but the Government must not only not usurp the parties' decision-making prerogatives, but must steadfastly refuse to let the parties pass the decision-making buck to it.

Even though you followed the day-to-day developments in the Westinghouse strike through the newspapers, radio, TV, and magazines, I doubt if you can appreciate all of the maneuvers that went on to induce various forms of governmental action that would have had the effect of injecting Government into the decision-making phase of the controversy.

I feel it is important for you to know that under the Eisenhower administration Government at all levels refused to take over and relieve the parties of their duty and responsibility to work out their own destinies. When this strike was settled, it was on the basis of a voluntary agreement negotiated between the parties themselves, without governmental compulsion or fiat.

I would be the last to deny that the parties got a very substantial assist and some real prodding in their collective-bargaining efforts from the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. But mediation is a voluntary, noncompulsory process—an extension of free collective bargaining, rather than a substitute for it. In the last analysis, Westinghouse and the IUE finally wrote their own settlement ticket. As a result, I can assure you that the relationship between the parties today is better than it could possibly be had we violated the principle of noncompulsion by Government. In my opinion, also, the basic relationship between management and labor throughout the country has been clarified and improved by the position taken by Government in the Westinghouse dispute. That position is, as I stated before, that the parties—not Government—control their own destinies and through collective bargaining must discharge their own responsibilities to all segments of society.

So much for the general principles underlying the responsibility of government in labor-management affairs. To implement and effectuate those principles calls for a substantial amount of diverse legislation, as well as a number of separate agencies, each charged with specific duties and functions. It might be helpful for orientation purposes to give you a quick rundown on the principal labor laws and agencies dealing with different facets of the labor field; not from the standpoint of complete or technical analysis, but rather to indicate their general scope, purpose and operation.

The United States Department of Labor is, of course, the largest and most important Federal agency dealing in matters relating to the labor force of the Nation, whether represented by unions or not. You are familiar with the Consumer Price Index, issued by its Bureau of Labor Statistics, and with various of its manpower and other related functions. Its Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division has responsibilities that will be of interest to you, since it is charged with the enforcement of various labor laws and regulations having a more immediate and easily discernible impact on your everday life. I shall touch briefly on some of these.

The Fair Labor Standards Act, generally known as the wage-and-hour law, was passed in 1938. It applies to employees engaged in interstate commerce, or the production of goods for interstate commerce, and sets minimum wages—recently fixed at $1 per hour—requires overtime payment at the mandatory rate of time and one-half for over 40 hours worked in any one week, and establishes a minimum age for employed workers.

The Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act, passed in 1932, applies to Federal contracts for the purchase of materials in excess of $10,000. It calls for the payment of prevailing wages as determined by the Secretary of Labor, requires overtime at one and one-half times the regular rate after 8 hours per day and 40 hours per week, establishes minimum ages for workers, prohibits convict labor on such contracts, establishes applicable health and safety rules, and prohibits home work.

The prevailing wage law, usually called the Davis-Bacon Act, was passed in 1931. It covers all construction work for the Federal Government, and requires the payment of prevailing minimum wages, as determined by the Secretary of Labor.

The 8-hour law, passed in 1892, applies to all Federal purchases or construction, and simply requires the payment of overtime at one and one-half normal rates after 8 hours work per day.

The National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) is a Federal labor agency you hear a great deal about. This is really a bi-functional organization. The "Board" itself is a 5-member "labor relations court" appointed by the President. It is quasi-judicial, and acts in an appellate capacity in determining the right of representation of employees by unions, and as a trial court (through a special master, called a trial examiner) in matters relating to unfair labor practices by either companies or unions.

The Office of the General Counsel (appointed by the President) was divorced from the Board by the Taft-Hartley Act. The General Counsel, through his field staff, acts in initial determination of representation rights of unions, and also as prosecuting attorney to investigate, prosecute, or enjoin unfair labor practices by companies or unions, as defined by the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947.

It is well to bear in mind that the National Labor Relations Board is interested only in the rights, obligations, and restrictions of the act. It has no jurisdiction over, nor interest in, the negotiation of collective bargaining agreements or their content, nor in operations under the contracts as such. Of course, unfair bargaining practices during contract negotiations, illegal contract provisions (such as those calling for discrimination because of union membership or activity) or certain conduct of the parties during the contract term, might be the subject of National Labor Relations Board proceedings. However, the Board would be interested only because such matters might be infringements of the law, and not because of the contract itself.

Another Federal agency dealing in labor relations matters, with which my own organization is sometimes confused, is the National Mediation Board. This is composed of three members appointed by the President, and was created under the Federal Railway Labor Act. This Board has jurisdiction over interstate railroad, express and airline operations only, and has a dual function. It acts to determine representatives for collective bargaining purposes, and assists through mediation and conciliation in negotiation of collective bargaining agreements—but only in railroad, express, and airline operations.

A companion board, also created under the Railway Labor Act, is the Railroad Adjustment Board, made up of 36 members, of whom half are appointed by the railroads and half by the unions. This board acts only to decide grievances arising under labor contracts with the railroads; express companies and airlines are not covered.

I naturally would think that the last of the Federal agencies to be discussed is the most important, since it is the one I have the honor of heading as director, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. My appointment is by the President, with confirmation by the Senate, and is for no fixed term.

The Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service was reconstituted as an independent agency, reporting only to the President, by the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947. Its predecessor was the United States Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor, which was authorized in 1913.

We are a relatively small and highly decentralized organization. My national office staff in Washington is very limited in size, and aside from liaison and cooperaton with the other Government agencies, is primarily concerned with fixing basic policies and handling personnel and budget matters.

The country is divided into eight areas, each headed by a regional director. These regional directors and a staff of some 215 mediators are charged with almost complete responsibility for actual mediation activities. Mediation is a highly personal operation, so that each mediator, apart from administrative requirements, is essentially an independent agent in the handling of each specific case.

The mediation process itself is a fascinating study and in many ways an even more fascinating activity. At first blush, you may find it difficult to understand how mature representatives of labor and management can find themselves in a situation which they cannot solve, but which can be solved with the assistance of an outsider who is a relative stranger to their bargaining relationship. Actually, there are many ways such a situation can come about without attempting to cover the whole subject, here are a few of them:

We sometimes find the parties deadlocked over what are termed issues of principle. These include issues such as the union shop, straight seniority, and pay for time not worked, such as holidays. The mediator in such situation can frequently be more effective than the partisan party representatives in urging a reevaluation of positions, based on the changes that have occurred in labor relation practices in the particular industry and the thinking of the people living and working in the area of the plant affected.

Institutional issues are sometimes most difficult to resolve. These are situations where either the company or the union feels it is completely bound either by general organizational policy, or by other contracts or conditions. To illustrate, consider a local union demand for a particular type of pension program conforming to well-established plans of its international affiliate, as opposed to the company insistance on an existing pension plan of its own which covers a great many nonunion employees in that plant, and perhaps several other plants. You can realize the difficulty of harmonizing these opposing institutional programs; yet the mediator ordinarily is able to help the parties work out an agreement.

Emotional blocks are frequently encountered where severe clashes of personalities or unexposed resentments have not only prevented the parties reaching an agreement, but may have made a farce of collective bargaining. Bad communications which have prevented the parties actually understanding each other's positions and the reasons for those positions, and lack of knowledge by the parties of all the existing facts and compelling circumstances involved, may easily cause a deadlock which the parties themselves seem unable to break.

The intensity that can easily creep into hard collective bargaining often results in a complete loss of objectivity by one or both groups, and with this loss of objectivity comes the inability to place issues in their proper perspective and to thoughtfully consider alternative solutions to the problems.

Not infrequently, we run into what might be called tactical blocks, where one party or the other may have placed itself in a tactical position from which it cannot gracefully retreat without someone to help it save face. We also occasionally run into situations where internal politics or internal conflict in either the company or the union may create a situation where it is difficult, if not impossible for the parties to openly talk with the frankness and honesty necessary to reach an agreement across the bargaining table. These are only illustrative of the situations and conditions that call for the presence and skill of a mediator.

Mediation itself involves no secret formula, nor obscure hocus-pocus. I believe, in its simplest form, it involves having the right man on the job at the right time; and the right man is basically a practical, mature, and capable labor-relations expert who is thoroughly experienced in the various techniques of mediation, and who can command the respect and confidence of the disputing parties.

Important elements of mediation are a proper sense of the appropriate time for intervention by the mediator in the negotiations, and his neutral status in calling and controlling conferences. The mediator normally will not enter a situation until the parties have exhausted good-faith collective bargaining. The fact that the mediator calls meetings and supervises the discussions frequently may remove the bargaining roadblock. This is particularly true if the parties are involved in tactical maneuvers in either seeking or avoiding meetings, or in procedures during conferences, since such maneuvers reflect intangible pressures and may indicate strength or weakness.

The use of joint and separate conference is routine, and the early attempt of the mediator to develop good negotiating attitudes and an objective approach to the issues, and to inspire confidence in himself and his impartiality, is standard procedure.

Beyond this point, each situation develops its own mediation demands. The mediator may seek to raise doubts in the minds of the parties about firm positions they have taken, and to develop some willingness to yield ground through suggestions, provocative questions or a clarifying restatement of issues. Many times the real problem is to develop true facts and situations and to isolate the wheat from the chaff. Developing alternative solutions and compromises, handling the bargaining to encourage progressive recessions, and controlling the critical timing of offers and proposals, all are important.

At times, when the parties have reached an emotional point where they cannot talk directly to each other, the mediator may have to function as a messenger boy; at other times, when face saving is involved, he may serve as a whipping post. Each situation calls for different handling and the successful mediator is one who can diagnose the correct approach to effect a good solution. The flexibility of our organization lets us almost "tailor make" our operations in each situation, to conform to the bargaining problems that exist. We often will assign more than one mediator to the case. If necessary, the regional director may take an active part or members of my Washington staff may participate. We try, as far as we possibly can, to make the service fit the need.

The thoughts I have expressed today are neither new nor original with me, but it seemed to me that there was a need for a restatement of them at this time; particularly those remarks concerning government responsibility in labor-management affairs.

We are all familiar with that old saw which runs "that government is best which governs least." That is still true. I submit that the ends of both labor and management are best served by government which insists upon the parties making their own settlements and is neither "pro-labor" nor "pro-management," but "pro-American."

Those representatives of labor and management who seek to enlist the aid of Government on a partisan basis and who criticize it because it has refused to take sides, do a serious disservice to our American concept of industrial democracy. They are blind to the fact that the true friend of labor and the true friend of management is that government which carries out its role in labor-management affairs in an impartial and even-handed manner.

If shortsighted representatives of labor or management should ever succeed in causing Government agencies dealing with any aspect of labor matters to take on a partisan color, those agencies will have lost their utility as peacemaking instrumentalities in the collective bargaining process. When political expediency, prompted by either labor or management pressures, takes over and we find Government injecting itself into bargaining problems in a partisan role, then indeed should the warning signal be sounded—because, at that point, the underlying tenet of voluntary, free collective bargaining will have been "sold down the river," and a totalitarian type of thinking substituted which is foreign to our basic American philosophy.

Needs of the Recipients of Old Age Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the real needs of the recipients of old-age assistance are so urgent and so important to them that it is a pleasure to place the remarks of Mrs. Frankie Childers, a citizen of California, before my colleagues:

To Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives:

My name is Frankie Childers. I am a registered representative of the National Institute of Social Welfare, whose offices are located at 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D. C., and western headquarters at 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles 15, Calif.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as Mr. George McLain, president of the National Institute, has already pointed out the defects of the administration bills now being considered by you, I would like to present what the recipients of public assistance, themselves, believe should be enacted.

The problem of our aging population is commonly recognized as a national problem. So, too, are the problems confronting those on public assistance. Only Congress can solve these problems through legislation designed to alleviate the misery and suffering of the millions of Americans who fall in this category.

A study of our Nation's public assistance laws reveals a grave lack of uniformity between States as to the amount paid and the qualifications for the receipt of such aid.

While Congress in the Public Assistance Section of the Social Security Act in 1935 did require uniformity of administration, they neglected to establish humane standards of need.

Chambers of commerce, taxpayers associations, and other spokesmen for the economic royalists of our day brought pressure on State lawmakers to impose conditions that deprive recipients of their right to human dignity.

In doing so, these spokesmen for the economic royalists backtracked and copied ideas from the infamous "poor laws" started piece-by-piece by Queen Elizabeth in England in 1563 and brought together into an early welfare and institutions code in the year 1601.

Thus, the basic pattern for organized public assistance in the United States today exactly fits the mold carved in the 16th century by Elizabeth and abandoned as inhuman and unfair by the English decades ago.

Take for instance our residence requirement laws governing applicants for public assistance. A strange law, indeed, because under any other circumstance the United States is considered the legal residence of all of us. No passports are needed to travel from State to State—our Constitution says that no tariffs can be imposed by States—in time of war, no one escapes the responsibility of defending his country because of State residence laws.

Then where did the residence law imposed on the needy come from? Just look back to the days of Elizabeth for your answer. You'll find that some of the parishes were richer than others, some had better climates, some gave more generous aid. So the settlement or residence act was passed, restricting the obligation of any parish to those who had a legal residence there. Legal residence could be acquired by birth, by ownership of land, or by apprenticeship.

Take the pattern of our so-called responsible relatives law. Yes, take it right back 350 years and fit it neatly into the "poor laws of Elizabeth." You couldn't just be a pauper. Your whole family had to be paupers before you could expect any aid from any source. The "responsible relatives clause," imposed by most of our States, is your modern version. These and many of the other laws dealing with public assistance, designed to harrass and intimidate recipients of aid in this country, stem directly from the "poor laws" of England.

Yet, the English recognized their folly more than a hundred years ago and greatly liberalized these vicious provisions. Then, in 1908 England repealed her "poor laws" altogether and passed the Old Age Pension Act, which includes all her citizens receiving such aid as a matter of right.

During the 20 years that the Social Security Act has been the law of the land it would seem that Congress by now should have seen the inequities in the public assistance section of the law. I am sure that each and every member of this committee, as well as each and every Member of Congress, has received much mail from their districts asking for the improvements which I plan to cover today.

While many, many worthwhile bills have been introduced by the good Members of Congress, individually, covering most of these subjects, I will speak specifically on H. R. 7848, introduced by Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California, because he has brought together in one bill a major program of overhauling the public assistance section of the Federal Social Security Act.

Pension groups throughout the country have found a rallying point behind H. R. 7848 because of its comprehensive scope. In early November of last year old-age pension and social welfare representatives from all over the United States gathered for a national conference in Los Angeles and adopted a program encompassing the type legislation public assistance recipients need and want Congress to adopt.

Most of this is covered by H. R. 7848.

This bill requires the laws of the 48 States to be uniform by having Congress establish a minimum standard of qualifications for the

applicants and recipients below which no State shall go.

For the first time a legislative intent would be established by Congress "that public assistance shall be administered promptly and humanely, with due regard for the preservation of family life, and without discrimination on account of race, sex, religion, or political affiliation; and the assistance laws be liberally construed."

As the Federal grants-in-aid to States for public assistance apply to the aged, the blind, dependent children, and the permanently and totally disabled, the bill provides that the States cannot window-shop on these programs, but must adopt all of them.

Other features of H. R. 7848 are as follows:

1. Raises the present federally imposed ceiling on matching of funds from $55 to $100 monthly for each recipient. Additional Federal funds will be made available to States with low per capita income while the wealthier States would be matched 50–50. An increase in Federal funds would be made available for needy children payments.

These amendments will encourage States to increase their payments to the needy by providing for larger Federal payments to the States with a low per capita income, and matching payments of the higher income States. It would not decrease the amounts which these States now receive.

2. The age for women applicants and recipients would be lowered from 65 to 62.

The House Ways and Means Committee has already provided for the lowering of the age for women on OASI in H. R. 7225, and, therefore, it is logical that they do likewise for those on old-age assistance.

3. The aged and handicapped would be allowed to earn up to $50 per month and needy children, up to $30 per month to supplement their assistance checks.

An aged or handicapped recipient, under present laws imposed by Congress, is sentenced to idleness and prohibited from earning even the smallest amount under the threat of having such earnings deducted from their aid payment. This privilege has already been granted by Congress to the blind.

Children, especially of school age, should be encouraged to better their lot instead of being forced into idleness because of the Federal provision that all "outside income and earnings be deducted from the amount of aid granted them."

4. Recipients may own a home of an assessed value less all encumbrances, up to $5,000 free from the imposition of a lien, and the ownership of such home will not be used as an excuse to deduct a so-called occupancy value from their payments.

Some years ago the Federal Social Security Agency adopted the following policy: "Compulsory transfer of control of property in order to qualify for assistance violates a cardinal principle on which the Social Security Act is based—that needy persons should not be differentiated by reason of their need and that recipients of assistance have the same right of self-determination by reason of their need in the use of their resources as others in the community."

Such ownership is now considered as a resource and a value is set anywhere from $3 to $15 a month, which amount is deducted from the aid payments to a recipient homeowner. Married coupled have double the amount deducted from their aid.

5. Elimination of the practice of enforcing collections from the relatives of recipients.

In a letter dated March 18, 1947, W. F. Mitchell, Acting Commissioner of the Social Security Administration of the Federal Security Agency, recommended the elimination of these clauses from State welfare codes:

"We are quoting the statement we made to State welfare agencies when we recommended that provisions conditioning eligibility for assistance on the ability of relatives to support the applicant be eliminated from State public assistance laws.

"The assistance laws in many States provide not only that assistance received from relatives shall be taken into account in determining an applicant's need, but also that the existence of relatives considered able to support shall make an applicant ineligible for aid.

"In some instances it may be known that the relative is actually not contributing to the support of the applicant and yet, because of the State law, assistance must be denied.

"The enforcement of such relatives' responsibility laws is sometimes tempered in the administration of such laws, yet the very existence of such provisions in the State assistance law represents a threat to needy individuals and subjects them to the uncertainties of administrative discretion.

"The income and resources of an applicant that are considered in determining need should be actual and not merely potential.

"The general support laws of the States provide the means of enforcing support from relatives if the individual or State wishes to take such action. The public assistance laws should not be used as a means of enforcing the support laws of the States."

6. Should an otherwise qualified person not meet State residence requirements, the Federal Government will pay its share direct to the person until they have met the residence requirement.

The present Federal law allows the States to impose a residence requirement not to exceed 5 years out of the 9 years preceding application. Many States require less than this maximum. Some States differ upon the interpretation of what constitutes residence. Other States discontinue payments as quickly as possible should the recipient be absent on a visit. Thousands of elderly, blind, and handicapped persons have found themselves suddenly becoming citizens without a State. This amendment will help to ease their suffering.

7. Prohibits publishing the names of recipients.

If a person in dire need of public aid applies for same, and after a careful investigation by competent welfare workers, is deemed worthy of such aid, how could chiseling be prevented by holding his name up to public reproach, so that those who like to shout "pauper" could do so?

To permit promiscuous invasion of the privacy of the aged, the blind, physically handicapped, and dependent children receiving assistance, by making public their misfortune, could, therefore, only result in perpetuating a useless and unnecessary indignity upon them.

This needless humiliation of public assistance recipients is reminiscent of the old custom of putting town drunks and wife beaters in stocks in the public squares to shame them before fellow townsmen.

8. The value of any United States surplus food made available will not be deducted from the recipient's aid.

During the 83d Congress, surplus foods were made available to the States for the unemployed and those on public assistance. The refusal of many States to pay the small cost of handling these foods, however, nullifies this congressional action to aid those on public assistance. The answer, therefore, is Federal surplus food stamps acceptable by grocery stores, which will supplement the recipient's income, and prohibit aid payments from being reduced because of it.

9. Household furnishings, etc., and an insurance policy or burial arrangement up to $500 in value is exempt. A floor of $1,200 is established under the amount of personal property which a single recipient is allowed to have.

10. Recipients should not be discriminated against because of marriage and no person receiving such public aid shall be deemed a pauper, and no warrant drawn in payment shall contain any reference to indigency or pauperism.

Some of these provisions may seem minor to you gentlemen, and not worthy of congressional consideration, but I can assure you that they are of the utmost importance to the constituents in your district. Correct these inequities and you will have gone far down the road toward solving the problems besetting our needy old, blind, physically handicapped, and dependent children.

When making laws dealing with these citizens, you must always keep in mind that although you pass the original laws with all good intentions, they must then be administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. On the State level the legislatures then tack their own provisions onto the law and deliver these to the State social-welfare department or commission, who in turn make additional rules and regulations for administration by local communities. The local authorities then adopt their rules, regulations, and policies concerning the provisions.

Unfortunately, by the time all of these people have given your good intentions a thorough working over, and the welfare worker doles out what is left to the recipients, it's doubtful in most instances that you could recognize the laws that you have passed.

This is why we, who work directly with the recipients year after year, urgently appeal to you gentlemen to set at least this minimum standard of need. Good intentions are not enough. You must spell into the law a "Bill of Rights" for the needy of America.

Thank you.

Watsonville (Calif.) Register-Pajaronian Wins Sigma Delta Chi Public Service Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the Sigma Delta Chi Professional Journalistic Fraternity yesterday announced that its 1956 award for public service in journalism would go to the Watsonville Register-Pajaronian which is published in Watsonville in the 10th Congressional District of California.

Only twice before in the history of the award has this honor, one of the very highest in American journalism, been bestowed upon a newspaper not published in a metropolitan city. Never before has it been awarded to a newspaper in the West. Neither has it ever been given to a more deserving recipient.

Under the leadership of its editor, Mr. Frank Fletcher Orr, the Register-Pajaronian has long been the conscience of its community. A rare combination of aggressive and meticulous reporting, imaginative editing, and judicious editorial comment have made this newspaper an outstanding example of sound, constructive American journalism with a reputation which far exceeds its immediate circulation area. I know that the community of Watsonville daily enjoys the expressed respect and admira-

tion of great metropolitan newspapers of much larger circulation.

Mr. Speaker, the community of Watsonville is no different from hundreds of cities of comparable size throughout the length and breadth of the United States. Its newspaper, the Register-Pajaronian, faces similar problems with similar resources as do scores of newspapers of comparable circulation from coast to coast. What makes it outstanding, and what now has won for it the coveted honor of the Sigma Delta Chi award, is the intelligent approach, the refusal to compromise with truth, the fearless determination to learn and report all the facts, and let the chips fall where they may.

This week, when the American Society of Newspaper Editors will hold its meeting here in Washington, much will be said about Freedom of the Press. We all know that there are many forces working consciously or inadvertently to restrict this freedom. May I suggest that in the United States of America, freedom of the press will never be in danger so long as courageous, intelligent editors with capable staffs are doing their jobs the way Frank F. Orr and the staff of the Register-Pajaronian have been and are doing theirs in Watsonville, Calif.

The late great William Allen White proved to all America with his Emporia (Kans.) Gazette that a small-town newspaper can, through sheer enterprise and excellence, gain influence far beyond the confines of its own small circulation area. As the representative of the 10th Congressional District of California, I am intensely proud that the Watsonville Register-Pajaronian is gaining national recognition for taking the same approach.

Panama Canal Policy: An Engineer's Evaluation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the major policy questions that has been before the Congress for a number of years is the increase of interoceanic transit facilities. As a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which has legislative jurisdiction over interoceanic canals generally, I have been impressed by the volume of published information on various phases of this complicated subject. Thus, I invite attention to the documentation on Isthmian Canal policy by Hon. CLARK W. THOMPSON, of Texas, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix of March 23, 1955.

A recent important contribution to current Isthmian discussions is a considered evaluation of the Panama Canal problem by E. S. Randolph of Baton Rouge, La., an experienced Panama Canal engineer, in the April 1956 issue of the Proceedings of the United States Naval Institute. The following biographical account of the author appeared with the article:

A registered professional engineer in Baton Rouge, La., Mr. Randolph was employed for some 35 years in the Canal Zone. He was in direct charge for the Government of the construction of Madden Dam and later headed the organization making the investigation for the Third Locks Project.

Mr. Randolph's statement, which represents the matured opinion of a responsible engineering leader gained from long service with the Panama Canal, merits the most careful study by all concerned with Isthmian problems, especially the higher officials of the executive departments and the members and staffs of cognizant committees of the Congress.

The engineering appraisal by Mr. Randolph is a timely sequel to an overall evaluation of Isthmian Canal policy in the March 1955 issue of the United States Naval Institute Proceedings. The latter was inserted by Chairman HERBERT C. BONNER, of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, in the hearings before his committee on the operations of the Panama Canal Company and Canal Zone Government, March 29–31, 1955, pp. 37–50.

The Martin-Thompson bills mentioned by Mr. Randolph are: S. 766, introduced by Senator THOMAS E. MARTIN, of Iowa; and H. R. 3335, by Representative CLARK W. THOMPSON, of Texas. These are companion measures that would create an Interoceanic Canals Commission to supply the Congress with adequate means to resolve the issues involved in determining future Isthmian Canal policy, with appropriate recommendations in the premises.

To provide nationwide distribution of Mr. Randolph's considered judgments on this vitally important national problem, under leave granted, I quote its text:

AN ENGINEER'S EVALUATION OF ISTHMIAN CANAL POLICY

(By E. S. Randolph)

Within less than 50 years after completion of the Panama Canal, the United States is faced with the fact that as magnificent a construction job as it is, the canal cannot much longer fill the needs it was built for. It is being outdated both as regards the size and number of ships that need to transit. Recognition of this fact is evidenced not only in the constant study by congressional committees but in numerous articles appearing in magazines and newspapers.

The high-level-lake and lock canal with modifications as proposed by numerous authorities can be readily constructed by altering the present canal without interrupting traffic.[1] All needed improvements can be built into the structures and waterways as the work progresses. The plan is entirely practical as an engineering project and is the first comprehensive plan for the marine operational improvement of the shipway. It is a plan for which precedents exist concerning the engineering and construction, estimates of cost and of time required to build, and cost of maintenance and operation year after year.

The canal enterprise includes all services of management and government for the population as well as for transit and other accommodations for the vessels in passage. These administrative problems can be very engrossing, as can the problems of correlating the interests of the diplomatic service and Armed Forces with the canal interests. Engineering considerations of long-range planning are therefore likely to receive secondary priority.

The policy during the construction of the canal was to retain a chief engineer, a member of the Commission, for the duration of the project. After completion, the policy has been to replace the controlling engineer about each fourth year. For the control of landslides there was no substitute for the experience gained before and after admission of water to the cut. For the control of floods pouring into Gatun Lake there was a long-range experience to be gained. Now, as the canal approaches the limit of its commercial capacity, there is a wealth of knowledge gained by long observation of the behavior of geologic formations and engineering materials, and the efficiency of different shapes and types of navigation structures, which knowledge is possessed by those who have devoted years of time to observation and study of the many special problems. Looking back, it would seem that the better policy would have been to establish a career position of chief engineer in the operating organization and to have filled it with a person having long and continuous responsible engineering experience in the canal service on the Isthmus of Panama and whose vision, projections, and accomplishments all stemmed from intimate knowledge of, and association with the Panama Canal. As long as such a policy is not adopted, errors made in the past must inevitably be repeated.

This writer, after 35 years employment on engineering works on the canal, during and after its construction, and additional years in the United States, concludes that it is neither necessary nor desirable that the head of the civil government of the Panama Canal be a professional engineer, but it is necessary that he be a capable executive. The engineering considerations relating to the maintenance and improvement of the utility are so broad, numerous, and highly specialized that the responsible engineer can do them justice only if he functions expertly and freely in his assigned duties, unhampered by responsibility for administration of the canal and by detailed directions, however well intended.

It is apparent that unceasing consideration should be given to future programs for maintaining the canal in adequate condition. Major modifications should be planned years ahead of need, and plans should be periodically modified to meet changing conditions. The first consideration is: When will expanded facilities be required? Because this question cannot be exactly settled it should be reviewed at yearly intervals. If not done, it is probable that the too late start made in 1940 will be repeated.

The start of the third locks project, in 1940, followed an investigation made without adequate funds to perform the immense investigation essential before successfully undertaking such a construction program. After war threatened there was insufficient time to complete the investigation.

The 1947 report of Isthmian Canal Studies contains much valuable technical information, but the recommendations no longer meet the tremendous changes in the art of warfare, nor do they now present a true picture of present-day costs. There is no Government agency which can properly undertake a comprehensive plan of major action for the modernization of the ship canal across the American Isthmus.

The "high-level" canal plan is characterized by its maximum utilization of the present waterway, with retention of the best features proven by over 40 years of opera-

[1] See Isthmian Canal Policy—An Evaluation, by Capt. Miles P. DuVal, USN (retired), in the March 1955 proceedings.

tion during both peace and war and with a correction of those features which have been found to be defective. The work of construction would involve problems that were solved during the construction and maintenance of the original canal. The convenience and certainty of operation would be a foregone conclusion. The maintenance problems would be known with certainty. The most economical use of existing structures and waterways would be made. The present firmly consolidated earthen dams and dikes would be retained as they are or strengthened if found necessary. The Gatun Lake receives the waters from the tributary rivers and diverts them to useful purposes. This "high-level" canal can be planned with every assurance of success and can be constructed for less cost and in less time than can any other design so far considered. The simplicity and relatively moderate proportions involved in the "high-level" plan may render it less glamorous and so operate against its adoption. The judges of the merits of the "high-level" plan may find it has less popular support than its excellent and serviceable qualities warrant.

The sea-level plan contains engineering and constructional features which are grossly without precedent in the Isthmian area. There would be masses of excavation and embankment work involving a wide variety of soils and rocks, earthen structures of great size and weight, and deeper cuts than previously made. The oversize dredging equipment required for deepening the cut before lowering the water level would necessitate a program of development involving unforeseeable risks, delays, and costs. Without experience, there is no solid basis for the evaluation of the action of the materials under the new order of pressures which would be developed.

Because tidal currents would prevail if locks at the Pacific entrance of the sea-level canal were not used, the waterway would necessarily be deeper, wider, and straighter than required for the high-level waterway. Heavy maintenance problems (perhaps insuperable) would develop because of the higher banks through a longer distance. The bottom of the proposed new channel would be about 108 feet lower than the bottom of the present cut, at Contractor's Hill, thereby cutting into an heretofore undisturbed geologic formation known to be unstable.

The success or failure of such a waterway would be a matter for demonstration after completion rather than before it is commenced as in case of high-level plan. The time and the cost to build the sea-level construction, not to mention the cost of maintenance after completion, are unknown quantities, but all would be vastly greater than required for the high-level plan.

The complexity of the sea-level plan and opportunities for experimentation are of a nature to intrigue members of the engineering profession. The massiveness of the physical work contemplated might well attract manufacturers and construction contractors to the project. The judges of the merits of this plan must ever be on guard against an enthusiasm which is not justified by its overall qualities inherent in the plan itself, or by any results to be attained therefrom.

Contrasting the high-level and sea-level plans, the former would not require any initial lowering of the undisturbed bottom of the 8-mile cut to obtain increased depth for navigation. The latter contemplates tremendous excavation of a new channel through the central mass that would be more than 100 feet deeper than the present cut and many miles longer. The problem of landslides would be greatly accentuated. The experience gained from maintaining the present slopes would probably not apply to the proposed new slopes at much greater depth because the qualities and arrangement of geological formations encountered would be different, as would be the internal stresses. The present cut is bordered by great valleys where once landslides were in motion.

Having walked in the bottom of the deep cut and having explored and studied the moving earth slides, this writer, who perhaps has a more respectful attitude toward them than have those who merely read of their histories, advises against stirring up numerous new and greater landslides unless justification is so overwhelming that the experience of the years can be deliberately rejected.

In the sea-level plan, the great diversion dams are proposed to be constructed by dumping excavated spoil from barges through the waters of Gatun Lake. Later the lake would be drained during an interval when it must be closed to traffic. There is no previous experience to guide the engineer to a safe conclusion of this work. The problems of subsidence, heaving, and lateral flow of the swamp muck under the lake will be present, but its action may be delayed until the lake water is lowered and the dikes become operative.

The builders of the Panama Railroad about 100 years ago, projected a line and built a fill through the Charges River Valley and upon the swamp muck. Any engineer who has to deal with that muck should make a thorough study of the difficulties encountered then, also again when the present railroad causeway was built on the drained swamp bottom to a height of 92 feet above sea level.

During the construction of the causeway the weight of the new fills caused, at places, a subsidence under the fill accompanied by an upheaval at the sides of the fill. This action was overcome by laying counterweight fills where heaving was observed or anticipated. The work was in plain sight above water, which would not be the case when depositing fill through water. Engineers who have encountered this swamp muck have invariably experienced difficulty.[2]

Having been employed by the Panama Railroad Company when the causeway carrying the relocated railroad line was being constructed, this writer doubts the advisability of carrying out the "sea-level" diversion plans without much additional assurance of their reliability.

The optimum water level in Gatun Lake is that maximum desirable level for required increase in navigable depth through the 8-mile length of the central mass and for other purposes. Increase in depth can be better attained by raising the water level than by cutting below the undisturbed bottom, thereby causing additional stresses in the high banks of the cut and precipitating new slides. Associated is the appreciable increase in minimum depth which would result from the dampening of surge waves if the Pedro Miguel Locks were removed. The optimum level can be determined only after a major engineering investigation. As long as such increase is possible, no new structures should be erected along the high-level waterfront without ample freeboard.

Widening and straightening of navigation channels could proceed before, during, and after the building of new high-level locks, by dredging at an economical rate, only when required for the accommodation of larger vessels, and by use of an augmented maintenance fleet of standard dredging equipment. The minimum dimensions, as determined by navigational considerations, need be anticipated only a few years in advance. Within the 8-mile length of deep cut, considerations of slide-control dictate that proportions be determined by more rigorous analysis than in all other reaches.

It is doubtful if any security would be gained by rejecting a high-level-lock canal in favor of a low-level-lock canal. I submit that the insecurely poised banks of any economically feasible sea-level cut through the Isthmus of Panama would be susceptible to atomic bombing so as to close the canal to traffic for an indefinite period, possibly years. There appears to be a relation between the depth of cut and security against refilling from the sliding of banks.

The interoceanic canal problem, includes, besides engineering and geology, grave questions of diplomatic relationships, economics, and marine operations. However great may be the pride of authorship of any proposal, the issues must be decided on their merits at the highest plane of wise and experienced judgment and statesmanship. This I firmly believe can be best accomplished by an independent and broadly constituted Interoceanic Canals Commission as provided in the Martin-Thompson bill now pending.

[2] R. C. Sheldon, Trans-American Society of Civil Engineers, vol. 114, 1949, pp. 847–9.

Inadequacy of the Administration's Proposals on Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the inadequacy of the administration's proposals on social security were devastatingly revealed by a witness from California before the Committee on Ways and Means and I am happy to place them before my colleagues:

To the Honorable Members of the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives:

Gentlemen, my name is George McLain. I am president of the National Institute of Social Welfare with offices located at 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D. C., and with western headquarters located at 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles 15, Calif.

As president of the National Institute of Social Welfare, I appear before you today also to speak for 26 individual State pension and social welfare groups, who have formed a confederation under the National Institute of Social Welfare with a collective membership totaling around a quarter million citizens.

While serving as chairman of the California Institute of Social Welfare for the past 15 years, I have worked daily with recipients of public assistance; the old, the blind, physically handicapped, and dependent children of California. It has been my duty to help these people with their individual problems, representing them before county welfare departments and the State social welfare board on appeals.

During the last decade and a half I have been in constant attendance at every session of the California State Legislature, appearing in behalf of social welfare legislation, and it has been my privilege, to come back here to our Nation's Capitol and appear before your distinguished committees in behalf of similar legislation on several occasions.

I come before you representing the public assistance recipients' point of view. After handling many thousands of cases for

recipients, I believe that I am qualified to give a first-hand observation, from the recipients' standpoint, of where many of the inequities in the social security law lie.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we are most happy that you are now considering the public assistance section of the Federal Social Security Act. And I am most grateful that you have afforded me this opportunity to appear and give the views of my organization on the pending legislation.

However, I am sorry to say that I do not believe the specific legislation now under consideration, H. R. 9091 and H. R. 9120, which embody the administration's thinking on public assistance, corrects any of the inequities existing in this section of the Social Security Act. Indeed, I believe that passage of this legislation would further hinder—not help—the recipients under question. I feel sure that neither of the authors of these bills nor President Eisenhower have this in mind.

Whenever studying proposed legislation, we must naturally project it into the future and consider the State and county administration should it become law. Only by doing this can we understand what effect it will have on the recipients, for they are dealt with on a county level. And, believe me, if you gentlemen had the time to observe the administration of some of the laws passed by you for relief of these unfortunates, you would be hard put to recognize the end result as being the same laws.

The plain fact is, I consider the legislation now under consideration to be headed in the opposite direction of what needs to be done.

Should either of these two bills become law, you would be adding to, not subtracting from, the heavy burden of harassment and loss of dignity now carried by the helpless victims of our society, our public assistant recipients.

Wordage of the "Declaration of Purpose" on page 2, as well as the legislative preamble, sounds most worthy and appealing. However, careful analysis of the legislation has convinced me that right there is where any resemblance to liberalizing the public assistance section ends.

On page 3, under title I—"Matching of Assistance Expenditures for Medical Care," these bills propose a $6 per month maximum for aged, the blind and the physically handicapped, and a $3 maximum payment per month for dependent children of which the Federal Government would pay one-half.

On the surface this would seem to be a good provision, but I wholeheartedly oppose it, and I'd like to tell you why.

No. 1, I should like to point out that each and every one of these people right now desperately needs a "cost of living" increase. Latest figures available from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare bear me out on this statement. These figures reveal that the average old-age assistance payment throughout the United States is only $53.93 per month; the needy blind receive an average of $58.09; the physically and totally disabled, $56.18; and the average for a needy child is $24.35 per month. These pitiful amounts are supposed to take care of food, clothing, shelter and all personal needs for these individuals.

These facts and figures cannot be taken lightly. They spell just one thing—malnutrition. Not since 1952 has Congress shown any consideration for these needy citizens, and then only to the extent that a temporary $5 increase for the aged, blind and physically handicapped, and a $3 per month increase for needy children was voted.

No. 2, should this medical provision be enacted, recipients in at least 22 States would would not gain any advantage. According to the Social Security Bulletin issued in March 1956, these 22 States are right now making average payments of old-age assistance below the Federal matching ceiling. It only stands to reason that if these States will not, or cannot afford to, match even the present $55 Federal ceiling of matching funds established by Congress, they certainly are not going to match any additional 50–50 provision.

You gentlemen can, and I'm convinced that you genuinely want to help our public-assistance recipients. For this reason, I beseech you to consider first the pitiful straits these people are in merely to keep body and soul together with the present low level of payments. I urge that any increase in Federal funds voted by you not be tied down to medical needs alone. The needs of human beings vary widely, and who is to say that medical needs should take precedence over all other human needs? Indeed, a little more money for nutrition and protective health measures might eliminate much of the medical needs.

No. 3, any increase (including the medical provision, should you deem it worthy) should contain more liberal Federal sharing of funds to enocurage States to pass these advantages along to recipients. In other words, if nearly half of the States right now aren't even matching up to the $55 ceiling, how in the world do you expect that they'll match the $6 medical provision? Therefore, the only hope I see to give recipents any advantage at all is either to have the Federal Government make a direct contribution for a cost-of-living increase (or medical needs), or at least to make the matching formula attractive enough to States that they will participate.

As you are doubtless aware, under the present assistance payments, the Federal Government starts off by putting up $20 against the first $5 the State contributes, and then the Federal Government matches on a 50-50 basis any additional State contributions up to a total of $55 per month. I have already pointed out the disadvantages of the 50-50 matching formula and sincerely hope that you will work out a more beneficial one for the recipients' welfare.

Now, gentlemen, we come to the section in these bills which really sends cold shivers up and down my spine.

On page 7, line 6, an "Advisory Council on Medical Care" is proposed to "advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Secretary on matters of policy under the provisions of the Social Security Act relating to medical care for recipients of Public Assistance."

I don't think that there is a member of this committee, or, indeed, a person in this room, who is not aware of the consistent stand taken by spokesmen for the medical profession against the entire Social Security Act. Can you gentlemen really be seriously considering legally creating a post inside the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare from whence they can attack this act. Such a move would be like installing a bunch of termites in your own house so they could start gnawing away and finally bring it tumbling down around your head.

Surely you gentlemen are not unaware of the fact that some 40 representatives of the American Medical Association, the physicians' and surgeons' lobby, recently appeared before the Senate Finance Committee and strongly opposed H. R. 7225, the bill which your committee wrote and the House overwhelmingly approved last year to liberalize the Federal Social Security Act.

Are you also aware that in 1953 the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons passed a resolution to abolish Social Security altogether.

And surely you are not unmindful of the rotten influence the medical profession exercised in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare during the time Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby was Secretary. You can't have forgotten the shameful events leading up to her resignation. Mrs. Hobby had an advisory council. Need I elaborate?

As an illustration of A. M. A. influence during Mrs. Hobby's reign, a Washington newspaper published an item in January which reported that James W. Foristel, Associate General Counsel for the Health, Education, and Welfare Department—a post he held under Mrs. Hobby for 2 years—resigned to became legal adviser for the Washington office of the American Medical Association—the same post he held prior to his appointment by Mrs. Hobby in 1954.

The Advisory Council on Medical Care as proposed in these bills would cement into law the medical profession's control over the lives and physical welfare of millions of helpless Americans, many of whose religious beliefs are contrary to such influence.

I cannot put too much emphasis on my opposition to this measure.

I now direct your attention to page 8, line 19, under title II—"Matching of public assistance expenditures" and "Gradual reduction of Federal share of old-age assistance supplementing OASI benefits."

This, gentlemen, is a measure designed to turn the clock back, if I ever saw one. It would invoke a cruel sentence on the needy persons who find their old-age and survivors insurance monthly benefit payments insufficient to provide for their needs and who must apply for old-age assistance to supplement their income.

In proposing this the administration has really put the cart before the horse. Such a provision will make sense if and when the minimum social-security benefit is raised to a level consistent with the cost of living. I don't think anyone would dare say that the present minimum old-age payment of $30 comes anywhere near meeting the needs of a human being.

The Federal Government now puts up $20 to the State's first $5, and then matches the State on a 50–50 basis on the balance of the payments up to a maximum of $55 for public assistance. This proposed amendment would do away with the basic Federal inducement of $20 and the Government would resort to a 50–50 matching from the inception of the payment.

In my earlier testimony I pointed out the hardships endured even under the present matching formula. To take away part of what is now being given would be catastrophic. States would be forced to sharply curtail assistance now being given to needy people who receive some OASI benefits. This would create a class within a class among our needy aged population and cause untold misery to millions of oldsters.

I was pleased to see that Congressman JERE COOPER, in introducing the administration bill, issued a press release which contained the facts of the bill's provisions. In his release Chairman COOPER stated that the revised matching formula for persons added to the old-age assistance rolls after June 30, 1957, who receive old-age and survivors insurance benefits, would bring about a curtailment of Federal funds to the States amounting to $6,500,000 by the fiscal year 1958 and $73 million annually by the year 1967.

In other words, because the individual had coverage under the Federal Social Security Act to which he contributed during his working years, he would be penalized because he later found himself and his spouse in need of public assistance to live.

There can be no fear of duplication of pension payments from the same source as Congress has provided that "all outside income, earnings, and resources must be taken into consideration in determining the amount of aid granted an applicant or recipient of public assistance."

The present administration's avowed intentions of "getting out of the public-assistance program," a move that this provision is

reportedly to start, is a frightening thing, while at the very same time they oppose any liberalization of the OASI sections of the Social Security Act.

I say that we will always need a public-assistance program based upon need to provide for those whose income from other sources is so small that they must seek additional help from their Government. Don't penalize old-age and survivors' insurance beneficiaries because Congress has not seen fit to extend to them sooner the benefit of coverage under the Social Security Act or that Congress has failed so far to make such payments realistic with today's living costs.

On pages 9 and 10, Title II—Matching of Public Assistance Expenditure," these bills call for temporary extension of 1952 matching formula. The so-called McFarland amendment in 1952 granted a $5-increase to the aged, the blind, the physically handicapped, and a $3-increase to needy children. Unfortunately, a condition was imposed that it should expire in 2 years. In 1954 Congress extended this small increase for another 2 years, which is due to expire in September of this year. These bills would again extend the $5 for another 2 years.

In view of the rising cost of living during these years is it not obvious by now that not only does this provision need to be made permanent, but that these people desperately need an additional increase to keep pace with this increased cost of living?

I am adamantly opposed to the provisions beginning on page 10, line 6, Title III—Self-Support and Self-Care for Those on Old-Age Assistance. Such a proposal for the needy aged is not only ridiculous when you consider the circumstances, but I think is designed as a means of forcing old people off the roles to face slow starvation rather than face the harassment that such a provision could impose.

Statistics show that the average age of a recipient of old-age assistance is 76 years old, that three-fourths of them are women, that the majority of them were reduced to dependency not only because of their sex, but due to the devastating depression of the early thirties. To seek to make them self-supporting at this late date is the height of unrealism considering the difficulty that even a man of 45 now has in getting a job.

While such a scheme may have negligible merit for dependent children, the blind, and physically handicapped, it's utterly ridiculous to expect old people in their 70's, 80's, and 90's to trek down every month to the county welfare office and take a physical examination to see if there is enough life left in them to be able to take a job and get off the roles.

It appears very likely to me that this proposed amendment is designed to return our social welfare program to the work relief test of the depression days.

California made an attempt in this direction a while back by contacting business firms, etc., to secure jobs for a so-called untapped pool of workers 65 and over. The net result of their efforts was to find that anyone who could work was working and didn't apply for public assistance until they were just plain physically unable to work any longer.

This brave attempt upon the part of half-baked crackpots who are out to save the taxpayers money at the expense of the needy, wound up by costing the taxpayers more money in equipping offices and paying high salaries to the instigators of the idea.

With the State and county welfare officials racking their brains to figure up harassments for the needy, I most certainly hope that Congress won't add impetus to this practice by encouraging work tests as this provision would do. Believe me, States can think up enough devilment on their own.

Further, on page 17, line 17, we find a section titled "Cooperative Research or Demonstration Projects." This proposed amendment seeks to let the bars down completely on the public assistance program and invite every, Tom, Dick, and Harry to get into the act of pestering these poor unfortunate souls. It not only invites, but actually finances private nonprofit organizations and agencies to snoop and poke around into the lives of these people.

Here again, the magic words are "prevention and reduction of dependency" and "help improve the administration and effectiveness of programs carried on or assisted under the Social Security Act."

My heavens to Betsy, if Congress and the State legislatures aren't capable of handling this program, what in the world will happen when all of these outsiders start officially moving into the picture with utterly no responsibility to the people for their actions.

The President, our Members of Congress, governors, and our State legislators are elected by the people and responsible to them—if any or all of them are not competent enough to run a government function such as this, then I say the future looks hopeless.

Already, one of the major ills of the public assistance program is the duplication—as it is administered by the Federal Government, State governments, and local governments. Invite all these outside organizations with their own axes to grind in as officials—with no responsibility to the people—and they would eventually be running the whole program. And then, only God could help the needy.

In this same amendment, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare seeks the advice and recommendations of specialists. Is there anything under present law which prevents him from seeking this advice? I think not. It's my opinion that if the Secretary is not sufficiently experienced or competent to run his Department, without a multitude of official outside interference then you either need a new Secretary, new Department heads—or both.

In summing up my objections to H. R. 9091, said to be President Eisenhower's answer to the public assistance problems, may I say that it is my studied opinion that adoption of this measure would throw the program into complete chaos and destroy practically the whole intent of Congress when they first established the public assistance section of the Social Security Act.

1. I cannot see how saddling the public-assistance recipients with rulings of a bunch of "doctors-turned-politicians" can do anything but harm the needy.

2. I urge that the small increase voted by Congress back in 1952 be made permanent thereby relieving State tension and the recipients' fear that this pitiful amount will some day be cut off their checks.

3. I strongly urge that any increase considered by you gentlemen not be tied down to medical needs alone. Surely the Eisenhower administration is not being consistent when they ask for $4,200 million for foreign economic aid on one hand and turn around and propose to withdraw $72 million a year from States because needy recipients may also be receiving old age and survivors insurance benefits.

4. The imposition of a program titled "Self-Support and Self-Care" to those on public assistance could only wind up as "work relief" practiced during the depression. This could only add to the present trend of making longevity a curse instead of a blessing.

5. The financing of outside private agencies to participate with equal authority in the Public Assistance Act would go far toward destroying the whole program and its original intent of helping people who need it with a minimum amount of harassment.

I do pray that out of this hearing you will design a bill to establish a uniform standard of need for public assistance, below which no State shall be allowed to go, and that in establishing need you gentlemen will seek to restore to the applicants and recipients their right to human dignity.

I also urge that you design a new formula for Federal grants-in-aid to States for public assistance designed to encourage States to raise payments to the needy aged, blind, and physically handicapped up to $100 per month, with a corresponding increase for dependent children.

As in all fields of human endeavor, we need to progress, not retrogress as these administration bills would do. Whether we progress or retrogress in the public-assistance field is up to you gentlemen.

Thank you.

To Pause, Now and Then

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am happy to include a confession of American faith appearing in Collier's for April 27, 1956, and which comes with a telling significance at this hour in our history:

TO PAUSE, NOW AND THEN

In this high-velocity world of ours, so many new things demand knowing that it is seldom anyone except the dogged historian, the duty-ridden student, or the professional researcher who deliberately pauses to look back.

In the series The American Tradition, which begins in this issue with Philip Van Doren Stern's story of Lincoln's poignant journey through Richmond, Collier's invites you to look back. They are not—this and the others of the series which will follow from time to time—stories to be bolted like a commuter's breakfast. They are stories to be read in an easy chair, when there is quiet and time to ruminate and savor, and flesh out the images brought into the mind's eye.

For there is much to be had from these stories, read in this way.

There is excitement, to be sure; no greater drama is written than can be found in Mr. Lincoln's walk through the fallen city of Richmond—a city no humbler in defeat than was Lincoln in victory; or in the handcart trek of the Mormons—through incredible suffering borne with incredible courage—westward to Utah; or in the clatter of cannon and oak and tearing sail as Captain Hull's seamen fought and whipped the proud *Guerriere*. But there is more than excitement to be had from these stories, told in this way. There is truth, and in truth, inspiration.

For these stories are fact, not legend. The series sets out to be a study into the sources of America's greatness, and that greatness derives from human beings, not flattering portraits hung on a wall.

There have been—as Professor Commager suggests in his introduction to the series—many authentic heroes in our story, men like Washington and Jefferson, Lincoln and Lee, who can hold their own in any Val-

halla. But there have been no demigods, no supermen, no Caesars or Alexanders or Napoleons. Washington, far from serene self-confidence, was plagued with fear of his own inadequacy; and it was Lincoln who said in all sincerity at Gettysburg: "The world will little note, nor long remember, what we say here."

It remembered those words, certainly, but it elevated almost to holy write the words he spoke a moment later, enshrining the doctrine of "government of the people, by the people, for the people."

Here was the essence of the drama, the greatness, the miracle of America—that it could set and maintain in motion a system in which every man was a leader, and every leader a follower.

This is the American tradition—of uncommon men discovering in their union a strength far greater than the sum of their strengths; and of these uncommon men keeping faith with their doctrine, generation through generation, across two centuries.

This is a tradition worth recounting, worth reliving through those moments, rich in excitement, deep in human drama, in which this unique entity of America took form. The stories will not always be of fife-and-drum quicksteps and crackling gunfire; that part of the American foundation that was built in the frozen quiet of Valley Forge is quite as strong as that part built at Cowpens or Yorktown.

But throughout will run the magnificent drama of people, marching through triumph, plodding through misery and tragedy, forever conscious, as Commager notes, of a peculiar destiny. The story has meaning, today, for all those millions in the world who, moved by the same impulses that moved our forefathers, are reaching for freedom and dignity.

And the story has special meaning for Americans. For in the desperate confusion and peril of the atomic age there is a risk that we may lose sight of this destiny, that we may forget something of its meaning and its worth. There is no better way to recall it to mind than to look back, to walk with the tall man through the desolation of conquered Richmond, to stand with Hull on the *Constitution's* pitching deck, to plod with the heroic brothers as they pushed westward past the fresh roadside graves of their loved ones—and to reflect how many hands have borne the torch it is now ours to carry, and to pass along still burning bright.

Max Abelman Honored by Philippine Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 4, 1956, there was presented to Max Abelman, of Brooklyn, a special diploma of honor from Dr. M. V. De Los Santos, president of the University of Manila. The presentation was made by His Excellency, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Philippine Ambassador to the United States, and was held in the Nurses Residence Hall of the Jewish Hospital, of Brooklyn. Surrogate Maximilian Moss, chairman of the executive committee of the hospital, presided. Following are the addresses made on this occasion:

Chairman Moss. His Excellency the Ambassador General Carlos P. Romulo, His Excellency the Ambassador Felixberto Serrano, other guests of great distinction, Chaplain Goldberg, doctors, nurses, ladies and gentlemen: American hospitals are playing a very vital role in creating better understanding and good will between foreign governments and the United States through their intern and resident medical training programs.

Thousands of doctors of foreign lands, graduates of recognized medical schools, are trained each year in this country. When they return to their countries upon completion of their work here, they serve as ambassadors of good will. Just as Max Abelman serves as an ambassador of good will for Brooklyn. They not only bring with them the latest American medical techniques, but also our attitude of friendship and democratic traditions. The combination is invaluable for America and the world.

The Jewish Hospital has trained more than 50 Philippine interns and residents since 1942 and will continue in close cooperation with that nation's great government.

I should like to read a letter from the President of the Philippines:

MALACANANG,
Manila, February 21, 1956.

Mr. MAX ABELMAN,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR MR. ABELMAN: It has gratified me to learn that you will be the recipient of a Special Diplomat of Honor to be conferred upon you by the University of Manila for your humanitarian activities. I still remember the excerpts from the issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dated January 11, and 13, 1955, wherein your charitable and civic activities were commended by Representatives FRANCES P. BOLTON and EUGENE J. KEOGH of the United States Congress. Surely the conferment of this latest award on your good self is a fitting recognition of your devoted work.

Please accept my sincerest congratulations and best wishes.

Cordially yours,

RAMON MAGSAYSAY,
President of the Philippines.

Chairman Moss (continuing). President Magsaysay refers to one of our Brooklyn Congressmen, who is sitting in the front row here today. He flew in from Washington purposely to meet General Romulo and to pay his respects to Max Abelman.

Gene, I couldn't present you any better than to read a letter from the President of the Philippines mentioning you. Congressman KEOGH.

Congressman KEOGH. Your Honor, Judge Moss, Your Excellencies, Dr. Goldberg, our very distinguished and genial friend, Max Abelman, and ladies and gentlemen: I had expected that I would just be one of those like you sitting here quietly, but sincerely showing our deep and abiding respect to a great Brooklynite and a great American; but, being a Member of Congress, you know, prompts one always to be ready to talk, especially on as pleasurable an occasion as this, for it affords me an opportunity in Brooklyn to greet His Excellency, General Romulo, with whom I recall having served while he was his country's representative in the United States Congress—and I am sure I am not telling secrets when I tell you that "once a member, always a member." We have followed him with great pride and great interest in the tremendous work that he has done and is doing in the cause of freedom and democracy.

I also welcome the opportunity to pay my respects, too, to his country's representative in the United Nations and to welcome him to Brooklyn. I wish to compliment them on the selection of the honor today and to extend my sincere congratulations to Brooklyn's ambassador of good will at large, who I know, has always been interested in advancing and promoting the common and beneficial interest of these two great countries. I therefore join with you, Mr. Chairman, in extending to Max Abelman our very sincere congratulations. With them go our prayers and hopes that he will be spared to serve with us for many, many years to come in the great and good and elevating work that he has dedicated himself to.

It is indeed, therefore, Mr. Chairman, a pleasure that I shall long remember that I should have been privileged to be with you today and, on my own behalf and on behalf of the congressional delegation from the great country of Brooklyn [laughter] to extend our best wishes to the great sister republic of the Philippines and to the great American who has brought these two countries even closer together, Max Abelman.

Chairman Moss. Dr. Ferreol mentioned Dr. Cotui and I should like very much if he would say a word. Dr. Cotui!

Dr. COTUI. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Abelman, Ambassador Romulo, Ambassador Serrano, distinguished guests: I have been assigned a job by the Chairman, and it may sound ridiculous in the face of all the sublime things we have heard, and that is to propose that we change the name of this hospital to the Philippine Hospital of Brooklyn. [Laughter and applause.]

Chairman Moss. We Americans should take a lesson from Dr. Cotui. He can say some very powerful things in one sentence.

There are several letters that I know you would want me to tell you of after you hear the names of the persons who wrote them. There is a letter from Harry S. Truman. There is a letter from Henry A. Wallace. There is a very long letter and a very intimate one, speaking of many activities together in Middlesex Medical College and otherwise, from Abe Stark. There is a letter from Governor Dewey. There is a letter from Mayor Wagner. And there is a letter from Jim Farley which refers to Max as "nature's nobleman."

I am shortening the session by not reading the letters.

There is the last letter in this portfolio from Ed Silver, our district attorney, and I think he actually speaks the same sentiments of all the letters when he says the following: "It is most fitting that a man who has spent so many years as you have"—meaning Max—"on behalf of humanity should receive it at the hands of another great humanitarian, General Romulo.

"If all the people you have helped could attend the function, you would have to hire Madison Square Garden and it would be crowded at that."

We have many distinguished personages here today and our time is very limited. The general must leave for Washington, and we must, of necessity, limit the speeches, but I am sure we all want to hear from His Excellency Ambassador Felixberto Serrano, permanent delegate to the United Nations from the Philippines. Ambassador Serrano.

Ambassador SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Abelman, my beloved General Romulo, and my American friends, when Mr. Abelman called me up by telephone at my office about 2 weeks ago, asking me if I could be present on this occasion, I answered him without hesitation "Yes," because I had acquired previous knowledge of the fact that General Romulo had been selected to confer upon him this award, and so I said to myself there could be no occasion more pleasurable than that in which one of the few greatest friends of the Philippines and the Filipinos shall be honored through one of the few greatest friends of America and the Philippines. I am referring to Max Abelman. The award to Mr. Abelman, in my opinion, has a dual significance. It is a recognition of

his continuing dedication to humanity: and, on the other hand, it has the larger significance of being a symbol of the friendship between your people and mine.

For 48 years we have forged these relationships; and, even if our political ties have been severed, we remain, as we were before, friends of yours in peaceful collaboration and perhaps, shall I say, in a noble comradeship.

Few things ever last in this world. It is my hope and my prayer that the services of Mr. Abelman and the recognition accorded to those services by my country and by one of the greatest institutions in my country, and what is more important, the bonds of friendship between your country and mine, shall never be forgotten and will last as long as the world shall be a place where we want to live in peace and happiness.

Chairman Moss. Thank you, Ambassador Serrano.

We are fortunate in having with us the Senior Chaplain of the United States Navy, who is here in a dual capacity. He is a warm friend of General Romulo's of many years' standing. He is a warm friend of Max Abelman's of many years' standing.

And with that, Chaplain Goldberg, would you honor us with your remarks, sir?

Rabbi JOSHUA GOLDBERG. Your Max's Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen: These two are also titles—"Your Max's"—because Maximilian Moss, as you know, is one of our outstanding Jewish leaders and an outstanding jurist, and Max Abelman is entitled to every possible honor as far as I am concerned for a very personal reason.

When I came back, having served in World War I and hardly speaking English, upon returning to the United States of America I was teaching Hebrew at the time in a religious school, and it occurred to some people to recommend me to Max Abelman, who was at that time the executive director of the Brooklyn Federation of Jewish Charities, as a possible candidate for assistant executive and in his wisdom he decided that I would not do, so for that alone he is entitled to a diploma of honor for whatever I have become across the years. Across those same years I have ever watched the ever-growing influence of good will which came from his personality and it is a pleasure to be here this afternoon to witness the conferring of this award.

I would like to say one more word, and that is to General Romulo in the presence of the permanent delegate to the United Nations from the Philippines. It is something to remember. It was before the police action in Korea, before other people awoke to the possibility of the invasion of Communist ideology into the major portion of Asia. I recall him speaking bluntly, articulately and to the point on the necessity for the free nations of the world to understand that the danger is not only European but the possibility is that it may veer altogether and in a cataclysmic way with all its force descend upon Asia.

In those days his voice was a voice in the wilderness. Alas and alack, the vision of the statesmen at that time was blurred by other interests and right now we are reaping the fruits of our blindness and the folly of our thinking in those days.

He is a man who is a true statesman, who sees things ahead and does not have the perspicacity of looking behind him.

His smiling face breaks through all the strains and stresses of the present revolutionary forces that operate in Asia. Asia is of the future. The teeming masses of mankind in Asia are looking for self-expression and for the place in the sun to which they have always been fully entitled. From there came wisdom, and wisdom and great ideas will yet flourish and come from that part of the world, but they can only flourish and wisdom can only be brought about and widen its horizon if it grows in a climate of freedom and liberty, and to this General Romulo has dedicated his smiling face and his stout heart. He has become almost an organic part of America, and, what is more, an organic part as a world statesman in the field of the search and the thirst for liberty.

Finally, it is pleasant to see this thing happening in a hospital. This is the common denominator of mankind. Pain and suffering make us all brothers under the skin regardless of the wisdom that may come from Mississippi or other places, wherever they might be. This is the place in which there is unity of that greater force in which the brotherhood of man is truly expressed through the love of men by reaching God. It is beautiful and it is good that it happens here. My congratulations and thanks.

Chairman Moss. Mr. Isidor Leviton, president of the hospital, wishes me to present personally greetings and the expression of his warm admiration and affection for General Romulo and his deep appreciation to Max Abelman for his long record of communal achievements.

Mr. Leviton also wants to submit his regrets to the general in not having been able to be present today as he was unable to return in time from out of the State, and on that note, with this message from the president of the hospital, we now move to the occasion that really brought all of us here today.

We are greatly honored to have present His Excellency the Ambassador to the United States from the Philippines, General Carlos P. Romulo, who in 1949 was the fourth President of the United Nations General Assembly. He has been Foreign Minister of the Philippines and chairman of the Philippine delegation to practically every session of the United Nations General Assembly.

About 10 days ago he was honored in Miami when he received the World Brotherhood Pioneer medallion for distinguished world statesmanship.

As recently as a few days ago, he again was honored by Robbins College in Florida, receiving the medal of deistinction for his work for world peace.

In 1946 General Romulo received from the same college an honorary degree.

Today we are privileged and honored to have General Romulo with us. He is here by request of Dr. Mariana De Los Santos, president of the University of Manila, and the university's board of trustees, so that His Excellency the Ambassador might present the "Special Diploma of Honor" to our dear friend Max Abelman in recognition of his humanitarian activities.

I therefore have the great privilege, great pleasure and honor now to present to you Gen. Carlos P. Romulo.

Ambassador ROMULO. Mr. Chairman, my good friend and worthy colleague, Ambassador Serrano; my good friend Max; ladies and gentlemen and friends: I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your very generous words of introduction. I thank my longstanding friend there [indicating Rabbi Goldberg] for his quite fulsome praise—undeserved—which reminds me of an incident in 1950 when I happened to be in Peoria, Ill. I was in a hotel lobby trying to buy a newspaper when I observed that a man was watching me very closely. Finally, overcome by his curiosity, he approached me and he said, "You are General Romulo, aren't you?"

I said, "Yes; I am."

He said, "You are Foreign Minister of the Philippines?"

I said, "Yes; I am."

"You are president of the United Nations General Assembly?"

I said, "Yes; I am."

"You were aide-de-camp to General MacArthur?"

I said, "Yes; I was."

He scratched his head, looked at me from head to foot—and that didn't take much time [laughter]—and then he said, "I'll be doggoned." [Laughter.]

So whenever I listen to good friends like the chairman here and the chaplain, and I want to be deflated, I recall that incident. [Laughter.]

At lunch today I told them the story of the widow who was in a seance and she asked for the spirit of her departed husband and the one in charge of the seance said, "Well, Mrs. Smith, your husband is here now."

So she said, "Harry, are you there?"

Harry answered, "Yes, darling. I am here."

"Are you happy there, Harry?" she asked.

And he answered, "Very happy, darling."

Again she asked, "Tell me, happier than when you were with me?"

And he answered, "Much happier, I must confess, darling."

So she said, "Then," she said, "heaven must be a wonderful thing."

And Harry answered, "I ain't there."

I also told them at lunch this noon that when I was in Wichita, Kans., several months ago, I found myself in a hotel, and naturally they have a Bible, a Gideons' Bible, in all those rooms. I usually relax by reading the Bible, so I opened the Bible and I happened to open at Psalm XXIV, and at the end of Psalm XXIV it said, "If you are still lonely, turn to Psalm CXX. And at the end of Psalm CXX there was a note: "If you are still lonely, call Mabel."

I must confess at the end of reading Psalm CXX I was no longer lonely and so—for the purposes of Mrs. Romulo, who is here today—I did not call Mabel.

I am very happy indeed to be with you this afternoon. I am not a stranger to this hospital. This is, I think, the third time that I speak from this rostrum here. Away back in 1949 I came, as president of the United Nations. Then in 1950 I signed my name on a wall here, in one of the wards in this hospital——

Mr. ABELMAN. The children's ward.

Ambassador ROMULO (continuing). The children's ward; yes. And then it was away back in 1948 and 1949 when Max Abelman and I met each other for the first time and we discussed how we could convince the trustees of this hospital to allow Filipino doctors to come here as internes and Max Abelman introduced me to the trustees of this hospital, and that has been a friendship that I have cherished all these years. That Max Abelman should be the recipient of this particular distinction by an institution of learning in the Philippines is but a pale token of the gratitude that my people feel toward this humble man—sometimes a persistent cuss when he wants to accomplish something—but really in his modesty and his humility he is a credit not only to this foreign country known as Brooklyn, but to the United States as a whole.

And indeed, how apropos that in a country like the Philippines one of its institutions of learning should think of expressing its gratitude to a private citizen such as Max Abelman for his efforts in our behalf. Generally it is the high officials of a government who are given recognition. Generally it is the men in the high places who are recognized, but in my country we take a special pleasure in recognizing those who have served us in any capacity, in whatever sphere and no matter how humble.

Max Abelman has rendered service not only to the Philippines but also to the United States, and in Brooklyn you may take him as an ordinary citizen, an average Tom, Dick, or Harry—"A prophet is not without

honor, save in his own country"—in his own section we take him for granted. It is Max—it is Tom, it's Dick, it's Harry—but it is the average Tom, Dick, and Harry who represent your country in the eyes of those abroad, and you are judged—and I am referring to the American people—by the deportment and the conduct of the average Tom, Dick, and Harry. And in these days when we are engaged in a life-and-death global struggle the implications of which and the significance of which are far-reaching, a global struggle the like of which mankind has not seen in recorded history, it is important that the average American Tom, Dick, and Harry should be appreciated abroad, as this token that I will soon present to Max Abelman shows that Max Abelman's efforts are appreciated in the far-away Philippines.

I am glad that the chaplain here spoke of Asia, how important Asia is to you, to your national security, to the safety of your lives. I remember it was in Harvard University that the chaplain was referring to, when I was given an honorary degree there in June 1950, and I then said that I was afraid the cold war was about to explode into a shooting war and that shooting war was to take place in Asia, and I added, "possibly Korea." And 1 week later the North Koreans attacked South Korea.

And it is because I had watched the trend of events very closely in Asia and I knew what was coming, as I am watching—and it is in the nature of our duty to watch—what is happening in the world today.

That Max Abelman should have taken this interest in Filipinos is a very encouraging sign of the times in the United States, because if you visualize your geography, your American perimeter of defense lies from the Aleutians away up north, through Japan, Korea, Okinawa, Formosa, Guam and the Philippines, and that Pacific chain of defense can only be as strong as its weakest link, and if any of the links in that chain falls under communism, your national security in Brooklyn is seriously threatened, because, don't forget, the Pacific Ocean no longer affords to you the protection that it gave you 10 years ago.

The Pacific Ocean has been annihilated by modern technology, so that while you may think that in terms of mileage that Pacific chain of defense is 10,000 miles away from Brooklyn, in terms of guided missiles, in terms of supersonic planes, in terms of snorkel submarines, in terms of the atom bomb, that Pacific chain of defense is your next door neighbor. So that it is paramount that America should take a more active interest in Asia, and tokens of your interest in Asia such as welcoming these Filipino doctors here in this hospital are not only an empty gesture of friendship, but it really helps to safeguard your national security, because you cannot allow any of those links in that chain to fall under communism.

That is why President Eisenhower announced to the world that the United States will defend Formosa to the last. Why? Because Formosa is an important link in that chain, and if Formosa falls under communism, that whole chain can snap, and if that chain snaps, your national security here in Brooklyn is gravely menaced.

That is why you fought in Korea, because you could not allow that link in that chain to fall under communism; so that the American boy who fought and died in Korea really fought and died for the safety of his sweetheart here in Brooklyn; the American boy who fought and died in Korea really fought and died for the safety of his relatives in Boston, Mass.; the American boy who fought and died in Korea really fought and died for the security of his friends and his dear ones in Tallahassee, Fla.

So don't forget that the welcoming of these Filipino doctors here in this hospital will, I hope, serve to show the peoples in Asia that there is a bond of friendship that the Americans want to cultivate and to strengthen with our fellow Asians, and how imperative it is for us to realize that in the midst of our abundance, in the midst of our contentment brought about by the superlative American standard of living, in this global struggle in which we are engaged, let us not forget that no one nation, no matter how rich or no matter how powerful, can win this war alone. We must have friends and allies, precisely because of the atom bomb—and you know, the guided missiles, the intercontinental ballistics missiles, which 2 years ago they told me in Washington could make the United States and U. S. S. R. in 20 minutes—in 20 minutes—and the atom bomb which can raze cities and entire populations, and, we know, soon, entire countries—and America unfortunately no longer has a monopoly of these terrible weapons. I say "unfortunately" advisedly, because the other side that has them, too, does not have the restraints of either ethics or religion, and since we know that these terrible weapons can destroy entire cities and soon entire countries, even when they are used against us—God forbid it—that is precisely the time when we need other countries, other peoples, and other populations to rise to our defense, and that is why I say no one country, no matter how powerful or how rich, can win this global struggle alone.

And so, when I present this diploma of honor that I have been charged by the president of the University of Manila to hand to our good friend, Max Abelman, I do so conscious of the fact that Max Abelman is a representative of the average Tom, Dick, and Harry of the United States, who in turn represent that clean, wholesome, honest American conscience that is deaf to the tinkle of the gold dollar and blind to the allurements of power, that clean, wholesome, honest American conscience that always asserts itself in cases of emergency on the right side of truth and freedom and democracy; that this is a symbol, modest though it be, of the appreciation of a people for the services of this symbolical Tom, Dick, and Harry of the United States, that my people do not forget favors extended to them, that they appreciate such favors, that they hold such favors in grateful remembrance, and that Max Abelman, having gone through the stages of anticipation and realization and appreciation through which every human being goes in the course of his life in this mortal world of ours, now stands on that stage of appreciation where his efforts are appreciated, recognized, and cherished, and since he is about to enter the stage of recollection, may he, when he sits on his rockingchair and looks back toward a fruitful, maybe a hectic, career, in his mind's eye he can see in the dim and distant far-away Philippines a vision of these doctors that he has helped and of the suffering humanity that these doctors have helped to relieve and that here in the Jewish Hospital, here where pain and suffering are the levelers of humanity, he has exerted an influence that will be as abiding as it is appreciated.

And so, Max, it is my pleasure, in behalf of the University of Manila—and this morning when I talked to President Magsaysay over the phone at the Waldorf—he called me up and I told him that I was here to present this diploma to you—he asks me to congratulate you in his name and to tell you that he hopes some day you can visit the Philippines where not only the University of Manila but all these recipients of the generosity of the Jewish Hospital can show you how deeply they appreciate your efforts in their behalf.

Editorial Comments on Veto of Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from newspaper editorial comments, gathered by the New York Times, the Associated Press, and the United Press, on President Eisenhower's veto of the farm bill:

EAST

NEW YORK

Courage again displayed

The Herald Tribune (Independent Republican): "President Eisenhower has again displayed the courage with which he upholds the highest principles of his office. The President disclaims the title of 'political expert.' He applied the single yardstick: 'Is it good for America?' If Congress fails again to rise to the needs of the hour, the farmers, and the Nation at large, will know where the blame rests. They will know that the President has striven earnestly and conscientiously for a sound farm program; that the obstacles were raised by those, in Congress and out, who insisted on delaying action, on piling up contradictory clauses in a legislative monstrosity that would have been an administrative nightmare. And when the voters look to the heart of the matter they will, one can be confident, prove that the best politics is what is best for the country, wholeheartedly endorsing the President's statesmanlike and courageous course."

One hundred-percent act of conscience

The Daily News (Independent): "There is nothing dictatorial about this veto. It may hurt General Eisenhower politically; but, on the other hand, it may help him. Time and again in our history, acts of courage and conscience on the part of public men have paid off in increased popularity and respect. This Eisenhower veto of the farm bill was 100 percent an act of courage and of conscience.

Not expedient, but right

The Daily Mirror (Independent): "President Eisenhower has met a decidedly political farm bill with a nonpolitical veto. His action was not expedient, but it was right. The President risks a loss of farm votes. We believe, however, that the admiration of the people generally for his nonpolitical decision will offset any damage that will accrue—or be drummed up—because of that decision."

Veto entirely justified

The World-Telegram and Sun (Independent): "President Eisenhower vetoed the farm bill because he said it was contradictory and self-defeating—which it was. The veto was entirely justified, as most of the bipartisan farm bloc which concocted the bill knew it would be."

NEWARK, N. J.

Statesmanlike action

The Star-Ledger (Independent): "President Eisenhower's statesmanlike veto of the politically motivated farm bill shows awareness of the fact that agriculture and its problems are the vital concern of the Nation as a whole. The President's action was sound. The President based his disapproval of the bill on the obvious and undeniable fact that it was contradictory and self-defeating."

PHILADELPHIA

Political hazards ignored

The Inquirer (Independent): "President Eisenhower's veto of the mixed-up farm bill is an act that will win the approval of most Americans because it plainly reflects courage, integrity, and a sure grasp of the real essential of the farm problem. The message rejecting the measure makes it clear that he was thinking, not of possible political hazards, but of the real interests of the farmers, and of consumers and taxpayers as well. For the fact is the bill, in its entirety, would be bad for the farmers and bad for everyone else."

PITTSBURGH

Smart course rejected

The Post-Gazette (Independent): "The easy, smart, and politically profitable thing for the President to have done was to sign the farm bill. But Mr. Eisenhower rejected the smart course. He believes, as we do, that the farm bill—with its return to rigid price supports—is bad for the American people and ultimately for the farmers."

BOSTON

Political acumen shown

The Herald (Independent-Republican): "It took courage to veto the farm bill, but it is not courage that counts most in the matter, it is political acumen or savvy, or know-how, or whatever you want to call it. It is the process of gaging the public response to a policy and adapting the measures taken to that end. It is the ability to go the long way around to an objective when the direct route is closed."

SOUTH

WASHINGTON

No yielding to expediency

The Post and Times Herald (Independent): "Obviously the Chief Executive did not reach a decision involving such turbulent political implications without a great deal of soul-searching. We cannot help feeling that the President's courage in sticking to principle will win him more respect than he would have obtained by yielding to expediency, particularly since he shows full awareness of the farm plight."

BALTIMORE

President does "what's right"

The Sun (Independent Democrat): "The President's strength does not rest on any great talent as a political manipulator, nor does it rest on sensational intellectual capacity. It rests on his instinct for doing "what's right" when he finds out what right is. When the President does "what's right" he appeals instantly to that great mass of people, farmers included, who also believe in doing "what's right." We doubt that the President will suffer politically by facing up to a bad bill and calling it bad."

RICHMOND

Nation is in his debt

The Times-Dispatch (Independent Democrat): "President Eisenhower's veto of the farm bill was one of the most courageous acts performed by a Chief Executive in recent years. He showed rare independence and devotion to the Nation's well-being. The now vetoed farm bill had so many monstrous weaknesses that it had to be killed. Mr. Eisenhower placed the Nation in his debt when he killed it."

MIAMI

Gain in public esteem

The Herald (Independent): "The United States is fortunate that men of stature rise at right moments to keep the Nation on an even keel. We think that the President in vetoing the mish-mash measure—which did nothing but appease pressure groups—and that Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson, who stood firmly by his sound reasoning, have gained enormously in public esteem and prestige."

MEMPHIS

Only honest course taken

The Commercial Appeal (Independent Democrat): "No one should have been surprised that the President vetoed the hodgepodge bill laid before him by a vote-minded, irresponsible Congress. He took the only course that was honest and straight-forward. The soil-bank feature of the farm bill would have put a brake on production and speeded the end of the surpluses."

MIDWEST

CHICAGO

Bill deserved veto

The Tribune (Republican): "President Eisenhower's veto of the Democratic farm bill was good politics because it was honest politics. Progress toward a rational farm policy is delayed for a year. The cost must be assessed, in all fairness, against the Democrats. They delayed the enactment of a good farm bill until it was too late to execute its provisions, and produced instead the vote-buying monstrosity that deserved the veto it has received."

Sound economic verdict

Daily News (Independent): "Mr. Eisenhower's verdict was based on sound economic principles, and if Congress will now get busy on an honest effort to pass a workable farm bill, it can be had within a week."

Monstrous bill rejected

The Sun-Times (Independent): "In vetoing the monstrous farm bill, Mr. Eisenhower showed such courage, statesmanship, and good sense in his arguments against it that he has risen to a new high stature in the minds and hearts of his countrymen—and we believe that must include many farmers, too."

CLEVELAND

Gain in public estimation

The Plain Dealer (Independent Democrat): "It was an act of statesmanship which raised Mr. Eisenhower higher in the estimation of thoughtful Americans than anything he has done since he became President."

DETROIT

Brave choice made

The Free Press (Independent): "It was a brave choice, whose political consequences may be tempered by the farmers' recognition that it was prompted by conscience."

ST. LOUIS

Gain in votes expected

The Globe-Democrat (Independent): "His veto may have cost the GOP some votes. Failure to veto would have cost more. Upon calm consideration we believe most of the Nation, including understandably restless and antagonistic farm elements, will conclude he was right."

KANSAS CITY

Bill bad for America

The Star (Independent Republican): "After the most careful consideration of the bill in its entirety he (the President) came to the conclusion that it was a bad bill—for farmers and for America—because it tended to increase surpluses which already have become a tremendous burden on all farm prices."

MILWAUKEE

Full credit deserved

The Journal (Independent): "President Eisenhower deserves full credit for vetoing a thoroughly bad farm bill. He has given the American farmers and American people a persuasive explanation of why he did so. If he had signed the farm bill monstrosity under political persuasion, he certainly would have fallen in the estimation of many of his admirers."

OMAHA

People's belief upheld

The World Herald (Independent): "In his [the President's] veto of the farm bill he remains the broad-gaged, honest, and courgeous leader they [the American people] thought he was. If he had taken any other course he would have repudiated all that he stands for in American public life."

LINCOLN

Farmers are people, too

The Nebraska Journal (Republican): "The honesty and integrity of President Eisenhower, demonstrated by the veto in the face of tremendous political clamor and expressed bluntly in his message to the people, shed more light on the whole subject than weeks of doubletalking congressional debate. Honesty and integrity are qualities the people understand, and too many politicians seem to forget that farmers are people, too, not just votes to be bought at so much apiece."

INDIANAPOLIS

Not ballot box problem

The Star (Independent): "Democratic leaders think they have Mr. Eisenhower in a hole and are not going to be easily persuaded to let him out of it. We hope, however, they will arise above partisanship this time and attack the farm problem where it really is, on the farm and not in the ballot box."

MINNEAPOLIS

Many votes will be kept

The Tribune (Independent): "In placing what clearly are deep-felt convictions ahead of political expediency [the President] may hold the allegiance of more votes than will now desert him."

DENVER

Democratic gain doubted

The Post (Independent): "It took unusual courage for the President to veto the farm aid bill which he knew to be bad. But his reasons, as given in his veto message and his address to the country, are so persuasive that the Democrats will find it difficult to make capital out of his action."

SOUTHWEST

DALLAS

No Eisenhower doubletalk

Morning News (Independent): "Dwight Eisenhower has again faced the Nation courageously with a forthright action, explanation and no doubletalk. There has been double dealing but not in the White House."

PHOENIX

Temptation resisted

The Gazette (Independent): "tempting though it was to remove one of the Democrats' few campaign issues by signing the bill, the President has had the courage to put economic soundness first."

FAR WEST

SAN FRANCISCO

Public thanks deserved

The Chronicle (Independent Republican): "The farm bill veto was an act of economic wisdom and political courage for which President Eisenhower deserves public respect and thanks. This country's agricultural economy has been saved from a dangerous and costly retrial of a scheme which is basically responsible for the trouble the farmers are having."

LOS ANGELES

Bad bill, but good veto

The Times (Republican): "President Eisenhower sent a bad bill back to Congress with a good veto when he disapproved the omni-

bus farm measure. We predict the act will help him politically, though it was plain from the tenor of his talk to the Nation that he had no regard to political effects."

SEATTLE

Bill is self-defeating

The Times (Independent): "It took genuine statesmanship and a high degree of political courage to veto a farm bill which many voting farmers believe contained the nostrums to cure their present economic ills. He—the President—deserves acclaim for disposing of a farm measure which was so full of contradictions and inconsistencies that it would have defeated all its own best purposes."

PORTLAND

People's trust justified

The Oregonian (Independent Republican): "President Eisenhower stood by his principles, justifying once again the trust that so many people place in his integrity and political courage. There is still time for Congress to take sound action on the farm problem. If it fails to do so, the onus will be on it rather than on the President, where, of course, the Democrats will desperately try to replace it."

Hon. James C. Murray's Address at the Annual Dinner of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, Held at the Mayflower Hotel on March 17, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to insert in the RECORD the stirring address of the Honorable JAMES C. MURRAY, of Illinois, delivered at the annual dinner of the Ancient Order of Hibernians on March 17 at the Mayflower Hotel.

The dinner of the Ancient Order of Hibernians is one of the finest in the country. Congressman MURRAY held the audience spellbound with his eloquence. His speech was a personal triumph and a tribute to the district which sent him to Congress and which he so ably represents. Realizing the speech with its scholarship and its message would be enjoyed by others, I am taking the liberty of inserting it in the RECORD. The speech follows:

When I received your kind invitation to speak at your outstanding St. Patrick's Day dinner, I made up my mind to be completely objective. Since an Irishman can be objective about everything except Ireland, I attempted to avoid as my topic our Emerald Isle. I thought that I might talk about our own country. When I started my address as follows—From the rock-bound coast of Maine—I had to stop because I became instantly aware of the fact that Maine was a founder of my own family and of a great Irish king.

I knew that I could not talk about Scotland because I am certain I would get into an argument with my Scotch constituents when they learned that Scotland comes from the word "Scotia"—as Ireland was originally called—which was settled, in part, by St. Columba.

To avoid controversy, I skipped over England, although I paused briefly enough to observe that the only extant manuscript of the earliest English epic Beowulf was written in Gaelic lettering. If I were to talk upon France, I would have to dwell on St. Columbanus' monasteries at Luxeuil—and in Italy, at Bobbio, which were the principal centers of the reconversion in education made by Irish monks of a Europe lapsed in barbarism. If I were to dwell on Switzerland, or for that matter, in any country up to the Ukrainian, I would find evidence of Irish teachers and missionaries.

Being thus frustrated in my attempts to find something to speak about other than Ireland, I decided to make my oration an objective speech about the Irish from the Celtic viewpoint. One of the gifts that St. Patrick secured for our race prior to his death was the promise that no son of Erin would experience the horrors preceding the destruction of the world. It would seem from this prophecy that some time prior to the end of the world, the last Irishman would have passed away.

If an historian at that time were to attempt to write the history of the Irish and were to predicate his history upon the Irish as pictured by present-day columnists, radio announcers, and other such organs of public information, I am afraid we would have a very misconstrued picture of ourselves.

I sometimes wonder whether or not the picture painted of the Irish by present-day organs of propaganda is one founded on jealousy, or aimed at the destruction of the things that an Irishman stands for. Since our basic virtue is spiritual rather than material, I am convinced the reason is the latter.

Oftentimes I wonder whether we ourselves, in our attempts to enjoy God's world, realize what we stand for. For the purpose of setting the record straight, if not to advise you of your birthright, and the obligations it entails, I would like to relate our Irish inheritance.

Biblical scholars tell us that we sprang from 1 of the 12 lost sons of Joseph. I don't know whether this is correct, but I do recall a song my grandfather used to sing which indicated that the Irish made the passover from Egypt to Israel with Moses. It goes like this: "It must have been the Irish that swam the River Nile because only an Irishman would fight a crocodile."

Anthropologists relate that we came from the stone-age hunters and fishermen which might be the basis for our stone throwing and tall tale telling ability. Bronze-age scholars related that our ancestors' gold and copper gave Ireland a preeminent position in early commercial and artistic world.

Regardless of what the early pages of history might have disclosed of an Irishman, we know the principal reason for our existence finds its source in our Apostle—St. Patrick. It is the love of God in every Irishman instilled by our Apostle and nurtured by our martyrs that is the divine spring from which flows the greatness of our race. From this divine fountain flows the love of individual liberty which has dedicated Irish everywhere to its cause. From it springs our saints, our missionaries, clergy, teachers, patriots and mothers.

Our birthright has proven to be the most formidable armor against every attack—against godliness or individual liberty—regardless of its form. Greater than the atom, our heritage is an indestructible eternity.

That which makes us Irish has been subject to every conceivable assault since its inspiration. Cromwell attempted to destroy it by military might but succeeded only in fostering it. Others attempted to suppress it by legislation but merely nurtured it. Today we face the most subtle attack ever hurled at our birthright. It is not hurled only at us as Irishmen—but as children of God. It is the assault of Satan's stepson who chose as his birthplace and growth the one place on the face of the earth not visited by our missionaries and patriots—Red Russia.

Its subtleness is most dangerous because it attempts to undermine our spiritualness by appealing to our worldliness. Our vices are encouraged, our virtues discouraged. Our humor stressed, our compassion depressed. Our intemperance glamorized, our esthetic-ness criticized. Our vanity appeased, our meekness derided. Our pride fostered, our humility starved. Our earthliness praised, our love of God taunted.

To those of you who might feel that we as Irishmen have not the strength or wherewithal to meet this latest and greatest assault made against that which an Irishman stands for, I would like to recall some of the contributions that our ancestors, fathers, brothers, and even sons and daughters made to the liberty under God represented by our own great country.

Historians approximate that one-third of Washington's army were of Irish descent, so you see we were here a great many years prior to any "potato famine." The only reason that there are not more of our wives in the DAR is because we were too busy building railroads and developing our country to keep track of our ancestors.

The founder of our Navy was an Irishman, as you all know. The early builder of the present-day Democratic Party—Andrew Jackson—was an Irishman.

As a matter of fact, one of the Congressmen wrote me that St. Patrick must have been a Democrat.

The greatest award given by this country for individual contribution to its cause is the Congressional Medal of Honor. It is an award presented for acts of bravery actually performed and not inspired in the mind of a competent press agent. The very creation of the Medal of Honor was inspired by deeds of an Irishman in the Civil War—Maj. Gen. Phillip Karney.

The first deed for which a Congressional Medal of Honor was awarded was a deed performed by a native Irishman during Indian warfare in the settling of the West—the name of that distinguished son of Erin was Col. Bernard J. D. Irwin, an M. D.

Over two-thirds of the Congressional Medal of Honor winners who were born on foreign soil were born in Ireland—this despite the fact that Ireland is comparatively a small country.

In recent years the deeds of our brothers, sons, and daughters in behalf of our country occupy as prominent a place in our history as did the deeds of their forebears. The first American bombardier to sink a Japanese ship in World War II was an Irishman. The first American to kill a Jap in World War II was an Irish-American. The first American flier to bag five airplanes in World War II was an American of Irish descent by the name of Edward O'Hara.

The first American to be eulogized by the President for bravery in World War II was an American of Irish extraction. The first American Coastguardsman to catch a spy, had Erin's blood flowing in his veins. And the first American to make himself a human torpedo was another of our kinfolk.

Although our War Department does not classify data on the basis of nationality, the Irish War Veterans, United States of America, have estimated that during World War II, 3½ million persons of Irish or part-Irish descent served in our Armed Forces.

I did not intend to bring any message to you, but if there is any message contained in this address, it is merely to urge you to be more Irish—for being more Irish—you will be more American. And being better Americans, you will have successfully borne the obligations required of your emerald inheritance.

A Bill To Provide Financing of Needed Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, at the request of a number of builders, laborers, lumber and material suppliers, and veterans' groups in my district, I have introduced a bill to provide financing of needed housing.

This bill is similar to one introduced by Hon. ALBERT RAINS, of Alabama, and referred to the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Here is a summary of provisions of the bill:

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Section 101 dealing with FHA title I home improvement loans provides—

(1) A 2-year extension.

(2) An increase in the maximum loan amount to $3,500 (present ceiling is $2,500) and from $10,000 to $15,000 for loans to improve multifamily structures.

(3) An increase in the maximum loan term to 5 years (present ceiling is 3 years).

(4) A sliding interest rate scale permitting a 5-percent discount on loans below $1,000, with a 4-percent discount permitted on that portion of the loan which exceeds $1,000. Presently a 5-percent discount is charged regardless of loan amount.

Section 102 would permit the FHA to become a self-insurer againt fire and hazard risks to properties acquired by FHA as a result of foreclosure.

Section 103 would liberalize rental housing insurance under FHA's section 207 by—

(1) Permitting a loan up to 90 percent of value (present ceiling is 80 percent of value).

(2) Increasing loan ceilings to $2,250 per room (present ceiling is $2,000) and up to $2,700 per room for elevator-type structures (present ceiling is $2,400). In high-cost geographic areas the Commissioner is authorized to increase the per room maximum by an additional $1,000. These liberalizations would establish loan ceilings for section 207 similar to those permitted for urban renewal insurance projects under section 220.

Section 104 would amend cooperative housing insurance under section 213 by providing—

(1) A new device to permit a cooperative sponsor to obtain a commitment for a loan up to 85 percent of replacement cost and proceed with construction before the prospective cooperative has been formed. This would overcome the marketing difficulties involved in the present requirement that the cooperative be sold 100 percent before construction can begin. The sponsor would certify intent to sell to a cooperative upon completion. Should he fail to sell the project he would be regulated by FHA as to rents, capital structure, and rate of return. Also, if the sponsor fails to sell to a cooperative, he cannot use this special insurance feature again.

(2) Authority to the FHA Commissioner to permit in the high-cost geographic areas an additional $1,000 per room in computing the maximum permissible insured loan.

Section 105 would increase the FHA mortgage insurance authorization to make available $3 billion for the next fiscal year.

Section 106 would permit a profit and risk allowance of 10 percent for sponsors of urban renewal insurance projects under section 220, although the FHA Commissioner could prescribe a lesser percentage if he certifies that a 10-percent allowance is unreasonable.

Section 107 would liberalize relocation housing insurance under section 221 by—

(1) Increasing the maximum permissible loan to $8,600 and to $9,600 in geographic high-cost areas. (Present ceilings are $7,600 and $8,600, respectively.)

(2) Permitting no downpayment financing by requiring only that the borrower pay at least $150 in cash to apply toward closing costs.

(3) Increasing the permissible loan maturity from the present 30 years' ceiling to 35 years and up to 40 years where the Commissioner finds such longer maturity necessary for low-income families.

Section 108 would amend the cost certification requirement by making such certifications incontestable after the Commissioner's approval of the certification, barring fraud or material misrepresentation. It would also permit an allocation of general overhead costs acceptable to the Commissioner to be included in the total certified cost.

TITLE II—SECONDARY MARKET LEGISLATION

Section 201 would liberalize the operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association by—

(1) Permitting advance commitments under the secondary market operations. Such commitments would be issued at a price high enough to provide production support to builders and yet sufficiently below the prices offered by the Association for immediate purchase to discourage excessive sales to FNMA pursuant to advance commitments.

(2) Reducing the stock purchase requirement to no more than 2 percent.

(3) Requiring FNMA until June 30, 1957, to pay par for special assistance mortgages.

(4) Increasing the advance commitment funds available for special assistance operations to $400 million (present ceiling is $200 million).

(5) Providing a $50 million revolving fund under the special assistance program to support FHA section 203 (i) loans. Section 203 (i) loans are designed to encourage low-cost housing in outlying and rural areas.

(6) Amending the present revolving fund for section 213 mortgages to make it clear that the $5 million limit per State is on outstanding commitments, in other words to make clear that the State suballocation can "revolve" exactly the same as does the $50 million nationwide revolving fund.

(7) Exempting from the $15,000 limit on loans eligible for purchase the following: (a) Military housing loans insured under section 803 and (b) FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed loans made in Alaska, Guam, and Hawaii.

Section 202 would establish a new secondary market support program for GI loans. Under its provisions the Secretary of the Treasury could invest up to 10 percent of the reserves of the national service life insurance fund by purchasing VA-guaranteed loans in geographic areas where discounts on GI loans are heaviest. Both current reserves and future premiums could be used. Since the fund's reserves are approximately $5½ billion, the program could supply approximately $550 million in funds to support the market.

Only loans guaranteed after enactment would be eligible for purchase. In case of serious default, provision is made for purchase of the defaulted loan from the fund by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

The program would expire on July 25, 1957, the present expiration date for the GI loan benefit of most World War II veterans.

Tht Federal National Mortgage Association would act as the Treasury's agent to purchase and service loans. Payment for such services is limited to a maximum of three-fourths of 1 percent. Since the GI loans purchased would yield at least 4½ percent, the fund would earn a minimum of 3¾ percent on its mortgage portfolio.

TITLE III—HOUSING FOR ELDERLY PERSONS

Sections 301, 302, 303, and 304 would establish a new loan program for housing for the elderly, similar to the college housing loan program.

These sections would provide $250 million to the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency for loans to nonprofit corporations for the construction or rehabilitation of housing for the elderly.

The interest rate could not exceed 3½ percent per annum and the maximum loan term would be 50 years. The cost of funds to the Administrator from the Treasury could not exceed 3 percent.

The bill would permit loans only when private capital is not available upon the terms and conditions provided in the bill.

TITLE IV—SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN RENEWAL

Section 401 would increase the funds available under present law for capital grants for slum clearance and urban renewal projects by an additional $1 billion. The sum would be made available in $500 million increments on July 1, 1956, and July 1, 1957.

Section 402 the Housing Administrator would be authorized to extend urban renewal assistance to major disaster areas, under certain conditions, without regard to requirements that the community must have a workable program for the prevention and elimination of slums, that the urban renewal plan must conform to a general plan of the locality, requirements of public hearings, and certain requirements with respect to the predominantly residential character or blighted character of urban renewal areas.

The FHA sections 220 and 221 urban renewal housing programs would also be amended to permit temporary waiver of the present workable program requirement, and urban planning grants would be permitted for a community affected by a major disaster without regard to the fact that the community's population is 25,000 or greater.

Section 403 the urban planning grant authorization would be increased from $5 million to $10 million.

Section 404 would extend to private nonprofit educational institutions of higher learning the same privilege with respect to Government construction planning advances, as that now enjoyed by tax-supported educational institutions of higher learning. Both such types of educational institutions receive equal consideration under provisions of the college housing loans program, and this change would place them on a parity with respect to planning advances.

TITLE V—PUBLIC HOUSING

Section 501 would provide 50,000 low-rent public-housing units annually for a 3-year period beginning August 1, 1956. Provision is made for carrying over to subsequent years any unused portion of the annual quota.

Section 502 would make low-rent public housing available to elderly persons (65 years or over)—

(1) By making elderly single persons eligible.

(2) By authorizing the construction of units specifically designed for elderly persons. The section provides 10,000 units annually for a 3-year period beginning July 1, 1956.

(3) By increasing the permissible per room cost for units for elderly persons to $2,250 (present ceiling, $1,750).

Section 503. The Public Housing Administration would be directed to transfer farm labor camps without monetary consideration to local public housing agencies in the areas of the camps if requested within 12 months after enactment of the bill and the local public housing agency certifies as to the low-rent need for the project and that preferences will be given, first, to low-income

agricultural workers and, second, to other low-income persons and families.

Section 504 would authorize the sale under prescribed conditions of two Government-owned projects, the Chinquapin Village housing project in Alexandria, Va., and the Techwood Dormitory in Atlanta, Ga.

TITLE VI—FARM HOUSING

Section 601 amends title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide the following additional authorizations for loans and contributions to farm housing:

(1) $100 million in the amount of loan funds which can be obtained from the Treasury;

(2) $2 million per annum in the amount of annual contribution commitments for housing on potentially adequate farms; and

(3) $10 million in the amount of appropriations authorized for loans and grants for improvements and repairs of farm housing.

TITLE VII—COLLEGE HOUSING

Section 701 would increase loan funds for college housing by $250 million, bringing the total authorized for such purpose to to $750 million.

TITLE VIII—MILITARY HOUSING

Section 801 would extend and liberalize the title VIII military housing program by—

(1) Extending the program until September 1959 (under present law the program would expire September 30, 1956).

(2) Permitting an average cost per dwelling unit of $15,000 (presently $13,500) and up to $16,500 in high-cost areas as determined by the Secretary of Defense. The aggregate total of mortgage insurance authorized would be increased correspondingly.

(3) Permitting the FHA Commissioner to waive or reduce the FHA insurance premium.

(4) Perscribing maximum floor area limitations for various ranks and grades with a special allowance for quarters outside the United States and for the quarters of commanding officers.

(5) Extending eligibility for military housing insurance to the Canal Zone.

International Cooperation Administration Grants Permitting Foreign Scientists To Study in the United States

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Hands Across the Lab Bench," published in the April 16, 1956, issue of Chemical and Engineering News. The article deals with the International Cooperation Administration's program of grants permitting foreign scientists to study in the United States.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HANDS ACROSS THE LAB BENCH—SUCCESS OF ICA GRANTS PERMITTING FOREIGN SCIENTISTS TO STUDY IN UNITED STATES MAY LEAD TO PROGRAM EXPANSION

How to win friends and influence people at very little expense aptly describes the International Cooperation Administration's foreign research scientists program. An outstanding success in cementing the bonds of international friendship through the medium of basic science, the program has cost the American taxpayer very little.

So well has this program worked that prospects are bright that it will be extended for at least 2 years beyond the present expiration date of June 30, 1957. In fact, observers say that the only thing holding up ICA approval of the extension is the routine of working out a few administrative details with cooperating nations.

As for cost, the entire cost of the program from its inception in 1953 to the expiration date in 1957 has been less than $1.5 million. Viewed against the background of American expenditures for foreign aid during the period, this is a small sum indeed.

HOW IT WORKS

Participation in the foreign research scientists program is limited to nations who are members of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC). Purpose of the program is to finance 2 years of advance study at American universities for scientists from the OEEC nations. Men selected for the program must have the Ph. D. degree or equivalent experience so that they are capable of doing independent work.

Although ICA provides the funds, actual administration of the program in this country and contacts abroad are handled by the National Academy of Sciences. On the other side of the ocean, selection of the men for the program is made by scientific societies, research councils, or university groups.

Quotas have been established for each country by the academy, and these quotas have been revised upward since the beginning of the program in 1953. Practically all fields of study are covered, but men studying in the fields of chemistry and biochemistry from a large portion of the group. Competition for the ICA grants is keen, and most foreign groups select likely candidates through a process of competitive examinations. Final selection is usually made on the basis of personal interviews. As a result of these elborate screening procedures, participants in the foreign research scientists program have been scientists of the highest caliber.

Here in this country the National Academy of Sciences has the task of matching the men to the institutions. Careful selection is necessary to place a man in a university with the strongest possible program in his special field. So far, scientists in the program have studied at schools located in almost every State in the Union.

PROGRAM GOALS

Of course the basic purpose of the program is to promote friendly relations between the United States and the member nations of OEEC using science as the medium of exchange. In addition, the intimate knowledge of American techniques and approaches to science gained during 2 years' residence in this country will have great influence on the attitudes of these men after they return to their own countries.

The scientists in the program are relatively young. All are under 40, and most are under 30. Some day these men will be the leaders of scientific thought in their individual countries. The personal contacts made and the friendships formed during their stay in the United States will continue through the years and form the foundation for a lasting bond of friendship.

Then, too, these young foreign scientists will learn at first hand how to deal with American scientists and with people in the United States in general. On their return home, these men can explain to their countrymen what normal life in America is like. Such factual information based on personal experience can go a long way toward clarifying mistaken ideas that so often arise about people in another land.

Not all the goals of this program are aimed at benefits for the United States alone. More rapid practical application of the discoveries of basic science could take place in many countries when these men take back with them attitudes toward industrial development learned in this country.

It is hard for Americans to understand the great gulf that exists in many European countries between basic science and practical applications. The close cooperation between fundamental research and industry in the United States, typified by the university industrial fellowship or foundation, is almost totally unknown in many parts of Europe. Such insulation of fundamental discoveries from the practical world tends to slow down the advance of applied technology.

At NAS they tell of an industrialist who established a fellowship at a leading European university to solve an industrial problem in metallurgy. Ten months later, when the industrialist inquired about progress on his problem, the professor told him that some thought had been given to the matter. However, in thinking of the industrial problem an interesting theoretical question in a related field had arisen. All of the professor's time had been devoted to the new problem and he was not able to say when he could return to the metallurgical problem.

After spending 2 years in an American university laboratory under the ICA program, a newly returned scientist would not be likely to assume the detached attitude of the professor toward practical problems.

IS IT A SUCCESS?

The answer to this question is an unqualified "yes." The people at the National Academy of Sciences who are responsible for guiding the foreign scientists during their stay here say that the program has been successful beyond their expectations. People at the International Cooperation Administration express the same sentiments.

Probably as a result of the care used in selecting candidates, the work done by these men in American laboratories has been of the highest quality. In fact, it has been so good that industrial laboratories would like to hire many of these men. But this would destroy the basic purpose of the program. Under terms of the agreement, all holders of grants must return to their native countries.

All the men have fit in well with their surroundings. By attending each year at least one national scientific meeting in specialized fields, the men have broadened their scientific contacts in the United States. Some men brought their families with them and in some instances have had an increase in size of the family during their stay. Some men have married American girls and when the time to go home arrived found that "in-law" problems are truly international. All are taking with them by absorption some part of the American way of life.

WHAT'S AHEAD

Extension of the present program will probably be for an additional 2-year period. However, there is a good chance that the foreign research scientists program may be established on a permanent basis. Such a move would tend to refute the oft-heard charge that the United States is interested only in short-term programs that benefit the United States. Putting the program on a permanent basis would be a firm indication of our desire to help other nations by helping their potential leaders.

Plans are underway to extend the program to other geographical areas in addition to the countries comprising OEEC. First area to be considered would be friendly non-Communist nations in the Far East that have a supply of properly qualified research men. Conditions are right, for example, in Japan and India. Other areas under consideration are South America and Africa. Expanding the foreign research scientist program to cover all friendly nations on a worldwide basis would be one way to help

cement our future international relationships.

Where they come from

Germany	29
France	25
Italy	22
United Kingdom	19
Norway	15
Denmark	11
Netherlands	10
Austria	8
Portugal	8
Greece	7
Turkey	6
Belgium	6
Total grants	166

One Thousand Years of Christianity in Ukraine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, recently there was celebrated in the United States by solemn observances, 1,000 years of Christianity in Ukraine. Ukraine is the largest non-Russian nation enslaved by communism behind the European Iron Curtain. Consequently, unusual importance attaches to this observance of 1,000 years of Christianity in that nation.

This occasion brings to memory the brilliant contribution to international thinking made by Don Luigi Sturzo in his famous work on Nationalism and Internationalism. Father Sturzo in this searching study of the forces which have shaped the destiny of the world points out that the forces which have had the most profound effect upon history are the ideas expressed by religion, national independence and liberty. Any one of these natural forces are capable of causing great and lasting changes in the affairs between nations and people. When all three of them are active and working in harmony the spirit of Amor Dei et Patriae becomes the driving force behind the nation so blessed.

That is the case of Ukraine down through history. Its sons and daughters have been imbued with that great spirit. They have lived and died for that cause. They have transferred that same rich spirit to America, as their adopted land, and America has been made better and stronger by it.

In the great State of Connecticut we are proud to count among our citizens many thousands who trace their ancestry back to Ukraine. We are also proud that Connecticut is the seat of a world known center of Ukrainian culture, education, and religion located at Stamford.

Today Ukraine is enslaved by communism, and therefore, is a colony of Moscow. All the national life of Ukraine is under attack. Religion is ruthlessly persecuted. The spirit of liberty is suppressed. There is great sadness throughout the entire Ukrainian nation over the tyranny which communism has visited upon the people. But the spirit of religion, liberty, and national independence are inseparable in Ukraine. They live on despite Communist occupation and tyranny just as they have endured and survived tyrannies of the past.

In connection with the observance of 1,000 years of Christianity in Ukraine, a large number of letters of encouragement were received by the Most Reverend Ambrose Senyshyn O. S. B. M., chairman of the committee in charge. I ask consent that some of the most significant of these letters be printed in the RECORD at this point:

MEMORANDUM

Christianity has been existing in Ukraine for more than 1,000 years. It has fostered a profound faith in God among the people, and has begotten abiding moral principles, and nourished a new culture and erudition.

In December 1917 Communist Russia invaded Ukraine and in 1919–20 occupied the eastern provinces of this country. The Soviets were bent on extirpating Christianity from these regions. In their coup d'etat they published aggressive antireligious propaganda and terriorized the people with threats of exile, torture, and death.

First, the Communists attacked the church in eastern Ukraine. Within 10 years, from 1921 to 1931, they unjustly arrested and ruthlessly murdered 34 Ukrainian Orthodox bishops and more than 3,000 priests. Hundreds of thousands of the faithful were inhumanly tortured in prisons or deported to concentration camps in Siberia; a greater part of these innocent people died martyrs to their faith; the remainder still endures the appalling trials and hardships of imprisonment.

The Reds destroyed 80 percent of the churches (many of these churches contained precious historical relics, as for example the Golden Domed Michalivsky Monastery in Kiev from the 12th century); other churches were despicably converted into warehouses, theaters, and convention halls; monasteries were outraged and cemeteries profaned.

By 1930 the Communists had completely liquidated the entire Ukrainian Orthodox Church, barring it from all public activity.

Though article 123 of the Soviet constitution, which is binding in Ukraine as well as the U.S.S.R., explicitly recognizes freedom of religion, yet, during the first Red occupation of western Ukraine (1939–41), the Communist regime overtly persecuted the church, arresting many Ukrainian priests and ruthlessly murdering 27 of them.

This anti-Christian terror adopted more hideous means of exterminating Christianity in the Ukraine during the second occupation of this country beginning in 1945. On April 11, 1945, the Soviets arrested the Metropolitan of Halych and Archbishop of Lviv, Joseph Slipyj, 80-year-old Bishop Gregory Khomyshyn, Bishop John Latyshevskyj, Bishop Nicholas Charnetskyj, C. SS. R., and Bishop Nykyta Budka. On June 25, 1946, Bishop Josaphat Kotsylovskyj, OSBM, and Bishop Gregory Lakota were imprisoned. All these bishops were condemned to forced labor for 8 to 10 years and even life; the imputation was lawfully unjust. Some of these bishops (for instance Bishop Gregory Khomyshyn and Bishop Josaphat Kotsylovskyj) later died from maltreatment in prison. Still more, when Archbishop Joseph Slipyj's or other bishops' terms expired, the Reds would not release them from prison.

In the autumn of 1947, the Communists murdered Bishop Theodore Romza, Uzhorod, Carpathian Ukraine, and in 1950, the Bishops Paul Gojdich, OSBM, and Basil Hopko, Pryashiv, Czechoslovakia, were imprisoned. On January 15, 1951, Bishop Paul Gojdich was tried and unjustly condemned to forced labor for life. Bishop Basil Hopko is now in a concentration camp.

Altogether, 10 Ukrainian Catholic bishops have been liquidated by the Reds.

In 1946, the Soviets enjoined the legal continuance of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Ukraine. Thus, in our own 20th century, it has been reduced to the sorrowful plight of the "Church of the Catacombs," as was the primitive church during the Neronian persecution.

Two thousand secular priests and monks, for rightfully refusing to acknowledge the patriarch of the Russian Orthodox Church as their head—this church is now subservient to the Communists—were arrested and deported to slave labor camps. The Reds exterminated all five dioceses of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, desecrated 4,440 of its churches and chapels together with 195 religious houses. The Communists continue to oppress mercilessly the Ukrainian laity for remaining steadfast to its Christian heritage, church and faith.

NATIONAL CATHOLIC
WELFARE CONFERENCE,
Washington, D. C., August 18, 1955.

Most Rev. AMBROSE SENYSHYN, O. S. B. M.,
Auxiliary Bishop, Vicar General,
Ukrainian Catholic Exarchate,
U. S. A.,
Stamford, Conn.

MY DEAR BISHOP SENYSHYN: It is interesting and inspiring to learn from your letter that our brethren of the Ukrainian Catholic Exarchate of the United States will celebrate a millenium of St. Olga's conversion to Christianity at Kiev in the year 955. Surely this is a most significant event which should serve to revitalize the faith of many thousands who in a special sense are the beneficiaries of that blessed occasion.

We will rejoice with our brethren of the Byzantine Slavonic Rite that they have had the opportunity here in this country to practice their faith in freedom such as has been denied them in recent years in the land of their origin. We express our profound sympathy for the persecuted Ukrainian people and we join our prayers with their own, that in God's providence there may be a brighter future for the oppressed church in the land made sacred by the sufferings of so many bishops, priests, and devoted faithful.

Please convey my greetings on this occasion to your associates and to the Ukrainian Catholic people of the Byzantine Slavonic Rite, and assure them of our sentiments of high esteem and of our union in prayer with them.

Faithfully yours in Christ.

KARL J. ALTER,
Archbishop of Cincinnati, Chairman of the Board, N. C. W. C.

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., September 2, 1955.

His Excellency Most Reverend AMBROSE SENYSHYN, O. S. B. M.,
Auxiliary Bishop, Vicar General,
Ukrainian Catholic Exarchate,
Stamford, Conn.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: On my own behalf and on behalf of the Catholic University of America, please permit me to join with you in the celebration of this year of special jubilee for the whole Ukrainian people.

It is fitting indeed that due recognition should be given solemnly to the passing of a thousand years since that wonderful day when Saint Olga, ruling soverign of the State of Kiev, was baptized and became a member of the Catholic Church. So entered the Ukrainian people into the community of Christian nations.

Considering this event in the perspective of 10 centuries of Christian achievement, we are impelled to join in profound thanks to Almighty God for the many graces which He has bestowed upon the Ukrainian people.

While we thus offer our thanks, we know with sorrow that millions still on Ukrainian soil are prevented from observing this joyful event as they suffer persecution, bereft

of clergy and robbed of their God-given liberties.

It is my fervent prayer that this year of jubilee may see the beginning of a new era in which the Ukrainian people, firm in the Christian faith, will move toward a fuller and deeped Christian life in union with the church which St. Olga entered a thousand years ago. In that great hope I remain

Fraternally yours in Christ,

BRYAN J. MCENTIGART,
Rector of the University, Titular Bishop of Aradi.

ARCHBISHOP'S HOUSE,
Santa Fe, N. Mex., August 15, 1955.

Most Rev. AMBROSE SENYSHYN, OSBM, V. G.,
Chairman Anniversary Committee,
Stamford, Conn.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: When, on September 5, the Ukrainians of our Catholic exarchate will celebrate the 1000th anniversary of St. Olga's baptism, they will not only review a glorious past of sufferings and conquests, but also renew their faith in a miracle for which all of us are praying: That the land of Olga and Vladimir may be freed from the present diabolical slavery and that its churches may again see the splendor of the Byzantine-Slavonic rite.

At the very beginning of your religious history, the relics of Pope St. Clement were solemnly brought to Kiev by the newly baptized Vladimir, who then ordered that the idol of Perun be thrown into the Dnieper and a church be built in its place. This page might prove to have a prophetic significance. We shall probably see the day when another Pope will be the instrument of the Divine Providence in destroying the throne of Satan and in rebuilding the martyr church of Ukraine.

St. Olga and her grandson, Vladimir, had a great devotion to the Assumption of the blessed virgin Mary, so much so, that Vladimir erected a Church of the Assumption. I am writing this message on August 15, and I pray that Our Lady of the Assumption may again reign, as queen and mother, over her land which an evil power has desecrated.

May this message of hope and prayer tell the Ukrainians of America that, in truly Catholic charity, we are close to them and that with them we pray for a brighter future.

EDWIN V. BYRNE,
Archbishop of Santa Fe, N. Mex.

ARCHBISHOP'S HOUSE,
Baltimore, Md., August 26, 1955.

Most Rev. AMBROSE SENYSHYN, OSBM,
Auxiliary Bishop, Vicar General, Ukrainian Catholic Exarchate, U. S. A.
Chairman, Anniversary Committee,
Stamford, Conn.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: It has come to my attention that on September 5 the people of Ukrainian ancestry in the United States will commemorate the conversion of St. Olga, Princess of Ukraine, whose baptism in the Catholic faith was the fountainhead of their glorious Christian tradition.

No greater testimony to the courageous constancy in the faith of our beloved Ukrainian people could be given than the record of their fidelity to Christ and His vicar upon earth, not only here in the United States but especially in the Ukraine where they still undergo most vicious persecution. The reports of their adherence to Catholic christianity despite every efforts of the persecutor to destroy their faith, are a source of holy pride and of great encouragement to the Christian world.

It will be my appreciated privilege on September 5 to join with Archbishop Bohachevsky, Your Excellency, and the people in the United States of Ukrainian ancestry in happy commemoration of their nation's conversion. At this time I shall implore the Holy Spirit to send forth in ever greater measure His divine spirit of fortitude into the hearts of the Ukrainian people and in the adorable disposition of His divine providence to bring speedily that peace which will enable them once more to practice their holy faith openly and without fear.

With expression of every good wish, I am,

Sincerely yours in Christ,

FRANCIS P. KEOUGH,
Archbishop of Baltimore.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *August 13, 1955.*

His Excellency Most Reverend
AMBROSE SENYSHYN, O. S. B. M.,
Auxiliary Bishop and Vicar General,
Stamford, Conn.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: Permit me to acknowledge receipt of your esteemed favor of August 12, 1955, in which you bring to my notice the very sacred and significant observance to be sponsored by a group of faithful Ukrainian members of our church to commemorate in an appropriate and blessedly fruitful manner the holy life of St. Olga, Princess of Ukraine, who embraced the Cross of Christain 955 at Kiev, the present capitol of Ukraine, and immediately sponsored and promoted the spread of Catholic Christianity among her subjects.

I understand that the group above referred to, as sponsors of this holy observance, are people of Ukraine nationality or descent, of whom about 400,000 reside in the United States.

I readily recognize that this commemorative observance will exert a blessedly inspirational influence and stimulate most opportune spiritual consolation and provide encouragement and hope to Ukrainians everywhere, particularly in those sections of our contemporary world where so many have been imprisoned or called upon even to endure death in their fidelity to their Christian faith.

It will be a precious privilege for the clergy, religious, people, and children of the Diocese of Brooklyn to join with your Exarch, the Most Reverend Archbishop Constantine Bohachevsky, D. D., yourself, and the members of the Ukraine clergy, people, and children throughout our contemporary world in offering glory to God, reverential honor to St. Olga, and to express the prayerful hope that through the providential care and mercy of our Divine Savior the Ukrainian clergy and people throughout the world will be soon favored with an opportunity to worship God and to sanctify their souls in peace and in assurance of their own sanctification and salvation.

With sentiments of sincere personal esteem, regard, and prayerful good wishes, I am

Faithfully yours,

THOMAS E. MOLLOY,
Bishop of Brooklyn.

Protect America's Future Through Patriotic Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL J. ERVIN, JR.
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, one of our greatest patriotic organizations, the National Society of Daughters of the American Revolution, is now holding its 65th continental congress at Constitution Hall in Washington City. On Monday evening, April 16, the Daughters heard the able address of their president general, Miss Gertrude S. Carraway, one of North Carolina's most charming, eloquent, intelligent, and patriotic daughters. The address merits the thoughtful consideration of all Americans who wish to preserve the way of life bequeathed to us by our Revolutionary forebears. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROTECT AMERICA'S FUTURE THROUGH PATRIOTIC EDUCATION

(Address of Miss Gertrude S. Carraway, president general, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, 65th Continental Congress, April 16, 1956)

America's future is in danger.

Our freedoms are at stake.

The American way of life is jeopardized.

From within and from without our borders are serious threats to constitutional provisions and liberties which have made our representative Republic the freest and finest Government in the annals of mankind.

Unless our citizens become more vigilant and assume more zealously our responsibility to preserve our priceless heritage, we may lose the rights and privileges for which our ancestors risked their lives and fortunes.

Our United States is at a crucial crossroads. Will it veer to the left, or to the right? Will it go backward, or move forward on its long-traveled highway of free enterprise and national independence? Will it succumb to those who would barter away our sovereignty, or will it retain the sound principles on which it was founded and which have made it so strong and so great?

This is an era of vital decision. Steps taken today will have marked effects on future trends.

Through the centuries there have been many critical cycles. This age is perhaps the most dangerous, or the most promising, depending on how we answer current questions and solve pressing problems.

ERA OF WORLD RECONSTRUCTION

It is a world reconstruction period. All around the globe are trouble spots, powder kegs, which at any moment might violently explode. Numerous areas are seething in unrest and turmoil. There are choices between slavery or freedom, darkness or light, disorder or order, war or peace, atheistic totalitarianism or self-rule under God.

Times of confusion, such as this, have often resulted in constructive and progressive movements, because of the unselfish efforts of exemplary leaders and loyal followers. The same could happen now, if we had citizens of earnest endeavor and ardent patriotism in each and every community of America.

When the night is darkest, we need our staunchest courage, our clearest vision, our most implicit faith. Today, as never before, we need the courage, vision and faith of our forefathers and predecessors, their integrity, devotion to duty, and self-sacrifice for the general welfare.

In his first inaugural address in 1789 President Washington declared:

"The preservation of the sacred fire of liberty and the destiny of the republican model of government are justly considered as deeply, perhaps as finally, staked on the experiment entrusted to the hands of the American people * * *

"Our national policy will be laid in the pure and immutable principles of private morality; and the preeminence of free government exemplified by all the attributes

which can win the affections of its citizens and the respect of the world."

AMERACA MUST BE SAVED

Is our Nation worth saving? All of us here would undoubtedly answer, "Yes. It must be saved."

Our Government may have its faults and failings. It can be no better than the men and women who comprise it. And humans are not perfect. Nevertheless, it is the best political system so far devised, with more freedoms, unparalleled productivity and industrial expansion, the highest standards of living in history.

Let's count our manifold blessings, rather than our troubles and differences of minor opinions, in this most favored place on earth.

It is right to emphasize more and more our achievements, philosophies and potentialities, so that our younger generations will not grow up in despondency over uncertain conditions and tendencies but be proud of our great past and greater destiny, eager to carry on in the same spirit which brought us triumphantly through other perilous epochs.

During the past year our DAR theme has been "Protect America's Future through Patriotic Education." This summarizes all our major objectives: preservation of our constitutional Government and American way of life through historical appreciation of the past, patriotic service in the present, and educational training for the future.

The political and economic structure bequeathed to our safekeeping was erected on firm foundations. Any framework, however, no matter how well constructed, needs constant attention. If neglected, decay may set in, rendering it more vulnerable to time, storms, divisions or attacks.

PROVIDE FOR THE COMMON DEFENSE

Our Country needs alert defenders. It is the duty of all of us to help "provide for the common defense."

This includes military might.

Daughters of the American Revolution have always stood, and still stand, unflinchingly, for a strong national defense, adequate preparedness for any emergency.

So long as there are international gangsters, with stockpiles of nuclear weapons, we must be invincible on land, at sea and in the air. Our enemies most clearly understand the language of force. It is a deterrent to aggression, a power for peace.

But, it is not enough to make a house impregnable, lock its doors and guard it with armed soldiers, sailors and aviators. It can be lost by treachery on the interior, by a Trojan Horse slipped in stealthily from the outside, or by termites which may destroy before being discovered.

The common defense, accordingly, is also dependent upon a strong citizenry, with moral stamina and religious faith. On these qualities our Republic was founded. With them it must be preserved.

EDUCATE CITIZENS IN PATRIOTISM

To do our part in protecting America's future, a primary essential is to know its past. That is one reason why knowledge of American history is so important. In order to appreciate, we must first understand. This calls for intensive and extensive patriotic education—realizing how our land has become successful and why it should continue along the safe and sane paths which have brought it to the forefront.

If we are well informed, we will be more willing to help in every way possible, with determination to defend and to win. Then we will be good citizens and promote better citizenship among others.

In the new testament, is the verse: "He that looketh into the perfect law, the law of liberty, and so continueth, being not a hearer that forgetteth but a doer that worketh, this man shall be blessed in his doing."

Our political edifice on its spiritual base in this "Nation under God" with the motto, "In God We Trust," on our coins and in our hearts, can survive and succeed, if we know and publicize its values and advantages, with keen interest and active zeal to keep it as "The Land of the Free and the Home of the Brave."

Theodore Roosevelt wrote: "Patriotism * * * is merely another name for that quality of soul which makes a man, in peace or in war, by day or by night, think of his duty to his fellows and of his duty to the Nation."

SPREAD THE FIRE OF FREEDOM

Before the adoption of our Declaration of Independence, colonial patriots drafted similar declarations. Signers in Mecklenburg County, N. C., pledged: "Every member of this delegation shall henceforth be a civil officer * * * to preserve peace, and union, and harmony * * * and to use every exertion to spread the love of country and fire of freedom throughout America."

Such inspiring examples should be emulated, if we would protect America—its principles of human liberty, private enterprise, and national sovereignty; its illustrious background, unsurpassed present, and limitless future.

It is not sufficient merely to save the old foundations. They must be strengthened, materially and spiritually. This is an effective way to combat the insidious spread of foreign ideologies.

THE CONSTITUTION—OUR SUPREME LAW

Daughters of the American Revolution believe in cooperation with other nations, but not subordination, subservience, or surrender. We have approved the original concepts of the United Nations Organization of sovereign nations working together for world peace and understanding.

For 10 years, however, we have been consistently on record against any form of world government. Our Nation thereby would lose its independence.

In Galatians is the admonition: "With freedom did Christ set us free; stand fast therefore, and be not entangled again in a yoke of bondage."

Since 1951 our national society each year has sanctioned the principles of a new amendment to our Federal Constitution which would prevent treaties or international agreements with conflicting provisions from taking precedence over our domestic laws. The supreme law of our land should be our own Constitution.

Americans like to assist other peoples. This is proved by our record. But, we must not let our liberality strain our economy. Our Government must be kept solvent.

There is not enough money in the United States to assure plenty for all the world. As intriguing as it may appear to some unrealistic dreamers, it is impossible for human beings to create a utopia.

HELP OTHERS HELP THEMSELVES

Nor should we allow others to impose on our generosity. It is better for them to learn from us how to help themselves.

In aiding other nationalities with our tax dollars, we should not weaken our own strength, lower our own standards, neglect our own unfortunates, or permit our money to be spent for propaganda conflicting with American fundamentals.

To insure our future progress, we must be cautious and thrifty, abiding by the tenets of self-reliance and initiative which have made us secure and powerful.

Despite temporary lulls of sweetness and smiles, Communist conspirators still have the avowed intention, constant and unshakable, to ruin our economic and political systems. Despite current changes in practices and techniques, they have never swerved from their long-range goal of world conquest and domination.

Among our own residents, even in high positions, strange as it may seem, there have been found Communist sympathizers, fellow travelers, and others unwittingly falling into traps to follow the Communist line.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation is doing superb work. But, its mission is to investigate and collect facts, not to evaluate.

CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES PROTECT FREEDOM

That is why our national society has endorsed the purposes of congressional investigating committees. We think that freedom will be more likely guaranteed for more of us if subversion is studied and exposed by congressional committees. They need documentary evidence, so they may recommend pertinent legislation. We believe in continuing congressional investigations.

To some of those being examined for alleged disloyalty who demand their constitutional rights—and we concede to all this fortunate privilege in our free land—it might not be amiss to ask a few questions:

"Do you deserve these rights? Have you earned them? Do you accept their twin responsibilities? Are you willing to protect the Constitution which protects you? If you claim cover under one or more constitutional amendments, do you agree to support the entire Constitution?"

During these days of infiltration, we need to turn searchlights on those who would weaken or destroy the Constitution under which they take refuge.

As Emerson wrote: "For what avail the plow, or sail, or land, or life, if freedom fail?"

More than 900 million persons are now behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. A similar fate could befall us, if we are apathetic.

The outlook is not hopeless. More Americans are becoming more anxious and alert.

PEACE WITH FREEDOM

Everyone wants peace. But not peace at any price. Enslavement, imprisonment, or pacifism might mean some kind of pseudo-peace. We must strive for real peace, mental as well as physical, with freedom and honor. World peace cannot be attained until the desire and will for peace are in the minds and hearts of individuals and their rulers.

Napoleon asserted: "The sword will always be conquered by the spirit."

This proved true not only for the Little Corporal himself by also for other ambitious warriors who ended in defeat because of the undaunted spirit of those who would have been oppressed. Victories in many decisive battles have gone to those with fewer numbers but with greater courage and conviction.

"Not by might, nor by power, but my spirit, saith the Lord."

America was founded on His spirit. On His spirit it can be preserved.

Americanism is traditionally based on trust in God, with confidence that man, through divine guidance, is capable of self-government.

FAITH OF OUR FATHERS

This faith of our fathers in religion and patriotism must be cherished, maintained and extended, not only as our strongest bulwark but also as the best hope everywhere.

In all men there is an instictive craving for freedom. The torch of liberty can serve as a beacon of hope for those under the dark ages of dictatorship.

Let us here highly resolve to rededicate ourselves to the highest ideals of our country and our society and to do everything we can, singly and collectively, to see to it, in Lincoln's immortal words, that "This Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Through widespread patriotic education we can protect and will insure the future of the United States of America.

The Open Door to Jobs for the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, one of the deterents of employing the physically handicapped has been the second injury. I have just concluded reading a very timely article on this subject by Paul E. Gurske, Director, Bureau of Labor Standards, United States Department of Labor. It is a constructive article and well worthy of the attention of all those interested in the physically handicapped.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am happy to include The Open Door to Jobs for the Handicapped, by Mr. Gurske.

SECOND INJURY FUNDS—THE OPEN DOOR TO JOBS FOR THE HANDICAPPED

(By Paul E. Gurske)

To go to a job in the morning when other men are going to work. To return at the end of the day to a home that is free from financial insecurity. To have a sense of self-reliance and self-respect.

These are the things a handicapped worker wants. These are what he needs to be self-sufficient—to be a contributing member of his community, his town, his country.

But to achieve these basic and elemental human goals, the worker with a physical disability must have employment opportunities that are equal to those of his able-bodied friends. It is the purpose of second-injury fund statutes to give him that opportunity.

Perhaps no other single form of legislation has done so much to open the doors of the Nation's factories, stores, and workshops to handicapped workers than the second-injury fund provisions that are found today in the workmen's compensation laws of 43 States.

WHY SECOND INJURY FUNDS ARE NEEDED

Second-injury funds have evolved over the years—after much trial and error—as the answer to an obstacle which early workmen's compensation laws placed in the employment path of disabled workers. For undeniably, though workmen's compensation sprang from the most altruistic and humane of concepts, it caused employers to discriminate against handicapped workers. The seeds of this discrimination were found in the old common law rule of "no-apportionment." Many courts, in applying this rule to workmen's compensation cases, held that if a previously disabled worker were further disabled on the job, his employer was responsible for the entire resulting disability. In other words, if a one-armed or one-legged man lost another arm or leg in a job accident, he would be entitled to benefits for a permanent total (rather than, as in the case of a previously able-bodied worker, a permanent partial) disability.

This problem was foreseen even before the first State workmen's compensation law was enacted. But at first no one quite knew what to do about it. Those in favor of workmen's compensation did not want to abandon the entire idea because of the likelihood that some disabled workers would have difficulty in getting and keeping jobs, although, interestingly enough, the opponents of this new form of social legislation were not hesitant to use this argument against the adoption of workmen's compensation.

EMPLOYERS REFUSE TO HIRE HANDICAPPED WORKERS

Not long after the first laws were enacted, it became evident that workmen's compensation was, in actual fact, tending to bar handicapped workers from jobs. Some employers freely admitted that they would not hire or keep disabled workers because of the consequences flowing from workmen's compensation. For example, the spokesman of one company, less than a year after his State had enacted its workmen's compensation law, stated with unabashed candor that "[we were] quite willing to abide by the law and pay for an eye, ear, finger, arm, toe, foot, leg, etc., if we were responsible. However, we did not propose to pay our workmen for injuries received in places other than while in our employment."

This employer told how physical examinations had been required for old employees as well as new applicants in order that those with physical handicaps could be weeded out.

Thus, very early, the issue was joined. It was apparent that if employers were made responsible for the total disabilities of workers who had had prior handicaps they would, with some justice, refuse to hire them. On the other hand, if physically handicapped workers were permitted by law to "waive" their workmen's compensation rights, or were compensated only for the second injury they were likely to become a charge on the community in which they lived instead of, as was proper, the industry in which they had become disabled.

SECOND INJURY FUND IDEA IS DEVELOPED TO MEET THIS PROBLEM

Various legislative expedients and ideas were tried from State to State in the early years to meet the problem. Most were inadequate. But eventually there evolved the idea of setting up a special fund—generally known as a "Second Injury Fund"—which could be used to limit the employer's liability. This idea has gradually superseded previous expedients and has become the accepted way of dealing with the second injury problem.

Stated very simply, a "second-injury fund" law protects the rights of both the employers and the employees by providing that if a worker with a permanent physical impairment becomes further disabled because of his employment, the employer shall be liable only for a prescribed portion of the resulting disability. The employee, however, is compensated for the full disability; the difference being paid from the second-injury fund. Usually such funds are created and supported by special annual assessments on employers or their insurers, or by a specific charge on the employer or his insurance carrier when a worker has been killed and leaves no dependents to whom benefits are payable.

Second-injury funds were established in New York and Wisconsin as early as 1919, but the idea was slow to spread to other States. When the United States entered World War II, for example, only 14 States had enacted second-injury fund legislation. The big "break-through" came during the war. When State legislators became aware that disabled veterans would face job discrimination because of their physical handicaps, the second-injury fund idea spread quickly. Between August 1942 and August 1945, 18 States established second-injury funds. Since the war 11 more have done so. Today, only five States do not have a fund.

MOST PRESENT SECOND-INJURY FUND LAWS ARE LIMITED IN COVERAGE

In spite of the almost universal acceptance of the second-injury fund principle in this country, most of the present State laws are inadequate in that they extend protection only to workers with certain limited types of handicaps. For example, it is often provided that the second-injury fund shall be used only when the loss of an arm, leg, foot, hand, or eye is followed by the loss of another such specific member or organ. States having this type of limited coverage open few job opportunities to workers with polio, head or back injuries, a cardiac condition, epilepsy, or most of the other physical infirmities to which man is subject.

It is encouraging that in recent years some States have begun to move away from the concept of limited coverage. The New York law is particularly notable for its broad coverage of disabled workers. In 1945 the "Empire State" completely abandoned the "one arm, leg, foot, hand, or eye" approach and provided instead that if a physically impaired worker sustains a job accident or occupational disease which causes a physical handicap "substantially" greater than would have been caused by the second injury alone, the employer is liable only for the first 104 weeks of benefits. New York's idea of setting an arbitrary liability of 104 weeks for all cases is unique. It has the advantage of simplifying administration by eliminating the necessity for making a separate evaluation and determination of the degree of the previous disability for each case that arises. Any benefits payable for more than 104 weeks are paid, of course, from the second-injury fund.

The coverage of the New York law is limited only in that the prior impairment must be permanent and must be a condition which is likely to be a hindrance to employment. Thus the law does not cover latent or obscure impairments which the employer does not know about and which, therefore, he could not discriminate against.

Today, about a fourth of the States are joined with New York in covering second-injury cases which involve something more than the loss of specific members or organs. And the trend seems to be toward more liberal coverage. In 1955, for example, when Florida enacted a second-injury fund law for the first time, it followed the New York system of coverage. Ohio also liberalized its law last year to cover a number of disabilities that are normally excluded—disabilities such as diabetes, cardiac disease, arthritis, polio, cerebral palsy, and epilepsy.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR PROJECT

For the past year or so a group of workmen's compensation specialists in the United States Department of Labor have been hard at work on a comprehensive reappraisal of workmen's compensation law. They have been trying to select and combine the best standards found in all the State workmen's compensation laws, bringing them together in "suggested language" for a bill which the States can, if they wish, use as a guide when they want to make improvements in their present laws. This draft of proposed standards draws on the most liberal of the provisions found in present State laws and attempts to remove as much of the employer's risk in hiring handicapped workers as is administratively possible. It provides that prior permanent impairment shall be deemed to include any permanent condition which is likely to be a hindrance or obstacle to employment. Like the New York law, it provides that the employer's liability, instead of being calculated separately for different kinds of injuries, be simply limited to a straight period of 104 weeks.

In past years objective studies by governmental agencies, academic institutions, and insurance companies have shattered many of the old shibboleths that surrounded the employment of handicapped workers. It has been shown, for example, that they are no more susceptible to job accidents than their more ablebodied coworkers. In fact, these studies have shown that when placed in proper jobs, physically handicapped workers not only have as good a record for safety as other workers, but one that is often better.

Another "superstitution" that has sometimes gained credence among unthinking employers is that their insurance rates will be raised if they hire handicapped workers. This myth has been refuted by both major associations of mutual and stock insurance companies. These groups, who have a direct economic interest in keeping their risks as low as possible, have stressed that the employment of physically handicapped workers is consistent with sound insurance principles and does not affect an employer's workmen's compensation rates.

FUTURE HOLDS NEW HOPE FOR THE HANDICAPPED

As more States liberalize their second-injury fund laws, more job opportunities will inevitably open up for handicapped workers. Though full coverage in every State will not come immediately, the trend is in the right direction.

Handicapped workers can look with hope toward the day when the post polio patient as well as the one-armed worker, the cardiac case as well as the one-legged man, and the epileptic as well as the employee with one eye will be considered as good a workmen's compensation risk as any other worker.

Then the handicapped worker will be fully accepted for what he can do.

With the help of liberal second-injury fund laws, he will make an even greater contribution to the industrial greatness that is America's.

Israel and the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, permit me to direct to the attention of our colleagues the following article on the Middle East situation which appeared in the February 27, 1956, issue of the Value Line Investment Survey:

THE PARTITION OF ISRAEL AND LOSS OF THE MIDDLE EAST

The interests of the United States of America in the Middle East are vital. The Middle East for one thing is the world's richest source of oil, still the major fuel of industry, our own as well as Europe's, and it is the place where hundreds of millions of dollars of American capital have been invested. The Near East is also the crossroads of world trade by sea, air, and land. Militarily it is an area of the highest strategic significance; and it is also Russia's bridge to Africa.

The policies of our State Department with respect to this vital area are hard to understand. The official explanation, such as the wish to avoid any arms race between Israel and the Arab governments, and the determination to preserve peace through the moral authority of the United Nations do not jibe well with the heavy shipments of offensive weapons to Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Transjordan, and other Arab States by both the United States and Great Britain during the past year. Nor does the haste to bring censure upon Israel in the United Nations for border violations, while ignoring the open blockade of Israel carried on by Egypt in direct violation of two United Nations orders quite square with the alleged objective of enforcing peace in the area through international law and authority. Also disturbing is the heavy veil of secrecy that has been drawn over the shipments of arms from Britain and the United States to the Arab nations at the very time that strong and widely-publicized accusations were being leveled against the Russians for doing the same thing, only openly.

What can the ordinary citizen get out of this maze of apparent contradictions? That it will somehow affect his welfare, the value of his investments, and the peace of his nation is perhaps the only obvious truth in the matter. One can however, look into the confusing pattern of events and find certain trends that have been consistent and deliberately advanced over a period of years. Such trends by their persistence point to a plan. They are the only even partially reliable evidence of what is actually being undertaken.

There are three main trends in the joint American-British policy on the Middle East which are clearly discernible and which have been consistently followed over a period of years. Unless reversed by some dramatic new development, the three policies point to the partition and crippling of Israel as a state and to the eventual loss of the Middle East to communism. Were the Middle East lost, Africa would be easy picking within a decade. And this desolate projection is the happy probability. There is a less happy one too, and it also appears to be possible: the massacre of the Israeli population and the outbreak of atomic war.

THE THREE MAIN DISCERNIBLE TRENDS

What are the discernible trends of American and British policy with respect to Israel and the Arab States? First, is the persisting effort to isolate Israel morally in world opinion. Second, is the policy of shipping offensive weapons to the Arabs while refusing defensive weapons to Israel. Third, is the repeated offer by the British Foreign Office to act as mediator in the "dispute" over the existence of Israel. The British mediation plan would offer territorial concessions to the Arab States which would add an insignificant percentage of land to the large territory already claimed by them, but enough of the tiny parcel that now belongs to Israel to cripple that new nation as a political economy. If Israel's territory were so reduced by partition, the assumption is that a compromise could be worked out that would permit the remnant of Israel to survive, if not as a nation, at least as a kind of cultural center in a tolerant Arab world.

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE THREE POLICIES

The moral isolation of Israel has been very largely achieved. In the recent United Nations vote of censure against Israel there was not a single dissenting voice. (This was the censure against Israel for silencing the Syrian artillery that fired across the border upon her citizens. The Israeli retaliation was deemed by the United Nations to be out of proportion to the Syrian provocation.) Israel drew censure and was threatened with economic sanctions as well if she again attempted to defend herself in such a manner. But there was no censure of Syria for opening artillery fire on civilians. No voice was raised to censure Egypt for its long continued and open blockade, carried out deliberately, uninterruptedly and openly for years in the face of two United Nations orders to desist. Indeed the blockade was further implemented only a few months ago by a shipment of British gunboats to Egypt. No voice was raised to protest the hundreds of raids across the open borders of Israel nor the Egyptian radio propaganda preparing the Egyptian people for a second invasion effort.

What with one twist or another, the propaganda drums have succeeded in beating out the tune that Israel with its 2 million people and 8,000 square miles of territory is entertaining aggressive designs against the 40 million Arabs in their 2 million square miles of territory. Israel therefore is now the moral pariah, and peace-loving Arab neighbors have been given to understand that Britain and the United States are their friends who stand for them in the councils of the United Nations.

The second discernible trend is the shipment of offensive weapons to the Arabs and the withholding of all but token shipments to Israel. Even before the Russians sent jet planes and tanks and submarines to Egypt, Israel had protested the shipment of British planes, tanks, and gunboats as well as American weapons to the Arabs on the ground that these created a dangerous imbalance in the Middle Eastern power alinement. Israel requested aid to redress the situation created by the shipment of our arms, even before the massive shipment of Russian weapons was under way. The request was taken under consideration, but nothing has yet been done, except to explain that the United States does not wish to encourage an arms race in the Middle East. While this explanation was being offered and at the very time that vigorous accusations were being broadcast against the Russians for shipping weapons to Egypt, the United States and Britain were secretly sending offensive armor to the Arabs, too. Significantly the refusal to ship defensive weapons to Israel and the assurance that its request for defensive weapons was "under consideration," was accompanied by a standing offer to "mediate" the dispute through the good offices of Sir Anthony Eden and the British Foreign Office. Apparently, the opinion was entertained that if the lower portion of Israel could be cut off and given to the Arab States, the British and Americans could then persuade the Arabs to accept what was left as a peaceful neighbor. The one quarter of Israel's territory that would be given over to the Arab States would not be of any significant territorial advantage to them, for 25 percent of Israel's territory would not add 1 percent to that of the Arabs. But such a partition would weaken Israel economically and militarily to the point where the neighboring Arab States would have no need to fear her rapid economic development. Then, too, there was the possibility that oil might be found in the lower part of Israel which was to be partitioned off under the Eden plan, and this, too, may have sharpened the appetite for partition.

So, the scheme looks like this:

First, isolate Israel as a moral pariah. Second, mount another invasion, this time making sure that Arab power is overwhelming. Third, step in to "mediate" the deplorable dispute, calling upon both sides, under God, to accept a peaceful adjudication, which would turn out to be the Eden plan or something like it.

In general, the scheme seems to be well on its way to accomplishment. Israel has indeed been morally isolated. The Arab armies poised on her open borders have been massively armed and in a few months will have been trained in the use of their new arms. The mediation offer (the partition plan) already rejected by Israel, is kept ready for presentation after the second, and this time successful, invasion. When accomplished, the Arabs will have peace of mind again and they will know us for their friends, who have aided them not only to achieve the political security they wish, but who also stand ready to provide the material aid they need to develop their economies.

IS ANYTHING WRONG?

A few things, however, are not going as well as might have been hoped. We have lost our posture of chief friend of the Arab nations in the United Nations' councils. When the British and Americans led the condemnation of Israel for silencing the Syrian artillery that had been firing across her borders, the Russians went farther: they not only condemned Israel, but moved for punishment as well. Thus, the Russian position was even more favorable to the Arabs than Britain's and ours. We were outbid.

The same annoying slip seems to have occurred in the matter of arming of the sec-

ond invasion. When British planes, gunboats, and tanks had been sent in such quantity to Egypt as to draw open protests from Israel, the Russians merely offered the Egyptians an even larger quantity of arms. They also sent technicians in large numbers to train the Egyptian army in the use of the Russian-made weapons and they offered training facilities for Egyptian pilots in Czechoslovakia, where, according to the Hearst press, there are now 2,000 under instruction. Again, our posture of friendship was rendered ineffectual because we were outbid.

The United States and Britain will probably offer to mediate the settlement of the next war of invasion by advising both sides to use restraint and by bringing forward the partition plan as a mediation effort. It is quite obvious, though, in view of what has been happening on the United Nations' front and on the arms front, that the effort to appear as the friend of the Arabs in the partition plan is also doomed to failure. For when Britain and the United States offer one-quarter or one-third of Israel's territory to the Arab States, the Russians will surely offer one-half or three-quarters. And again we will be outbid.

Thus, the main objective, which seems to be to establish ourselves and our British allies as the great friend and protector of Arab nations, is already doomed, for it appears that the Arabs can find a greater friend elsewhere, as their moral defender in the United Nations' councils, as a weapons supplier, and in due course, as a mediator.

That leaves the United States with only one other way to bid for the friendship of the Arab States: to offer large loans for capital improvements like the dam project in Egypt. But here, too, we seem to be on dangerous, if not treacherous, ground. The Governments of Arab States whose friendship we court are not representative governments. They are technical governments—under feudal sheiks or army juntas. Such governments can easily be taken over by well-trained conspirators at the right time, and in Egypt today, there are already 3,000 Russian "technicians." If these technicians have no political errand to perform in addition to their military one, it will be the first time that Russia has sent such a multitude into any backward country for such a limited purpose. The 3,000 "technicians" go with the planes and the tanks; and when the right day comes along, they will find it no trick at all to bump off a couple of colonels and a few sheiks, and only a handful of people in all Arabia would know or care.

In the Middle East there is desperate need to reclaim the desert and improve the living standards of the people. Their poverty is pitiable. They are the backward people who are the most fruitful soil for Communist indoctrination. With the rapid development of the State of Israel as an example, the rest of the Middle East would be prodded into developing itself politically as well as economically and along democratic lines. But with Israel crippled or destroyed, the economic development of the area would be retarded. The spur of example, competition and trade, would be gone. Communist agents would have established their bridgehead and the United States would hesitate to make the large investments in the capital goods so badly needed by the Arab people but now so easily convertible into Communist assets. Because progress would be retarded, the revolution would be assured.

Our policy is to win the friendship of the sheiks and colonels, on the theory apparently that these are the people of the Middle East. But the people of the Middle East will be prone, if they are like other people, to trade a handful of feudal overlords any day for such promises as the Communists will give; and with the sheiks and colonels removed, we would find ourselves without government allies in lands where the masses of the people had been conditioned to anti-democratic beliefs. The value of the Arab rulers now lies only in their ability to inflame nationalist sentiment. But in the long run they will stand or fall on what happens to the standard of living of their people; and in Saudi-Arabia, Syria, and Transjordan very little improvement has occurred under the traditional form of government. The longer the economic development of the Near East is retarded, the greater is the danger that it will fall to the Communists, who if they have little capital to offer, can at least through political sophistication and high aptitude for organizing illiterate masses, hold a great advantage over us whose desperate effort it is to retain the friendship of a few topply rulers.

Once the Near East fell under Communist domination, the smouldering resentment of the Africans farther south and west would flame out into full revolution in short order. For the Communist revolution, as has been proved time and time again, can run like wildfire through territories and nations that are without representative government, without a decent standard of living, and without national self-respect. Our own South American dictatorships would then be next in line for attention.

The stakes in the Middle East are high, yet if the policies which have been in effect fro so long persist into the future, it appears that we have already lost. We might have a hope in the State of Israel as a bridgehead of democracy and as an example of something better than communism, if Israel were a strong and vigorous nation. But our policy, clearly, defined in the trends, is to scuttle Israel.

It is not altogether improbable that the sell-out of Israel will result in an even more shocking end-result than that implied by the British partition plan. It is quite possible with the arms imbalance as great as it is today, and the Israelis practically defenseless in the face of this situation, that nearly the whole of the population of Israel will be massacred. The incitement to war here is of a fanatical nature—a jihad. Civilization in this part of the world has not progressed as far as we like to think it has elsewhere. Such an outcome could hardly fail to bring about some loss of faith in the United Nations' integrity and especially in those moral virtues which we of the West like to think of as our special field of excellence. And in a world of desperate dangers, the loss of faith in the integrity of the United Nations could be a lethal blow.

More immediate is the risk that the United States and Britain, in furtherance of what seems to be the partition scheme, might step into the middle of the Arab-Israeli war, as we stepped suddenly into the middle of the Korean war—if anything so one-sided as this could be called a war—and in so doing find ourselves lined up against Russian forces. The Russian Foreign Office has already announced that it regards the Near East as an area of legitimate concern and that it would resist any attempt by the United States, Britain and France to violate the sovereignty of the nations of that area. This is plain notice that to intervene when the invasion gets underway unless the intervention is shared by the Russians, who in that case would also share in the bid for the favor of the Arabs in any "mediation" scheme that would later be proferred.

Unless we are willing to fight communist armies in Arabia, the Russian camel already has his nose and forequarters in the Near-East tent. In case we do decide to fight, we have just had the word of Marshall Zhukov for it that in a war between Russia and the West, atomic weapons would be used against American and European cities. Our cities are less widely dispersed and our industries less skillfully concealed than those in the Russian and Communist areas. Our vulnerability to atomic bombing appears therefore to be greater.

America could use a brand new foreign policy for the Middle East.

President Eisenhower's Restatement of His Philosophy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, those of us who had the privilege of listening to President Eisenhower last evening were fortunate.

His summary of the traditions and philosophy of the Republican Party richly merits the careful reading and most serious consideration of every voter in this country. The millions of Americans who shared in electing him our President in 1952 have the rare opportunity now of guaranteeing his reelection in November. We can all start now with an immediate and continued effort to make his full statement available to every possible friend and neighbor.

In my opinion, certain portions of that statement are of such striking importance and in such marked contrast to a great deal we all are reading and hearing from certain sources that I want to take this means of making these excerpts available now to as many of my friends and constituents as I can.

The President said:

The mission of our party is to help 167 million Americans build a Nation stronger spiritually and materially, a Nation whose every citizen has reason for bold hope, where effort is rewarded and prosperity shared, where freedom expands and peace is secured.

The President also said:

As a Republican I share my party's deeplying trust in what free men can do—a fundamental trust in the nature and capability of individual human beings.

People are made in the image of God—

He stated.

They are divinely endowed with aspirations and talents. Their destiny reflects their divine origin. Therefore, the Republican Party must be inspired by a concern that comprehends every American; that sets up no walls of birth or creed or party; that ranks all men and women of decency and good will equal in their dignity.

Speaking of the difference between the Republican and the Democrat Parties, President Eisenhower said:

We are all Americans, but in the practical pursuit of national objectives we differ in our methods, in our traditions, in our philosophy of Government's responsibilities.

I believe the Republican Party, in its methods and traditions and broad philosophy:

1. Offers the best hope of preserving the self-reliance and vigorous independence of individual Americans.

2. Best serves the Nation in the search for peace with justice and freedom.

3. Best fosters a competitive enterprise economy whose purpose is a wider prosperity fairly shared.

4. Best keeps economic decision-making in the hands of the people and out of the hands of government.

5. Best answers the concerns of people for the meeting of their human needs.

6. Best assures our children, and their children's children the heritage of an America rich in all the resources of nature, dynamic in great traditions and ideals and purposes.

The President referred to the record established by this Republican administration and suggested that the Republican Party platform for 1956 should include the following basic principles:

1. The individual is of supreme importance * * *people everywhere—every American of every race and creed should enjoy equally the rights and privileges of free citizens in a free nation.

2. The spirit of our people is the strength of our Nation. The ultimate values of mankind are spiritual. These values include liberty, human dignity, opportunity, and equal rights and justice. These are our heritage and our birthright.

3. America does not prosper unless all Americans prosper. More jobs and better jobs, and happier living for every family * * * call for a strong, growing, private-enterprise economy.

4. Government must have a heart as well as a head * * * Government should increase and strengthen personal and family security without impairing the self-respect, initiative, and incentive of the individual.

5. Courage in principle, cooperation in practice make freedom positive * * * all parts of our American community deserve the concern and support of Government in making their contribution to our well-being.

6. The purpose of Government is to serve, never to dominate.

He quoted Abraham Lincoln, "In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, Government ought not to interfere."

7. To stay free, we must stay strong. We must gird ourselves with sufficient military strength to discourage resort to war and protect our Nation's vital interests; we must help to strengthen the collective defense of free nations against those who would seek their ends through aggression. Our own and our allied strength must be spiritual, intellectual, scientific, material.

8. Under God, we espouse the cause of freedom and justice and peace for all peoples. The peace we want will be the product of understanding and agreement and law among Nations * * *. It will foster the concentration of human energy for the advancement of human standards in all the areas of mankind's material, intellectual, and spiritual life.

Hon. Jonah J. Goldstein 70 Years Young

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to place in the Appendix of the RECORD the partial story of a great man and a useful life. Judge Jonah J. Goldstein, of the Court of General Sessions of the City of New York, is this month celebrating his 70th birthday. He is still in every way a young man and a vibrant personality. Through the years, he has dedicated himself to the service of his community and the well-being of others.

At the age of 16, he took charge of a group of youngsters from the lower East Side, accompanying them each summer to Surprise Lake Camp at Storm King on the Hudson. This institution is now known as the Eddie Cantor Camp. For this service, Jonah received a little vacation himself—a free ride to and from camp, lunch, and 5 hours in the country. He was the first group boy in the Educational Alliance to serve as a group leader. The group he led was known as the Young Americans. Shortly after this, he helped to organize the Jewish Big Brother movement and served as its volunteer secretary. The Jewish Big Brother movement soon proved its value. Court records showed that 60 percent of youngsters who got into trouble and who had no big brothers, returned to the criminal courts and ended up in adult penal institutions. On the other hand, of those who did have big brothers to guide them, less than 3 percent found difficulty later on. In the course of his big brother work, Jonah acted as a lay rabbi on the high holy days, conducting religious services at the House of Refuge on Randalls Island.

As a young man, he was a resident worker at the University Settlement. A resident worker usually served at least 2 nights a week at the settlement, but Jonah did not limit himself to the 2 nights; more often he served 6 nights a week and all day Sunday.

Shortly after the infamous Becker case and the Rosenthal murder, he helped to organize the East Side Neighborhood Association for the purpose of combating vice and other evil conditions on the lower East Side. Of this association, Dr. Henry Moskowitz was chairman, Miss Lillian Wald was vice chairman, and Jonah was executive director without salary. In 1911, the late lamented Alfred E. Smith was majority leader of the Assembly of the State of New York. He took Jonah to Albany as his secretary and as clerk to the all important ways and means committee of the State legislature. While at the State capitol, Jonah helped draft a bill requiring that children, appearing in the children's court, should receive both physical and psychiatric examination before sentence. It took 3 years before this bill became law. For 2 years the State legislature passed the bill only to have it vetoed by the then governor. Upon the third try, Jonah succeeeded.

Al Smith was extremely fond of his indefatigable coworker and his affection for Jonah was returned in full measure. During this time, Al Smith was chairman of the annual fund raising affair for the Holy Name Centre for homeless men. Jonah assisted him. Upon Al Smith's passing, Jonah was asked to step into Al Smith's role as chairman and as director of the Holy Name Centre.

In 1920 he met Harriet B. Lowenstein, who was extremely active as a social-service worker and intimately connected with the federation, the joint distribution committee, as well as being philanthropic advisor to the late Felix M. Warburg. Harriet and Jonah were married in July of 1920. Ever since, she has been his partner, loyal and loving companion, and the inspiration for all of his many activities. Harriet was for 13 years the comptroller of federation. When she retired, Jonah was elected a trustee at large. He now is, and for the past 15 years has been, the chairman of federation's council of fraternal organizations.

In 1929, as representatives of the Jewish agency and the joint distribution committee, Jonah and Harriet were asked, on 48 hours notice, to go to Palestine to inaugurate a relief program and investigate the causes of interracial riots in that land.

In 1931, Mayor Walker appointed him a city magistrate. He served as chairman of the committee on reorganization of the magistrate's court, introducing such reforms as the consolidated bail bond, health examinations in the women's court before admission to bail, and the stagger system in traffic court. He was responsible for the organization of the adolescent term of the magistrate's court, over which he presided after regular hours, and he successfully fought for the removal of the criminal stigma theretofore given by the magistrate's court in all family nonsupport cases by turning them over to the newly created domestic relations court. He is the author of many articles on social service and the law, as well as the book entitled "The Family in Court," which is used as a textbook by social service students.

In 1936 Judge Otto A. Rosalsky died. In his place, Gov. Herbert Lehman appointed Jonah a judge of the court of general sessions. He was elected to that court in 1939 and has been serving there ever since.

In 1945 Jonah tried, but did not succeed in taking on the bigger job of mayor of the city of New York.

He was one of the organizers of the United Jewish Appeal for Greater New York, created to avoid a multiplicity of campaigns and has served as a member of the board since its inception. He was president for 5 years of the Central Bureau for Jewish Aged and Infirm. For 14 years, he was chairman of the New York Jewish committee of the Boy Scouts of America and, for 7 years, he served as president of the Jewish Club. He is still active in support of the Harlem branch of the Young Men's Christian Association, but the major portion of his spare time after these many and varied activities is engaged in working for the organization which is closest to his heart—the Grand Street Boys' Association, of which he is now serving his 21st year as president. As a corollary and cumulation to his work at Grand Street, his greatest pride is the Grand Street Boys' Foundation to which he has dedicated himself wholeheartedly.

Jonah has been one the most useful members that our community of New York has ever had. His service has always been effective, unstinted, and given without distinction to race, creed, or national origin.

Mr. Speaker, I have given but a few of the highlights of Jonah's useful life. There are many people who played an important part therein. None, however, bore a greater influence than his dear wife Harriet, whose sacrifices and guid-

ance in large measure made possible Jonah's many accomplishments.

Jonah J. Goldstein, 70 years young, still leading a crowded, busy, useful life, rich in experience, wise, compassionate and eager to help his fellow man—he stands as a tower of strength, whose contributions to society are, in his own words "only my way of paying back for the privilege of living in a great democracy."

Straightening the Record on Postal Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in his crusade for higher postal rates the Postmaster General has created the impression that Congress has been derelict in its duty in regard to the postal balance sheet. I am glad to say that someone at last has come up with the facts and figures that will put this whole problem in a truer perspective, giving the Congress credit for the care and statesmanship that have been exercised in the setting of postal rates. Although the statement which I shall ask to have placed in the RECORD that all may read it was made officially on behalf of a particular class of mail users, I can say that it truly represents the best interests of the American people.

A few days ago, witnesses appeared before the House Commitee on Post Office and Civil Service in connection with postal rates. At that time testimony was given by an expert. I hold that testimony in my hand. I am informed by the Government Printing Office that it is estimated that the printing of the statement will cost $267. It is very material testimony, and I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the cost, it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HARRY J. MAGINNIS, EXECUTIVE MANAGER, ASSOCIATED THIRD CLASS MAIL USERS, WASHINGTON, D. C., BEFORE THE HOUSE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE RE H. R. 9228, MARCH 20, 1956

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am Harry J. Maginnis, executive manager of Associated Third Class Mail Users, located at 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. The Association consists of approximately 400 members who either use third class mail in their business or who supply users of third class mail.

As committee members are aware, H. R. 9228 provides for increases in third class rates. If enacted, the users of third class mail would be called upon to pay an additional $77 million in postage. That is a large sum of money. We believe that the $272 million third class mail users now pay annually in postage fees is more than adequate. We oppose, therefore, the enactment of H. R. 9228.

Now this opposition will come as no surprise. This is the week for hearing opponents. Yet it is not enough simply to say we are opposed. You have a right to expect convincing arguments from the opposition witnesses. If you will bear with me, I believe I have some to make. A great industry is depending to a large degree on what I say here today and how you react to the evidence presented. We believe we are correct in our convictions. We believe that the Postmaster General's proposal is both inequitable and fraught with danger.

I have sat through most of the testimony so far. I have viewed carefully the testimony of Mr. Summerfield and his aides. I am not unmindful that they have presented what appears on the surface to be a good case for H. R. 9228. Nevertheless Mr. Summerfield has advanced claims which simply are not correct. Moreover, he has failed to present data which must be placed on the table for all to see before this committee can decide whether or not the adoption of H. R. 9228 is the wise course to follow.

Before getting into the case for third-class mail, I should like to point out some of the gaping holes in the Department's case and then place in the record some important facts which have not yet been advanced.

The Postmaster General opened his case by repeating the statement he has so often made that postal deficits in the past 10 years total $4,600,000,000. He sought to dramatize this figure by charts which showed how many destroyers, how many miles of road, how many libraries, how many schools, etc., could be constructed with that amount of money.

That kind of testimony affects not only congressional but public opinion as well.

But is the portrait painted by the Postmaster General an accurate one? I say "No." Mr. Summerfield failed to explain that there are many purely public service items contained in the $4.6 billion figure. Without such a listing, the picture is grotesquely distorted.

What are the facts? Members of this committee know that for 8 of the 10 years referred to there is contained in the $4.6 billion figure an airmail subsidy of about $80 million annually and the frank and penalty mail items of about $36 million annually. These happily have been transferred to other agencies of Government.

What else is included in the $4.6 million figure? Well, there's the small item of the congressionally approved second-class subsidy of approximately $200 million annually. That comes to $2 billion in a 10-year period.

What else? We have the admission of Department witnesses that there are free items in the deficit. I happen to believe their cost is greater than the $30 million figure announced by Department witnesses, but, for the sake of argument, let us just suppose that the Department's figure is correct. The total for 10 years would be $300 million.

I believe it would be fair to include some other items. We may disagree regarding some of them but, I, for one, believe they should be included. I remember vividly the discussion here when it was proposed to raise post and postal cards from 1 to 2 cents. The testimony of Postmaster General Donaldson was that it cost the Department 2.8 cents to handle a first-class card. These cards have never paid their way. They do not now. The cost of handling each card at present is close to 3.3 cents. And if Mr. Stans program of differential pricing is valid the price of each card should be 4 cents.

Now I am not objecting to providing to the public for 2 cents a card which it costs between 3 and 4 cents to handle. If the Congress desires to create that kind of subsidy for users of post and postal cards, I am all for it, but I think the public is entitled to know just what the 10-year loss on the handling of these cards has been; what future losses will be.

I do know that the present volume of such cards is about 3,300,000,000. If the loss on each of them is 1.3 cents, we are forced to admit that the users of post cards are now subsidized to the tune of $35,800,000 annually.

While we are on the post-card item, it is interesting to note that their volume in fiscal 1950 was 4,400,000,000. The rate then was 1 cent. In 1955, at the 2-cent rate, the volume was only 3,300,000,000. This 25-percent reduction in volume should raise a few eyebrows. If I am not mistaken the Department's estimate of $406 million additional revenue from rate increases via H. R. 9228 is based on the assumption that total mail volume will remain constant. This is far from being a realistic concept and should be examined by the committee.

Later on, when I get into the discussion of the question whether or not the post office is a business or a service, I will comment on the Department's admission that the cost of not handling parcels of a certain weight and size is $73 million annually. I don't want to get into the argument whether or not the post office competes with the Railway Express Agency, but the very existence of Public Law 199 proves better than any other fact that the post office cannot be operated as a business. You can imagine what the response of the president of Republic Steel would be had he been asked: "Do you refuse to manufacture steel beams because Bethlehem Steel says it is producing the same item?"

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. CORBETT, interrogated the representatives of the Rural Letter Carriers Association when they appeared here as witnesses. He was trying to develop the fact that rural free delivery does not pay its way. I don't believe that this particular service begins to approach the break-even point or that it was ever intended to operate at a profit. We have testimony from the Senate side that RFD suffers an annual loss of $150 million. Here again there probably will be disagreement. Nevertheless, the committee should try to develop the facts on this particular item for if, as I believe, such a large sum is spent in a purely public service venture the users of the mail should not be called upon to pick up the tab.

It will be apparent, therefore, from the data I have presented that Mr. Summerfield's figure of $4.6 billion is suspect. When the facts are placed on the table, his charts are not so dramatic.

The regrettable outcome of stressing the staggering figure of $4.6 billion is the fostering of the suspicion among our people that somehow or other the Congress has been derelict in its duty. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Congress has acted very wisely in its constitutionally authorized handling of postal policy. A lot of credit is due this committee for proceeding as carefully and judiciously as it has on rate matters.

Public opinion is what the press chooses to make it. The witnesses from various newspapers who appeared here on behalf of the bill were able in only a few instances to answer intelligently the questions of committee members. As Mr. DOWDY pointed out, one editorial writer was so out of touch with postal problems that he still is asserting that franked and penalty mail are part of the postal deficit. Counsel for the Washington newspapers endorsed the bill, but was unable to answer Mr. Moss' question as to whether the News, Post, and Star were really willing that second class be charged the total of its allocated costs. It is all right to endorse a policy of paying your way, but the newspapers have a duty to inform the public that this would require a 500-percent boost in

second-class rates and result in the destruction of our free press.

While I am on this point of slanted editorials, I would like to give a little credit where credit is due, namely, to this committee. Mr. CEDERBERG inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 12 an editorial from the Flint (Mich.) Daily Journal. The editor appeared here as a witness on Friday. It contains this statement: "The Post Office Department's deficit for the fiscal year 1952 was an astronomical $727 million. Changes instituted by Mr. Summerfield after he became Postmaster General January 20, 1953, reduced that deficit to $362,700,000." This is a statement that has often been made. If believed, it places a mantle of efficiency on Mr. Summerfield and deprives this committee and the Congress of its just deserts. What are the facts regarding this significant drop in the deficit? By action of the Congress, franked and penalty mail totaling $36.4 million annually was transferred to other Government agencies, as was the $70.3 million annual airmail subsidy. In addition, the Congress raised rates just prior to Mr. Summerfield's tenure. These raises, coupled with the raises on parcel post granted by virtue of a petition filed by the previous Postmaster General, totaled $272 million, or a grand total reduction in the deficit of $379 million.

No wonder the Postmaster General can show that his deficit was substantially reduced.

But let no one misunderstand. It was the Congress of the United States that accomplished the feat.

Let us examine another claim of the Department. In executive session some weeks ago Mr. Summerfield presented to the members of this committee as expensive-looking booklet which contained pictures and text. In it he says that third-class postage is "essentially the same today as in 1932."

That statement has been repeated by other witnesses. It is not a factual assertion. It denies that this committee has had legislation enacted increasing postal rates.

The minimum piece rate on bulk mail was raised from 1 cent to 1½ cents in the last rate bill, enacted in 1952. Eighty percent of third-class mail is sent under bulk permit. Since the present volume is about 16 billion pieces annually, that means that bulk permit holders today are paying about $64 million more annually than they did 3 years ago. If that is not a substantial increase, I will cease and desist. That is more than the total receipts from second-class mail.

So we can throw that claim out the window.

In his testimony last week, the Postmaster General used the common law pleading device known as the anticipatory replication. He sought to anticipate the claims of opposition witnesses and to answer them in advance. At one point he states:

"The importance of identifying and providing reimbursement for so-called public-welfare services is further emphasized by the misapplication of this term by opponents of rate increases. In seeking to adapt the public-welfare concept to their own ends, they allege that no private business could operate so many units and offer such broad services as does the Post Office and still break even. They reason from this that smaller post offices and rural routes are operated in the public welfare and that the costs should be paid by the taxpayer. This is specious reasoning."

I think Mr. Summerfield's claim of specious reasoning is worth a few paragraphs. I suspect, and hope, that Mr. Moss will, as he has other witnesses, interrogate me on this phase of the postal problem.

Before stating my facts on this public service against business issue, I shall first suggest a conclusion. It is this: "Whenever the Post Office Department breaks even somebody is being charged too much postage."

One gathers the impression from these hearings that certain members do not feel that first-class rates should be increased. We all know that Mr. Moss is of a mind, and I agree with him, to find out once and for all what the true deficit is and then go about hiking rates on the various categories to make up that true deficit. He is on sound ground.

I do not know the answer regarding first class but I have some suspicions regarding that category. I believe they warrant study. It is not sufficient to ask, "Everything else has gone up in price, why not first-class mail?" Is it not possible that first-class mail since 1932 has been paying more than enough; that only now it is beginning to reach the break-even point? Mr. Alexander at one point asked what the cost of handling the average first-class letter was. Mr. Stans responded by stating 3.3 cents. Unfortunately, no one went the one step further necessary to get the real fact established. Someone should have asked what the revenue is from the average first-class piece of mail. The last I heard it was 3.6 cents.

And why is this so? The answer is fairly simple. When one mails a 1½-ounce letter, it costs 6 cents; a 2½-ounce letter costs 9 cents; and so on up the scale. I believe I emphasized this fact in my testimony of 3 years ago. In substance, the mailer of a letter weighing more than 1 ounce is charged an unconscionable fee. Postmaster General Donaldson used to gloat over the heavy first-class pieces he had to handle. He admitted that this business was pure gravy.

If $406 million is raised through this bill, the deficit will be but $94 million. Since all of the free services and subsidized services I have listed total well over $300 million, the users of first class will be picking up the tab for the others.

And therein lies the paradox. Mr. Summerfield does not want a bill without a 4-cent first-class rate. Yet it is the only place where he can get substantial revenues. Certainly the $17 million sought from second class is not going to dent his deficit very much.

I may be flying in the face of public opinion, but it seems as certain to me that, as the night follows day, the Post Office Department, like all other agencies of Government, is going to have to operate at a deficit.

I have prepared for the information of the committee a chart which shows the deficits incurred by other agencies of Government. You will note that the Post Office Department, the agency of Government closest to the people and probably doing more good than all the others, is the only one approaching the break-even point. Yet these agencies do charge fees of a sort. If, for instance, all of us who are not inventors, wished to complain we would take a dim view of the insignificant fee charged inventors for filing patents. In like vein those who avoid litigation would oppose the filing fee of $15 which permits a plaintiff the use of a $100,000 Federal court room, a 12-man jury, a bailiff, a United States Marshall, a $25,000 judge and all the trimmings of a Federal case.

I would like to submit at a later time a study of free services performed for the American people by various Government agencies. It is a hefty document prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. Without knowing why, we use the term "appropriation" when referring to other Government agencies. In the case of the post office only do we use the evil-sounding term "deficit."

Congressman TABER was asked whether or not he knew of any business which operated so many outlets as the Post Office Department. He responded by stating that all large businesses had to operate profitless units, taking the bitter with the better.

Let us examine that statement. The largest corporation in America is General Motors. They sell a lot of cars every year. Can any member of this committee tell me where they keep open a service unit in the remote areas of America where a profit cannot be realized? I seem to recall testimony 3 years ago pointing out that the corporation with the most outlets was A. & P. stores. They had but 4,300 units.

I have read some history of the post office. The Colonial Postmaster at Philadelphia was Benjamin Franklin. The British Crown had operated it for some time, charging fees so high that very few people could take advantage of the service. Franklin had a different concept—more volume and lower fees.

A few days ago Senator DIRKSEN appeared before this committee. He sought to prove that history supports the Postmaster General's request that the Post Office Department be run as a business. Unfortunately, the Senator's story was not complete. It is true that the Congress in establishing the Post Office in the act of February 20, 1792, provided that the Postmaster General was authorized to carry the mails and that "he shall defray the expense thereof, together with all other expenses arising on the collection and management of the revenues or their operation." However, modifications of this balanced-budget theory were enacted into law starting in 1797, just 5 years after the initial pronouncement. In 1814 further restraints were removed and Congress exempted from the self-supporting requirement "all post roads necessary to furnish mail communication to country towns which have no mail." In 1822 President Monroe told the Congress in a message that "post offices were made for the country and not the country for them." In 1836 Congress sidestepped the question of budget balancing by simply providing that all postal receipts should be paid to the Treasury and the Congress should appropriate to cover its expenses.

Finally, in 1844, Congress met the issue squarely and appointed a United States Postal Commission to report to the Congress as to the real purpose and value of the postal service.

I should like to quote a paragraph from this report. "The United States postal service was created to render the citizen worthy, by proper knowledge and enlightenment, of his important privileges as a sovereign constituent of his government; to diffuse enlightenment and social improvement and national fellowship; elevating our people in the scale of civilization and bringing them together in patriotic affection."

Nowhere is there an indication that this is a business establishment. Less than a year after the report had been made, Congress enacted substantial rate reductions despite the current postal deficit. The wisdom of this move was dramatized by the greatest percentage volume gain in postal history.

Over the years Postmasters General have been troubled by the issue of service versus business. The present Postmaster General is probably unequaled in his devotion to the business principle. Exposure to the actual management of the Postal Establishment in the past has generally been sufficient to convert any businessman to the theory that the primary purpose of the Post Office was to serve the people.

It is an interesting history, the story of the postal service, but in essence the Founding Fathers and their successors considered it a tool with which to tie together a vast nation, to spread information, to educate and to permit the transaction of business. That goal has not changed. A great many of our people are still located in the lonely reaches of this broad land. I have seen some of the clerks' and postmasters' journals which carried pictures of remotely located post offices. Mail was gotten in by dog sled, kayak, heli-

copter, and horse. I know of no citizen who complains about this necessary but costly service. We cannot all be residents of cities although some of who are yearn for the lonely spot.

This committee has heard the president of the Burroughs Corp. and the president of Republic Steel. How many service units do they have in these isolated areas? There seems little sense arguing the point. I am convinced that the Department operates rural routes, second, third, and fourth class offices which no profit-minded businessman would keep open for a day.

I suppose the second-class representatives will present their own case at these hearings. I hesitate saying a word on their behalf but I share a view held by many people that the low rates established for second-class material have had a most salutary effect in the development of the Republic. For good, sound reasons the Congress has provided subsidies in many areas. To mention only a few—merchant marine, farm, airline, and railroad. On the Senate floor a few days ago two Senators, who, it seemed to me, were the most unlikely to take such a stand, expressed approval of the second-class subsidy—Senators HUMPHREY and MORSE. I should add, of course, that they expressed the wish that certain newspapers and magazines would not chastize in editorials those who happened to favor rigid farm price supports. That is a dilemma the publishers face, but it does not detract from the validity of the policy which permits the distribution of the printed word to all Americans at low postage rates.

It will be said that the Department is not seeking to overload the publishers. Only $17 million is sought, they say.

If I understand the figures, that leaves a deficit in second class of about $230 million. Who is to pick up the check for that amount? The first-class users of the mail? Third-class users? I know of no logical reason why that should be so. As surely as county agents' salaries are paid for out of general taxation and not by an assessment or fee placed on the farmer, so should the second-class subsidy be paid.

Let's earmark it as a subsidy and remove it from the postal deficit. The Congress cannot legislate intelligently on a postal rate bill until all subsidies have been acknowledged and the true deficit determined.

On this public service question, I have mentioned my belief that the rural delivery service is far from paying its way. I suppose this is a touchy subject, but from the best information I can get the demand for rural carrier positions is very great. Now there must be a reason for this. I am told they are well paid and that the hours worked by many rural carriers are extremely short—sometimes as little as 5 hours a day. I am not charging that this is so but I would like some member of this committee to develop the facts. If I am wrong, I am open to conviction. But if I am right, the fact reinforces my point that the Department cannot be run as a business.

Another witness appeared here—Congressman GARY, of Virginia. I should like to read into the record an answer he got from Assistant Postmaster General Abrams regarding the closing down of unneeded post offices. Mr. Abrams stated:

"We have closed 3,048 post offices. I can say without fear of contradiction that if I had closed all of those which were recommended for closing there would have been probably over 5,000 closed. There have been many we have not closed. Many of those were continued on the basis of complaints of the people of the community. That is the type of appeal which has been used very effectively."

It will be obvious that the Department is subject to pressures which prevent it from acting in a fully businesslike way. I remember another occasion last year when it was decided to keep a profitless post office open on the appealing ground that the former great ballplayer Cy Young got his mail there.

No steely-eyed chairman of a corporate board ever decides issues for such reasons. I am sure the hard-pressed small-business man is never moved by this kind of appeal.

Getting, finally, to the case for third class and why I do not think the rate should be increased. First off let me say that the rate structure for various third class items is somewhat confusing to the uninitiated. There is an individual piece rate presently of 2 cents for the first 2 ounces, 1 cent for each additional ounce. This kind of letter can be dropped in the corner mailbox, unsealed. It may not carry any personal message. It is subject to inspection and it is handled by clerks only after first- and second-class mail are out of the way.

Here again we have a paradox in public opinion. This particular rate emphasizes my point. It has been claimed that few people care about or read third-class mail. Yet half the Christmas cards sent by Americans through the postal service go out under this third-class rate. The Department never makes cost ascertainment studies at Christmas time, but we have the word of the greeting card manufacturers that 1 billion Christmas cards—1 billion—go at the 2-cent third-class rate.

In a way this is Congress' Christmas present to the American people because the only time the principle of deferred service for third-class mail cannot operate is during the Christmas rush. It matters not, if you place a 2-cent or a 3-cent stamp on your Christmas card. It will get the same attention by postal clerks. The greatest confusion would exist if clerks had to separate such cards into first and third class. So, as I say, Christmas card senders are the recipients of a $10 million gift at Christmas time.

You might ask, "Is this not true of business third-class mail"? The answer is "No." From Thanksgiving through Christmas, the business users of third-class mail get out of the postal service. It is the one time of the year that they cannot get readership. People are just too concerned with other things at yuletide.

Next there comes the pound rate. On books and catalogs the bulk rate is 10 cents a pound. The weight limit is 8 ounces. An 8-ounce catalog is charged half of 10 cents or 5 cents. This particular rate has not been changed since 1949. H. R. 9228 proposes to increase this rate from 10 cents to 12 cents, or a hike of 20 percent.

Then there is a 14 cents a pound rate. This applies to heavy pieces of advertising material other than books and catalogs. An 8-ounce piece is charged 7 cents. It is proposed to increase this rate to 16 cents. I might say that about 5 years ago this rate was raised from 12 cents to 14 cents.

There is a minimum piece rate of 1 cent on nonprofit mail sent out by certain charitable, educational, fraternal, religious, and veterans' organizations. Until the last rate act both profit and nonprofit organizations paid the same rate of 1 cent. When the business rate was increased 50 percent to 1½ cents, the nonprofit rate remained at 1 cent. H. R. 9228 does not propose to change the nonprofit rate. I assume the deficit incurred on this type of mail is charged to all third class mail bulk. That, of course, should not be done. The cost ascertainment figures give no clue as to the volume of such mail. The fact should be developed.

We come now to the rate in which my membership has the most interest—the minimum piece bulk rate on letter mail. As I indicated earlier, this rate was hiked just 3 years ago from 1 cent to 1½ cents, or a boost of 50 percent. The present bill proposes to make the increase 100 percent over the original figure, or a minimum piece rate of 2 cents.

The largest volume of third class mail falls within this category—62 percent, I believe.

There are several misconceptions regarding this category of mail which I should like to clear up here and now. Before any mailer can qualify for 1½ cent rate he must purchase a bulk permit at a cost of $10. The present bill proposes to increase the permit fee to $20.

After he purchases the bulk permit, the mailer must perform certain manual handlings of third-class mail which, in the case of first class, the Department performs. They are as follows: The mailer must sort the mail into State and city bundles, he must face the letters on either side of the bundle, he must tie the bundles, he must use printed indicia or precanceled stamps so that the post office is relieved of the canceling burden, he must place it in mailbags and deliver it right to the post office where no handling is required save to put the sacks on the next outgoing train.

Now it will be obvious to all that if the mailer undertakes to do these expensive manual handlings, the cost to the Department is going to be much less for bulk third class than it is for first-class mail. The fact that this is so knocks into a cocked hat the claim that third class should bear 98 percent of its allocated cost and casts serious doubt on the fairness of a 75-percent formula.

If the Congress were to apply the 98-percent formula, the proper rate would be the same as that for first class. Congressman HARRISON of Virginia in his bill, H. R. 8801, has proposed that this very thing be done, namely, the charging of first-class rates for third-class mail.

Imagine if you can what would happen to the postal establishment if direct-mail advertisers were forced to pay first-class rates and dumped into corner mail boxes 12 or more billion pieces of unsorted, untied, uncanceled, unfaced pieces of mail. We once estimated that if you multiplied the 12 billion pieces by the 7 manual handlings and required the Department to do the job, 50,000 new clerks would be needed to process the mail.

But it isn't only the fact that the mailer performs so many manual handlings of third-class mail which warrants the lower rate. There is another economic principle involved. It is a principle used by business after business. The principle was valid when third-class mail was created. It is just as valid today.

I have reproduced a chart issued by the Washington postmaster which shows the volume, hour by hour, in a typical post office. You will note that the greatest rush of mail comes at about 5 or 6 p. m. This is so because businesses hold their mail until day's end and drop it in the mailbox at the late afternoon hour. This situation has plagued the Department for some time. Anyone who can devise a system to achieve an even flow of mail at all hours will have his name carved on some enduring monument.

Committee members might well ask: "How do we keep these valuable clerks profitably occupied during slack periods? Their wages go on. They are there, willing to work." It was just that kind of question which prompted the inauguration of third-class mail—a fill-in mail to be handled during slack periods.

Mr. Stans in his testimony put the problem this way: "The same pricing principle explains why night letters are cheaper than day telegrams and why crushed rock is transported by the railroads at lower rates than machinery."

I am glad Mr. Stans used the night-day telegram analogy. Members of this Committee will be interested to learn that the charge for a fifty-word telegram at straight rates from Washington to San Francisco is

$3.45. The same fifty words at night rates, which received deferred service, cost only $1.30. It makes our 1-1/2¢ rate look very favorable in relation to the 3¢ first class rate. The only difference—and a significant one—is that the mailer himself does a lot of the work.

It was Mr. Moss in 1953 who mentioned that gas rates are contracted for at prices based on peak and non-peak periods. Here again we have a good analogy.

Why is it that movie house owners charge less for admission in the afternoon than at night? Their overhead for both periods is the same. Again we have the simple answer: It is better to attract some customers than none at all during slack periods.

So too we find the National Theater charging $5.50 for orchestra seats for a musical and $2.20 for the second balcony.

There is a reverse to this principle often used by barbers. Barbers are flooded with adult customers on Saturday afternoons and evenings. At these times they do not want to handle the youngsters. Accordingly, they raise the price for minors during Saturdays. The children have plenty time to come in during the week when the barber is begging for customers.

What has been the result of Congress' creating the third class category of mail? One would never know it from the constant attacks made on third class mail, but this single decision by a wise Congress has had such favorable effects that today direct mail advertising stands as the second largest advertising medium in the United States, accounting for the sale of goods and services well beyond $15 billion.

Yes, members of the committee, I said $15 billion. Just kick that figure around a little bit. Compare it with the total production of oil in the United States, which, last year, amounted to $5½ billion.

I remember 2 or 3 years ago visiting the Commerce Department with a friend. One of the division heads there was curious about direct mail. When I mentioned that our postage bill alone was $250 million annually and that the mailers spent well over one billion and half dollars just creating their advertising material, the Government employee was astounded. He said, "Why we have no figures in the Commerce Department about this industry. Get something over to us." We did.

It seems to me that this committee would perform a real service if it would invite the comments of the Commerce Department regarding this legislation. Since all testimony shows that 75 percent of the Post Office Department's revenue comes from businessmen, the Commerce Department's advice should be sought.

There are those who sneer at advertising, those who believe that there is too much of it. I can make one comment in that regard and it is this—in America we can produce as much as we want of everything but it is not going to do us much good if we can't prompt the public to buy it. We are all familiar with the plight of the Chrysler Corp. just 2 short years ago. General Motors and Ford were gobbling up most of the car market. Chrysler retooled, restyled its cars. They went on an all-out advertising campaign. As a result, Chrysler is solidly back in the ranks of major automobile producers. I do not want to leave the impression that direct mail did the job. The colored ads in magazines; newspaper, radio, and television advertising did the major part.

Well, you will ask, if everybody is so successful, why not a rate increase? There is the issue. There is the great responsibility. Therein lies the need for careful judgment. How delicate is the balance? You must ask. Third-class mail is unusual in another respect. It is the tool mainly of small business concerns.

There are 230,000 bulk permit holders. These firms are big business only in the aggregate. And the Lord knows, and this Congress knows that if the small-business man goes under there will be difficult days ahead.

There will be a series of witnesses after me to tell you how this vital advertising sales tool is used. I urge you to give them the closest attention.

In closing I should like to say that you, the Congress, have created a great and important industry. Had the Congress of 1926 imposed a 2-cent rate instead of 1 cent it might not have come into being. Wisdom prevailed, however, and the fruits of that congressional decision are evident.

Because the fruits of congressional wisdom have been so abundant, I can sum up in a few words my views about that part of H. R. 9228 which provides for the creation of an independent ratemaking commission. There is a line in the Mikado which refers to playing the game with elliptical balls and a spiral cue. If Congress should ever divest itself of its constitutional job of setting postal policy and the establishment of postal rates, that is how the game will be played.

Texas and the Cotton Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The magazine Texas Bankers' Record for February 1956 contained a very interesting article entitled "Cotton Farmers and Bankers Share Many a Common Problem." This article was an excerpt from a speech made before the meeting of the Fifth District Texas Bankers Association by Mr. Oliver Clift. Mr. Clift is the executive vice president of the Citizens National Bank of Waxahachie, Tex., located in my congressional district, the heart of the old historic cotton-producing area.

I think the article clearly demonstrates the problems of Texas in the cotton industry and its interrelation with the banking industry in that area.

COTTON FARMERS AND BANKERS SHARE MANY A COMMON PROBLEM

(Excerpts from an address before meeting of Fifth District Texas Bankers Association, in Dallas, February 6, by O. E. Clift, executive vice president, Citizens National Bank, Waxahachie)

In dealing with cotton farmers I have never found one of their problems that did not pertain to some banker. The banker has his investment in the outcome of the cotton farmer's operations; therefore, the cotton farmer's problems are the banker's problems, too. The sad part is many of the cotton farmer's problems are those over which he has no control; such as, no rain, too much rain, hailstorms, sandstorms, late freezes, etc. For 20 years I managed 8,000 acres of cultivated farm land. These farms were rented to third and fourth tenants. Back when we rented the number of acres per team, 50 acres was considered a one-team crop; 100 acres a two-team crop, etc. I have watched the farmers operate on a trial and error basis. After several years the farmer would find by trying various crops on certain parts of his land that one crop would do better than another. This was costly practice. I have seen farmers get in debt when cotton was 18 to 20 cents per pound and repay that money when selling cotton for 5 to 8 cents per pound, on the same farm and with the same number of acres in cotton. I do not know the answer. I have seen plowups, layouts, certificates, subsidies, parities, red cards, white cards, green cards, and now alloted acres that bring us down to the shifting of acres from one part of the country to the other. (See table below.)

Shifting of cotton acres, 1929–53

State	1929	1953	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Texas	18,229,000	9,568,000	−8,661,000
New Mexico	132,000	323,000	+191,000
Arizona	227,000	401,000	+174,000
Missouri	348,000	561,000	+213,000
California	319,000	1,348,000	+1,029,000

Allotted acres by States

	1938	1956	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Arizona	197,595	343,640	+146,045
California	402,472	782,405	+379,933
New Mexico	112,151	179,378	+67,227
Texas	10,019,639	7,410,893	−2,608,746

Now let's take from 1938 to 1956. This information is from the United States Department of Agriculture release, November 3, 1955, and USDA representative L. Beaty.

This information brings out the fact that Texas and the other older cotton-producing States are losing cotton acreage through USDA politics, and at the same time the Department is allowing new land from other States to be planted in cotton. This procedure increases the stockpile cotton carryover, since in most cases these new lands are in the irrigated districts and the yields are greater per acre. This does not make sense.

The same thing has taken place within our own State in the blacklands of north central, central, and east Texas. The State committee has seen fit to allow shifting of allotted acres to new western lands at the expense of the old cotton producing parts of the State.

Our part of the State has been a one-crop area, cotton being the only money crop. Our whole economy was built around cotton. The biggest business in our country is cotton farming, with a payroll of around $12 million a year. I have presented these facts to illustrate what is happening to the cotton farmer in our area. Take a farmer working 100 acres in cultivation. He is allowed to plant in cotton the coming year 38 acres—average yield would be half a bale, but grant he will make 20 bales; he pays one-quarter to the landlord leaving 15 bales for his part. Say the loan is 32 cents, that is $160 per bale, total, $2,400. His picking has cost $45 per bale; labor, gasoline, repairs, etc., $250. This small-cotton farmer is unable to qualify for a crop loan. He cannot show his banker how he can feed his family and have money left to repay even a small amount, taking for granted he makes a good crop.

The small cotton farmer faced with this problem has one of three courses: first, to take on a diversified program such as raising turkeys, chickens or feeding cattle; second, he can rent twice as much land to increase his allotted cotton acres; third, to quit the farm.

The banker has a big responsibility, and also a big opportunity to render service to the

cotton farmer. Every bank should have on its staff an agriculturist with banking experience who is quallified to analyze the farmer's operations, to determine and to work out a diversified program best suited to the man and take into consideration the type of farm land. Also, he should work with the local county agent and Soil Conservation Service to encourage practices that will increase revenue for the farmer. Every bank should contribute to the Texas Research Foundation, Renner, Tex. This fine organization is doing a wonderful job and deserves support. The cotton farmer problem will have to be worked out by a closer relationship between banker and farmer and not by the United States Department of Agriculture nor in the Halls of Congress.

Address by the Governor General of Ceylon Broadcast on the Occasion of Independence Commemoration Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

TEXT OF HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL'S BROADCAST TO THE NATION ON INDEPENDENCE COMMEMORATION DAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1956

Eight years ago, when Ceylon regained her freedom, there were some who had lingering doubts about the reality of our independence. I am sure that, by now, these doubts have been fully dispelled. Just 2 months ago, our independence received the seal of international recognition when Ceylon took her rightful place in the United Nations Organization. But even before Ceylon entered the portals of this world assembly our international stature had been growing from year to year. Barely 2 years after the country regained her independence, a historic meeting of Commonwealth Foreign Ministers was held in Ceylon. From this meeting emerged the now-famous "Colombo Plan," which has contributed so much to the economic development of southern Asia, and which is so splendid an example of international cooperation between countries at widely differing levels of economic development. Its extension for a further period of 6 years was one of the most heartening international decisions of the last 12 months.

The Colombo plan aims at international cooperation in the economic sphere. Much bolder and wider in its concept was the plan for political cooperation between the nations of the Afro-Asian region, which emerged from the Conference of Asian Prime Ministers convened in Colombo in April 1954 by our own Prime Minister. This plan, which was a vague and distant dream in 1954, became a reality when the first conference of Afro-Asian nations was convened in Bandung last year. The tremendous importance of this conference has just begun to dawn on the world's consciousness. Half the human race is on the move again. It is as if a mighty giant has bestirred himself after centuries of repose. We in Ceylon have played an important part in translating the dream of Afro-Asian cooperation into reality. The notable contribution which our prime minister made at the Bandung Conference has received worldwide acclaim. The part he has played and the contributions he has made to the cause of Afro-Asian unity will forever be writ large in the pages of our island's story.

While Ceylon's prestige abroad has grown tremendously since she attained independence, her internal development—economic and social—has not lagged far behind. In our agriculture and our industry alike, in our health and social services, we have made spectacular advances to which we can look back with legitimate pride and satisfaction.

All over the island's dry zone, where for centuries wild animals have roamed undisturbed in their jungle lairs, buzzing hives of activity have sprung up. Huge tractors are busily at work felling the mighty forests. In dozens of land development schemes all over the dry zone, thousands of neat little cottages are springing up—cottages to which peasant families from all over Ceylon will be moved to begin a new and brighter life. Gal Oya is already a household word throughout the length and breadth of Ceylon. Less well known, perhaps, but collectively as important in the agricultural development of the island are the other major colonization schemes which, like Gal Oya, have been started after we achieved independence. Allai, Kantalai, Huruluwewa, Padawiya, and Vavunikulam are all major schemes begun in the last 8 years and now completed, or nearing completion. One hundred and fifty thousand acres of new land have been opened up under these major colonization schemes, over two-thirds of this total being paddy land under irrigated cultivation. The total irrigable area under major irrigation schemes has increased by over 60 percent—from about 170,000 acres to over 280,000 acres. In other words, in 8 short years, the Government of independent Ceylon has brought two-thirds as much land under irrigated cultivation in the dry zone as was done in the previous 150 years.

Food production constitutes one main strand in the pattern of Ceylon's agriculture: The other main strand is, of course, the cultivation of plantation crops for export. While the battle on the food front has forged steadily ahead, our great plantation industries have not stood still. Here, the tea industry has the brightest record. The island's production of tea has mounted steadily since independence, from 298 million pounds in 1948 to over 360 million pounds last year. This spectacular increase in so short a period has been achieved with no significant change in the area under cultivation. When we recall how closely intertwined Ceylon's trade and prosperity are with the fortunes of her tea industry, we realize how deep is the debt of gratitude we owe to those who have maintained the efficiency of this industry and made the steady expansion of its production possible. Rubber and coconut have, unfortunately, not registered a similar expansion. But their turn will soon come. Fifty thousand acres of worn-out rubber land have already been replanted with high-yielding clones under the Government-sponsored rubber rehabilitation program. A further 100,000 acres will be replanted in the next 4 years. When this area comes into bearing, Ceylon's total production of rubber will increase by nearly 50 percent. A parallel program for the development of the island's coconut industry has just been announced and will be brought into effect very shortly.

While agricultural extension and improvement are Ceylon's most pressing requirements, no balanced development of her economy will be possible unless there is a simultaneous advance in the industrial field. Here, the leeway to be made up is much greater and the progress made since independence is perhaps less spectacular. But the foundations for the future development of our manufacturing industries have been well and truly laid. The essential prerequisites of industrial advances are power, capital, and technical skills. In each of these fields we have made notable advances. In 1947, the year immediately preceding the attainment of independent, Ceylon's total production of electric power was barely 55 million units. Last year it had increased to over three times this figure. The first stage of the Laxapana hydroelectric project was completed in 1951, and the second stage is already well under way. To meet the two other requirements of industrial advance, the Ceylon government has recently set up two new organs. The Development Finance Corporation will remedy the serious shortage of finance capital for industrial development. The Council for Scientific and Industrial Research will meet the pressing need for fuller technical knowledge regarding the potentialities of local industries, and supply the skills needed to adapt modern industrial techniques to local conditions.

It will profit us little if we develop the country's economic wealth, agricultural and industrial, while we neglect our vast human resources. Ceylon is not, and will not be, an unhappy land where wealth accumulates and men decay. Our welfare services, our health and education services in particular, are held out as models for the rest of Asia. The death rate, the infant mortality rate, and the maternal mortality rate are universally recognized as among the most sensitive indices of the general health and well-being of a people. These rates have all dropped by 30 percent or more in the 8 years since we attained independence. The death rate has dropped from over 14 per 1,000 in 1947 to approximately 10 last year. Infant mortality has dropped from over a hundred to approximately 70, while maternal mortality has fallen correspondingly, from almost 8 to under 5 per 1,000 births, in the same period. These rates are now lower than those in any other Asian country, with the possible exception of Japan, and compare favorably with the rates prevailing in many advanced countries of the West. The progress made in the field of education, since independence, has been equally spectacular. We are spending today twice as much on education as we did in 1947. We have been able to accommodate in our schools 1,600,000 children. Increased attention is being given to a more practical approach in education, not only in the form of the acquirement of skills, but in the approach to the acquisition of knowledge.

In the progress of any land, the position of its public finance is the controlling factor. In Ceylon, our finances have never been better. At the end of 1953 our net public debt stood at 993 million rupees. At the end of 1955 it was 898 million rupees. In December 1953 Government had to pay 2.48 percent on 3-month treasury bills; but in December 1955, Government was able to borrow at .75 percent. At the end of 1953 the external assets of Ceylon were 607 million rupees and at the end of 1955 they were 1,154 million rupees. There is no inflation in Ceylon. Consumer goods are in plentiful supply.

I have given you these facts to prove that the overall picture is most encouraging. The carefully conceived 6-year plan has started auspiciously, but the final picture will be bright only if everyone in the nation does his best to produce the desired results. It is necessary that those responsible for the execution of the 6-year plan should realize that in a democratic country like ours, it is not a question of being ordered to do something, but of carrying out a task, willingly, as a duty and a pleasure. I appeal to every member of the public service to give of his best as a demonstration to the people whom they serve, and to the world, that our love of country can take a very practical form. The great tasks which lie before us cannot be brought to fruition except through this single-minded devotion to

whatever type of work each one of us is called upon to perform.

I have been repeatedly appealing during the last 18 months for continued and increased financial support to the various voluntary and religious organizations that daily minister to the underprivileged in this land. In this connection the people of Ceylon will never forget the magnificent gift by our Prime Minister, to the underprivileged orphans of Ceylon, of his grand Kandawala residence, with its housing estate of 100 acres, with 25 beautiful bungalows already on it. There are many corporations, and individuals, in Ceylon, who can well afford to emulate our Prime Minister's example.

The leadership of a country is in the hands of one or a few individuals. These provide the inspiring example and given the direction in which to advance. The responsibility of implementing this leadership, however, belong to all grades of the peoples of Ceylon—to every home—and in the final analysis to every single individual. It is to them I make my submission today. There has never been in the long history of this land a period when the oportunities for a real advance in the happiness of our people have been greater, or more real. It must never be said of any of us that, in such a period, by failure to put first things first, by disunity, by overemphasis of matters that are not fundamental, by exaggerated fears and baseless suspicions in regard to each other, we have lost opportunities of great service to our country. I firmly believe that the ties that unite us as a nation will in the end prove stronger than the differences which divide us. I wish independent Ceylon and her peoples another year of great happiness.

Israel's Eighth Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join with my distinguished colleagues and say a word with regard to the observation of the eighth anniversary of the State of Israel. I am unable to say "happy birthday" for this is not a happy day for the little democracy which is surrounded on all sides by hostile, aggressive, and threatening neighbors.

I wonder how long the State of Israel will have to stand on guard. I wonder for what period of time she will have to continue to spend practically all of her substance on armament and a military establishment. This is the state which cheerfully burdened itself with a program of immigration for distressed and homeless people and sought to work out an economy amidst most inhosptiable surroundings. From a harsh, cruel, and unyielding desert of sand, Israel's people have brought forth a citrus industry. They have worked the farms so that now her people are self-sufficient insofar as vegetables are concerned.

Israel has worked and has accomplished much to educate and give medical ministrations to the people of the Middle East. She has given dignity and self-respect to people who have heretofore despaired of any further whatsoever. All the while she has had to stand guard. Farming, with a rifle ready at hand. Teaching children with a lookout on the hill. Nursing the sick with an armed guard on the roof of the hospital.

Israel has endeavored and succeeded in making a great humanitarian contribution to a benighted and backward part of the world. She is entitled to a happier birthday than the one she celebrates today.

I wish merely to say, Mr. Speaker, that if Israel's requests for defensive arms are granted by this country, Israel will have a happy birthday because war will be averted. There will be no conflagration in the Middle East with the fearsome possibility of its spreading throughout the world. Stability will take the place of impending chaos. There will be no need for foreign intervention. And I must here repeat, Israel is not asking that the United States send its soldiers to fight her battle. Israel wants to defend itself, or better yet, ward off and avert Nasser's threatened aggression.

President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles, you, gentlemen, can make this a happy birthday for Israel, and at the same time, you can serve the cause of world peace, democracy, and fair play. As Winston Churchill has recently put it, you can discharge an obligation which this country owes to the democracy of Israel as a matter of honor.

The Need for the Housing Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be an effort in progress to make political capital of the fact that a group of women will gather in Washington next week to exercise the important force of public opinion about consumer preferences in homes.

Mr. Albert M. Cole, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, recently asked the women of the United States to tell him what type of home they as homemakers would like to live in. From some 3,000 replies, he chose about 100 that seemed to show the keenest interest, the most insight into this problem and the most fruitful ideas. With some regard to geographical location, 100 women were invited to attend the Housing Conference that will meet in the Nation's Capital on April 23, 24, and 25.

It is an example of truly representative government that the Housing and Home Finance Agency should draw upon the collective knowledge and wishes of women in the home to help the Agency in its necessary functions. Mr. Cole's Agency has, among other functions, supervision of the Federal Housing Administration. The statutes and regulations governing the FHA require that in the insurance of mortgages in its regular and most often used programs it should consider the economic soundness of the dwelling with relation to the housing market. Homes that do not meet modern standards and tastes are not economically sound. Who can be more helpful than a panel of 100 women who have demonstrated their interest in this matter, and who represent all segments of our diversified Nation?

As a Member of Congress who has sponsored and supported housing legislation in the past several years, I object to those who say it is silly and useless to ask for this very pertinent information from homemakers. I would remind those who question the need for women's opinions that the latest figures available to me show that women hold 40 percent of the titles of America's 30 million homes and that they pay 40 percent of all property taxes. It is generally agreed by those who have made studies of home buying habits of the American people that women are in the main the final arbiters about whether a home should be purchased and—once bought—what should go into it.

It has been contended also that the recent publication of a book entitled "What People Want When They Buy a House," makes this Housing Congress unnecessary. In checking the facts I learn that although this volume was published last year, it was based upon a sample survey made 6 years ago. The Agency tells me that there was no money available to provide for the publication of the book in the time intervening. The book, I am informed, is an excellent study, but reflects none of the modern developments in housing, nor does it give the woman's point of view which is so important to sound home building.

Those who have the greatest stake in adequate homes for America's families are strongly endorsing the aims of this Housing Conference. Supporters include the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the National Association of Real Estate Boards, the National Association of Home Builders and the American Institute of Architects.

I would like to add my congratulations to Mr. Cole for originating this project that will attempt to improve homes by going to the people most directly concerned: the women of America.

Letter From Dr. Frank S. Wong, President, the American University Club of Hong Kong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under previous leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a letter which I have just received from Dr. Frank S. Wong, president, the American University Club of Hong Kong. Doctor Wong's correspondence emphasizes the importance of trade to the Communists, and he

also emphasizes that it is imperative that the United States not relax its opposition to trade with the Communists. He says that supplies such as machinery, gasoline, diesel oil, and various metals are being smuggled into the mainland of China where they are exchanged for narcotics. He also stresses the effect with which the Communists are using beguiling smiles, and he explains how stage and screen and press are employed as media through and by which the insidious propaganda of communism is being disseminated and spread. I commend Doctor Wong's letter to the attention of my colleagues.

The letter follows:

THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY CLUB
OF HONG KONG,
April 7, 1956.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BYRD: I must apologize for my long delay in answering your kind letter of February 22, 1956. I had a recurrence of rheumatism in my limbs and attended to the sickness of my life. We are now much better, so I am able to write you. I am now giving you some news and views about the situation in this part of the world.

The embargoes against Red China are hitting the Communists hard. The scarcity of materials can be seen everywhere in Red China. The 5-year plan especially that relating to heavy industries suffers delay owing to the lack of capital goods.

The Communists are doing everything to defeat the embargoes by proposing a resumption of through train service between Hong Kong and Canton and direct sailings of ships between these two ports. If such transportation facilities were available, considerable strategic goods in large quantities could be moved up to Communist China. This would mean that its war preparations and plans will be completed sooner and cost less.

At present small quantities of much needed supplies such as machinery and automobile spare parts, metals, gasoline, kerosene, and diesel oil are smuggled into the Communist mainland via Shea Kou (meaning snake mouth), a coastal village in Kwangtung Province about 25 miles northeast of Hong Kong. They are paid in farm products or with narcotic drugs, which are cheap in Red China and sold at high profits outside of it.

The prices of the smuggled goods at Shea Kou are generally 50 percent higher than those in Hong Kong, but machinery like certain generators which is priced here at HK$60,000 each is paid HK$270,000 by the Canton authorities in Canton. The price of a motion picture sound reproduction machine is HK$30,000, here but is sold at HK$120,000 in Canton. Small objects could flit through the eyes of the preventive services, but the heavier objects draw attention and are therefore more costly.

What I say here is a cross section of the violations of the embargo. There are shipments direct by vessels to Communist ports such as Foochow, Chuanchow, Shanghai, Tsingtao, Tientsin, etc.

More serious is the smiling offensive launched by the Reds with newsmen and players on the stage and screen, intellectuals and merchants as targets. The primary aim is to lessen their anti-Communist stand. Later on the victims will be forced to play Communist tunes. Newspapermen and writers are asked to write for the four local Communist publications or given outright subsidies, while workers receive aid in foodstuffs, schooling for their children, and medical attendance in case of need.

I want to draw you and your colleagues' attention to the imminent resumption of through train and direct sailing service, as it will enable heavy goods to get into Canton at quicker, cheaper, and convenient means. Unless democratic nations exert diplomatic pressure to prevent such new transportation facilities this plan will be materialized sometime this summer.

At the same time the United States Government should give more ships and planes to the National Government in Formosa to enforce the closing of Communist ports. This would block the continuous shipments of rubber, fuel oil, metals and other strategic goods consigned from Europe and points in southeast Asia to Red China.

One way to raise money to finance the purchase of smuggled goods and the smile offensive is to allow the Chinese in Hong Kong to visit their relatives and friends in China without the necessity of waiting for months for entry permits. Since last October, about 120,000 residents have visited their native districts in Kwangtung province. Each spent an equivalent of US$25 to US$40. Hence the Reds are netting an equivalent of about US$3,500,000.

Neither the United States nor Taiwan has any plan to check the Communist inroads in Hong Kong. I understand the United States Information Service has no resources or plans to cope with this Red offensive. I believe Washington should appropriate money—not necessarily large sums—to checkmate the Communist move and to go on the offensive. Some of the countermeasures may be best done by Chinese as if they were on their own, otherwise any trace of American participation would defeat its purpose.

I could give some concrete ideas on how to debunk the Red smiles as I am watching their maneuvers and methods. This matter is becoming more serious. Unless the United States is taking steps to stem the Communist tide in time, the entire world will be overwhelmed.

I shall be very glad to hear from you again and to know what is the reactions of the American people and Government toward this new and powerful menace.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK S. WONG.

Independence of the Ukraine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the just cause of the independence of Ukraine, the largest captive non-Russian nation in the slave half of Europe, is well known to most Members of Congress. In the recent celebration of the 38th anniversary of Ukrainian independence numerous Congressmen and Senators paid tribute to the undying patriotism of the Ukrainian people and their stubborn resistance to Russian Communist domination. In many States and cities official observances of this occasion were held. In both the House and Senate invocations were given by representative Ukrainian clerics, and in this city a most outstanding banquet was held on the occasion, which many Members, Senators, and representatives of the executive departments, as well as other distinguished guests, attended.

The State of Pennsylvania proudly participated in these nationwide observances. I have received from Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of Soviet economics at the graduate school of Georgetown University and also national chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, a short address delivered by the Honorable Roy E. Furman, Lieutenant Governor of Pennsylvania, commemorating Ukrainian Independence Day at McKees Rocks, Pa. This address clearly expresses the feelings and sentiments of the people of Pennsylvania toward the people of Ukraine in their courageous struggle for national independence and free government. I request that Lieutenant Governor Furman's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ADDRESS OF ROY E. FURMAN, LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY CELEBRATION HELD BY PITTSBURGHERS IN MCKEES ROCKS, PA.

It is befitting the people of the State of Pennsylvania to join today with the many other loyal Americans of Ukrainian descent in commemorating Ukrainian independence and in expressing sympathy and hope for the liberation of the people of Ukrainia; for Pennsylvania, more specifically Philadelphia, is the cradle of American independence. Furthermore, it is in the very nature of us Americans to sympathize with and encourage all nations in their aspiration and struggle for freedom and independence.

Unfortunately, today we find Ukrainia without her independence. Today there are no four freedoms for her—the freedoms for which the true democracies of the world struggled so long and so patiently during the last war. Instead, we read with distress of mass deportations of Ukrainians, of arrests in the night, of swift trials, of executions, of suppression of both the Catholic and Orthodox Churches, and of the other tragic symptoms of systematic extermination. These unhappy events can give us little cause for rejoicing on a day which commemorates a country's independence—an independence embezzled by Russian treachery and betrayal.

The cause of Ukrainian independence must be supported by our country, because it is based upon principles of representative government. The peoples of Europe who respect these principles and ideals should be given the opportunity to embrace them and shape their own way of life and choose their own form of government. Let us, at the very least, lend strong moral courage to those who through ties of family, friendship, and tradition, look to us as a powerful stronghold of moral and civil liberty, for a word of encouragement and hope in these troubled times. If we revere our American traditions, our country must take the moral leadership which is ours by virtue of our strength and moral heritage. We must work toward the goal of a world in which free governments are freely chosen by free men.

This is a moral ideal, but it is an ideal which will make for the greatest security for our country.

To be sure, the world outlook at the present time is not a happy one and the objectives of freedom and independence for all peoples may seen sometimes remote and elusive. But we Americans are gratified to know that the Ukrainian people continue to struggle for independence, for in reality, they constitute America's first line of defense. As long as Ukrainians and other East European peoples resist communism, russification, and consolidation, so long will Russia hesitate to start a major war. So I urge all Americans of Ukrainian descent, who would help to bring freedom and independence to their friends and kindred in Ukraine, to be of strong heart, firm in their purpose, patient in their determination, and unyielding in their

endeavor. I urge you to make known to the world the present sufferings of the Ukrainian people and their just and sacred efforts in the struggle for freedom. Today more than ever before when the fate of world civilization is at stake, we need organizations whose faith in the principles of freedom and justice inspire and encourage those who are still fighting for freedom.

America has profited from the fact that people from many lands have contributed to her strength. And we Americans, regardless of where our forefathers came from, should not hesitate to observe the significant anniversaries in the history of the people who have made our country what it is. The Ukrainian people, like other Slav peoples, brought to America love of freedom and devotion to God. And it is good that this is so, because America now faces stern challenges which will test to the utmost the character of her people. It is my sincere hope that the principles of liberty and justice, which are basic to both the American and Ukrainian character, will triumph, and that future Ukranian Independence Days will be occasions for happier celebrations.

Retirement of George P. Teel as Personnel Manager

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Tamaqua (Pa.) Evening Courier which pays tribute to Mr. George P. Teel on the occasion of his retirement, effective April 1, as personnel manager of the Atlas Co.'s Reynolds plant. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Teel was held in high esteem by both union representatives and representatives of management, which is an ideal situation. He has retired to White Haven, Pa., which is located in my district, and I wish him a long and happy retirement.

The editorial follows:

A HIGH TRIBUTE

The farewell party given by the joint negotiating committee of the District 50, United Mine Workers of America, Union of the Atlas Powder Co. for Mr. George P. Teel, who is retiring as personnel manager, is not only unique but is a high tribute to Mr. Teel and to the members of the union committee.

Seldom does any union honor or recognize a management representative and the fact that it has been done in this instance bespeaks well of the cordial relations among the negotiators on both sides of the issue.

It is particularly pleasing to the Tamaqua area because it offers one more proof to the skeptical that labor-management relations can be of the best in our area and discredits those who consider this a troublesome area insofar as employer-employee relations are concerned.

Every credit must be given to the Atlas local unions for displaying their respect for a man on the management side of the firm. They have thus demonstrated that above all else and despite differences of opinion, they recognize that we are all neighbors and neighborliness goes a long way to make good will.

Our congratulations to Mr. Teel on his long period of successful service to the Atlac Co. and to the Atlas firm for having such a man as Mr. Teel on their staff.

And congratulations to the union committee for their broadmindedness and the fine neighborly spirit in which they have recognized the true American way of life.

No Time To Relax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass., which should be commended for its straightforward remarks in the issue of Saturday, April 14, 1956. It should have the thoughtful and studious attention of all Americans seeking to keep this Nation fully prepared to defend its freedom and liberty:

NO TIME TO RELAX

It should be carefully observed that while the present Kremlin rulers are busy reviling Josef Stalin and all his works, they still are dedicating themselves wholly to Leninism as the basic Russian Communist faith.

This is the key fact underlying the behavior of Soviet leaders today. For, in the view of experts who know Russians well, there is no fundamental difference in purpose between Stalinism and Leninism.

Stalinism was crude, brutal in the extreme, blunt, and unsubtle. But the record shows plainly that Leninism has been no less ruthless and cruel, though not so obvious in the applications of tyranny.

And with both forms of totalitarianism the great and unchanging goal has been world conquest.

In other words, the objectives of the Soviet regime have been basically the same from the moment the Communists came to power until now. Only, in some periods the ugly face has appeared undisguised, and at others it has been deceptively masked.

Currently we are in one of the latter periods, with Russian chieftains striving hard to put an attractive countenance on their single-minded efforts to seize the globe.

Unhappily, at such times they always seem able to count upon the gullible assistance of many intellectuals in Europe and elsewhere. No matter how often the mask is torn away, once the Kremlin has put it back in place these groups show a puzzling readiness to accept it as the true face of Soviet communism.

Unluckily, too, many others in the free world, given a freshly prettified and perfumed image of communism, show a disheartening tendency to push the ugly reality into the back of their minds. Thus falsely reassured, they seize the cheerful interlude to relax and let down their guard.

It is at these very moments when the Communist menace is perhaps most remote to many millions, that it is in fact most dangerous.

Today, while the Kremlin smiles, sends out good-will emissaries, and tries to disavow Stalin as an ogre, Soviet communism is pressing hard its already great advantages in the Far East, is fomenting trouble in the explosive Middle East, and is endeavoring to win Europe by economic devices and the quiet warfare of "political cooperation."

No one should be fooled. The Soviet Union is having altogether too much success with its newest and in some ways boldest masquerade. We have little to cheer about as we survey the state of our free-world friends. We have no reason whatsoever to let down our guard.

Aid on an effective scale still must go to those who can be helped to help themselves. Our military alliances must be kept intact and reinforced. And we must push ahead in the forefront of military science, knowing that our safety and the free world's depend largely upon our having at all times a command of force so superior that the Communists dare not ever translate their drive for conquest into annihilating war.

President Eisenhower's Speech, April 17, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of this afternoon is most significant and appropriate in terms of the action taken by the House today in sustaining President Eisenhower's forthright and courageous veto of the farm bill. It is clear already that the overwhelming majority of Americans, irrespective of party affiliation, and, to a considerable degree, regardless of their personal opinion of the wisdom of the farm bill, respect and admire the President for the action he has taken in this instance, which was entirely characteristic of his entire conduct of the office of the Presidency.

The editorial is as follows:

President Eisenhower kicked off his campaign for re-election last night with a speech to the Republican National Committee here in Washington.

It was billed as a strictly political speech—but it was not much of that in the usual sense. It was more a reiteration of the man's philosophy.

Basically, it is the philosophy on which this country was built, a philosophy which glories the individual and affords him the utmost in liberty and opportunity. It is a philosophy which rejects the theory of a paternalistic, all-knowing, all-doing Government.

In the more than 3 years the Eisenhower administration has been in office, it has not always been so clearcut in the practice of this philosophy as the President was in his 1952 campaign speeches. And as Ike restated it last night.

But the trend of preceding years, which was rushing the country headlong toward the welfare state, on a Papa-knows-best-and-does-best basis, has been checked and in some respects reversed.

Here then is an issue which surely can be put to the test in the coming campaign. Those now in the running as possible opponents of Mr. Eisenhower all, in slightly varying degree, are advocates of the ever-expanding government.

Despite some of the performances of the Eisenhower administration, we think Ike passionately believes in the principles of self-reliance, competitive enterprises, restrained

government and administration based on the general good rather than the influence of pressure blocs.

We think American people are ripe for a decision on this issue. We can go to bat on it in 1956.

Fresno County, Calif., Celebrates Its Centennial and 100 Years of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise on the floor of this House today as the Representative whose district includes Fresno County, Calif., to call the attention of the Members to a most significant event in the history of that county.

Tomorrow will mark the 100th anniversary of the enactment on April 19, 1856 by the legislature of the State of California of an act creating Fresno County. All this week the people of the county are celebrating this event and are pausing to pay tribute to the pioneers whose vision and courage, hard work and sacrifice, have contributed to the county's foremost position in our country. I am most happy to add my word to theirs and to ask that the Members join with me in marking this hundredth anniversary and recognizing its importance to the San Joaquin Valley, the State of California, and the Nation.

The people of Fresno County are rightly proud that their industry, vision, and hard work have carved an agricultural empire out of semi-desert and have won for the county for at least the past seven years an official classification as the richest county of the Nation in value of agricultural production.

Land that once was arid and nonproductive today nurtures the roots of farm crops valued at more than $300 million annually and forms the foundation for the steel and concrete and homes of 15 thriving, growing cities. The bounty of this 5,985 square miles of area comes from its fertile farm lands, its beautiful and valuable forests and its mineral-producing formations.

The key that opened the door to this phenomenal growth was water—water in the hands of farmers willing to couple their toil with a farsighted realization of the possibilities for making Fresno County a modern Garden of Eden.

From a sparsely cultivated, dry farming economy, with limited cattle and sheep raising, these farmers have successfully progressed through one-crop dependency on grapes and raisins to today's versatile production of some 86 different species of field, horticultural and seed crops. The 1954 total crop value represents an increase of almost 10 times the value of crops raised in the county in 1935, while acreage planted has increased from 450,000 to 1,329,210 in 1954.

In addition to its agricultural production, Fresno County is noted for its beautiful forests which provide both valuable timber and recreation for thousands of people, including visitors from all parts of the world who enjoy with us the scenic grandeur of the Sierra Nevada and its great national parks.

Concentrated in the county's western area is some $116 million in annual production of minerals such as natural gas, petroleum, and quicksilver, while the mountains to the east are mined for tungsten, gold, silver, and other minerals.

Its great attraction of climate and location have resulted in a constantly increasing industrial growth for Fresno County. Twenty years ago there were only 4,000 manufacturing employees in the county, while in 1954, 14,600 workers in industrial plants earned more than $94 million.

Fresno City, seat of the county, is the trading center and metropolis for the entire central section of the San Joaquin Valley, and is growing by leaps and bounds. A recent census disclosed more than 200,000 persons in this metropolitan area.

From its small beginnings as a sleepy frontier community a hundred years ago, Fresno County has achieved miracles of development and it can confidently look forward to equal miracles of progress in the future, which I know all of us want to see directed toward greater happiness, stability and finer achievements for all of the people of this great county. Tomorrow I am flying out to join with the people of my county in their centennial celebration and from the expressions of many of the Members here, I know that I can take with me the congratulations and best wishes of this House to the people of Fresno County.

How Surplus Watches Were Handled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the following letter written by an Iowa farmer and published in a recent issue of Wallaces' Farmer and Iowa Homestead throws an interesting sidelight on how military men take care of surpluses and, incidentally, protect industry:

To the EDITOR:

During World War II, I was stationed in Europe. And after the conclusion of hostilities, I had reason to visit the large Army Air Corps supply depot located at Burtonwood, England.

There, I saw an amazing sight. In one of the larger hangars, I witnessed the destruction of hundreds of pilots' and navigators' watches. The watches were laid out on mess tables by the hundreds. And two privates were systematically smashing them in the face with hammers while a second lieutenant checked them off, by the numbers, on a clip board.

Those watches were manufactured by Elgin, Bulova, and Waltham, and were contracted for by the Government—with the promise that they would never be brought back to depress the manufacturers' future production and prices. The entire Nation, therefore, bore part of the cost of overproduction.

Under flexible price supports, the farmers and the farm communities alone will stand the cost of reducing the wartime surpluses that rightly should be divided among all the taxpayers.

Punishing the farmers through lower and lower prices will only add to our surpluses. Farmers will be forced to work harder and do a better job of management in an attempt to make a living. When a farmer does fall by the wayside, his farm will be taken over by a more efficient man who has survived thus far, and who will produce more on the same land and therefore add to the problem.

DARRAH L. ROBERTS.

HARDIN COUNTY, IOWA.

World Trade: Highway to World Peace and Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today, with pride and high hopes, introduced a joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the United States World Trade Fair to be held at the New York City Coliseum from April 14 to April 27, 1957. The personal satisfaction and pleasure I have in offering this resolution is twofold: I am honored to take this small part in the World Trade Fair for it is a step toward better international understanding, economic advancement and good will; and because the New York Coliseum is part of a vast new development in my district on Manhattan's west side. From the Coliseum at 58th Street, north to the Lincoln Square dramatic arts center, we are witnessing a vast rebuilding and redevelopment of a too long neglected area. As a result, the entire west side is being revitalized. The city of New York, the State and the Nation will benefit immeasurably.

The United States World Trade Fair will bolster and encourage the economies of our friends throughout the world.

The fair will be one of the first of important events to be held in the coliseum, and rightly so. It will be the most comprehensive of its kind ever to be held in the United States. Foreign nations will be given an opportunity to exhibit their products together under one roof, to offer them for sale to the buyers from all of North and South America at our principal port and the hub of our merchandising and marketing industry: New York City.

The well being of all of us depends upon the ability of each to produce products, goods or services which others need. Without trade we wither and die.

At the close of World War II we recognized this and in an effort to restore the devastated lands we established the Truman and Marshall plans. Point 4 aid enabled millions of people throughout the

world to start rebuilding. It is now as it has always been, the policy of the United States to assist others to achieve greater prosperity for themselves through freedom and trade. This is a continuing policy. The dole, the handout is no part of it. Necessity has at times required such measures, both at home and abroad, but it is a well known fact of life that a policy based on handouts is bankrupt and debilitating; the giver does not like it; the receiver detests it and in time comes to despise the benefactor. We all know this truth.

It is the same in international life as it is in family life. The brother-in-law who needs and gets monetary assistance to overcome temporary financial difficulties does not resent the help at first. But as it goes on, if he continues to accept a weekly gift, he begins to lose self-confidence and self-respect. The giver meanwhile deplores the lack of initiative he sees. How much better it is to help him find a job so that he might earn his own way. Then the formerly dependent in-law becomes a productive, happy, and proud member of the family.

The United States World Trade Fair presents a unique opportunity. At the Coliseum businessmen of all nations will assemble in the most modern exhibition hall in the world. Each will demonstrate what he produces and offer it for sale, proving again what we all know: Every dollar earned in trade is worth hundreds in aid.

The cold war is now being waged in the economic arena. I stressed this fact last June when we considered the foreign-aid bill. Russia has for the time forsaken bluster and force. Now she resorts to guile and economic penetration.

Russia is in reality trying to play our game. Let them play, for we will triumph. By a positive, continuing program in keeping with our historic aims, we can and shall help others to help themselves and to eliminate want and fear, disease and hunger, war and poverty.

The United States World Trade Fair is a tangible demonstration of our desire to work with and help peoples in all nations, through free and competitive enterprise. World trade, the mutual exchange in an international market place of goods and services, of arts, crafts, cultural and scientic ideas and advances is the high road to world peace and world prosperity. No greater goal can be desired. This is our aim.

On the other hand, pure or preponderantly military alliances, as history has demonstrated time and again, are highly perishable.

Economic ties are ties of strength and solidarity when based upon an awareness of common goals and common hopes and will result in the creation throughout the free world of indestructible alliances, freely and openly made, desired by all and impervious to Communist threats or guile.

Let us then join together, here and with our friends abroad, to stride forward with determination, and with hope and strength, confident in the knowledge that through efforts such as this trade fair, part of a continuing, morally forceful and responsible program of international trade, we shall as partners in the free world achieve that ultimate goal: peace, prosperity, and freedom.

Parity Prices and Farm Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram I received from Robert M. Harris, of New York, as well as a letter I received from a farmer in Lisbon, N. Dak., dealing with the farm problem, enclosed with which was a notice of an auction sale.

There being no objection, the telegram, letter, and auction sale notice were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PALM BEACH, FLA., *April 16, 1956.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

Congratulations on the good fight you made for parity prices for the farmer and agriculture. I supported President Eisenhower in the 1952 election. May I suggest you bring to the President's attention that in the 1952 campaign the President stated the farmers were entitled not to 90 percent of parity but 100 percent. The farmers and rural population are the backbone of our country also the Republican Party and it is imperative that prompt action be taken to restore parity prices otherwise the Republican Party is certain to lose the November election. This can be quickly avoided by stockpiling one-half of our God-given surpluses that are our best weapon against combating world communism properly administered and selling the other one-half equally monthly over a period of years on long-term credits to friendly non-Communist countries. The selling must not be left at the discretion of any governmental agency as this will depress prices. In substantiation of the foregoing will you please read the U. S. News & World Report issue of April 13 on the analysis of the recent Wisconsin primary election and also their issue of April 13 on President Eisenhower's campaign promises.

Best wishes.

ROBERT M. HARRIS.

FOREST HILLS, N. Y.

LISBON, N. DAK., *April 16, 1956.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Can you do anything to get that organization, the FHA to be somewhat reasonable in their dealings with these small farmers who have been hit by bad weather and rust the past 3 years. They are termed "disaster loans," and that is exactly what they are proving out to be. The Government has to have their money even if it works actual hardship on the family involved. I don't believe that is right or in any way reasonable.

I didn't ask you to pursue my case any further as it was too late to save me then and if I cause the FHA any trouble they will surely find some way to hang me for misuse of Government money or some darn thing.

You can congratulate Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Benson on the wonderful job they are doing on the little farmer in this section of the country.

Between the administration's farm policy and the FHA regulations, I'm whipped. I'm selling out Friday the 20th in the hopes that I get enough so that I can get out of this section of the country.

I wish to thank you again in regard to my welfare and if you can help anyone else in this mess I know it would be greatly appreciated.

Thank you very much.

ALBERT C. LINDHOLM.

AUCTION SALE

I will sell the following property at my farm, located 8 miles south and 6 miles east of Lisbon, 2 miles east of Aliceton School, on Friday, April 20, at 1 p. m.:

Fourteen head of cattle: 6 purebred Holstein cows—two 8-year-old milking; one 5-year-old milking; two 5-year-old springing; one 4-year-old springing. Two milking Shorthorn cows—one 5-year-old, fresh soon; one 8-year-old, fresh soon; one 4-year-old Whiteface and Shorthorn cow; two 2-year-old Shorthorn Holstein heifers, springing; one 8-month-old purebred Holstein heifer; one 8-month-old Shorthorn Holstein cross heifer; one 3-month-old purebred Holstein heifer. All Bangs tested and vaccinated.

Machinery: One 51-mm. 12-foot press drill; one International washless cream separator; one 46 MMU, very good; one 40 Ford tractor; one 51-mm. 4- to 14-inch plow; one 40 Ford 2- to 14-inch plow; one 50 Ford 2-row cultivator; one 51 Woods Dearborn combine; one 4-wheel trailer, wood flange box; one 4-wheel trailer, straight box; one trailer on steel wheels; one 300-gallon gas barrel and hose; one hay rake; one Ford hay bucker, three rolls cribbing; two 50-gallon gas barrels; one 30-gallon gas barrel; hay forks, milk cans, grease guns, many other articles.

A. C. LINDHOLM,
Owner.
GAY LOVAS,
Mayville, Auctioneer.
FARMERS STATE BANK OF LISBON, *Clerk.*

Terms: Cash, or see clerk before sale. Zion Ladies Aid will serve lunch.

Auto Dealers Interested in the Federal Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to direct to the attention of my colleagues the following letter, forwarded to me on April 10, 1956, by the Brooklyn and Long Island Automobile Dealers Association, Inc., expressing its interest in the passage of Federal interstate highway legislation this session:

BROOKLYN AND LONG ISLAND AUTOMOBILE DEALERS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Brooklyn, N. Y., April 10, 1956.

Congressman ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ABE: The 450 members of our association (Kings-Queens-Nassau and Suffolk) are enthusiastically in favor of and want Federal highway legislation enacted. We all feel that highway legislation is a must for

this session of Congress. The exact form of legislation or the precise method of paying for it are secondary considerations to the urgent necessity for more and better highways.

It is vital to national defense, to the national economy, the preservation of life and property, and to our business.

We urge your support for the early passage of such legislation.

Yours very truly,

HENRY EISENHAUER,
Executive Vice President.

Civil-Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL CHUDOFF
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, a program of civil-rights legislation can and must be enacted in this session of Congress.

There is nothing before this Congress more vital to our national conscience and to our international self-respect than assuring all citizens of this great Nation freedom and security in the exercise of their constitutional civil and human rights.

We all know that the suppression of and infringement on those rights is still a threat. We cannot expect to continue to lead a strong free world successfully as long as our enemies can exploit this as a defect in our national character.

Our forefathers had the courage to recognize and declare the equality of men before God and the law. Can we do less than enforce this equality?

Mr. Speaker, we cannot, we must not, let down the people of the world now. We must not fail to do what we know is right, just, and necessary. We must wipe out every vestige of the suppression of the civil rights of millions of our fellow countrymen.

On April 9 the Attorney General sent to the Congress a so-called civil-rights program of the present administration. Unfortunately, this is a weak and inadequate program. Evidently strong leadership in this vital field does not grow on the golfing greens of Georgia.

The administration's program does not go nearly as far toward the protection of civil rights as do bills introduced by myself and by other Members of Congress. I am sure the administration's program does not go as far as Congress is ready to go right now.

Mr. Speaker, the great interests of the Nation and of the free world require that we in Congress take the lead and enact a good civil-rights program immediately. We must put an end to lynching; we must strengthen our election laws and abolish the poll tax; we must guarantee to all citizens full protection and enforcement of each and every constitutional right; we must wipe out discrimination in interstate travel. A vigorous commission with authority to study all types of economic, social, legal, and other developments affecting civil rights and with a duty to present its findings to the President, to Congress, and to the country must be established. A regular joint committee of Congress should be set up with the protection of civil rights as its main concern. The civil-rights activities of the Justice Department must be strengthened and made effective.

These measures will be a definite step in the right direction. They will do much to redeem our national conscience and to restore our place in the minds and hearts of oppressed and hopeful people everywhere.

Future Use of Anthracite Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial of the United Mine Workers Journal of April 1, 1956, which outlines the future and extensive use of anthracite coal with relation to the steel industry:

ANTHRACITE FOR BLAST FURNACES CAN MEET STEEL'S NEED FOR FUEL

The public is not generally aware of it but there is one type of coal that is in short supply in the United States. Outside of the industry the average person thinks of coal as coal and is vaguely aware that this country has virtually unlimited supplies.

But the basic steel industry, now in a period of major expansion, has urgent need for ever-increasing amounts of blast furnace fuel. We agree with the anthracite industry that steel producers have only to look in their back yard to find large and readily available reserves of hard coal that well may be the steel industry's answer to the need for metallurgical coal.

The steel industry will add 15 million tons to its capacity in the next 3 years, compared to an average annual increase in capacity of 3.5 million tons over the past 10 years. On the average it takes a ton of coal to make a ton of steel.

The anthracite industry believes that it has the answer to the metallurgical fuel problem. Tests conducted by the United States Steel Corp. and the United States Bureal of Mines show experimental blast furnace operation to be successful with anthracite substitutions for coke up to and including 60 percent of the total fuel. These tests do not provide the final answer because that can come only from actual operation. But there is every indication that some percentage of anthracite may be used satisfactorily above 10 percent.

This is not a new idea, by any means. Anthracite was the No. 1 metallurgical fuel in this country from 1854 to 1874. As late as 1890, 173 of the Nation's 551 blast furnaces were using anthracite, the Anthracite Industry Bulletin notes.

The shift to coke came not because coke is a superior fuel—anthracite and coke have virtually the same carbon content—but because the steel industry moved westward to the Mesabi Range to obtain its ores.

Without scrapping or redesigning a single blast furnace, a minimum of 10 to 15 percent of the steel industry's fuel requirements can be met by the partial use of anthracite.

If the steel industry uses anthracite as a substitute for coke in from 10 to 15 percent of its total blast furnace requirements, the demand on the anthracite industry might reach from 8 to 12 million tons annually. Reserves of hard coal are such that the steel industry could expect such requirements to be met for 150 years.

Editor Fights Prejudice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to insert into the RECORD a tribute to a good friend of mine, Mr. Charles Wartman, of the Michigan Chronicle, which appeared in the Detroit (Mich.) News of Wednesday, April 11, 1956.

Mr. Wartman has served his country, his people, and the city of Detroit with distinction for many years, as executive editor of the Michigan Chronicle, a fine newspaper which is dedicated to the principle that all of our citizens should share the equality which the Constitution of our beloved country guarantees.

I hope that all who read this editorial on Mr. Wartman and the Chronicle will join in my pleasure not only at the splendid job which the Chronicle is doing for our people, but at the strong and constantly anti-Communist stand which it has taken at all times:

EDITOR FIGHTS PREJUDICE

(By William T. Noble)

Charles J. Wartman is a history professor who 11 years ago decided his future depended more on the present than affairs of the past. He gave up teaching for a career in journalism. Recently he took a few hours out of a hurried schedule to review the accomplishments or failures of his decision.

Wartman, executive editor of the Michigan Chronicle, one of the country's leading Negro newspapers, concluded the change of careers had been a wise move. He looked pridefully on the growth of his paper and scanned a series of temperate, informative articles he had written about the sad and sometimes crushing problems of his people.

WITHOUT RANCOR

"A classroom never could be as satisfying," smiled the 40-year-old editor.

For the last 11 years Wartman and his staff of college-trained men and women have been chipping away at ancient prejudices through the columns of the 20-year-old weekly newspaper.

But theirs has been a quiet, persistent voice. They survey the scene without rancor or rebellion. Often the age-old color question is discussed with a sense of humor not found in many such publications. But more often they chide those people who want to maintain the invisible line separating their people.

"The Negro today is a powerful economic factor," said Wartman. "It would be foolish to ignore us, and most sensible businessmen realize it."

CIRCULATION 38,000

Detroit feels the Virginia-born Virginia State College and Atlanta University graduate, is making slow but positive strides toward what he calls an "integrated," society. But the goal of leading Negroes, said Wartman, is to eliminate race consciousness in America. He admits it will be a long struggle.

But it is a challenge. And that is what is making his career so interesting.

Wartman and the executive council of the weekly paper that boasts an audited circulation of 38,000, take particular pride in the many issues tackled in the past 20 years.

The newspaper, with offices in a converted residence at 268 Eliot, was established by Louis E. Martin, now editor-in-chief of the Chicago Defender. Martin, still publisher of the Chronicle, felt his people needed guidance during the period of labor organization in the city.

"They didn't know which way to turn," said Wartman. "They were just beginning to get jobs in industry, and some feared alinement with a union would jeopardize their chance. Martin plugged hammer and tongs for unions. The Chronicle made many friends through his wisdom and built a firm foundation."

RIDICULED REDS

The Chronicle kept a sensitive eye out for Communist-front groups that tried to burrow into the Detroit Negro society and denounced them with scathing words and ridicule.

"The Chronicle staff probably is high on the Communist purge list," smiled Wartman. "We want to be recognized as first class citizens, but only under the framework of our present Government."

The award-winning paper also has taken a few editorial stands not popular with all Negroes. But these things are quickly forgotten when subscribers review the paper's basic unswerving policy of equal civil rights.

ASKS STATE JOBS

It asks for State and city appointments for Negroes, "but only for qualified Negroes, and not merely because they are Negro," Wartman pointed out. In this field the paper has succeeded quite notably. Wartman is a member of the Michigan State Fair board, and managing editor William Matney is secretary of the Michigan Board of Athletic Control.

Management of the paper is divided between Wartman, Longworth, Quinn, general manager; Matney, Clarence Jackson, advertising manager, and Martin, who only occasionally confers from Chicago.

Wartman, a slight man who dresses conservatively, and frequently prefaces or emphasizes his remarks with quotations from the great poets or historians, visions the day when a Negro will be able to sit with a group and never attract attention simply because he happens to be dark-skinned.

"This race consciousness is America's greatest battle," he said. "How can a white man intelligently solve the problems of Negro education, etc., when he sits in his office worrying about whether a Negro will move next door. He can't.

Dissolution of Cominform Means Nothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, Russia's announcement that the Cominform has been dissolved actually means very little. The Communist information bureau which was established in Warsaw 9 years ago actually has been inactive since 1949.

The significant point to keep in mind is that abolishing the Cominform has not changed in any way the complete and total loyalty of the Communist Parties in various countries throughout the world to the Soviet Union. The Red organizations in other countries blindly follow every twist and turn of the Soviet line and owe their first loyalty to Russia. The men in the Kremlin despite their change in tactics have not given up their hopes of world domination.

Recent events as well as observations made on my trip to the Soviet Union and five satellite countries last fall convince me that we are enterihg into one of the most dangerous and demanding periods in world history. It was much easier to keep our guard up when the Russian-led Communist movement was engaging in aggression and obvious subversion to destroy human freedom. The snarling Red tiger is often less dangerous than the smiling Red tiger.

It is imperative that we keep in mind that the Communist conspiracy continues to follow the Soviet objectives in all political problems and aids and abets Russian intelligence services throughout the world.

We must now recognize that the new Russian approach will be much more palatable to nations in the West, including our own, than previous Soviet policy. We must now prepare ourselves to accept a greater responsibility than ever in leading the free world in this more relaxed and at the same time more dangerous Russian approach. We must accept this new challenge by the Communists to compete with us more readily in diplomatic and economic fields.

Yes; Nursing Career Is Glorious

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, every now and then I am asked: "Why have you always been so deeply interested in nursing and nurses?" Several weeks ago the Cleveland News printed an article by Severino P. Severino, their medical news writer. He wrote the article as a memo to his daughter, Pat, a young girl, 16 years old, who had asked her father his ideas about a nursing career.

Mr. Severino's answer to Pat so beautifully illustrates what a nurse means to one who is ill that I want my colleagues in the House to read it. Under unanimous consent to revise and extend, I include in my remarks Mr. Severino's article:

YES; NURSING CAREER IS GLORIOUS

To Pat—my 16-year-old daughter who asked me today about a career as a nurse:

I'm happy you are considering a career as a nurse. It is a proud profession that adds glory and dignity to all womanhood.

A nurse is sunshine in the bleakest hours of human life. She brings charm to a house of antiseptics and detergents. She makes a small cloth cape twinkle like a costly mink.

She is an angel of the gentle word and soothing touch. She is the strong hand that moves a 200-pound patient in one deft turn.

She moves softly and swiftly, and the swish of her uniform in the corridor gladdens the heart of the ill. She is everybody's leaning post.

She shields herself with calm against the rude patient, the whiner, the cantankerous, the bossy. Her face is a mask in the depths of stress and strain. She is a mother, a bully, a friend. She is kind, scolding, and flattering. Her smile is equal to a mountain of medicine.

She is a veteran of human joy and tragedy. She is an authority on pain. She has witnessed death when it is cruel and when it is merciful. She has clasped the hand of life to the threshold of death.

She is the one whose heart is broken a million times. She melts to the pleading eyes of every ailing child. She keeps a vigil when he is sinking. And she sobs herself to sleep when he is taken away.

She is a woman of sacrifice, of hidden emotion, of gallant selflessness. She is a buck private in a hierarchy of discipline. She is a beautiful queen to a curly headed boy.

She is the one who shares the torture of every patient's crisis. And then she rides home on a pink cloud when he makes it.

She is the one who teaches good diet and she herself nourishes on quick peanut-butter sandwiches.

She is the one who watches romance pass by and yields to the duties of her ironing board.

She is a girl in white whose labors rank with the noblest of human effort. Her pay is not great.

Her biggest reward shines through the eyes of those she serves. She was born with a passion for nursing.

Her career started when she lavished her love on her sick doll. Very much, Pat, like you used to do with your doll, Penny.

Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, rigid farm price supports in the 1956 farm bill vetoed by President Eisenhower would have kept the farmers' incomes high in an election year, it is true, but it encouraged costly overproduction for increased storage at the expense of all the people. As usual, the President did the right thing.

After all, the domestic parity plan for wheat alone would have cost consumers in increased grocery bills almost $350 million. All food products containing wheat would have gone up in price. Bread would have gone up about 2 cents a loaf. Also, under the two-price plan for rice, its retail price would have increased at least 2 cents a pound. Low income city families would be doubly subsidizing the farmer.

The results of rigid supports have been high food prices plus high taxes for payments and cost of loans and cost of storage of surpluses.

The farmer, like any other group, has a right to expect protection from all-out

distress, but farmers should not expect their Government to return to a barren program which created and was responsible for the basic trouble.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, the administration's soil-bank plan would cut surpluses and yet boost farm income. The delay in enacting this program into law in time for this year's planting is not the administration's fault. But the President's suggestion of advance payments to the farmers to alleviate their distress should help to overcome part of the effects of the delay of this Democrat-controlled Congress.

The farm bill as voted by Congress as President Eisenhower said was a bad bill for all the people of the country. In the interests of my constituents and consumers generally, that is why I voted against it.

By the same reasoning, I am voting to sustain the President's veto.

But I will vote to help the farmer because that is what the soil-bank plan will do, but not by adding the cost to the consumer's food bill.

I urge immediate action on the soil-bank plan recommended by the President to reduce surpluses and prevent distress prices.

USAFE-Sponsored Youth Activities Plan Embraces 10,519 Service Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to compliment the United States Air Force in Europe on their splendid program of youth activities. Lt. Gen. W. H. Tunner, his staff, and the members of the USAFE have earned and deserve our hearty commendations for the excellence of this youth activity program in Europe.

I include as a part of my remarks an article from the April 7, 1956, issue of the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal:

WIESBADEN, GERMANY.—The United States Air Forces in Europe boast one of the strongest youth activities program in the Air Force with more than two-thirds of the command's dependent children between the ages of 6 and 18 participating in some form of youth activity.

A recent report revealed that 10,519 youth participated in the USAFE youth activities program during the last quarter of 1955. Teen age clubs alone added 800 members since the previous quarterly report.

Maj. Gen. Mark E. Bradley, Jr., USAFE's vice commander in chief, emphasized the importance of the command's youth activities program when he said:

"The scope of our efforts must be governed by the valid premise that our young people constitute our greatest national treasure. The grasp of basic values and development of moral character which we impart to them will in great measure influence their life upon reaching maturity. Our country, one day, will be what they make it. They are our future. No effort should be spared to assure them an environment for development which will be conducive to great strength of character on their part."

OVERSEAS NEED GREATER

The need for a youth program in overseas areas is greater than at home because normal recreation activities such as movies, TV, parks and playgrounds may not be available. Likewise, normal neighborhood and community interest in youth activities is lacking in overseas areas. For these reasons a strong youth program becomes a necessity.

USAFE leaders considered the program important enough to establish a special Youth Activities Branch in the Personnel Services Division at USAFE headquarters to guide and direct youth activities throughout the command.

The responsibility for youth activities at installation level was given to the base commander. However, the base commander, in most instances, appointed a youth activities council to aid him in carrying out the program.

A typical council consists of a chairman, project officer, personnel services officer, chaplain, parents, youth representatives, and other specialists in youth work such as teachers.

The USAFE program is financed from nonappropriated funds distributed to installations on a strength basis. Each base usually gets additional financing through local fund raising drives.

VOLUNTEERS ARE KEY

"Success of the program hinges directly on participation of volunteer instructors at base level who must support activities with their time and effort," said Maj. Donald J. Tyler, Chief of the USAFE Youth Activities Branch. More than 1,300 adult volunteers and assigned military leaders are now working in the youth program.

One of the big problems attached to parental participation is lack of training among parents in conducting a youth program. To help alleviate this problem, the Youth Activities Branch at USAFE headquarters periodically distributes appropriate literature to parents concerned with conducting the program. In this connection, the branch published a 79-page Dependent Youth Activities Manual that provides the basic framework for carrying out a youth program at installation level.

Arrangements have been made with the National Recreation Association to provide this command with a professional instructor for 1 month to train volunteers in program planning and operation. The first series of these training courses will be held this May in Germany, France, the United Kingdom, and French Morocco.

Of all the various youth activities in the command, the scouting program is the best organized and has the largest participation. About 4,000 boys and 3,000 girls participate in Boy Scout and Girl Scout activities through a joint Army-Air Force program under the direction of the Transatlantic Council, Boy Scouts of America, and the North Atlantic Girl Scouts of America. Both councils have their headquarters in Heidelberg, Germany, where a staff of professional personnel from the two organizations direct scouting activities in this area.

TEEN-AGE CLUBS TOPS

Junior and senior teen-age clubs are a favorite of the older children. In all, the USAFE program encompasses more than 50 different types of clubs, sports, and hobby activities from archery to woodwork.

One of the primary aims of USAFE's youth program is the development of better community relations between American dependent youth and the youth of countries where Air Force personnel are stationed.

USAFE Commander in Chief Lt. Gen. William H. Tunner wholeheartedly endorsed this aspect of youth activity when he said of German-American relations:

"I believe that the true spirit of friendship, and also most lasting, can be developed by close association of German and American children during their early years of life. The individual friendships and common understanding developed by our youths of today, many of whom will be the leaders of tomorrow, will endure through the years and have a vital and far-reaching effect on our future American-German relationships."

GOOD-WILL AMBASSADORS

An example of how individual friendship and common understanding between German and American youth can be fostered was the organization of a "small fry" soccer league in Wiesbaden, Germany. Half of the team was composed of German youth and the other half made up of American youngsters. The teams were coached by Germans and Americans.

"The small fry soccer league proved unusually successful," said Major Tyler, "and it will be adopted at other localities in the future."

The big problem of overcoming the language barrier in such countries as France and Germany is accomplished by conducting mandatory language courses for USAFE dependent children in Air Force operated schools.

"We feel we have an excellent youth activities program now, but we know we can make it even better. Our goal is to provide a diversified program that will offer some type of recreational activity for every boy and girl in the command between the ages of 6 and 18," Tyler said.

"Emphasis will be placed on constructive activities in which children can learn by doing; activities that develop the mind as well as the body; activities that encourage mass participation rather than mass spectators," he said.

Pat Casey and the American Theater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a very interesting article concerning an old friend of mine, Pat Casey, now residing at Springfield, Mass., formerly head labor relations representative for the movie picture industry.

The article historically portrays the great development of the American theater and the movies and the significant part which Mr. Casey played in the entertainment world of his time.

The article is as follows:

REPORTER'S NOTEBOOK
(By Frank B. Murray)

Pat Casey, a native son of Springfield, can look back on a theatrical career spanning more than 60 years—a career that took him from the managership of the old Gilmore Theater here to the bright lights of Broadway and then on to the glittering center of the entertainment world, Hollywood.

Mr. Casey, who retired in 1948 after 21 strike-free years as labor relations chief of the Motion Picture Producers Association in Hollywood, is more than 80 years old now, but he recalls the early days of the theater and the very beginning of motion pictures with remarkable clarity.

Resting in his home in Bellevue Avenue, attired in a blue silk dressing gown, this large, powerfully built man with well-groomed white hair and twinkling light blue eyes that peer out from a cheerful pink face, told of his career with the ease and color of an old sea captain spinning a yarn of sailing around the tempestuous Horn.

His career began in 1894, when he was manager of the Parlor Theater in Bridge Street, located about where the side entrance to Steiger's store is now. This was the Gay Nineties period, the days of bustles and flowing gowns, of bowler hats and flowing moustaches, when you could get a schooner of beer for a nickel, along with a free lunch, and it only cost a dime to see a good show.

"The town was a good theater town in those days," he remarked. "The Parlor Theater ran two shows a day and they were always packed. But Colonel Getting, who owned the building, sold out to the telephone company, so we moved to the Gilmore, where the Capitol Theater now stands. People had to walk up two flights to get to the theater, but it was always packed just the same."

Mr. Casey recalled that the late George M. Cohan, one of Broadway's all-time greats, worked at the Gilmore in those days in the team of Cohan, Woods, and Harris. But they played melodrama and it was some time before George reached his peak. He remembered, too, the start of another great career.

"The first time Mary Pickford ever played before the public," he said, "was in a show that appeared on the Gilmore stage. She was just a kid then."

* * * * *

In 1898 the Nelson Theater, which was later to become the Fox Theater and now is the Art, was built.

"This Nelson was from out west," Mr. Casey recalled. "One of the Vinton girls put up the money. It was a beautiful theater. They spent a fortune on it. So we closed at the Gilmore and moved up to the Nelson."

Mr. Casey recalled one of the first performers there, a little girl about 5 years old, named Elsie Bierbower, from Columbus, Ohio. It was her first stage performance. But the little girl later became internationally famous as the beloved Elsie Janis.

Business, ironically enough, was not as good at the sumptuous Nelson as it had been at the old Gilmore, despite the glittering surroundings, he said. Pat couldn't figure it out, so he asked one young fellow, a devoted patron of the Gilmore, why he didn't like the Nelson. The answer was that he didn't feel at home, at ease, in the new palace of gold.

"You see," Mr. Casey explained, "in those days going to the Gilmore was like going to church. It was a habit. Young fellows would come home from work, eat their supper and drop down to the Gilmore. When the Nelson came along, they figured they'd have to dress up to fit in with the new showplace and they didn't care at all for it."

Just about that time the first movies entered the theatrical picture.

"The Pathe people from France took a machine to New York," he said, "and in a short while the city went mad with the movies. Then the Biograph Company was formed. They put a machine into Keith's Union Square Theater in New York and the crowds were standing in the streets waiting to get in.

"Wally McCutcheon, who was manager of Biograph at the time, was a friend of mine and I tried to get the films for Springfield, but they asked $750 a week for four weeks and the figure scared me. I finally raised $2,000, all I had in the world, and asked him if I could get the films. He told me to come back when I had $3,000. I finally dug up the $3,000 and took the first movies back to Springfield."

Pat showed them at the Gilmore charging 10 and 20 cents admission.

"I never saw such crowds," he said. "They were coming from all over in horses and carriages; whole families, bringing their kids to see the first moving pictures."

Things technically were not nearly as good as they are today. The cameras had to be cranked by hand, he said, and frequently the film would snap, which required that a small card, asking patience while the film was repaired, be flashed on the screen. Biograph at that time was working with film about an inch and a half square and they couldn't keep up with the demand. The Pathe people, he added, and other foreign concerns, came out with film about three-quarters of an inch in size, which is now called 35-millimeter, and which could be used on all screens. This first big technical development put Biograph out of business.

Studios were operating in Jersey City, Brooklyn, Philadelphia, Chicago and other places by this time, and the first great stars were making history; stars such as the Gish girls, John Bunny and Francis X. Bushman, the Clark Gable of the early 1900's. D. W. Griffith was top director of the day and the western films were cast with names such as Bronco Billy, Tom Mix and his horse Tony, and the grim-faced gun slinger, William S. Hart.

Pat had another specialty. While he was running the theater here, his brother had a horse auction. Pat was the auctioneer.

It was this horse auctioneering that brought him face to face with another great figure, Will Rogers. It was at an auction Pat ran in Madison Square Garden. A western outfit brought in some draft horses and some cowhands along with them.

"These cowhands used to do tricks with ropes and other little acts to entertain the audience. At one of these shows, in comes the gawkiest guy I ever saw. All he had was a horse and a rope and all he would do was chew gum and twirl the rope. I thought he had something to offer. I had some friends who ran theaters in New Jersey so we made a deal with this cowhand to show his rope twirling acts from the stage. He agreed, just to pick up a little money. Soon after this we got him to the old Hammerstein theater in New York.

"One night, while he was twirling his rope, chewing his gum and remaining absolutely silent, something went wrong and he made some wise crack. The audience roared and the manager came rushing to me to make sure that he made the same wise crack in the next performance. He did and the audience roared again. After that he wasn't silent any more. He kept making wise cracks in his drawling way and Will Rogers was on his way."

As a vaudeville booking agent in New York after the turn of the century, Mr. Casey rubbed elbows with other greats. He ran a show on a roof garden in a Pennsylvania city for F. W. Woolworth, the 5-and-10-cent-store magnate, and Woolworth offered to build him a theater. Unfortunately, Pat couldn't find a site on any of Woolworth's extensive property holdings in New York that he thought would be suitable for a theater.

He was in at the start of the career of another man who was destined to make a great mark in the theater, particularly the movies, William Fox. The latter twice offered Pat a partnership with him, Johnny White and Bill Long, in his budding enterprise. Pat rejected both offers. Fox, he said, started off with two theaters that everybody figured were all done. Pat made a deal with him to supply talent and even worked out a program of putting on little-known acts from the West. The shows caught on and Mr. Fox, instead of being ruined, was in business for good.

At that time the Academy of Music in 14th Street, which was built by Tompkins of Boston and Ed Gilmore, brother of Dwight Gilmore of this city, was New York's biggest theater. "The Old Homestead," its first big success, had a 2- or 3-year run which virtually paid for the building. Tompkins died, and after Gilmore passed away the building went to his nephews, the Gardners. Schubert offered $65,000 a year for the building and Fox finally got it for $100,000.

"Nobody figured Fox could raise the money at the time, but I was in the lawyer's office when he came in and peeled off 100 thousand-dollar bills and laid them on the table. The banks were closed and nobody dared take the cash, so he had to take it home with him overnight," Pat said.

Fox started a stock company in the Academy and Pat recalled that one of his first stars was Theda Bara, the slinky vamp of the first celluloids. After that Fox went into movies and became one of the top producers of his day.

After working for the B. F. Keith vaudeville circuit throughout the East, and the Orpheum circuit covering the western half of the Nation, Pat went to Hollywood at the invitation of Sidney Kent, then head of Fox Films, and Nicholas Schenk, president of the Loew Co., to handle labor problems for the fast-growing movie industry.

From the outset he took a leaf from the book of Franklin D. Roosevelt. F. D. R. was then Secretary of the Navy, and in Mr. Casey's opinion the labor agreement he wrote with the shipbuilding workers during World War I was the greatest labor contract ever written. He applied its arbitration provisions to his own dealings with the carpenters, electricians, truckers, and others who make film productions possible.

All disputes came to him first. If he couldn't settle them, they went to a union representative, and then to a committee, if necessary. But this man, who sat on the powder keg between the Nation's movie producers and the 38,000 trades union people for 21 years, ruled well. Disputes never went beyond him and there wasn't a single strike in his 21-year tenure.

"I wouldn't back down on anything," he said. "They used to tell me, 'Pat don't yell at us any more, please.' But everything went along all right."

In Hollywood the atmosphere was entirely different than in his old world of vaudeville and anyone listening to Pat might detect a slight note of nostalgia for the good old days. Hollywood, when he first arrived, and the Hollywood of today are vastly different, he said. Along with great technical improvements, there has been a great change in actors, he said.

"In the old days they'd throw a script at an actor and he played it well. Today everybody's got to be typed. There were some great actors then. Lewis Stone, there was an actor. That Swanson girl was very clever, too. Another girl who handled herself very well was Eleanor Powell from here. She refused to be pushed around. Old Louis Mayer thought the world of her. She kept her head. Wendell Corey is doing pretty well, too."

What Hollywood had done to other actors, such as Walter Hampden, they greatest Shakesperian actor, causes Pat's blood pressure to rise dangerously high. He doesn't pull his punches when talking about Hollywood.

He numbered among his close friends, William S. Hart, Lionel Barrymore, Marie Dressler, and Cecil B. DeMille. He was also very close to the late Irving Thalberg, the producer, and felt that Johnny Considine was a young fellow with a brilliant future as a director before he succumbed to the Hollywood life.

Pat's connections with the theatrical world are somewhat limited now, but frequently he is consulted by the bigtimers on some question or another. Highly regarded

on both sides of the labor-management picture. Pat's greatest tribute came from Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association. Johnston said:

"Pat Casey's retirement as MPA labor relations chief will be a great loss to the industry. Casey grew up in the show business. He has friends everywhere. All admire and respect him—for the warmth of his heart, for his unflagging energy, for his wisdom, his vision, his leadership. Casey leaves behind him 21 years of the most outstanding labor relations service any industry ever had."

And that is the story of the little boy who grew up on William Street, became a major figure in the theatrical world and who today is as untarnished by the glittering glamor of Hollywood as the day he entered it.

First Anniversary of the African-Asian Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today marks the first anniversary of the African-Asian Conference held in Bandung, Indonesia. I was privileged to be present. I rise today to commemorate that occasion by addressing myself to the problem of how we can win the uncommitted nations.

The uncommitted nations are centralized in southeast Asia. Southeast Asia is important because of its geographical location athwart communication lines and its enormous wealth in natural resources. Its manpower is capable of contributing significantly to world peace and prosperity.

Today all shipping between Europe and the Orient via the Indian Ocean must pass through either the Strait of Malacca or the Strait of Sunda. Control of these two southeast Asian straits gives dominance over a sea route that is comparable in importance to the Panama Canal route.

Furthermore, all intercontinental airways in the Far East traverse the southeast Asian area.

The successful advance of communism through China and well into northern Vietnam threatens the remaining southeast Asian countries with a more deadly form of colonialism than any the world has ever known. Extension of Communist control over the remainder of Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, and Burma, which together form Asia's rice bowl, would place most of the independent Asian nations in mortal danger. India, Ceylon, Japan, and Malaya, which are dependent upon that rice bowl for life itself, would have access to it only on Communist terms.

It was because of this that despite the attempts of the Department of State to dissuade me that I went to the Bandung Conference, April 18, 1955.

Now, as regards the Bandung Conference, let me be very specific and point out that the United States of America per se did not come out on top. The idea of democracy most definitely did. For the first time in the history of the world the Asian and African countries had an opportunity to go on record as to whether they wanted democracy or communism and they voted overwhelmingly for democracy. Because the United States has been the foremost exponent of democracy through all the years we naturally basked in the reflected glory.

Now, democracy does not of necessity have to win again in Cairo in 1956. On a significant question such as the admission of Red China to the United Nations, I believe that the Bandung conferees would have voted 17 to 12 against Red China. On this basis, I would say that 17 out of the 29 nations were committed to the idea of democracy. The 17 nations will not of necessity continue on the side of democracy. Very definitely, at the Conference, Cambodia and Laos were wooed close to the neutralists' camp. The future of South Vietnam is in danger. It is just possible that when the Conference meets again the forces against democracy plus the forces that are uncommitted to democracy might be in the majority.

Never, therefore, has any nation in the history of the world been confronted with such a great problem and with so little time in which to solve it as ours. And yet the very suddenness of this impact upon our Western World might greatly assist us in making the idea of democracy globally triumphant. Forces in Asia are compelling us to accelerate the timetable of democracy. An outstanding American paper cabled one of their correspondents in the midst of the Bandung Conference asking this correspondent to find out what were the opinions of the delegates from Asia and Africa concerning the Supreme Court's implementation of the decree to bring about integration in the public school system. This would be equivalent of asking an eastern Asian journalist in the United States to find out what the United States reaction was to the abolition of the untouchables in India or the signing of the agreement on dual citizenship of the Chinese and Indonesians. We know that these two questions were not explored in the slightest by correspondents here in the United States, but Bandung was of such importance that the American press wanted to know what was the attitude of the Chiefs of State of Asia and Africa on our own problem of racialism within our borders.

And so we come to this breathtaking moment when the United States of America, a modern colossus, stands astride western civilization with one foot at Oak Ridge, Tenn., and the other foot at Fort Knox, Ky., holding in our hands more gold than any other nation owns and more atomic energy than any other nation controls. We feel that we are all powerful. We sense that we are invincible. The voice of conscience has died. Where is there the still small voice to tell us that no man has ever lived by bread alone?

Congressman WALTER JUDD, distinguished missionary to China for many years, told me this story when I came back from Bandung. A very great Chinese leader said to him one day, "Yes, we need gold from the United States but we also want the roses." We are not going to be able to buy friends even though we have all the gold at Fort Knox at our disposal. We are not going to be able to frighten people into being our friends even though we possess the A-bomb and the H-bomb.

What does gold mean to vast sections of Asia and Africa where for thousands of years hundreds of millions of people have never even seen a piece of silver?

The possession of nuclear weapons did not help us. The specter of the H-bomb haunted the halls of Bandung. No single thing has done more to destroy trust in us than the explosion of the A-bomb at Hiroshima and the continuing experiments in the South Pacific. In other words, the very things upon which we place all of our pride and all of our faith in the future—gold and atomic power—these are utterly meaningless in the Far East and when misused are actually Trojan horses within our camp.

The time is getting short. The caravan of democracy will succeed there only to the degree that it comes with roses; with complete equality and with complete dignity for all men.

Matthew Arnold stood on the beach of Dover one day when the hordes of nazism were poised on the other side of the English Channel ready to destroy that fair isle and penned these words:

> We stand between 2 worlds, 1 world is dead and the other world has not yet been born.

Bandung was the womb from which the other world sprang. The President of Indonesia in his opening address called his address, Let a New Asia and a New Africa Be Born. And they were born: A potential for peace was unleashed by the peoples of the Far East. Now we have suddenly thrust upon us full and certain knowledge that the old World is unmistakably dead, irretrievably gone. The shaping of the New World and the giving of content to it will no longer be monopolized by western powers.

More than anything else our Christianity is on trial, too. The Asian-African Conference was a great parliament of the world's religions. The concept of brotherhood was stressed repeatedly. One speaker said:

> If our religion, whatever it may be, does not allow us to get along with our brothers, regardless of what his religion may be, then our religion cannot be of much value.

Here in the United States, the forces of organized religion are still operating in a 19th century fashion in a 20th century world.

The powers of Caesar—the Supreme Court of the United States—have contributed much more effectively to the cause of brotherhood and to the cause of the recognition of the individual's worth than has the Christian church. Where the Supreme Court on one hand has abolished segregation in the public-school system, the United States of America still continues to practice segregation in

its churches. The eminent Dr. Wade McKinney, of Cleveland, Ohio, said one day:

> There is more segregation practiced in the United States of America at 11 a. m. on Sundays in our Protestant churches than at any other time in our Nation.

This then is the time for a great positive moral witness on each of us. We have lost this individual personal witness. We gave it over to the politicians in the field of civil rights. We abdicated our responsibility as churchmen to the paid professionals. Even though we go to church in droves, contributing as never before, we say "that paid professionals will take care of our religious responsibilities during the week," and we return to our ancient ruts of intolerance and prejudice.

The hour has been struck at Bandung for us to recapture our individual witness. The mantle of world leadership cannot become sheep's clothing. We must rise up and accept the responsibility regardless of the agonizing soul searching that must precede it.

We are a privileged people, privileged to live at one of the great crossroads that every now and then the force of history thrusts upon an unwilling world. Which way we should take depends entirely upon the individual choices made by American people up and down the main streets of our villages and hamlets and in our towns and cities. Capitol Hill cannot do it for us. The Supreme Court cannot be our personal witness. Individual, personal, moral witness must be made. The faith of our forefathers is not enough but the ferment of our forefathers is a deadly necessity.

And so, in far-off Indonesia on April 18, 1955, maybe America was brought back to the kind of arena that our forefathers lived in and died in. The men who stood at the rude arching bridge at Lexington and Concord were men dedicated to the idea of an individual witness. Black Crispus Attucks, striding across Boston Commons, refusing to bow his head to British colonialism and dying—the first American to die for freedom—was a dedicated revolutionary.

Bandung sent us forth on our way to a new world. As we journey as pilgrims to these new meccas, we cannot journey blithely as tourists but we must walk with the full weight of destiny on our shoulders. We must walk with the awesome knowledge that we have become the appointed prophets of democracy, that if communism shall envelope the earth it will be because we failed in these testing years to give a bold and free and untrammeled witness to the idea and ideals of democracy.

Across the broad earth's surging breast there comes a cry of 1,400 million people, why cry, in the language of Donald Grant, for "admission to the front door of modern mankind." We are the guardians of that front door. The marks of the fraternity of modern mankind are decent clothes, minimum creature comforts, abolition of disease, no illiteracy and above all, no patronizing condescensions. This, the entire world, all humanity, is determined to have. If the United States of America, meaning you and I, do not let them in, they are going around to the back door where Soviet Russia with blandishments and enticements is urging them to come. They do not want to go in the back door unless we refuse to open the front door.

The weakest spots in our democratic offensive is the Department of State. Our Asian-African foreign policy is being given to us second-hand through the foreign offices of the English, French, Dutch and other colonial powers. In other words, we, the foremost exponent of democracy in the free world, are evaluating Asia and Africa through the eyes and ears of powers which are being pushed out of Asia and Africa as fast as the natives can do it. This is why we have been behind the eight ball in so many places such as Indochina and the same tragedy is being repeated in North Africa as we follow this 19th century policy.

On Monday, May 9, I met at a top level off-the-record meeting with the key people of our Department of State. I will not be breaking any security rule by saying that one of those present insisted that Bandung was an anti-white conference. I spent quite a little time disputing his point. When I saw the President of the United States, Dwight David Eisenhower, on Wednesday, May 11, I mentioned this to him. It is not permissible to quote the President of the United States; nevertheless, I can state that he pointed out that this State Department position could not be true because we had so many friends at Bandung standing up and fighting for the United States. This is an obvious fact to anyone.

How could Bandung be antiwhite when democracy came out on top and the majority of the delegates were praising the United Nations and the United States? And yet, after the Bandung Conference it was still the considered opinion of one of our top career men that Bandung was a conference against the white people. I do not discount the possibility that Bandung can develop through the years into an antiwhite conference. If it does it will be because we of the western Anglo-Saxon world refused to give them the equality and the dignity which they and God demand that all people should have.

Another great mistake in the operation of our Foreign Service is the steadfast refusal of the Department of State, under Democratic and Republican administrations, to utilize colored Americans in embassy posts. When Mr. Eisenhower first became President of the United States I got hold of a confidential analysis of the Negro in the Foreign Service from the Department of State files. This is not marked "classified" nor "security" and I am going to release portions of it for the first time because I hope that by doing so American public opinion will be goaded into action to do some good. Page 7 of that analysis is as follows:

> The above report represents considerable progress after much diligent work by the Office of Personnel. However, it is admitted that there is much to be done before it can be said that the Department of State has hired nonwhites fully and fairly and has utilized them to best effect in various parts of the world. There are only 55 Negroes among the 8,231 persons employed abroad in the Foreign Service. There are only 15 Negroes with upper-grade classifications among the approximately 6,700 departmental employees grade 7 and above who are in Washington, D. C. Small progress has been made in the hiring of Americans of Asian descent. Only 7 are known to be employed both at home and abroad. Present outlook for employment opportunities in the Department of State is not good.

Now it is important to realize that I am quoting from a State Department document so there can be no arguments about any discussion later. I would like to continue now:

> Some further idea of the importance of such employment (nonwhites) can be seen in the experience of United States delegations to the United Nations. The presence of Negro members in recent delegations to the General Assembly of the United Nations has been a source of good will and stimulated confidence in the United States. Moreover, the division of opinion on many issues in the United Nations Assembly, especially in relation to human rights has sometimes tended to follow a color line, white against non-white, with Russia seeking to be recognized as the champion of the nonwhites. In such situations, the assurance that Negro citizens of this country may be found among the employees and representatives of the Department is a source of strength to the United States in the presentation of its foreign policy and achievement of its objectives.

After almost a year and a half had gone by, Mr. George F. Wilson, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Personnel, wrote me from the Department of State:

> I have your letter of April 8, 1954, regarding the employment of Negroes by the Department of State. I cannot make any observation on the accuracy of your figures as to the number of our Negro employees.

I was unable up until then and I have been unable since to find out what the picture is in the Department of State but I do know that if an analysis could have been made by the Department of State in the early days of the Eisenhower administration, there is no reason why such an analysis could not be made now. In my White House conference with the President on May 11, I brought up this issue and I am happy to say that immediately he say the psychological value of colored people serving in our embassies. After President Eisenhower instructed Mr. Maxwell Rabb, Secretary of the United States Cabinet, to confer with the State Department, an appointment was arranged. Mr. Rabb and I met with Mr. Loy Henderson, Under Secretary of State in Charge of Personnel, and although a year has passed, absolutely nothing has been done. This, I consider, open defiance of the President's orders.

Bandung has placed a time limit on indecision. It is absolutely impossible for the United States to continue to hope for any more support from the people of Asia and Africa if we continue to abstain on the question of colonialism before the United Nations. Congress on June 6, 1955, by record vote in the House of Representatives and Senate, established the following as a part of our foreign policy:

[84th Cong., 1st sess. H. Con. Res. 153]

Whereas Communist imperialism and other forms of colonialism constitute a denial of the inalienable rights of man; and

Whereas the people of the United States have traditionally supported other peoples in their aspirations to achieve self-government or independence and in their struggle against tyranny or domination: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States should administer its foreign policies and programs and exercise its influence through its membership in the United Nations and in other international organizations so as to support other peoples in their efforts to achieve self-government or independence under circumstances which will enable them to assume an equal station among the free nations of the world.

Despite the fact that the foregoing resolution on colonialism was passed by both Houses of the Congress and thus became the law of the land, our delegates to the United Nations completely ignored this as indicated by the following votes:

Issues	For	Against	Abstained	Vote of United States
Cyprus—U. N. Assembly consideration of self-determination, Sept. 23, 1955.	28	22	10	Against.
Algeria—Question of U. N. considering French administration, Sept. 30, 1955.	28	27	5	Do.
West New Guinea—Placing the question of West New Guinea on U. N. agenda, Oct. 3, 1955.	31	18	10	Abstained.
South Africa—On the question to continue a special commission on the racial situation in South Africa and proposal to continue consideration of the subject, Dec. 6, 1955.	41	6	8	Do.

I am, therefore, requesting the Foreign Affairs Committees of the House and Senate to sharply question the appropriate officials as to why.

I recognize that Britain and France and other western powers have for centuries stood at our side and fought with us, even though the fighting has ofttimes been our men fighting with them to protect their national sovereignty and integrity. I do not believe that for 1 minute we should turn our back upon these ancient allies. We should very vigorously and emphatically state that in Europe they are our allies and we can always be counted upon to give them the fullest measure of every kind of support.

I do believe that a historic break must be made and that we must just emphatically tell them that we can no longer support either with aid or with arms any form of imperialism sponsored by these nations in Asia and Africa. The cold stark fact confronts us that whether we take this stand or not, imperialism is finished. The natives, country by country are going to drive out the colonial powers and if we continue to stand with these powers on the question of colonialism then we are going to suffer diplomatic defeats. The full force of freedom is now sweeping over the earth and there is no powers that can stop it—short of a complete war of annihilation. This I don't believe the most rabid isolationist or warmonger would dare to suggest. From here on in the Western powers can no longer decide the fate of Asians and Africans without their leaders being present. There is a new group of powers in the world; the Eastern powers, and this group of powers wants to work in complete cooperation with us.

It is true that the United States has no colonies in Africa; yet we have a great responsibility as a permanent member of the Trusteeship Council, for the Trust Territories of the United Nations in Africa. The total population of these territories, excluding southwest Africa, is 15,433,339. The land area of these territories would be roughly comparable to all of New England and the Middle Atlantic States.

Since the establishment of the trusteeship system and the recognition of international responsibility for the freedom of dependent peoples, the United Nations has become the center of a struggle between the colonial powers, principally England, France, and Belgium, and the ex-colonial countries, principally India, Iraq, Egypt, Pakistan, and Indonesia. The colonial powers constantly seek to limit the scope of international responsibility under the charter and the ex-colonial powers ceaselessly attempt to broaden it. Probably no other subject has consumed more time or claimed more items on the agenda in the various meetings of the United Nations. The ex-colonial countries are highly responsive to any evidence that the colonial powers are not expediting the maturation of self-government within their colonies and trust territories. They feel a natural kinship with those people still in bondage.

The United States is one of the six administering powers in the Trusteeship Council. However, its territories are not as extensive and it is not traditionally a colonial power. Thus, in this power struggle, the United States has officially sought to take a middle moderating position between the colonial and ex-colonial points of view.

On the surface this seems like a correct policy. However, in practice, the weight of the United States has been preponderantly behind the colonial powers. The result has been that the ex-colonial countries have come to the conclusion that since the United States is generally found to be supporting the colonial power position where it really counts, that it, too, is a colonial power. The Russians have never lost an opportunity to make this point, for they are only too happy to drive a wedge between Asian and African countries and the United States.

A very important issue that has come up several times in Trusteeship Council and the General Assembly is that of target dates for self-government for trust territories. In two cases of Italian territories, Libya and Italian Somaliland, the General Assembly set actual dates for independence. As Italy was a defeated nation, her opposition to this was not taken seriously.

The suggestion that target dates be set for the other trust territories has been strenuously resisted by the colonial powers. In 1952 the General Assembly invited the administering authorities to give reports on measures taken to lead their trusts toward self-government and the period of time regarded as necessary to reach this goal. This request was repeated again in 1953, over the opposition of the administering powers, who opposed the recommendation on the grounds that it was impossible to foretell the date of independence. The United States abstained from this particular debate.

The issue was raised again in the 1955 report of the U. N. mission to Tanganyika which recommended that assurances be given to the people of Tanganyika that they would have their freedom within 20 to 25 years. The United States was a member of this mission and the United States representative initially supported this highly controversial recommendation. Under great pressure from the colonial powers, however, the United States reversed its support for such a target date. Clearly United States officials in principle support this policy of establishing target dates but find themselves overruled by the State Department, which regards this as a secondary issue but is under strong pressures from the colonial powers who regard it as a primary issue.

The United Nations Charter provisions on trusteeship did not make provisions for visiting missions. These missions have often been criticized by the administering powers for their inability to make profound judgments on the basis of a 6- to 8-week tour of a territory. The Trusteeship Council should, therefore, establish advisory councils in each trust territory. This would enable the Trusteeship Council to play a more direct role in the supervision of the trust territories.

If the United States were to support the establishment of such advisory councils, the other administering powers would be hard put to refuse. This would be a highly strategic step for the United States to take at this time in expediting the movement toward self-government.

In the second place, racialism everywhere in the world must be speedily eradicated. This means that we must clean up our own house in the United States everywhere. The hard core of resistance based in the South must be dissolved. All Americans must become law-abiding citizens living according to the edicts of the Supreme Court, the orders of the President and the laws of our land. No Federal funds should go to any defiant State. In other words, stop subversion in our hearts and homes.

We must consider immediately the problem of South Africa and in the consideration of that problem we cannot afford, directly or indirectly, to allow the

people there to think that we are in any way condoning the policies of segregation. If the rule of reason and order does not prevail, we should consider economic sanctions against the Boers. If the whole force of the United Nations is unanimously dedicated to eradicating racialism in the Union of South Africa, it will go. We need to realize that the Union of South Africa does not intend to stay within the British Commonwealth of Nations. They are anti-British and already they have announced that by 1958 they will withdraw and set up their own separate nation.

Thirdly, a thoroughgoing drastic reorganization of our Department of State, its Foreign Service, and all related activities should immediately take place. This is the showcase of America. Regardless of what we do within our borders, regardless of how we think, regardless of what public opinion may be unless the Department of State is actively projecting these things into the full arena of international diplomacy, international relationships, and international propaganda and education, then all we do here is nothing but sounding brass. The full impact of the American way of life in all its vast and progressively advancing fields is not being sold to the people of Asia and Africa. It is not being sold because there is a roadblock at the highest peak—and that roadblock is in the Department of State. The men in the Department of State are undoubtedly able and dedicated, but they are operating under the archaic 19th century system of evaluations and they are letting minor matters of protocol stand in the way of America giving the leadership the world so desperately and hungrily is demanding.

Mr. Dulles is our greatest deterrent. I suggest Stassen, Nelson Rockefeller, or Chester Bowles.

Fourthly, the Madison Avenue technique of selling is one of the great innovations of American life. This is the kind of technique that we need in the international field—bold, daring, new, fresh, vigorous, bringing a new impact each day, using every channel, every resource, every bit of our strength. Being fully conscious of our weaknesses and fighting the idea of communism with our greatest strength: the greatest idea—the idea of democracy. The Western World should not condemn what it does not understand. India and Burma's neutralism should be approached by the West in a new light. These countries are primarily interested in economic development and secondarily in strong military defenses.

Russia has taken the initiative away from the United States in southeast Asia. They make every punch count. Russia has a propaganda policy. The United States has none. It is time for a change. We must keep up our good work in an area of economic aid, but we need to appropriate a certain amount of money to strategically placed things. For example, to use an extreme point of view, Billy Graham advocates giving a white Cadillac to Nehru for its sheer propaganda and news value.

In order for the United States to wage effective propaganda war in Asia we must have one on the home front. We must make our people ready to accept new concepts of neutralist nations. Instead of scorning Burma and India we should let the American people know that neutralism is not an enemy—it should not be regarded as an enemy, but friendly action. Home-front plans of propaganda should be followed by a plan of action which is well coordinated. We need a bipartisan foreign policy that really works to make it effective at home and abroad—we do not have this policy today. Dulles and his aides seem to have no understanding of those problems. Too often our foreign policy is geared for the home front and is totally unrealistic. We must prepare the United States before we can go to southeast Asia.

Whenever we give aid to southeast Asia, whenever possible it should be administered through Asians themselves because we must recognize the sensitivity of these peoples to colonialism. We must help them build themselves up to resist communism; we must find unobtrusive ways to get credit for what we do. We might give a million dollars in aid but we should appropriate a share for administration by Asians and some for show purposes. We must coordinate our aid to these countries with their own plans. There should be no strings to our help. Those not wanting aid could be given low interest loans if they want them.

We should contemplate long-range aid, not sporadic aid. We have failed to convey the idealism of America to these people. We have become satisfied. We, not Russia, were the revolutionaries which these countries hoped to model themselves after. Our callous feelings toward them have resulted in our failure to convey our idealism to them. We are a young country and have more anti-colonialism than any other power in the world. Russia is a colonial power—her satellites prove this. The United States holds the torch of liberty but we do not let these people see it. We do not sell our ideas properly.

Fifthly, we must recognize as we go out to fight communism in the East that it is not sufficient to have military alliances. Even if communism were completely destroyed the ancient problems of the East would still haunt them as fearsome specters—colonialism, disease, hunger, and illiteracy. What value the complete destruction of communism in Indonesia when the average income of an Indonesian for an entire year, in the year of our Lord and Bandung was only $25?

What does it matter if communism is completely destroyed when the life expectancy for a man or a woman in India is only 32 years?

A foreign policy founded upon defeating communism alone may be of great value in the West but it is of very little value in the East. Yes, we must continue our fight against communism but we must expand our fight against the ancient problems of the East on all fronts.

Sixth, Africa is the No. 1 problem of our world. That dark, vast continent stretching for 5,000 miles is shaped like a question mark and it is. For there in Africa will be won or lost the world battle for freedom. This our Foreign Office is not aware of or, if so, is doing nothing about it. Communism is the West under the leadership of Soviet Russia and in the East under Red China is supposedly waving the flag of peace even if it is a little dirty and blood-stained. While they are doing this, north Africa and south Africa represent soft spots to establish new beachheads of subversion by Communist agents. We went to Africa centuries ago carrying a cross. It is time to go back to Africa again carrying an offer of full equality, dignity, mutual respect and direct and adequate assistance for social change. This is the only way to stop the wave of communism in Africa.

We need to channel as much of the aid that we give in Asia and Africa through international organizations. We know that the United Nations has a limited role but we should seek to build its strength through concrete demonstrations of our belief in its principles.

And lastly, with the full facts that I have presented indicating that the United States has no Far Eastern foreign policy except one founded on military alliances, let us for the first time in the history of the world sit down with the leaders of the people of Asia and Africa and work out an adequate Far Eastern policy.

This the last thought that I left with President Eisenhower—why not be bold and daring and call an eight-power meeting in Manila in the Philippines. This would, in my own words to Mr. Eisenhower, "just about annihilate the propaganda of Red China." What a day it would be for the forces of democracy and of peace for the President of the United States to sit down with the leaders of Pakistan, India, Ceylon, Burma, Indonesia, Thailand, and the Philippines. This has never been done in all our history before. This alone proves the inadequacies of our foreign policy. The Presidents of the United States have been holding historically for years Big Four, Big Five, and Big Six meetings all over Europe but never have they held a meeting with the leaders of Asia and Africa. Bandung was an invitation for this. I and members of the press talked to chiefs of these states and they indicated that they would be extremely well disposed to meet for a summit talk in the East. Gen. Carlos Romulo on Meet the Press on Sunday, May 8, said:

> The President of the United States should come to the East and talk to the Asian leaders.

There is not much time left to do this. The world is moving with a startling rapidity that transcends not only the visual but even the imaginative. With our Yankee courage, our Madison Avenue know-how, our Christian heritage and the bulwark of the Bill of Rights, in back of us, using our 25 million colored citizens as a spearhead, we can launch a drive for peace and for full equality now in the Far East. Only through such a bold maneuver can we win. History will pass us by if we do not.

Ike Asked for It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which was published on April 3, 1956, in the Standard-Times, of New Bedford, Mass. The editorial, in my opinion, contains some very appropriate statements on the problem which has been created by the United States Supreme Court in its decision affecting our public schools.

The editorial follows:

IKE ASKED FOR IT

In two recent press conferences President Eisenhower discussed the school segregation issue in the South, saying this is "a time when we must be patient" and try to avoid "a tremendous fight that is going to separate Americans and get ourselves into a nasty mess."

Unfortunately, the mess which the President deprecates, already exists and should have been foreseen, when, under White House pressure, the Supreme Court reversed the law of 60 years' standing with reference to school segregation in the South.

Several cases involving alleged discrimination against Negroes in southern schools were pending in the Supreme Court when former Governor Warren became the new Chief Justice. Tht views of the President against segregation were well known, as may have been those of Chief Justice Warren. But, to make doubly sure the Supreme Court made the "right" decision, the President instructed Attorney General Brownell to appear in the case, as a "friend of the court," urging desegregation.

Two important provisions of the Federal Constitution are involved in the desegregation decision. The 14th amendment, approved in 1868, forbids any State to "deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

The other provision of the Constitution directly affecting the desegregation problem is that one which specifically says, "The powers not delegated to the United States, by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

Under the former provision of the 14th amendment, no State could discriminate between Negro citizens and whites with reference to schools or otherwise. Under the second provision, the 10th amendment, control of the schools was specifically reserved to the States, as not having been delegated to the Federal Government.

Obviously, under the 10th amendment the South had the undisputed right to control its schools, unless its policies violated the 14th amendment forbidding discrimination between Negroes and whites. For 60 years the Supreme Court had ruled the 14th amendment requires equal school and other facilities, but not identical; in other words, schools and other facilities may be separate, but must be equal.

The Warren decision, which the President now faces with pleas for patience, destroyed the school formula of the South, a formula under which admittedly the Negroes of the South and the South had made steady and peaceful progress for more than half a century.

In a windy decision by Chief Justice Warren himself, the Chief Justice said in effect, "The very fact of segregation constitutes discrimination, gives the Negro a sense of inferiority, etc."

That this is untrue is evidenced by the fact many of the leaders of the Negroes in the South and the North, including many of the Negro schoolteachers of the South, not only feel no inferiority as a result of segregation, but object to attempts to force desegregation upon either Negroes or whites.

Though the President may not himself have been influenced by political considerations, the Warren decision was heavily weighted with politics.

Leaders close to the President undoubtedly told the President desegregation, if accomplished during his administration, would go a long way toward winning back the Negro vote of the North. This vote had been lost to the New Deal of the Roosevelt-Truman era.

Not only was such a purpose highly improper, but it has not and it will not work. For one thing, there is no segregation problem in the North—for there is no segregation. For another thing, the Negro vote, to whatever extent it was and is Democratic, is influenced by the New Deal philosophy, which only can be cured, if at all, by the process of education, a process which has been rudely struck down in the South by the recent Supreme Court decision.

Another equally improper consideration which is thought to have been influential in the Supreme Court's political decision is that there was thinking emanating from the State Department that desegregation would eliminate Communist-inspired criticism of the United States in India and others of the countries of the dark races.

Here again the administration did not see beyond its own nose. The antipathy of India does not spring from segregation in southern schools, etc. It springs from the fact that India, while recipient of our generous bounty, is basically Communist in its sympathy and is interested in the segregation issue of this country only because it suits its own propaganda purposes.

We're sorry for the southern whites.

Address of Vice President Nixon Before Brand Names Day Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, Vice President NIXON today delivered a most interesting and inspiring address before the Brand Names Day dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City. I urge all my colleagues to read the Vice President's excellent and careful analysis of the leadership of President Eisenhower and his administration.

The address follows:

TEXT OF ADDRESS OF THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES BEFORE THE BRAND NAMES DAY DINNER, THE WALDORF ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, APRIL 18, 1956

May I first join with you in congratulating the Brand Name Retailer-of-the-Year Awards winners. Before the evening is over, I hope to have the opportunity to meet and congratulate each one of you personally for the achievement so justifiably recognized this evening.

I must admit at the outset that I have had some difficulty in selecting an appropriate subject for this gathering.

A speaker should usually direct his remarks to a subject of particular interest to the organization which he is addressing. Unfortunately, my knowledge of the businesses and other organizations represented at this dinner is limited to that of the millions of Americans to whom brand names are household words.

It is true that I have had experience on both sides of the counter in that respect, having grown up in a family which operated one of these old-fashioned general merchandise stores.

And, as one who has sold products, as well as purchased them, I know you can't sell something unless you know what you are talking about.

That's why well-advertised, brand-name products were easier to sell. I knew about them, my customers usually did also, and less sales talk was necessary.

That's why I have tonight selected a subject I know something about—the record and philosophy of the Eisenhower administration.

I want to admit at the outset that my views will necessarily be biased by the fact that I am a member of the administration.

But I don't believe I am being partisan or prejudiced when I say that most Americans, regardless of party affiliations, are grateful to the man whose leadership has brought peace and unparalleled prosperity to America, and honesty, dignity, and integrity to Government in Washington, D. C.

In fact, the problem I was confronted with tonight, as always, was to select which field of accomplishment to discuss in the limited time I have.

With your permission, I should like to direct my remarks to the economic policies of this administration in terms of what they are, what they have accomplished, and what we can expect for the future.

We immediately are confronted with a problem with which you are far more familiar than I—what to call this policy—its brand name if you please. Because the Eisenhower economic policies which have been in effect for the past 3 years have been called from time to time both conservative and liberal, both Republican and Democrat, both Old Deal and New Deal, both moderate and radical.

As you know, better than I, in the final analysis, it isn't the name but the product that counts.

No better proof of the application of this truth in the field of politics could be found than an event that occurred last week.

Thomas Jefferson's birthday was celebrated on Friday, April 13. Democratic orators all over the country hailed him as a member of their party. But a study of history reveals that Thomas Jefferson was elected President in 1800 as the candidate of the Republican Party.

And when we consider his devotion to the rights of individuals and of the States, and his opposition to too much power in the Federal Government, I do not believe I am overstepping the bounds of objectivity when I say that if Jefferson were alive today he would probably be an Eisenhower Republican.

Therefore, before we can brand this policy we must examine the programs which have been executed under it, the results of those programs, and the philosophies behind them.

In January 1953 the President and his Cabinet were confronted with a basic and difficult decision in the field of economic policy. Here is what we found when we came into office:

Taxes and spending were at record peacetime rates.

Controls shackled the economy and more were being advocated.

Various messages to Congress by the President's predecessor had urged the adoption of

new programs in the fields of education, health, housing, agriculture, and power which would have carried the national economy further down the road to nationalization, federalization, and, in some instances, socialization of basic American institutions.

The decision we had to make was this—should we drift with what seemed to be the wave of the future or should we turn to more conservative policies?

Purely apart from the principle involved, there were strong political arguments for allowing things to go on as they were. Because, whether we like it or not, we must recognize that millions of Americans lost faith in conservative economic policies as a result of the great depression of the thirties.

They were convinced that those policies had brought on the depression. And they feared that a return to those policies might bring on another depression.

The problem was thoroughly debated in the Cabinet, and, finally, a basic decision was made.

In essence, we decided to give the free American economic system a chance to work. We based that decision on our faith that conservative policies were right in principle, and that if they were right in principle they would, in the end, prove right politically.

To implement that decision—

We removed controls from the economy.

We got the Government out of business, rather than putting it in.

We cut spending.

We cut taxes.

We adopted fiscal policies designed to encourage the initiative, the dynamism, and the ingenuity of the American people.

It will be many years before an accurate and objective appraisal of the major accomplishments of this administration can be made.

But I submit that when the history of this administration is finally written, no accomplishment will have been more significant, or more in the interests of the great majority of the American people than this: The danger of America following some of our friends abroad down the road which leads inevitably to socialization or nationalization of our institutions has been averted and the faith of the American people in businesslike, conservative conduct of Government economic policies has been restored.

Statistics are invariably dull. But, just for a moment, let us look at the record in terms of what has been accomplished.

Gross national product, personal income, labor income, savings deposits, retail sales are at all time highs. For the first time in recent history, the United States has enjoyed over 3 consecutive years of high prosperity, and records are being broken almost as fast as they are made.

Furthermore, we are not using rubber dollars as our measuring rods. When President Eisenhower took office in 1953, the index of living costs compiled by the Department of Labor stood at the level of 113.4. Three years later, the level was 114.6, a rise of 1 percent. Compare this if you will with the record of the 4 years preceding this administration when the rise was over 11 percent.

This means that today when wages go up, the profits increase, there is a real gain, not merely a money rise that is canceled out by higher prices. The tremendous increase in almost every sector of economic life is sound and well-grounded.

I realize that sometimes our political opponents charge that this is a business administration. If they mean by this that government is running efficiently and well, we plead guilty to the charge.

We have done our best to give the country a good example of economy, industry, and integrity in the handling of Government affairs.

But, if the charge means that we favor the interests of business to the exclusion of other groups of the economy, we suggest that all Americans look at the record.

In 1952, there were those who said, "You have never had it so good." But let us make some comparisons between 1952 and 1955, not in terms of the economy as a whole, but in terms of the 65 million American wage earners.

In 1952, the average gross weekly earnings of a factory worker was $67. At present, it is $78.

In 1952, the take-home pay of the average factory worker with three dependents was $56. Today it is $62.

In 1950, 20 million persons owned their home. Today, 24 million homes are owner-occupied—an increase from 53 percent in 1950 to 58 percent in 1955.

The average life insurance policy in force per family has increased from $5,300 in 1952 to $6,300 in 1955.

What these figures mean is that wage earners today are better off than at any time in the entire history of the Nation.

How did this unprecedented prosperity come about?

From a political standpoint I would like to be able to claim all the credit for my party and the Government policies this administration has instituted during the past 3 years.

But to do so would not only be historically inaccurate; it would miss the great secret of America's economic progress from the time of our foundation.

What we must recognize is that under our system governments do not create wealth—people do.

We know that, in all fairness, the credit for America's great prosperity today must be shared among Democrats and Republicans, labor leaders and business executives, farmers and city folk, alike. Together they have brought about the changes that have made our economic system the model that it is today. In a real sense the achieving of the American dream has been the combined work of all Americans.

Yet, without in any way detracting from the other factors I have mentioned, I think I can state without fear of contradiction that the philosophy of government that has prevailed in Washington for the last 3 years has been the most important single factor in producing the good times we enjoy today.

That philosophy is not easy to describe.

There are many who ask what the difference is between the Eisenhower economic policies and those of the administrations which preceded this one.

The difference is not in goals. All Americans, regardless of their political affiliations, want better schools, housing, jobs, medical care, and more progress for all our citizens.

The difference is in means—how we achieve these goals.

And, as far as the difference in means is concerned, the difference is in where we start.

The administrations which immediately preceded the Eisenhower administration in Washington assumed in virtually every instance that Federal Government action was the answer to all social and economic problems. If more jobs were needed, the Government should create them. If better medical care was desired, the Government should provide it, and so on down the line.

In other words, they believed that if there was a social or economic problem to meet, the way to meet it was to begin with the Federal Government and work down.

We, in this administration, have exactly the opposite point of view. We say that the most effective way to meet social and economic goals is to begin with the individual and work up. We believe the Federal Government should step in only where individual action or State and local action is inadequate to do the job.

We hold to this view not only because we believe that individual action should always be encouraged rather than repressed under our system of government, but for the very practical reason that we know that in the long run this is the best way to meet social and economic goals.

Because, though whenever something needs to be done it always sounds easy to suggest that the Federal Government will do it, the difficulty generally with such programs is that they won't work.

For example, over the next 10 years, it is estimated that to keep pace with our growing population and insure continued progress and prosperity, we shall have to spend approximately $180 billion for schools, hospitals, power installations, roads, and slum clearance.

To meet these goals we must tap all the resources of America. If the Federal Government were to step in and assume full responsibility, State, local and individual action would shrivel up.

That is why the Eisenhower Federal partnership program, which encourages State and individual action, will succeed where a program of Federal paternalism would fail.

We now come to a problem which I am sure will intrigue those in attendance at this brand names dinner: What do we call the economic philosophy of this administration which I have been describing?

I have used the word "conservative" tonight in describing it, but I realize that "conservative" during the early days of the Republic referred to those who advocated more power in the Federal Government. Now it tends to mean almost the opposite.

"Capitalism" is another word which is often used to describe the economic philosophy of this administration, but certainly the capitalism we have in the United States today is very unlike the capitalism we knew 50 years ago, or that which still prevails in some other parts of the world.

If it is capitalism, the term "consumers' capitalism" or "people's capitalism" would be perhaps more appropriate.

Ours in a capitalism in which owners, management, workers, the general public, and consumers participate and share.

We have witnessed a dispersal of economic power in the United States on a truly democratic scale. Main Street has displaced Wall Street as the controlling and dynamic force behind American capitalism.

The terms "middle of the road" and "moderation" have often been used to describe the administration's philosophy.

Does this mean, as the extremists contend, lack of firm principles in dealing with economic and social problems?

Certainly not. Because when we speak of "moderation" and "middle of the road" we are not speaking merely of a compromise between the left and the right.

Ours is a new approach to political economy.

Extreme individualism has rendered a great service in developing the Nation, but, in the process, it has rendered itself obsolete.

On the other hand, exclusive emphasis on Government action to meet social and economic needs, we find, inevitably leads to loss of freedom.

What then is the alternative?

What we have sought and what we believe we have found is not a compromise, but a living and dynamic synthesis.

In the past, private initiative had been primarily confined to the economic field and selfish ends.

But the mistake of those who opposed it was that they tried to liquidate private initiative, rather than to redirect its ends.

Social goals are of utmost importance, but the individual must remain the agent of his own destiny.

The middle way is to expand private initiative for social goals. We believe that private initiative is the dominant social force in a free society.

That is why in finding solutions to social and economic problems we always begin by exploring whether the problem can be handled by private intiative.

The role of government is to help the individual—not to make decisions for him.

Russell Davenport in his penetrating analysis of the American economic scene, "The Dignity of Man," which he left unfinished at his death, summarized this philosophy in these words: "No solution of any problem in a free way of life should be provided by calling upon the State to undertake tasks which under proper circumstances of education and encouragement citizens themselves can do."

In summary, what this little excursion into philosophy means to me is simply this. America is a great Nation today because our Founding Fathers recognized the supreme importance of the individual dignity of men and women. And, any administration which bases its policies on that fundamental precept, whether it be Democrat or Republican, whether it be called liberal or conservative, will help to make the American dream come true.

Less than 2 years ago President Eisenhower predicted that within 10 years economic production would reach a level of $500 billion in dollars of constant value. Many persons thought he was too optimistic when he made that prediction. But now it appears that we may attain this goal several years sooner.

This is not a wild prediction. I am simply projecting the rate of growth that we have recently been enjoying.

For all this, I repeat, the Eisenhower economic program deserves an important share of the credit.

The idea that government is the servant of the people is not a new idea, but the way that it has been applied in the last 3 years is new, and we are all better for it.

We have seen something rare in American political history—a government that is really dedicated to helping all the people—a government that rises above political considerations and class interests, and judges all its programs by one, and only one, norm—does this benefit all Americans, does it recognize, conserve, and protect the inherent dignity of every man, woman, and child in America?

As long as this is our goal and our philosophy, we can look forward with confidence to a fuller, richer, and brighter future for all Americans.

Growth of Natural Gas Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, when the bill to exempt producers of natural gas was before Congress those of us who opposed it were warned of the dire consequences if the bill did not become law.

On Monday an article was published in the New York Journal of Commerce which is well worth noting and filing for future reference.

The headline was "Natural Gas Demand Spurs Overall Industry Sales Rise."

The article was as follows:

Total sales of the gas utility and pipeline industry during February rose 6.9 percent over the same month of 1955, the American Gas Association reported at the weekend.

Gas sales to industrial consumers was up about 5.7 percent during the same period.

The total February 1956, utility and pipeline sales were 8,113 million terms, against 7,591 million for the same month of last year.

Natural gas sales by utilities and pipelines to ultimate consumers totaled 7,676 million therms in February, up 7.2 percent over last year. Total manufactured and mixed gas sales rose 4.8 percent to 436.8 million therms, despite a decline of 13.8 percent in the manufactured gas category. Mixed was up 7.7 percent.

During the 12 months ending February 29, 1956, total utility and pipeline sales of gas was 68,451 million therms, for a rise of 8.7 percent over the 62,971 million in the 12 months, ending February 28, 1955, due mainly to higher natural gas sales.

Local Ties to Israel Strong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, Monday marked the eighth anniversary of the founding of the free State of Israel. This birthday is an occasion for joy and thanksgiving among all men of good faith. Through all the storms and tribulations which have beset that brave little nation, it has continued strong and true toward its goal of achieving independence and freedom from outside interference.

In their courageous struggle to retain their autonomy, the friendship between the United States and Israel has played a great part. The bond between our country and the noble new homeland of the Jewish people is one of the key partnerships of the free world.

In addition to Government support for Israel, gifts of money and time from thousands in this country have played an important role in bolstering the material and spiritual strength of the people of Israel. The city of Rochester, N. Y., has perhaps responded as vigorously to the needs of Israel as any community of this Nation. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article by Cliff Carpenter from the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle of April 16, which describes the close ties between Rochester and the State of Israel:

LOCAL TIES TO ISRAEL STRONG

(By Cliff Carpenter)

War can be a remote kind of a horror; or it can be an intensely personal one when it touches a husband or the boy next door or a cherished ideal. Rochester learned that in World War II, again in Korea and now the principle is being demonstrated again in the case of war-threatened Israel, the splinter-like country which clings to the eastern edge of the Mediterranean.

For there are surprisingly powerful spiritual, physical, financial and sentimental ties stretching from Rochester, in this greatest of democracies, to that newest and smallest of democracies, which celebrates its eighth birthday this week.

Ringed by hostile Arab states, bloody about the border, Israel will celebrate its birthday with the same two ingredients which are synonymous with its existence—work and war. Literally thousands of Rochesterians have a stake in the outcome. They have been there, or they have friends and relatives there. Some Rochesterians have even emigrated to Israel and are working there.

An effort to document those ties between Rochester and Israel unfolds a long and strong tale of dedication.

For in gifts and in investment funds, this city's contributions are well in the millions. And by simply substituting hours for dollars, one might strike a fair estimate of the time given by Rochester Jewry to supporting this tiny state.

An attempt at documentation might go this way—and it can be only an attempt:

Rochesterians have bought $1¼ million worth of State of Israel bonds, handled through a permanent Rochester committee, headed this year by Joseph E. Silverstein. The investors—for this is an investment in the development of Israeli economy—are in effect gambling that the civilized world, which created Israel, will not let it be destroyed. Bond headquarters is active now; further sales will be inspired by the visit to Rochester this week of the famed Zionist, Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, fresh from scenes of fighting on Israel-Arab borders.

Meanwhile, the United Jewish Welfare Fund of Rochester is well into an emergency drive called the UJA Special Survival Fund. It will raise $200,000 toward a national goal of $25 million to finance resettlement in Israel of 45,000 Jews from strife-torn North Africa.

This fund conducts an annual campaign in behalf of some 30 Jewish agencies and institutions here and abroad. But the major beneficiary is the United Jewish Appeal which has for years financed the movement of Jewish refugees and displaced persons to Israel from Europe, North Africa, and Moslem lands. Officials estimate that the Jewish Welfare Fund in Rochester has averaged sending $600,000 a year to the United Jewish Appeal since 1948, os close to $5 million from this city alone. The peak year was 1948, the year Israel was born, when the fund allocated $1,100,000 to the United Jewish Appeal.

But the documentation of help does not stop there.

Segments of the Rochester Jewish community contribute about $20,000 annually to the Jewish National Fund. This organization buys and owns land in Israel, in perpetuity, and leases to tenants for long terms for their own farming use; also it is a key figure in reforestation, which is imperative in Israel's drive to reclaim deserts and wastelands.

Hadassah, the women's Zionist organization, raises about $28,000 in Rochester annually toward maintenance of buildings and staff of the Hadassah hospital system in Israel. And Hadassah along with the Pioneer Women raises another $25,000 annually which becomes part of a larger national fund devoted exclusively to children—bringing them to Israel from underdeveloped areas, and financing their resettlement, maintenance, and education.

Why this outpouring of funds, this tight tie to a new little nation?

Leaders of Rochester Jewry will tell the questioner that the plight of their peoples through the world has been so critical in recent years, that there must be an Israel to which Jews can go in safety and in protection.

Rochester's Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein, now chairman of the American Zionist Commit-

tee for Public Affairs, is in a position to sketch this picture eloquently.

He was adviser on Jewish affairs to the United States military commanders in Germany at the close of World War II. He saw the survivors of Hitler's purges—about a quarter of a million of them—gathered in German and Austrian camps under United States care. He was a leader in a tragic and fruitless effort to persuade some other lands to take in those Jews for resettlement. Recalling the strong role the United States ultimately played in the resettlement of those refugees, he says:

"The fact that compounded their tragedy was that nobody wanted them. We beat frantically on doors everywhere, but they were closed against these Jews. It was only when a United Nations committee recommended the partition of Palestine into Jewish and Arab states, only when the United Nations gave its approval of this plan, only when Israel came into existence as a state, that the diplaced persons camps were liquidated as with a magic wand. I saw these people in the camps caught, as they put it, like rats in a trap. Then later I saw them arrive in Israel, free human beings, with their fate at last in their own hands."

Rabbi Bernstein, incidentally, is an example of the physical and sentimental, as well as spiritual, ties mentioned earlier. For he is a friend of David Ben-Gurion, Israel's Prime Minister, and a close personal friend of Moshe Sharrett, former Acting Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of Israel. Sharrett and Rabbi Bernstein met in 1926 when the latter was a student in the first class at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem.

They met again in 1937, a year of terror. That year Rabbi Bernstein, on sabbatical leave, took his wife and two children to Tel Aviv. With Sharrett, he toured Palestine in a bullet-proof sedan inspecting new Jewish settlements. They drove through rains of rocks hurled by dissatisfied Arabs. He recalls Sharrett's utter calm, for this was a period known to Jews as Havlagah, or self restraint, in which Jewish residents of Palestine sought to placate the Arabs by no strife of any sort except in extreme self-defense.

They met again in 1951, when Rabbi Bernstein was president of the Central Council of American Rabbis.

Dozens of other Rochesterians know Israeli officials by their first names. Another notable example is Mrs. Julia Berlove, national Hadassah executive, who even now is in Israel on Hadassah business.

Another bit of evidence on the close bond of feeling between Rochesterians and Israel is simply the number of Rochesterians who have made the long and expensive trip—nearly half way around the world—in the last 3 years or so. Asked to make a random guess at the number, 2 leaders of the Jewish community ad libbed 55 names for the writer without reference to notes. So there must be many more. And to this they added offhand the names of 18 Rochesterians whose dedication to Israel is so deep they have gone there to live.

There is hope in Rochester's Jewry that Israel's eighth birthday will be less tragic than other days of the last few months. And there is gloom, but not despair, that the West will not take a stronger stand in behalf of the little nation. As another spokesman put it:

"Israel has no quarrel with Arab peoples. She has repeatedly offered to conclude nonaggression pacts, write permanent peace treaties, resume normal trade relations, but these overtures are always spurned. She is strongly prowestern, a democratic oasis ringed by Communist-influenced countries, a stubborn block to the spread of totalitarianism. She rightfully looks to democracies for moral and material support."

But in war or in peace, those ties to Israel will remain powerful. So say the Rochester supporters, for they feel that they are being rewarded regularly. They have seen Israel grow in 8 years from a population of 650,000 to 1,789,000, have seen it give refuge to Jews in trouble from many parts of the world, have seen it pioneer in industry, agriculture, medicine, health, and education. They see Israel as a potential benefit to the entire Middle East given only peace and tolerance.

Protection of Animals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I received from a person in Washington, D. C., dealing with the Peoples Lobby.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 18, 1956.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: S. 2015 and H. R. 6680 protect dogs in the District of Columbia. It may be said that this is but a crumb but will Congress deny us even that crumb? Surely, dogs, the beloved of mankind should have sanctuary some place, sometime, and where better than the Nation's Capital, now. Can one look into his pet's eyes, the one utterly devoted to him in loyalty, and say "you must be ruthlessly used as a tortured instrument of student practice." Christianity teaches benevolence and surely that extends to man's best friend. He is an unyielding friend even in dire necessity. Is it enough that he lay down his life for us, must he be also tortured.

Throughout our land self-sacrificing men and women strive unceasingly to better the lot of these defenseless ones. They devote their time and substance to this praiseworthy work, this Christian endeavor. And their accomplishments redound to their credit.

They educate the populace in humane endeavor, they provide animal shelters, they rescue stray animals and return them to their owners or find new havens for them. They, in a word, instill into our Christian consciousness an appreciation of God's handiwork.

However, when it comes to the point of reducing concern for animals to protective legislation there is an evident record of lack of accomplishment. The failure may be attributed to two patent defects. First, the lack of unity. There is a wide diversity of opinion amongst the various groups as to which action should be taken.

There is no united front of all the friends of animals. This, despite the fact that they are all humanitarians and should consider the enactment of any measure of protective legislation as a step forward even though it is not the actual legislation they favored. Second, public opinion has had no voice. The humanitarian groups, after all, are but a segment of our population and as such do not have sufficient impact in the matter of persuading legislators to their viewpoint.

Many of the leaders of movements for animal protective legislation in the past are today discouraged and disheartened. They state that attainment of such legislation is impossible. They state that this is not the psychological moment and that the bulk of the people are antagonistic to any corrective legislation.

We sharply disagree with these defeatists. Public opinion is overwhelmingly opposed to the torture of animals. If ours is a Christian Nation, and it is, can any follower of the all-loving Christ fail to display a benevolent, kindly attitude toward God's lesser creatures? It remains for this public sentiment to be vividly portrayed for the benefit of legislators. This is the most persuasive factor in the consideration of any legislation.

Peoples Lobby, Inc., Washington, D. C., is a nonprofit organization chartered for the sole purpose of procurement of protective legislation for animals. It provides a common ground for unity of legislative action by all society members and other humanitarians, combined with the impact of public opinion.

Sincerely yours,
THERESA H. RUSSELL.

We Must Protect American Labor and Industry From Unfair Foreign Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the OTC legislation, represented by H. R. 5550 and reported out by the Committee on Ways and Means, strikes me as extremely important. H. R. 5550 is not just another bill. It is one of those crucial proposals that would change radically the lines of our constitutional division of powers.

The State Department seeks through this legislation to obtain the consent of Congress to its own abject demotion to the sidelines in the matter of regulating foreign commerce. If this seems presumptuous it is in keeping with that Department's action in this field during the past 10 years. By one scheme or another it has aimed at obtaining and keeping control over our tariff and related aspects of trade. H. R. 5550, the OTC proposal, is only the last in a series of steps.

Why does this interest me as a Member of Congress?

It interests and concerns me for several reasons. In the first place, as a Member of Congress, I am bound to carry out my obligations and responsibilities as a Congressman; and this clearly does not involve resignation to the State Department or the abdication of powers that the Constitution has placed upon us, whether on the grounds of expediency, following the path of least resistance, or anything else.

Second, I have definite obligations to the people who elected me. It has become something of a stigma to acknowledge this fact. We hear of bowing to "local selfish interests" when we pay attention to the electorate back home.

In this particular instance I am speaking for such local selfish interests as the

owners of and workers in various industries in my district. They have a real stake in this legislation. Their interests, that is, their economic welfare, the wage levels, the employment opportunities and the very value of investments in plants, mills and manufacturing enterprises in my district are affected by and stand to benefit or lose by what Congress does or does not do in its action on this bill. We are not legislating in a vacuum.

If the employment opportunities of men and women in the manufacture of watches and clocks is a local, selfish concern then I am guilty of catering to local selfish interests in seeking to preserve and to promote such employment. If continuity or increase of employment at good wages in rubber-soled-footwear plants, or in factories producing bicycles and parts, or in those making wood screws and metal fasteners or in textile plants in my district is a matter of local selfish interest, then again I am guilty of upholding such narrow interests; and I may say that I am proud to do it.

At the same time I will challenge anyone to say that it is against the national interest for a Member of Congress to speak for those who elected him, to seek to preserve their jobs and their earnings against influences that might upset them or even take them away.

For these several reasons I support the resolution introduced on both sides of the aisle, by the gentleman from Maine and by the gentleman from West Virginia. The OTC bill leaves too much in the dark. It presents us with a handle to a pan but says nothing of what is to be cooked in the pan, or how. We are simply to agree to hand over the pan to cooks in Geneva, Switzerland, who will want to use it as they see fit, to cook what they please.

Looking back over the last 10 or 20 years of State Department activity, I am convinced that American industry, American producers, including some important parts of our agriculture, would be asked to supply the goose to be cooked, and if the past is any guide to the future that goose would be cooked in short order. I am afraid that Congress' own goose would be cooked at the same time. We are here, among many other things, to regulate foreign commerce. Evidently that means what it says.

I am not willing to give the pan and its handle away; and I do not believe that any reservations about the use of the pan will do us much good so long as we leave it to others to decide what is to be cooked in it.

To be plain about it, amendments to the OTC, such as those adopted by the Ways and Means Committee, can do little good so long as GATT itself remains free to operate under the power of self-amendment without reference to Congress.

In H. R. 5550 we are addressing ourselves only to the OTC, that is, to the pan and its handle. What goes into the pan and how it is to be cooked; that is, the real substance of the issue, corresponds to GATT and GATT is not brought before us in H. R. 5550. GATT would be left free to work out its own destiny beyond the reach of Congress. It could by a two-thirds vote extend its own powers without consultation of Congress in any way. GATT has amended itself in the past; and there is nothing in H. R. 5550 or in the OTC agreement or in the amendments adopted by the Ways and Means Committee that would prevent its doing so in the future.

What good could I do then in behalf of the many producers in my district who would be injured by action taken in Geneva? Neither I nor any other Member of Congress would be able to reach the decision-making spot in Geneva, or if we could the delegates from the 35 countries congregated there behind closed doors would be under no obligation either to see us or pay us the least attention.

Is that the goal to which we want to move? Is that the way we want to dispose of our responsibility to regulate the foreign commerce of this country?

There are those who deny that membership in the OTC would have that effect. I say the burden of proof is on them. We have observed for 10 years or more the direction of State Department activities in this field. It has moved ever farther away from congressional control directly toward international control of our foreign trade. The ban on import quotas written into GATT is only one example.

It would require a complete reversal of State Department policy to prevent loss by Congress of its authority to an international organization in this field if Congress should approve OTC membership on behalf of the United States. The burden of proof to the contrary is indeed upon those who deny this.

Let them bring GATT before us for a thorough examination. If they balk at this, they will demonstrate the duplicity of their position. If they have nothing to hide, if they are not bent on wresting powers from Congress and lodging them in Geneva, they will gladly come forward and place before Congress the full record of the State Department in its GATT negotiations. Then Congress can determine for itself what is what.

In my opinion the resolution should be adopted forthwith.

What Others Think—Extend Canal South From St. Marks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my own remarks and to include extraneous material, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following reprint from the Tampa Times, Tampa, Fla., which appeared in the April 15, 1956, issue of the Tallahassee Democrat, Tallahassee, Fla., under the heading "What Others Think" and entitled "Extend Canal South From St. Marks." The near tragic incident referred to in this article points up an addition to the many other important reasons why it is imperative that the Intracoastal Waterway development between Tampa and St. Marks, Fla., be completed as soon as possible.

The matter is as follows:

WHAT OTHERS THINK—EXTEND CANAL SOUTH FROM ST. MARKS

Thanks to the vigilance of the Coast Guard, six seamen were rescued yesterday from a barge which broke up in the raging waters of the gulf some 80 miles northwest of Tampa.

The accident is another reminder of the need for suitable Intracoastal Waterway development between Tampa and St. Marks. At present a protected waterway exists from the Mexican border, along the gulf to Apalachee Bay in Florida. But this is of no use to the heavy barge traffic between Tampa and other gulf ports. It must brave the open seas in heavy oceangoing barges and tugs, risking rough weather and high seas.

In the interest of better transportation facilities it is clear that the Intracoastal Waterway between St. Marks and Tampa Bay should be completed. While the Federal Government contracts to finance dams in Egypt and Afghanistan and spends millions in aid to India, this vital development needed by United States transportation facilities is neglected.

It was good luck yesterday that a helicopter could make the long trip into the Gulf to save the six seamen on the sinking barge. The next time the story might have a different and more tragic ending. But until the Intracoastal Waterway is completed, these needless risks of men and equipment must be made, increasing the cost of transportation in this area and reducing the efficiency of barge traffic.

Social Security and Railway Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Voice of the People column of the Chicago Tribune, under date of April 15, 1956, discussing relative social-security payments and benefits as compared with benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act:

SOCIAL SECURITY AND RAILWAY PENSIONS

Although the Government has administered both social security and the railroad retirement fund since 1937 when both systems started, rail employees have paid an average of three times more taxes.

The present cockeyed disparity between both systems has caused endless confusion among rail employees and to both Houses of Congress. To wit:

One industrial worker pays a tax rate of 2 percent on the first $350 per month earnings into social security. Maximum cost per month—$7.

One rail employee pays a tax rate of 6¼ percent on the first $350 per month earnings into railroad retirement. Maximum cost per month—$21.88.

One rail employee pays three times more taxes or as much as the combined tax paid by three industrial workers.

Three industrial workers therefore, may receive a social-security retirement (and spouse) benefit in return for the same

amount of taxes paid by one rail employee.

The present social-security maximum retirement benefit is $108.50 plus one-half ($54.30) for a spouse, or a total of $162.80 per month.

Three industrial workers and their spouses may receive a total of $488.40 per month in return for the same amount of taxes paid by 1 rail employee.

One rail employee and his spouse, therefore, should (but doesn't) receive $488.40 per month.

To receive the present maximum railroad retirement annuity of $166 plus one-half up to $54.30 for a spouse, or a total of $220.30 per month, the employee must have earned $300 per month from 1926 through June 1954, and $350 per month thereafter. During the last 30 years less than 1 percent of employees had such earnings.

To receive the present maximum social-security retirement and spouse annuity of $162.80, the industrial worker retiring this year at age of 65 needs "only" 6 quarters of coverage (18 months—1½ years—not 30 years) if he earned $350 per month (regardless of prior earnings less than $350 per month) since January 1, 1955.

Why should a rail employee require 20 times as many months (30 years, 360 months) of service to receive less than twice as much in benefits, for which he has paid 3 times more in taxes?

WALT SANDS,
Editor, Rail Pension News.

The Farm Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, on April 11, I voted against the passage of H. R. 12, the Agricultural Act of 1956. I want my colleagues to know that I intend to vote to sustain the President's veto.

The President, in my opinion, is absolutely correct in his decision to veto this legislation since the same is fraught with much inequity and the result of a strictly political maneuver. The consumers of the United States can be proud of the action of the President which means a very definite saving to their pocketbooks.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the New York News of April 17, 1956:

THE GUY'S GOT GUTS

"Only after thorough consideration and searching my mind and my conscience," President Eisenhower yesterday vetoed the farm bill.

This was the catch-all measure put together by Senate-House conferees in a near panic over declining farm-product prices in a presidential election year.

What the President and Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson chiefly couldn't stomach was the restoration of rigid, 90 percent of parity price supports for 1 year on wheat, corn, cotton, rice, and peanuts. It was these that piled up the present mountains of stored surplus foodstuffs.

There is nothing dictatorial about this veto. General Eisenhower goes on to say in his no-soap message that he will do what he can for the farmers under existing law.

Price supports on the 5 products above named are to be lifted to at least 82.5 percent of parity. The support price on milk used for butter, ice cream, etc., is to go up to $3.25 per 100 pounds. All this will mean $600 million more for farmers this year. In addition, the Agriculture Department will spend $400 million to bolster prices of perishable farm products.

This won't satisfy extremists, who think the world, or at any rate the United States taxpayer, owes the farmer a living. But it should help ease the troubles of some farmers.

It may hurt General Eisenhower politically; but, on the other hand, it may help him. Time and again in our history acts of courage and conscience on the part of public men have paid off in increased popularity and respect.

This Eisenhower veto of the farm bill was 100 percent an act of courage and of conscience.

Independence of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on April 16, 1956, by the Jewish calendar, Israel was 8 years old and its people can well take pride in that fact. I wish to extend my sincere felicitations to the people of Israel, President Ben-Gurion, and His Excellency Abba Eban, Ambassador of Israel, upon the occasion of the celebration of Independence Day.

The Republic of Israel emerged fully clothed with the problems and realities of political statehood on May 14, 1948. During these short years of independence the two main preoccupations of Israel have been economic development of the country and the establishment by diplomatic and military means of the security of the country within the boundaries set by the armistice agreement.

The State of Israel is a product of an ancient dream, of suffering, courage, faith, and sacrifice of a people striving to create a new democracy and to live in peace. There are few historic parallels for the present resurgence of faith in democratic values witnessed in Israel. Israel's faith is everywhere in evidence in the energy of its manifold activities and in a rapidly accumulating array of solid achievements along social, economic, political, and spiritual lines. The triumph of the human spirit in Israel over seemingly endless and overwhelming obstacles is a constant beacon light of faith to all men.

Because Israel is small and poor in natural resources it faces towering economic problems. The economy of Israel is still in the process of building healthy foundations for a normal existence. The economic policy of the government is characterized by the encouragement of healthy economic enterprise in all its beneficial forms. In economic matters Israel has steered a middle and nondoctrinaire course between the totalitarian economics of the slave states and the typical laissez faire of the 19th century. It is developing an indigenous blend of free enterprise and free government suited to its own particular problems.

The Middle East is the crossroads of the Old World, the bridge between Europe, Asia, and Africa, straddling global air and sea routes, the Dardenelles and the Suez Canal. Within the Middle East the state of Israel is clearly the heartland of the crossroads. The present masters of the Kremlin, following the lead of past military conquerors, covet this position. The deeply disputatious question of peace with the Arab States leaves the political future clouded. Yet within Israel there is energy and optimism, for here at last a dream of centuries for a homeland has become a political reality.

The avowed aim of the United States is to promote the political and economic stability of the entire region of the Middle East with a course of action based on neither favoritism nor on prejudice, but on the principle of safeguarding the best interests of the United States and the free world. The United States has given increasing attention to ways of reducing tension along the troubled frontiers of the Middle East. The most serious threat of this continued strife, from the free-world point of view, is the danger it presents to the Middle East as a whole. Seeking new directions for further Communist exploitation, the masters of the Kremlin already are looking upon the troubled waters of Palestine as a good spot for launching their next dangerous activities.

If our world-wide position is to be secure, we must recognize the potentialities of Israel as an outpost for western civilization. The whole Arab world is in a state of underdevelopment and extreme poverty. Its populations are restive and if practical solution to the miseries of millions of people do not come, Communists will certainly make the most of their opportunity.

If we in the Western World ignore the Middle East and its unsolved human problems, we shall not only have failed a large section of humanity, but we shall have mortally weakened our own defenses of the West and its message of freedom. We can strike no more effective blow in defense of our way of life on a global basis than to do everything possible to make Israel a strong bastion of freedom in the Middle East and through it to reach the rest of the region in the true spirit of our freedom. And, further, we must cooperate in all wholesome economic endeavors of the entire Middle East.

Federal Employees Need and Deserve Basic Guaranties Provided in Union Recognition and Arbitration Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention

to H. R. 10237, a bill to provide for the recognition of Federal employee unions and the establishment of arbitration machinery for the settlement of grievances. I am pleased to note that the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee has scheduled hearings next month on an identical bill, S. 3593, introduced by Senator OLIN JOHNSTON. Because of the demonstrated need for this type of legislation, I am hopeful that hearings may also be scheduled by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following guest article on this subject, which appeared in the April 13, 1956, issue of the Government Standard, the newspaper of the American Federation of Government Employees:

ON CAPITOL HILL

(By GEORGE M. RHODES)

Employees of the Federal Government enjoy the unique distinction of having 166 million employers, since it is their duty to provide a necessary assortment of scientific, technical, clerical, and administrative services to all our citizens.

As our Government has grown, both in complexity and the scope of its activities, it has become clear that those Americans who serve their fellow-citizens need, and have a right to expect basic guaranties affecting their conditions of employment. Tens of millions of employees in private industry have long since been granted certain well-defined rights in the field of labor-management relations. The labor-management relations law, established by act of Congress, makes this significant statement in its findings and declaration of policy:

"Experience has proved that protection by law of the right of employees to organize and bargain collectively safeguards commerce from injury, impairment, or interruption, and promotes the flow of commerce by removing certain recognized sources of industrial strife and unrest, by encouraging practices fundamental to the friendly adjustment of industrial disputes arising out of differences as to wages, hours, or other working conditions, and by restoring equality of bargaining power between employers and employees."

But unfortunately, our Government has not chosen to legally apply a similar set of rules to dealings with its own employees. A beginning was made in 1912 with the passage of the Lloyd-La Follette Act, which guaranteed Federal employees the right to join unions of their choice—provided such unions did not impose an obligation to strike against the Government. However, there was no requirement that the executive branch of the Government recognize or deal with such unions as the spokesmen for Federal employees.

Thus, effective labor-management relations having any degree of bargaining rights binding upon executive branch "employees," are nonexistent in the Federal service. The injustices of this situation have long been recognized by many responsible authorities.

The 1955 report of the American Bar Association's Committee on Labor Relations of Governmental Employees said:

"A government which imposes upon other employers certain obligations in dealing with their employees may not in good faith refuse to deal with its own public servants on a reasonably similar favorable basis, modified, of course, to meet the exigencies of the public service. It should set the example for industry by being perhaps more considerate than the law requires of private enterprise."

It is obvious that some practical machinery for dealing adequately and fairly with the labor-management problems arising between the Federal Government and its employees is badly needed. I have introduced such remedial legislation in the past several Congresses.

Recently I introduced H. R. 10237, a strengthened version of my previous bill, H. R. 697. The chief difference is that the new bill provides for arbitration of disputes as a final recourse. It would give Government employee unions official recognition in the Government and require executive agencies and departments to deal with them on personnel policy matters and employee grievances.

A similar bill, though without the arbitration feature, was favorably reported by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in 1952 by a vote of 14 to 1. Unfortunately, the action came too late in the session for floor debate to be scheduled. It was placed on the Consent Calendar but chances for enactment were killed by the objection of a single Member.

In the past, established unions representing Government employees have discussed personnel problems and presented grievances to various administrative officers of the Government; but this action is a matter of sufferance rather than a right. If the Government administrator or his subordinates should refuse to meet or discuss the problem with union representatives, or should fail to take the necessary remedial action, the aggrieved parties have no appeal short of Congress.

As the American Bar Association pointed out in its report:

"Government which denies to its employees the right to strike against the people, no matter how just might be the grievances, owes to its public servants an obligation to provide working conditions and standards of management-employee relationships which would make unnecessary and unwarranted any need for such employees to resort to stoppage of public business. * * *"

I regret that no action on my bills has been forthcoming in the present Congress, despite the clearly demonstrated need for some type of remedial legislation to provide basic rights for Federal employees. Not one of the executive agencies or Departments of the present administration has even submitted a report to the committee stating their views on the proposed legislation—in favor or in opposition. They have chosen to ignore the existence of the bills, which is to deny that any problem or need exists. This "head in the sand" policy of the administration is shortsighted and unfair to the millions of loyal and devoted public servants who are entitled to workable standards of conduct affecting their hours and conditions of employment, vacations, and sick leave, as well as the expeditious settling of grievances which necessarily arise.

This present administration policy is also unfair to the citizens of our Nation because the present adherence to outmoded employee-management practices is contrary to sound and enlightened public personnel administration. It is arbitrary, unjust and undemocratic. It destroys the morale of efficient and hard-working Government employees through the pyramiding of resentment, misunderstandings, and irritation because of the failure to provide necessary grievance machinery and other sound principles of employee-management relations which have been in effect in private industry for many years.

I feel that the principles and objectives of this legislation are reasonable and just. I feel that the need for enactment of such legislation is urgent. It is the duty of both the administration and the Congress to recognize this need and act accordingly, without further delay.

Hon. Lyndon Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an editorial which appeared in the Sunday, April 8, edition of the Hillsboro Evening Mirror, Hillsboro, Tex., regarding our esteemed colleague, the Hon. LYNDON JOHNSON, majority leader of the Senate. He is truly a fine and great leader as the article demonstrates.

The editorial follows:

SAY "YES," LYNDON

Like many Texas citizens, we are anxiously awaiting the answer to one of the big questions in national politics. The question: Will the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Democratic majority leader of the United States Senate and senior Senator from Texas, consent to be this State's favorite son candidate for the Democratic nomination for President.

Senator JOHNSON, we do not know what your answer will be, but we wish to add our plea to those of countless other Texans. Our plea is: Say "Yes," Lyndon. Say "Yes."

We have long known that you have the ability to perform the duties of the presidency, and we have long been aware of your conscientious, unselfish and untiring devotion to the performance of your duties in public office.

Your personal popularity was attested to in our county last November 21, when 1,500 central Texas citizens gathered in your honor at Whitney. The long and continued standing ovation those people gave you when you were introduced has never been surpassed in our section of the State.

The many standing ovations that interrupted your speech prove that your views on, and solutions to, our many national problems coincide with the views and wishes of a great majority of the Texas citizens.

Senator, you are a great Texan, and a man who dwell deserves the title of favorite son.

However, we do not wish to see your candidacy limited to the role of favorite son. We hope to see you as an active candidate for the office of President of the United States of America. We feel that the people of Texas and of the United States should make you the Democratic nominee and then elect you President.

The dignified, yet thorough and efficient, manner which you have maintained while performing your duties as senior Senator from Texas and as Democratic majority leader of the United States Senate has endeared you to millions of American in every walk of life.

Your election as Democratic majority leader before completing your first term in the United States Senate was a tremendous tribute to an outstanding American. It was an even greater tribute to the citizens of Texas for having sent you to Washington. Those persons who do not know you, undoubtedly are still trying to determine how you accomplished such a victory in the United States Senate. They must still be wondering how you, as a first-term Senator, could gain the respect and devotion of Democrats many years your senior. So much respect, in fact, that they unhesitatingly call you their leader.

We know the reason, Senator. And we believe that one of your recent statements very aptly reflects that reason. The statement you made was: "I will not consent to lead

a group composed of delegates from any single faction of the Texas Democratic Party to the National Convention in Chicago." How proud we were when we read that statement.

This is a time for unity and harmony among the members of the Democratic Party. The social and economic unrest, both at home and abroad, will not permit us to waste time bickering among ourselves. It is for that reason that we are willing to share our favorite son with the rest of the Nation, and propose that you, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas, be the next Democratic nominee to the office of President of the United States.

Syria Celebrates Evacuation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to salute the people of Syria, His Excellency Shukri al-Quwwatli, President of the Republic of Syria, and His Excellency Dr. Farid Zeineddine, the Ambassador of Syria, on the occasion of the celebration of the 10th anniversary of Evacuation Day, April 17, 1956.

Before 1920 the Republic of Syria in its present boundaries had no separate history of its own. Despite centuries of subjugation to the Ottoman Empire, Syria, like other Arab countries, played a notable part in the shaping of modern Arab history. From the middle of the 19th century to the second decade of the 20th century—the period of the "Arab awakening" and the struggle against the Ottomans—Syria played a leading role in determining the aims and objects of the rise of nationalism in the Arab world.

Syrian proclamation of independence on March 18, 1920, announced to the whole world her determination to remain a free and independent country. This act, although short-lived, marked the climax of the Arab national movement and the farthest point of success reached in the partial realization of Arab national aims. The strangling of Syria's first period of independence was engendered by the conflicting interests of the so-called big powers of the era. High hopes of the period of independence dimmed and the fight against the twofold foreign domination of the Arab countries initiated a struggle which is continued today in some parts of the Arab world.

Syrian history from 1920 to 1946 is that of a desperate and bitter national struggle. The changes in the international scene influenced the crisis in Syria. Making full use of the special circumstances of the Second World War, Syria succeeded in obtaining recognition of her complete independence and in achieving the evacuation of all foreign troops from the country. The increased pressure of the Syrian nationalists forced the mandate authorities to restore constitutional life to the country. In July 1943 elections were held and Syria's second nationalist regime was established. His Excellency Shukri al-Quwwatli became President of the Republic of Syria. During the period of this regime evacuation took place—one of the outstanding events in Syria's history after the achievement of independence. Force was met with force and the Army of the mandate power was expelled from the country. The death knell of imperialism in Syria was tolled when finally on April 17, 1946, the United Nations approved by a large majority of votes the evacuation of all foreign troops from Syria.

Other Syrian successes in this period included her participation in the field of international politics. The Syrian Government in 1945 joined the Allied cause. Following this, Syria was invited to participate in the San Francisco conference where she signed the charter of the United Nations as one of the first members of the organization, achieving thereby the status of a free and fully sovereign state.

Syria has made notable contributions to culture and civilization. In the course of many centuries, Arab Syria has produced eminent poets, men of letters, jurists, historians, scientists, and journalists who made great contributions to world culture. Syria has also transmitted to the West the philosophy and sciences of the ancient world, serving thereby as a bridge over which the cultures of the ancient Greeks, Persians, Romans, and Indians passed to Europe and America.

Syrians today are eager to keep step with the progress of modern civilization. Education is being fostered, books are being translated, and the ancient heritage of Arabic culture is being recovered. Syria's institutions of higher learning, for example Syrian University and the Arab Academy of Damascus, proceed along Western patterns. Through these and other channels the learning of the West is being translated, digested, and introduced to the country. Valuable research projects and studies are being conducted on a scale that promises well for the cultural future of Syria.

The Syrian struggle for liberty served as a symbol to other oppressed peoples in the world. In the words of today's Syrian leaders:

> The people of Syria are content and gratified that their struggle for political independence has been accompanied by a parallel fight for the liberation of the country from feudal and reactionary forces and for the achievement of a social, economic, and cultural revival which, it is hoped, will ultimately bring great good to all Arabs, will strengthen the people's social consciousness and will secure for the country the benefits of a true democratic rule, based on the great principle of government by the people and for the interest of the people.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.* 6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*.....
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*....120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*...
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*..
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*....The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*..
Eastland, James O., *Miss*...5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*..
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*..
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*..
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.* University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*..Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*...
Jenner, William E., *Ind*....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*...
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*...
Laird, William R. III, *W. Va*.
Langer, William, *N. Dak*...2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*..Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*...
McClellan, John L., *Ark*....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*...
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*...The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*...
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.* Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*.
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*...
Purtell, William A., *Conn*...
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*...
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*...
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*..Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*...
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Wofford, Thomas A., *S. C*...
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*..Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Johnson of Texas, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Barkley, Anderson, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Morse, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Wofford, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Laird, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Wofford, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Laird, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Scott, Wofford, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Appendix

Hon. Horace Seely-Brown, Jr., Tells Hi-Y Youth Legislators More Politicians Mean Better Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for unanimous consent to extend my remarks, and wish to do so by inserting in the RECORD an address which was delivered during the recent recess of the Congress by my colleague from Connecticut, the Representative of the Second Congressional District, and as such my own Congressman, the Honorable HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

The Members of this House know that Mr. SEELY-BROWN does not take up much of the time of the House with speeches, but when he does speak, we have observed that invariably it is briefly and to the point, and his remarks always are a cogent contribution to the business before the House.

The address which I am about to place in the RECORD was delivered at the Hotel Bond, in Hartford, Conn., where Mr. SEELY-BROWN was asked to be the guest of honor at a dinner which marked the close of a 2-day session of the general assembly of the Hi-Y youth in government project. There were about 175 young men present, all juniors and seniors in high school, who had been elected by their Hi-Y Clubs at the Young Men's Christian Associations in their home communities, to serve as senators or as representatives in the youth general assembly. They performed all of the steps involved in carrying into effect a law of the State of Connecticut.

As always, my colleague was brief in his remarks, but the advice which he gave to the youth legislators and the other guests present was so well thought out, and it is of so much interest, not only to parents, but to all citizens of all ages, that I am inserting at this point in the RECORD the text of his address:

HON. HORACE SEELEY-BROWN, JR., TELLS HI-Y YOUTH LEGISLATORS MORE POLITICIANS MEAN BETTER GOVERNMENT

Mr. Chairman, I consider it an honor and a privilege to be given the opportunity of sharing in this program with you. The invitation so graciously tendered by your chairman to address this closing session of the Youth General Assembly was one which I was pleased indeed at being able to accept.

During these past 2 days, you as members of the Youth and Government Assembly have completed an arduous program. I am sure that in your "stand in" capacity you have had a real look at some of the problems faced by the duly elected executive and legislative officers of our State government. I trust that you have passed all the bills that needed to be "passed," and perhaps repealed a few acts that needed repealing. At any rate when you finished, it was unnecessary for the Secretary of State to proclaim, "God save the State of Connecticut." I wonder if any of you are already making plans for calling a special session.

I have been pleased to examine the Handbook of Instructions so carefully prepared by the Youth and Government Committee of the Connecticut State YMCA. I congratulate those who worked in its preparation. This manual could well serve as an effective "do it yourself" manual for your prototypes, the elected Senators and Representatives, especially those coming to Hartford for their first term of service in the General Assembly.

I have not yet received any specific report as to the "laws" which you have enacted during this session of the Youth and Government Assembly. I am sure there are many which rightly can be counted as an index to your alert civic responsibility and sound thinking.

I would not be at all surprised, nor would I blame you, if there were no bills passed under the general entitlement of "juvenile delinquency." I am sure that many of you are sick of the term and for much of the loose talk for which this term serve as a label.

I promise not to belabor the point, but it does seem to me that even those of us who are adults have become quite confused about juvenile delinquency, including alike what it is, and what to do about it.

"Juvenile delinquency" is a term which we do not find in the annals of the past. It does not appear as such in our literature of other centuries, or in the jurisprudence of distant times. No doubt, mother's knee and father's knee were important administratively as well as anatomically in preventing the need for such a term.

The Scriptures, the lawgivers, the ancient and modern philosophers, the poets of the Golden Age do not give us anything about "juvenile deliquency." Instead, they have handed down to use much that is well worth remembering about youth and its qualities and virtues.

Fame Is the Thirst of Youth. Youth is on the march to fame and will not be stopped. It has been so in every generation. Age could not stop this, nor would it. In our present day, there would be perhaps less confusion if we elders, we parents, spent more effort in undertaking to understand youth, and more time and energy in working with youth.

Young people are not the only ones who seem to be confused. One State, Georgia, already says that persons are mature enough to vote when they reach the age of 18. In fact, a proposal is presently before the Congress for the same voting age in all States in electing Federal officials. On the other hand, all States but 6 say a man cannot get married without his parents' permission until he is 21 years of age. At 18½ you are old enough to be drafted into the military service, and, if necessary, to fight for your country; but you are not old enough to buy anything on the installment plan, except by your parents' authority, until you are 21.

Here in the State of Connecticut we hope that willful damage and acts of vandalism will be reduced, as the result of a law which was passed last year, making parents responsible, up to $250, for any willful damage to property by their children up to the age of 21 years. In New York, however, Governor Harriman has just vetoed a similar bill, I am informed, saying that young people would use the threat of causing damage, for which their parents would be liable to pay, as a club over the heads of their parents to make them give them the things they wanted. And so I say, who is confused?

Whether or not the legislation you have adopted at your youth-government assembly deals with any of these matters, I am sure that you can help, by your studies, by your interests, and by your influence and example, to clear up much of the confusion that prevails on these and many other important subjects.

I have been examining the list of the members of the youth and government committee of the Connecticut State YMCA, the committee responsible for this program. It is an impressive list.

Do you know that the chairman, Judge Maltbie, served as chief justice of Connecticut for 20 years—a longer period than any other man in that office since our State's present constitution was adopted in 1818? I believe that he was the youngest man to be appointed to the superior court bench, either before or since, when he was nominated to that high judicial office by Gov. Marcus Holcomb. And already, at that early age, he had served his town of Granby as representative in the general assembly, he had served Hartford County as assistant State's attorney, and he had served as executive secretary to Governor Holcomb. His distinguished career has comprehended public service in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of our government.

The honorary chairman of your committee, Justice Raymond E. Baldwin, of the supreme court of errors, was one of our State's most beloved governors, and a member of the United States Senate from Connecticut; and, before he was elected governor, he sat in one of the very seats that you youth legislators sat in, in the House of Representatives at the Capitol, where he represented the town of Stratford for 2 terms, during 1 of which he was the majority leader of the House.

I would like to point out to you that both Judge Maltbie and Justice Baldwin were politicians. I look over the names of the other members of the distinguished committee, and I find among them many personal friends of mine from my own congressional district of eastern Connecticut. They are politicians, too.

"Politician," according to the distorted usage of today's world, has become an ignominious word. There is no reason why this should be so. One of the things of greatest value that you could carry back home from this session is that there is nothing wrong with being a politician; in fact, that you should aspire to be one, to the extent that your time and talents permit.

Politicians are an essential part of our system of government. The dictionary says that politics is the science or art of government. Politicians are men and women who have had sufficient interest in public service, sufficient care about the kind of government we have, to take the time and trouble to become experts, to a greater or lesser degree, in the science or art of government.

Most politicians do not conform at all to the cartoon conception of what a politician is, and what he does, and how he operates.

You who have just served in the general assembly of the youth and government program no doubt are aware that in our official general assembly there are 36 Senators and 279 Representatives, and all they receive by way of compensation for their services to the State, at home and in Hartford, for their entire term of 2 years, is $600. They are barred by law from accepting appointment to a public-service job with a salary while they are members of the General Assembly.

There are about 750 men and women, serving on more than 100 boards, commissions, and committees that constitute part of the government of the State of Connecticut, who are responsible for important decisions of policy, and the direction of thousands of employees, and the spending of millions of dollars in State appropriations. They receive nothing for their services—not a penny! They are politicians.

In your own community back home, and in every community, there are other citizens, men and women by the dozens, by the scores, in the larger cities even by the hundreds, who are serving as aldermen, councilmen, commissioners, and as members of boards of education, boards of finance, etc. They are paid nothing for their services. They are politicians.

Also, in your own community, and in every other community in Connecticut, there are men and women who serve on the town committee of the political party of their choice, or they serve on the State central committee, or they serve on a ward or precinct or district committee. They do not receive anything for their services, and they do not expect to; but they care enough about the principles and about the candidates of their party to devote much energy, many hours, and, yes, a lot of their own money, to working for the attainment of their objectives. They are politicians.

In the assembly sessions which you have attended I am sure that you have learned much. As true representatives of your respective clubs, it will now be your responsibility to report back to those whom you represent. You have had an opportunity to see our government from the inside actually.

Take back home the message that the government of Connecticut is well conducted, and that it is conducted as the people want it to be, as expressed in their mandate to parties and to candidates every election.

Take back the message that the science and art of government demand skilled and talented practitioners, just as every other science, art, or craft demands, and that these are politicians. Groom yourself, and influence your fellow club members at home, to take an eager interest in government—local, State, and Federal—even at your present age, and continue and develop it when you are able to become voters.

Do not be afraid or ashamed to be a politician. Being a politician is also being a patriot; and the more politicians we have—the more sincere, interested, and experienced men and women in politics—the better our politics will be, which is just another way of saying the better our government will be.

Welfare and Pension Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement issued by AFL–CIO President George Meany with reference to an investigation by the Subcommittee on Welfare and Pension Funds, in which he gives general support to the recommendations for disclosure, although making reservations on some minor points.

I think this is a very interesting and commendable statement, in view of the fact that the subcommittee took evidence indicating that there were some union plans which had been managed corruptly and others which had been managed inefficiently. I think this is an indication that the AFL–CIO will clean house, and also that it will push for constructive legislation.

Now that the AFL–CIO has taken action, I hope the insurance industry and the representatives of business and the banking interests, which were also subject to some criticism in the report, will take similar action, and that it will be possible to move speedily in the direction of sunlight in an area which badly needs sunlight.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY AFL-CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY

The Senate Subcommittee on Welfare and Pension Funds, under the chairmanship of Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, deserves commendation for the impartial and objective manner in which it has conducted its investigation of problems arising out of the administration of welfare and pension plans, and for the fair, constructive, and informative character of its final report.

The information and material contained in the report will be a valuable aid to efforts, such as those of the AFL–CIO and its affiliated unions, to assure that the funds involved in these plans are conserved and employed in the most effective manner for the sole benefit of employees and their families.

While strongly condemning the acts of corrupt individuals, the Douglas subcommittee's report goes deeper and points to some of the underlying conditions, such as certain practices of the commercial insurance industry and the laxity of State regulatory bodies in supervising ommercial carriers and agents, which have opened the way for the development of abuses. This represents a constructive approach which has been largely lacking in previous investigations. Punitive action against corrupt individuals, while necessary and desirable, is not likely to serve as a permanent deterrent unless these underlying conditions are also corrected.

While certain of the conclusions and recommendations, and particularly the suggestion of the Securities and Exchange Commission as the appropriate agency for the administration of a disclosure law of the type proposed, are subject to serious question, we are in agreement with the main features of the report. The AFL-CIO strongly advocates and will strongly support legislation designed to bring about full disclosure of the financial operations and transactions of all types of welfare and pension plans, whether administered jointly or unilaterally. With the aforementioned exception, the standards for such legislation recommended in the subcommittee's report appear to meet the criteria spelled out by the AFL-CIO merger convention, though final judgment must be withheld pending the introduction of an actual bill to give effect to the recommendations.

The bill (S. 3051) introduced on behalf of the administration earlier this year, on the other hand, falls short of our objectives, in that it would give the Secretary of Labor excessive discretion to exempt favored corporations or groups, and to otherwise weaken or water down the reporting and disclosure requirement.

We strongly urge the Congress to act promptly upon the recommendations of the Douglas subcommittee, and to enact an adequate disclosure law during the present session.

Statistical Record of the Passport Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the Passport Office has just released some impressive statistics which support the contention of many Members of Congress that it is one of the hardest working and most effective services in the Federal Government.

It is less than a year since Miss Frances G. Knight took office as the Director of the Passport Office and appeared before the House Appropriations Committee to request funds to refurbish, reorganize, and modernize an office which for years had been sadly neglected.

Miss Knight managed to cut through bureaucratic redtape and interference, and, with the support of Congress, moved the Passport Office from an antiquated building to new, modern quarters. It is now housed in an air-conditioned building with adequate space for its files, records, and equipment. Miss Knight established a Washington Passport Agency which handles applications from the Washington area in the same manner in which applications are handled by the Passport Agencies maintained in New York, Chicago, Boston, San Francisco, and New Orleans.

With the assistance of the General Services Administration, the Civil Service Commission and the General Accounting Office, Miss Knight was able to revise filing procedures, establish modern records management, improve the format of instructions to the field, simplify brochures, application blanks and revise even the passport itself. This week, a new format for the United States passport has been issued. The description of the bearer is arranged in such a manner that there will be but 1 impression of the Department of State seal instead of 2. This, in addition to the fact that the number of pages in the passport has been reduced to make it possible to type passports on standard typewriters rather than the cumbersome flatbed machines heretofore used in this work, will reduce processing time.

With her determination to serve congressional offices, Miss Knight has persisted in her quest for more adequate telephone service and at long last, has been able to secure two lines set aside for congressional calls. The telephone congestion has been alleviated to some degree. Congressional offices calling on passports should ask for extensions 2228 or 2229.

Miss Knight promised to provide statistics on travel and other information in this field of interest to the travel

industry and to Members of Congress. In the midst of all the moving and reorganization, the battle for recognition, for funds, for understanding, the Passport Office has been industriously compiling statistics. They found that the volume of passports issued and renewed in the United States increased 240.3 percent in the past decade. In 1912 the Passport Office issued or renewed 21,719 passports; in 1922 this number increased to 137,551. In 1932 there were 153,218 passports issued or renewed; and in 1942, 129,985; in 1952, 395,337; and in 1955, a total of 528,009 passports were processed for use by American citizens leaving the United States.

I hope Miss Knight will long serve as Director of the Passport Office, and with the support of Congress, continue to improve and expand the services of that office.

I wish to include as part of my remarks the statistical record of the Passport Office:

PASSPORT OFFICE,
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D. C.

Statistics compiled by the Passport Office of the Department of State relative to passports issued and renewed indicate the following increases for periods in 1956 over 1955:

	Percent
First calendar quarter	8.8
January	6.7
February	11.2
March	8.4

Applications for passports received by the Passport Office indicate the following increases for periods in 1956 over 1955:

	Percent
First calendar quarter	13.3
January	19.5
February	22.9
March	3.5

The 4.5 percent difference between the first quarter percentage increase of 13.3 percent of passport applications received and the 8.8 percent first quarter increase in passports issued and renewed is largely due to persons submitting incomplete information on their applications.

The following statistics pertain to passports actually issued or renewed during January, February, and March 1956 according to (1) State of residence, (2) occupation, (3) citizenship, (4) destination, (5) object of travel, (6) mode of travel, (7) age of traveler, and (8) number of travelers.

The last item has been added because more than one person in a family can travel on a passport. It is subdivided into (a) number of military travelers, (b) number of military dependent travelers, (c) number of civilian Government tavelers, (d) number of all other travelers, and (e) total number of travelers. These statistics reflect the total number of persons traveling on passports issued and renewed for both official and unofficial purposes.

These statistics are based on information made available through passport applications. No adjustments have been made for persons changing their travel plans after receiving their passports.

Passport Office

	Total 1st quarter	January	February	March
1. State of residence:				
Alabama	1,121	356	351	414
Alaska	44	9	12	23
Arizona	678	173	214	291
Arkansas	619	217	169	233
California	19,615	4,684	6,226	8,705
Colorado	1,255	356	409	490
Connecticut	3,711	883	1,130	1,698
Delaware	445	100	168	177
District of Columbia	1,724	398	536	790
Florida	3,484	881	1,082	1,521
Georgia	1,598	520	484	594
Hawaii	74	32	33	9
Idaho	310	113	91	106
Illinois	8,386	2,020	2,586	3,780
Indiana	1,923	507	570	846
Iowa	1,097	332	345	420
Kansas	1,024	327	314	383
Kentucky	1,302	435	397	470
Louisiana	1,405	465	444	496
Maine	493	139	182	172
Maryland	2,277	620	751	906
Massachusetts	5,660	1,310	1,785	2,565
Michigan	4,970	1,166	1,558	2,246
Minnesota	2,246	589	754	903
Mississippi	561	216	142	203
Missouri	2,103	615	677	811
Montana	326	75	131	120
Nebraska	575	185	189	201
Nevada	232	68	89	75
New Hampshire	456	136	133	187
New Jersey	8,112	1,985	2,489	3,638
New Mexico	453	155	126	172
New York City	16,641	4,459	5,185	6,997
New York State	13,105	2,938	3,896	6,271
North Carolina	1,446	447	457	542
North Dakota	263	70	88	105
Ohio	5,651	1,251	1,909	2,491
Oklahoma	1,415	487	396	532
Oregon	1,046	285	405	356
Pennsylvania	7,703	1,755	2,541	3,407
Puerto Rico	118	48	49	21
Rhode Island	840	156	237	447
South Carolina	685	223	212	250
South Dakota	209	73	63	73
Tennessee	1,301	367	389	545
Texas	5,270	1,611	1,646	2,013
Utah	616	186	178	252
Vermont	242	83	80	79
Virginia	2,236	704	634	898
Virgin Islands				
Washington	2,394	688	719	987
West Virginia	578	189	193	196
Wisconsin	2,257	507	758	992
Wyoming	183	66	56	61
Total	142,478	36,660	44,658	61,160
2. Occupation:				
Accountant	874	152	282	440
Actor-actress	312	82	97	133
Architect	289	80	82	107
Artist	483	148	139	196
Banker-broker	2,311	507	771	1,033
Barber-beautician	505	102	167	236
Buyer	519	153	177	189
Clerk-secretary	9,194	2,048	2,856	4,290
Contractor	964	267	311	386
Doctor-dentist	2,167	507	700	960
Draftsman	2		1	1
Druggist	204	36	59	109
Engineer	4,363	1,276	1,389	1,698
Executive	4,117	1,214	1,210	1,693
Exporter-importer	679	211	211	257
Farmer-rancher	1,180	327	418	435
Florist	76	31	32	13
Housewife	43,785	12,241	13,346	18,198
Interior decorator	194	66	54	74
Laborer:				
Common	816	213	253	350
Skilled	2,009	769	610	630
Lawyer	1,475	360	497	618
Librarian	338	45	120	173
Manufacturer	1,162	295	393	474
Merchant	2,925	848	968	1,109
Military	4,341	1,912	1,661	768
Missionary	271	2	35	234
Musician	460	80	120	260
Nurse	1,541	298	568	675
Religious	1,447	411	480	556
Restaurateur	635	136	236	263
Retired	8,589	1,801	2,912	3,876
Salesman	2,528	664	810	1,054
Scientist	175	119	44	12
Servant				
Student	8,019	2,308	2,408	3,303
Teacher	4,582	955	1,309	2,318
Technician	2,196	906	760	530
Tradesman	522	295	176	51
Writer	752	328	222	202
Other or not stated	25,497	4,467	7,774	13,256
Total	142,478	36,660	44,658	61,160
3. Citizenship:				
Native born	101,673	28,423	31,831	41,419
Naturalized	40,805	8,237	12,827	19,741
Total	142,478	36,660	44,658	61,160
4. Destination:				
Czechoslovakia	123	28	40	55
Rumania	18	6	7	5
U. S. S. R.	22	4	12	6
Other Eastern Europe	3,002	578	941	1,483
Arab countries	976	337	323	316
Israel	986	265	298	423
Other Middle East	1,302	464	453	385
Australia and New Zealand	663	250	170	243
British Isles	10,674	2,309	3,266	5,099
Western Europe, tour	59,677	12,360	19,041	28,276
France	3,118	911	928	1,279
Germany	14,866	4,946	4,511	5,409
Italy	6,698	1,435	2,090	3,173
Other Western Europe	7,862	1,649	2,352	3,861
South America	7,454	2,721	2,331	2,402
Central America	3,461	1,075	1,164	1,222
Far East and Hong Kong	10,515	3,745	3,156	3,614
Africa	1,415	560	373	482
World tour	9,646	3,017	3,202	3,427
Total	142,478	36,660	44,658	61,160

Passport Office—Continued

	Total 1st quarter	January	February	March
5. Object of travel:				
Commercial business	12,319	3,482	3,523	5,314
Employment	4,055	1,237	1,293	1,525
Education	4,468	1,182	1,391	1,895
Health	590	108	229	253
Personal business	3,214	985	1,018	1,211
Pleasure	95,813	20,383	30,658	44,772
Religious	949	323	302	324
Scientific	1	1		
Civilian Government travel	1,337	617	546	174
Military travel	3,729	1,767	1,397	565
Military dependents	16,003	6,575	4,301	5,127
Total	142,478	36,660	44,658	61,160
6. Mode of travel:				
Air	58,565	15,614	18,187	24,764
Ship	63,452	12,718	20,644	30,090
Other or not stated	20,461	8,328	5,827	6,306
Total	142,478	36,660	44,658	61,160
7. Age:				
Over 76 years	1,613	292	532	789
60 to 76 years	30,524	6,269	9,944	14,311
50 to 59 years	27,712	6,228	8,652	12,832
40 to 49 years	22,327	5,643	6,927	9,757
30 to 39 years	25,501	7,660	8,025	9,816
20 to 29 years	26,735	8,406	8,115	10,214
Under 20 years	8,066	2,162	2,463	3,441
Total	142,478	36,660	44,658	61,160

	Total 1st quarter	January	February	March
8. Number of travelers:				
(a) Military travelers:				
Male	3,409	1,756	1,150	503
Female	353	11	252	90
Total	3,762	1,767	1,402	593
(b) Military dependent travelers:				
Male	11,752	4,785	2,931	4,036
Female	24,803	10,266	6,525	8,012
Total	36,555	15,051	9,456	12,048
(c) Civilian Government travelers:				
Male	1,041	472	426	143
Female	311	151	127	33
Total	1,352	623	553	176
(d) Other than official travelers:				
Male	66,577	16,213	20,771	29,593
Female	77,171	16,027	24,384	36,760
Total	143,748	32,240	45,155	66,353
(e) Total number of travelers:				
Male	82,779	23,226	25,278	34,275
Female	102,638	26,455	31,288	44,895
Total	185,417	49,681	56,566	79,170

The Role of Agriculture in National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Mr. C. H. Russell, the editor of the Mankato Free Press, of Mankato, Minn., on April 10, 1956, contributed a column concerning the tremendous role of agriculture in the perspective of our national-defense effort. I ask unanimous consent to insert this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Sometimes it seems to us that the farmer himself, the farm bloc in Congress, the several nationwide organizations which represent the farmer, all have done a poor job in selling the rest of the Nation on the simply magnificent job that the farmer has done in making agriculture the efficient, productive, modern industry that it is today. Also of the tremendously important part that particular industry plays in our national defense.

These thoughts are prompted by the comment of an eastern journalist the other day, that the proposed soil bank program now before Congress is "just another subsidy for the farmer."

The three words that are wholly wrong in that comment are "for the farmer." The soil bank, price supports, all of the other aids the farmer has received, to stabilize prices and keep his industry productive and efficient, have benefited the Nation at large far more than they have benefited the farmer personally.

As we said before, our agricultural industry is one of our strongest bulwarks for national defense. Other nations do not fear us nearly so much because of our strength in atomic weapons as they do because of our productive strength in the waging of prolonged warfare. That is the strength which has won the last two global conflicts—the productive capacity and the staying power of the United States.

We could not have furnished that power without our gigantic and efficient industrial plant. But we could not have manned and operated that industrial plant without an equally modern and efficient agricultural industry backing it up.

Back in 1850, 2 out of every 3 people in this Nation lived on farms. And from their operations they produced one-third of the Nation's total output of goods and services. Many backward nations today occupy a position comparable to ours in 1850. Russia has progressed somewhat beyond that stage, but she still has a long way to go. That is why neither she, nor most of her satellites, have the staying power to wage prolonged war. And they know it.

In this Nation today less than one-seventh of our population live on farms. That compares with two-thirds in 1850. Today the farmer's production accounts for only one-seventeenth of our gross national product, whereas back in 1850 it was one-third. So people are inclined to say, "Look how industry has progressed in this Nation." The point is, industry could not have progressed as it has, had not the farmer become so efficient in his production, that he released millions of workers to man factories and operate machines. The farm had to become efficient and highly productive before our gigantic industrial plant could be built.

Back in 1850 we used 12½ acres of land per capita of population to supply our agricultural needs. Of this 5 acres per capita was harvested cropland. Today we use 7 acres of farmland per capita, of which 2 acres is harvested cropland. Still we have more food and fiber than we can either consume or give away.

Our agricultural productivity and efficiency is the marvel and envy of the rest of the world—and it is, as we have said, one of the most vital bulwarks of our national defense.

Now to get back to our journalistic friend's jibe about subsidies: What has the farmer done with the income and the modest prosperity which he has enjoyed over the past decade and a half or so?

Drive out across our own county, or almost any other county in the Midwest, where the bulk of the Nation's foodstuffs is raised, and you will see. Our agricultural plant was never stronger or in better shape. Fields are heavily fertilized, tremendously productive. Lowlands have been tiled out; buildings are in good paint and repair; machinery in most instances is adequate and modern; farms are not only well stocked but herds have been planned so they will continue productive far into the future.

That is where the farmer's so-called subsidies have gone. They have gone into sound investments in an industry which is absolutely indispensable to all of the rest of us. It reminds us of a story that is told about the late William G. McAdoo when he was Secretary of the Treasury during World War I. Some of the eggheads and theorists of that era had needled McAdoo to draft wealth just as you are drafting manpower. The Treasury head was reported to be impressed. A Wall Street figure of the day by the name of Barron, who was also the publisher of a market review service, journeyed to Washington to argue with the Secretary on the point. Barron was a fabulous character, weighing some 300 pounds; so heavy he had a baggage car, with a broad side door, through which he could pass, built over as a private car in which he traveled. In this car he met and conferred with McAdoo.

"Look, Mr. Secretary," he is reported to have said. "Suppose Rockefeller makes 20 million a year. He can only sleep in 1 bed at night, wear 1 suit of clothes a day, eat 3 meals. At most he couldn't possibly spend a million a year, and much of that would go as wages to people who would be jobless otherwise. What does he do with the other 19 million? He invests it in oil wells, railroads, heavy industries, which will all add to the productivity of the Nation. Who do you think is better able to spend that 19 million for the good of the Nation—Rockefeller and his aids, or the Members of Congress?"

McAdoo was convinced—he did not attempt to draft wealth. That part of the argument, about where the money goes, applies to the farmer today, just as it did to Rockefeller. What the farmer gets as a soil bank subsidy, or any other form of subsidy, or added income, he pours right back into providing this Nation with a more productive, a more efficient, a stronger agricultural industry.

And these are investments which benefit all of us; which make our economy stronger and our defense potential infinitely greater.

Address by Hon. Herbert H. Lehman Before the Albert Einstein College of Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered at the award dinner of the Albert Einstein College of Medicine, in New York City, on April 17, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN AT AWARD DINNER OF THE ALBERT EINSTEIN COLLEGE OF MEDICINE, APRIL 17, 1956, WALDORF-ASTORIA, NEW YORK

I am grateful for your award. I am honored, greatly honored, to be included in the company of Carl Sandburg, Dr. Stanley Cobb, and Dr. John von Neumann in receiving this recognition from the Albert Einstein College of Medicine.

Carl Sandburg and these two brilliant scientists have enriched mankind's heritage in a way and degree that no political figure possibly can. The contributions of these men will be remembered and utilized long after the political chronicles of these times have been relegated to the archives of oblivion.

To be honored in the name and in the memory of that towering figure of the ages, Albert Einstein, makes me feel humble, and thankful, indeed.

There is a man who lent luster not only to his adopted country, America, but to all humanity. Our entire epoch will one day cite Albert Einstein as one of its chief claims to immortality. There was a mind—and a soul—which soars above our time, like an eagle over the distant terrain below.

This College of Medicine of Yeshiva University, under whose auspices we meet tonight, is richly endowed with Albert Einstein's name alone. The finest hope I can express for this college is that it will never cease to be animated by the spirit and ideals of Albert Einstein. If that hope be realized—and I am confident it will—this college will repay in full measure all the efforts and sacrifices that have gone, and must continue to go, into its creation and growth.

What nobler enterprise is there, what finer way to carry on in the spirit of Albert Einstein, than to provide this facility, this college, for the training of young men and women in the twin pursuits of medical research and medical practice. And here, I am proud to note, under the aegis of the Jewish tradition, the scientific spirit is to be given free rein and scope, "on the principle," in Albert Einstein's words, "that the desire for truth must take precedence over all other desires."

In these words Albert Einstein wrote what could be the inscription on the foundation stone of this college.

The search for truth is a sacred quest whose inviolability must be recognized by any society which aspires to the ways of freedom. It is the hallmark of a mature society which has a true faith in freedom.

I accept your citizenship award, hoping that I have indeed contributed in some small measure to the struggle for freedom in our beloved country, against the encroachments of those men, to be found in every time, who view every unorthodoxy as heresy, and whose answer to heresy is repression.

Against these forces I have fought in these recent years, as during all the years of my life, with such strength as I have had. And if my efforts have served any purpose, it has been to help sound the alarm for the mobilization of those legions of Americans who, loving freedom, have been aroused to defend it.

We have had some measure of success. The worst assaults have been beaten off. The chief vigilante of them all, Senator MCCARTHY, has been, at least temporarily, unhorsed. The hobgoblins of fear with which he frightened the people and made America the object of ridicule throughout the world have been exposed for the penny-show effigies that they were.

The junior Senator from Wisconsin, for the moment, preaching to unhearing ears the doctrines of fear, danger, and hate which, only 2 years ago, commanded the breathless attention of the Nation and the world.

I have emphasized the phrase "for the moment." I have done so because I do not share the confidence of some that the danger of McCarthyism is past.

Indeed, I think it still hovers over us. It may take another form and pass under another name; while the sickness in our national soul which permitted McCarthyism to rage so violently has apparently been arrested, I doubt whether it has been completely cured.

I am reminded of the prophetic words of the late Huey Long, when asked whether the United States could be swept by facism. He was an intellectual cynic: he said it could happen, but in America it would be called antifascism. He was wrong only in terminology. In fact, when it came, it was falsely called anticommunism. Next time, if and when it comes, it will probably be called something else again.

No, the danger is not over and the damage has not yet been undone.

The stigmata of the basic illness remain with us. The climate of apprehension is much milder now but it still can be felt in the schools, in the Government service, and in the general body politic. The teacher, the public figure, or the Government servant must still think twice before he makes an appointment, writes a letter, buys a book, discusses an idea, or makes a speech or statement. He must weigh and consider how this activity could be made to look in its worst light, how it could be made to sound in the mouth of a McCarthy, or before a congressional investigating committee.

Public men must still take frequent public oaths of hatred for communism, as though such hatred required public affirmation in order to give assurance of loyalty to America.

And we still have the unedifying spectacle of congressional committees touring the country inquiring into the individual beliefs and long-past associations of private citizens.

It was only a few months ago that a most unfortunate attempt to intimidate a great newspaper, the New York Times, was to be discerned in one of the investigations conducted by the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security.

The stage and screen have continued to be exposed to sporadic attacks, and the blacklist is still a reality in the entertainment world.

Finally, the Government security program, perhaps at a somewhat slower pace than before, continues to claim its innocent victims, although the numbers game, which Attorney General Brownell enjoyed so much at one time, is no longer as popular as it was.

No; freedom's banners can scarcely be said to fly at full mast in our country yet. We have much to do, much wreckage to repair, and many battles still to win, before we can claim that we are even at the point from which we came a scant few years ago.

Nor must we forget that the struggle for human freedom is one which must be continuously pressed forward to new victories and new advances. To do otherwise is to lose ground in a world which is in irresistible motion, where standing still results, in effect, in moving backward.

Albert Einstein said: "Laws alone cannot secure freedom of expression; in order that every man may present his views without penalty, there must be a spirit of toleration in the entire population. Such an ideal of external liberty can never be fully attained but must be sought unremittingly if scientific thought, and philosophical and creative thinking in general are to be advanced as far as possible."

Today, while facing the imperative duty of pressing onward to regain lost ground in the field of civil liberties we are presented with a fresh challenge in the field of civil rights.

I am proud and glad to take note that in this college, students are selected entirely on the basis of individual need and merit, without regard to race, creed or color.

The application of this rule to our entire society is the problem with which we must now grapple with all our might.

This problem weighs upon us today with the accumulated force of generations of injustice. Today we are being asked—no, we are directed—to eradicate the evil practices of the past and to make a prompt start upon this heavy task.

The immediate problem is legally enforced segregation in the public schools, but looming behind this one are others—the denial of the right to vote, the denial of equal opportunity in employment, and the denial of the equal protection of law against physical violence. And finally there is the overall, the basic, problem—the eradication of the assumption that race, creed, color, or place of national origin is per se a warrant of superiority for some and a badge of inferiority for others.

These problems demand, in one degree or another, our immediate concern, attention and action.

The denial of basic human rights to some, based on race, can no longer be tolerated. It will no longer be tolerated. The victims of discrimination, disenfranchisement and unequal justice are no longer content to wait for the gradual rusting away of their chains. And the conscience of America, in this respect, can no longer withstand the pitiless inspection of mankind two-thirds of which consists of peoples of colored races.

While the denial of basic rights and the repression of people on the basis of their race is concentrated in its most acute forms in some parts of the South, the larger problem is common to every part of our country.

We, in the North, while urging and requiring a forward movement on these fronts in the South, have our own movement to make, to eradicate the practices of discrimination in our own part of the country—and the existence of prejudice in our own hearts and minds, whether the victims of such discrimination and prejudice are Negroes or Puerto Ricans or Jews or Catholics or just foreigners.

We have our own backyards to clean up, even as we continue, as we must, to lend our force to the tide which is sweeping back the barriers of legal discrimination in the South.

Nor should we forget in this cleanup of discriminatory practices and prejudicial actions and attitudes, the McCarran-Walter Act. There is an area which falsely reflects and distorts the spirit of America. We cannot rest until the national origins quota system—that shameful codification

of the mythology of Nordic superiority—is expunged completely from the laws of our land.

The tasks confronting us are difficult, weighted with practical problems of the greatest complexity.

In every direction there is a new challenge, a tangled array of almost insuperable difficulties.

We must not seek to escape from this troubled prospect by passing the responsibility to others, or by contenting ourselves with the pious hope that time will bring easy solutions. There are no easy solutions.

This is the responsibility of every man. Each one of us shares in that responsibility. Each one of us has a part to play in the drama of these critical days.

We must catch up, in our human relationships, with the seven-league advances of science in the field of communication, movement and destruction.

We must do battle for freedom and justice now for everybody, or we will awake to find them gone for everybody.

I have faith. I have hope. I believe that the purposes we serve will prevail. God willing, we will not fail.

Washington Trends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Washington Trends," published in Newsweek for April 23, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON TRENDS

A SOUTHERN BOLT?

Call it whistling in the dark or not, but Democratic leaders are saying the South won't bolt the ticket in 1956.

Party strategists, northern and southern, are convinced they can stop any dangerous Dixiecrat movement this year—and prevent a repeat of the 1948 split at their national convention.

CHICAGO FORECAST

This is what they think will happen at Chicago:

The platform committee will adopt a civil-rights plank defending the Supreme Court's school-desegregation decision and expressing the hope that it will be enforced with deliberate speed.

Southern representatives on the platform committee will file a minority report holding that the Supreme Court exceeded its authority in the school decision.

The majority plank will be adopted by the convention, and the southerners, having made their protest, will abide by the convention's decision.

THURMOND AGAIN?

The only Southern State in which there is any enthusiasm for another convention walkout and another third-party movement is South Carolina.

Senator Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina, was largely responsible for the pro-segregation manifesto signed by most southern Members of the House and Senate. However, he has lost his forum by retiring from the Senate.

At a recent meeting of the South Carolina State Democratic Committee, it was decided to sound out other Dixie States to find out how much third-party sentiment could be enlisted.

There has been no response to these feelers.

APPEAL FROM GEORGIA

In a little-noticed speech this month, Gov. Marvin Griffin, of Georgia, a Herman Talmadge man, definitely announced his opposition to a Dixiecrat splintering. He said: "Georgia's best hope lies within the Democratic Party."

This is the position also taken either positively or passively by party leaders in North Carolina, Florida, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Louisiana.

JOHNSON'S ROLE

Several southern delegations probably will back Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, for the presidential nomination and accept his moderate leadership on the convention floor.

There seems to be slight doubt that JOHNSON, with the backing of Speaker SAM RAYBURN of the House, will become chairman of the big Texas delegation and the State's favorite-son presidential candidate.

All this could be upset by a bitter fight at the tag end of this congressional session over civil-rights legislation. But this isn't likely.

In fact, the odds are against any final action on the administration's civil-rights program. The House may pass it, but it won't get by the Senate.

THE POLL-TAX ISSUE

What the Senate probably will do is push through a proposed constitutional amendment outlawing the payment of poll taxes as a qualification for voting. If enacted, this would affect four Southern States.

The poll-tax amendment is not a fighting issue to most southern Representatives and Senators. In fact, Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND, of Florida, is one of the sponsors.

The fact is that administration Republicans aren't any more anxious than the Democrats to stir up any kind of a big civil-rights row in this election year.

The President is a moderate in this area and feels that the Republican Party shouldn't play politics with it.

Moreover, some of his political advisers, notably Fred Seaton and Howard Pyle of the White House staff, still think the President has a good chance of carrying several Southern States.

Winning Essay by Janice Johnson in 4–H Club Radio Public Speaking Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, each year the Minnesota Jewish Council sponsors a 4–H Club radio public speaking contest. For its sponsorship of this contest in 1955, the council was awarded the George Washington Honor Medal by the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa., "for outstanding achievement in bringing about a better understanding of the American way of life."

This year 931 boys and girls participated in the contest. The first-place winner was Janice Johnson, of Roseau County, Minn., and the second-place winner was Julie Gerber, of Big Stone County, Minn. I ask unanimous consent to have these two State championship addresses inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT CAN I DO TODAY TO MAKE THE WORLD BETTER TOMORROW?

(By Janice Johnson, Roseau County, Minn.)

A short time ago, I heard of a boy in our community who had quit high school and gone to a nearby city to work. He had been there only a short time when he was approached by a gang of older boys who were known juvenile delinquents. They wanted this boy to join them. That weekend he went home and confessed the problem to his parents and later his pastor. With their help he made the right decision. He decided to go back to school and take a trade course later so that he could get a good job.

This boy's decision is one we all must sometime face, in varied forms. It is the decision whether or not we are going to do our part to leave the world a better place than we found it, or do our part to add to the wrongs and suffering already present.

As youth, you and I have the best opportunity to shape tomorrow's world. We are the future planners, the voters, and the leaders of our country. The poet William Wordsworth once said, "The child is father of the man." By this he meant that the things we do, good and bad, as children will be the basis of our adult life. What we are as youth today will be what we are as adults tomorrow.

As young people, as teenagers, you and I must now start to build the foundation of tomorrow's world. It must be a strong foundation, and I see it as one having four cornerstones. These cornerstones are areas where we can all develop our citizenship. First of all, you and I must learn, secondly, we must teach others what we have learned, third, we must be willing to work, and fourth, we must believe. Never, in our country, have young people had a better chance to learn. The Government provides schools for everyone regardless of race or creed. There are good teachers and facilities to aid us in obtaining knowledge. Yet, some of us fail to take advantage of this. Many young people quit school or refuse to apply themselves while there. It is wrong to take an education for granted. Knowing about the world and its people is the only way that we can help solve its problems.

When I am in school, it is my duty to apply myself. I must study our country's Government, the responsibilities that I, as a citizen have, and the problems of the world in general. However, it is not only in school that I can learn. All the organizations that I join, such as our own 4–H clubs, all the things in which I participate, will teach me valuable lessons in getting along with people and accepting responsibilities. It is important, though, that we do not concentrate only on our community and country. The United States is a part of the world, and problems of the world will affect this country. It is also my job to combat prejudice by realizing that other people's ideology is just as good as mine. I can learn by study and observation, but my knowledge is worthless unless I put it to use by passing it on to others.

So we come to the second cornerstone of tomorrow's world's foundation. As young people learn they must be willing to teach others. If I learn the duties of a good citizen and practice them myself, I must also tell others about them. Too many Americans, young and old, take our democracy for

granted. How many people think how grand it is to be allowed to speak, to worship, and to act as we want? Do all of us remember the blood shed by our forefathers that gave us these rights? It is my duty, as it is everyone's duty, to teach youngsters the meaning of citizenship, and to teach it to anyone who may not know the import of being a freeman. As much as I can, it is my task to teach that prejudice of race and religion is wrong—to show that we live in an enlightened world where people of all classes and races have done great things for humanity. Teaching takes in such things as speaking publicly for what I believe is right. It means informing people of this and other countries the necessity of working together for world peace.

We have now reached the third cornerstone. You and I must be willing to work. Right now many young people are helping their communities by serving on councils, taking part in exchange programs, working in the churches, and serving as hospital aids. But remember this, it is not necessary to lead a group to be useful.

I can be very useful, for instance, in my own home. Obeying my parents, who have had much more experience than I, and cooperating at home to make my family more harmonious, is an example of how I, as a teenager, can work for world betterment. I realize that everyone cannot be a leader, but I think that everything one does to create harmony in his own group will help him in adult life. If everyone worked for the mutual good of everyone else, there would be no world problems.

At last we come to the fourth cornerstone of tomorrow's world. It is the stone of believing; believing in God and in our fellow men. The Pilgrims had belief and faith when they left England to brave this new land. Our forefathers had a belief in their hearts in 1776, and all through the years Americans have had a belief that freedom will triumph. I must have this same belief to further the belief of those around me. If I, as a person, and we all, as individuals, believe in the truths of freedom and cooperation, the world will become a better place.

When you and I, today's youth, have placed the cornerstones of learning, teaching, working, and believing, on the foundation of tomorrow's world, and I have done my part in helping, I will know that I have done my best to make the world of today a better place tomorrow.

What Can I Do Today To Make the World Better Tomorrow?

(By Julie Gerber, Big Stone County, Minn.)

Do you remember the story of the little boy who sat down on the steps of his cottage and looked across the valley each evening at sundown? He saw shining golden windows. They were so beautiful that he longed to touch them. One evening his longing became so great that he started to walk to the golden windows. It was cold and dark, and the way was strange but his dream of seeing the great splendor gave him courage to keep on. When the dawn came, he had crossed the valley. But the golden windows were not there. The houses that he saw there were as humble as his own. He sank down to rest, weary and disappointed. But then as he glanced across the valley, he saw the rising sun reflected on the windows of his own home. There were the golden windows.

Our golden windows—a better world tomorrow—can be found in our homes too. The world which we hope for, for the future must begin in our homes today.

I must assume in my home, the same responsibilities that I will need to have in adult society. I am learning to take care of myself and to share in the duties of family living. At one time, even my personal care was something for my mother to do. Now, I not only have health and good grooming habits, but I share in the cleaning, cooking, and gardening as well as the planning and entertaining my family does and the recreation we have. I think my sense of responsibility will grow until I am independent. I recognize the obligation I have to my parents and brothers and sisters in family living. In the world of tomorrow, I will be able to recognize and fulfill my obligations to society.

A successful family has to work together. When I have something to do at school I know that my chickens will be taken care of when I get home. We are always filling in for each other. It will not be hard in the world of tomorrow to cooperate with other people.

One of the sure things of family life is how they knock off the rough edges by teasing and finding fault. I don't suppose I'll ever be among people who are quite so frank as my family. Nor would I speak so frankly to someone besides those I love. This is the best way to learn to live with other people.

Duty, work, and responsibility are not all there is to a better world. There is also appreciation. When a family goes camping together, watches birds and enjoys the beauties of nature, they gain richer lives. I know that because I appreciate this beautiful world, I will always want it to be beautiful for those who come after me.

There is no limit to what a family can do to understand the world in which we live. You remember that before the little boy recognized the golden windows of his own home, he admired those across the valley. A few years ago, we shared our home, pleasures, and duties with Riitta, an IFYE delegate from Finland. Last year we entertained Henery, a high school exchange student from Germany for a while. We got to know Marie from Mexico. Henie, from Switzerland, a fellow student in my history class is an exchange student being sponsored by my hometown. This direct personal approach to someone different from one's self lessens differences and increases the understanding. I believe that the interest my home has in people from other lands will teach me tolerance and develop a feeling of oneness with those we often call strangers now.

A habit of public service is formed when a family works together by active participation in a 4–H club, in church work, or other organizations. I will be able to work with the organizations of government and society because it has become a habit as I am growing up.

A family that worships together gives the individual a lasting and unquestioning spiritual strength. With this I will have courage to stand by my convictions and to fight for the right as I see it.

The golden windows—A better world tomorrow is formed within my home today. I am learning to be independent and to share work and responsibilities with others.

I am cooperating with other people and living happily with them. By developing appreciation for this beautiful world I am increasing my determination to conserve it for others. I am increasing my understanding and enlarging my interest by associating with people "Across the valley." I am developing a habit of public service and a lasting, unquestioning spiritual strength.

The golden windows are not found by marching off across the valley all alone, but by clasping hands with those we love and so enlarging the circle of our concern until it embraces mankind. When we can enlarge our family living into world living with the same understanding, the world tomorrow will be better.

Financing Our Highway System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the question of financing our highway system is giving all three levels of government great concern.

We all know that our present road system is inadequate. In fact, the roads we have at the present time are what we should have had 10 years ago.

A very able editorial on the subject, entitled "Dividing the Responsibility," appeared in the Washington Reporter, of Washington, Pa., under date of Wednesday, April 11, and I ask unanimous consent the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIVIDING THE RESPONSIBILITY

Governments—local, State, and Federal—ultimately decide how our highway needs should be met. One of the first questions about highway policy that has to be answered is how the responsibility for the Nation's highway system should be divided, particularly between the Federal Government on the one hand and State and local governments on the other.

Traditionally highway construction and financing have been very largely a State and local responsibility. The committee believes they should continue to be so. In general, smaller government units are better able than larger ones to measure the benefits from road improvements within their borders.

At the same time the committee believes that there is a place for Federal Government participation in highway policy. Many of the benefits of highway improvement are of a type which only the Federal Government can take account of. It would be too much, for example, to expect the States to take into account the benefits to national defense of a given road project and on these grounds to increase its highway expenditure. National defense is the concern of the Federal Government. So, under the Constitution, is the promotion of interstate commerce, and this is another important benefit of an adequate highway system.

Furthermore, there is a danger that States and local governments, planning their road construction, will give insufficient weight to the needs of interstate traffic. Unless a State can impose a toll, which is not usually the case, it may have difficulty in levying charges that will cover the costs of roads that are heavily used by motorists from outside of the State. This is particularly true of the high-speed, limited access, multiple lane-divided highways, which yield huge benefits in time and running costs saved and which reduce accidents, but which are expansive to construct.

Finally, there is a need to coordinate all the State and local highway programs so that they result in a logical national network. This function is performed by the Federal Bureau of Public Roads.

For the most part, these justifications for Federal participation in highway policy apply only to one segment of the highway system—to the Interstate System. But the

Interstate System, including as it does most major urban connections and bypasses, contains just the roads where improvements and new construction are most urgently needed. Secondary and rural roads, while still far less adequate than those who use these roads would like, are not suffering from congestion.

Of the $875 million which the Federal Government was authorized to spend in fiscal year 1955–56 on highways, only $175 million was earmarked for the Interstate System. With this money the Government may assume up to 60 percent of the costs of improvement projects on the Interstate System. The other $700 million is available on a 50–50 matching basis for improvements on the primary and secondary Federal-aid systems.

In view of the reasons which justify Federal participation in highway policy, and in view of the fact that the most serious deficiencies in our highway system are to be found on the Interstate System, the committee believes the present emphasis in Federal financing for highways is wrong and should be corrected. The committee recommends that any increase in Federal finance for highways should be applied exclusively to the Interstate System.

Furthermore, the committee recommends that the Federal Government be authorized to assume more than 60 percent of the costs of improvements on the Interstate System. A Federal share up to 80 percent would assure rapid improvement on the Interstate System.

The current $700 million in annual grants from the Federal Government for other roads and streets should at least not be increased.

Finally, Federal responsibility in highway policy should be confined strictly to financial aid, to collaboration with State highway departments on the location of interstate routes, to the establishment of minimum construction standards on Federal-aided roads, and to the testing and development of new road construction methods and materials. All actual construction, maintenance, and policing should continue as State functions.

Friends of the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Friends of the Farmer," published in the Christian Science Monitor of April 18, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRIENDS OF THE FARMER

Republicans and Democrats alike are making it difficult for the American farmer to determine who his friends are. When the Democratic leaders in Congress put through the farm bill they thought they had shown conclusively that their party wished to be more generous with farm aid. Some of them still feel that the President's veto will sharpen such an impression among many farmers.

But right now they are trying to get out from under the hot potato Mr. Eisenhower has tossel in their laps. Just how do they deal with his demand for early enactment of the soil-bank plan—which it is estimated could still put large sums in farmers' hands this year? Can they refuse the farmers this help simply because the President would not accept all the aid plans Congress put forward?

Congressional leaders may have thought they had got past the soil bank for this year—since few farmers could wait this long to see what Congress would do. Republicans have been pushing for action—fearing that this main feature of their aid program would be rendered useless by delay. But Mr. Eisenhower had an unexpected trump in his hand. He suggests now that under this plan "earnest money" (half the total soil-bank payment) could go to farmers this year who contract to take land out of production at their next planting period—fall or spring.

It is estimated that this ingenious plan for paying farmers before they begin "not to plant" could add $500 million to farm incomes this year. Combined with other big sums the administration can put in farmers' hands without any other new legislation, this amount could considerably blunt farm discontent. From a partisan standpoint it would be clever Democratic strategy to keep all discontents sharp. But can they afford to do so by withholding soil-bank aid? What kind of farmers' friends will that make them?

The Crazy Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Crazy Farm Bill," which appeared in the Washington Daily News of Friday, April 13, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CRAZY FARM BILL

If ever a bill cried out for veto, it is the so-called farm bill Congress has sent to the President's desk.

One of the best sum-ups comes from the president of the largest farm organization—Charles B. Shuman of the American Farm Bureau Federation. He hit it on the button when he said:

"The bill abandons any semblance of sound economic principles for the illusion of political gain."

Mr. Shuman went on to point out what everybody knows, even the politicians who voted for this Rube Goldberg absurdity—that the bill is a return to the discredited programs which created the horrendous glut and caused the recent-year downturn in farm prices.

This is a bill to hypnotize farmers until after the November election. That's its sole purpose. Whether it will accomplish this in any respect, and if so whether it will benefit Democrats or Republicans, is open to broad question.

But there is little doubt of the disservice it will do, not only in the long run to the subsidized farmers themselves, but to the overwhelming majority of nonsubsidized farmers, taxpayers, and consumers.

The bill restores the 90 percent parity system for wheat, cotton, corn, and peanuts for 1956. The Government, because of the past performance of this same rigid parity system, now is spending $1 million a day just to store the stuff.

It is the bill's intent to hike the prices of these commodities. If so, who will pay? On feed grains, those who raise cattle, hogs, and poultry will be the first to pay. They get no subsidies, but they will have to buy subsidized feed, and they pay taxes.

Next year, the bill would impose on wheat what Mr. Shuman calls a "three-price domestic dumping plan" in such fashion that the price of bread inevitably would rise.

The bill boosts the Federal subsidy on dairy products, forerunner to higher prices there.

The much-advertised soil-bank plan, originally intended to cut surpluses, has been so rigged that some farmers could retire their whole farms and get paid for not raising anything.

While the bill will hurt more than half the farmers directly, in increased prices for feed, it will hit all taxpayers—because it adds about $2 billion to the Government's outlay.

If it is a bill, as its backers intend, aimed at cadging the votes of a relative few on November 6, it also is a bill to dismay and alienate the lop-sided majority who are nonsubsidized farmers, consumers, and taxpayers.

It is utterly bad legislation, as Mr. Shuman puts it. On political, economic, and moral grounds, it fully commends itself to the Presidential veto.

Now Life Is Easier at Alcatraz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Now Life Is Easier at Alcatraz," written by Leonard Milliman, and published in the Bismarck Tribune. The article deals with some changes which have been made in Alcatraz prison.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHILE FAR FROM A BED OF ROSES, NOW LIFE IS EASIER AT ALCATRAZ

(By Leonard Milliman)

SAN FRANCISCO.—A cautious series of increased privileges for prisoners and stricter security measures has reduced violence on bloody Alcatraz. But there's no intention of abandoning the maximum security prison in the near future.

This was indicated to newsmen by Warden Paul J. Madigan in a rare mass tour of the Rock this week by reporters, photographers, and television cameramen. The Department of Justice invited them to make the visit in response to requests.

Although they live behind rose-colored bars only 1½ miles from San Francisco, life on the island in San Francisco Bay is no bed of roses for its 281 prisoners. They are the most dangerous, the most rebellious of convicts in all Federal prisons.

Major changes made over a period of 20 years include (1) permitting men to converse with their neighbors in cell blocks or at the dining table, (2) letting them see two movies a month, (3) letting them listen to the radio over earphones 3½ hours a night with a choice of 2 stations, and (4) reducing the workweek for those permitted industrial jobs from an 8-hour day 6 days a week to a 6½-hour day 5 days a week.

First of the changes, elimination of the silent system, followed the slugging of former Warden James A. Johnston as he walked through the dining room in a 1937 strike.

Security changes also followed waves of violence.

Since the 3-day battle of Alcatraz in May 1946, the most violent uprising on the island, mesh screens have protected the catwalks behind which gun guards watch the cell blocks in which inmates are locked at least 14 hours a day.

The battle was touched off when Bernard Paul Coy, a Louisville bank robber, scaled bars to the catwalk and pried them apart with a spreader made of stolen toilet connections. He slugged the guard and passed down his weapons to five companions. Before the battle was over, 5 men were killed and 15 wounded, mostly guards. Three convicts died in the battle and three later by execution.

The old model shop on the northwestern corner of the island has been turned into a storeroom. It was too easy to try to escape from there.

Among the new privileges, three safety razor blades are issued weekly to each inmate. Formerly he had a blade only long enough to shave; then it was taken away.

"If a man wants to kill himself," says the warden, "he'll kill himself."

Even after the changes, Madigan said, "discipline is strict, but not too rigid and not cruel. There are no trusties. Men are never out of sight of a guard. No one is allowed out of his cell at night. No one is paroled from Alcatraz.

But they do leave, normally after 5 years, by transfer to other prisons. This is contrary to the belief that the only way out of Alcatraz is in a coffin.

Alcatraz is a prison for troublemakers, all with long criminal and prison records, who couldn't get along in other Federal penitentiaries.

There's been a great deal of talk of abandoning it because of its location far away from the Nation's population center and the high cost of operation—$7.50 a day per man.

"We don't know whether we can get rid of Alcatraz, but we would like to," said G. Frederick Mullen, director of information of the Department of Justice.

Madigan added, "The need is still with us for a maximum security prison, as proved by the men we have here. So far as continuing Alcatraz as a prison, that is entirely up to Attorney General Brownell."

Mullen indicated its future would depend on the fate of a bill before Congress to appropriate $10½ million for a maximum security prison to be built somewhere in the Midwest.

Until another such prison is built, Madigan and Mullen agreed, there'll be Alcatraz, with a maximum of security and a minimum of privileges.

Recent Decisions of the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, a few days ago a very able editorial appeared in the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, entitled "We Dissent."

In order to keep the three branches of Government as intended by the Founding Fathers, it will be necessary for the legislative branch to give serious consideration to pressure from both of the other branches of our Government.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE DISSENT

Twice in a week, the United States Supreme Court has handed down decisions that invade State's rights.

In both cases, the Court cited the Federal Constitution to nullify a basic principle of the Union—the principle that "powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

On April 2, the Court ruled that State penal laws against subversive activities are unenforceable because Congress has preempted the field with Federal legislation.

This decision adversely affects the police powers of the States, which under the Constitution are definitely reserved to them.

On April 9, the Court overturned a decision of New York State's distinguished court of appeals and virtually repealed a section of New York City's charter relating to municipal officials and employees.

This decision, involving a dismissed college professor, diminishes the right of States and local governments to hire and fire within the terms of State or local law.

The decision not only does violence to the constitutional doctrine of States' rights—it also invaded the domain of education, which has always been deemed a State and local function.

Both decisions unquestionably give aid and comfort to Communists and their fellow travelers. But that is perhaps not the main point at issue.

The main point is that the Supreme Court, as now composed, has labored to set up by tortuous reasoning new doctrines which 4 of its 9 members dispute.

In the school case, a Brooklyn college professor refused to answer questions about communism before a committee of the United States Senate, pleading the fifth amendment.

The New York charter requires the dismissal of "any employee of the city" who "utilizes the privilege against self-incrimination to avoid answering a question relating to his official conduct."

On advice of the city's corporation counsel, the professor was dismissed summarily and went to court.

The New York Court of Appeals held that the professor had a right to invoke the fifth amendment to avoid self-incrimination—and for no other reason—but that the city was thereby bound to discharge him under its charter, which was really a condition of employment.

The United States Supreme Court has reversed that ruling.

The Court, however, actually rested its majority decision not on the 5th amendment but on the "due process of law" clause, which is a very different thing, appearing in the 14th amendment, and which, the New York court had found, did not apply.

Better law, in our lay belief, is expressed in the two dissents.

Justices Reed, Minton, and Burton said:

"In reliance upon the due process clause of our Constitution the Court strikes deep into the authority of New York to protect its local governmental institutions."

Justice Harlan sustained the New York Court of Appeals in holding that "the assertion of the privilege against self-incrimination" by a New York City employee "is equivalent to resignation."

Justice Harlan likewise implied that the Supereme Court, to reach its majority opinion, went beyond its jurisdiction. Respecting the fifth amendment, he said:

"On the record, I would affirm the decision of the court of appeals.

"A different question would be presented under the privileges and immunities clause of the 14th amendment. But that question was not raised below and is therefore not open here."

Veto Sustained

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Veto Sustained," published in the New York Times of April 19, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETO SUSTAINED

Since it had committed itself to the farm bill monstrosity that was to meet with a Presidential rejection, the House of Representatives had no choice yesterday but to go through the motions of trying to override the White House veto. The result, as it figured to be, was a touchingly depressing spectacle.

Many of the legislators who had voted for the bill originally in the belief that the President wouldn't dare risk a veto had had time to think things over and were in no mood to return to the fray. Also reversing their positions on the measure were those less than noble souls who had supported the bill knowing it to be a thoroughly vicious piece of legislation, in the expectation, or the hope, that the President would, to put it colloquially, "take them off the hook." The result was that in this recount the friends of what one of its critics has grimly described as the "ominous farm bill" not only didn't come within hailing distance of the two-thirds vote they needed; they failed to obtain even a majority, going down by the ignominious vote of 211 "against" to 202 "for."

The simple fact is that the political forces that had entered into a series of purely political alliances calculated to seize credit for rescuing the farmer from a plight that was partly of their own creation have not only been repulsed but now find themselves in a state of confusion. President Eisenhower has protested more than once that he isn't a politician. And we are sure that in the narrow meaning of that term is true. But too many people are inclined to forget that the present incumbent of the White House spent much of his life as a professional soldier and that he is a master of military strategy. And a military strategist can't afford to make many unconsidered moves. We would like to suggest that the recent clash over farm policy was an excellent example of what can happen when an assorted group of amateur strategists take on a professional.

If the President made any mistakes in basic strategy in this dramatic campaign over farm policy then we don't recall them. His position, in the first place, was impregnable from the standpoint of sound economic and social policy. Because he refused to be drawn into making bellicose gestures, the opposition mistook this as a sign of weakness. Before it realized it, perhaps, the opposition had become so intoxicated with this thought that it had concocted a bill so bad that the President not only had to veto it, but the public could clearly see why he had to veto it.

But in military strategy one must always have alternative plans prepared for any possible contingency. That is why Mr. Eisenhower not only was able to veto the farm bill and to make the public see why he had to do so, but to produce a program that he had prepared against just that possibility.

At the same time he has maneuvered Congress into the position where, if it is to justify all its fine talk about being the friend of the farmer, it must do its part by promptly passing the soil bank, which it has already advocated and voted for. Mr. Eisenhower has even stripped Congress of the feeble remonstrance that it is too late for the soil bank to be of use this year. He has proposed to insert a provision in the soil-bank bill under which the farmer who agrees to cooperate would receive half his payment as soon as he signed, or any time after July 1, this year.

Congress has continually harped on the importance of putting cash in the hands of the farmer this year (meaning before election). It is going to be a little difficult for it to explain its action if it refuses now to go along with this proposal of the President's, which could mean $500 million in additional purchasing power for the farmer in 1956.

Let's Stick to the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, when a man is elected to the post of governor of a State, the electorate expects him to hold the interests of his State above all else. We in New York State have a strange situation in this regard.

Governor Harriman stated early this week about the President's veto of the farm bill, that the veto marked a black day for the New York dairy farmer.

Actually, the facts of the matter point to a directly opposite conclusion. I am shocked that the governor of a great State like New York should make these intemperate remarks about an important segment of his State's population without looking into the facts of the matter and with complete disregard for the welfare of the farmers of his own State.

The figures illustrate plainly that the cost-price squeeze on New York farmers would have been greatly aggravated, had the crazy-quilt farm bill passed by this Congress been signed by the President. Under the terms of that bill, the dairy farmers of my State would have paid $32 million in increased feed costs to get approximately $2,650,000 in increased income from higher price supports on dairy products. If you subtract the $2,650,000 increased income from the threatened loss of $32 million, it is clear that the New York State farmer would be on the short end of the stick to the tune of nearly $30 million. Obviously, the President has done a great service to the farmers of my State by vetoing this bill.

The President has provided for increasing the income to New York farmers by the same $2,650,000 as in the vetoed bill by directing the Secretary of Agriculture to increase the support price on dairy products. But he has not saddled on them these added costs.

The facts of the matter are plain. The President has not only acted in the best interests of the whole country in vetoing the bill, but in particular his action has saved the farmers of my State a great deal of money.

Winning Essay by Miss Janet Bellin in Peace Essay Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I have recently received a copy of the award-winning essay in the Fifth National Lawrence S. Mayers Peace Essay Contest. The subject of the essay was the question: "During the Next 5 Years What Can I Do To Help Bring About Permanent World Peace?" The prize-winning essay was written by Miss Janet Bellin, of Stayton, Oreg. Miss Bellin was then a student at Stayton Union High School and subsequently entered the University of Oregon.

Mr. President, I think we can all be pleased and proud to see the kind of responsible and constructive thinking which the members of our younger generation are giving to the vital problems of peace and war. While we read much in the newspapers about more sensational juvenile activities, it is good to be reminded that other young people are giving thought to the problems of international relations which will continue to play a major role in forming their lives, as it does today.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Miss Bellin's prize-winning essay on the question propounded by the Fifth National Lawrence S. Mayers Peace Essay Contest.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SOLDIER'S QUESTION

My country said, "Go to war!"
I heard its cry.
I marched away and left my life behind—
I left to die.
Doubting Thomas, Denying Peter, that was I
But I didn't flee.
"Go to war!" my country said—
I went—to Gettysburg, to Iwo Jima and the rest.
I did not question what was best.
I went to war.

I had some boots, I had a gun, a ship, a tank, a plane.
I knew their strength—
Fighting in the frozen mud of Korea
I knew their strength.
In all ages past men have fought
Because they ought.
They fought for peace, for land, for rights.
I, too, for my country fought,
Because I ought.
His eyes were slanted, he did not know my face.
He and I make up the human race.
I killed him for my country said I must
He lay there, silent in the dust.
But still, I heard a cry that pierced and rent and tore,
"Why is there war?"
It reverberated from the hills,
Its echo roared—
"Why is there war?"
"Why is there war?"

—*Janet Bellin.*

MY QUESTION: DURING THE NEXT 5 YEARS, WHAT CAN I DO TO HELP BRING ABOUT PERMANENT WORLD PEACE?

I am an 18-year-old farm girl in a small town in Oregon. It is a logging community, and familiar to everyone's ear is the cry of "timber" and the sound of a powersaw snorting its way through the few remaining stands of second-growth fir and cottonwood. How hard it is for me to realize as I hoe in the warm sunshine and feel the firm, sandy soil beneath my feet that this tiny community is part of a clashing, struggling civilization that claws like a wild beast underneath while it clamors on the surface for world peace.

I have lived for 18 years on this earth. During that time my parents have provided me with food and shelter, love and affection; the opportunity to grow up and go to school in a free country. Teachers have taught me from books and opened new horizons of interest. Townspeople have invited me in for a cookie, attended school functions, and were interested in the fact that I was a child growing up. Now, after these years, the time has come for me to do what I can to make the world a better place for the children of tomorrow.

When I was in the fifth grade, Mrs. —— came to school one day. She had a flag with her. She stepped to the front of the room and as she unrolled the familiar Stars and Stripes, I wondered why she had saved this tattered, faded flag. "Boys and girls," she cleared her throat, her voice a bid unsteady as the room grew quiet, "Boys and girls, after my son was killed 4 years ago, I kept this flag which covered his grave. I'm leaving it here to fly above your school and I pray that none of you will ever have to be shiped home dead to your mother from a strange land where you died for your country. Take this flag * * *." She couldn't go on. She left the room crying. I had never seen Mrs. —— cry before. I'll never forget that moment. I have a twin brother, a boy friend, cousins, and friends. Mrs. ——'s son can only die once.

Next time, perhaps it will be me who stoops to remove a faded flag from a newly turned grave. In 18 years I have been taught to eat, to walk, to talk, to sing, to drive, and a thousand and one other things. But no one has ever taught me what to say in this moment when I ask myself, "What can I do during the next 5 years to promote permanent world peace?"

It does no good to look at the lives of famous people, living and dead, to see what they did to answer the question. They are not I and I am not they. This must be my own solution. However, the question is not mine alone. It belongs to every man, woman, and child everywhere. If each answered it not only in words, but in deeds, to the best of his ability there would be no such question for generations to come.

Next fall I plan to enter college. Surely there will I find an answer to my question. As a freshman, I haven't much choice of courses, but I ought to be able to squeeze in several hours a week for the study of international relations. Learning of the prob-

lems of coexistence is not the complete answer. A nationwide organization, the International Relations Club, might also help me to understand my question, even if it won't solve it. Perhaps if I major in political science, studying world politics, international law, European political theory, etc., and after finishing, find my place in one of today's international organizations, I will be doing my job.

It has been said that the people in countries across the sea have a strong dislike for the United States as a country. Part of these feelings are present through misunderstanding. By writing to a pen pal in Ireland, Japan, or another country, I would only be reaching one person, but at least I could tell that one person about this community where I live—so unlike the picture Communist countries paint of the extravagant, imperialistic United States of America.

Like most 18-year-old girls, I dream of some day having my own home and children—in some nice town, not too different from the place I live. If I were to be married next month how could I use my 5-year time allotment to help promote world peace? Instead of the garden club, and bridge club, and the numerous other societies which young wives of today find so attractive, I might join the town's United Nations Club, or if it didn't have one, start one. The American Association for the United Nations is very cooperative in helping such organizations to get on their feet. Such a group could study the U. N., raise money to help support its specialized agencies, provide milk and clothing for children in India and undertake countless other small projects. An even larger one could be sponsoring an exchange student or refugee.

By teaching my children to respect other people and their property, to control their tempers when in an argument, and to make every effort to get along with the other children of the neighborhood, I would be promoting peace—even if it were on a very small scale.

I hope to graduate from college and teach in Oregon schools. Here my peace promoting could operate on a slightly larger scale as I teach students the Golden Rule along with their other courses. In social studies classes, I could help them to explore the countries which make daily headlines in the American press. Here, though they were influenced by their parents' feelings, they could learn to broaden their opinions and their understanding through group discussion about these trouble spots. Sending pencils to Korean children, soap and washcloths to the children in Panama—these are projects that would help answer my question and would answer it for my students, too.

My question has been presented to me in another way. Jesus said, "Be ye kind one to another." As part of my Christian heritage I must do all that is in my power to promote world peace. Again, it is hard to find an answer to this question which is so overpowering. To what degree shall I give? How hard shall I try to answer it?

A missionary in the steamy jungles of Africa could promote permanent world peace. In 5 years I could complete missionary training and represent my church in a missionary field. I would have to provide not only spiritual help and translations of the teachings of Jesus Christ, but I would also have to be, in part, a medical adviser, a counselor, and a friend—an ambassador of the United States of America.

"More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of." Perhaps I am overlooking the closest, but most effective way of answering my question. How simple it would be for me to dedicate a few minutes a day to prayer for world peace. Who can tell what power those collected minutes could hold? In this way I would be fulfilling my Christian duty, my duty as a citizen of the United States, and my duty as a citizen of the world.

No one ever thinks he has enough money. No matter what he has, he always needs more. Although my future earnings will certainly never total a million dollars, a small percentage of them could help organizations that are the means by which the average citizen may contribute to possible peace. Agencies such as CARE, and specialized agencies of the U. N.—UNESCO and UNICEF, for example—spend dollars carefully, aiding the most people possible, helping them to become better educated, to be healthier and thus, enable them to better understand why world peace is the route to happier living for all mankind. Because I have visited the United Nations headquarters in New York and spent a week there studying its functions, I am convinced that promoting the U. N. is synonymous with promoting world peace.

I offer no solution for impressing upon people their duty to serve in this capacity. I have invented no secret weapon that will cause the world to "heel" at my command. All I have to offer is the minute bit of knowledge that I have acquired, plus my faith in God and the future.

It's up to me as an individual of this world, who has been lucky enough to attend school for 12 years, to send CARE packages, join the International Relations Club at college, study foreign affairs, write to a foreign pen pal, and be constantly on the lookout for new and more efficient ways to complete my task.

I pray that someday everyone will hear my question, answering it to the best of their ability, and, in some year to come, perhaps the soldier's question will be changed. As he puts aside his gun forever, he may look wonderingly at a comrade and ask in hushed tones, "Why is there peace?" The people who have answered my question will know.

The Real Betrayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Real Betrayers," published in the Wilmington Morning News of April 14, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REAL BETRAYERS

Former President Truman, of late, has been elbowing his way into the political limelight almost as frequently and somewhat more brashly than the announced candidates for the Democratic presidential nomination. This week, at a Jackson Day dinner, he lashed out at Mr. Eisenhower as a "do-nothing President," called his stand on farm legislation "one of the most amazing records of political betrayal I have ever seen," and said that the farmers could count on a depression every time they made the mistake of putting the Republicans in power.

This is demagoguery in the authentic and colorful Truman style, so full of exaggerations and distortions that it hardly deserves an answer. However, we suggest that if the farmers want to know who their real betrayers are they will find them in the ranks of those who are playing politics with their distress.

These are the politicians who offer the lure of high, rigid price supports, although these will simply pile up more unmanageable surpluses and add to the farmers' future woes. They are the members of the Democratic majorities in Congress who have deliberately loaded up the new farm bill with contradictory provisions in the hope of making the bill so bad that President Eisenhower would be forced to veto it. These men, despite their crocodile tears, are not half so much interested in farm relief as they are in using the farmers' genuine distress as a means of advancing their own political fortunes.

The Army's Keystone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of Congress the anniversary of one of the leading military facilities of the world. On May 7, 1956, the Command and General Staff College of the United States Army located at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., will be 75 years old. The part this school has played in America's heritage would fill volumes. From its beginning as the "School of Application for Infantry and Cavalry" in 1881, to the present day, the Command and General Staff College has gained the unsullied reputation of affording officers training which has paid great dividends in command, administrative, and logistical efficiency for our Armed Forces.

The college occupies a crucial position at the center of the Army education system. It is the first and only combined-arms school attended by any officer in his military career. At the same time, it is the last and highest level tactical school that he will attend.

As the only combined-arms school, the college is entrusted with educating the officer in the organization and operation of the combined-arms team. Here he finds the place of his branch in the Army at large. It is his first schooling in a college designed to accommodate all branches.

In addition, the college occupies a key position in the Army combat developments system, as it is responsible for the preparation of doctrinal concepts of present and future wars at division, corps, and army levels.

It is upon these doctrinal concepts and the combat tactics of the combined arms, which are developed at the Command and General Staff College, that the successful implementation of our war plans and, hence, the security of our Nation, depend.

George Washington said, "To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace."

I would like to quote the mission of the Command and General Staff College:

To prepare officers for duty as commanders and as general staff officers at division, corps, Army, and comparable levels in the communications zone.

To provide instruction in the light of war lessons and modern developments to ensure effective development and employment of

all field forces within the framework of the field Army and the communications zone; and the efficient administrative, intelligence, and logistical support of the fighting forces.

To review, formulate, and revise doctrine and provide for its incorporation in training literature and instructional material.

The Atchison Daily Globe, Atchison, Kans., on Monday, April 2, 1956, ably presents the thinking of the residents of Kansas toward this illustrious school. Mr. Al. Bennett is the editor of this outstanding newspaper. The Atchison Globe editorial merits the attention of all Members of Congress. The editorial follows:

THE ARMY'S KEYSTONE

The United States Army's Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth will be 75 years old on May 7, and northeast Kansas is proud to be its home. It is the senior tactical school of the Army, and the only school that teaches the tactics of all the combined arms and services in combat.

The Command and General Staff College has operated under various names since it came into being in 1881 when William Tecumseh Sherman, a Leavenworth lawyer and onetime legal associate of Abraham Lincoln, was chief of staff of the United States Army. It was known then as the School of Application for Infantry and Cavalry with 42 senior lieutenants and captains enrolled for a 2-year course in reading, writing, grammar, and arithmetic, as well as advanced subjects in military science.

From this beginning and through many reorganizations of the physical facilities and curriculum, more than 5,000 officers were graduated from the school prior to World War II. It was known at various times also as the School of the Line, General Staff School, Command and General Staff School, and finally Command and General Staff College.

During World War II, 27 classes turned out more than 18,000 student officers. Since then an accelerated program of training officers from allied countries gradually increased the enrollment of foreigners until this year more than 125 officers from 40 countries have attended courses at the college.

Present-day instruction is at the postgraduate level. Each year more than 2,000 officers of our Army, together with some from the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, and the armed forces of our allies, complete resident courses at the college. Another 11,500 students, most of whom are officers of the Army Reserve and National Guard, are enrolled in various phases of the nonresident program.

Winston Churchill once said: "One of the greatest miracles of this (World War II) conflict was the staff work of the worldwide forces of the United States. That so vast an undertaking could have been successfully prosecuted by so small a body of trained men is resounding tribute to the training of the United States military schools." The No. 1 military school in the United States is at Fort Leavenworth, worthy of high praise on its 75th anniversary.

Examination of National Banks

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 1188) to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the examination of national banks.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], has correctly stated the facts relating to this legislation. I most assuredly agree with him that this is a simple bill. There is nothing in it that could be considered earthshaking. It might well have been put on the Consent Calendar, except for the fact that in committee a request was made that a rule be asked for, and that was done.

May I, Mr. Chairman, emphasize one point that is important in this bill. The Comptroller of the Currency has found that it is not easy to develop and to keep an efficient corps of examiners. In view of the fact that this bill proposes that over a 2-year period there may be 3 examinations of some banks instead of 4, the Comptroller will have some latitude and he will be able to make better use of his work force. That is a telling argument and a very strong one in support of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I see no reason for my taking more time. I do, however, reserve the balance of my time.

The Right and Left of Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an exceptionally well prepared summary of the existing immigration and nationality laws and an appraisal of what some of the legislation designed to repeal or amend these laws would do to the citizens of this country.

The summary was prepared by Mrs. Kenneth Field, first vice president of the Allegheny County League of Women Voters of Pittsburgh, Pa. I have congratulated Mrs. Field on her brilliant analysis of a complex problem, and I believe that Members of the House should become acquainted with her work. It is an honest and intelligent presentation, refreshingly void of the usual name calling resorted to by so many people in discussing this problem:

THE RIGHT AND LEFT OF IMMIGRATION

We Americans have contributed over 54 billion of borrowed dollars to the rehabilitation of the war-damaged world; yet we are subject to a barrage of accusations that we are believers in the Anglo-Saxon myth of race superiority, that we are wrecking international good will and are all kinds of brutes for our selfish, repressive immigration policies.

LET US LOOK AT OUR SPLENDID RECORD

From 1820 to 1954, we have admitted 40,175,330 to permanent residence. While we still had vast unoccupied territory, we placed few restrictions: 1880–1890 saw over 5 million immigrants settled in the United States. From the early Nineteenth Century to 1930, we had taken 60 per cent of world immigration. Then we came to the end of free lands and went into a depression and finally the war; so from 1930 to 1945 immigration averaged less than 50,000 a year. Then from 1946, annual immigration rose above 100,000 a year. In the last 6 years it has averaged over 200,000.

From 1948 to 1952, we took one-third of all the displaced persons left in Europe by Hitler's reign of disaster. We took one-third; yet we have only 6 percent of the land area of the world. Let us remember we took one-third as we compare our population and land areas with that of three other nations who took fewer.

	Number of persons per square mile	Total land area (square miles)
United States	45	2,800,000
Brazil	15	3,300,000
Canada	3.5	3,800,000
Australia	2.5	3,000,000

THE QUOTA IS NOT THE WHOLE STORY

We also hear about the "pitifully small quota of 154,657" as if it represents total limits of immigration. It does not.

The following nonquota immigrants may also obtain visas for permanent residence:

1. All wives, all husbands, all children of United States citizens.

2. All persons born in the Western Hemisphere who are healthy, can make a living and are not criminals or subversives. This is part of our good neighbor policy. It is designed to build hemispheric solidarity.

UNITED STATES CAPACITY TO ABSORB IMMIGRANTS

All Americans, except those who wish to bring our sovereign Nation into subjection to communism or to some other form of world domination and see in unlimited immigration a means to our financial destruction, would agree that there are limits to the number of immigrants for whom we can find room. Our own population is growing at the rate of 3 million a year. Europe's unemployment problem is severe in many areas; yet her population also continues to increase at the rate of about 3 million a year. Then there are the 900,000 unfortunate Arabs in the Middle East and all of Asia's millions who are just above and often below starvation level. And there is another pathetic prospect of possible need which EMANUEL CELLER points out—I quote from a speech in which he discusses the changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act which Senator LEHMAN and he are advocating. He concludes, "It is not lightly that I make these proposals. I have this in mind: With the possible easing of tensions the time may not be too distant when the Iron Curtain countries may permit those of Jewish faith to emigrate. Therefore we must work now to bring about availability of quota numbers, even if in a limited degree, so that we shall not fail them at their moment of greatest need." America sympathizes with people in need—witness the Displaced Persons Act and the Refugee Act. Would it not be better to meet a special need with special legislation which could be regulated to fit both the need and our economic situation at the time, than to open the United States indefinitely to more people?

To learn how many more we can absorb, let us see what happens to the resident aliens who represent, to some degree, our most recent acquisitions. They must report their place of residence, and where do we find them? Seventy-one percent are to be found living in eight of our populous industrial States: New York, California, Texas, Illinois, Michigan, New Jersey, Massachussetts, and Pennsylvania. At the same time 24 of

the less industrialized States had fewer than 1,000 immigrants each.

HOW DO OUR NEW IMMIGRANTS MAKE A LIVING?

Of the 208,177 persons who came into the United States as permanent residents in 1954, 112,067 had no occupation. The majority of these would be wives, children, and aged parents—people to be suported by someone else's labor. Where will we find the 96,110 who list an occupation? Of all these, only 3,846 listed themselves as farmers or farm managers and 1,622 as farm laborers. These 5,468, together with their families, seem to be about the only ones whom we can expect not to gravitate to the cities. As you have seen, alien registration of addresses backs this statement.

From these facts we must deduce that the success of our present immigration program depends on the continued expansion of our industries, for the majority of our newcomers must find work in the cities. Immigrationwise we are United States Unlimited—only so long as we can remain on the crest. A nation with total obligations of $700 billion [1] can all too easily slide off that crest.

POINT OF CONTROVERSY

With this background of fact let us examine the Immigration and Nationality Act (McCarran-Walter Act to most of us) which became effective December 24, 1952. Though it was the result of some 5 years of study, research, and investigation, and though passed over a Truman veto by a vote of 57 to 26 in the Senate and of 278 to 113 in the House, it continues under ever-increasing attack.

What is this act which more than two-thirds of Congress considered so vital that they dared override a Presidential veto? What is this act that has been endorsed by the Central Intelligence Agency, the Department of Justice, the Visa and Passport Section of the State Department—all governmental agencies or departments that apply its provisions daily and are, therefore, aware of its very detail? And what is there in this act which has resisted, so far, the concerted effort of a vocal leftwing element in Congress? Above all, what is this act which continues to be vilified by Red controlled newspapers and magazines, by many Communist-front organizations, by minority pressure groups, the criminal underworld, and, unfortunately, by some well-meaning philanthropic and religious groups?

No other law under present attacks concerns our American way of life or our basic institutions more deeply. Step by step Americans are walking backward from our constitutional Republic. Our immigration policies can show or hasten this regression.

Whether you call the Immigration and Nationality Act police law or as its advocates, the most liberal law on the statutes of any nation in the Western Hemisphere, depends on what you want immigration to do to the United States.

THE QUOTAS

To understand the attack, it will be easiest to see the act compared with 1 of the nearly 100 bills for its revision that were introduced in the first session. We shall use S. 1206, the bill sponsored by the following powerful Senators: LEHMAN, GREEN, HUMPHREY, KEFAUVER, KENNEDY, LANGER, MAGNUSON, MCNAMARA, MORSE, MURRAY, NEUBERGER, PASTORE, and CHAVEZ. It is commonly called the Lehman bill. It would revolutionize our present policies.

QUOTA—M'CARRAN-WALTER ACT

One-sixth of 1 percent of 1920 population 154,675—according to proportion from each nation at the time.

1. Fifty percent—to immigrants whose high education, technical training, and specialized experience the Attorney General believes valuable to the United States.

2. Next 30 percent to parents of United States citizens over 21, plus any left over from 1.

3. The remaining 20 percent goes to wives of aliens in permanent residence, plus anything left over in 1 and 2.

4. What is left over up to 25 percent of total quota goes to brothers, sisters, sons, or daughters of citizens of the United States.

QUOTA—LEHMAN BILL

One-sixth of 1 percent of 1950 population 251,000—this total to be adjusted upward as each census indicates national increase.

Four preference groups:

Family unification preference: Not less than 25 percent nor over 35 percent.

Occupational preference: Not less than 5 percent or more than 10 percent.

Asylum preference: Not less than 15 percent or more than 25 percent.

National interest preference: Not less than 20 percent or more than 25 percent.

Newcomer group: A newcomer group is allotted not less than 20 percent of the total.

The act bases the quota on one-sixth of 1 percent of the 1920 population, or 154,675. The proportion assigned to each nation (save for Asiatic nations) is one-sixth of 1 percent of the number of American inhabitants attributable to a specific national origin in 1920. The total number of Asiatic or of 50 percent Asiatic origin allowed is 2,000. A person who is at least 50 percent Asiatic must be assigned to the Asiatic quota, no matter where he has been living. In no case can the unused quotas of one country be transferred to another.

PHILOSOPHY OF QUOTA

What is the philosophy back of this? Is it that north Europeans are better than south Europeans or than Asiatics? No. The House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of the 68th Congress expressed it as follows:

"Since it is an axiom of political science that a government not imposed by external force is the visible expression of the ideals, standards, and social viewpoint of people over which it rules, it is obvious that a change in the character or composition of the population must inevitably result in the evolution of a form of government consonant with the base upon which it rests. If, therefore, the principles of individual liberty, guarded by a constitutional government created on this continent nearly a century and a half ago, are to endure, the basic strain of our population must be maintained and our economic standards preserved."

United States is not alone in this point of view. Canada and Australia—though less vocal about it—quietly maintain their north European majorities too. If one were to wish to break down our constitutional Republic and our basically Christian ideals, could there be an easier way than to flood the country with peoples who have a totalitarian concept of government (be it socialistic, Nazi, or Communist), to flood the country with peoples who regard our Bill of Rights as ridiculous, who consider rights as something granted or removed at the will of the government in power? Such men have no concept of inherent, inalienable, God-given rights with which government may never tamper. And are such views rare? Just remember that when our aliens reported their addresses in 1954, 116,735 were citizens of the U. S. S. R. Have we proved all of these to be anti-Soviet? Some of the nearly 100 proposals for the revision of the Immigration Act open the door so wide as almost to invite wholesale infiltration.

The present quota does limit the number of orientals, though by allowing all those in permanent residence at the time the Act was passed, to be naturalized, some 85,000 became citizens. Prominent members of oriental groups have were questioned and expressed themselves as satisfied with the provisions covering them.

CREED IS NOT ON QUOTA

Man is not excluded for creed. Some critics have claimed that the South European quotas were smaller because they were Catholic countries. If that were true, why would we have no quota at all for the Western Hemisphere with its Catholic Quebec and Catholic South America? Criticism has also been made that it distinguished against the Jew. That is totally untrue. Pat McCarran has marshaled these convincing statistics to deny it. "In no year were the Jews less than 3.3 percent of all immigrants; and after 1933, they rose from constituting 10.28 percent of all immigrants to 52.3 percent in 1939; 52 percent in 1940, 45 percent in 1941, 36 percent in 1942. Half of the world's Jews now live in the United States and Canada, with the overwhelming majority in the United States." The rise in Jewish immigration here parallels the Nazi reign of terror. It also shows that United States is not insensitive to human needs. At present the Immigration Service does not even keep a record of Jews, as such. They simply come in from the nation of which they are citizens. If you think a man's creed keeps him from this country, just study a big city newspaper section listing sects and places and times for worship.

No, the groups this act tries to prohibit are the Communists and Fascists and any form of totalitarianism. The authors want—justifiably—to preserve our constitutional Republic.

UNUSED QUOTA

Perhaps the portion of the act most sharply attacked is that which makes the unused portion nontransferable—either from year to year or from nation to nation. This is a law to be administered according to specific provisions. The State Department and the Justice Department who administer it are not given discretionary powers to do what they wish with visas.

THE LEHMAN FORMULA

Now let's see what Mr. Lehman's quota provides: one-sixth of 1 percent of the 1950 census would be, roughly, 250,000. But as population increased in the United States, so would the quota, for the one-sixth of 1 percent would be applied at the end of each decennial census. Thus, as we have less and less spare room, we get more and more immigrants.

Mr. Lehman's quota would ignore the present preference given to the Western Hemisphere. Is not our present immigration policy one of the best ways to develop our hemispheric solidarity and, therefore, defense?

FURTHER BASIC DIFFERENCES IN ACT AND LEHMAN BILL

The act provides that 50 percent of quota immigrants shall be trained people; the Lehman bill calls for from 5 to 10 percent. Our Nation desperately needs scientists and trained technicians. Our cold war is largely the battle of the laboratory and the experimental departments. Thus we see that the act attempts to meet this need. The bill does not. The act is concerned with what America needs. The bill is concerned with what Europe and the rest of the world want.

The act gives the next 50 percent to family unification; the bill gives 25 to 35 percent to family unification. So in the Lehman bill a minimum of 30 and a maximum of 40 percent of all quota immigration goes to the combination of family unification and well trained persons.

Now let's look at what the bill provides for the remaining 60 to 70 percent: 15 to 25 percent for asylum. That is presupposing a large number of European refugees still exist. Actually one of the problems of administering the Refugee Act passed in 1954 is that bona fidé refugees are scarce. Then the

[1] Hoover Commission: Lillian Wald Kay, assistant director, Citizens Committee for Hoover Report.

Lehman bill gives not less than 20 or more than 25 percent for national interest—whose national interest? It is here that the makers of foreign policy can use human beings as a bargaining point. A nation is afflicted with unemployment. We take so many of the unemployed off its hands in return for certain concessions to our interest in NATO or some other of our projects. Thus we have a permanent responsibility for what may prove to be an ephemeral advantage. The last 20 percent, in Mr. Lehman's bill, goes to newcomers. "Newcomers" seems to be a catchall for anyone that doesn't precisely fit any other designation.

WHO ARE THE ADMINISTRATORS?

In the McCarran-Walter Act the State Department and the Immigration Service, which is located in the Department of Justice, share responsibility of administering the act; and designations of powers and of limits of powers are clearly drawn. Here is government by law.

The Lehman bill transfers almost all responsibility for administering the act to a commission of five. This commission is given enormous discretionary powers which would make honest administration dependent on the integrity and efficiency of the Commission. This is government by man—not law.

To back this I quote from Francis Walter: "This proposal certainly has flexibility, if nothing else. In fact, it permits the politically appointed commissioners to exercise flexibility to the extent that, of the 250,000 quota numbers to be made available under the bill, only 250 numbers (visas) would be guaranteed to any one nation or quota area, leaving approximately 200,000 quota numbers to be dispensed by the commissioners at will, as political expediency may direct.

"There is no restriction to prevent commissioners to allot total visas to one nation or quota area."

WHOM DO WE EXCLUDE?

Now let's see whom our present law excludes. Put a check beside any one you would admit. Unless you are a Fascist or a Communist, I'm sure you will not have a single check. Here are the major provisions:

1. Excludes the feeble minded, insane (or those who have had an attack of insanity), the psychopathic personality, epileptic, drug addict, alcoholic.

2. Excludes those with tuberculosis, leprosy or any dangerous contagious disease.

3. Excludes beggars, paupers, vagrants, or other persons likely to be public charges, polygamists, prostitutes, procurers, persons supported by prostitution.

4. Excludes criminals (other than political), unless alien committed only one crime while under 18 and that is more than 5 years prior to date of application for a visa; or aliens who have committed two or more nonpolitical offenses with an aggregate sentence of 5 years.

5. Excludes laborers when the Secretary of Labor says United States has sufficient workers and such aliens would affect wages adversely.

6. Excludes stowaways, persons deported or excluded from admission who apply within the year for reentry.

7. Excludes those aliens who departed from the United States to avoid military service in time of war or national emergency; and those who have been convicted of illicit traffic with narcotics.

8. Excludes complete illiterates over 16 years, except in case of grandparents, parents, spouse or child of admissible alien.

9. Excludes all who seek to enter the United States to engage in activities prejudicial to interests of the United States, such as Anarchists, Communists, and Fascists.

10. Excludes aliens who have aided other aliens to enter United States illegally.

THE CASE OF ALIEN CREWMEN

Here also is the controversial section on alien crewmen. As the act went into effect on December 24, 1952, the alien crewmen's plight on Christmas Day—the bad relations the treatment of crewmen would produce in France and Norway, etc., were played up on the radio by such commentators as Eric Severide and in many newspapers. Do you consider the following vicious and totally unmanageable?

"Each non-immigrant shall present or surrender to the immigration officer at the port of entry such documents as may be by regulation required. In the case of an alien crewman not in possession of any individual documents, such alien crewman may be admitted, subject to the provisions of this title, if his name appears in the crew list of the vessel or aircraft on which he arrives and the crew list is visaed by a consular officer, but the consular officer shall have the right to exclude any alien crewman from the crew list visa."

Watching alien crewmen is no easy task, but it is an important one. In 1954, 52,878 vessels, 102,184 planes arrived with 1,143,386 alien crewmen. Of those that were granted shore leave, 1,963 deserted. Air and sea traffic has been increasing at the rate of 10 percent a year. Hence the crewman problem will increase rather than decrease. Here is where it has been common for Communists and underworld characters to slide into the United States.

Well, how many checks have you?

LATITUDE IN THE LEHMAN BILL

Now let us see what the Lehman bill does about excluding these undesirables. It lists much the same bases for exclusion but gives to the Commission discretionary power to override the law's provisions—for instance, chapter 5, section 341, C, "The Commission may, upon finding that (1) serious hardship would result from deportation, and (2) that continued residence of an alien in the United States would not be desirable, determine that an alien deportable under subsections (5), (6), or (7) of subsection (b) by reason of a single conviction, shall not be so deported."

What are these subsections?

"(5)" Is for the person sentenced and confined in a prison in the United States for a crime involving moral turpitude.

"(6)" Is for conviction for prostitution, soliciting, procuring or assisting a prostitute, or any other crime involving commercialized vice.

"(7)" Is for violation or conspiring to violate United States laws on narcotics.

Hence the Commission decides whether such unsavory characters are to be good for the United States. Personally, I'd rather trust the laws than political appointees.

WHAT RIGHTS SHOULD ALIENS HAVE?

We should add that the Lehman bill automatically freezes such unsavory characters into our Nation's population, if they have managed to elude the law long enough. I quote from section 342 (b), "No alien shall be deported (1) who was admitted into the United States for permanent residence before his 14th birthday; or who has lived in the United States for 20 years or more, other than as a nonimmigrant or as a fugitive from a criminal charge, the conviction on which would be a ground for deportation; or (3) for an act, or omission to act, or for a criminal conviction which occurred more than 10 years prior to the issuance of a warrant for his arrest in deportation proceedings." Why should an undesirable alien be given status in our land just because he has lived here for 20 years? This should be very popular with the criminal underworld. Why, for that matter, should an alien of questionable character have any status? How many of our people can he infect?

Perhaps the most startling concession made to the alien, in the Lehman bill, comes under section 304 of the bill, which reads, "No alien shall be excluded from the United States unless he is advised of the charges against him and accorded an opportunity for a hearing."

This is based on a philosophy that the rest of the world has a fundamental right to the United States. It would be a tremendous invitation to the hordes who look at United States with greedy eyes. Think of the expense. The act considers that the United States is a sovereign nation whose immigration policies are her sole business.

SECOND-CLASS CITIZENS

Now we come to one of the sharpest points of controversy on the bill: Should a naturalized citizen lose his naturalization? The slogan that the vilifiers of the McCarran-Walter Act use is "Let's not have any second-class citizens.

The Lehman bill provides that if a person secures naturalization by fraud or otherwise illegally "No such proceeding shall be instituted more than 10 years after the naturalization order was issued." This would make it impossible to deport some of our worst Communists and underworld characters. It also puts a premium on the smart ones who elude justice.

In the act, use of fraud in obtaining naturalization remains fraud—whether it is discovered 5 years or 15 years after. And in the act, if one affiliates with a subversive organization within 5 years after he is naturalized, it is assumed that he concealed the facts of his political beliefs. He likewise is denaturalized for refusal to testify on subversive activities before a congressional committee. The act is tough on Communists. Should it be?

If nations knew they would get back their criminals, there would be less likelihood of dumping them on us or inviting them to desert as alien crewmen. If an individual is a liar concerning his political affiliations or his criminal past, it is well for him to know that he will be returned, providing he is ever caught. Under the Lehman bill, a good gambler would take a chance. If he can freeze himself into citizenship for a few years, he is safe. Again the act, unlike the bill, is really tough on the Communist.

However, the act deports no one without that individual having full opportunity to take his case to a proper court. At the present moment eight such cases are in process in the Pittsburgh area. They include such persons as the notorious Steve Nelson. Isn't it fortunate that we still have a law with provisions to get rid of the dangerous and vicious? Good naturalized citizens should have no fear of propaganda slogans, such as second-class citizens. It is a trap to catch the unwary.

If we want to build our Nation into greatness, the more aliens of the Steve Nelson ilk we can clear from our shores, the fewer spots for deadly contagion we shall have.

Our native-born cannot completely escape false accusations for crimes. They must stand trial. Why should the naturalized citizen be given immunity from naturalization fraud which should be a crime? If a native-born tried to defraud the Government, in any of the ways possible to him, he would be in trouble. It just happens that being born in the United States of United States citizens, he cannot defraud the Government on one specific subject—that of his naturalization. The time is ripe for the United States to stop being abjectly afraid that someone will not like us. Naturally, another nation would prefer us to pay its jail bills, but it would respect us more if we refused.

Let us hold on to the main provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act. It is man-made; therefore, imperfect. Its authors recognized that imperfections would appear; and so set up, within the act, provisions for a continuing investigation of problems which arose. The committee has been requested to make proposals for change.

In the next League News issue President Eisenhower's suggestions will be discussed briefly together with other developments. The Eisenhower proposals will not make great change in the essential philosophy of the act.

Maurice H. Thatcher: Benefactor of Kentucky and the Isthmus of Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ROBSION, JR.
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, in the Filson Club Quarterly, of Louisville, Ky., January 1956, volume 30, No. 1, there appears a very fine tribute in honor of an able and popular predecessor of mine in this body, Hon. Maurice H. Thatcher, of Louisville, Ky. The author of the article is Capt. Miles P. DuVal, United States Navy, retired. (See editorial note accompanying the article given below.)

Reference is made in this article to the luncheon held in the city of Washington by the Society of Mayflower Descendants, of Washington, D. C., on June 11, 1955, on which occasion he and I paid high tributes to Governor Thatcher. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 29, 1955.)

The Filson Club, by the way, is one of the outstanding historical organizations in the entire country. It was founded in 1884, and named in honor of John Filson, Kentucky's first historian. It has collected and preserved most important historical matter pertaining to Kentucky and adjacent States, and is supported by those who are interested in the great work which the club is accomplishing in its chosen field. Its membership is national in character.

The managing editor of the quarterly and secretary of the club is Judge Richard H. Hill. Other officers are Judge Davis W. Edwards, president; Miss Mary Verhoeff, first vice president; Leo T. Wolford, second vice president; Dr. J. A. O. Brennan, third vice president; and Downey M. Gray, Sr., treasurer.

The board of directors is made up of the officers and Preston P. Joyes, J. Alexander Stewart, Mrs. Julian P. VanWinkle, Arthur H. Almstedt, Alexander G. Booth, Martin F. Schmidt, C. W. Stoll, John T. Metcalf, and William H. Kinnaird. The curator is Mrs. Dorothy Thomas Cullen and assistant curator is Miss Evelyn R. Dale.

These names are given because of the highly patriotic, important, and unselfish work that is being performed by these public spirited citizens in and about the compilation, appraisal, and preservation of the history of the great region of Kentucky and the border sections, including the vast Northwest Empire brought into the Union at the close of the Revolutionary War through the truly magnificent exploits of George Rogers Clark of Virginia and Kentucky.

The sketch in the quarterly is eminently just. Had space permitted, other important achievements could have been added, including Governor Thatcher's general work as a Member of Congress and of the House Committee on Appropriations.

I believe that the well-merited tribute thus paid him by Captain DuVal deserves a permanent place in the annals of the Congress. Therefore, under leave accorded, the text is made a part of these remarks:

MAURICE H. THATCHER: BENEFACTOR OF KENTUCKY AND ISTHMUS OF PANAMA

(By Capt. Miles P. DuVal,[1] U. S. Navy (retired))

Kentucky is rich in history extending back many years prior to its admission in 1792 as a State. Situated in the region between the North and South, it has long been the scene of political struggles that have served to develop eminent leaders. But few of their careers have been so filled with constructive achievement as that of the Honorable Maurice H. Thatcher, of Louisville.

What is the nature of his record and how did he attain such stature? The explanation traces back to the earlier part of his life when young Thatcher began his upward climb in the composing room of a Butler County newspaper in western Kentucky, where he learned the printer's art, and in the county offices, where he was first trained in civil government. Thus, in his teens he acquired the habits of close application, industry, and integrity, which have always characterized him.

Soon after reaching his majority, he was elected clerk of the circuit court of Butler County, and became known as one of the most efficient court clerks of the Commonwealth. Later, he served on the staff of the State auditor in Frankfort, studied law, and, in due course, was licensed to practice.

Appointment as an assistant attorney general of his State at an early age, his success was praiseworthy and led to his designation in 1901 as an assistant United States district attorney in Kentucky. In this post, he made an enviable record as an able and fearless prosecutor.

This service, in turn, resulted in his selection in 1908 as State inspector and examiner for Kentucky. In this office he obtained firsthand and intimate knowledge of State charitable and penal institutions, and revenue systems, as well as other governmental functions of the Commonwealth. His record in this position was outstanding.

Thus, in 1910, when President Taft, following the resignation of former Senator Joe C. S. Blackburn, of Kentucky, from the Isthmian Canal Commission, sought a well-qualified man to fill the vacancy. Mr. Thatcher was considered a natural. On April 12, 1910, the President appointed him as a member of the Commission with assignment as head of the Department of Civil Administration, who functioned as Governor of the Canal Zone.

With the building of the Panama Canal then at its peak, Governor Thatcher was on the Isthmus during the great period when the vast project was being rushed toward completion. Making frequent inspections along the line of the canal, he saw the Atlantic and Pacific locks take shape; observed Gatun and Pacific dams slowly form; arranged for needed lands in the Republic of Panama for lake purposes; watched Gatun Lake start from a body of water no larger than a fishpond; and saw it gradually rise, transforming mountains into islands and becoming, what was at that time, the largest artificial lake in the world. All of this together served to give him a deep insight into the meaning of the canal as an avenue of marine transportation for vessels of all nations on terms of equality as provided by treaty.

Governor Thatcher, who was not satisfied in performing mere routine tasks, undertook to effect needed reforms in the Canal Zone. For these, he was the—

1. First to recognize the evils of flogging prisoners and to abolish it.

2. First to institute a system of rewards and denials to prisoners as instruments for the enforcement of discipline, which reduced infractions by 50 percent in 6 months.

3. First to use prison labor in the Canal Zone for constructing highways, which became models for others areas in Latin America and some of which are still in use.

4. First to introduce the teaching of Spanish in Canal Zone high schools.

5. First to enforce the Mann Act in the Canal Zone and, by such enforcement, to send a number of notorious criminals to prison.

6. First to draft a comprehensive vehicular traffic code for the Canal Zone, which was enacted into law by the Isthmian Canal Commission.

7. First to supervise an adequate census of the Canal Zone, then approximately 75,000 of many races and nationalities.

An event of tremendous significance during Governor Thatcher's administration was the first non-stop transcontinental airplane flight—a seaplane from the Bay of Panama to the Atlantic entrance of the Canal on April 27, 1913. Witnessed by him, this historic flight was to bear important fruit in the future.

Following a change in the national administration in Washington, Governor Thatcher, on August 18, 1913, resigned his position after more than 3 years' effective service, for which he was warmly commended by Secretary of War Garrison, President Porras of Panama and members of his cabinet. At the time, he did not realize what an impact his Isthmian experiences had made on him, or what would eventually unfold from them.

Resuming the practice of law in Louisville, he also made a record of fine achievement as a member of the Board of Public Safety and as Department Counsel of the city.

Later on, in the Congress as a Representative from Kentucky and a member of the powerful House Committee on Appropriations, 1923–33, new opportunities opened. Lessons learned in Kentucky and on the isthmus qualified him to play important roles in handling State and National problems as well as isthmian and Latin American. His achievements in the Congress were unique.

Of special interest to Kentucky, he was the author of legislation for: the establishment of the Mammoth Cave National Park, improvement and maintenance of the Lincoln Birthplace Farm, creation of the Zachary Taylor National Cemetery and construction of the George Rogers Clark Memorial Bridge, and construction of a new Federal

[1] EDITOR'S NOTE.—Captain DuVal, a Virginian and graduate of the Naval Academy and Georgetown University, has had a distinguished career, features of which include service as Captain of the Port, Panama Canal, 1941–44, and participation in Pacific naval operations, 1944–46. He is also an outstanding historian of the Panama Canal, having written two volumes, And the Mountains Will Move and Cadiz to Cathay, both by Stanford University Press. A third volume to complete the trilogy is in preparation.

building, a new marine hospital and new Coast Guard station at Louisville, and a veterans' hospital at Lexington. Also he collaborated with two chiefs of staff of the Army, Generals Summerall and MacArthur, in bringing about the conversion of Camp Knox into the permanent military post of Fort Knox.

On the national scene, he was a leader for increased appropriations for printing braille books and manufacture of apparatus for schools for the blind throughout the country, the author of the action creating the Eastern National Park-to-Park Highway project, and a champion for the establishment of our system of domestic air mails, including the route from Cleveland via Louisville, Memphis, and Little Rock to the west coast.

In the international field, he was a principal in the establishment of the first air-mail routes from the United States to Latin America. One line extends down the west coast to Chile, and thence to the Argentine; another along the eastern seaboard to Buenos Aires. These developments were largely inspired by his observation in 1913 of the first transisthmian flight, when he visualized the need for such mail service by aircraft.

Another great international benefaction was his authorship of legislation for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory in Panama City. This celebrated research institution developed much of the basic knowledge of the transmission of yellow fever, malaria, and other tropical ailments. Thus, to mention a single instance of gratifying results, it contributed greatly toward successful conduct of our Armed Forces operating in tropical regions in World War II.

Also, since he left Congress, he has served without compensation as vice president and general counsel of the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, which supervises the work of the laboratory, the latter operating under Federal appropriations.

For the benefit of the Panama Canal and the isthmus, he aided in the authorization and appropriations for construction of the Madden Dam and power project at Alhajuela. Completed in 1935, this work has supplied more water for lockages, generated power, controlled floods, and improved navigation. It remains a monument to all who contributed to its success.

Another and constructive service was his authorship of legislation authorizing construction and operation of a free ferry across the Pacific entrance of the Panama Canal, and of a highway connecting the ferry with the road system of Panama. Opened to traffic in 1932 the Thatcher Ferry and highway, officially named for him and constituting essential links in the Inter-American Highway, have transported tens of millions of passengers and hundreds of thousands of vehicles, thus rendering indispensable service to the entire Isthmus in both peace and war.

These are only the highlights of an action-packed life. Most appropriately, on June 11, 1955, in the Nation's Capital, Governor Thatcher was signally honored by the Society of Mayflower Descendants in the District of Columbia, of which he had served many terms as governor; he is now serving as counsellor general and deputy governor general of the General Society of Mayflower Descendants, the national organization. Treated there in greater detail and published in remarks to the House of Representatives by Hon. CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri,[2] Chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, his record entitles him to high place in American achievement. It establishes him as an outstanding benefactor of Kentucky and the Isthmus of Panama.

[2] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (84th Cong., 1st sess.), vol. 101, No. 110 (June 29, 1955), p. A4741.

Federal Assistance in Distressed Labor Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under permission given me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the statement of Hon. Thomas Kennedy, vice president, United Mine Workers of America, before the House Committee on Banking and Currency, on April 18, dealing with Federal assistance to distressed labor areas.

For my part, I heartily concur in Mr. Kennedy's remarks and can recommend this article to all my colleagues:

STATEMENT OF THOMAS KENNEDY, VICE PRESIDENT, UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, APRIL 18, 1956, IN RE H. R. 8555 AND SIMILAR BILLS ON FEDERAL ASSISTANCE IN DISTRESSED LABOR AREAS

The declaration of purpose, which is section 2 of this bill, is as follows:

"The Congress declares that, notwithstanding the prosperity enjoyed by the Nation as a whole, some of our communities are suffering substantial and persistent unemployment; that such unemployment causes hardship to many individuals and their families and detracts from the national welfare by wasting vital human resources; that to overcome this problem the Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, should help areas of substantial and persistent unemployment to take effective steps in planning and financing their economic development; that Federal assistance should enable communities to achieve lasting improvement and enhance the domestic prosperity by the establishment of stable and diversified local economies; and that new employment opportunities should be created rather than merely transferred from one community to another."

In a general sense this declaration points out the general principle of requirement which is essential in order to combat unemployment in distressed labor areas. Following up the bill, however, in succeeding sections and paragraphs, it is my opinion that something else must be added to benefit the distressed labor areas in the coal mining communities, where unemployment is the rule rather than the exception; and where this unemployment has lasted for a considerable length of time.

It is my conservative opinion that we have about 155,000 persons unemployed in the coal mining communities, including bituminous and anthracite. This unemployment is serious in such States as Pennsylvania, where it affects the bituminous and especially the anthracite regions, as well as other coal-producing States like West Virginia, Kentucky, Ohio, and Illinois.

I have appeared before various Senate committees dealing with this subject and also before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report in February of this year with reference to the problems referred to in this bill. The economic report properly points out in the matter of helping local communities to reduce unemployment that it is a "matter of national as well as local concern." The various suggestions such as are now bringing some relief to distressed labor areas through establishment of new industries, etc., are very commendable, but I doubt that they are sufficient to take care of the needs in the coal areas. My experience with respect to acquirement of new industries has been that it is only younger men who obtain employment. Ages in the mining industry run from 18 to 65 years and over. A great number of men beyond the age of 40 are affected by the present unemployment situation and they have very little chance of taking up employment in new industries. Although I submit that the average mine worker is a skilled man, we might as well face the fact that quite a few firms have an age limit for employment which does not contemplate employing men beyond the age of 40.

In many sections of the coal fields the payment of unemployment compensation has been exhausted, which further intensifies the problem and requires maintenance of the idle population on the basis of a subsistence level through surplus food commodities and in many cases on the basis of public assistance. In the economic report the suggestion is made "that unemployment compensation is the bulwark for sustaining purchasing power." These payments generally run to a maximum of from 26 to 30 weeks. To give a typical example of unemployment compensation benefits running out, I am taking a county in the anthracite coal fields to illustrate the problem. In Schuylkill County of Pennsylvania there is total unemployment of 13,450, of which 11,700 are males and 1,750 are females. Of this number 3,654 individuals are receiving unemployment compensation, while 1,328 receive partial unemployment compensation. These figures would fairly indicate the number of people receiving unemployment compensation in other coal districts; or relatively only one-third of the total number of unemployed are receiving unemployment compensation. All the others in the category of unemployment have exhausted the maximum number of weeks of unemployment compensation. While it is true that some of the slack of unemployment could be taken up through the acquirement of new industries and public works, the fact remains that it would only partially alleviate the situation and it would take considerable time to supply even a partial remedy.

Repeating the language of the Economic Report "that unemployment compensation is the bulwark for sustaining purchasing power," I might say that it would become a greater bulwark if these unemployment compensation payments were to be made for the duration of unemployment and I certainly would highly recommend this step to the Congress as the proper basis for the development of plans and policies for general rehabilitation of these distressed labor areas. I further submit that the cost would not be too great upon the Government nor upon the unemployment compensation funds.

The machinery is there to work out this matter and the whole general program could be implemented by the payment of unemployment compensation during the period of unemployment without difficulty. The mining industry is not a roving industry. It cannot be moved from place to place.

The Federal Government could do a great deal of work in bringing about increased productivity, if it would put its own house

in order, as for instance curbing the dumping of residual oil on the eastern seaboard.

In 1955 approximately 36 million tons of coal were displaced by the dumping of Venezuela waste oil, and as I indicated in previous statements to various congressional committees, this waste oil is coming not from a free country but from a country where a dictatorship form of Government is in existence. This Government operates much on the same plane as the dictatorship forms of government which prevail in Soviet Russia and other countries behind the Iron Curtain. For the first quarter of 1956 the figures indicate that the dumping of this residual oil has been increasing and, if kept up at this rate, it will displace approximately 40 million tons of coal this year.

The dumping of waste oil should be stopped, or be placed on a proper quota basis. The Federal Government could assist in bringing about stability and increased productivity by the creation of a national fuels policy, which would be protective of our natural resources and national defense and each fuel would be placed upon its proper competitive foundation. We should also give some consideration to the question of exporting coal to Europe and go into the matter of providing some basis for proper equitable ocean freight rates. It seems to me that we have a potential overseas market of approximately 50 million tons of coal per year.

An intensified research program for greater uses for coal should also be built up by the Government. Legislation on this particular subject is now pending in the Congress.

Last but not least, and more important at the moment because it can be made effective immediately, is the matter and necessity of payment of unemployment compensation by the Federal Government for a period beyond the 26 or 30 weeks now in effect for the duration of the unemployed period.

I have given a great deal of study to this entire matter and it is my judgment that the foregoing suggestions are the most practical and realistic that could be applied to relieve the distressed unemployment areas and to provide for the individuals and families affected. Assistance is necessary and requisite to carrying out the purpose of these various plans and the suggestions in the Economic Report, all of which would lead to stability and improvement of the economic situation in the distressed labor areas in the various coal-mining sections of the United States. I might also add that stability and increased productivity in the mining industry would not only affect the situation in the mining industry itself, but other collateral industries would likewise be benefited; and in an economic sense, general improvement for the people in industries directly and indirectly affected by coal production would result therefrom.

Examination of National Banks

SPEECH
OF
HON. HENRY O. TALLE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 1188) to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the examination of national banks.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

This matter of examination of national banks goes back to 1863. At that time it was agreed that some banks might need more examinations than two per year. So, if favoritism arises out of the number of examinations, the practice dates back to the origin of the National Bank Act because the provision was made then for special examinations. If there are classes of banks, they are classes which are made by the banks themselves because of the manner in which they manage their operations.

Years ago, a distinguished public servant who was Comptroller of the Currency or Deputy Comptroller for as long as 30 years wrote a book called "The Romance and Tragedy of Banking." Anyone who reads that book will find that the principal reason for the failure of banks is poor management. Human beings are not endowed with equal managerial talents. I doubt that those who oppose this bill would be able by law to guarantee the same class of management in every one of our banks. If they could do that, then there would be some point to the opposition argument. This bill does not establish any classification of banks whatever. What it does do is to conserve the time of the work force, the corps of examiners, so that they can be employed profitably where they should be employed, in the examination of some banks that need further examination because the management is less good than in other banks.

Opposition to Utility Provision in Federal Highway Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that the utility reimbursement section which has been approved by the House Public Works Committee for incorporation in the Federal highway bill, is an undesirable section. This section would allow reimbursement by the Federal Government of 90 percent of the cost of relocating utility lines on Federal interstate highways. In my opinion, the action is too liberal and should contain restrictions.

The Roads Subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee had previously established restrictions limiting such reimbursement to 50 percent of the cost of relocation, and providing that such reimbursement could not exceed 2 percent of the cost of the highway construction project. However, the full Public Works Committee, on a split vote, struck out these limitations and inserted the more liberal 90 percent provision in the bill. I voted against this provision for 90-percent reimbursement, and desire to point out that the provision contains no limitation whatsoever on the portion of the cost of a highway construction project which can be used for utility reimbursement, whereas the Roads Subcommittee had previously set a limitation of 2 percent of this cost.

I am concerned about the effect of this provision upon the States. As an example, the State of California now is authorized under State law to enter into agreements with the utilities for partial reimbursement of relocation costs, but these agreements normally limit reimbursement to 50 percent of these relocation costs. The insertion of a more liberal 90 percent reimbursement provision in the Federal highway bill will, in my opinion, be likely to cause pressure by the utilities on the California State Highway Department to increase utility relocation reimbursement payments on all State highway construction projects from 50 percent to 90 percent. The California State Highway Department is opposed to this 90 percent utility reimbursement provision.

Public Housing at Its Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER M. MUMMA
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, on April 22, 1953, when public-housing legislation was under consideration in the House, I asked this question: "How long is it reasonable to allow a tenant to stay in this low-cost, subsidized, less-than-cost housing?" I think my remarks then are worthwhile repeating in part at this time. I quote:

I think this approach to the public-housing situation is very important. Some plan should be adopted whereby tenancy is limited to a certain period of time. This would help get out of these units some of the people who expect to make this a permanent thing and allow others to have a chance. It is reliably estimated that public housing can at best take care of only one-tenth of our people who are in the low-income group and need this help.

Another angle that should be studied, when the whole housing situation is reviewed, is the matter of incentive. It is claimed that Federal housing rehabilitates. If it is a matter of rehabilitation, there ought to be a period of so many years or months of occupancy provided to permit tenants to acquire a stake to be used in the purchase of homes of their own. I realize it is a much easier proposition for a veteran to get out of these low-cost housing units and have a little garden for his kids to run around in than for a widow with 2 or 3 children to support. This should be taken into consideration when this public-housing item is reviewed again next year by the Banking and Currency Committee.

In my community of Pennsylvania we have a very good housing authority. We have a very good manager in charge. We have 1,100 units and, in my opinion, those 1,100 units should form the basis for a turnover so that people who run into a streak of hard luck may be taken care of and perhaps save a little money. In my experience, it is not always the fellow who makes the most money who lives in the nicest or has the best home. I can show you cases of people, living more or less on a low-income wage, who get in there and pitch and own their

own homes. They look nice; they have a nice garden. It is mainly a matter of their will to lift themselves up rather than continuing to accept this subsidized housing.

Now read these interesting figures from an article in the Harrisburg (Pa.) Evening News of February 16, 1956:

MODERN UNITS FOR FAMILIES WITH LOW INCOME LAUDED

M. W. Smith, executive director of the Harrisburg Housing Authority, today released figures indicating the modern facilities of local public housing projects are encouraging thrift among low-income occupants.

Harrisburg has 1,080 modern housekeeping units in four public housing projects; George A. Hoverter Homes, William Howard Day Homes, John A. F. Hall Manor and Hillside Village.

In the last 3 years, Smith said 633 families moved out voluntarily, 169 of them, or 26.7 percent, going into homes they are buying.

"We are of the opinion," said Smith, "that if these 633 families had not enjoyed the benefits of modern public housing they would still be 'existing' in substandard dwellings."

The Housing Authority, the Harrisburg Redevelopment Authority and City Council are currently striving to obtain 330 more units of public housing to replace substandard dwellings.

Smith also disclosed figures of a recent housing survey showing that although 1,893 units of public and private housing were erected since April 1, 1950, the city, on February 1, still had 7,662 units of substandard dwellings. Of those, he said 6,337 are occupied by white families, 1,325 by Negroes. Dwellings demolished in extended Capitol Park since April 1, 1950, he said numbered 452.

I have always felt that we have a good Housing Authority in Harrisburg, with efficient, honest management. I believe you will agree with me, after noting the authority's approach to this housing problem as carried in the friendly, helpful and constructive news article mentioned above. It speaks well for public housing as it has been managed and developed in our community.

Qualifications of Directors of National Banking Associations

SPEECH
OF
HON. HENRY O. TALLE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 1736) to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the qualifications of directors of national banking associations.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, like the preceding bill which was just passed by the House, is a good one. It is simple; nothing earth-shaking about it. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] has stated the case correctly and well. It is an attempt to be realistic. A lot of improvement in communication and transportation has occurred since the National Bank Act was written near the middle of the last century. This bill is realistic in its outlook, and it will make for stronger bank boards of directors.

Mr. Chairman, there is great variation among the States as to residence requirements for directors of State bank boards. There are 18 States that do not have any residence requirements at all.

I think, Mr. Chairman, there is no point in my taking further time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Wanted—A Candid United States Farm Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article by Joseph C. Harsch entitled "Wanted—A Candid United States Farm Policy," which appeared in the March 30 issue of the Christian Science Monitor.

I think this article accurately describes the difference in viewpoint between a majority of the Members of Congress and the Secretary of Agriculture and his principal advisers. It also clearly points up the basic questions which must be decided in the way of national policy if there is to be any rational solution of our accumulating difficulties in agricultural production and distribution.

The article follows:

WANTED—A CANDID UNITED STATES FARM POLICY

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

WASHINGTON.—The farm bill as it stands today in Washington is, of course, a hodgepodge. It undoubtedly will continue to be a hodgepodge no matter what changes the conference of Senate and House delegates of the United States Congress does further to it before it is finally sent to the White House for a Presidential "yes" or "no."

But it would be well to consider why it is a hodgepodge rather than just dismiss it as another horrible example of election-year politicking.

The statement that we are living in a revolutionary age is trite, and also true. It is nowhere more true than in agriculture. Over the last half century the tractor, the combine, chemical fertilizer, and hybrid seeds have increased the man-hour productivity of the farmer at what can only be called a fabulous rate.

The simplest way to express the change is that one man now can plow, seed, and harvest as much land as a whole family with several sturdy boys, plus a couple of hired men, could barely manage 50 years ago. And the one man frequently can spend the winter in Florida—that is, if crop prices are right.

We have learned to produce more food with fewer men—more food than we can presently consume. Some day the growth of population may take up the slack, but we are in a transitional stage. Another way of expressing it is that 50 years ago in the United States it took 32 million farm dwellers to feed a total population of 92 million—and they just barely did it. Today 22 million farm dwellers feed 165 million people, and produce a mounting surplus which is the bane of Ezra Taft Benson's life.

If the United States practiced a classic free-enterprise economy, the situation would adjust itself. The farm population and the form of land cultivation would adjust themselves until production came into balance with demand.

Allow it to work, and what would happen? No one can be sure, particularly because Congress probably will never let it happen. But certainly if farm prices were turned loose by the Government the trend would be a rapid one toward decline of the farm population to perhaps half of its present size, and toward fewer and larger farm units, many of which might be run as corporate industries.

But a reorganization of this magnitude is a brutal process for people, whether it be done as a deliberate policy of Government in the shortest possible time, as it was done in the Soviet Union when Stalin set out to collectivize Soviet agriculture—as it could not possibly be done in the United States—or merely allowed to happen at its natural pace.

Some such natural reduction process is taking place in the United States. Farm population is declining, small units are merging into larger units to some degree, and the children migrate to the factories in town and city.

The argument over the farm bill this year was basically over the extent to which the Government will cushion the shock of the transition and manage its pace. In effect, Congress revolted against the speed which Mr. Benson would tolerate. Mr. Benson's flexible price supports aim at the ultimate removal of all supports. They could be a cushion for transition to bigger farms for fewer farmers.

Even 100 percent rigid price supports would not halt the trend. They would slow it down and provide a softer cushion. In effect, the Congress has declared that Mr. Benson's cushion is too thin. Congress will not, in fact it dare not, allow the change which is visible to take place so fast. It may not even dare allow it to go so far as it would go if the ultimate form of United States agriculture were to be determined only by the "interplay of the market." Too many human beings would be hurt too seriously in the process.

A Communist government can, and did in the Soviet Union, speed the collectivization of agriculture deliberately, even at the cost of millions of human lives. A democratic government cannot allow a trend toward bigness to take place even at a natural free-enterprise pace. There is a very serious question whether a democratic government should allow the process ever to reach its logical free-enterprise conclusion, for the ultimate big farm run as a privately owned factory is not sociologically very different from the big farm run as a government-owned factory. In either case the yeoman farmer and the one-family farm would disappear from the social structure.

What has got to be decided some day in the United States is the extent to which the one-family farm should be retained for its social structure and moral and political values. If and when that step is taken, it then will be possible to apply reason and wisdom to the transition process and shape farm legislation which will produce the desired end result by a humane and gradual but steady progression.

The United States has yet to resolve the basic question. There is no such thing as an agreed policy on the future form of United States agriculture, on the value of the family

farm, on the extent to which concentration of farm land into big units should be permitted to go.

Because there is no agreed policy there is an annual free-for-all battle in the Congress over the thickness of the cushion to be provided by the government for the farmer in transition.

The result inevitably is a hodgepodge bill which pleases few and which can scarcely contribute to an orderly arrival at an agreed objective.

Text of Address by New York Democratic National Committeeman Carmine G. De Sapio, Before the New York County Democratic Committee, April 12, 1956, New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address given by the Honorable Carmine G. De Sapio, secretary of state of the State of New York. Mr. De Sapio is also the Democratic National Committeeman from New York, as well as the Democratic leader of the county of New York. The following address was given on the occasion of the annual dinner of the New York County Democratic Committee:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY NEW YORK DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEEMAN CARMINE G. DE SAPIO BEFORE THE ANNUAL DINNER OF THE NEW YORK COUNTY DEMOCRATIC COMMITTEE, THURSDAY, APRIL 12, 1956, AT THE HOTEL COMMODORE, NEW YORK CITY

My good friends, my fellow Democrats, I say to you, from the bottom of my heart, it is you who deserve the applause. It is you who have earned the plaudits and the accolades of those who are privileged to serve your party as its spokesmen. It is you who have made possible the rebirth and the revitalization of dynamic, progressive government in our State under the leadership of Gov. Averell Harriman. And it is you who have created the compassionate, the humane, and the enlightened administration of Mayor Bob Wagner.

This dinner, with its enthusiasm, its spirit, its vibrant drive, and its unquestioned dedication, is a tribute to every man and woman in this room, and a testament to the inevitable victory which lies ahead. And I am proud to report that at similar events all over the country, which I have had the opportunity to attend during the past years, I have found the same spirit, the same determination, and the same understanding of our party's role in the Nation, and our Nation's role in the conduct of world affairs.

And just as real and alive and tangible as your presence here tonight, is the awareness of all Democrats that our party will be called upon to assume the responsibility of national leadership this November * * * to provide the leadership which is so painfully lacking now.

So, too, are the issues of the day—real and alive—and so, too, is the program of our party. So, too, is our history, our heritage and our record of accomplishment. And so, too, is our leadership.

And this real—this vigorously alive—democratic movement will replace the invisible—the phantom—government which today controls the lives and destinies of 165 million Americans and which haunts the future of all the people of the world.

America today is governed by a privy council which rules by hap and hazard. Leadership has been abdicated. Decision has been delegated. Responsibility has been forfeited. A country-club quartet—a small clique of self-appointed and self-annointed men who never exposed themselves to the mandate of a national election—now rules the White House and runs our Nation.

These men—Sherman Adams, Charles Wilson, George Humphrey, and John Foster Dulles—these men dominate the national and international scene. They are the Richelieus and Rasputins of 20th century America, differing from their historic counterparts only in their superlative ineptness, in their ingenious inability and in their extraordinary incompetence. But these men—these masters of pretense, perfidy and privilege—are possessed of one great talent. They can whip up a slogan and coin a phrase with unbelievable dispatch and alacrity. And their favorite contribution to present-day political literature is the clarion call, "Peace and prosperity."

My friends, let us here and now—once and for all—reject the unfounded and perverse claim that the Republican Party brought peace to our time. Their peace is as substantial as that which Neville Chamberlain proclaimed after the Munich Conference, a peace held together by a rope of sand.

They coldly cast aside an era of Democratic statesmanship which was broadened by a constructive bipartisan approach. The courageous and realistic foundations for world peace established by Democratic leadership is stricken from the revamped Republican version of history. They ignore the undeniable milestones of peace and security erected during the years of decision by leaders of our Nation—in both parties—who placed patriotism above partisanship.

They close their eyes to the Marshall plan, the mutual security program, the founding of the United Nations, and the decisive containment of communism. And these phantoms who now haunt the White House have the monumental audacity to tear out the credit pages of history's ledger, like crafty auditors doctoring a set of books.

Can we boast of peace in the light of the tension in the Middle East; the unrest in Formosa; the rumblings in Morocco, and the instability on the island of Cyprus?

Is there peace in the understanding which today exists between Russia and Yugoslavia? Or in the Red annexation of most of Indochina and in the loss of democratic influence in Asia?

Is there peace in India's accelerated approach toward the Communist orbit?

Indeed, is the shooting and bloodshed on the borders of Israel, the new, the modern American definition of peace?

As Russia gains greater and greater strength, absorbs millions and millions of more people and waxes more and more arrogant and influential, John Foster Dulles, talking out of both sides of his mouth, brashly proclaims a world at peace, at the same time that he admonishes us not to debate foreign policy.

As American scientists at their listening posts record more horrifying and more devastating Soviet nuclear explosions, Dulles cautions us to keep quite lest the voice of an enlightened people be heard above the din of international saber-rattling. And although Neville Chamberlain, the unbrella man of Munich, made one colossal blunder, Dulles has blundered in virtually every corner of the globe, earning for himself the dubious distinction as the umbrella man of our day and age.

The American people want to be told the truth. They are not afraid of the truth. They deserve and demand the truth. Yet, the Government of the United States supplies shadows and innuendoes instead of forthright declarations of policy, and through the expedient of diplomacy-by-magazine article, brings us one day to the brink-of-war; the next day to the brink of apathy; the third day to the brink of silence, and, inevitably, to the brink of disaster.

My good friends, we Democrats believe that the peace of the world and the security of its people stem not from the idle chatter of typewriter keys or from the competitive quest for headlines, but rather from a program of positive action and courageous leadership. Certainly world peace cannot be established on a foundation of diplomatic quicksand, nor secured through reckless promises on the one hand, and abject surrender on the other.

We believe that the hope for peace rests in America, and can be attained only when America regains its position of world leadership. We believe in strengthening the United Nations; in expanding the point 4 program; in helping the democracies to resist communism and aggression. And we believe that this can be achieved only if we have the complete and unquestioned confidence of the free nations—both large and small—who look to us for leadership.

We believe that every dollar sent abroad to bring economic independence to a country which is being tempted by the Communist Lorelei, will eventually save the life of an American boy. We believe that every gun shipped to a democracy for use in its defense will one day save the lives of American soldiers. We believe that the uniting of the free nations in a meaningful, mutual-aid program will one day save American cities.

We believe that it is far more important to establish maximum defense strength than it is to go through the empty pretense of balancing the budget and making false claims of economy in Government.

We believe that only by our united determination to resist the march of Red totalitarianism, can we, in fact, halt that march. And only thereby can we assure permanent peace.

Well, my friends, now we come to that other exclusive Republican property—prosperity. Let us look at this prosperity. Let us examine, if you will, just a few facts, a few figures.

Does the American small-business man enjoy prosperity? Any standard reference book or almanac provides the answer. Since the present administration took office, there have been 11,000 small business failures a year, a rise of 31 percent over 1952. Nor does this figure include the great number of small businesses which have been swallowed up in monopoly mergers, and it doesn't begin to spell out the heartache and despair of a half billion dollars lost by small business firms each year since 1953. Such are the clear-cut, unvarnished facts.

But even these facts cannot answer the plantive and discouraged question being asked by millions of Americans—the people to whom a pay envelope is the sum-total of income. And that question is: "What price prosperity?"

Does the American farmer enjoy prosperity? Farm mortgages have hit a new high since the depression of 1930. Farm income has dropped $3 billion, and farm employment has decreased by a quarter of a million people since the present administration heralded its great age of prosperity.

Do the American slum dwellers enjoy prosperity? Public housing has been cut from 135,000 units per year under the Truman administration, to 35,000 apartments under the Republican program.

Can we boast of prosperity to our children in overcrowded and obsolete schools in the face of a virtual standstill in the program of Federal aid to education.

Prosperity is a lovely word, but is meaningless unless it benefits all the people—the farmer, the laborer, the housewife, the small-business man, the consumer, and the homeowner as well. It cannot be a prosperity which filters down, strained and diluted by a small minority at the top.

The healthiest economy is one which has the broadest possible base of prosperity. Prosperity must be horizontal, not vertical. Prosperity must reach into every American home; into every American community.

Farm failures in one section of the country threaten the prosperity and well-being of our cities; and bankruptcies in the cities threaten the well-being of the entire Nation.

And while we may take heart in the unprecedented rate of employment and in the fact of economic attainment, let us not forget that when our party took over the helm of our National Government in 1933, we inherited an awesome depression, more frightful and destructive than mankind had ever before witnessed.

My good friends, we Democrats believe that prosperity can be built and sustained not through the irresponsible quest for votes, but rather as a result of the responsible advance of a sound economic program based on world stability. We believe that prosperity is the automatic result of the movement of machines and men and technical skill and farm products in increased world trade.

We believe that the building of schools and houses and dams and highways gives impetus to full employment and to fruitful social achievement. We believe in affording industrial opportunity and the chance to expand to small as well as to big business. And we believe in the enhancement and advancement of social security, old-age assistance and affirmative, constructive programs for our youth.

This is our faith as Americans and this is our challenge as Democrats. This, we know, can be done and this, we pledge, shall be done.

We do not delude ourselves that the task is simple. We believe it calls for strong, courageous, full-time national leadership. The American people will reject with indignation the callous suggestion by Republican National Chairman Leonard Hall, who said: "Even if he could only serve half-time, Eisenhower would make a better President than anybody the Democrats could put up."

The obligations of national and world leadership are tremendous and overwhelming. Every minute of every hour of every day the President of the United States is called upon to make decisions of momentous importance.

Upon these decisions rests the future of the world, and though they may be delegated or even forfeited, their consequences must remain the responsibility of the President. No one can be blamed for the failures of the administration, but the elected head of the administration. The abdication of presidential responsibility is more than a matter of personal conscience. It is a problem which affects the security of civilization.

This is the message which you, my good friends, must bring to the American voters between now and November 6.

We do not have the vast sums of money necessary to saturate television and radio with our message. We do not have the resources of corporate dynasties behind us. We do not have the cynical skill of supersalesmen who market government by hoaxism and hucksterism.

But we do have the program, we have the courage and the strength, and we have 20 historic years of progress, victory, security, and stability as the record upon which we stand.

And above all, we have with us the people—millions of men and women like yourselves—who will reach out to their neighbors, their families, and their friends, and who will interpret and expose the phantom Washington regency—the invisible government.

And with the help of God, we Democrats will lead our country and the free world toward a new era—a new future of real, of meaningful and of lasting peace and prosperity.

Thank you very much.

Northeast Assails Examiner's Charges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following news release of Northeast Airlines:

WASHINGTON, D. C. April 18.—In a formal appeal from the recent recommendations of CAB Examiner Thomas L. Wrenn in the New York-Florida Air Route case, Northeast Airlines today filed with the Civil Aeronautics Board a document containing 24 pages of exceptions to the examiner's report.

The exceptions cited more than 60 claims of error by Wrenn. Copies of the Northeast document were also served upon all other parties in the proceeding.

George E. Gardner, president of Northeast, who was in Washington today, explained that this action by the New England-based airline was "the first step in the vigorous protest" he had promised as soon as he had learned of Wrenn's April 3 report.

The CAB examiner recommended Delta Airlines as the third carrier on the New York-Miami route. At the same time, he recommended denial of Northeast's application for route extension to Florida.

Filing of exception means that the case will now be heard in oral argument by the full membership of the Civil Aeronautics Board before a final decision can be reached. Briefs in support of the exceptions must be filed prior to May 14.

In sharply worded criticism, the Northeast document strongly assailed the examiner's charges with respect to certain control relationships involving Atlas Corp., Northeast's majority stockholder.

Northeast's exceptions termed these findings "contrary to facts of records with the Board of which Examiner Wrenn should have informed himself" and referred to the Board's action in three other proceedings "either approving all the control relationships mentioned in the report or determining that approval of such relationships was unnecessary."

According to Northeast, Wrenn was under a duty to take "full and not merely partial notice" of the official CAB records reflecting earlier Board action.

The choice of Delta, rather than Northeast, as the third New York-Florida carrier, also drew sharp attack in many of the New England airline's exceptions. Northeast charged that the examiner ignored Northeast's outstanding service record, indicating its complete adequacy to provide effective New York-Florida service, and also ignored the Board's "established criteria for carrier selection."

Northeast pointed out that the Board has recently held that a primary factor to be taken into account is the need for strengthening of the smaller carriers.

The exceptions further charged the examiner with error for not recommending Northeast in accordance with established Board policy and the recommendations of the Board's bureau counsel.

The document also pointed out that the route award would provide important New England and Florida communities with new one-carrier services which they urgently need and would also bring about significant expansion of New England's regional service.

The Bricker Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, nationwide today there is renewed interest in the Bricker amendment and the alert citizens who are apprehensive of legislation through treatymaking are anxious for further consideration of Senator BRICKER's proposal.

As evidence of this interest and support, I include with my remarks an excellent editorial from the April issue of Town Journal, which I commend to your attention:

A CHANGE TO MAKE

The Washington reports shortly will be discussing the Bricker amendment to the Constitution. As usual many confusing and many inaccurate statements will appear. Some of these will be intentionally misleading.

The question raised by the Bricker amendment is this: Shall Americans be compelled to live under laws put in force by treaties or other international agreements even though they conflict with the Constitution?

In order to be adopted, an amendment has to win a two-thirds vote in each House of Congress and the approval of three-fourths of the States. The Bricker proposal will come up for a vote this month in the Senate and will then be presented before the House.

Two years ago 28 Democratic Senators voted for it and 16 against; 32 Republican Senators voted for and 14 against; 1 independent voted against. This division shows clearly that the amendment is not a party question. The total lacked 1 vote of the necessary two-thirds.

Passage this year will depend upon the vigor with which informed citizens indicate their support. The division may again be close in the Senate. A hard battle may be expected in the House.

The language of the amendment, slightly changed to meet former objections, is simple and clear: "A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with any provision of the Constitution, shall not be of any force or effect."

The Constitution itself says that a treaty "shall be the supreme law of the land * * * anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding." That provision was written primarily to protect the treaties then in force which had been made prior to the Constitution. It was probably intended also to give the National Government full control in foreign affairs, which it should have. In those days treaties concerned boundaries, commerce, fishing rights, navigation, and such matters.

In recent years, however, wholly new circumstances have arisen. Through the United Nations and other new agencies, the United States is asked to participate in many new kinds of international agreements and trea-

ties. The practice of "executive agreements" between nations has grown up—deals between heads of nations which are not submitted to the United States Senate, as treaties have to be, for ratification.

Ways are thus opened by which Americans could be forced to accept as domestic law rulings which have not been passed upon by Congress and which could conflict with constitutional rights. It is this danger which the Bricker amendment will prevent.

The amendment, as revised, should be adopted. Americans will protect their freedom for the future by insisting that Congress submit it to the States.

Foreign Aid: A Tempting Target

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PERKINS BASS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including below an editorial from the Milford Cabinet in Hilford, N. H., on the difficult foreign-aid problem. Editor William Rotch has here contributed a thoughtful, intelligent, and searching analysis of the issue.

FOREIGN AID: A TEMPTING TARGET

To New Hampshire's Senators and Congressmen.

GENTLEMEN: As the April 15 income-tax deadline approaches, many of us look to you, almost in desperation, for some means to ease the Federal tax burden. It is a time when we must rely heavily on your wisdom as to what is necessary and what is not. Yet, at the same time we plead for economy, we must urge you to be cautious, to weigh any immediate tax saving against the long-range effect on America.

Foreign aid is a tempting target to those who demand economy. Perhaps they are right. Certainly any saving here would seem to be relatively painless. And yet the subject is so complex, and the results of a mistaken policy could be so disastrous, that we hope you will proceed with caution.

The danger lies in listening to the advice of people who see foreign aid only as a gigantic giveaway program of doubtful benefit to this country. It seems only fair that you insist that those who tell you to "reduce foreign aid" should specify which particular expenditures they feel are extravagant.

For example, we are told that much—in fact, most—of what we term foreign aid is for military assistance to our allies. Certainly any reduction in this field should be made only after serious study.

We understand that much foreign aid is to enable other countries to buy goods from America. A foreign government seeking farm machinery, for example, to raise the standard of living of its people, may prefer to buy it from the United States. If we refuse the necessary aid we may give the other country no choice but to barter some of its strategic goods with Moscow. And it would be ironic to refuse aid to countries that would prefer to trade, but are prevented from exporting goods to us by our own tariffs.

It should be obvious that we cannot buy friendship. If we offer aid as bluntly as that we are certain to be disappointed. We can, however, offer to help "underdeveloped" countries to help themselves; the possibilities are endless. It was President Eisenhower who pointed out last week that a dollar spent intelligently to aid underleveloped countries now is worth five dollars in "just sheer defense." It is the strong and self-sufficient country that is best able, and most willing, to resist the advances of communism.

Above all, do not make the mistake of condemning foreign aid of the future because of mishandling in the past. That would be shortsighted in the extreme. For foreign aid is an integral part of the struggle between the free world and the communists. Its aim is to maintain allies and win sturdy neutrals. Perhaps the most important thing you can do is to insist that this country have a consistent policy, that it knows where it is going and why, and that it adjust its foreign aid to attain that purpose.

Give those requests for foreign aid appropriations a long, hard look. Demand to know why they are necessary. Take all possible measures to see that the money is used wisely. But do not yield to the election year temptation of "economy at any price," and upset a program that we believe keeps much of the free world in balance.

Opposition to H. R. 7089

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, out of the 435 complement of the House of Representatives, 6 Members were appointed during the 83d and 84th Congresses to a special group known as the Select Committee on Survivor Benefits. Under a special rule of the House which permitted no amendments except by the special committee, a significant piece of legislation, H. R. 7089, was introduced last year and passed the House of Representatives on July 13, 1955.

I concede the fact that some of the bill's provisions were good, however, the bad features far outweighed any merits. I, therefore, take this opportunity to indicate my reason for voting against this bill, because in all good conscience, I could not agree with the concept of basing death compensation on the attained rank and length of service of an individual as proposed in section 202 (a). This section contained one of the most radical changes in existing legislation and, in my opinion, has never been made in the history of our country.

I am convinced that a life given for one's country is a life, whether the individual be a general or a private. There is certainly a need to provide for the widow and children in either case, yet who is to say that a widow and children of a general should have more benefits than the widow and children of a private. Let us compare the pay of each. A general receives approximately $1,200 a month as opposed to $120 a month for a private. These figures alone immediately indicate that the chances of leaving a sizable estate are much better in the higher than in the lower ranks.

I do not object to increasing benefits to widows and children of men who make the supreme sacrifice, however, I strenuously object to any system that would create a wide disparity between benefits given families of high-ranking officers and next-of-kin of privates, airmen, and seamen.

The high military echelon voiced their approval of this bill, and well they should. This is an excellent proposal for the career military personnel, who in view of long service have a better opportunity to attain some degree in rank. But what of the civilian soldier called to serve his country for the duration of an emergency? The majority have little opportunity to rise above the E–3 to E–5 bracket where the great number of deaths occur. These individuals have been forced to leave their families, their homes and their jobs—in most instances, jobs which pay far more than the military.

For example, let us consider the case of a lieutenant colonel with a monthly income of approximately $525 and the newly inducted private, just out of basic training, who prior to induction was earning $125 a week either as a steelworker, glassworker or coal miner. The wives of both men enjoyed similar standards of living prior to the private's entry into service. Both men lose their lives, side by side, by the same enemy shell. The private's widow receives as her death compensation $122, while the wife of the liuetenant colonel would receive between $169 and $193, depending upon the length of service. I can see no equity in such a proposal—both faced the same hazards, both subjected themselves to the same dangers—yet the widow of one receives far greater benefits than the other.

The Federal Government has a direct obligation to the widows of men killed in service of their country. However, this obligation should be discharged in the historic manner of equality and not based on rank and length of service. I have long advocated an increase in compensation based on a flat sum. In lieu of the formula contained in section 202 (a) of H. R. 7089, I suggested a flat monthly rate of compensation to all widows in the amount of $140, since this appeared to me to be equitable in view of the loss of the servicemen's indemnity.

Other provisions of the bill calls for expansion of social-security benefits—depending on rank and longevity of the deceased serviceman—and a lump-sum gratuity of between $800 to $3,000—again depending on the deceased husband's rank and longevity. I could not look upon these features in favor and I voted against its final passage and endeavored to persuade by colleagues to do likewise. Even though the bill passed the House of Representatives over negative objections by many conscientious Members of Congress, I have been gravely concerned over its future, because of the injustice involved and the resulting effects upon the morale of a great majority of the men in service during an emergency.

I cannot endorse any proposal injecting the philosophy that rank, length of service or military pay should be considered as factors in discharging the

Federal Government's obligation to the widows and children of our servicemen who died as a result of service connected disabilities.

H. R. 7089 is now pending before the Senate Finance Committee, and I hope the committee will strike this rank philosophy from the bill.

A Tribute to a Great Hungarian-American—Michael de Kováts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, 177 years ago, a great patriot of our country was killed in a battle waged in the fight for freedom and independence of the infant United States. Of foreign birth, Col. Michael de Kováts typified the many great European leaders who fought so valiantly for a cause they believed to be right and just.

Born in Karcag, Hungary, in 1724, little of his youth is known. His name does not appear in history until 1744 when he joined the Jasz-Nagy-Kun Huszar Regiment as a junior officer at the age of 20. He fought in the Second Silesian War as a member of Empress Maria Theresa's army. A document dated December 14, 1761 shows that he distinguished himself in this war and by the time of his discharge he had decided to enter upon a military career.

He took a very active part in the Seven Years' War in the service of Frederick the Great as a Prussian officer. His commander, Col. Michael Székely, led the First Prussian Hussar Regiment which took part in the battles of Pirna, Gotha, Lobosits, Prague, Torgau, and Leitmeritz. Kováts received very serious wounds in the battle of Gotha but recovered to become, in 1760, captain and commander of the so-called Gersdorf—free Hussars.

On March 12, 1761 he resigned his army commission, probably because he did not like his military assignment, which forced him to be the tax collector and oppressor of certain territories occupied by the armies of Frederick the Great.

In 1762 he returned to Hungary and Empress Maria Theresa appointed him a major in the Hussar Regiment. But with no major conflicts to claim his attention, he was restless for military action. In the new world the Colonists had signed the Declaration of Independence and, having followed with keen interest the activities in America, it was not surprising that Major Kováts decided to help the great cause of George Washington and the revolutionists.

Kováts was 53 years old when he wrote an historic letter to Benjamin Franklin, American Ambassador to France. He had been in military service for 33 years. This letter of application, written in classical Latin, is in Philadelphia at the Library of the American Philosophical Society among the papers of Benjamin Franklin. The letter, speaking for Kováts and his cultural standing, reads:

Golden freedom cannot be purchased with yellow gold. I who have the honor to present this letter to Your Excellency, am also following the call of the Fathers of the Land, as the pioneers of freedom always did. I am a free man and a Hungarian. I was trained in the Royal Prussian Army and raised from the lowest rank to the dignity of a captain of the hussars, not so much by luck and the mercy of chance, than by the most diligent self-discipline and the virtues of my arms. The dangers of the bloodshed of a great many campaigns taught me how to mold a soldier and, when made, how to arm him and let him defend the dearest of the lands with his best ability under any conditions and developments of the war.

I now am here of my own free will, having taken all the horrible hardships and bothers of this journey (refering to his trip from Budapest to Bordeau, France). I beg Your Excellency to grant me a passport and a letter of recommendation to the most benevolent Congress.

At last, awaiting your gracious answer, I have no wish greater than to leave soon, to be there where I am needed most, to serve and die in everlasting obedience.

When he received no reply from Franklin, he became impatient and set sail for the colonies without a letter of recommendation, probably sometime in the summer of 1777. Kováts was a professional soldier, a specialist in the branch of light cavalry and he had one purpose in coming to America: to organize hussars—cavalrymen—for Washington.

He knew that Washington had no cavalry in the professional sense. The four so-called mounted regiments, commanded by Colonels Moylan, Bland, Baylor, and Sheldon were mere mounted infantry without the least elementary training or organization in the true cavalry sense.

Kováts and his commanding officer, Count Casimir Pulaski, of Poland, faced an uphill fight to establish a true cavalry unit in the Revolutionary forces. And, in the strict sense of military history, they failed. Cavalry never became of any importance in the Revolutionary War. Washington's English military background included the scepticism of the value of cavalry in combat. With only a pitifully small army of men at his command, Washington felt he could ill afford to allocate the 400 to 500 men that Kováts and Pulaski requested. Forced to undertake their own recruitment program among a people already stripped of most of their eligible men, they were forced to accept into the ranks of the newly created Pulaski Legion many former prisoners, and deserters. With food and supplies in short supply, Kováts, as master of exercise, had great difficulty in keeping his troops disciplined and defections were an ever-pressing problem.

These conditions resulted in several clashes with some of the townspeople where Kováts' troops were billeted. Although he was careful not to resort to the classic custom of commandeering the supplies and housing needed for his troops, both he and Pulaski could not understand why disloyal tories should retain their wealth while soldiers and horses went hungry. In June 1778 matters came to a head. One of Kováts' men was arrested by a civil officer for confiscating some tory-owned supplies. The civilian officer was then abused by other members of the regiment and Congress, hearing of the incident, became aroused. Kováts strongly supported the actions of his men and Pulaski was obliged to explain the matter to Congress. This was something of a dilemma for Congress, but it finally solved the problem by supporting Pulaski while reminding him that civilian authorities must be obeyed in situations of this nature.

The legion was fully trained and ready for action by the summer of 1779. Congress delayed approving the new unit and the men, including Kováts, spent 6 idle weeks in Philadelphia. Orders finally arrived on September 29. The legion was to help counter a British offensive in south Jersey. As had been feared, some of the men proved unreliable. Treachery and desertion led to severe reverses in the first engagement. Again the legion's critics became active and Pulaski had to defend himself to Congress. Eager to redeem his reputation, Pulaski and Kováts hurried to their next assignment on the frontier in New York State. Disappointments followed again. Cavalry was ineffective in this wooded wilderness and Pulaski obtained permission to bring his legion back to Philadelphia.

Months passed with no action other than bickering with Congress over the finances and abuse of local citizens. Then, toward the end of 1778 the British invaded Georgia and threatened Charleston. Pulaski's Legion was among the forces ordered south to meet this new attack. Reaching Charleston on May 8, Pulaski and Kováts found the city on the point of surrender. The arrival of the Legion fired the spirits of the defenders and it was decided to resist. On May 12 the Legion swung into action against a much superior British force, and although it fought well, it was completely overwhelmed. Colonel Kováts, with most of his men, died in this battle.

Though hardly an American victory, the dash and bravery of Pulaski's force buoyed up the defending forces and strengthened the resistance immeasurably. It is impossible to assess the true importance of so small an engagement, but the sacrifice of the gallant Hungarian Michael de Kováts equals that of any hero of our Revolution and shines as a true example for all patriotic Americans today.

Qualifications of Directors of National Banking Associations

SPEECH
OF
HON. HENRY O. TALLE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 1736) to amend

section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the qualifications of directors of national banking associations.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, under the law, boards of directors of national banks must consist of not less than 5 members nor more than 25, so this proposed change in the residence requirement is genuinely minor; but it does mean something to some banks. If we will take into account the changes that have taken place here in the Washington area within the last 15 or 20 years and consider how much farther away from the Capital Members live now than formerly, we can visualize very easily why we should not restrict a bank director from living as far away from the bank as say 100 miles. This bill is realistic and should be passed.

I have no further requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

Part-Time Presidency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that President Eisenhower's ability to perform the necessary functions of his office have been made a matter of public concern by the President himself, the American people cannot be other than confused by the many conflicting opinions that almost daily make headlines.

We are assured by White House spokesmen—even by the President himself—that he has been devoting full time and attention to the necessary duties, eliminating only some allegedly nonessential, ceremonial functions.

On the other hand the President is classified as a part-time Chief Executive.

Strangely enough, Mr. Speaker, I agree that Mr. Eisenhower is a part-time President, but I also believe he, himself, is completely sincere when he tells us he is not shirking the necessary duties of this high office.

Why I cannot doubt the President's personal sincerity is ably pointed out in a column appearing in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Wednesday, April 18, written by Marquis Childs, a distinguished and veteran recorder of the facts of Washington life.

Mr. Childs discusses the President's military approach to the Presidency, and I think his comments are extremely pertinent. It would appear that we are the victims of the old Army game.

I include the column by Mr. Childs as a part of my remarks:

IKE'S FARM APPEAL SHOWS BAD TIMING
(By Marquis Childs)

In this political year, the charge of a part-time President is bound to grow in volume. It results, in part, from the extensive discussion of President Eisenhower's health and the debate over whether he would run again.

But a look at the record shows that the heart attack has made comparatively little difference in his approach to the most difficult and demanding office in the world. The Eisenhower concept of the office differs, markedly from that of his predecessors.

It is the chain-of-command concept under which broad authority is delegated to subordinates. They are responsible for success or failure in their separate departments. This is shown most clearly in the record of the President's public addresses during his first term.

His predecessors felt it was part of their duty to go directly to the public with policies which they wanted Congress and the public to accept. Again and again, to nationwide audiences on radio and after the war on television, Presidents Roosevelt and Truman explained, expounded and persuaded. This was outside the campaign periods when the speeches they made were strictly political.

But Mr. Eisenhower has rarely gone to the public. The record shows that aside from the 1954 campaign he has been on radio and/or television 40 times during his first term.

This includes brief recorded greetings to special groups. It includes remarks on the annual lighting of the White House Christmas tree and informal participation in the back-to-God rallies. It also includes some talks with an avowed political objective, although they were not given in a campaign.

Of the total 17 or 18 speeches can be said to deal with issues.

The appeal to public opinion by persuasion and exposition is raised acutely by 2 controversies, 1 domestic and 1 foreign, now confronting the administration.

The President's farm program has been brushed aside by Congress in favor of the old rigid price-support system. While several warnings against this action have come from the White House, the President never has taken his case to the public. Now he has explained to a nationwide audience what is wrong with the bill passed by Congress. But a forthright appeal earlier might have enlisted sufficient public support for his farm program.

On the issue of his foreign-aid program, again it is the President alone who can make the case. There is evidence of considerable public support for expanded foreign aid and for a commitment up to 10 years in some instances. A Presidential speech explaining the whys and wherefores might focus this support, although the President already may have waited too long.

Before he entered the White House, Mr. Eisenhower made many eloquent speeches. As the first Supreme Commander of the North Atlantic Alliance, he preached the cause of European unity with a vigor and a forcefulness that contributed a great deal to his reputation as a politico-military statesman. Those speeches helped to advance him on the road to the Presidency.

Yet once in the White House he seemed to suffer from all sorts of inhibitions.

For one thing, the caliber of his speechwriters has not been high. He has had few who have been willing or able to spark discussion of the great issues of the day.

And the mechanics of television may have had something to do with the President's lack of ease in his infrequent public speeches.

Given the proper setting and a theme close to his heart, the President has demonstrated that he can rise to an occasion.

The atoms-for-peace proposal, which captured the imagination of the country and the world, is one of the rare instances in which the President has gone outside the conventional mold to strike a new and dramatic note. Too often his speeches have consisted of well-intentioned platitudes.

One of the obligations of a President is to articulate the needs, the aspirations, the hopes, and the ideas of the people. In the words of Woodrow Wilson, he must be "the spokesman for the real sentiment and purpose of the country."

This President Eisenhower has not done. This phase of the Presidency is alien to his experience and background. In the chain of command, an order is an order and there is no need to persuade anyone to carry it out.

How the Miner Looks at Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, one of the qualities that has played such an important part in our development as individuals and as a Nation is the faith of our working people. This characteristic has been vividly portrayed in a statement appearing in the Portage Dispatch, Portage, Pa., on February 16, 1956, by Mr. John Ghizzoni, president of District 2, United Mine Workers of America.

As spokesman for thousands of miners and their families in western Pennsylvania, he could justifiably express keen disappointment and discouragement as regards the economic outlook, in view of the troublesome road onto which the mining industry has been plunged the past years. After having experienced such depressed conditions despite the general high levels of prosperity, miners might very well be skeptical of what is in store for them in the immediate future.

Because of unparalleled determination and perseverance born of experience, however, miners refuse to lose faith regardless of hardship. I also believe that it is incumbent on the Congress to make certain that this faith has not been in vain, for only through an adjustment of policies detrimental to our people can they again be given the opportunities that are rightfully theirs.

The miners' spirit is commendable, Mr. Speaker, and one which can provide an incentive for all Americans. For the record, I should like to have Mr. Ghizzoni's statement inserted as part of my remarks:

HOW THE MINER LOOKS AT COAL
(By John Ghizzoni, president, district 2, UMWA)

Thousands of men who dedicate themselves to the mining of coal and therefore expect to earn an honest, decent livelihood therefrom would like to see a permanent improvement in the production and consumption of coal.

The production of coal for the year 1955 has improved to some extent in our area but it did not put an equivalent number of coal miners back to work. It has, however, given more working time to the miners who are employed in the mines.

During the past year, when the coal business was good, the railroads could not meet their railroad car requirements in furnishing sufficient railroad cars to maintain full running time at the mines. That was due to the neglect of the railroad and not maintaining their old stock and acquiring new

railroad cars sufficiently to carry our coal to its markets.

At the moment, this condition has alleviated itself because of the fact that the lake trade is now closed for the winter, but, coming spring it may become another irritating factor, and to which we look to the railroad for easement.

Thousands of miners in District No. 2 are still without jobs because of the closing of a large number of coal mines and because of a large number of coal mines curtailing their working force by laying off coal miners. The mechanization program carried forth in our coal mines has substantially reduced the cost of coal at the mines.

We, however, look forward to the future with optimism because of the expansion of our population and increased use of power made from coal. It is estimated that by 1960, we shall be using 100 million tons of coal, in addition to the coal now being mined.

Greater uses for coal are being found daily and with this we are hopeful that additional thousands of coal miners will eventually be put to work to satisfy the needs of our expanding economy.

So that, while at the moment the picture may not be a rosy one, there is sound hope for the future of coal mining and for coal miners to earn a living therefrom.

How the Pie Is Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DeWITT S. HYDE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the April 16, 1956, issue of the Morning Herald, Hagerstown, Md.

HOW THE PIE IS CUT

The Democrats' favorite theme—that the "big guy" gets all the benefits of the Eisenhower Republican prosperity while the "little guy" is not getting his full share—is "baloney."

At the risk of mixing metaphores, when the pie is cut, labor receives a larger slice under Eisenhower than it did under Truman; the big corporations, on the other hand, have received smaller slices under Ike than under Harry.

Let's take the national income (total net income of persons and corporations) and see how it has been divided:

National income, for the Nation as a whole, has risen and so has labor's share. Under 7 Truman years, labor's share was about 65 percent; under Ike's first 3 years it has risen to about 69 percent.

Conversely, corporation incomes after taxes have accounted for only 6 percent of the national income under Ike as compared to 7.7 percent under Truman.

As for corporation dividend payments, they remain about the same under both Presidents; on a year-for-year basis they have been higher under Truman in a few instances.

Another important item is personal income which is, primarily, national income with corporation profits and business taxes excluded. Labor income has averaged about 75 percent of total personal income under Ike; under Truman it was about 71 percent.

Finally, there is per capita disposable personal income—the income of persons less taxes. This averaged $1,508 in 1952. It has risen to $1,630 under the Republican administration.

The Eisenhower administration has achieved unprecedented prosperity with peace. And more people are sharing in that prosperity than ever before. It is no wonder that Ike is leading all political popularity polls.

Japanese Protest Against Alabama and South Carolina Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in the Japanese textile controversy, the State Department is not representing the best interests of America. They brought on the situation that necessitated South Carolina and Alabama taking action. I cannot blame Japan, but I do blame the State Department for not pointing out to Japan the utter ridiculousness of bringing Japanese textile goods into this country where we already have a surplus.

We who are fighting for fair trade policies appreciate the following press release by Mr. O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy:

JAPANESE PROTESTS AGAINST ALABAMA AND SOUTH CAROLINA LAWS

(Statement of O. R. Strackbein, chairman, the Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy)

Official Japanese Government protest against State laws enacted in South Carolina and Alabama requiring merchants to display signs notifying the buying public that Japanese textiles are carried in stock for sale, comes as no surprise.

Japan claims that the South Carolina and Alabama practices violate the treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation signed by the United States and Japan in 1953. Japan claims discrimination against the products of her export industries.

Here is a magnificent example of the fruits of executive efforts to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States. In its grasp for unlimited power over our foreign trade the State Department has sought subordination of all considerations of the domestic economy to its own particular objectives.

The Japanese protest is but the comeuppance to be expected. Should this succeed, foreign protests will soon be telling us how to run our factories and farms. The point is that protests of this character are the natural consequence of State Department policy. That policy acts as an open invitation to foreign interference in our domestic affairs. That is why the Japanese protest should cause no surprise. More protests of this character may be expected from other sources. If they do not come spontaneously we may be sure that the State Department will instigate them. The protests can then be used as a club over Congress or our States to beat them into submission to the State Department policies.

The implication of the Japanese protest and the immediate expression of anguish by the State Department over the efforts of South Carolina and Alabama to protect themselves against the results of the trade agreements policy of the State Department throws a revealing light on the OTC legislation that is now before Congress.

If further evidence were needed of the intent of the State Department to come into a position of cracking the whip over our industries and their efforts to defend themselves against destructive import competition, or to reach its tentacles into every town, village, or city to bend them to State Department policy, the Department's reply to Japan as voiced by Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, admirably supplies it.

The Secretary of State seems to deplore the fact that because of our constitutional system he cannot order the signs torn down in South Carolina and Alabama. He is seemingly apologetic for what under the circumstances he pictures as a clumsy system of government. He overlooks the fact that it is the State Department's own doing or its own nonfeasance that places the Japanese in the position of having what might appear to be a legitimate grievance.

If the State Department had not usurped the constitutional powers of Congress and thus could not nullify all legitimate efforts of protection against destructive import competition, the States of South Carolina and Alabama would not have found it necessary to resort to the drastic steps they have taken. But the State Department has lost both the art and the will to listen to counsel that comes from American producers who are injured by excessive imports.

The doors are virtually closed against recourse. This drives the aggrieved areas to such self-help as they can legitimately muster.

Why cannot import quotas be established to regulate the imports of textiles and other products that offer a grave threat to American industries?

The answer is the State Department says "No," and has illegitimately written this "No" into the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade or GATT. If there is to be a "yes" or a "no" to import quotas Congress is the only legitimate source under the Constitution that can give the answer. The State Department is only reaping what it has sown by way of violating the Constitution.

There will be more protests as a result of this violation; and there will be bitterness and misunderstanding both at home and abroad. Mr. Dulles would do well to lend his weight to getting the State Department on its legitimate track rather than standing in apologetic posture before the world, deploring our constitutional system.

The Late Leo R. Sack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a sad coincidence that Mr. Leo R. Sack, the distinguished soldier and diplomat and former member of the Capitol Press Galleries, died on Sunday in Los Angeles, Calif., on the eve of the observance of the eighth anniversary of the independence of the State of Israel, in the creation of which he played such a significant role.

As public relations counselor to Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, then president of the Zionist Organization of America, Leo Sack rendered an incalculable service that will be long remembered by those who have the cause of democracy at heart.

As a patriotic American he saw the wisdom of the establishment of a bastion of the free world in the Middle East where comunism had long sought, and still seeks, a foothold. As a member of the Jewish faith whose brethren survivors of the Nazi holocaust sought a refuge in their traditional homeland he labored for the justice of their cause.

And as an experienced journalist and diplomat of wide experience and friendships he directed his efforts in the crucial days of the partition fight and the birth of the fledgling nation to the success of that cause.

I am sure I speak the sentiments of many other Americans, Jew and non-Jew alike, who knew and loved Leo Sack when I extend our sympathies to his wife, his daughter and grandchildren and other members of his family and add: "Well, done thou good and faithful servant."

Fewer Laws Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, as one of a helpful and congenial nature and by way of solace to those who have the responsibility of explaining away the charges of a do-nothing Congress, I respectfully submit an editorial from the Hudson Star which is an outstanding publication from the city of the same name in my district:

FEWER LAWS NEEDED

Legislators should realize that the voters are not clamoring for new laws. In fact it would be of real pleasure to the country at large if the lawmakers suddenly decided on placing a moratorium on hundreds of insignificant bills as introduced by politically-minded sponsors.

Laws are now too numerous. Every year many new ones are introduced but luckily the majority of them fail of passage or draw a veto. The only new law that the voters as a rule favor is one which has to do with reduction in taxes. Such a law would be popular.

Take for instance in the last session of the legislature. There were 7,460 bills which were introduced for consideration. Half of them were products of assemblymen. Of the record total 1,288 were passed but only half of them will become laws because of the governor's veto power.

Much wasted effort goes into these bills which are designed in many cases to satisfy constituents of a certain locality. Members of the assembly and senate should give careful consideration to each request for a bill before it is brought up for vote. The same is true of Congress.

But the wishes of the voters for fewer laws will continue to be ignored as long as there are lawmakers who have political ambitions to satisfy.

A Very Bad Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include editorials relating to the farm program which appeared in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of April 10, 1956]

BY ANY TEST, A BAD FARM BILL

Economically, agriculturally, even politically, the farm legislation congressional Democrats high-balled through Senate-House conference is a wretched measure.

Almost certainly, if it is passed in the present form, the President will be forced to veto. He should refuse to sign.

The bill could not be passed over his veto. Then Democrats and the Republicans in Congress who connived at this omnibus of political largesse will be on a spot.

Farmers will know their so-called friends on Capitol Hill balked all relief. Agriculture would not be so naive as to cast all the blame on the White House.

Millions of farmers understand the high, rigid parities the administration steadfastly opposes have been responsible for the huge surpluses that depress prices. Millions are not in favor of top, inelastic supports, as many in Congress seem to think.

While Congressmen are going hog-wild to bolster farm income by makeshift bounties, insuportable by long-range farm economics, they seem to have forgot the consuming public. The multimillion voters who will have to pay more for bread, meats and other products of agriculture will know whom to blame.

If the present measure is spiked by a veto, no doubt a new bill would be quickly drafted and an attempt made to rush it through the mill. But even if it were passed and signed, it would be too late for this year. Farmers would have no guide in planting or in "soil-banking" until too late for present crops. It is already late, as a result of the political wrestling in Congress.

The best procedure is for Congress to send the bill back to conference, as GOP leaders plan to do. The 90-percent rigid props must be knocked out and other changes effected.

The President has made it known he does not expect perfection and will go along with some compromise to obtain farm relief. But he is dead right in his temperate statement the present measure does not meet "the test of a good farm bill." It is, in fact, a legislative atrocity, even for an election year.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of April 13, 1956]

VETO THE FARM BILL

The President should veto the farm bill.

This measure is one of the most brazen political hoaxes ever hatched by a Congress. It is scarcely more than a boodle bill, designed to buy the votes of farmers next November.

Talk about giveaways. This proposal is bloated with public largesse.

It is a $3 billion bribe, designed by Democratic leadership of Capitol Hill—with connivance of a GOP minority—to lure ballots in an alection year.

The bill provides billions for farm blandishment, billions out of taxpayers' pockets. If you don't think so, take a hard look at the provisions of the legislation.

Crux of the battle has been over high, rigid parities. The Eisenhower administration has foughtt this system, under which agriculture's income has steadily dwindled for years, under which Government has built up $9 billion of idle and rotting farm surpluses.

Two years ago the Ike regime secured a sliding parity scale, from 75 to 90 percent. Now Congress has voted back inelastic parity props of 90 percent, in some cases rising to 100 percent.

It has not made this change because members believe top, compulsory supports are an answer to the serious farm problem. It seeks to restore fat, rigid parities as a political sop so agriculture can get a fast billion on the eve of a tough presidential campaign.

This bill provides high parities only during 1956. In 1957—when the elections are all over—the lower, sliding parity schedules will be returned.

What a cozening of an afflicted agriculture. What a blatant job of political trickery. Congress does not, obviously, believe rigid, top parities are realistic solution for slugged farm income.

But it votes to restore them for an election year, because some farmers—not the majority—want them. This smacks loudly of legislative looting, a prolix raid on the Federal till in the interests of political pandering.

Expediency dictated the farm hodgepodge that has come out of the congressional mill. Expediency and political ruthlessness.

The measure contains a $1,200,000,000 soil-bank provision, about which there is no controversy. It is eminently worth a trial. The plan would offer subsidies to farmers for retiring arable land, thus cutting down the pyramiding surpluses. High parities, however, would sabotage the soil-bank by encouraging more production, discouraging soil-banking.

In addition, this omnibus handout includes a dual-parity scheme which would raise subsidies, and two-price plans for wheat and rice, designed to bolster these crops to 100-percent parity. There are other gimmicks, decking the bill with glittering Federal cumshaw.

Congressmen, we are convinced, make a mistake if they imagine the farmers will be taken in. They make a mistake if they think the farm vote demands parities up to the ceiling. The smashing Eisenhower vote in southern Illinois should dispel such jump conclusions.

Congressmen also err if they consider this farm monstrosity will thrust the President into an acute political dilemma.

A veto of this act would still leave time for speedy adoption of a more sane measure. Mr. Eisenhower's veto would not be overridden. It could bring from Congress a rational compromise which would insure the soil-bank program.

If the Democratic Congress refuses to do anything further, both parties will suffer politically—not merely Republicans. Farmers will recognize the hoax contrived in this political bribe bill.

Veto of this unconscionable measure is urged in the national welfare and in the best interests of agriculture.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of April 14, 1956]

A VERY BAD BILL

The more one reads and studies the patchwork farm bill passed by a politically minded Congress, the more cynical one becomes on the workings of Government processes in an election year.

The bill is a bald attempt to bribe the farmer with short-term good and long-term ill.

The Democrats in the Senate and House who voted overwhelmingly for it, or those Republicans who were wooed to it on the specious theory that you can't go wrong with bread and circuses in an election year, are ignoring the best interests of the farmers whom they allegedly would aid.

The reason the overwhelming majority voted for General Eisenhower was because he represented integrity in America. Under his administration, at least a beginning has been made in the effort to cut down the glut of farm surpluses which costs the taxpayers huge sums, only to lie and rot in warehouses.

Flexible price supports are an attempt to solve the basically wrong system whereby the taxpayer has to pay high taxes to support farm subsidies (including those surpluses which so often become a complete waste), and then must turn about and pay higher prices at the grocery store when he buys the goods which his tax money has made more expensive.

Admittedly the farmers have not shared as they should in the gross national product. But they are poorly off not actually, but only when compared to the wages of some workers and the large profits of some, though not by any means all, corporations, or to the years of phenomenal prosperity which could not continue.

The best farmers, and all right-thinking ones, will see through the transparent scheme to toss them a bone just to get them past November 6 or to make a campaign issue for the Democratic Party. Even today the consensus among the stable element in the farm groups urges the President to veto a thoroughly bad bill, which would set back farm progress more than the possible temporary relief would help him.

The Globe-Democrat believes that the President will be turning his back on the element of character which, more than anything else, helped to elect him—integrity—if he signs this bad bill. We hope most sincerely that he will veto it.

The Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a series of seven editorials from Wisconsin papers, commenting on H. R. 12, the so-called farm bill. These editorials are taken from six different newspapers in Wisconsin and I believe represent the thinking of Wisconsin citizens on this legislation.

[From the Marshfield (Wis.) News-Herald of April 10, 1956]

THE FARM BILL

President Eisenhower finds himself in an uncomfortable position with regard to the farm bill which has been revamped by a House-Senate conference committee after much discussion. The President has said that he is dissatisfied with the measure in its present form, while the Democratic chairmen of the Senate and House Agriculture Committees have insisted that it will be passed by both Houses on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. If Mr. Eisenhower decides to "leave it" he will be denounced by his critics as opposing help for the farmer.

At this stage it would be impolitic for the President to say that he will veto the measure if it comes to him in its present form, nor can he say that he will not, if he hopes to see it recommitted to the conference committee for revision. At the moment the bill serves as a test of confidence—will the country support Congress' claim that the bill is the best that can be adopted, or will it back the President if he vetoes it on the ground that it is worse than no bill at all?

Neither political party can claim infallibility in the matter, for there are Democrats and Republicans on both sides of the fence, some for rigid support prices and some against. Minority leader MARTIN has admitted that he knows of no way to swerve the 21 House Republicans who disagree with the President on this issue.

Headlines in Wisconsin newspapers emblazon the story, but the accounts from Washington generally fail to point out that passage of the bill as it now stands is hardly worthy of the consideration of the Badger State's great dairy industry. The rigid-price support provisions it would restore mean a 15-percent boost in subsidies for producers of corn, wheat, cotton and the other basic but offer the Wisconsin farmer no more than a 2 or 3 percent increase.

The recent Department of Agriculture decision to raise the Cheddar cheese support price to 34 cents will bring more money into the State than anything the current farm bill could do, and can be justified in view of the dairy market situation. But restoration of rigid high supports for the basics can only result in production of crop surpluses for storage in nonexistent warehouses and, for Wisconsin farmers, in higher milk production costs.

If Wisconsin farmers could grasp the full picture, we believe they would flood the White House and Congress with protests against the passage of the bill Congress and its conference committee have brought forth.

[From the Stevens Point (Wis.) Daily Journal of April 14, 1956]

FARM MEASURE WON'T REDUCE THE SURPLUSES

As President Eisenhower's decision is being awaited on the farm bill sent to him by Congress, the measure continues to be defended and attacked, depending upon political and other viewpoints. Even the major farm organizations are not in agreement as to its merits.

The bill contains provisions opposed by the President, including the return to farm price supports at 90 percent of parity, the system blamed in the past for the huge farm surpluses. The Democratic strategy is out in the open. In event of a veto, the Democrats will use this as a springboard for direct attacks on the President in the national political campaign.

The farm bill is called a disgrace and all bad by the Milwaukee Journal in an editorial declaring it is "a bald bid to buy farm votes by misspending $3 billion more of taxpayers' money, to the ultimate harm of the farmers and of practically everyone else." The editorial continued, in part:

"The bill is a disgrace to a Congress that completely forgets its responsibilities in the mad scramble for momentary political advantage.

"The bill is a gross steal from taxpayers and customers, rural as well as urban.

"It is an insult to American farmers, indicating a belief that they are so stupid that they won't see through this bag of tricks, and so greedy that they would sell their votes for a paltry price."

The editorial went on to say that Democrats and Republicans in Congress vied with each other for the "friend of the farmer role" by adding larger and larger giveaways.

The Wisconsin State Journal of Madison is equally critical, calling the measure a monstrosity. It says that so far as Wisconsin is concerned, the bill further heightens the discrimination shown against the dairyman in the Federal farm program. "Not only does it restore rigid 90 percent supports for another year to the cash grain crops while continuing dairy supports at a lower figure; it removes the safeguard on soil bank acres to pave the way for still greater milk production on land now devoted to grains," the Madison paper declares.

Walter H. Ebling, statistician for the State agriculture department, commented that the measure will not have much effect on Wisconsin agriculture, at least for the present. Wisconsin, he pointed out, was most concerned with two sections of the bill, those dealing with dairy price supports and the soil bank plan. The price support minimums in the bill for milk and butterfat, while higher than the minimums under existing law, are about the same as present supports. As to a reduction in the number of acres under the soil bank program, this would come too late for the 1956 planting season even if the bill is signed.

As for the return to high, rigid prices supports on the basic crops, not enough of these crops are grown in our State on a cash basis to make much difference in the State's economy, according to Ebling.

The controversial bill leaves much to be desired from the standpoint of a sound national economy for agriculture. It became so deeply involved in election strife as to lose track of numerous important considerations. Even the spending of $3 billions won't solve the surplus and other problems that exist. And surpluses may grow still bigger by encouraging the growing of still more basic crops for which there is no demand or need ,if the bill becomes law.

[From the Shawano (Wis.) Evening Leader of April 14, 1956]

IT DESERVES A VETO

It will be a long time before a more cluttered piece of legislation than the farm bill goes to a President for signature.

The bill passed by the House and the Senate and now awaiting Presidential signature or veto is an election-year monstrosity which ill graces the Congress.

It calls for a return to high rigid price supports for the basic crops such as wheat, corn, and cotton. It provides a price-support minimum of $3.25 per hundredweight for manufacturing milk and 58.6 cents a pound for butterfat.

The dairy minimums are higher than the minimums under the present law, but according to Wisconsin agricultural department statistician Walter H. Ebling, these minimums will make very little difference to the economy in Wisconsin. They are about the same as present supports.

The heart of the bill, which calls for the rigid supports for the basics, will likewise have little beneficial effect on Wisconsin, because the State raises only nominal quantities of these crops.

Representative BYRNES, Green Bay Republican who voted against the bill, contends that less than 1 percent of Wisconsin's production is in basic crops. He argues that it is unjust for the Wisconsin dairy farmer to remain on a flexible-support basis while the basic crops are placed under a 90-percent mandatory level.

The House passed the farm bill 237 to 181 and the Senate voted 50 to 35 in favor of passage. Voting on the bill represented fierce jumping of party lines and some inconsistencies which probably will never be explained. Wisconsin's Democrats in the House voted for the bill and were joined by Republican O'KONSKI; all the rest of Wisconsin's representation in the House is Republican and all voted against the bill; yet Republican Senators WILEY and MCCARTHY voted for the bill.

The bill is bad enough in that it discriminates against dairying in favor of the basic crops; what is worse is that it fails to protect dairymen against the use of land taken

out of other production from being put into grass to provide economical feed for cattle in other areas of the country. In effect, enactment of the bill would encourage others to compete against the dairy farmer.

Only in an election year could such a hodgepodge of legislation emanate from the Congress. The farm bill is a flagrant attempt by election-minded politicians in Congress to curry favor for the farm vote. It would reestablish high supports in areas where there are already overburdening surpluses—and high supports have been the prime cause of the surpluses in the first place.

The farm bill passed Congress purely because this is an election year. Its enactment would make worse the surplus situation in the United States. It discriminates against the dairy industry. It is a disgrace that politicians would bend so far to jam through such unsound legislation.

The farm bill deserves a Presidential veto.

[From the Marshfield (Wis.) News-Herald of April 14, 1956]

FARM BOOBY TRAP

Democrats leave no doubt that they think they have set a neat trap for President Eisenhower in the farm bill they pushed through Congress this week. They know that the President is convinced of the inadequacy of rigid price supports, but they believe that if he follows his inclination to veto the measure he will incur the anger of farmers throughout the Nation.

The President's decision will not be an easy one, for much more than the farm problem itself is involved. Even though he realizes that the restoration of rigid supports can only aggravate that problem, he cannot dodge the possibility that loss of the farm vote could return the executive as well as the legislative branch to Democratic control, which would spell the end of the constructive national program his administration has been carrying on for the past 3 years.

So the question that confronts Mr. Eisenhower is whether to take a chance, for the sake of principle, on ending the tenure and thereby wrecking the program, of his own administration. The choice is a hard one, and it is doubtful whether there is anyone in the Nation capable of advising the President of the effect a veto would have on agricultural opinion.

The situation in Wisconsin serves to demonstrate the complexity of the problem, for in this State where the bill offers agriculture nothing, politicians and the leaders of some farm groups are managing to convince many farmers that they would lose by a veto. If that is true here, how much easier it must be to build up farm support for the bill in States where the basic commodities, the beneficiaries of the bill, are the major sources of agricultural income.

Mr. Eisenhower's task, if he intends to stand by his convictions and veto the farm bill, will be to convince farmers that the return to rigid price supports will only build up new crop surpluses at public expense and eventually wreck the farm price structure completely. Some farmers are as well aware of that as he is, but the others will not easily be convinced that Congress has no authority to repeal the natural laws of economics.

[From the Wausau (Wis.) Daily Record-Herald of April 16, 1956]

A MONSTROSITY

The farm legislation just passed by Congress has been called a lot of things both good and bad, but the term which seems to fit it about as good as any is "monstrosity."

It is wildly contradictory, grossly discriminatory and confusing to the point of chaos, to name but a few of the glaring faults which have been pointed up in debate and discussion.

Worst of all as far as Wisconsin is concerned is that, instead of helping Wisconsin dairy farmers, it would actually do them serious damage.

Any piece of legislation that would have such a result is indeed a monstrosity.

Six of Wisconsin's 10 representatives, including Representative MELVIN R. LAIRD, of the State's Seventh Congressional District, have told just how it would harm instead of help Wisconsin dairy farmers in a message to President Eisenhower calling for a veto.

Wisconsin farmers would gain about $14 million from temporary increases in the milk support level, but they would lose $26 million through increased feed costs, the 6 Congressmen contend. And they have offered a convincing array of facts and figures to back up that contention.

Gov. Walter Kohler, for similar reasons, vigorously opposes the measure, as do Milo K. Swanton, executive secretary of the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture, and Curtis Hatch, president of the Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation, largest farmer group in the State.

Legislation that seeks to help some American farmers at the heavy cost of seriously harming other American farmers who are already facing extreme difficulties—the Wisconsin dairy farmers—is not only poor legislation but is vicious legislation as well. The 6 Wisconsin Congressmen who fought to prevent that monstrosity from being inflicted upon Wisconsin farmers are the true friends of Wisconsin agriculture—Representatives LAIRD, BYRNES, DAVIS, SMITH, WITHROW, and VAN PELT—not the 2 Wisconsin Senators and 4 Representatives who voted for the bill—Senators WILEY and MCCARTHY and Representatives O'KONSKI, ZABLOCKI, REUSS, and JOHNSON.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal of April 17, 1956]

FARM BILL VETO A GOOD THING

President Eisenhower deserves full credit for vetoing a thoroughly bad farm bill. He has given the American farmers and American people a persuasive explanation of why he did so.

He has proposed an alternative program to bring considerable needed help to farmers this year. Some of that can be carried out without congressional action. The expedited soil bank program that he urges would, however, require congressional approval. This is uncertain at best with the political pot boiling harder by the day and the farm bloc, including many Republicans, miffed by the Presidential veto.

The President's alternative program is far from perfect, as he has tacitly admitted. However, it isn't as positively bad for the country and the farmers as the hodgepodge political measure that finally came from Congress.

It will take time to determine what the ultimate effect of the veto will be—economic or political. That effect will differ according to regions and crops and climates, according to various farmers' land, markets, skills and attitudes.

Realizing those uncertainties, the President has done what commonsense, his farm advisers and his conscience dictated rather than what many—but not all—of his party political advisers wanted.

If he had signed the farm bill monstrosity under political persuasion, he certainly would have fallen in the estimation of many of his admirers.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Sentinel, of April 17, 1956]

FARM VETO

In vetoing the politically loaded monstrosity which reached his desk in the highly publicized guise of a farm bill, President Eisenhower again acted in the interest of sincere and conscientious statesmanship, rather than endeavoring to meet political expediency with more political expediency.

The veto is particularly fortunate for Wisconsin's dairy farmers, and therefore for the entire State.

It is fortunate that 6 of this State's alert Republican Congressmen discovered the bill's built-in trap through which our Wisconsin dairy farmers would lose $12 million in 1956 because the $14 million that they would have gained from temporary election year milk increases would have been offset by $26 million in increased feed costs.

We congratulate these Congressmen for this outstanding statesmanlike service: BYRNES, DAVIS, LAIRD, SMITH, VAN PELT, and WITHROW.

For joining them in calling Mr. Eisenhower's attention to this bad bill's injurious features which would have brought havoc to our State and Nation, we also congratulate:

Gov. Walter Kohler; Curtis Hatch, president of the Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation, and Milo Swanton, executive secretary of the Wisconsin Council for Agriculture.

All of these gentlemen have obviously acted in the interest of the public, not in the interest of trying to make political hay out of a very real farm problem.

Are We Losing India?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William Randolph Hearst, Jr., has just completed a 30-day trip through the Far East that took him into 10 nations. His observations are contained in a series of nine articles which are deserving of the attention of our colleagues. The first article was inserted in the RECORD of April 16, 1956—page A3007—by our distinguished colleague from Indiana, Hon. E. ROSS ADAIR. The other articles appear in the issues of the New York Journal-American for April 9 through 16, 1956. In the second article, which follows, Mr. Hearst makes the following remarks on India:

DANGER AHEAD—ASIA: AMERICA IS LOSING COLD WAR IN INDIA, W. R. HEARST FINDS

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

1. America is losing the cold war in India today.

2. That vast country, with its teeming millions and great undeveloped resources, is being turned against the United States.

3. Communism is growing stronger there every day.

I make these three statements with reluctance.

Despite the politeness and charm shown me by government leaders, and the friendly attitude of most Indians one encounters, I firmly believe them to be true.

A government which enjoys the luxury of neutralism, to the full, under the protection of America's atomic umbrella, is allowing a biased press to lead the Indian people to mistrust and misunderstand the United States.

While there does not appear to be any immediate likelihood of communism gaining

control of India, my visit convinced me that the country represents the greatest long-range political danger spot for the United States in Asia.

Huge, passive India, in effect, is awakening. That giant nation, with its 350 million inhabitants, is coming out of a slumber sedatively applied by British colonialism for centuries. It is stirring with nationalism aroused by its independence from the white man's colonial rule. Impatient for a better way of life.

WHICH WAY WILL MASSES TURN?

Its masses are becoming politically conscious. Even its illiterate peasants sense almost subconsciously that they need not suffer the miserable poverty, disease, and degradation that has been their loathesome lot for so many years.

The great question is which way they will eventually turn. Will they develop democratically and peacefully? Or, in their eagerness to get quick results, will they accept totalitarianism and join with Red China and Russia in a Communist combine that will put all Asia under the despotic denomination of a ruthless, regimented rule?

If the former should be the case, India can become a bulwark of freedom in Asia that will help preserve world peace and contain Chinese Communist imperialism.

If the latter happens, woe be it for the West. The days of the white man's supremacy as the dominant political force in the world will be numbered.

What I saw and heard in India was not too reassuring or promising. We may still be able to turn the tide, but if we cannot or do not, we will lose India, and eventually all Asia with it.

Here are some of the factors which I found so disturbing on my visit to India:

There is more anti-Americanism reflected in the Indian press at the present time than in the Russian press. The tendency on the part of all Indian newspapers is to emphasize news unfavorable to America and omit news unfavorable to Russia and vice versa.

During my stay in New Delhi, one Indian Communist newspaper was trying to convince the people that "American imperialism is plotting to destroy our freedom."

Even the son of the late Mahatma Gandhi, the "father' 'of Indian independence, told me that the Communist influences are strong in the newspaper of which he is the editor—the Hindustan Times. This paper claimed recently that "the climate of peace is being sustained by Russia."

Other reliable sources informed us that Communists are scattered throughout the entire press of India, many of them holding key posts in the editorial and makeup departments. They have cells in all the universities, and are said to almost control India's merchant marine.

PARALLEL WITH RUSSIAN POLICY

While government officials discount the danger of communism in India, recent municipal elections in various parts of the country have shown a strong Red trend.

We were told that Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru called off elections scheduled to be held currently in Calcutta because he knew that, if they were held, the Communists would win control of that city of 7 million people—second largest metropolis in the British commonwealth. In addition, he placed the Communist leaders in Bombay under "preventative detention."

These actions are indicative of how tough he treats the Communists at home when they threaten the political dominance of his own Congress Party. At the same time, he is complacent about international communism. (Shades of President Truman.)

In fact, his foreign policy runs parallel with that of Russia in many ways and thus tends to weaken the free world's resistance to the spread of communism.

He is opposed to the defensive alliances which we have developed to deter Soviet and Chinese Communist aggression. He would like us to agree with Russia to destroy our stockpiles of nuclear weapons and prohibit the production of new ones, although in our interview with him he showed clearly that he felt the H-bomb was the world's greatest instrument of peace.

NEHRU'S VIEWS CHANGED, TOO

He said the terribly destructive power of nuclear weapons rules out world war and makes it impossible for one side to impose its system on the other.

This, coupled with economic developments of the modern atomic age and the growing political consciousness of the people, would, he felt, lead to an end to the cold war through peaceful coexistence. The Soviet leaders were, in his opinion, changing their views on basic Marxist doctrine.

He, too, has changed his views because there was a time when he wrote that he shared the Lenin theory that permanent coexistence between the Communist and capitalist states was impossible.

In "Glimpses of World History," Nehru wrote that there was a fundamental incompatibility between the capitalist and Communist systems.

"Peace between the latter two," he added, "can only be temporary. It is but a truce."

Perhaps Nehru has changed his mind. He seemed to indicate he had in his talk with us. I certainly hope he has because in his autobiography we read:

"I had long been drawn to socialism and communism, and Russia appealed to me * * * the Communist philosophy of life gave me comfort and hope * * * much in Soviet Russia I disliked, but there was no lack of violence in the capitalist world."

ANGERED BY GANDHI'S FAITH

"It was the essential freedom from dogma and the scientific outlook of Marxism that appealed to me.

"The bolsheviks may blunder and even fail because of national and international reasons, and yet the Communist theory may be correct."

Even more disturbing was his criticism of Gandhi because of the latter's strong religious faith.

"I felt angry," Nehru wrote, "at his religious and sentimental approach to a political question, and his frequent references to God in connection with it. He even seemed to suggest that God had indicated the very date of the fast."

This man is acclaimed today, especially in Europe, as one of the great leaders of our time. He is certainly one of the most controversial and enigmatic political personalities.

He wields great personal influence over the Indian people. His friends hail him as a highly intelligent individual with a touch of genius. They credit him with holding together by the sheer force of his character a nation whose caste system, sects, religious superstitutions, and diversified languages tend to tear it apart.

Some say he is the most valuable living Asian to the West because he is keeping India from going Communist. Others say he is the most dangerous man in free Asia because he is paving the way for communism to take over India by measures short of war.

MAY BLOCK COMMUNIST RULE

His enemies accuse him of being an intellectual snob with an inferiority color complex which prejudices him against the western white man. His youngest sister, Krishna Hoti Singh, predicted not long ago that he would become the "undesirable dictator of future India."

It is conceivable, too, that his social-democratic political system could turn into Hindu fascism or communism. Socialism was, of course, the first step which led on the one hand to fascism in Germany and Italy and to communism in Czechoslovakia and Hungary.

Somehow I felt after talking with Nehru that as long as he remains in a position of leadership, the Communists won't gain control of India.

He is unquestionably a passionate patriot.

The independence which his country attained less than 10 years ago is precious to him. In the deep recesses of his mind I think he is aware that communism would mean subjugation to Soviet imperialism.

He enjoys personal power, and I think that one of the reasons why he plays the neutralism game is that he believes it enhances the prestige of his position.

He is a bigger fish in his own pond than he would be swimming around with the SEATO nations or collaborating with the collective leadership of the Kremlin.

He is astute enough to know that while all are theoretically equal in the Communist combine, some are more equal than others.

Whatever his faults, and he is one of the most complex leaders in the world today, one cannot talk with him as we did without being impressed by his personality.

There is a quiet charm about him. He speaks calmly, profoundly and with an easy, graceful flow of words which give the impression of sincerity. He has the fine bones and strong features of the high-caste Brahmins, who in the civilizations of India have always been the thinkers—and dreamers.

While he professes to believe in, and practices, political democracy, his economic policies are basically socialistic. He had the constitution amended recently to give him power to nationalize industries by ordinance. Under the terms of the amendment, parliament will determine the amount of compensation with no recourse to the courts.

He seems to feel a sense of moral superiority over western democracy and communism. He is confident that his policies can lead India to a "golden age."

If he is right, they may do so.

If he is wrong, India like trusting Czechoslovakia will be lost to communism or some other form of totalitarianism.

The gamble is great, and the stakes for the free world are high.

MOUNTBATTEN ENDING TOUR

While we were there, Adm. Lord Louis Mountbatten, the last British Viceroy in India, and his wife were just completing a swing through the country.

A curious note was the manner in which the pro-Communist press treated him.

One of the papers implied that Mountbatten shared Nehru's sympathy for Marxism, characterizing him as a "serious student of Marx" and describing him as "one of the torchbearers of the new world."

Stating that Mountbatten "shares with our own Prime Minister the novelty of approach to current problems," the newspaper Blitz eulogized him as "a man eminently qualified to dispel the ills which beset Great Britain."

Strange political bedfellows, this scion of British royalty and this Indian ex revolutionist.

But then India is loaded with contradictions.

In fact—India is a contradiction.

Warnings From Syngman Rhee and Chiang Kai-shek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the third article by Mr. Hearst

in which he describes his visits with Syngman Rhee and Chiang Kai-shek:

DANGER AHEAD—ASIA: W. R. HEARST REVEALS FEARS OF UNITED STATES POLICY

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

Two old and proven friends of the United States in the Far East—Syngman Rhee and Chiang Kai-shek—are eyeing American policy in their area with a skepticism that is rapidly turning to disillusion.

It is clear to even the casual visitor that these two old pros of war and revolution in the Orient share the fear that we will never stand firm enough against the aggressive thrust of Communist power.

Both nourish dreams about the future of their respective countries.

To Syngman Rhee, the culmination of a lifetime's struggle would be the unification of North and South Korea under his presidential direction.

The one burning ambition coursing through Chiang is to return to the Chinese mainland from his island base of Formosa and resume the rule he lost to the Communists in 1949.

Chiang at 69 and Rhee at 81 are realists enough to know that time is running out on both of these dreams.

In fact, Chiang thinks the next 3 years will be crucial. In that period the Communists could consolidate their power, see their farm program through to completion, and finalize their grip on the minds of China's youth.

It is customary in some American circles to dismiss Rhee and Chiang as two anachronisms who brood over lost causes and yearn for the outbreak of war as the only solution to their difficulties.

But anyone who has spent hours with them discussing the problems of the world—as our party did on this trip—begins to see that their experience has given them a penetrating wisdom concerning the tactics and objectives of the Kremlin.

One State Department representative put it this way in analyzing the motives of Syngman Rhee.

"So far as I can see," he said, "Rhee has been as right as anyone about the Communist program out here. And even though I'm against his ideas about how we should handle it, I always have the feeling that he and not the State Department may be right again, after all."

Americans should always bear in mind that much of the discontent that spurs Rhee and Chiang to their warlike utterances stems from the knowledge that the United States—and not little Korea or Formosa—is the number one world target of the Kremlin.

TWENTY-TWO NEW AIRFIELDS IN NORTH KOREA

They wonder when the American people are going to realize this. Rightly or wrongly, they have the feeling that most Americans believe communism in Asia is only a distant threat that can be handled with trims and adjustments of allied policy.

While the Red Chinese and North Korean commands openly flout them, can you blame Syngman Rhee for thinking we're either stupid or spineless when he sees our continuing and precise observance of certain terms of the Korean armistice?

The North Koreans have built 22 new airfields capable of handling advanced jet models even though the armistice limits them to the construction of nonmilitary airfields.

They have blossomed forth with scores of new jet aircraft, although the armistice forbids any increase in armaments beyond those in Korea at the time it was signed in July 1953.

And there is a cunning arrongance to their explanation of how they justify this bold violation.

Didn't our aerial observers notice those hundreds of freight cars ranged along North Korean roadbeds in July 1953? Well, sir, those very cars contained the parts of jet aircraft which then were assembled into complete planes.

And this with a straight face.

The U. N. command, meanwhile, is scrupulously observing the truce terms with the result that American ground troops and aviators are using the obsolete equipment, July 1953 vintage.

TROOPS IN FINE MORALE SHAPE

We are forbidden to introduce new models into the theater. The latest jet planes, the newest tanks and up-to-date infantry weapons have no place in our Korean ordnance.

"If this keeps up we are going to have a museum-piece army out here," said one American commander. "The funny thing is, when we get new personnel out here we have to retrain them in the old weapons. They have to forget all they've learned about the latest weapons and start learning how to handle weapons the Army has long since discarded."

Despite these accepted handicaps, the American and South Korean troops are in fine morale shape, fully confident that they can cope with anything sent their way by the 700,000-strong enemy, dug in less than 3 miles from them across the demilitarized zone.

In Gen. Isaac Davis White, the last wartime commander of the famed Second Armored hell-on-wheels Division, the Allied command has a leader whose professional competence is deeply impressive.

General White has 43,000 American troops under his command, most of them in two divisions, the seventh and the 24th. The bulk of his battle-line consists, however, of 20 Republic of Korea (ROK) divisions and 10 more divisions in reserve, all totaling about 660,000 men.

These have been brought to a razor-sharp fighting skill under an efficient American military training program. No one doubts that they would give an excellent account of themselves in any showdown with the Communists.

PRIVILEGED SANCTUARY NO MORE

The reported introduction of atomic cannon into North Korea, first revealed some weeks ago by Kingsbury Smith in a dispatch from Seoul, would tilt the military balance in favor of the Communists if brought into play in a surprise attack.

American and Korean observers are agreed, however, that the status quo will undoubtedly prevail for the indefinite future in Korea. Use of atomic cannon, or any other kind of an all-out attack, would only be permitted by the Kremlin as part of a larger pattern of violence.

The Red Chinese are on notice that no longer will they be granted a privileged sanctuary in Manchuria, if they resume hostilities. Our commanders confidently expect to be given the green light for massive retaliation on Manchurian airfields, staging areas, and Yalu bridges should the ballon ever go up again.

The drama of Korea, with its memories of the heartbreak and of the treasure, and the blood left there by 33,000 American dead—the total American casualty list reached 140,000—is so absorbing that one is inclined to forget there are other phases of tremendous importance to the country's future.

The economic problem is shattering. A Nation which endured a $5 billion beating in 3 years of war received wounds that will take a long time in healing—and then the scar tissue will be vulnerable for decades to come.

INFANT MORTALITY DECREASED

Inflation is a constant nightmare and the economy is running at a huge deficit. Korea's intelligent, hard-working farmers extract an ample rice crop from the land each year, with a surplus that could be exported.

But even here the picture is not pretty. The population growth is now encroaching on the rice supply—because American insistence on our medical standards has decreased infant mortality and added an average of 7 years to the Korean's normal life standard.

Even those who admire Dr. Rhee most highly concede that he has little grasp of modern economics. This drives his American financial advisors to despair at times.

"Once we had him persuaded that he ought to increase certain taxes," said an American economist. "The old man agreed, the bill was passed into law, and he signed it. Next thing we knew, about a week later, he said the law wasn't going to be enforced."

What is the situation on Formosa, as Chiang Kai-shek and his gracious, American-educated wife wait hopefully for their hour to strike?

Much more impressive than it was 5 years ago, according to Frank Conniff, who spent some time on the island in 1951 on his way home from the Korean war.

"There's a stability evident now that was lacking then," he says. "The trouble between Chiang's forces and the native Taiwanese seems to have worked itself out. And the growth of Chiang's military potential also is striking.

ODDS HEAVY AGAINST CHIANG

"Before coming here on this visit, I thought Peiping's blasts at Chiang were mostly propaganda noises for home consumption. But after talking with our people here, I'm convinced that Mao must give Formosa a No. 1 priority rating. He must do something sooner or later to take it out."

Americans should engrave two little names on their minds right now, because they could eventually spell war or peace for the Formosa area, for the Far East, and even for the whole world.

They are: Quemoy and Matsu.

Small islands lying off the mainland, they are now garrisoned by some of Chiang's crack troops. He will fight there desperately—and wait for United States armed might to come to his aid.

It is breaching no confidence to say that high-ranking Americans in this area believe we must take every step—no matter what it entails in the way of land, sea, and air power—to insure that Chiang is not thrown off either Quemoy or Matsu.

"It's all over out here if we let him take a licking," runs the general consensus.

They further believe that a warning of our intentions would have a strong deterrent impact on Peiping. The feeling there is that Moscow is as unwilling as Washington to let general war erupt over the two Chinese islands.

However, they are willing to leave the ultimate decision up to President Eisenhower, where it now resides, in the belief that Ike will understand the psychological as well as the strategic importance of the islands.

ONE ENDURING GRIEVANCE

Lying a few miles off the ports of Amoy and Foochow, these islands are nicely placed to block the coastal flow of Chinese trade. The gates to Southeast Asia would be pried wide open if they fell into Communist hands.

On Formosa itself, Chiang and his administrators have embarked on a comprehensive program to make the bastion a "model province." Corruption has been largely eliminated, according to both pro- and anti-Chiang sources.

Can Chiang's army ever fight its way back to the mainland?

The odds are heavily against it, of course, but the dream of returning home sparks the morale and fires the imagination of officers and men alike.

Chiang has taken steps to reduce the average age of his troops by incorporating Tai-

wanese recruits into the ranks. An American management survey team found soldiers as old as 70 in the Nationalist ranks.

Weeding the oldsters out is quite a problem, because places must be found for them in private life. The Nationalists' high command denies that Chiang's army is "aging" and asserts that these new steps will bring its fighting competence to its highest pitch.

Tough and energetic as he nears three score and ten, Chiang looks eagerly into the future, although he is human enough to now and then mull over the mistakes of the past.

Like Syngman Rhee, he nurses one enduring grievance toward the United States that time cannot mellow: The conviction that he could have stopped the Communists had our policy not favored a soft approach toward the "agrarian reformers" of the late 1940's.

The white paper issued by the State Department in 1949 is a living, loathsome memory that corrodes his moments of reflection. In Chiang's defense, it must be said that the white paper has been exposed in the light of later knowledge as a tissue of distortions if not downright fabrications.

There they are: Two strong-willed, firm-convictioned anti-Communists Chiang Kai-shek and Syngman Rhee.

Good friends of America, if doubting ones. And good allies in a showdown.

The Philippines Need Our Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in the following article, the fourth of a series, Mr. Hearst discusses his visit with President Ramon Magsaysay, of the Philippines.

DANGER AHEAD—ASIA: PHILIPPINES HAILED BY HEARST AS ALLY

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

America's most dependable and valuable ally in Asia today is the Philippines and its inspiring leader, President Ramon Magsaysay.

Our visit to Manila and our long talks with the 48-year-old chief executive of the Philippine Government were the most encouraging experiences of our entire trip.

Not only do the Philippines constitute the strategic backbone of our defensive system in the Pacific, but they represent a bright beacon of democracy whose rays can, if we give adequate help, show the dubious and even the lost nations of the Orient the way to freedom.

This man Magsaysay and his country could be the keys to the problem of how to save Asia from communism.

He was in many ways the most impressive personality we met on this fact-finding mission which took us literally around the world in our quest for information.

IDOLIZED FOR COURAGE AND HONESTY

A man idolized by his people for his courage, honesty and devotion to their welfare; a man who heroically led guerrilla forces on our side during the Japanese occupation; who crushed communism in the Philippines after the war, and who is dedicated to the western concept of democracy, President Magsaysay could provide the inspirational leadership that the free world needs in Asia today.

One of the greatest difficulties confronting us in the struggle with communism in the Far East is the tendency of the Asiatics to suspect our motives and associate us with Western colonialism. We are big and rich and white, and we hail from the West. All of which revives painful, even hateful, memories of exploitation and serflike inferior treatment by British, French and Dutch colonialism.

That we believe all men are born equal regardless of race, color or creed; that we believe in equality of opportunity for the individual and are not bent on imposing our will for the sake of exploitation are factors most of the Asiatics find difficult to comprehend. And, of course, Communist propaganda does its best to convince them we are not sincere; that what we are really trying to do is replace the British and French as exploiters.

Even the French think we are trying to take over Indochina from them. President Magsaysay told us of a conversation with a French officer from Vietnam who said he was convinced that was America's aim, and asked if the Philippines' leader was not concerned that the United States would use its military and economic aid program as an instrument to regain control of the country.

"I told him I was not at all concerned about any such thing happening. I told him I knew Americans and what they stood for. I told him, as I have told others, that I am pro-American and proud of it. America gave my country its independence, and has helped us develop our democracy."

The President also related an incident with an Indonesian dignitary who was visiting the Philippines.

"He, too, felt we were again becoming subject people because of the presence of American military forces in the islands," President Magsaysay added. "I took him to the training grounds where American and Filipino forces were holding combined exercises. He was astonished to see Filipino officers giving commands to American soldiers."

These are examples of the service that President Magsaysay can render in convincing his fellow Asians to trust America. If we help him improve the living conditions of his people and make the Philippines a prosperous and happy nation, he can, I am convinced, accomplish wonders for us in Asia.

He is the man who should be our spokesman out there. He can talk to the Asiatics as an Asian, and they will listen to him with much less skepticism than they listen to our Voice of America.

And fortunately for us he is eager to be our champion. He has, in fact, proved to be our best friend in Asia. Unlike some of the European leaders on whose countries we have spent so much of the taxpayers' money, President Magsaysay has no reservations nor hesitation about his support for American policy. He has faith in America and he wants to spread in Asia the gospel of our democratic way of life.

The United States should give him all possible help and encouragement to do so.

We should urge him to tour the free nations of the Far East, dispelling the disbeliefs; telling them the truth about us and about our conception of democracy; about how we gave the Philippines their independence and how we are helping them remain free. And also telling them the truth about communism, and why united action is necessary to resist it.

This man is the most important pro-American leader in Asia today and we should gratefully accept the services he is willing to render to us and to the free world.

GET REAL VALUE IN FRIENDSHIP

It is from him and his country that we get real value in terms of loyalty and friendship for our foreign-aid funds. We will not have to spend nearly $150,000 in the Philippines during the coming 12 months to discourage neutralism, as I noted with astonishment our Government feels we should spend in Britain for that purpose. Nor will we be confronted with the same wavering attitude that the present French Government is showing in respect to a united allied front against communism.

We should by all means divert some of the funds we give to ungrateful allies and unreliable neutrals and place it in the Philippines, where we know it will be appreciated and will help a loyal ally develop into a bastion of freedom in the Far East.

By helping President Magsaysay make his country prosperous and self-supporting, we should show that it pays to be a genuine friend of Uncle Sam. That would, I believe, encourage other Asian nations to become our friends, and few really are today.

President Magsaysay needs help, and needs it badly. In the face of strong opposition from the sugar bloc, themselves wealthy landowners, and other vested interests, he is carrying out a peaceful social revolution in the Philippines, designed to lift to a decent level living standards of the people, to educate them, and to suppress a system of exploitation that dates back to the feudal days of the Spanish conquest.

In answer to one of our questions, the President said:

"Our major economic problems are those of developing expanded production, and of diversifying that production to relieve us of dependence upon a few major crops which are at the mercy of world market competition.

"Since our living standards are somewhat higher than those of some competing producers, we need industrialization which will add to the value of our present product and enable us to compete more favorably in world trade.

"All this requires capital investment which is beyond our own means. At the same time, the longer we defer this expansion of our economy, the more difficult it becomes to maintain even our present low standards of living.

"All of our economic problems are related to each other. An accelerated village road program is one of the most important. Such roads not only open new areas to cultivation but give the farmer in those areas freer access to markets, thus stimulating his desire to increase production.

"At the same time, the products he needs from other areas reach him at lower cost. But most important, perhaps, is the fact that such extension of communications would permit us to bring the benefits of democratic government to vast numbers of our people who for too long have been isolated from those benefits."

SETBACKS IN ECONOMIC FIELD

"The United States has already been of considerable help to us in developing our economy. Unfortunately, however, setbacks beyond our control have kept adverse economic influences ahead of the improvements which have been registered.

"However, our problems are known to the United States Government and only they can determine the degree to which they wish to help us solve them."

That degree amounts to approximately $139 million for 1956, according to our officials in Manila. President Magsaysay said he needed $200 million. I am sure that any of my readers who visited the Philippines and talked to this man as we did, would agree with us that we ought to give him the additional $61 million and more to build those roads and expand those industries, and even if we have to deprive some of our doubtful allies or namby-pamby neutrals of a little of what they are trying to get out of us.

If we do not help President Magsaysay succeed in his efforts to improve the lot of his people, I am certain communism will raise its head in the Philippines and we may lose our strongest line of defense in the Far East. If we should lose the Philippines, our military experts say we would have to pull back our front line of defense in the Pacific to Australia, Alaska, and Hawaii. Asia, under such circumstances, would be lost to the free world.

During the few days we spent as the guests of the President and his beautiful and charming wife at Malacanan Palace, formerly the residence of the Spanish viceroys who ruled the Philippines for almost four centuries, he told us some fascinating stories of his fight against the Huk Communists movement and his efforts to wipe out corruption in the nation's bureaucracy.

I particularly remember one evening when we sat around a table on the terrace of the palace, my brother Randolph, Frank Conniff, my editorial assistant, and Kingsbury Smith, the general manager of International News Service, were also present.

The President, attired in white, sat with the upright bearing of a military man, and yet there was no stiffness nor formality about him. What impressed us deeply was the vitality of the man. He seemed to exude energy. It was reflected in the gesticulating movement of his hands and the twitching of his body when he was emphasizing a point.

He related how a Communist plot to assassinate him in 1950 failed because the triggerman's jeep broke down and the Huk commander in Manila became so impressed with his defense of democracy that he gave him the names of all the Red leaders.

"Shortly after I became national defense minister," he said, "I was informed that the Huk commander in Manila wanted a secret meeting with me. He sent word that I must come alone. My wife tried to dissuade me, but I decided to go.

"I was driven by my aide de camp to a house in an isolated district of Manila. He waited in the car while I went in. The Huk commander was alone. He started out by telling me the Communists were going to win, and urged me to join the movement. I told him why I was opposed to communism and why I believed in democracy. He seemed to be impressed and when we finally broke up, it was agreed that we would meet again. We did and eventually I won him over.

"I asked him to give me the names of the Huk politburo members in Manila. He told me that an old lady with a basket of vegetables on one arm and a basket of meat on the other would call at various houses in Manila. He told me where she lived and said if I had her followed I would discover the identity and the whereabouts of the Communist leaders. I did, and thanks to him, we rounded them all up.

"He later told me that he had been instructed to kill me the night of our first meeting, but the 'triggerman' who was to shoot me failed to turn up because his jeep broke down. It was that delay which led to our long talk."

The President's aide-de-camp, a handsome young major, told us that he was sitting at the wheel of the car with a submachine gun in his lap and had the triggerman arrived, he would have shot him.

President Magsaysay said he had succeeded in crushing the Huk movement not simply because of superior military force but because he had won the people away from them.

"I found out what the people needed, mostly lard and other food, and I provided it. I did everything I could to help them and I won their confidence. At first the peasants had refused to cooperate in revealing the whereabouts of the Communists. They gave them food and shelter, but when they realized that our cause was the right one, they ceased protecting the Huks.

"Now the people have faith in me, and I must keep faith with them, that is why I am determined to wipe out corruption. If the people think I am permitting it, they will lose confidence in me."

In the opinion of American observers in Manila, the President is making an honest effort to rid the country of corruption, which flourished in the past.

He spoke to us with bitterness and painful disappointment of the officials, even cabinet members, he has had to dismiss because they resorted to graft.

"On one occasion I was informed that a large quantity of rice had spoiled and must be sold to Japan at reduced prices.

"I was suspicious and refused to approve the order submitted to me. Instead, I went to the warehouse where the rice was stored and slit open sacks at random. The rice was perfectly good. Of course, I fired the official chiefly responsible. Since then, he has been assailing my administration. But people believe me, not him."

That is Magsaysay, a man of strong character and courage. A man of the people. He can be our most effective answer to the Communist-inspired suspicion that the United States has colonial aspirations in Asia.

Communist Threat in Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the fifth article in the series by Mr. Hearst, in which he makes the following observations on Japan:

DANGER AHEAD—ASIA: HEARST CALLS JAPAN UNENTHUSIASTIC ALLY

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

A future clouded with uncertainties confronts the free world in Japan today.

That became clear to our party during the 5 days we spent in Tokyo in the course of our Asian trip.

The Japanese people are not enthusiastic allies of the United States, despite the lenient post-war treatment accorded them and the vast sums of money we have spent to revive and maintain the Japanese economy.

We have some loyal friends in high and influential positions in Japan and they seem genuinely dedicated to our concept of democracy. As individuals, the Japanese are traditionally gracious to visitors.

But there are some very disturbing aspects to this Japanese situation.

The spirit of neutralism and pacifism appears to be strong in Japan today and it is growing.

Of even more serious concern, the threat of communism has not, as Gen. Douglas MacArthur thought back in 1949, ceased to be a major issue in Japanese life.

While leftwing elements numerically are not strong in Japanese politics, leftist influence in intellectual and education fields is definite and active.

The leftist influence in labor is widespread although it is sometimes difficult to differentiate between homegrown leftist and Soviet-line Communists. Communists are active in labor.

The Japanese labor movement is heavily on the Socialist side. Sohyo, which is the most powerful union, has a political complexion ranging from Marxist-Socialist to Soviet-Communist; it includes more moderate elements but they are definitely in a minority.

Of Sohyo's 3 million members, approximately 2 million are civil servants and thus in what we could call "sensitive" positions to make trouble.

COMMUNISM REMAINS A DANGEROUS ASPECT

Furthermore, what we learned during our stay in Japan about the extent to which the Communists have infiltrated the educational system of the country convinced us that communism is at present an important, and for us, dangerous aspect of Japanese life.

The Japanese Teacher's Union, with a membership of 600,000 reaching every corner of Japan, is under strong Communist influence. Government officials concede that its membership includes 300 Communist Party members, the hard core of the militant leftists.

Some informed Japanese observers in Tokyo believe the JTU constitutes the backbone of the Communist movement in the country because it dominates the Parent-Teachers Association, with a membership of 30 million.

Not only parents but children have been assessed by these two organizations. There is no reliable information as to how the money collected was spent, but it is commonly believed that a good deal of it went to finance Japanese Communist Party activities.

The JTU provides the Communists with a golden opportunity to influence the minds of Japanese youth.

Schoolchildren are used by the JTU to spearhead demontrations (which have an anti-American implication) against military bases. The children on occasion have been incited to lie down in mass groups on airfields in order to obstruct the construction of runways required for our strategic bombers.

BASES IN JAPAN MAIN DETERRENTS

Since our bases in Japan are one of the main deterrents to Communist military aggression against the free world, this sort of thing is a matter of grave concern.

There is every reason to believe that the Japanese Communist Party, through various leftwing organizations under its influence, is making headway in its efforts to sway the minds of Japanese youth against the United States and toward Socialist-Communist ideologies.

A top official of the Government's public safety investigation board (Japan's FBI) said:

"There is no doubt the Communists are making strong efforts to indoctrinate Japanese youth, but it is diffiult to pin these efforts down aside from specific incidents that have been exposed."

He recalled the so-called school diary case in Yamaguchi Prefecture where leftwing teachers of an elementary school were found to have prepared a "pupil's diary" for classroom instruction in which incidents were fabricated to demonstrate the benefits of socialism and the evils of capitalism.

In another school the teachers instructed students to write essays with a hate-America theme.

Tamotsu Murayama, a member of the board of directors, National Council of the Boy Scouts of Japan and vice president of the Tokyo Boy Scout Council, said the JTU was organized originally during the early days of the occupation under Communist sponsorship, with the aim of revamping school textbooks toward a Socialist slant.

He further said that when Madame Li Tehchuan, president of the Communist Chinese Red Cross, visited Japan early this year, she carried a message to the JTU calling on them to engage in more militant tactics to indoctrinate Japanese youth in socialistic principles.

DIFFICULT FOR SCOUTS TO FIND FACILITIES

In an effort to undermine the Boy Scout movement in Japan because it is considered American influenced, the JTU makes it difficult for scout troops to obtain the use of school auditoriums, playgrounds, and classrooms for their meetings.

In addition to this Communist and left-wing influence in the elementary schools of Japan, the universities, we were told, are centers of Red infection. Long before the war, many university professors were fascinated by Marxism and while some of them have seen the light, far too many apparently remain affected by its doctrine.

Thus, the Communist foothold in Japan's educational system is a major reason why we should be deeply concerned over the neutralist and pacifist sentiments in that country.

Sweden and Switzerland pursue a policy of neutrality in world affairs, but there is no danger of them going Communist. The same could not be said for Japan if that country was left entirely on its own. I am not saying it would go Communist overnight, but the danger that it might eventually be brought under Communist domination is inherent in the present trend of events.

If Russia's resources and China's manpower could be integrated with Japan's industrial potential, the enormity of the threat to the free world would be staggering.

If Japan did not go Communist, it could go back to fascism.

JAPAN LENDS SELF TO TOTALITARIANISM

Japan has conserved a society which in some respects lends itself to totalitarianism of the right or left, and the future trend, I think, would be more likely left.

It is based on the theory that a superior or more powerful authority tells you what to do. Three centuries of regimentation before the end of the last war conditioned the Japanese people to discipline, hard work, and self-sacrifice—all good ingredients for communism or facism. Even the religion, Shintoism, involves a strong degree of reverence for the state.

The Western concept of democracy which we sought to impose on Japan during the occupation does not yet appear to have taken deep roots, though the Japanese women seem to enjoy the right to vote which we gave them. If political freedom lasts, they may nurse Japanese democracy into a strong and healthy state.

Neutralism, however, could mean the end of democracy in Japan.

We found several reasons for the neutralist sentiment. One, the reluctance of the Japanese to rearm, and especially to be an advance base for American airpower in the Orient. The Japanese fear that if there should be war between the United States and Russia, they would quickly be subjected to atomic bombing—this time by the Soviets. They are the only nation in the world to have had a taste of atomic bombs and they want no more of it.

TRADE WITH CHINA HOLDS ATTRACTION

Another reason is the attraction which the possibility of complete freedom to trade with Red China holds for Japanese business. China was one of Japan's biggest markets before the war and the offer of expanded trade that Peiping keeps dangling before the Japanese today is a powerful temptation, though some of our Far Eastern experts think it is a deceptive mirage.

Japan found lucrative markets in China before the war because that country was undeveloped. In fact, Japan owed its power and glory to the weakness of China. Today China is being industrialized and collectivized by the Chinese Communists, and Western economic observers believe that Chinese trade would hold no really important prospects for Japan, except as a minor palliative.

A further reason for the neutralist sentiment is that the Japanese intellectuals think Japan could act as a bridge betwen East and West. The French want to play the same role. So does India.

What I think we want from these nations that we have done so much to help is a united front with us in our resistance to the Communist threat. Unity is the firmest foundation for any bridge over which to deal with Communist China and Soviet Russia.

Suppose we said we wanted to be the bridge between Russia and the rest of the world. Stalin indicated on more than one occasion that he would have been prepared to make a deal with us at the expense of other countries. I don't doubt that his successors would be disposed to do likewise.

ONE WAY OF GETTING A UNITED GERMANY

We might even get a united Germany in Europe if we agreed to turn Japan over to the Communist world. How, I wonder, would the Japanese neutralists like that?

One cannot, of course, blame the Japanese people entirely for the neutralist and pacifist sentiment that seems to pervade the country. In the first place, we encouraged them at the end of the last war to think it was wicked to have anything to do with arms, even for defensive purposes. Under General MacArthur's guidance, the Japanese people renounced war forever and pledged themselves in their constitution never to maintain land, sea, or air forces.

A few years later we told them they must rearm to help defend themselves and protect the free world from the danger of Communist aggression.

The people can be excused for being somewhat confused. But the leadership of Japan cannot be excused for failing to see to it that the reasons for our policy are not made clearer to the people.

There is official grumbling about the presence of our military forces in Japan. There is grumbling because we do not let Japan have a free hand in trade with Red China. There is grumbling because we want Japan to maintain a strong, common front with us against communism.

They should stop and think for a moment how Japan would have treated the United States if the Japanese had won the war and then found themselves in the same type of struggle with international communism that confronts us.

WOULD THEY TOLERATE NEUTRALISM FOR US?

Would they have tolerated neutralism on our part? Would they have accepted grumbling over the bases they felt it necessary to maintain on our soil in order to protect us as well as themselves? Would they have poured billions of yen into our country to try to put us back on our feet economically? Would they, under the circumstances have even risked granting us sovereignty? I hope my Japanese friends will ponder those questions.

I told them in Tokyo that the American people genuinely want to be friends with the people of Japan. I believe that if the Japanese people were told the truth about our motives, they would want to remain friends with us and help us preserve their democracy and safeguard the free world.

The Japanese are a determined, courageous and hardworking race. They could, I think, be strong allies and good friends if what we stand for and what we are trying to do was fully and frequently explained to them. It is up to the leadership of Japan to do so. It is not being done today.

Japan depends on our aid to save it from economic chaos. It looks to us to help it become the industrial base for the economic development of southeast Asia. As long as Soviet and Chinese communism remains dedicated to the destruction of Western democracy, we need Japan as an ally.

ECONOMY OF COUNTRY APPALLINGLY UNSOUND

Under these circumstances, Japan is in no position to talk about neutralism. The Japanese should be helping us and we should be helping them.

The economy of the country is appallingly unsound. The war cost Japan 52 percent of her territory. In an area smaller than the State of Texas, there are approximately 90 million industrious people, and the population increases another million every year. Only 16 percent of her mountainous islands are arable.

To maintain its living standard, Japan needs more food and more industrial raw materials. She also needs to modernize her export industries and find new markets.

The logical area in the Far East for the expansion of Japanese trade is southeast Asia.

The free nations of southeast Asia are desperately in need of the goods and technical services Japan can render to help improve living standards for the people, and thus make them less vulnerable to communism. They can supply Japan with the raw materials and other commodities the Japanese must import.

Use of Japan as the industrial base for the economic development of southeast Asia should be part of a sound long-range program. It would require financing by the United States, either private or governmental, or a combination of both.

I think it would be in America's interests to back such a program, but in return for our assistance, we should have satisfactory assurances that the Governments of the countries concerned are going to stand firm with us against the Communist threat; are going to keep their people adequately informed as to why it is necessary to maintain a united free world front, and, above all, are going to see to it that their people are told the truth about our motives.

Under such a program, Japan could prosper, could be a good friend of the United States, and could constitute a bastion of freedom in the Far East.

South Vietnam and Pakistan Rely on Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in the sixth article, which follows, Mr. Hearst describes the report on South Vietnam and Pakistan, made by the members of his fact-finding party, who toured these two countries.

DANGER AHEAD—ASIA: SOUTH VIETNAM AND PAKISTAN BOLDLY SUPPORT AMERICA, HEARST REPORTS—NEW DEMOCRACIES ACCEPT RISK THAT WE MEAN WHAT WE SAY

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

While Kingsury Smith, my wife, Austine, and I visited Bangkok for talks with Thailand leaders and American and British diplomatic representatives there, my brother Randolph and Frank Conniff veered off on an independent mission to South Vietnam and Pakistan.

Here, in essence, is their report of what they learned and observed.

South Vietnam and Pakistan are two rugged sentinels of hope projected against

the darkening panorama of Communist-haunted Asia.

While bigger and edgier countries seek protection behind the cloak of neutralism, these emerging democracies boldly proclaim their faith and confidence in the United States.

They are accepting the risk that America means what it says when it encourages smaller nations to reject communism and stand with the free world.

Their leaders have an invigorating contempt for the lofty stuffiness of Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru of India. They equip about our tendency to be impressed by Asian statesmen mouthing stale pacifist platitudes.

VIETNAM DOESN'T PLAN TO GIVE IN

Between the two, they may provide an impetus to freedom's cause in 1956 that will give the Kremlin more heartburn than developments in any other controversial area.

Originally scheduled to lie down and die next July under the rigged elections promulgated at Geneva 2 years ago, little Vietnam is not going to do anything of the sort.

Come July and the government of Ngo Dinh Diem will assume a posture of defiance against Communist Vietnam, Red China, Great Britain, France, and other signatories of the Geneva accords.

The Vietnamese will st"ke this pose despite the fact that the armies of Ho Chi Minth in the north, double theirs in size and equipment, could probably implement the Geneva agreements by force if precipitated into action with Kremlin permission.

But South Vietnam did not sign the accords and neither did the United States. Therein lies the bare framework of a mighty drama that may confront the Eisenhower administration with a real tough decision in this election-year summer.

VIETNAMESE COACHED CAREFULLY BY UNITED STATES

Not to mention the soul-testing question it could pose for the American people, somewhat complacent in an era of peace and prosperity.

America, be it remembered, showed very little urge to rush into Indochina with its manpower when French colonialism was breathing its last in the spring of 1954.

But the Vietnamese Republic today is a native government, cautiously coached by the United States, and slowly shedding the last remnants of French colonialism as it would a dirty, threadbare old coat.

The question they ask is, would America, which looked the other way as Dien Bien Phu went down, respond differently to a brave people defying unto death the superior forces of aggressive communism?

It's something for Americans to ponder. And the Kremlin, too. Because the enduring factor that could touch off a shooting war out here is the Communist tendency to miscalculate United States reaction.

Despite the ominous possibilities, the feeling is general that the crisis which is scheduled to come this summer will pass away as Ho Chi Minh's ambitions prove expendable to the Kremlin's grand design.

SOUTH VIETNAM MOLDED INTO VIABLE CONCERN

This leak in prestige—and it will definitely be a setback for Asian communism—may flow over into Laos, Cambodia, and other states in southeast Asia now inclined to quiver before Red expansion.

How did the miracle of South Vietnam happen?

How has a partitioned country written-off as lost to freedom as recently as one year ago bounced back to a position of virility?

The story is largely written in the ascetic personality of Ngo Dinh Diem, a man of stubborn convictions all dedicated to the proposition that South Vietnam will remain free.

He has molded his country into a viable concern, introduced constitutional government, whipped the religious sect armies, and defied the French relics who sought to sabotage and thwart him.

He is a blocky little bachelor of 55, an introvert who hopes to end his days communing with his God in a Catholic monastery.

He has checked his religious aspirations for the time being and turned the whole force of a remarkable intellect to the task of rebuilding Vietnam.

NATIVES DISPLAY CONTEMPT FOR FRENCH

The French hierarchs said, openly and loudly, that it couldn't be done. So did a few Americans, notably Gen. J. Lawton Collins, former Chief of Staff. The French made no secret—and the last handful maintain the attitude—that they are rooting for Diem's downfall.

In fact, the hatred between the French and Vietnamese reaches an intensity that makes the old English-Irish emotion a love idyll in comparison.

Connoisseurs should appreciate this instance of how the natives showed a massive contempt for their departing overlords: The signs on French-named streets in Saigon—Rue de Gaulle, Rue de Lattre, etc.—were promptly torn down and replaced with Vietnamese titles.

There was one bizarre switch: A street originally carrying a Vietnamese name was renamed Rue de Pasteur.

The meaning was plain. The Vietnamese were saying that at least one Frenchman had contributed something to humanity.

Can the Vietnam armed forces be built up to a combat efficiency capable of stemming a Communist assault?

Members of the United States military assistance group in Saigon are confident they can be, (1) if given enough time, and (2) if the United States Government will shed the agonizing timidity that keeps our training program under wraps.

TRAINING MISSION AT REDUCED STRENGTH

The Government's shyness manifests itself out here in a particularly craven form. We were not parties to the Geneva accords, although we did agree not to do anything to frustrate their operation.

Under this grudging consent to go along, we are keeping our training mission of men and officers at one-third the strength experts estimate is needed to really do a job.

This because the Geneva Pact stipulates that armed strength in either end of Vietnam cannot be increased beyond that present as of June 30, 1954.

So we are pouring hundreds of millions of dollars into South Vietnam to rehabilitate its economy and military establishment—and refusing to O. K. the use of several hundred more men that would make our training program really effective.

Hampered by this self-defeating caution, United States officers cannot possibly have the South Vietnamese Army in shape to halt a Communist lunge should it come in July.

But they have hopes that the 150,000-man army will be ready sometime before the year is out. Ho's army is estimated to be close to 300,000 in strength.

HANDICAP FACED BY DIEM'S ARMY

Schooling of Diem's army is also handicapped by the fact that the French left no trained command personnel behind. General Minh, who commanded a five-division effort against the Binh Xuyen sect, was only a captain in the French Army. He is 30 years old.

There are no trained cadres available on which to build larger formations. Burly, grayhaired Sam Williams, three-star general heading up the United States training mission, is not discouraged, however.

"Their morale is high, they're quick and intelligent," he said. "They're fighting for themselves now, not the French. Before we get through they'll be able to handle anything Ho sends at them."

The shortage of qualified personnel likewise complicates Diem's task in forming an efficient government. The French left no trained officials behind when they took leave of Indochina, as the British creditably did in India and Burma.

This has led to charges that Diem allocates the choice positions to his own immediate family. His brother Nu is his closest advisor; the latter's wife is a legislator and also influential; her father is Ambassador to Washington; Diem's brother Ganh is a political boss of central Vietnam; another brother, Thuc, is Catholic bishop of Vienh Long.

The road ahead for Diem is rugged and strewn with trouble. But if strength of character, determination, and devotion to democratic ideals mean anything, he may confound the world by establishing a permanent, pro-American government in South Vietnam.

PAKISTAN FACES FUTURE HAPPILY

Pakistan's problems differ somewhat from those of Vietnam, except that the path ahead is also uphill. Worldly and civilized, groomed by years of British training in the arts of government, leaders of the new Islamic republic of Pakistan face their bone-breaking job with cheerful good humor.

They ask only of American leaders and the American people that they see Pakistan's troubles with India in true perspective, knowing well that many influential Americans are fascinated by the personality of Nehru.

A nation of 76 million Moslems split in two parts—with 1,200 miles of Hindu-populated India separating East and West Pakistan—Pakistan fervidly believes it got the shabby end of the deal when the subcontinent broke free from English rule in 1947.

Lord Louis Mountbatten was Indian viceroy at the time zones were allocated to the Hindu and Moslem groups. It was considered significant in Karachi 2 weeks ago that Mountbatten was warmly received in New Delhi on his current world tour but didn't even bother to touch down in Pakistan.

"He might have been assassinated here," said an embittered Pakistani.

NEHRU WON'T DISCUSS KASHMIR PLEBISCITE

Right now the Kashmir dispute threatens to further electrify relations between the two nations. Pakistani officials trust that this is one problem where American vision will be able to discern the true facts despite our preoccupation with Nehru.

A U. N.-sponsored plebiscite was scheduled to be held 7 years ago to decide Kashmir's ultimate status. It has never been held and Pandit Nehru refuses to even discuss the issue.

Kashmir has 3 million residents, largely Moslem. Pakistanis charge that Nehru occupied the district by force and scorns a plebiscite because at least 90 percent of the inhabitants would vote for union with Pakistan.

Instead Nehru has launched a propaganda campaign charging the Pakistan Army with aggressive intentions. Border clashes of growing severity are a frequent event on the edgy frontier.

The accusation of planned aggression provides Pakistani leaders with their best platform for exposing what they term Nehru's hypocrisy.

We talked with responsible officials, Pakistani, British, and American, and they all agree that India has an overwhelming military advantage over Pakistan. The Indian armed forces number 500,000 in contrast to Pakistan's 150,000 and the discrepancy in modern equipment is even wider.

The best-informed American on the scene, in a position to know the real ramifications of Pakistan's and India's relative military strength, told us:

"The Pakistani Army wouldn't last 120 days against the Indians," he said. "Any officer in the world could figure that out. Pakistan has an indefensible border, and Nehru knows he's talking poppycock when he says its army might attack him."

Kashmir could be the point-of-no-return in Indian-Pakistani relations because 3 of the 6 rivers which drain through Pakistan have their origin there. The other three rise in India proper.

PAKISTAN SURVIVAL DEPENDS ON WATER

Water is vital if Pakistan is to survive. The most elaborate irrigation network in the world—another sign that England left something constructive behind—laces into the Indus River Valley.

Some 25 million people feed and live off this intricate mosaic of levees, water fields, and plantations, twice the number sustained by the Nile.

Americans who remember the old fights for water rights during the building of the West—and there are still a few arguments unsettled, notably between California and Arizona—can easily understand Pakistan's concern over India's control of its river sources.

Pakistan realizes it lags far behind India in getting its story across to the American people. But a nation strongly on our side in the cold war believes it deserves at least an even break in having its position understood by influential Americans who are now inclined to concentrate on Mr. Nehru.

Urbane, witty, and civilized Pakistan leaders like President Iskander Mirza and Prime Minister Chaudry Mohammed Ali discuss their country's problems with poise and detachment. One gets the impression that they derive a certain sardonic amusement from the current infatuation of so many ranking Americans with the inscrutable Mr. Nehru.

A small country has only modest choices in this hard world of the 20th century. It became apparent some years ago that Pakistan's "big friend" would have to be either the United States or Russia.

Pakistan chose to snuggle up to Uncle Sam.

Thailand's Importance to the United States—Hong Kong and British Far East Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in the following article, the seventh of the series, Mr. Hearst gives his impressions on the current position of Thailand and of Hong Kong in the Far East scene:

DANGER AHEAD—ASIA: HEARST CONSIDERS THAILAND AS VITAL UNITED STATES ALLY IN ASIA

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

One of America's most important allies in the Orient today is the little kingdom of Thailand.

This land of gentle people and Buddhist temples which became known to many Americans through the lyrics of "The King and I" and that charming book entitled "Anna and the King of Siam" is of great importance to the United States because:

1. It is situated in the heart of southeast Asia;

2. Its government is firmly anti-Communist;

3. Its military alliance with the SEATO (Southeast Asia Treaty Organization) powers serves as a strong deterrent to Communist aggression in a strategically vital area.

In fact, American military and naval experts with whom we talked during our Far Eastern trip felt the presence of Thailand in our Pacific defensive structure will probably help save neighboring southern Vietnam from the danger of attack this summer by the northern Communist forces of Ho Chi Minh.

POWERFUL BASE AGAINST REDS

Thailand provides a potentially powerful base of operations from which the United States and the other SEATO allies could operate on the mainland of Asia not only against Communist-held northern Vietnam, but against Red China itself.

However, my brief visit to Thailand with Kingsbury Smith, general manager of International News Service, and my wife Austine, convinced me that the continued secure adherence of that country to the Allied camp in Asia cannot be taken for granted.

There are elements of uncertainty in that Thai situation which warrant vigilance and a constant effort to strengthen the free world's position there.

Our unwillingness to risk war with Red China in order to save Northern Vietnam from Communist conquest or to achieve victory in Korea has caused the Thais to wonder whether we would really stand by them if they were confronted with a military showdown.

The diplomatic talks we have been conducting since last summer with the Chinese Communist representatives in Geneva have also caused the Thais concern.

Thailand has refused to recognize Communist China, against whom it maintains a strict trade embargo. At the same time it would not wish to be left out on a limb should the United States decide to compromise with the Chinese Communists and agree to their admission to the UN.

I hope I did some good by reminding them that our President is a man of honor. That he has promised the people of the United States that the United States will never agree to Red China's admission to the UN as long as they hold one American prisoner. That as long as he is President people like themselves and myself could rely implicitly on Ike's word.

I admitted, though, that in the unlikely event Ike should be superseded by some weak-spined, one world-minded candidate at the polls this fall, their fears would most certainly be justified.

Thailand, like other Asian nations, has a problem in respect to Chinese residents—the so-called overseas Chinese: 3 million of its estimated 20 million inhabitants are Chinese. Many of these are known to favor any government of China. They constitute a potentially dangerous fifth column.

CHINESE RESIDENTS ARE RESTRICTED

Like the Philippines, Thailand has maintained discriminatory restrictions on its Chinese residents in order to prevent them from gaining control of the country.

They cannot vote, buy land, or own business enterprises unless they become Thai citizens, which most of them refuse to do because of patriotic feelings for their native land. Despite the handicaps under which they operate, the Chinese control much of the nation's small business.

The Thais fear them and have, from time to time, treated them harshly. Because of this, China, even under the Nationalist government, nursed long time grievances against Thailand.

If Thailand thought it was ever going to be left alone to face up to Communist China, its ruling classes probably would start trying to come to terms with the Peiping regime just as they did with the Japanese during the last war.

ONCE RIVALS, NOW ENEMIES

In fact, one of the most interesting things we learned during our visit to Bangkok was the role played by two Thai leaders, once friendly rivals, now political enemies.

One of these men is the present Prime Minister, Field Marshal Pibul Songgram, who entertained us graciously at a state dinner. The other is Pridi Banomyong, who heads a Communist puppet movement in Red China.

Pibul is a conservative military man, Pridi an intellectual leftwinger. They cooperated together in 1932 to stage a bloodless revolution that took away the absolute power of the king and led to the establishment of a constitutional monarchy.

Pridi became regent, was intensely nationalistic, anti-Chinese and, at the time, anti-Communist. A political struggle developed between him as head of the civilian faction and Pibul as leader of the military faction.

ONCE AIDED UNITED STATES AGAINST JAPAN

In 1938, Pibul took over as prime minister. When Japan invaded southeast Asia, he quickly came to terms with the Japanese and in January 1942, declared war on the side of Japan against the United States and Britain.

Pridi, on the other hand, organized an underground movement, worked with American and British intelligence services and assumed control of the country when Japan's defeat doomed Pibul's government.

Pibul managed, apparently with Pridi's help, to escape trial as a collaborator. He seized control of the government in 1947 and Pridi fled into exile.

While Pibul threw in Thailand's lot with the free world, Pridi turned up in Communist China in 1954 as leader of an exile movement. Thus, if the Communists should ever gain control of southeast Asia, Pridi would be in a position to take over again in Thailand.

"Politics," it has been said, "make strange bedfellows."

"International allies," say I, "even stranger."

It seems a strange coincidence which places Thailand in a position where one of these two men can lead her on the winning side in the global struggles between the great powers.

PIBUL NEEDS UNITED STATES ENCOURAGEMENT

There are some in Bangkok who think Pibul might not hesitate to let Pridi take over once again if he thought Thailand was going to be subjected to the fate of Korea.

My own personal observation of Prime Minister Pibul led me to believe he will remain a loyal ally as long as he feels he can count on the United States to help him keep his country free. We should leave him and his nation in no doubt about our determination to do so.

He needs encouragement and support because there are elements in Bangkok who, while not pro-Communist, are attracted by neutralism.

They think that if Thailand was neutral it would not have to spend so much money on defense. They would also like to trade with Red China. They think big money could be made selling their surplus rice to the Chinese Communists, and Western observers in Thailand are inclined to agree with them.

MAKE SACRIFICE TO FIGHT REDS

In other words, Thailand is making an economic sacrifice in order to stand firm with the free world against communism.

Our diplomatic representatives in Bangkok are confident there is no danger whatsoever of Trailand deserting the allied camp to go neutralist as long as Pibul remains head of the government. In fact, they discount reports of a neutralist trend in the country.

The recent SEATO maneuvers in Thailand, in which American forces participated, apparently encouraged the people to feel they would be protected from Communist military aggression.

We were told the people were greatly impressed by the show of allied force, and especially by the fact that one of the American Army companies was commanded by a Negro captain.

PRIME MINISTER REALLY THE BOSS

In connection with reports that Tailand is ruled by a military triumvirate composed of Pibul, Army Chief Sarit, and Police Chief Phao, we were told that the Prime Minister is really the boss.

"The word oligarchy does not actually describe the situation here," one of our informants said. "Everyone is under Prime Minister Pibul."

We gathered the impression, however, that there seems to be some rivalry between the army chief and the police chief, both of whom maintain their own armed forces, including tanks, in the capital.

This was described by one Western envoy as a "typical oriental situation." Pibul is going to be urged to persuade the army and the police chiefs to move their tanks out of Bangkok into the countryside.

While the possibility is not entirely excluded that the political situation could blow up the Western observers with whom we talked generally seemed to feel the Prime Minister possesses the power to remain in control.

PRAISES HEARST ROLE FOR JUSTICE

Our own diplomatic people in Bangkok speak well of Pibul. They think he is truly our friend; that he is sincerely interested in improving living conditions for the people, wants long-term loans to build houses, schools, and roads.

The Prime Minister certainly spoke in a most friendly manner at the dinner he gave in our honor. He said he was familiar with my father's "determined struggle for the cause of justice and enlightenment," and he added:

"We are all well aware of the vital role played by the newspaper as a medium of public information both at the national and international levels.

"At this particular point in world history, when the world is divided into two camps—free democracy and communism—the newspaper assumes an importance hitherto unknown in history.

"We all realize the service the newspaper can render in combating the lies and half-truths, and evil insinuations emanting from enemy propaganda. If not properly handled, these falsehoods and unfounded allegations may endanger relationships between the free democratic countries."

We found that the Thai people are better off than most Asians. They do not enjoy a high standard of living, but they do seem to have enough to eat and we were told there is no serious unrest or class hatreds.

They come as close to being a happy people as we saw in Asia.

Now for a few words about Hong Kong.

That famous outpost of Britain's restless, disintegrating empire was the most picturesque place we saw during our entire trip around the rim of Asia.

The twain really meet there in a mixture of the colorful East and the modern West. Concrete office buildings and rickshas; oceangoing steamers, Chinese junks, and tiny sampans all bustling about the harbor. Chinese women in slit-skirts or bright silk pajamas hustling along streets crowded with Western tourists.

IMPORTANT FAR EAST TRADING CENTER

Over Hong Kong hangs the menace of Communist China. It tends to act as a veto on British policy in the Far East. It is one of the reasons why Britain pursues a "soft" policy toward the Chinese Communists.

With the best harbor along 1,000 miles of the east Asian coast and thus invaluable as an important trading center, Hong Kong is the largest British city in the Far East.

Still a Crown colony, it holds an afterglow of the power and the glory that was imperial Britain.

Yet its competent governor, Sir Alexander Grantham, knows that the Chinese Communists could turn it into a turmoil for him any time they wished to do so. Ninety-nine percent of the 2,500,000 inhabitants are Chinese; over a million are refugees who have fled from Red China.

The Communist fifth column is estimated to total at least 20,000. If Peiping wished to apply pressure, it could close down on food supplies, terrorize the inhabitants, bring Hong Kong's business to a virtual standstill.

USED AS OUTLET BY RED CHINA

But Red China prefers to use it as an outlet for trade with the West and a political lever on Britain.

Furthermore, China knows it is going to get Hong Kong back eventually. The city of Hong Kong is ceded territory, but it includes leased territories.

This land is on a 99-year lease which expires in 1997. Loss of these leased territories will mean that Hong Kong can no longer exist as a self-supporting free port.

Therefore, Peiping prefers to wait and utilize the British presence in Hong Kong as a restraining influence on American policy toward Red China. They believe, too, that it serves to weaken Anglo-American unity.

In some ways it does.

In others it strengthens our bonds as it enables us to see the situation through English eyes—as it were—and better understand England's problems in Asia.

A Positive American Policy Is Needed in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in the following article, the eighth in his series on the Far East, Mr. Hearst sets forth some of the conclusions he has reached:

DANGER AHEAD—ASIA: CLEAR-CUT UNITED STATES POLICY CAN SAVE EAST, SAYS HEARST

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

Those of you who, through the preceding seven articles, have journeyed with me around the Far East will understand by now why we decided to title these pieces "Danger Ahead: Asia."

With the Communists consolidating their hold on a unified China; with India being turned against the United States, with such old allies as Chinese Nationalist President Chiang Kai-shek and President Syngman Rhee of South Korea losing hope for the future, with other allies like Thailand and South Vietnam wondering whether we intend to stand firm with them against Communist expansion, and with Japan an increasingly uncertain ally, there is indeed danger ahead in Asia.

But it would be wrong to believe that we have already lost all in Asia. In fact, I am optimistic enough to believe Asia can be saved for the free world. There are bright spots, like the Philippines, Pakistan, Thailand and South Vietnam. There are Asians who have faith in us; who are prepared to resist with their lives, if necessary, the Red tide of communism if we will help them. These are allies who will give us real value for our money; who will not take the billions Europe has taken from us and then waver in their attitude toward us.

This trip through the Orient convinced me that we are now doing too much for Europe and not enough for Asia. The time has come, in my opinion, to devote much greater attention and thought to the Asian situation.

Communism is making headway out there. Let there be no doubt about it. We heard on every side about the progress the Chinese Communists are making in the industrialization and agricultural collectivization of China, and in the indoctrination of the youth. And the Chinese peasants do not appear to be resisting collectivization as the Russian peasants did.

Not that there is no resistance to communism in China.

One high ranking Indian official in New Delhi told me he did not discount the report that since the Communists took over in China they have liquidated from 10 to 20 million people. Out of a population of 600 million, the Communists would probably think that was a small number to sacrifice to give them control of one of the most potentially powerful nations in the world.

It now looks as though nothing short of a major war with the United States will dislodge the Communists from China. Chiang Kai-shek believes he could do it if we would land him and his Formosan army on the mainland; give him air and naval support over the beachhead and keep him supplied with arms and munitions. But we could not do that without becoming involved in war with Red China, and I found no one in the Far East who thought we were deliberately going to do that.

President Eisenhower's policy has been to try to keep us out of new wars in Asia and he has succeeded. We had to sacrifice North Korea and Northern Vietnam as the price for peace, but the Communists found out we were not quite the paper tiger that their propaganda tries to make us out to be.

We have been pursuing a cautious policy in the Far East and I think we have convinced the Red Chinese we are not going to wage preventive war against them.

Now I think the time has come to pursue a more positive policy. Still peaceful, still unprovocative, but one which will help us win the cold war in Asia, which we certainly are not doing now.

We have been trying to be all things to all men in those parts of Asia not under complete Communist domination. We have been taking our friends for granted like the Filipinos, while we concentrated our attention on ex-enemies and neutralists. We have allowed ourselves, because of the European problem, to become so closely associated with the remnants of British and French Colonialism that some of the free Asians have become suspicious of our motives.

We have pursued a policy of giving aid to neutralist nations with few if any strings while insisting on conditions with our friends. I am not against strings on our aid. I think we have every right to insist on them, but we should apply them just as strongly to the neutrals, like India, as we do to our friendly allies. We should not allow anyone to talk us out of this policy.

The problems of Asia are, of course, so many and complex that no easy solutions present themselves to the touring newspaperman.

The area does not lend itself to an overall formula applicable to all places and under all circumstances.

Its component parts are moving in different directions at varying speeds, and a policy that sought to inflict the same goal and the same pace on each separate part would be self-defeating.

Asia is united only in the determination of its swarming millions to obtain a larger share of this world's goods and a greater human dignity, plus recognition by the West that the days of the white man's imperialism are ended forever.

In fact, the core of a successful American policy for Asia must be an acceptance of these plain and stubborn truths, unpalatable as they may be to our Western allies.

Great Britain and France are through in Asia. England clings to several toeholds, like Hong Kong and Malaya, but psychologically she has had it. It would be foolhardy to expect much support from the British Government in any political or military showdown.

But the luxury of further retreat in Asia is not open to the United States because of our exposed geographic position in the Pacific basin.

Therefore our Government must attempt to fashion a cohesive policy despite the enormous complexity of Asia's problems—and it must be a policy that the American people can understand in order to give it full support in a crisis.

In our 10-nation, 35,000-mile journey, the Hearst task force reached some conclusions that we hope may be pertinent to the problems confronting the United States along the whole Asian arc.

DISPEL THE UNCERTAINTY

1. It is imperative that we clear up the uncertainty in the minds of our Asian friends about the ultimate intentions of American policy.

With due respect to Secretary Dulles and the huge pressures centering on him, I do not think he has succeeded in making our policy understandable to many Asian leaders. He should repeat and reiterate our policies, goals, and aims until no one could be in doubt.

They are not completely convinced that we are determined to oppose further Communist aggression. The lessons of Korea are still vivid in their minds. The fear that we eventually intend to scuttle in Asia is deeper than I had previously realized.

2. We should help build up President Ramon Magsaysay of the Philippines as the inspirational leader of free Asia. This man, who is idolized by the great mass of the people of his country, who is a proven loyal friend of America, and a dynamic personality can be the most effective answer to the Communist-inspired propaganda that America has colonial aspirations in Asia.

He needs help, and he needs it badly. Powerful vested interests in the Philippines are working against him because he is carrying out a social revolution there to improve the living standards of the people.

His opponents cannot attack him on that issue so they are trying to undermine him as being too pro-American. And they are succeeding in creating a good deal of anti-American sentiment in the islands.

They take full advantage of some of our mistakes, especially in respect to such matters as the lands to which our military authorities claim title.

These lands were purchased by the American Government from private interests long before we granted independence to the Philippines. They were held for use as military and air bases. Some of the land is close to Manila.

The Filipinos contend that under the terms of the independence agreement title to these lands automatically passed to the State. United States Attorney General Brownell not long ago ruled that the lands are still American possessions.

This has developed into a highly emotional, nationalistic issue in the Philippines and is being used by the opponents of President Magasaysay to whip up anti-American sentiment.

The value of the land is estimated to be about $1 million. Brownell said the President was free to give the land back to the Philippines if he wished to do so, despite our legal claim to it.

I recomend that President Eisenhower invite President Magsaysay to Washington, and give him the land as a gift from the American people to the Filipino people.

Such a gesture on our part would have tremendous prestige value for us. It would greatly strengthen President Magsaysay's position and help to offset the growing anti-American sentiment in the Philippines.

When we stop to think of the billions we have poured into Europe, the value of this land would be a drop in the bucket, but the results in goodwill and the strengthening of our ties with our most dependable ally in the Pacific would be worth many times the $1 million.

President Magsaysay also needs more economic aid from us. He is trying to develop industries to help make the Phillipines self-supporting. He wants to build roads and schools. We should help him do so.

There is a growing feeling in the Phillipines that since President Magsaysay succeeded in crushing the Communist movement there, the United States is less interested in helping the country.

American aid to the Philippines for this year is earmarked at approximately $139 million. The President told us he badly needed $200 million. We ought to give him the additional amount, even if we have to deduct it from some of the funds we have allocated for our less dependable and less grateful allies.

We should help this remarkable man make his country prosperous and thoroughly pleased with its relations with America so that the other Asian nations will know that it pays to be a friend of Uncle Sam.

Nineteen Hundred and Fifty-six Is the Decisive Year in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article concludes the report by Mr. William Randolph Hearst, Jr., on his recent 30-day tour of the Far East:

DANGER AHEAD—ASIA: SHAKE OFF KOREA TRUCE TIMIDITY, HEARST URGES

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

This final article in the series on my Far Eastern trip brings us to the problem of what to do about Korea.

As the third point in our list of recommendations on Asia, I would like to suggest that we shake off the timidity toward the Korean armistice which condones Communist violations but insists that our men scrupulously observe its provisions.

President Eisenhower, Secretary Dulles, and every other American in a position to know realizes that the Communists are brazenly flouting the truce terms and building up armed strength in North Korea.

Granted that we might not want to precipitate a shooting war over the issue of Communist violations, why do we still insist that our Korean forces adhere to provisions which could place them at a dangerous disadvantage in actual combat?

Technically, of course, it is a United Nations command in Korea. Fifteen other nations must be consulted about policy shifts, although American and South Korean troops compose practically the whole command.

But we have an obsolete army in South Korea with obsolete equipment. In a sudden scramble, it might not be possible to rush up-to-date arms into the theater in time to avert a catastrophe.

We should give the North Korean Communists 30 days' notice to respect the arms limitation and neutral supervision terms of the armistice or consider those provisions inoperative.

Similarly in South Vietnam we are abiding by the terms of an armistice that neither the United States nor South Vietnam ever signed.

Time is of the essence in South Vietnam. If we can take advantage of the present lull in the cold war to create a modern fighting force to support the Diem government, Communist Vietnam's opportunity may pass forever before 1956 is out.

But our training mission in South Vietnam is only one-third the estimated strength required—because lawyers in the State Department say we would be violating provisions of an armistice we didn't sign if we increased our training complement beyond present levels.

In both places, of course, we are taking the calculated risk that the Communists won't launch an armed attack. If they once more refuse to guide their actions by American blueprints, we could be in real trouble in Korea—and disaster would strike in South Vietnam.

4. We must work out an agreement with our major ally, Great Britain, that will enable us, at certain times and under certain conditions, to act unilaterally in Asia.

This, I realize, is the most controversial conclusion we reached on our trip, and the one most susceptible to misinterpretation.

I'm not recommending that we pull apart from our allies; I'm not suggesting that we do anything to upset the NATO machinery.

But I do suggest that it is only being practical to realize that there are potential situations in Asia that will require swift and determined moves on the part of the United States which our allies are likely to oppose.

Quemoy and Matsu, for instance. Defense of these 2 islands may be essential to America's position in Asia, but British public opinion is not prepared to support such American action.

Sir Anthony Eden has difficulty enough getting British support for our position toward Formosa. It is highly improbable that he can educate the British people to the importance of Quemoy and Matsu.

And, in all truth, there is little evidence that even the American public understands the importance of those 2 islands. But after hearing every high-ranking American in the area say we cannot allow them to fall into Red China's hands, I'm convinced that a better understanding is required.

If the defense of Quemoy and Matsu is a must, we should not allow our hands to be tied by an uninformed British public opinion, the same force that kept us from using our full resources in Korea.

It might be a wiser policy, and a stronger deterrent to Chinese Communist aggression, to state clearly and unequivocally that we do intend to defend those islands if they are attacked.

5. In regard to the "neutralism" of India, we must reconcile ourselves to the realization that we cannot buy or bribe Prime Minister Nehru over to our side.

FUNDS WON'T TAKE NEHRU FROM COURSE

Congress can appropriate funds for India till the sacred cows come home, and Mr. Nehru won't be swerved from his present path of "neutralism."

For India's long-range good or ill, rightly or wrongly, Mr. Nehru has placed his bets

squarely on the proposition that communism is changing, that it has lost its aggressive dynamism, and that Indian can survive alongside its neighboring giants, Communist Russia and Red China.

Future developments may rudely shatter Mr. Nehru's complacent dream about the benevolence of Khrushchev and company and of Mao Tze-tung.

But American money won't buy him over to the opposite belief. Because Mr. Nehru has taken this position and is attempting to enlist other Asian "neutrals" behind his banner, the United States should not become angry with India and attempt to lecture it away from its present "soft" attitude toward Russia.

But no more should we prostrate ourselves before Nehru and act is if appeasing this influential statesman represents a lofty aim of our Asian policy.

We should treat India with unemotional realism. Heaven only knows that is the way they treat us so they should recognize and understand the technique. Nehru wants economic aid from the United States but he wants no strings attached. We should tell him quite plainly that he is not going to get any aid without conditions, and one of the first conditions we should insist upon is that the Indian press stop turning the people against the United States.

We are treated far worse in the Indian press today than in the Russian press. Nehru may say he cannot do anything about the press because it is free but that just isn't so. We learned during our visit that Nehru is the boss in India and when he wants something done, it is done. He doesn't hesitate, when he feels it necessary, to mix a little autocracy with democracy.

For example, he found means of calling off scheduled elections in Calcutta because he knew that if they were held, the Communists would win them.

If he wants the American taxpayer to help develop India economically, he should raise his own voice in defense of the United States. A few speeches or public statements by him giving a fairer picture of American motives in world affairs would help to offset the anti-United States tendencies of the Indian press. There are many ways in which he could bring his persuasive powers to bear to see to it that the Indian people were not given a distorted and unfair impression of America.

UNITED STATES SHOULD LEAD PACIFIC PEACE ARMY

There is one form of aid I am in favor of offering India apart from Nehru, without any strings attached. That is a scholarship program to enable Indian youths to come to the United States to study. They could then learn the truth about America. They could go home qualified to assume positions of leadership in the economic, political, and social life of the Nation. This was what the English did in India; in fact it was the one of the best things they did do for the country. Most Indians who studied in this country would, I believe, remain good friends of America. We would get enduring value from that kind of aid to India.

6. Turning now to Japan, I think we should insist that the Japanese Government take stronger measures to counteract the anti-American sentiment that has been allowed to develop in that country. The Government should explain fully, frequently, and truthfully to the people what the United States is trying to do in the world today. Far too much leftist sentiment is being allowed to develop in Japan's educational and labor fields.

7. We should help to establish a Pacific peace army composed of units of the armed forces of all free Asian nations, including the Philippines, Japan, Nationalist China, South Korea, South Vietnam, Thailand, and Pakistan. We should help to equip and train such an army, but it should be composed of and commanded by Asians only. It would not have to be a big army, but it should be trained as a highly mobile force of fighters for freedom. The very existence of this army would, I believe, strengthen the unity of the free nations of Asia and serve as an effective deterrent to Communist military aggression.

8. There should be created an organization for the exchange of information between the free nations of Asia and it should be called the Freeinform. This organization could counteract the propaganda and subversive activities of the Cominform.

There are some of the measures by which I believe the free world can still win the cold war in Asia.

In closing this report on Asia, I would like to pay tribute to the role now being played by our airlines in the task of cementing our good relations with the rest of the world.

We traveled thousands of miles on this journey with Pan American, TWA, and Northwest Airlines and in every instance, we were impressed by the fact that our airline representatives have become unofficial ambassadors of American good will.

Their skill and efficiency, topped off by great personal courtesy toward the passengers, are bound to have a lasting impact.

Once again we have been able to visit many foreign countries with a speed that would have astounded previous generations because of the great operational know-how of these superb American air transport systems.

It Appears That United States Always in Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post, April 14 issue. This editorial raises the question as to whether or not it is possible for Uncle Sam to ignore at least one crisis. The editorial follows:

ISN'T THERE ONE CRISIS UNCLE SAM CAN IGNORE?

When the Nation's policymakers hold their next conclave on what the United States should do about practically everything, it might be a good idea to search the global horizon for one area, however small or insignificant, of which it could be safely stated that its internal affairs were none of our business.

There are so many places in whose affairs we are forced to be concerned—places like some of those recently visited by Secretary of State Dulles with important results—that it would be soothing to the public if an area could be found whose crises we could calmly ignore. Possibly Tristan da Cunha might serve as a pilot project to provide practice for our statesmen in this unaccustomed field. With diligence our diplomats might eventually find themselves actually resisting the impulse to stick their necks out in areas where our national interest is at best remote. Too often, the "For God's sake, do something" bloc favors places outside our orbit of interest rather than posts held by essential allies, like Formosa.

In view of the dismal consequences of many of our well-meaning efforts to settle things all over the world, this suggestion for some new restraints on our meddlesome-Mattie impulses may not be so impractical as the apostles of American world leadership think. As to Cyprus, we appear to have kindled the hopes of the Greeks while enraging the British, who, while feeling free to rebuke us for failing to see the virtues of Communist China, simply loathe being criticized themselves. And the pressure to involve the United States of America in a possible police action along the borders of Israel poses grim possibilities which should be well explored before we edge closer to that melee. In short, political realism seems to suggest a statement from high sources which might be summarized as, "We deplore tyranny, oppression and rioting. We are sorry that so many people are discontented and belligerent. But Uncle Sam has only two hands."

Such a policy would undoubtedly be condemned in certain quarters as a modified neutralism. Conceivably the description would be justified. However, even neutralism in matters beyond one's control or concern should not be condemned out of hand. Indeed, President Eisenhower, commenting on Cyprus, said that, while this country desired to contribute everything possible to a reasonable settlement, "the solution itself is going to have to be reached by the people most greatly concerned." Take the case of Nehru. The more neutral he becomes the more money he gets from us; and the more money he gets from us the more neutral he becomes, until finally, after a particularly vigorous denunciation of everything American, he is invited to come to Washington. The United States of America can hardly expect to duplicate Nehru's record, but we might venture "no comment" on at least one distant fracas.

Hon. Albert P. Morano

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a feature article which appeared in the Bridgeport (Conn.) Sunday Herald on April 15, 1956. This article concerns my friend and colleague AL MORANO, and the tenor of the article expresses pretty well how we feel about AL here in Washington.

With the election campaigns coming up, the people of the State of Connecticut are indeed fortunate to have such a great personality, vote-getter, and conscientious and able gentleman as AL MORANO.

ASPIRANT FOR GOVERNOR KEEPS ONE FOOT SOLIDLY ON BASE—EX-MILKMAN AL MORANO IS PEOPLE'S CONGRESSMAN

ALBERT P. MORANO, the energetic Congressman from the Fourth District, Connecticut, listened intently to debate on the farm bill on the floor of the House. A page approached and handed him a note. MORANO left his seat quietly and headed for his office in the House Office Building.

"Your wife called and asked that you phone her immediately," an aide told him when he reached his office.

MORANO put in a call to his Greenwich home. His wife Millicent was distraught. She had just received word that her mother had died in Brooklyn.

A few hours later, MORANO alighted from a plane at International Airport to join his wife in Brooklyn.

Next morning he was back in Washington. It was important that he cast his vote on the controversial farm bill. He voted, rushed to the capital airport and was on his way back to Brooklyn for the funeral.

The criss-cross flights between Washington and Brooklyn provide an insight to the character of Congressman MORANO, a man who refuses to permit devotion to his job to dilute his devotion to his family and friends.

There is no conflict in these loyalties. MORANO applies his terrific energies to see that they are resolved.

It is this facet of the three-term Fairfield County Congressman's character that has given rise to speculation that MORANO could emerge as the Republican Party's nominee for Governor in 1958.

MORANO himself shrugs off the possibility of heading the GOP State ticket in the next gubernatorial campaign.

He has already announced his candidacy for a fourth term in Congress. Of the four Connecticut Republican incumbents in Congress, MORANO is considered the "safest" bet for reelection in the GOP panhandle stronghold.

Following John Lodge, who vacated the post to become Governor, MORANO entered Congress by defeating Danbury labor leader Dennis J. Carroll in 1950. His comfortable margin of 32,706 votes over Carroll was increased to 56,808 when he eliminated Democratic candidate Edward R. Fay of Stamford 2 years later to retain his seat.

Political analysts are taking MORANO's disavowal of gubernatorial aspirations lightly. The Governor's mansion is constructed of ethereal fabric for Republican hopefuls at this stage of the game. On the other hand, the Fourth District congressional chair is firmly rooted to the floor, barring an earthquake that will release it to the Democrats.

MORANO knows this. A master politician, he realizes the advantage of maintaining one foot on base while scouting his opportunity to scurry home to score in the gubernatorial ball game.

His security is reflected in the Fairfield County Democrats' dilemma as the congressional election approaches. With the runoff less than 6 months away, there hasn't been a whisper out of any possible Democratic challenger. The role of the sacrificial lamb is forming no queue.

Of Italian extraction, MORANO, like Gov. Abraham A. Ribicoff, regards his selection and reelection as a realization of the American dream. The shattering of the myth of the invincibility of sectarianism in Connecticut by Ribicoff must surely light the candle of hope for MORANO as he regards the next rung of the political ladder.

MORANO likes to be known as the "people's Congressman." By and large, he is. Reviewing his 5½-year record, neither extreme conservatives nor liberals have embraced him. For the most part, his conduct of office stamps him as an Eisenhower moderate.

His reputation as a "people's Congressman" stems largely from the excellent service he provides for constituents regardless of political affiliation through his Washintgon and Greenwich offices.

Hundreds of visitors from "back home" stream through MORANO's congressional office during the course of a week, seeking and getting help to arrange tours through the White House, the visitors' gallery of the House, the FBI building and other points of interest.

One of his closest associates says: "AL's faults, if they may be termed as such, are that he worries personally over the plight of the many distressing incidents daily brought to every Congressman's attention by his constituents.

"He is too generous of his time and finances, spreads himself out too thin in trying to please the hundreds of organizations and groups requesting him to address their meetings. His weekends in the district are spent in listening to people who visit him at his home or district office.

"Every day is a work day for Al Morano. When he goes to church there is usually a lineup of people waiting to see him when he comes out. If he does some shopping on a Saturday he ends up with a roast beef and a mess of notes written on butcher wrappings reminding him to check on 'Joe's' case."

Hardly a day passes, Morano's associates disclose that a letter doesn't arrive at the office referring to a problem that could be applied to any number of people and winding up with no further identification than a puzzling "Joe" or "Bill."

The trick is to wrack a laden memory to try to tie up the problem with one of hundreds of Joes or Bills who have been contacting the office. A huddle with his dedicated staff, confidants, executive secretary John P. Baxter of Bridgeport and Administrative assistant Sid Yudain of New Canaan, usually results in a process of elimination that turns up the right "Joe" or "Bill."

Morano's forte in affairs of state is in his preoccupation with his duties as a member of the highly important Foreign Affairs Committee.

In the 84th Congress, he turned his attention toward Latin-American affairs. As a one-man mission to study and pave the way for bolstering the economy of Cuba, he won the plaudits of both his colleagues in Congress and highly placed Cuban government officials.

Domestically, organized labor, which greeted his first candidacy with misgivings, came to rate him as one of the "better" Republican congressmen until he came a cropper on one of labor's pet peeves.

Labor dropped him in its rating a couple of months ago when he voted in favor of a bill which they describe as a natural gas "grab." President Eisenhower vetoed it.

While Morano has supported the bulk of Eisenhower's legislation program, he has not hesitated to differ with the President and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles on such foreign policy items as arms aid to Israel.

As one of the leaders of a Republican congressional delegation, Morano called at the White House to insist that arms be sent to Israel for defense to restore the balance in the Mideast, tipped by the sale of Communist arms to Arab countries.

The visit to the White House symbolizes the strides ahead Morano has made since his early youth when he worked variously as a pinboy, milkboy, cab driver, carnival worker, dancing waiter and insurance man.

His baptism in politics came as a member of the Chickahominy Town Meeting District in Greenwich, his home for the last quarter century.

Closely allied with the late Dr. Albert E. Austin, stepfather of United States Ambassador to Italy Clare Booth Luce, MORANO was the sparkplug of the drive that sent Austin to Congress in 1938. Austin rewarded him by naming him his congressional secretary.

When Dr. Austin died 4 years later, MORANO approached Greenwich intimates to suggest that Mrs. Luce be drafted to fill the House vacancy. What happened after that is history. Clare Booth Luce was elected the first woman to serve in Congress from the Fourth District.

The morning following her election, Clare phoned MORANO. "Good morning, Mr. Secretary," she greeted him.

Here began an association that resulted in mutual regard which catapulted both Clare Booth Luce and ALBERT P. MORANO to the heights of the political orbit.

As Mrs. Luce's executive secretary during the war years of 1942 through 1946, MORANO operated with zeal and knowhow. He was in a position to render service—some people call it favors—to the people of Fairfield County. MORANO does not consider requests for assistance as favors. It adds up to service to which his employer's constituents were entitled.

A former GI volunteers the story of his personal experience with MORANO. The GI was on a top-secret intelligence mission in Europe at the height of the war. His folks had received no correspondence from him for a month.

So secret was the GI's mission that not even his commanding officer knew his whereabouts. Yet, when the soldier's worried, parents pleaded with MORANO to trace why the letters home had stopped, MORANO was able to unwind Army redtape to reassure the family.

One day a British officer approached the intelligent agent in a CP near the front lines in Luxembourg. "Your Congressman's office wants you to write home as soon as your security restrictions on this mission are lifted," he said.

How MORANO accomplished this bird-dog feat remains a mystery. The fact is that accomplish it he did, winning the everlasting gratitude—and votes—of a large Fairfield County family.

MORANO's devotion to this type of personal service was equalled by his concern for the war-heavy duties of Government burdening Mrs. Luce. He worked far into the night to lighten the burden. It didn't go unnoticed. He was elected the "hardest working and best executive secretary" in Congress at the end of Clare's first term.

In 1946, Clare Boothe Luce stepped out of politics temporarily. It appeared that MORANO's political fortunes, tied to Clare's, had knotted. He stepped aside as John Lodge sewed up the nomination for the fourth district, later strengthened his political position with an assist from then Gov. Raymond E. Baldwin, who appointed Morano State unemployment compensation commissioner for Fairfield County.

His patient waiting paid off 4 years later. John Lodge became governor. Clare Boothe Luce emerged from political retirement long enough to designate her former secretary as the "people's candidate."

It was Clare Booth Luce who nominated MORANO at the congressional convention in Ridgefield in 1950. "When he is nominated," she said, "it will be the most wonderful sign for the party. They will have begun at last to give the people people's candidates."

MORANO breezed in.

Six years later, a Congresman of international stature, MORANO contemplates the past with the hope that history will repeat itself. The last man to hold MORANO's congresional seat went on to rise to governor and then ambassador.

The high regard MORANO holds for Clare Booth Luce was apparent at the baptism of his daughter in the family church in Greenwich 10 years ago. The child was christened Clare Anita.

MORANO's attractive wife, the former Millicent Greco, shuns the social whirl of the Nation's Capitol. She prefers to live quietly and graciously at the family home at Indian Harbor in Greenwich. AL joins his family every weekend and whenever other opportunities to return to Fairfield County during sessions of Congress occur.

A son, Anthony, 22, recently married, is an Air Force lieutenant working for his wings at Malden Air Force Base in Missouri. He is a university graduate—Amherst—an opportunity his father never had. A self-educated man, AL MORANO has lifted himself to his position of prestige by his bootstraps.

En route home for his weekend visits, MORANO delights in picking up little gifts for precocious Clare Anita. During his foreign travels on official business he invariably receives notes from her requesting specific souvenirs.

At home, the Congressman fancies himself a great cook—much to his wife's regret. Sometimes he imposes his culinary fetishes on waiters, describing in minute detail how he wants his food prepared.

Once, at Joe's C'est Bon Restaurant in Greenwich when he wasn't getting through to the waiter, he cancelled his gourmet order and said plaintively, "Bring me a can of Italian sardines, a fork and a key."

While other Congressmen have chosen the luxurious hotels and expensive Georgetown or Capitol Hill apartments for their Washington quarters MORANO still lives in a rooming house on East Capital Street, where his executive secretary, Baxter, also resides.

When MORANO is free of the onerous duty of attending official functions he hastens to join the family of Maria Perticcone, his landlady, for a good spaghetti dinner. He usually brings his own spaghetti—noncaloric—since he's guarding his waistline.

To insure his silhouette from burgeoning, the former amateur boxer-turned-Congressman gets in some exercise in the House gym every afternoon, schedule permitting. He walks to and from work, about 10 city blocks, to maintain his strict regimen.

Ordinarily courteous and quiet, MORANO occasionally shows fits of temper. He has been known to "burn" a few official ears on the telephone when he thought one of his constituents was getting a runaround, or when bureaucratic bumbling was delaying a project which he thought could be accomplished sooner.

One of MORANO's idiosyncracies stems from his intense loyalty to his home county with its hatting centers of Danbury and Norwalk. Every visitor to his office in Washington and his home or office in Greenwich is expected to wear a hat.

An abstainer from smoking, MORANO takes an occasional Scotch on the rocks or an ale with his food. He loves opera and proved it by introducing and guiding a bill through Congress to exempt nonprofit opera and symphonic organizations from admission taxes.

The expression "for the birds" has a special significance for the Congressman. Bird-watching is his principal hobby. Millicent's lunch or dinner plans are often disrupted when she finds her bread supply has been crumpled up for bird fodder.

John Baxter presented his boss with a book on bird identification last Christmas and AL can now spot and identify practically any bird indigenous to this part of the country—even visitors from other areas.

One Sunday a top politican came to MORANO's Indian Harbor home to discuss urgent political matters. MORANO started pointing out the birds in his backyard and describing their characteristics. The politician left an hour later, well versed in bird lore, but not a word of politics had been spoken.

The story of the birds and the politicians is not apocryphal. It actually happened. But there are doubters who insist that any time AL MORANO foregoes an opportunity to talk about or work at politics, it's "strictly for the birds."

Regional Water Laboratory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, land utilization is affected by many economic, physical and social conditions. However, the main factors which determine the suitability of land for crop production are the extent of rainfall and the supply of water.

As Dr. H. H. Wooten pointed out in his excellent study Major Uses of Land for the United States, published by the USDA in October, 1953, as Technical Bulletin 1082:

> Several significant interrelationships exist between use of cropland and water. These include limits on lands used for crops in moisture-deficient areas; problems of excess water in wetland areas and those subject to overflow; condition of land in relation to general water; relationship of ground water to supplemental irrigation and domestic water; and drainage and soils in relation to salinity (p. 62).

Water is becoming a more scarce, and, at the same time, valuable resource. Competition for its control and use is becoming more intensified as the various demands for water—agricultural, municipal and industrial—multiply in number. In light of this intensive competition, it becomes exceedingly important that the most efficient use is made of this valuable but diminishing resource. For example, we need to know more about:

First. Water sources and their development, both surface and underground.

Second. Storage, control, measurement, and conveyance of water.

Third. Water requirements and uses.

Fourth. Application of water—alternative methods and their relative efficiencies.

Fifth. Removal of excess water from surface and sub-surface areas.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the climate of the eastern part of the United States is generally characterized as humid or subhumid; while the western part, except the Pacific Northwest, is generally referred to as an arid or semiarid area. While the former area during parts of the year has an overabundance of water, giving rise to problems of drainage and flood protection; the latter is a moisture-deficient area, giving rise to the need for collecting and storaging of water during wet periods for use by irrigation during the dry seasons. It is evident, therefore, that the relationships between cropland and water I outlined a moment ago and the need for more basic information relative thereto are not sectional or regional, but rather national in both their nature and scope.

Although nearly 95 percent of our irrigated cropland is in the 17 .Western States, the expansion of irrigation in Eastern and Southern States has been rapid. For example, whereas in 1939 only 39,862 acres of cropland were irrigated in 28 States designated as either Northeastern, Corn Belt, Lake States, Appalachian, Southeastern; the number of irrigated acres increased to 61,902 by 1944; and 152,586 by 1949.

On the other hand, the number of acres in organized drainage enterprises declined during the decade 1940–50, by 119,000 acres in the Mountain and Pacific Coast States; whereas the number of acres in such enterprises in the North and Southeastern States increased by 15,840,000 acres. This is not to say that some western and Pacific-coast irrigation areas do not have drainage problems, they do, but the major concern of people in these areas is the acquisition and more efficient use of water.

Although we have regional laboratories which are studying basic soils and plant relationship and water hydraulics, and so forth, there are inadequate facilities in existence today whose basic concern is the more intelligent development and use of water. Because of these facts, Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a regional water laboratory. The bill also authorizes an initial appropriation of $1 million for this purpose.

Big Bend Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most monumental flood-control programs ever attempted in the United States is currently underway in the Missouri River Basin. Involved are 10 States and a sixth of the land area of the United States. The program has been progressing on schedule and overall is about 60 percent completed.

The last major structure involved is the Big Bend Dam in central South Dakota. No funds were provided for this project in the budget. Recently I wrote to all members of the House Appropriations Committee, making a recommendation in regard to this dam. I would like to insert the letter I wrote in regard to this project as I believe it provides a feasible solution:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, House Appropriations Committee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Reference is made to the development program in the Missouri River Basin, which was authorized in 1944, and which is made up of a series of large dams plus subsidiary structures to assist in controlling floods and to provide other benefits throughout a 10-State area. The program is getting along exceptionally well and has reached a high degree of completion with the exception of the last major structure; namely, Big Bend Dam.

In this regard I should like to call your attention to my testimony before the Public Works Subcommittee of your committee on March 28, relative to this dam. I was notified earlier this year that the Corps of Engineers has sufficient funds currently available to complete a structure known as the Gavins Point Dam. The budget request which was submitted to the Congress contains a provision for $1,700,000 for the Gavins Point Dam. The budget provided no funds for the Big Bend Dam, although it has been authorized. My suggestion to the subcommittee was that whatever funds are necessary for the preliminary engineering and survey work on Big Bend be allocated from the $1,700,000 budgeted for Gavins Point. Such action would in no way increase the budget request of the executive department

and would provide the first step in the last major phase of the river program.

Various estimates have been made as to what the initial engineering and surveying would cost, and the most recent figure available to me is $650,000. This would leave a balance of well over a million dollars in the budget, which could be used for other river purposes, such as surveys on some of the tributary streams and channel stabilization from Yankton, S. Dak., south. I think there is considerable merit to this suggestion, because (1) it would assist in bringing the Missouri River Basin development program into its final stages, (2) it would not increase the budget estimate, and (3) it would hasten the day that the interrelated structures on the Missouri River can work in conjunction with one another more efficiently than they can operate individually.

I would appreciate it very much if you would give this suggestion your consideration during your deliberations.

Thank you kindly.

Cordially,

HAROLD O. LOVRE.

Speech by John E. Rogers, National High School Oratorical Contest of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK IKARD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, recently I have had called to my attention a very fine speech made by John E. Rogers, the son of our colleague, WALTER ROGERS, at the 19th annual national high school oratorical contest of the national Americanism activities of the American Legion. John Rogers is a senior in St. John's College High School here in Washington and by this speech certainly demonstrates that he is an able son of his distinguished father. It would, in my judgment, be a fine thing if all Americans could read this speech and if we would all heed the lesson he teaches us there:

In 1883, near the Sable Islands, the French liner *La Bourgogne* collided with another ship and quickly sank to a watery grave taking with her the lives of 584 persons trapped within the iron coffin of her hull.

November 12, 1928, the steamship *Vestris* foundered off the Virginia Capes—113 persons perished.

1890, the British steamer *Utopia* collided near Gibraltar—540 of the passengers and crew died.

September 8, 1934—the night skies near Ocean City, N. J., were suddenly illuminated by flames from the steamship *Morro Castle* in one of the worst naval holocausts of our time. The ship was completely destroyed, along with the lives, hopes, and bodies of 137 of her passengers.

But as different the times, places, and circumstances of the destruction of each of these ships, they still had several things in common.

In all instances the ships were completely destroyed and an appalling number of persons died—and again in all instances there were only two possible reasons, a bad ship or a poor crew.

Nowhere else, as on a ship, is so complete cooperation demanded of men, nor does so great tragedy mark indolence.

And yet there are those who have shown such casual interest in the greatest ship afloat, that it is wondrous indeed that she is still able to carry the hopes and destinies of the American people.

It was 169 years ago that our country was launched on the stormy seas of state. Though she was built and launched in a shipyard called Independence Hall, her home port is the heart of every loyal American.

Her decks were hewn from the tree of freedom and her sails were cut from the robe of liberty—and as she embarked that September morn of 1787 her bow was not washed with champagne but with the blood of patriots.

And what of her crew?

They were not great sailors; they knew little of the running of a government, but they were honest men and they were determined; they had fought a long, hard war with the greatest power of the time to see this ship launched, and far better an inexperienced crew than a corrupt one.

As she set sail that morning, toward a horizon already obscured by the pessimism of the world, the wildest imagination could hardly have foretold of the coming events of her voyage: how she was to steer a straight course through as storm seas as ever threatened to engulf a Nation and seven decades later to face and defeat her most critical peril.

Within a period of only 40 years she was to become engaged in the two worst conflicts this world has ever seen. The first was fought at Belleau Wood, Verdun, and in the Argonne Forest. The second was fought on Guam, Midway, and in Normandy.

In both, our craft surmounted the greatest odds and the highest waves to plant the flag of freedom on the doorstep of tyranny.

Yes; throughout history our ship has shown herself to be not seaworthy—not very seaworthy—but the most seaworthy vessel existent on the choppy waters of shifting alliances and honeyed half-truths that we call international harmony.

It has been a long voyage, a hard voyage—and our trip has been safe only because we have had the finest ship and the best crew.

Our trip has been safe and pray God may it continue to be safe.

Our ship is still the finest and our crew is still the best but, as in all times of peace and prosperity, indolence and self-confidence have set in. They have not just set in, but have so established themselves that they have given birth to a hideous offspring—indifference. Indifference is not just a sentiment, however; it is the decay of ideals. It is the rot that eats at a ship; that eats at her crew. It is passive, but it is deadly. It is the rust that can destroy the mightiest metals. It is the malnutrition that can kill a Hercules. It is the disease that now threatens the life of our Nation.

Communism, sin, and depravity are easy to spot. You can point to suffering, to death, to slavery and there is your communism, your sin, your depravity.

But indifference is deceptive. It cannot be seen, it cannot be realized, we can only see what it has done.

We look at the skeleton of Poland and say, "Too bad." But it was indifference that murdered her.

We read in the paper that a small country has been engulfed by revolution and death. Again, we say, "Too bad," but it is indifference that bleeds her.

A thousand ships, a hundred nations, a billion lives have been ruined by indifference, but yet we do not recognize it. We do not recognize it and even now it is upon us. It is upon us and it is not hidden. It shows itself in many ways:

In low election returns.

When John Q. Citizen turns to the comics instead of the editorial page.

When junior citizen takes gym instead of civics.

When no one can find time to attend citizens' meetings.

It shows itself in all of these and many other similar ways and yet it is not recognized. It is not recognized because it is people, and people are harmless. They mean no harm, yet they do no good, and someone must carry their burden. Our ship has become heavy with their weight—they are as barnacles serving only to slow our vessel down and make her an easy prey for the pirate and slave ships of tyranny.

And yet the indifferent are not just barnacles—a barnacle cannot think; it does not seek to hurt, it cannot understand the necessity of good citizenship, of interest in world affairs, of the exercise of the vote. A barnacle is blameless.

But for an American citizen to sit back and allow the reins of government to slip from his grasp and become in grave danger of being taken over by the cruel claw of oppression—that is treason, lacking only motivation and intent.

How can a "good" American be called a traitor when he respects the flag and upholds the Government?

How does he respect that flag?

Does he actively seek to protect and defend her that "long may she wave on high" or does he merely tip his hat in passing?"

How does he uphold the Government?

Does he know there are some 280 front organizations devoted to destroying that Government: Does he know their names, their approach, what to do about them? Or does he say, "Someone in Washington will take care of it."

Someone in Washington can't do everything—can't show step by step all the pitfalls to each of the 160 million Americans.

America is not a nation of dullards who have to be waited on hand and foot, and spooned full of information; who must live in constant jeopardy of being poisoned by the sugar-coated pollution of communism.

If communism were to bang at our door at this minute, and flash bayonets and guns in our faces, Americans would rise as a man to smite down this foul invader of our free shores. But because it sneaks in, because it infiltrates, we say someone else will take care of it. Without a doubt what happened to Poland, to Yugoslavia, to Albania, to Latvia, to the Balkans, and to many, many others can happen here. In fact it has very nearly happened already. Just 15 years ago when World War II broke out and America began to gird and prepare herself for battle, detailed checks were made of all Government employees, workers, and anyone else in any way connected with the war effort. It was then that it became evident just how many beams in our ship were rotted and infested with the worms and termites of subversion, and by far the majority of these vermin were not Nazis or Fascists, but radical free thinkers, that is to say, Commies.

Commies, Reds, pinkos, fellow-travelers, leftists, progressives—many were rooted out and unmasked—many, but not all. Some burrowed deeper or took on new colors. These are the Hisses, Remingtons, and Coplons of our present day.

However, those that were uncovered were found out, not because we finally wised up, but because of wartime security, and the discovery of these Americans in name only did not do away with them entirely.

They have only changed their immediate objective. Though still penetrating the stronghold of free men, their main purpose now is to lull us into a false sense of security and well-being.

And it must not happen.

Are the ideals and hopes on which this Nation was founded to be washed over by a lukewarm ripple of Let George do it. Because George will do it. Georgi Malenkov, Georgi Ivankovitch, and all the other Georgies.

Are we to sit back and see our Nation slip inch by inch under the waves of apathy because there are none who would guide or save her.

For over a century and a half the Constitution has been the warden, guardian, procurer, and defender of the rights of the people but it has no life of its own; its purpose is attained only when it is used as an instrument of freedom by freemen, and freemen are you and I and the person next to you and 160 million others across the face of America. We are the ones who must protect our rights and only we. Democracy is too great a thing to entrust it to any but the elected representatives of the people; and these representatives must be elected, not appointed by the ignorant or the evil.

If America is to remain whole now is the time to act, not tomorrow or the day after that or as soon as you can find time. Now is the time to caulk up the joints of our ship and sheath her in the armor of alertness.

For if we do not, if we fail through neglect or carelessness, then tyranny and oppression will not be just ugly words in an oratorical contest.

Arabian Base Poses Knotty Problems to United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BOYLE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, on June 18 the present agreement that the United States has with Saudi Arabia for use of the Dhahran Air Base will expire. It is my understanding that the Department of State is preparing to enter negotiations for a new 5-year lease for this base. Edwin A. Lahey, the Washington bureau chief of the Knight newspapers who is a very perceptive and thoughtful columnist and reporter, whose nimbleness of expression is appreciated by all of us from Chicago, calls attention in an article appearing on Monday, April 16, 1956, in the Chicago Daily News to discrimination which is permitted against our Jewish citizens in Saudi Arabia under the present agreement. It is to be hoped that our Secretary of State will not permit such discrimination to continue under the new agreement which he is preparing.

The article of Mr. Lahey follows:

ARABIAN BASE POSES KNOTTY PROBLEM TO UNITED STATES—PRESENT PACT UNDERWRITES MOSLEM HATE FOR ZIONISTS

WASHINGTON—The United States is about to open negotiations for renewing the lease on the Daharan Air Base in Saudi Arabia.

In the present agreement under which we operate this air base, the United States implicitly underwrites the violent antipathy of the Saudi Arabians for Jews.

One paragraph of this 1951 agreement says: "There must not be among members of the mission or among the other employees any individual who is objectionable to the Saudi Arabian Government."

A reporter who called at the Saudi Arabian embassy in Washington was told by a Mr. Shalfan, identified as the counselor, that the negotiations for renewing the Daharan Air Base agreement would be opened "within a matter of days" in Saudi Arabia.

"What Americans would be regarded as 'objectionable' in Saudi Arabia?" he asked.

"Communists," replied Shalfan.

"What about Jews?"

"We are not anti-Semitic," Shaffan replied. "Remember, the Saudi Arabians are Semites themselves.

"But we do not want Zionists at the air base.

"We are still technically at war with Israel. The base at Daharan is for Saudi Arabia, as well as for the United States.

"If Zionists were at the base, they would have access to military information that would be valuable to Israel."

Shalfan insisted that any feelings that the Saudi Arabians have about Jews dates only from the Arab-Israel war 8 years ago, and is kept alive by the fate of 1 million Arab refugees who were expelled from their homes in Israel.

The Saudi Arabian diplomat, who reminded the caller that his is a free country, said that his government imposes the same restrictions against "objectionable" people on the American oil interests that operate in the Arabian Peninsula.

There are some early indications that an election year issue might be made of the State Department's facility for adapting to local prejudices like those in Saudia Arabia.

It is a tossup, however, whose issue it is. The State Department of Dean Acheson made this agreement, whereas the State Department of John Foster Dulles must negotiate the renewal.

The American Jewish Congress only Saturday criticized the State Department for going along with such restrictive agreements.

The Jewish War Veterans the other day charged that United States Air Force personnel in Daharan are "not free United States citizens," because of our respect for the religious prejudices of the Saudi Arabians.

Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota, asked Secretary of State Dulles at a hearing in February about reports that "American personnel of Jewish faith" were not stationed at Daharan.

Dulles replied:

"It may be. I think that for many years there has been a prohibition on Jews in Saudi Arabia."

The Secretary told the Senator that while the United States must recognize the fact that Saudi Arabia is an ally, this does not mean that "we approve of all its practices."

Where Does Business Paper Journalism Stand Today?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago a group of men with high ideals and a devotion to achieving better practices in business papers established what is today the Associated Business Publications. The group's earliest efforts produced a "Code of Ethics" which established the current membership prerequisite for the 162 member-publications of the Associated Business Publications.

In 1956, as a half century earlier, the adult education of businessmen is being constantly extended through reading better grade business magazines. George Westinghouse found ideas in a business paper which helped him develop the air brake. Henry Ford read in a business magazine the first detailed description of the "Kane-Pennington Motor," a revolutionary new gasoline engine. The discovery helped Ford design the new engine for his automobile.

In one of this year's nationwide golden anniversary celebrations, the Associated Business Publications held its regular Washington editorial conference at the Shoreham Hotel on April 12–13. Awards for outstanding editorial achievement were presented to 21 deserving editors and the following address was made by Ralph H. Smith, vice president and editorial director, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., a pioneer and leader in business paper publishing and a pioneer member of the association.

In this age of radio and television, Mr. Smith's talk on the responsibilities of a responsible business press is interesting to all who must "read and run." It is of even greater value to those who become tomorrow's leaders in business and industry, as well as to others who would like to know how editorial responsibility to the reader is conceived at or near the top. The wisdom of such editors is constantly reflected—monthly, weekly, and daily, in the product of their editorial competence.

Under unanimous consent, I insert this thought-provoking address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHERE DOES BUSINESS PAPER JOURNALISM STAND TODAY?

(Address by Ralph H. Smith, vice president and editorial director, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.)

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, honored award winners, ladies, and gentlemen, the tentative program of our meeting told me that I was to deliver the principal address at this dinner session. The program was surely tentative. We can now see that the principal business of the session has been completed.

This was the business of honoring those of our group who, during the past year, have made outstanding contributions to our joint effort to serve our readers and to advance the world's work. All that is left for me is to voice, as well as I can, some group reflections that we must have made on the significance of such an occasion.

I am sure that those who have received awards tonight will have been the first to reflect that these honors recognize superb teamwork, as well as fine individual achievement. In the profession of business-publication editor it is particularly true that "no man is an island." They who enter the communications business become centers, as well as sources, of communication. If they are to succeed, they must leave behind the sharp individualism of the poet whose message is so personal that we have to enter into his personality before we can understand him.

I know that some, and I think that all, of tonight's stars are also planets that reflect and focus light from other sources. Such other sources include colleagues who have shared professional know-how. There is the community that starts with the editorial staff and goes on to encompass the whole field of plants, offices, laboratories, bureaus, and people that live by the light that the

business-paper editor turns back on it. The best modern business magazines are galaxies of teamwork.

To the winners, all honor—and the reflection that they honor us and many more than us.

John Donne's reflection that "no man is an island" is of the essence of anything that I could say tonight on where business-paper journalism stands today. There may have been a time when it stood in the pulpit or sat in the professional chair. I once worked for a business journal whose publisher literally built into an industrial structure the businesses for which he saw an opportunity to build a magazine. He almost single-handedly organized the people in these businesses into State, regional, and national associations—and was canny enough to organize their suppliers into matching associations. His publication became the monthly textbook of their technology, which was hardly a technology at all until he gave form and record to their experimental fumblings. He was the precursor of laboratories, of college engineering courses—and inevitably of publishing competition, first paid and then, just inevitably, free-distribution competition.

Sometimes our publishers of today are inclined to mourn the disappearance of that kind of great individualist-editor—for this man started as an editor, as did most of the publishers of his day. But they would have real occasion for mourning if we tried to live back in his day, to publish our magazines as periodical textbooks, to visualize their pages as bearing any resemblance to the archives in which an industry deposits its documented technology, to exercise the monopoly of the preacher's pulpit or the professor's chair. We have too much competition today to be able to afford such nostalgic exercises. The competition has long broken my old friend's monopoly.

The competition to which I refer is not what we usually mean when we talk so much—as we do talk so much—about competition for our readers' time. It is not the competition of television, of other recreational activities, of other forms of reading that are pursued for recreational purposes or that cater to a man's quasi-recreational interest in areas of citizenship that lie outside the world's work through which he makes his major contribution to the world's progress.

I should like to dispose of such intrusions on our readers' time by a reflection that we do not make nearly often enough. Today's readers of business publications are living in an economy that is constantly cutting down the hours of the day's work. It is constantly speeding up their travel between home and work (or, if they are Long Islanders or New Havenites, it is, at least, letting them use their travel-time as reading time). These people are increasingly cosseted at home by labor-saving and time-saving appliances. These prospects for our publications have more time, much more time, than ever men before them had to do anything that interests them.

So far as the competition of television and its equivalent temptations to a man's will are involved, our concern must be to interest him.

My own concern about the strength of such temptations is assuaged by another reflection. What a running head-start we have over all such competition. We deal with subject-matter that, of necessity, lies at the heart of every man's complex of interests. We forward his life's work, out of which come the means to all other satisfactions in life—from indulging in marriage when you are young to financing a hobby when you are old. And yet, my friends, the business press is still in need of, first, realization and, then, intelligent promotion of what this difference in responsibility from all other media should mean in its editorial costs and in advertising rates per thousand satisfied subscribers.

In potentiality the business press stands today in its relation to leisure-hour distractions just where it has always stood—as far ahead as a man's livelihood comes ahead of all his other interests. But that is just a fine ringing statement so long as we expect a reader to lay aside his sophistication when he submits to our demand for a share of his leisure hours. He has been taught by well-paid illusion-builders that he lives in a world of rapid change that makes radio news every hour on the hour. He reads—in The Exurbanites, for instance—that he is served, if not mastered, by experts in organizing words and pictures to get the story out in just the way that his mind will best take it in. He is under heavy persuasion to believe that what they give him has been measured according to its significance and weighed according to its consequences.

This reader of the communications-era will not be patient if we rest a case for dull, disorganized, pedestrian and cheaply financed presentation on the superior importance of our magazines' content and on the danger of oversimplifying it, as his entertainers oversimplify their content. In his own interest, we must avert that danger. In our interest, however, we cannot avert our minds from our need to combine, or to complement, fine engineering and industrial know-how with sheer journalistic know-how. The profession, after all, is editing—communication.

If, in the entertainment and edification world, communication occasionally comes ahead of having something worthwhile to communicate, our own purity must not blind us to the necessity of paying the price of communicating, as well as of finding. It may involve a higher wage-price for talents that are rarer than some business publishers yet realize, but perhaps they have competition that is also unrealized.

The competition that I should like to emphasize tonight may not have been sufficiently realized by any of us. It is not so easy to see as television and its equivalents. But it is far more serious, I believe.

This is the competition of other and new forms of job-education. Men start out in our industries better educated and more sophisticated than when these papers were published and edited by our predecessors. They go to school in their employing companies as never before. The average company investment in ever more elaborated training has immeasurably multiplied. Some of the larger companies conduct what amount to educational institutions, not only for beginners but for higher-ups. Many companies send promising and ambitious men—our best prospects—back to college for all kinds of technical and management courses. Most companies strongly encourage attendance at professional meetings and seminars and promote visits to other plants in their industries. Our advertisers sponsor customer-education programs. (Or sometimes, our free-distribution sisters provide the sponsorship.)

The colleges are now heels over head in our business of communicating work knowledge, not just prework knowledge. If a company takes a defense contract, our friends here in Washington place at its disposal the know-how of other contractors, the findings of Government laboratories, and the research data of such completely new and formidable institutions as the Rand Corp., which is under contract to the Air Force. Incidentally, the airplane, the speed of air travel, has simplified every educational effort made by our readers that takes the form of going and seeing.

Here is the competition that worries me. Our relative monopoly on adult job education has been broken to bits, and our function is changing before our eyes. This is something that we have really got to think about. You know, it sometimes seems that they could almost live without us.

However, there is opportunity here, as well as threat, if we can correctly reappraise the needs of our readers.

The more communication of this kind we have, the more expert reporting we must do for the benefit of those who do not participate in it, notably the men in the smaller companies.

The more technology communicated, the more need of our professional screening to save men throughout industry the time that they would otherwise give to the welder of words. What limit can you place on the demand for editorial competence to weed out the insignificant, to appraise the significant, field by field?

The more news that our man hears on the hour and the half-hour, and the more he is persuaded that he lives in a changing world that is reeking with news of change, the more need he has of an interposing editor whose discrimination between what is news and what is merely new can be completely trusted. But that editor had better know how to play his copy as news. The modern news-oriented timing-conscious reader is no longer interested in ponderous textbooks disguised as journals, or vice versa.

Finally, the more attention one of our readers has to pay to the multiplication of specialized information lying within his own narrow field, the more he must rely on our editorial sense of his need to prepare for the day when seizure of an opportunity for top-management responsibilities and pay will depend upon proof that he is not imprisoned in his specialty.

So I say that there is opportunity here if we are flexible enough.

I see it as opportunity for the business magazine that conceives its first function as one of alerting, rather than of teaching in the outworn, time-ignoring pattern of our days as periodical textbooks for adult education. I see it as opportunity for editors who stop each story with its basic alerting facts and their appraisable consequences. As opportunity for editors who prefer more stories—and more sharply pointed stories—in and around their readers' fields to more details in each story, knowing that a reader persuaded to action will, in any event, do more than read before taking action—and may delegate details to juniors.

I see opportunity for a publisher who really knows how to promote his readers' reliance on his paper to alert them when a new idea had better be looked into—and where; when somebody had better grab a plane, visit another plant, consult a supplier, watch Washington or Stuttgart or Bombay. Opportunity for a publisher to capitalize on his readers' confidence that they can safely skip developments that his pages have skipped. (Parenthetically I suggest to publishers some reflection on the possibility that a few of our free sisters may be luring success because they have the appearance of fast-reading alerting and screening magazines, though they lack the first essential of the substance—which is the independence to alert readers to what is significant and ignore what isn't.)

There is certainly opportunity today for the business magazine that is edited and financed on the theory that its customers are readers first and anything else after that—that what makes any kind of reading easier for any man who is working at reading makes reading easier for a man who, at other times, happens to work at engineering, or management, or selling. We can—and should—promote our enterprises as great service institutions, but what we sell are magazines—reading matter that must excite the reader's interest again each month or each week. Their field-coverage will determine their potential readership, but their

actual readership depends wholly on what each issue does to engage the attention of the reader who has become more sophisticated in this communications era than we sometimes realize. "More spoiled," our predecessors might call it.

I have spoken of what I "see." Perhaps I should more properly speak of what I hear. I hear what I have told you from our research reports and I hear it from our readers, including the rather distinguished ones who participated in that ABP panel in New York a couple of weeks ago and who spoke for a multitude.

If you do not altogether agree with me on this version of where business paper journalism stands today, I feel sure that I have, at least, voiced your conviction that it had better not stand at all. The Jesse H. Neal Awards of this year and of all future years are for those who know that he who runs will have the readers—and the advertisers.

A Courageous Veto Deserves Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it has been extremely gratifying to note in the last few days the way in which the Nation's press has applauded the President's veto of the farm bill. The Rochester Democrat and Chronicle is a case in point. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a fine editorial printed in that paper on April 17, in which the shortcomings of the vetoed bill are pointed out and the integrity and stature of the President are clearly indicated:

A COURAGEOUS VETO DESERVES SUPPORT

The President's veto of the farm bill again demonstrates that he has courage. In his judgment, with which we concur, the bill passed by Congress was unsound, destructive and would further aggravate the economic ills of agriculture.

In such circumstances what other course could a man of integrity be expected to take?

Many who will admire the courage of the President may say, "Sure, he is an honest man, but is he absolutely right? Did he fully consider that some farmers' pocketbooks are thin?"

The President has pointed frequently to the inescapable fact that prices of wheat, cotton and other commodities are depressed by mounting surpluses. There is no chance of prices rising until the pattern is changed. The Government already has 15 billions invested in farm surpluses and reports are that three additional billions will be needed this year. The bill which the President vetoed would have made the surplus problem much worse.

The President wants to help farmers financially. In January he proposed to Congress a soil bank plan under which farmers would be paid for reducing production and surplus stocks. The plan was accepted by Congress. Then the pressure blocs got busy to load the bill with rigid high price supports and numerous other devices to offset any good that might result from the proposals of the President.

Cotton, wheat and other bloc politicians say that all these unsound schemes and raids upon the Public Treasury are necessary bids for the farm vote. It is noticeable that the American Farm Bureau Federation is against the bill. Don J. Wickham of Hector, president of the New York Farm Bureau, wired the President urging a veto. This means that in the main the bill appeals to selfish interests.

Mr. Eisenhower represents the entire country, not some subdivision as do Senators and Congressmen. The pull of local wishes and local greeds is not as strong upon him as it is in the case of the legislators. Still, he has been told that a veto might mean a GOP defeat this fall.

The President stands out as a giant figure against the men who let politics guide their vote on the farm bill. It is our feeling that Mr. Eisenhower's action will stir fresh admiration for him. His veto ratifies the belief of Americans that his integrity stands rock firm.

President's Latest Demonstration of His Interest in People as Whole Will Serve Him Well Next November

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BAKER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein the very fine and timely editorial which appeared in the Knoxville Journal, Knoxville, Tenn., April 18, 1956, entitled "President's Latest Demonstration of His Interest in People as Whole Will Serve Him Well Next November":

The man has courage.

Friends and enemies alike will agree this sums up their opinion of President Dwight D. Eisenhower. Most of them held it before he vetoed the Democrat farm bill. More of them hold it now and those who did previously do so now in much greater degree.

"It is a bad bill" the President said with great firmness and then proceeded to describe it as one that would work to the injury of farmer and nonfarmer. He deplored the efforts to get him to sign it on the ground of political expediency and reminded the people that he represents all of them for the good of the Nation as a whole.

Undoubtedly the President's action caught some of the more ardent Democrat supporters of the measure by surprise. They did not believe he would have the courage to do what he did in an election year. But beyond that he put the opposition in a difficult position. He proposed immediate help for the farmer by raising price supports on five basic crops and he called upon Congress to enact as quickly as possible a soil bank measure under which farmers would be able to draw benefits up to $500 million this season.

The hot poker is now back in the hands of the Democrats.

It has been a part of the Democrat election year strategy to fashion in the farm bill a legislative creature which they could present to the farmer as a lure for votes which they had obtained against the wishes of the White House. They proposed to say to the farmer: "Here is something we have brought you at great risk and trouble. The President didn't want you to have it but we have overcome him and are happy to present it to you."

But that is not the picture now. The President not only vetoed the bill. He announced what the administration will do and he outlined a job for Congress to do, also. And any failure of Congress to do what he has asked must lie at the door of the Democrats since they are the majority party on the legislative side of Washington.

Thus, from the political side of the picture—and that is a side that can not be ignored during an election year—the Democrats have been placed on the defensive. And if they do what the President has asked the facts remain that it was at his suggestion. If they fail to act they are open to the charge of having sulked in their tents rather than carry out his recommendations simply because they did not want to implement the program of a Republican President.

The dilemma in which the Democrats find themselves at this time is further complicated—for them at least—by the difficulty of meeting the Republican chant of "peace and prosperity." They know that many farmers will reckon it a blessing if they have, in the face of reduced income, their sons safe at home instead of on Korean battlefields.

And millions of Americans are old enough to recall that under President Eisenhower the Nation is having, for the first time in two decades, 4 years of peace and prosperity. Such a condition has not existed since the late 1920's. It did not exist during the administrations of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman. True, a wartime prosperity was achieved but the greatest prosperity this Nation, or any nation, has known in times of peace, is that which we are enjoying now.

This condition, plus the latest and most convincing instance the President has given that he places the welfare of the people of the United States above and beyond all political considerations, gives him a place in the hearts of his countrymen that will not be forgotten, certainly not at the ballot boxes next November.

Problems of the Family-Size Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following letter dated April 9 which I have received from one of my farmer-constituents in regard to the current agricultural situation, especially as it applies to the family-size farm:

MORRICE, MICH., *April 9, 1956.*

DEAR SIR: The purpose of this letter is not for any favor but to give some personal views of one who seems to be of a vanishing group in our society of the human race in the United States. I am speaking of the family-type farm, or business. The disappearance is being forced upon us so fast that one wonders what is to become of the small individual who once was considered the backbone of the Nation and made it the greatest on earth.

According to the Constitution we are given freedom of religion, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. I believe this gives us the right to work as an individual.

It seems to me that when the larger businesses merge and freeze out or absorb the little independent business, be it manufacturing, processing, mining, farming, bank-

ing, or even the public schools, that we the people, are losing our constitutional rights.

Our school systems are being forced to merge by State dictates for doubtful benefits. Greater concentration leads to gangs, cliques, and juvenile delinquency, for the ones who need individual guidance or understanding are lost in the mob or mass. It is much easier for the weak to follow the path of least resistance than to seek help which they sometimes need.

We know that improvement in the school system is greatly needed to better utilize the facilities for our ever-increasing population. We are told that the larger school systems and districts afford our youth more opportunities, but there is a question in my mind as to that. For example, most of our schools encourage athletics for the sportsmanship and character-building influence which is exerted on the youth. Most of the coaches and leaders are concerned with only the varsity teams, and so the larger the school the smaller the percentage who can become team members. So it would seem that the smaller schools would be able to give more pupils more opportunities to some extent. The same is true of many activities such as music, debating, and drama, etc. Even in the classroom of many, the individual who needs the extra help or attention is deprived of such.

A parallel could be drawn between the schools and our way of life today. Farming is becoming so complicated as is other business that we just can't begin over again. At the age of 40, man is too old to work, yet too young to retire. The factories and most other fields of employment don't want us unless there is a war contract to get out. The population has increased and life expectancy has raised, but social security (welfare) doesn't benefit one until the age of 65. Where and what will be done with those 25 years of the plain average man who still has lots of get up and go if only given the chance?

I could go on and on about this so-called progress of ignoring the litle man irrespective of political parties, for both are at fault. History repeats itself, for there is usually a rise to power, then leadership, then the downgrade of notions, companies, or great individuals as they at last ignore the little man completely. Oh, yes; there have been attempts to break monopolies, chains, cooperatives and unions but still they get larger and the smaller get weaker and are absorbed or extinguished.

This is happening in our government as the township or village offices are being absorbed by centralized county or managerial officers, and again the little fellow's voice is not heard. Is this progress? I wonder. Why is it that the politician or executive usually release for the press a boast that they came from the farm, small town, one-room school, or across the ocean as a penniless immigrant? Then they go on to say how they were helped by being one of the common little men. Then with the next breath these same people contrive to take these "old-fashioned ways" from us.

The other Sunday I heard and watched the debate between Mr. Hall of the Republican Party and Mr. Butler of the Democratic Party. Of course the whole thing was political but they were tossing the farm issue about as bait for our votes. They were bidding for the farm vote by claiming that their respective parties were really more concerned with the dear simple farmer than the other. Each mentioned parity, price support, and soil banks, but we simple people still call all of this "dole." We don't want to be on a public dole, we still have our pride. We are still individuals with an aim in life.

Being a farmer, I am interested in everything which concerns us, but was dismayed as I read what one writer had to say. "The small or family type farm is on the way out and the sooner they realize it the sooner this farm situation can be solved." He then stated several sound reasons why the trend was to larger farms and progress but he could not explain what was to become of the many so-called "strong back but weak-minded" farmers or their families.

I know that we are of a minority group, but we have a few wanted votes, they say 90 to 100 percent parity, the other a soil bank and payments. They are both expensive subsidies and a lot of us farmers of the family type are, I guess, old fashioned and it gets our ire aroused when the radio and press play it up about how much the farmer will be supported. It sounds too much like welfare or a dole system. Have we become parasites on this great country?

This "dole" does not nearly make up for his living and upkeep when his equipment must be replaced for efficient use and our crop rotations and fertility maintained.

For instance our family-type farm of 160 acres, of which 120 are now tillable and another 10 or 20 could be used if need be, has a 19-acre wheat allotment. It was cut from a 3-year average of 3 or more years ago of 33 acres. Our corn allotment is of 13 acres cut from a 30-acre average. We plant about 20 acres of oats for feed for our 6 to 8 milk cows, and our 35 head of sheep. The balance of the cropland is used for hay or pasture which due to our rotation and fertilizing and other good accepted farm practices have not only maintained the fertility but given us enough hay that we can sell it to make ends meet. We don't believe this a good policy to cut all our hay when the fertility is to be preserved. The clovers and some other hay crops store up nitrogen which the soil needs and so should not be destroyed every year.

If we keep more livestock we have to have more grain and the appeal board has refused this request because they had a figure of .702 for corn from our past crop history and so they cut our acreage. We wouldn't mind so much because we did maintain a good crop, hay, and animal balance during the war years and stayed home on the farm and did the best we knew how to get the most yield and still preserve our soil we are now penalized. For it seems that those who worked in the factories and farmed nights and weekends to put all of their land into cash crops with little or no livestock have helped create these present surpluses. Their acreage has been cut but still they have such high allotments that by sowing fertilizer and having an outside income they still do quite well on the Government "dole." They are the ones who will benefit in this area from the soil-bank plan. What benefit will we receive when more of our 52 acres of allotted cropland has been taken from tillage. Remember we have 120 acres of work land, but the Government says to work only 52 of it. We could convert to the raising of soy beans but that means new or different equipment which we can't afford and there is a rumor that acreage might be curtailed on them. We have not any recent crop history on beans of any kind so we could not be allowed to grow them.

We are in a squeeze and are also past 40. My father is 78 years old, but still active, he will soon receive social security. I am 48 years old. Outside labor is hard to find for an added income for employers want men under 40 years of age. We can't afford the $3,000 for new tractors or $2,000 for automobiles or combines to replace our old equipment. That's why I say the little smalltime family unit is going, being forced out by man's, not nature's, dictates.

We raise as good or better crops than the average because we have kept up with good farming practices by reading approved agricultural literature. This has meant the use of good quality seed, rotations and balanced livestock and crop production which is now so much out of balance that we wonder if this is progress we are paying for.

There are many of us, so we aren't alone as one individual. Our problems are complex, we don't know the answers, but perhaps this gives you an insight into them. So with a glimpse of some of the people you represent I hope you can better reach a fair judgement for the problems of all.

Thanks for your letter telling of your work in Congress and thanks for coming back to your district to see how these people you represent are affected by what you decide.

As ever,

FRANK W. MORTIMORE.

Wanted: A New Look at Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the editors of the Scripps-Howard newspapers urge that American foreign policy be thoroughly reexamined. I agree that it should be.

In the Washington Daily News of Wednesday, April 18, there appeared a most interesting article based upon a 2-day conference of 19 editors of Scripps-Howard newspapers at which the principal subject was our foreign policy.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the article in question:

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY IS IN URGENT NEED OF REEXAMINATION

Editors of 19 Scripps-Howard newspapers ended a 2-day conference last night with agreement that American foreign policy urgently needs a thorough reexamination.

Deeds not just words are also needed at home to boost American prestige abroad and to equip the country for the Bolshevik challenge.

The editors heard reports from Scripps-Howard Foreign Editors Ludwell Denny, now in Europe, William Philip Simms, retired foreign editor, and from members of the Washington Bureau of the Scripps-Howard newspapers. They also received from M. H. Trytten of the National Research Council a report on the serious problems in American education, especially the shortage of scientists and engineers.

The editors agreed with Mr. Denny and Mr. Simms that America is losing the cold war; that patching up old foreign policies leads only to new crises; that many of the crises are beyond our control, but are compounded, as Mr. Denny reported, "by putting luxury above security at home and by improvised, contradictory and naive policies abroad."

The consensus was that easy solutions are not in sight—that it will be a long, long haul where the strong and diligent will win over the weak and complacent.

But there was agreement that many problems at home, if tackled wisely and with determination, will better equip the country for that struggle both abroad and at home. Among such problems reported to the editors, were:

Education: Strenuous efforts should be made in local communities to raise the general level of the quality of education in primary and secondary schools if we are to compete with Soviet Russia.

Scientists and engineers: We are losing this race with the Soviets who are engaged in a

crash program. More American youngsters with ability must be stimulated and guided into these careers if we are not to run second best to the Soviets in the rapidly developing era of peaceful uses of atomic energy—especially power. We need more scientists and technicians for point 4 programs abroad.

Physical fitness: Alarming numbers of American youth are no table to pass examinations for military service. The Russians won the winter Olympic games and are the favorites with their professionals to win the summer games. If they do, it will be a cold war victory of immediate propaganda value.

Desegregation: Ability to cope with this problem, without resort to extremism in any direction, will be a major test of the United States in the eyes of many abroad.

Domestic politics: The degree which politicians can refrain from using foreign policy issues, such as the Arab-Israeli dispute, as vote catchers will be a measure of America's maturity as a world leader.

Propaganda: Boondoggling in our information services does the United States more harm than good abroad.

Foreign aid: Present programs, designed for long past situations, are out of date.

Mr. Simms urged a complete reappraisal of our foreign and defense policies. Of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles' recent statement that it is a healthy sign other nations criticize us, Mr. Simms said:

"I couldn't disagree more. To me, at least, it is a most ominous sign—a sign that our foreign affairs are mighty sick."

FAILING

Mr. Denny reported that the United States was failing to fulfill the great responsibilities it has inherited since the war—"not for lack of good intentions; rather, our failure is from misunderstanding the nature of the world crisis and misjudging its duration." A reappraised policy, he said, must be based on these obvious, if distasteful, facts:

"This global crisis cannot be cured by putting patches on the prewar world. New worlds are in the making.

"Any speedy cure is quackery. The American idea that we can cure everything with a few billion aid dollars, a few Madison Avenue advertising stunts, a few divisions, and bomber bases abroad—all without sacrific of luxury living at home—is insane.

"Our democracy is not exportable. Democracy is indigenous, or it is nothing. We can help others achieve it, but not by trying to make our brand fit divergent heritages and different conditions.

"We cannot buy allies. Military aid should be concentrated on genuine allies—those determined to fight for their own freedom. Except for charity and the minor nuisance value of subsidies, economic aid should be limited to point 4 technical assistance, and foreign financing should be left to the World Bank and the Export-Import Bank.

"The world is not to blame for communism but for chaos. A united Europe and a healthy Middle East could not be endangered by Soviet infiltration, or a strong Asia by Chinese expansion.

"Finally, in our long overdue reappraisal of United States foreign policy, let us remember the simplest fact of all: America is not God. There is a limit to our capacity and our responsibility. We cannot run the world. We cannot alone set it right.

"The best we can do is to preserve our own strength in a weak world, sharing where our kind of help is wanted, preserve our sanity in a mad world which may profit by our successful example, preserve our faith in human decency in a dark world which needs that more than all our money, munitions, and manifestos.

"We can defeat ourselves by our fallacy of easy solutions and quick victory, by the delusion that we have all the answers—or could make others accept them if we had.

"The world is in chaotic transition from an old western civilization to a new global nuclear age whose nature is unknown. We, in strength and in patience, must keep the faith and make the long, long fight."

The Hodgepodge Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, the city of Petaluma, Calif., is known as the Egg Basket of the World because of its prominence as a major poultry area of the United States.

This important agricultural commodity contributes largely to the economy of the First Congressional District, which it is my honor to represent.

Poultrymen are displeased. They have a right to be. They are caught in a squeeze which is not of their making and over which they have little or no control. They receive no supports of any kind but, on the other hand, are forced to pay prices for feed grains which are maintained at a high level under the system of rigid, high-level price supports on the basic crops.

I keep in close contact with this problem through meetings and correspondence with poultry raisers. They have expressed to me their opposition to the return to rigid price supports as contained in the farm bill vetoed by the President last Monday. I voted to recommit the bill, and voted against its passage. I also voted to sustain the President's veto because this hodgepodge bill is not a good one and most certainly clouds the attempts of the administration to develop a workable and feasible answer to the farm problem.

The Petaluma Argus-Courier carried a significant and apropos editorial on the farm bill in its issue of April 10, 1956. Entitled "Conference Farm Bill Is Worse Than None at All," it is an expression of opinion worthy of attention, and I desire to include it with my own remarks, as follows:

During the Easter recess the Senate-House conference committee on the controversial farm bill worked overtime, and finally came up with a farm bill that now goes to the two Houses for their approval or disapproval. In the meantime the President and his advisers are considering the hodgepodge bill that has resulted from an attempt to compromise the differences between the two bills as originally passed by the Senate and the House.

The farm bill seems to be more political than realistic, and it is a wonder that anyone considers it seriously. It contains just about every panacea that has been offered to settle the farm problem, including what the administration wants as well as what it doesn't want. It is not a serious attempt to resolve the farm question. It is frankly a plea for votes. Although it is difficult to see how any politician could consider that the farmers of the Nation would be pleased with the resulting bill and would therefore be inclined to vote for one party or the other in November.

The farm bill includes the administration-backed $1.2 billion "soil bank," but it also includes the administration-opposed 90-percent price supports for basic crops and mandatory rigid supports for feed grains. Rigid high supports would again encourage overproduction and simply aggravate our present situation. Temporarily, of course, they would mean higher income for the farmer, but at the expense of the general taxpayer.

The President wants a good farm bill, and he wants it promptly. He has even said that he might accept a bill with some poor provisions, if it has the good provisions he deems necessary. The question now is whether the bill contains enough of those good provisions to offset the admittedly bad provisions. And if the soil bank is not put into effect soon, it will be of no use this year—so there is one of the good provisions that soon may be useless.

That there is some farm dissatisfaction with the present administration is admitted. But whether this dissatisfaction will grow into a revolt remains to be seen. The farmer, himself, is about as confused as the rest of us on what should be done to solve the farm problem. And he probably is going to vote for the party that he feels is doing the best job possible on a solution. But he is not going to be influenced too much by an obvious political maneuver, which the present farm bill is. Nor is he going to vote necessarily with a farm bloc. The farmer is an individualisit and he is influenced by many factors other than his particular economic situation.

If the farm bill should be vetoed, then the farmer would continue to live and work under the present farm situation. And it might well be that the President would veto the bill on the ground that the bill is worse than none at all.

One for the Books

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of every Member of the House to the excellent editorial in the Toledo Blade of April 11 which asks for passage of the library service bill. Today the Rules Committee granted a ruling for the library services bill, and I earnestly hope that when this measure comes before the House for a vote it will be acted upon favorably so that the important program it contains can be begun. Children from every area in the United States deserve the opportunity of borrowing from an adequately stock library.

The editorial follows:

ONE FOR THE BOOKS

Caught in the legislative jam of big, politicaly significant bills confronting the secon dsession of the 84th Congress is a small bill of fine purpose. If there's any politics connected with it, there oughtn't to be. If it's a giveaway, it's of something besides money.

We refer to the library services bill, backed by the American Library Association, and designed to help bring books within the reach of many Americans on farms and in small

towns not presently served by libraries or bookmobilies.

Intended as a helpful prod to neglectful States and localities which ought to do this job on their own, it limits the cost to $7.5 million annualy for 5 years, with funds to be matched by States on a rural population-per capital wealth formula. And so there can be no talk of sinister Federal controls over libraries, it provides that the States have complete jurisdiction over their individual programs.

Action on little bills helps make the legislative record of a Congress, too. Passage of this one won't win the farm vote for anyone; it will bestow a benefit on rural folk in one field—learning—which is unlikely to pile up an unmanageable surplus.

General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, please permit me to insert in the RECORD the following two paragraphs from a news story dated Geneva, Switzerland, April 12:

The secret 26-nation negotiations to reduce tariffs, which began in January, now have entered a critical stage, it was learned today.

The 500 delegates are trying to finish the discussions by the end of this month. The negotiations are being carried out under auspices of GATT—the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Every Member of Congress should give serious thought to the implications contained in this report. I find it extremely disturbing that policies which can have a heavy impact upon the working people of our country are being made in secret session by a conference in which America has a very small voice. To me, what is taking place in Geneva should serve as a warning against this country's committing tariff and trade policies to the quicksand of an international pool capable of submerging entirely the interests of United States citizens. This warning comes at a most appropriate time, in view of the fact that H. R. 5550, the bill to provide for the inextricable involvement of this country in these important matters, is soon to be considered by the House.

I ask my colleagues to think back to the constitutionally delegated functions of this legislative body as regards foreign commerce. Under normal procedure, Congress decides how much of a foreign commodity is to be admitted into our markets, and what the assessed tariffs should be. These decisions are not made in secret meetings. The people of our land would not permit any such malpractice to take place in our Capitol. Our faithful corps of newspapermen assigned to relaying to the reading public news of what takes place in the House and Senate would justifiably assail any attempt of Members of Congress to conduct secret meetings on any such important issue.

How then, Mr. Speaker, are the actions of the GATT delegates to be explained? In view of the fact that what is taking place in Geneva is the outcome of the magnanimity—or should I say the neglect?—of Congress in permitting the executive department to assume powers that are not constitutionally assigned to it, Members of Congress should be vitally concerned about those secret meetings in Geneva. Who, may I ask, has consented to a program whereby tariff concession are to be effected to the exclusion of public information? What course does Congress assume if agreements inimical to the best interest of our country are negotiated at Geneva? So far as can be determined, Congress would be forced to take ex post facto action in an attempt to negate the effects of a pact made under the auspices of—presumably—an official body of the executive department.

In order to preclude the necessity for any such unpleasant duties—with their subsequent diplomatic complications—Congress must forbid those delegates, who travel around the world concocting unauthorized trade tables with those nations who are looking for a place to unload products manufactured by underpaid workers, from further participation in such conferences. The first step to bring about such an objective is to refuse to allow the United States to enter into the OTC. From there, Congress can and must prepare and enact suitable legislation to undo the damaging consequences of action already committed by the unauthorized agents of the executive department in foreign commerce.

Mr. Speaker, representatives of coal-producing areas are often accused of being concerned about the foreign trade situation because of its impact on the coal industry and its workers. We do not resent such accusation. I, for one, have seen and talked with members of scores of mining families whose very subsistence has been threatened by excessive imports of residual oil.

Residents of mining communities—though for the most part they may be many miles distant from ports of entry to this Nation's markets—are fully cognizant of the reasons for the many mine shutdowns that occurred in postwar years. They know full well that customers who had been buying the product of their efforts shifted to foreign oil because it could be obtaind on a comparatively cheaper basis than an American-produced fuel. When we protested this situation to responsible officials in Washington, members of the State Department, who now want to assume complete responsibility for trade negotiations through the medium of the OTC, were the first witnesses to appear before Congress in an effort to dispute the legitimate claims of our people. We do not wish to be subjected to the further whims of this group which has shown time after time that conditions in mining communities should not be taken into consideration when international trade pacts are being negotiated.

Yes, it is because of what might happen to my congressional district that I ask Congress today to turn down those lofty executive department appeals for United States membership in OTC. But, to you Members outside the coal-producing States, let me remind you once again of that news story from Switzerland. Arrangements to reduce tariffs are being made in secret session. Can any Member of Congress consent to this procedure?

Gary, Ind., Golden Jubilee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, 1956 marks the 50th anniversary of the establishment and incorporation of the city of Gary, Ind., and also the starting of the steel mills on the south shore of Lake Michigan by the United States Steel Corp.

A month ago the board of directors of the United States Steel Corp. were honored at a banquet in the city of Gary, commemorating the 50th anniversary of Gary, Ind., now a city of 160,000, the youngest, largest metropolitan city in the Nation.

Last evening in Gary, Ind., the golden jubilee committee entertained and honored the leaders and members of the United Steel Workers Union, and all the workers who have contributed to the phenomenal growth of the steel industry and the city of Gary.

The principal address at this gathering was delivered by David J. McDonald, president of the United Steel Workers of America. His address follows:

ADDRESS OF DAVID J. MCDONALD BEFORE GARY, IND., GOLDEN JUBILEE ORGANIZATION, APRIL 18, 1956

This is a truly inspiring occasion. The 50th anniversary of your miracle city is here. Tonight, the great pride and sense of accomplishment which is yours must have no bounds. And I am deeply grateful that you have asked me and my fellow officers to share this historic moment with you.

Only a half-century ago, your city was nothing more than a dream and a hope. The first surveyors came here to this sandy shore of Lake Michigan and began to plan your city. That was exactly 50 years from this day. Had a modern-day Rip Van Winkle gone to sleep at that time, what a tremendous reawakening he would have today. What a marvelous change would greet him.

Risen over the once barren wastes of sandy prairie, is a thriving metropolis of 155,000 men, women, and children. Its streets and boulevards are dotted with fine, substantial homes. Throughout the community are splendid churches of every denomination. Beautiful parks and recreational areas are at the service of the people. An extensive system of schools and other institutions of learning give indication of the many cultural opportunities that are available.

Here in your prosperous business community, the visitor finds a wonderland of shops and stores filled with a limitless array of goods the people need and want. And beyond that, just about every imaginable profession is represented in the many different types of services that are offered.

Not the least part of your great growth and development are the many factories and plants which not only breathe economic life into the community but also contribute so much to the wealth of our Nation.

Yes, yours is truly a miracle city. And we of the United Steelworkers of America salute you as you pause to observe this important milestone in your miraculous history.

Others are more qualified than I to extol the virtues of your city fathers who had the vision and foresight and the determination to build and expand the city of Gary. You should learn much of this as you proceed with the celebration of your community birthday.

There are those who can also speak with more authority than I about the civic contributions of your industrial, business and professional leaders. They certainly deserve full recognition for their part in making Gary what it is today.

STEELWORKERS' ECONOMY

What I would like to discuss with you tonight is something with which I am a little more familiar—the role that steelworkers play in the social and economic life of Gary and how they might possibly be of even greater service to you as your great community looks ahead toward a brighter future.

Thirty thousand steelworkers of all faiths, creeds, races and nationalities man those great stretches of busy, throbbing mills along your lake shore. By adding their labor, their skills and craftsmanship to the ingenious know-how of management, does it not seem reasonable that they too have helped make Gary become an outstanding steel center of the world? Are they and their families not an inetgral and useful segment of your city's greatest asset—its people?

I am sure you would answer with an emphatic "Yes" because the recognition you have accorded steelworkers at this magnificent affair is of itself an indication of their acceptance in your community. You have discovered that a union can be a valuable ally in elevating community standards. With admirable insight, you have swept away antiquated prejudices and welcomed with open arms the support and cooperation that labor might give.

You are the richer for it and I am sure that other communities, other groups, will profit by your example. If they but look to Gary, they will find impressive evidence that teamwork between labor, management, and Government does pay big dividends.

STEELWORKERS' UNION

The steelworkers' union was organized in Gary about 20 years ago for some very fundamental reasons. There was great need to raise the pitifully low wages and to improve the conditions of work. This need was apparent to more than just the steelworkers who bore the brunt of these injustices. Many of the townspeople, businessmen, and clergymen, were also sympathetic to the idea. They knew that happy, well-paid workers make for a prosperous and economically healthy community.

How well has our union succeeded in this respect? Please examine the record. Prior to 1936, when the steelworkers' organizing committee was just an idea, the common labor rate in the mills was 47 cents an hour. Today the rate is $1.74½ per hour. Before the union came, average hourly earnings were only 66 cents. Now they are about $2.45 per hour.

The high wages which our union has successfully negotiated for Gary steelworkers have done more than raise the social level of the individual. His increased income has helped sustain the churches and the schools and pay the taxes for the maintenance of the Government. This helps the community generally and is of direct benefit to numerous business and cultural institutions, as well as the workers.

A living wage, which our union has consistently sought, is the lifeblood of the community. But the union does more than pump new consumer purchasing power into the economy; it has brought about many new benefits that are real and meaningful to the entire populace.

STEELWORKERS' WELFARE

A sick or injured steelworker was once a charge against the community. So was the steelworker who had given his best years to industry and then found himself too old to work. These fellow citizens were once serious liabilities who often depended on public charities for help and sustenance.

The steelworker and his family are today protected with life, accident, health, medical, surgical, and hospital insurance which is guaranteed in the union contract. When he gets too old to work, a decent pension is waiting for him. He is not a drain on the resources of the community and can maintain his self-respect without becoming a public charge.

There are other equally valid instances of how improved conditions of work have redounded to the benefit of the community. Clean, modern, safe, and healthy places of work; grievance procedures which minimize disputes and establish stability; systems of evaluating job rates to assure every worker equitable earnings; paid vacations and holidays to give steelworkers more leisure time. These and many more in a very real sense provide an infinitely better way of life that enriches the whole community.

But perhaps most important of all is the human dignity that the union has won for the steelworker. He has achieved recognition and status. At last he is a full-fledged citizen in the industrial order that determines the economic well being of not only himself but his family. Now, he has a rightful place in the community and can exercise his citizenship along with other important segments of the population. He is not merely a clock number, but a human being whose role in society is fully accepted.

The Gary members of our union have a high regard for the success and welfare of their community because they feel deeply they are an important factor in its destiny. They are sensibly aware of their rights, but also conscious of the responsibilities that go with those rights.

STEELWORKERS' COMMUNITY LIFE

Consequently, Gary steelworkers are most anxious to be of service to their friends and neighbors in the community. They have championed the cause of the common man in all walks of life. They have sought to improve conditions at all levels and stand ready and willing to cooperate in all city-wide efforts to make Gary a better place in which to live and raise children.

A shining example of the new responsibility undertaken by steelworkers can be found in the annual Community Chest campaigns. In 1954, over 86 percent of the steelworkers contributed financially to the chest drive. Their total donations amounted to almost half the sum raised by the entire Gary community. During the 1955 drive, steelworkers participated even more generously and the chest's goal of $498,924 has been exceeded by nearly $50 thousand.

Justifiable pride is due Gary steelworkers for the national recognition they achieved in cooperating with management and others in the chest campaigns. You have conferred a signal honor on a steelworker when you chose Orval Kincaid, subdistrict director of our organization, as the president of the Gary Community Chest for the past 2 years. Every union official in Gary, year after year, has plunged into the important task of raising funds for the chest. This is as it should be.

I was happy to learn more recently that members of our union were instrumental in still another great forward step that Gary is taking—the creation of a united fund. Your city is among the first in the Midwest to consolidate its fund-raising activities so that the generosity of its citizens can be expressed in a single, all-out effort that will meet the entire needs of the community. This is highly commendable.

Since 1948 the Gary Community Services Committee has operated as an important arm of the United Steelworkers. It has been of tremendous help in acquainting union members and their families with health and welfare services and other civic agencies in the community. Through their knowledge and understanding, the members of this committee have been able to help hundreds of persons with all sorts of unfortunate problems.

STEELWORKER CIVIC LIFE

Under our democratic system, everyone recognizes the importance of exercising the right of franchise. In this area the Gary steelworkers have done much to encourage increased interest in local, State, and national affairs. The percentage of registered voters has been much higher, thanks to major efforts in this direction. We firmly believe that good citizenship demands full participation in all elections and I am sure that everyone here agrees with that objective.

Far and beyond these group programs, the steelworkers have been of help to the community in still another area. They have responded admirably when called upon to assume responsibility in many civic endeavors. Members of the United Steelworkers serve on many public agencies, on many different boards, and on civic committees of various kinds. They serve gladly and willingly with but one thought in mind; to help the community.

Now, what about the days ahead of us. What challenges are there in store for a young and vigorous community such as yours?

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

We, of the United Steelworkers of America, see only the brightest of futures for Gary. You are already one of the great steel centers of the world. The proposed expansion of steel facilities, added to your tremendous natural resources, is indication enough that you will not only retain this position, but strengthen it considerably.

Within the next few years, the deep-sea channel of the St. Lawrence Seaway will have been completed, opening up the way for great inland harbors which will serve the world. Gary should become an important stopping point in this vast new system of international trade. You must look ahead to even greater expansion of your industrial facilities and provide for the many new opportunities you will have in serving more foreign markets.

You will readily see the need for more housing, more schools, better recreational facilities, bigger hospitals, and wider community and business facilities of all kinds to accommodate a growing population. This is one of your great challenges.

As you prepare to meet this challenge you will find members of the United Steelworkers of America at your side, working with you, in the common objective of building an ever greater city. We know that what is good for the community is also good for labor and we recognize that our interests are identical with the interests of others.

The people of Gary, want progress and welcome it. I am sure, however, that you are not interested in progress at the expense of the people. And it is in this respect that I think we, as a union, can be of tremendous service.

Insofar as steelworkers are concerned, we intend to see that their labor is rewarded to the degree that they can continue being a happy, industrious, religious and cultural group that you know them to be. This calls for an improvement in their living standards and a fair share of the good things in life.

STEELWORKERS INCREASED PAY

We expect to get substantial increases in pay. And, as I pointed out earlier, this will benefit more than the individual who takes it home in his pay envelope. The businessmen at this gathering I am sure can quickly understand and appreciate what this additional purchasing power can mean to the community.

We have high hopes of securing for Gary steelworkers and other employees in the steel industry what we call supplemental unemployment benefits. Nothing can more quickly upset the economy of a growing community than a few hundred unemployed workers. A jobless worker must still eat, pay rent and utility bills. His kids must continue their lives at home, in school or at play. Unemployment insurance checks in Indiana, as in all other States, hardly begin to meet the ordinary living expense of the man thrown out of a job. It is our plan to negotiate agreements under which this limited jobless aid will be supplemented by additional payments from a fund created for that purpose. You will readily see how this will do much to stabilize employment and strengthen your local economy.

STEELWORKERS WORK HOURS

Another injustice which we soon hope to correct also concerns the community. As you know, steelworkers in many cases have had to forego community activities, church services and many other aspects of a normal life because of required work on Saturdays and Sundays. We think the time has come to establish a regular 5-day work week. Monday through Friday, such as is enjoyed by the vast majority of other Americans. We are confident that industry can adjust these work schedules to give more steelworkers the privilege of spending their weekends with their families, their friends, their neighbors and their God.

We see room for improving the insurance benefits of steelworkers so that these citizens in your midst, together with their families, can enjoy an even healthier and happier life.

These are merely some of the things we are thinking about. In the attainment of these goals, I submit that we deserve the sympathetic cooperation of all citizens as a matter of enlightened self-interest. So we welcome your interest and your support.

In closing, I want to assure you of our great ambition and determination to do all in our power to secure Gary's future. We stand ready to help because we know that your success will be shared by every steelworker and his family.

It is going to take much pooling of all your community resources to make the next 50 years even better. This calls for the joint collaboration of many hands and minds in the common task. Business, management, government, and labor must work together. Each has an important stake in Gary's future.

I wish you well in your dramatic effort to build a city second to none. Because of your compassion for the people, whose well-being you put above all else, you are doing God's work. You must succeed. You will succeed.

Thank you.

Piercing the Iron Curtain by Rule of Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the International Commission of Jurists has been formed to defend the basic tenets of law upon which the civilized world is based. This organization is also designed to investigate and denounce the wholesale destruction of these principles. We feel the need to pierce the Iron Curtain through emphasis on the rule of law. There is some reason for hope that, should the forms of law be followed in Sovietized regimes, the humanitarian foundation of law would gradually become a powerful force against totalitarianism. We of the free world must look to this principal beacon of the ideal of individual dignity and worth, regardless of the political system under which people reside. A very important meeting of the International Congress of Jurists was convened by the international commission in June of 1955 at Athens, Greece. At this meeting, the enslavement of the law in Communist lands was unanimously condemned, and the Congress also formulated a brief, simple jurists' creed as follows:

ACT OF ATHENS

We, free jurists from 48 countries, assembled in Athens at the invitation of the International Commission of Jurists, being devoted to the rule of law which springs from the rights of the individual developed through history in the age-old struggle of mankind for freedom; which rights include freedom of speech, press, worship, assembly and association, and the right to free elections to the end that laws are enacted by the duly elected representatives of the people and afford equal protection to all.

Being concerned by the disregard of the rule of law in various parts of the world, and being convinced that the maintenance of the fundamental principles of justice is essential to a lasting peace throughout the world, do solemnly declare that:

1. The state is subject to the law.

2. Governments should respect the rights of the individual under the rule of law and provide effective means for their enforcement.

3. Judges should be guided by the rule of law, protect and enforce it without fear or favor and resist any encroachments by governments or political parties on their independence as judges.

4. Lawyers of the world should preserve the independence of their profession, assert the rights of the individual under the rule of law and insist that every accused is accorded a fair trial.

And we call upon all judges and lawyers to observe these principles and request the International Commission of Jurists to dedicate itself to the universal acceptance of these principles and expose and denounce all violations of the rule of law.

Socialism Via Radio Free Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John B. Crane is an outstanding foreign news correspondent. In an article which appeared in the Kenosha (Wis.) Evening News on April 4 he called attention to the fact that while we are fighting communism in the Iron Curtain countries, Radio Free Europe advocates state socialism in opposition to the free-enterprise system. Our American economy is based upon individual initiative. The people behind Radio Free Europe are ignoring this basic principle as they oppose communism abroad. It is well to remember that soicalism is communism with a slow-burning fuse, and if our system is to be preserved we must resist communism in any form in which it appears. The article in question follows:

SOCIALISM VIA RADIO FREE EUROPE

(By Dr. John B. Crane)

In fighting communism in the Iron Curtain countries of Europe, Radio Free Europe preaches socialism and never says a word in favor of free private enterprise and the American system of individual initiative.

This is only one of several serious charges leveled against Radio Free Europe (RFE) by Jiri Brada, prominent Czechoslovakian refugee journalist. RFE, a quasi-private psychological warfare outfit, broadcasts its propaganda by radio to Iron Curtain countries 18 hours a day from its studios in Frankfurt and Munich, Germany.

Brada's charges are printed in detail, with much substantiating evidence, in three long articles which have just appeared in the January, February, and March issues of Facts Forum News.

Not only does RFE follow a definitely leftist line in its radio broadcasts, but many of its personnel, especially those employed in the Czechoslovakian division, are either Communists or pro-Communists, Brada maintains, and he proceeds to name names and cite cases.

Within the past year no less than eight Czech employees of RFE have redefected to their homeland and are actively cooperating with the Communists in Prague, private Czechoslovakian sources have just informed me. Among the eight are Antonin Kucera, Karel Foltys, and Mrs. Marie Dvorakova.

When I made a tour of RFE's facilities in Munich some time ago and inspected their plant and conferred with their director and other leaders, I was informed that all personnel were carefully screened and was assured there were no Communists working for RFE.

Since I had been privately informed that some of their Czechoslovakian staff were Communists in disguise, I asked specifically about their Czech personnel. There were absolutely no Reds among them, they declared confidently. Now it appears there were several, if Brada is to be believed.

Regardless of how communistic RFE may be, the evidence compiled by Brada is conclusive that RFE follows a general socialistic line and one that is far removed from the political philosophy of conservative American Republicans and Democrats.

In its broadcasts to Cezchslovakia RFE has referred to outstanding Republicans as reactionaries and has likened Adlai Stevenson to Abraham Lincoln. Certainly in its comments on political events in the United States, RFE broadcasts to Iron Curtain countries should refrain from taking sides and should be strictly nonpartisan.

But this they do not do, but follow a New Deal line and often express sentiments which are definitely socialistic. This is not surprising since the chief of the Czecho-Slovak desk for RFE, Ferdinand Peroutka, is a former National Socialist and Communist collaborator from Prague. He has never renounced his faith in socialism.

In the same issues in which Brada outlines his case against Radio Free Europe appear two articles describing RFE's activities and accomplishments as revealed in official documents published by RFE or its parent organization, the Free Europe Committee.

In these two articles the constructive work performed by Radio Free Europe vis-a-vis

the Reds in Poland and Hungary is clearly set forth.

A sharp controversy has been going on for some time as to whether Radio Free Europe is really effective in fighting communism behind the Iron Curtain, whether its espousal of socialism is the best method for fighting communism, and whether it wouldn't be better to shut it down entirely and form a brandnew organization devoted to fighting communism by advocating a system of free private enterprise and individual initiative.

It is ironical, to say the least, that the money which finances Radio Free Europe in its socialistic program is largely put up by wealthy American private industrialists and businessmen who are dedicated to the promotion and preservation in the world of the American system of free private enterprise.

Israel's Vital Importance to America and the Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, 8 years ago, it was my privilege here to be among the first to applaud the United States recognition of the new State of Israel and extend, with a great majority of fellow Americans, my prayers for her continuing peace, progress, and prosperity.

I believe that most Americans were heartfully glad about the initiation of this new State by courageous people because they realized the fundamental bond of democratic principles and aspirations connecting our two countries even in a certain similarity of birth conditions.

Because we here offered the first and strongest encouragement to Israel, and because of the related cultures of our two democratic peoples, we had at their origin and should maintain now a very particular interest in her survival and advancement as the democratic bulwark against Communist intrusion and control of the Middle East.

In the midst of the present tension surrounding her, I think we should try to more clearly and more forcefully understand that Israel has only one desire, and that is to live peacefully among her neighbors. Israel's record of progress during the past 8 years is ample evidence of her objective for a peaceful existence to carry on her programs of modern agricultural and industrial improvements. In this short time, this new state has become perhaps the most progressive and energetic state in the Middle East. In the last 8 years, more than 400 new agricultural settlements have been created in a small area, compared to less than 300 in the 70 years prior to Israel's birth. Every type of industry has developed. Transportation and housing have greatly progressed, but beyond this mere material success, Israel is today the symbol of courage for the rest of the free world, sharply reminding us of the hardships and trials and challenges surrounding the beginning years of our own Nation.

It is fitting, then, that on this occasion we earnestly beseech this administration, particularly the State Department, to intensify their efforts to promote the cause of peace in the Middle East, while at the same time taking appropriate steps to insure the survival of this courageous State of Israel by granting them at least sufficient assistance to adequately protect themselves by maintaining a balance of arms, during negotiations for peace. Such a course might well serve to eliminate much of the tension now threatening war erruption in that whole area and would tend to permit Israel and her neighbors to concentrate their attention and energies to the peaceful needs of their peoples. In any case, so long as the threatening situation remains as it is, this Nation can hardly consider any other course than a forceful policy to prevent the destruction of this democratic state and the loss of a vital and reliable ally, where needed most, to the free world.

Let us, then, continue our prayers while we reemphasize our appeals to the State Department to perseveringly work for the preservation of Israel and the establishment of peace in the Middle East for the security of ourselves and the rest of the free world.

"For Where Your Treasure Is, There Will Your Heart Be Also"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, those who would disregard the old just because it is old are reminded that the thought expressed in the above quotation from the Sermon on the Mount is still with us.

That pressure groups are still thinking in terms of temporary, material self-interest, rather than the permanent welfare of all, is demonstrated every time Congress is called upon to enact major legislation carrying appropriations.

Every thinking individual knows that paying a Government subsidy which increases a price for the production of anything, whether it be automobiles or farm products, above that fixed by supply and demand, will result in the creation of a surplus.

Because of farm subsidies which came to us with the war and which were then necessary, we now have on hand billions of dollars worth of agricultural products, the mere possession of which is costing us a million dollars a day. The fair, useful disposal of that surplus appears to be an unsolvable problem. We know that a continuation of the payment of subsidies will but increase our dilemma. The approximate overall cost value, as of April 4, 1956, of surplus commodities in storage was $5,165,395,000.

What I am trying to express is the idea that some of those who insist upon the continuation of a high, rigid farm subsidy, who object to the President's veto of the farm bill, have a personal financial interest in that type of legislation.

Justifiably, they say that, having been enticed by the Government into overproduction, and having assumed obligations which they otherwise would not have incurred, supports should not be suddenly, wholly kicked out from under them. With that I can agree.

While a continuation of subsidies at a high level will but make our farm problem worse, the shock of a total, sudden withdrawal of benefit payments should be tempered by a gradual but ever-continuing lessening of such payments.

CHASING THE DOLLAR

But in seeking and applying the remedy, we should not forget that some of those who insist upon a rigid 90 percent of parity policy are personally financially interested. The Farmers' Union, ostensibly in behalf of the little fellow, has been putting the heat on Congressmen, but has not publicized the fact that some of its members are financially interested in and control the Farmers' Union Grain Terminal Association. That outfit, during the year ending December 22, 1955, in the Minneapolis area alone, collected fees for storing surplus wheat, corn, barley, oats, rye, flax, and soybeans, amounting to the not insignificant sum of $1,604,069.

The Farmers' Union has the right to establish for financial gain storage facilities. But when they write me stressing the need of the small farmer and his family, who profit but little if any from subsidy payments, I wish they would also advise whether the big boys of the Farmers' Union who are in the storage business are sharing their storage profits with the small farmer. How many small farmers have received a dividend check from the storage organizations of the Farmers' Union?

Why not, instead of laying up treasure for a few, enact legislation for the long-time, overall welfare of all the people?

Uniform Code of Military Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I present the following statement of Judge George W. Latimer, of the United States Court of Military Appeals, before the House Armed Services Committee on H. R. 6583, a bill to amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice:

STATEMENT OF JUDGE GEORGE W. LATIMER, OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS, BEFORE THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE ON THE BILL, H. R. 6583, TO AMEND THE UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE

Mr. Chairman and members of the Armed Services Committee, I am particularly pleased

to be afforded an opportunity to present to the members of the House Armed Services Committee my views on the amendments to the Uniform Code of Military Justice. In a sense both the chief judge and I appear here in a dual capacity. First, as judges of the United States Court of Military Appeals, we represent the judicial arm of the Government to hear the appeals of cases originating in the armed services. We must, therefore, be concerned with the enactment of good military law, but in that capacity we are not primarily interested in becoming advocates for or against proposed changes to the code which may have to do with certain policy considerations. However, Congress charged us with an additional responsibility by making us members of a code committee—which I will identify as the article 67 committee—to advise the Members of the House and Senate on desired improvements to the code. There our scope broadens, and it is in the latter character that I prefer to appear this morning. I believe that my views can be better presented if my judicial robes are cast aside and I become a supporter for the recommendations which better the code and an advocate against those which, without good cause, undercut some of its beneficent purposes. However, regardless of the capacity in which I appear, I fail in my assigned task unless I aid members of the committee in selecting properly those proposals which will improve military law without impinging on any substantial rights or privileges now granted an accused person.

In order to evaluate properly the effect of the code since its enactment, I have, in addition to my review of records, considered it necessary to seek the advice of both line and staff officers in all the services, particularly those with combat experience. The chief judge has enumerated many of our sources of information, but, in addition to those, I mention one other. I had the privilege of consulting with Admiral Stump and addressing a group of his senior commanders and their legal officers in Honolulu. Many of them had commanded fighting organizations in the Far East during the Korean war. From all of my contacts, I have ascertained that the uniform code has worked under combat conditions; it is now working, and most of the alleged deficiencies are more imaginary than real.

In my presentation today I do not seek an argument with the services, or with their representatives on the article 67 committee, but this thought I most certainly hope to leave with the committee members: When the criticisms of the code are scrutinized closely they simply cannot be sustained. In my humble judgment, the code was a splendid piece of legislation which, in its present form, can be defended from any street corner in America. I stress that statement particularly, because I do not want members of this committee to gain the impression that, because the judges have not waged a vocal and public campaign to meet the charges made against the code, their conduct smacks of a confession that it is vulnerable to attack. On the contrary, I believe our experience over the last 5 years establishes its soundness and the wisdom of Congress in its enactment. Furthermore, I believe the chief judge, our departed associate, Judge Brosman, and I all concurred in the belief that the place for us to reply, if necessary, was in the Halls of Congress, and I am prepared, now or at any other time, to prove to the members of the original committee who fostered and made possible the passage of the code, that it has measured up to your expectations. Certainly, the law is not perfect, and some minor adjustments can be made which will expedite the processing of cases and save some time and expense. However, major changes and modifications which seek to disturb the present balance between justice and discipline, or between the civilian court and the military services, are uncalled for. In my judgment, it would be better for Congress not to pass any of the proposed amendments than to enact provisions which in the end would be a retreat from the present advancement of the law.

Finally, I believe it worthwhile to suggest that the code went into operation during an armed conflict. It was tested while troops were fighting and dying in Korea and a tremendous volume of business was transacted. Growing pains were encountered, but justice was administered. Now military justice, as spelled out in the code, has found its place in the judicial system of America, and in the minds and hearts of those civilians who are familiar with its history and development. By and large, military personnel do not disagree with that contention and they, in good conscience, cannot support the assertion that it has impaired discipline and morale. We are now approaching the end of the first 5-year phase, and the developments during that period have given to the country a solid body of military law which I believe has kept discipline and justice in balance. I would hate to see it thrown out of adjustment by some of the proposed amendments. I know that a number of witnesses will appear, and each will have his own patent remedy to cure the ills of the code. The only difficulty with that is, the code is not ill. To those of us who have labored with it for 5 years, it is a virile and growing infant in the judicial sphere, and, like any young judicial system, it should continue to grow. Congress set up a statutory body to aid in its development and I believe that when all service members of the code committee become fully convinced that the code and the United States Court of Military Appeals are here to stay, then Congress will have a screening board which will unite on, and recommend, beneficial changes only.

Eighth Anniversary of the State of Israel

SPEECH
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, this is a historic day for the people of Israel, for it was 8 years ago that the dynamic democracy now known as the State of Israel was established. Once merely a dream and an idea in the minds and hearts of many who now call it their homeland it is now a reality. The courage and the fortitude displayed by these people in their great struggle brought about this gallant little nation which is now a matter of history. Their spirit of freedom and their desire for peace, their determination to live as a truly democratic nation among the family of free nations, is worthy of their great heritage.

Today, as I have done before, I salute the State of Israel and its proud people. Theirs is a record of achievement and accomplishment during 8 short years of existence.

But today this bulwark of democracy in the Middle East is threatened. It is threatened by the shadow of international communism which has been reaching out over the Middle East fomenting hostilities and creating tensions. We know that this is a threat not alone to the security and peace of Israel—the Middle East—but to the whole free world. For pulling the strings behind the whole Arab-Israeli conflict are the Soviet agents who by their offer of arms and economic aid to the Arabs seek to establish themselves in the Middle East.

We must not permit this nation to fall at the hands of the Communist conspirators. The United States should take immediate steps to maintain the balance of power in the Middle East by providing Israel with defensive arms. We must in justice to the name of democracy, in the interest of world peace and freedom, help to preserve the integrity of Israel as a nation. The people of Israel look to us—as the champions of democracy—we cannot and must not turn our backs on them. Let us help to maintain this fortress of freedom.

Our Insecure Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a most interesting editorial on social security appeared in the Janesville (Wis.) Daily Gazette of April 7, 1956. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the editorial as it expresses a point of view which every person covered by social security should fully understand.

In view of the extensive coverage under social security today I find that there is a general misunderstanding among recipients of social security as to just what are the objectives of this program. It is my view that the editorial clarifies some of these points.

Mr. Speaker, the important point for Congress to remember is that the system must be placed on a sound basis. There is only one source of income to support social security and that is by taxes, either directly upon those covered or by taxing the Federal Treasury.

I respectfully call this editorial to the attention of every Member of Congress and I am sure they will find it extremely interesting:

OUR INSECURE SOCIAL SECURITY

With excellent reason, an increasing number of citizens are calling for a clarification of the purposes and scope of the Federal social-security system. The constant extensions in coverage and benefits are a cause of substantial concern. There is no less concern on the other side of the question—the manner in which the obligations which are being incurred are going to be paid.

It is quite plain that the system must have more money in the years to come if the promises now made or under consideration can be kept. These can be provided in either of two ways—higher social-security taxes or appropriations from general Federal funds, with resulting increases in United States taxes, or additional Federal debts. Whichever of these alternatives is chosen, the effects are bad. They are especially bad

for young persons who must do the paying for a lifetime.

Already the taxes—those paid by employees and employers or by the self-employed—are sufficient to finance a modest retirement program through available private agencies and without the uncertainty of politics and the whim of elected officials.

Great changes were made in the system in 1954. The overall effect appears as a sizable increase in the tax take, but an even greater boost in new obligations to millions of persons.

Now there are a half dozen new proposals in Congress, some of which would result in tremendous additional costs. Chief among these are the plans to reduce the eligible age for women to receive benefits from 65 years to 62 years. Aside from the purely political arguments, it is difficult to see why women should be treated differently from men in this respect. In the pattern of the past, it is almost certain that when 3 years is cut off the eligible age for women it will be found necessary to make the same concession for men. Thereafter the age for women can be cut back to 60 years, with men following in order.

This has been the pattern of social security amendments ever since it was passed—constant erosion of the basic provisions, always in the direction of more liberal treatment. At the same time the constantly increasing schedule of rates originally proposed to finance the obligations has been repeatedly cut back, so that we are not even now paying the rates which were provided when the first act went into effect in the 1930's. When the full load of obligations settles upon the fund in the years just ahead a suddenly desperate situation is bound to arise. By that time the security in social security will be mighty insecure.

Among the other changes now contemplated is that to provide pensions for anyone over 50 years of age who may be disabled. This is a good example of the "new look" which is being imparted to the program.

Originally the idea of social security was to provide a sort of floor under living standards of older citizens, providing for them a minimum living standard in the event that all else failed. Since then we have been changing this view so as to provide substantial income, well above subsistence levels, and to take care of all sorts of dependents and family situations. The belief that social security should support disabled persons is just another step in that direction.

It would seem that we have been drifting long enough so that the direction of drift is apparent to everyone. The time is here for an honest decision by the public as to what it wants. Is it a Government guaranty of a minimum old-age pension so that the unlucky in life can avoid the poorhouse? Or do we want the Government to seize an important part of earnings in return for the promise to support us in the style to which we have become accustomed? The issue is particularly important to young wage earners and to those who will soon be turning in their first social-security dollars to Uncle Sam. They are the ones who will carry the burden for the coming 40 years, more or less. At the rate we are going that burden may easily become too great to endure.

Representative Harry Coltun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Chelsea Record, Chelsea, Mass., Monday, April 16, 1956.

The honor bestowed on Representative Harry Coltun was richly deserved, since he is one of those great Americans whose contribution to our strength, to our culture, and to our enlightened concept of human values will be more clearly recognized and appreciated as we travel along on the pathway of human progress.

The editorial follows:

A TRIBUTE RICHLY DESERVED

Hundreds of our prominent citizens, and a good representation of city and State officials, as well as leaders of philanthropic movements, turned out at the local temple yesterday to honor Representative Harry Coltun, "Brotherhood Man of the Year."

The tribute was richly deserved. We know of no single individual who has contributed more to benefit the community in the last 10 or 12 years than the distinguished guest of honor.

In politics, Coltun has been an inspirational leader first as a member of the Chelsea Board of Aldermen, and then as a member of the State legislature, where he is completing a second term. In both legislative bodies, he has conducted himself on a high level, and has been the author of many constructive measures which has benefitted the community.

In philanthropic endeavors, Representative Coltun has also stamped himself as a leader during numerous, worthy drives, the most recent last year when he successful chairmanned the combined Jewish appeal campaign in this city.

Despite numerous pressures, including his law business, Representative Coltun has made time to serve as president of the YMHA community center, which is now enjoying one of the busiest and most successful years in its history under his regime, and he has also served Temple Emmanuel as its brotherhood leader.

This outstanding young man has more than carried out the responsibilities entrusted to him. His life, yet to reach its prime, has been an example for our young men to follow. His future promises to even outshine his past.

We join, a bit belatedly in the tribute to the "Brotherhood Man of the Year" and reiterate that it is richly deserved.

War-Risk Insurance for Aircraft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to extend for 5 years the authority of the Department of Commerce to provide war-risk insurance for aircraft.

The usual commercial insurance policy does not cover aircraft against war risk in the event of outbreak of hostilities. Air carriers are, therefore, reluctant to permit their aircraft to venture into potential danger areas.

Lack of adequate insurance protection would jeopardize mobilization of the country's air-transport facilities in case of an emergency. For these reasons, in 1951 the Congress enacted title XIII of the Civil Aeronautics Act to authorize the Department of Commerce to issue binders insuring United States aircraft against war risk in the event of an outbreak of hostilities. This authority will expire on June 14, 1956. The Department has informed me that, if legislation extending this authority for 5 years is approved, binder fees will more than cover expenses chargeable to the war-risk-insurance fund under peacetime operations. If the program should go into operation in time of war, it is anticipated that premiums would keep the insurance fund self-sustaining.

Enactment of the legislation therefore would insure our civil air fleet against loss from war risks with little likelihood of any need for significant appropriations to the war-risk-insurance fund. The Department of Commerce urges early enactment of this legislation to keep the civil air fleet covered by war-risk insurance without danger of lapse.

Rowland R. Hughes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on April 1 of this year, Rowland R. Hughes resigned as director of the Bureau of the budget to return to private life. In his resignation, the United States Government and the American people as a whole lost the services of one of the finest and most capable men that it has ever been my privilege to know.

Mr. Hughes took office as director of the Bureau of the Budget on April 16, 1954. Prior to his appointment to this post by the President, he served as Deputy Director of the Bureau for 8 months and as Assistant director for 3 months. Thus, for a period of almost 3 years he was in a position of critical responsibility in the vital task of bringing Federal spending and the Federal budget under control. How well he met this challenge is demonstrated by the fact that today the Federal Government has achieved a balanced budget. For his splendid contribution to this achievement, the American people owe a debt of gratitude to Rowland Hughes.

Before coming to the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Hughes was a vice president of the National City Bank of New York, an institution with which he had been associated since 1916. He had been a senior official of the bank since 1934, when he was appointed comptroller, an office which he held until 1951. He was assistant comptroller from 1929 to 1934, and inspector of foreign branches in Europe in 1928 and 1929. From 1916 until 1927, when he returned to the head office, he served in the bank's foreign branches in London, Shanghai, Bombay, and Japan.

Long active in tax work, he has been chairman of the committee on the excess profits tax of the American Bankers' Association, chairman of the Federal taxation committee of the Comptrollers' Institute of America, a member of the

Committee on Federal Tax Policy, and a member of the tax committees of the Foreign Trade Council and the Council of State Chambers of Commerce. He has served as consultant to various congressional committees. As chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means during the 83d Congress, I appointed Mr. Hughes to serve as a member of a Special Advisory Committee on Revision of the Internal Revenue Code. He made especial contributions in the field of foreign-tax problems. In addition, as chairman of the Joint Committe on Internal Revenue Taxation, I appointed Mr. Hughes to the advisory group on the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

He was born in Oakhurst, N. J., March 28, 1896. He was graduated from Brown University in 1917, and has been a university trustee since 1943. In February 1955 he received the Susan Colver Rosenberger Medal, highest honor awarded by the Brown University faculty. It is given in recognition of specially notable and beneficial achievement in scholarship or public life. In June 1955 the university awarded Mr. Hughes the honorary degree of doctor of laws.

Mr. Speaker, Rowland Hughes is a close personal friend of mine, and over the years I have developed the highest respect for his splendid character and capability. With his resignation, we have lost a public servant who represents the very finest in every respect. His dedication to the principles of sound government and fiscal integrity will be sorely missed. In this year's balanced budget and the prospect for a continued balanced budget next year, he is leaving a monument of which he can well be proud. I can only hope that, in returning to private life, he will continue to make available to the Congress as well as to the executive branch his wise counsel and great experience.

Women's Congress on Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it has recently come to my attention that an unusually petty attack has been made on the very worthwhile effort of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to obtain the opinions and ideas of American women to determine what kinds of homes are most needed and wanted by the American people.

This attack has taken the form of an attempt to belittle the forthcoming Women's Congress on Housing, to be convened in Washington, D. C., on April 23, 1956. Our former colleague, Albert M. Cole, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, has announced that a representative cross-section of homemakers will meet with Government and private industry experts to discuss the future course of housing design.

I deplore the attempt to discredit this project and regret that it was obviously motivated by partisan considerations. I am confident that the American people will agree that the Woman's Congress is a major contribution to continued progress in the housing field.

Housing is the Nation's second largest industry, employing many millions of people. It is essential that those in Government charged with maintaining the stability of this most important segment of our economy be aware of the needs and desires of the buying public. The plans announced by Mr. Cole represent an important forward step in that direction.

In the interests of presenting the full and correct story to the American people, I place in the RECORD herewith various statements issued recently relative to the Women's Congress on Housing:

The housewives of America were asked today to help the Federal Government to solve one of its most vexing problems—how to design a typical modern home that will keep pace with the rapidly changing mode of contemporary living.

Albert M. Cole, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, suggested that a representative cross-section of homemakers meet with Government and private industry experts in Washington to discuss the future course in housing design. He also urged all housewives to write to his agency immediately, giving their ideas on how the modern home can be improved.

"Home builders, manufacturers, realtors, laborers, and the Government cannot go forward on the basis of well-meaning opinions and untested theories," he said. "They need hard facts. A woman's congress on housing may help provide these facts," he added. The 10 million houses built since World War II represent an investment in excess of $100 billion. In the decade ahead, the American people will invest at least another $100 billion in new homes. "The Government does not propose to be a partner to a $100 billion mistake," Cole asserted.

The housing industry is undergoing a revolution, he pointed out. Men and women from all walks of life, with more leisure time than ever before, are tired of giving unrewarding hours of service to the house. "They want the house to give service to them," he said.

"New homes must be fitted more and more to the new patterns for living," the Housing Administrator said. "Every new house that does not take these new patterns into account will be obsolete long before it is old or even middle aged—a dubious investment alike for builder, buyer, and banker."

"The Federal Government, which insures or guarantees millions of dollars worth of mortgage loans, must do everything in its power to safeguard this huge investment," he stated.

Wary of the "temporary lure" in some new housing designs, Cole said that the housewife needs the type of home that best meets her practical needs.

"We must separate the superficial from the fundamental," he said. "We must know whether families really get more service out of single-story houses, out of split-level houses, or open-design houses."

Information is also being sought on family rooms, game rooms, TV rooms, rumpus rooms, unwalled carports, centrally located kitchens, movable partitions, rolled-back roofs, and picture windows, and scores of other innovations in home design.

"The Government not only wants to find the answer to these and other questions, but has to have them," Cole emphasized.

"Private industry has the responsibility and capacity to carry out the future program," he added. The function of the Government is "to provide counsel, to encourage, and to give assistance."

"I shall welcome letters and comments from the housewives of America," Cole concluded. "I hope that my mail will shortly reveal an active demand for a women's congress on housing."

Nearly 1,500 housewives have responded enthusiastically in the first 10 days to Housing and Home Finance Administrator Albert M. Cole's invitation for them to write him their views on what the modern home should be like. Letters to the Housing Administrator continue to come in at the rate of about 200 a day.

"The housewives are most enthusiastic in their response," Mr. Cole said. "All of them say they are grateful for an opportunity to express their views on a subject that is very close to their hearts. One of the writers, for example, said this was the best thing that has happened since the Boston Tea Party."

Mr. Cole also announced that the Woman's Congress on Housing, at which the suggestions made in the letters will be discussed by about 100 women from all parts of the country, will be held on April 23, 24, and 25, at the Washington Hotel in Washington, D. C.

Mr. Cole said that the bulk of the letters received reflect serious and practical thinking on the home as a place for modern family life.

"While the women have many kinds of ideas on how the home can be better tailored to family needs, they in general seem to like most of the basic trends in modern design that accent fuller family living and few of them are critical of the present-day building industry."

STATEMENT BY NORMAN P. MASON, COMMISSIONER OF THE FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION, ON THE WOMEN'S CONGRESS ON HOUSING, APRIL 23, 24, 25

FHA officials plan to attend all of the sessions of the Women's Congress on Housing.

We will study carefully all the recommendations suggested by the group. Naturally we will welcome anything which will result in practical improvements.

We feel sure that such a group will give us some such suggestions. That has been our experience with all the many advisory groups we have consulted during the 2 years I have been head of FHA.

The FHA is interested in the Women's Congress for several reasons. Our principal responsibility, of course, is to provide an adequate financing system to facilitate homebuying, and this entails the application of construction and architectural standards. We currently have a special advisory committee of expert architects, engineers, and builders at work reviewing our minimum standards with a view to simplifying them and bringing them up to date.

It seems to me that the views of the ultimate consumer, the housewives and homemakers, are a proper part of this picture. We ought to know what they are thinking; in fact, we owe it to ourselves as authorities in the housing field as well as to the general public.

Mrs. Theodore S. Chapman, of Jerseyville, Ill., president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, has joined the forces supporting a recent proposal of Housing and Home Finance Administrator, Albert M. Cole, that a Woman's Congress on Housing be held in Washington to enable the Nation's homemakers to make known ways by which the modern home can be improved. "The majority of the women in this country are homemakers," Mrs. Chapman said, "and they know that poor housing is frequently the result of poor design.

"Most of the social improvements that have come about in this country in the past

65 years, such as the penny-lunch programs for children in the schools, the book-mobiles which have brought culture into isolated homes, the marshaling of public opinion against child labor, prison reforms, the Pure Food and Drug Act are a result of women's views being brought to the attention of the lawmakers and the public.

"I cannot agree with Congressman QUIGLEY, of Pennsylvania, who is quoted as having said, 'Why housing authorities would be interested in learning what the women of this country want in a house is beyond my comprehension.'

"I believe the Members of the Congress should know what women feel are basic reforms in Federal, State, and local housing projects. Who knows better than the housewife how to utilize workspace in the home, and the kinds of storage space needed, about lighting and air and conveniences generally? I believe that if women have the opportunity to make known their time and step-saving ideas, as well as other observations as to safety and efficiency, that all America would benefit by housing that produces more for the money, and meets today's housing needs more adequately.

"I hope the Federal Government will give women a chance to suggest positive improvements to better and more comfortable housing.

"I enthusiastically approve Mr. Cole's plan as the only really sensible and practical way to set standards for adequate housing."

Tribute to Helen Delich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying when deserved recognition is given to an individual whose intelligent and earnest efforts are directed to the enlightenment of the American people on a matter vital to our national security and to our commercial pursuits. Such an event has just taken place in my congressional district where Miss Helen Delich, marine editor of the Baltimore Sun, has been honored by the Advertising Club of Baltimore. Miss Delich has been outstanding in her widespread publication of articles relating not only to the great port of Baltimore but also in regard to present-day challenges to the maintenance of an adequate merchant marine. In order that our citizens can better understand this important subject matter, I ask unanimous consent that the article in the Baltimore Sun relating to the Helen Delich testimonial be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

TRIBUTE PAID HELEN DELICH—MARITIME EDITOR HONORED AS WOMAN OF THE YEAR

Miss Helen Delich, maritime editor of the Sun, yesterday was honored as "woman of the year" by the Advertising Club and the Women's Advertising Club of Baltimore.

The reporter, who was introduced as the woman who has publicized the port of Baltimore, was guest of honor at a joint luncheon attended by 215 persons in the Emerson Hotel.

Miss Delich joined the Sun staff in 1945 and assumed her present post as maritime editor 3 years ago. She also conducts a weekly television program on the port.

Accepting the tribute, Miss Delich noted the personal significance the honor had for her, because "my parents * * * immigrated through the port of Baltimore across the Locust Point piers from Yugoslavia 50 years ago this month."

NATIONAL AWARDS

In 1950 and 1951, Miss Delich won national awards for excellence in maritime reporting. The awards, granted by the Propeller Club of the United States, had never before been given twice to one newspaperwoman.

Miss Delich is a native of Ruth, Nev. She studied at the State university in Nevada, attended George Washington University, and was graduated first in her class at the University of Missouri School of Journalism.

Subsequently, she was manager of the United Press bureau in Fort Wayne, Ind., and later was telegraph editor of the Lewiston (Idaho) Tribune before joining the Sun.

In 1947, Miss Delich became the first woman reporter to cover a national convention of the American Federation of Labor, reporting that event for the Sun from San Francisco.

In a speech before the advertising clubs yesterday, Miss Delich called for more public relations efforts on the part of shippers in the port of Baltimore.

"The maritime industry," she declared, "with no exception has the worst advertising and promotion program on the whole of any industry."

NATURAL SALES APPEAL

"And yet it is one industry that could work out an interesting, long-range program with little difficulty because it has such a natural sales appeal. Everybody loves the sea. Everybody loves ships * * * and everybody needs and is very dependent upon world trade."

Miss Delich cited publicity programs that have been effective in New Orleans, New York, Philadelphia, and several southern cities.

Segregation and Integration in the Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, we have constantly before us today the almost overpowering problem of segregation and integration in the public schools as a result of the horrible decision made by the Supreme Court of the United States of America on black Monday, May 17, 1954.

The problem created by this illegal and unfounded decision based on the political philosophy and theory of the Supreme Court Justices has done more to disrupt and damage race relations in the South than we realized at the time of the decision. It is heartening, however, to see that gradually there is an awakening on the part of a large part of the American people and particularly the editors to the awareness of our problem in the South and the necessity for combating, overriding, and changing the dreadful decision referred to heretofore. It was not based on law and legal precedent.

The people of my area are not willing to integrate the public schools. They are not going to integrate them. Now is the time when our people, if we are to preserve our way of life, must remain firm and meet the issue head on. This is no time to vacillate or temporize or to retreat. Certain people in our State profess to be great believers in States rights as well as strong segregationists but at one and the same time appear to be willing to and are advocating that the Commonwealth of Virginia take steps toward integration and a recognition of the validity of the decision of the Supreme Court. They attempt to justify their actions by expressing great sympathy for the people of Prince Edward County as well as an effort to assist the county in its present court fight by permitting integration in the State.

The people of Prince Edward County have stood firm and unflinching in the face of all of the pressure that has been exerted by the integrationists and those who would change our very way of life. But for the will and determination of these fine people the fight for States rights, segregation and the sovereignty of the people of this great Nation would have been lost before now. The men and women of this great county deserve the everlasting gratitude of all of the people of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

The editor of the Farmville Herald, J. B. Wall, has been one of the leaders in this fight on the part of the people of Prince Edward County. His paper has had a large part in guiding and directing in the proper channels the action that has been taken to preserve our heritage. On Tuesday, April 17, 1956, there appeared in the Farmville Herald an editorial entitled "Prince Edward Under the Gun," which sums up the position of the people of Prince Edward County. It leaves no doubt that they are willing to fight for the principles they know to be right. They are not going to compromise the issue nor are they going to take a middle-of-the-road stand. They are going to operate the schools of Prince Edward County in the future as they have in the past. They hope the Federal court will not deprive the youth of Prince Edward County of a public education. If the court in its desire and effort to mongrelize the races of our Nation is willing to go so far as to prohibit the Negro children of Prince Edward County from receiving an education that is something we should know now and we can only find it out by meeting the issue head on. The issue cannot be resolved otherwise unless our leaders are willing to give up the fight and integrate a little at a time. This I do not believe the people of the Commonwealth of Virginia desire or will stand for.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include herewith the above-mentioned editorial:

PRINCE EDWARD UNDER THE GUN

NAACP attorneys have expressed in the press an intention to file additional suits for racial integration of public schools in Norfolk and Charlottesville in the near future and will petition the Federal district court this week for a progress report on Prince Edward County. So, this county will prob-

ably be in the foreground of the public eye and the public press again, and under compulsion of the NAACP.

In all honesty and good conscience there is but one answer to be given to the court; namely, that Prince Edward has made no progress toward integrating its schools. Prince Edward has no plans for integrating its schools. Prince Edward will abandon public schools in preference to attempting to operate integrated schools. If this determination forces the closing of public schools in the county it will not be of our choosing nor according to the desires of the vast majority of the people of Prince Edward County, both white and Negro. There is nothing new in the statement of these facts. The issue was determined last June, when a vast meeting of patrons determined this policy and set up the Prince Edward Educational Corp. The Prince Edward Educational Corp. has stood by all of this year, ready to provide education for the white children of the county. There is no doubt that it will continue to stand ready.

In assuming and maintaining this position the people of Prince Edward County do not adopt an arbitrary position, on the contrary, they stand upon rights retained by the States under the 10th amendment of the United States Constitution, and section 140 of the Virginia Constitution. In addition, by virtue of a resolution of interposition, passed almost unanimously by the Virginia General Assembly in 1956, the Commonwealth of Virginia, disputes the power of the United States Supreme Court to control or regulate the public schools under the State's jurisdiction. Unless or until the Constitution of the United States is amended, or the disputed power of the United States Supreme Court has been resolved, Prince Edward in good conscience and honest could not do otherwise.

It has been indicated in the daily press that Governor Stanley is being urged to call a special session of the general assembly to enact new laws relating to the public schools. It is said that counsel for the Prince Edward school board wish to allude to such a step as evidence of progress toward integration. In honesty and good conscience we cannot agree with this suggestion so far as this county is concerned. The people of Prince Edward are not interested in "buying time" with the attendent loss of the most cherished principles of self-government and State sovereignty.

It seems to this editor that the Commonwealth of Virginia through its resolution of interposition has set its course and until this dispute of jurisdiction is determined no further action need be taken. Certainly not by using Prince Edward as a reason for any laws at any time leading to integration of races in its public schools.

It Will Cost $50,000 To Move the Old Enginehouse—Step Held Wholly Unnecessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, a solution of the dilemma faced by the International Monetary Fund, arising from the proposal to move the Old Union Enginehouse occupied by the Association of Oldest Inhabitants, can be reached by leaving the historic old structure where it is. This is the considered opinion of Homer Joseph Dodge, a distinguished member of the Association of Oldest Inhabitants, as he outlined it in the Evening Star of April 18, 1956.

Mr. Dodge points out in his important statement that—

> The plans for the addition to the IMF Building provide for a spacious parked entrance on the Old Enginehouse site. It is wholly unnecessary to remove the firehouse from this park.

Fifty-eight countries contribute to the International Monetary Fund. The United States quota, which is 31.43 percent of the total fund, amounts to $8,750,000,000. If my figures are correct it will cost the United States $15,715 to move the Old Union Enginehouse, a move which is wholly unnecessary, according to Mr. Dodge. This would seem to me to be a matter of interest to the many associations of taxpayers throughout the country. Conceivably it may be of interest to the members of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

My own interest in this matter springs from a bill, H. R. 9719, I have introduced—"to amend the act of March 2, 1891, as amended, to insure that the Association of Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia will continue to have the exclusive right to occupy and use the Old Union Engine House in the District of Columbia."

At a meeting of the Judiciary Subcommittee of the House District Committee on March 5, 1956, the members of the subcommittee determined that a hearing would be held on H. R. 9719 at an early date. In the meantime the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia have been officially requested that any order to the Association of Oldest Inhabitants to vacate the premises of the old Union Engine House be withheld until such time as the members of the District of Columbia Committee of the House of Representatives have had an opportunity to hold hearings on my measure.

I would like to take this occasion to commend Mr. Dodge for his fine statement regarding the old Union Engine House. I was particularly moved by that part of his statement in which he says:

> Just as Trinity Church stands in the shadow of towering structures in New York's financial district as a symbol of grace and antiquity, so should the Old Engine House remain against the background of the wholly commonplace and undistinguished IMF Building.

A number of years ago when the new General Accounting Office at Fifth and G Streets NW., Washington, D. C., was being planned, the Federal Government proposed to buy the land on which St. Mary's Church is located. The issues that confronted the congregation of this fine church and its doughty pastor at that time, were remarkably similar to the problems faced by the Association of Oldest Inhabitants. I am very pleased to be able to say that St. Mary's Church was not destroyed, nor was it moved. It continues to serve its historic and important mission, and, I should add, the General Accounting Office is unquestionably better off for that mission. Certainly the thousands of Federal employees who work in the General Accounting Office and the other Federal buildings in the area feel safer because of the church and the beneficent influence it exerts in what is surely one of the less desirable neighborhoods in the District of Columbia.

I include here for the information of my colleagues the splendid statement by Homer Joseph Dodge, in the Washington Evening Star, of April 18, 1956:

OLD ENGINE HOUSE

A solution of the dilemma faced by the International Monetary Fund, arising from the location of the Old Engine House occupied by the Association of Oldest Inhabitants, can be reached by leaving the old building where it is. The plans for the addition to the IMF Building provide for a spacious parked entrance on the Old Engine House site. It is wholly unnecessary to remove the firehouse from this park.

The National Capital, more than most cities, has a special interest in historic structures. The present IMF Building, with the planned addition, constitutes a structural mass similar to a thousand, yes, 10,000, other office buildings. The Old Engine House is well-nigh unique.

Just as Trinity Church stands in the shadow of towering structures in New York's financial district as a symbol of grace and antiquity, so should the Old Engine House remain against the background of the wholly commonplace and undistinguished IMF Building. This is especially compelling as the life expectancy of the Association of Oldest Inhabitants is far greater than that of the International Monetary Fund. The purpose of the fund is to stabilize currencies of civilizations built upon our economic system. The fund has an unexampled opportunity to achieve its stabilizing function by preserving the Old Engine House where it is.

HOMER JOSEPH DODGE.

Eighth Anniversary of Independence of the State of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, this week the eyes of the world are focused on the State of Israel because the people in that nation are celebrating the eighth anniversary of their declaration of independence. One of the outstanding publishers in my district, Mr. Al S. Waxman, has written an editorial in which he likens the courage and stamina of the Israelis to that of the courageous Americans who declared their independence in 1776. Mr. Waxman's editorial appeared this week in his five newspapers: The Los Angeles Reporter, the Beverly Hills Reporter, the Pico Reporter, the Park LaBrea Reporter, and the Wilshire Reporter.

The people in my district have called my attention to previous editorials in the Waxman publications, but this one, because of its timeliness and depth of un-

derstanding, is one which I feel will be much appreciated by many others who have the opportunity to see and read it.

THE EDITOR'S COLUMN

(By Al S. Waxman)

April 18, 1956.

AN INDEPENDENCE DAY

In 1776 a comparatively small group of people, consisting of men, women and children, banded together the arms, strength and will of their 13 colonies and adopted the Declaration of Independence. They were from many different lands, however, mostly British. With this Declaration they became good Americans.

Other nations eyed them inquisitively, but sat by to see what would happen next. France, on the other hand, decided in 1778 that the United States of America was here to stay and recognized the new Nation by treaty. Seven years later the British Empire conceded the status of American independence and gave official recognition to the small new Nation.

Freedom did not come easily to these hard-fighting, God-fearing people. They received internal and external help from people and nations who admired their fight for freedom.

Thousands of miles away from here, this week, another small nation celebrated an Independence Day. It was their eighth anniversary and the eyes of the world are upon them today. Their enemies are not reconciled to the fact that the people of the State of Israel have declared their independence and, after having made that declaration, have fought and are prepared to continue fighting, if necessary, to maintain it.

On the day U. N. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold arrived in the Middle East to survey the Arab-Israeli conflict, an editorial appeared in one of the official publications of the Arab league in which he was informed that "the success of Hammarskjold's mission depends upon the elimination of the State of Israel."

In other words the enemies of Israel refuse to recognize the sovereign rights of the state.

A tiny state in both miles of land and population, Israel is surrounded by several Arab nations. It is outnumbered 20 to 1 in population and 300 to 1 in acres of land. Even though outnumbered by such odds, they were able to wrest their freedom and independence. What they lacked in weapons and manpower, they made up in determination and courage. They were fighting for the promised land.

Today the state of Israel looks behind as it celebrates the eighth anniversary of its declaration of independence and looks ahead as it sees dark clouds overhead. The big nations of the world are fighting for power. In the center of their orbit stands this little nation. The cold war, the war of nerves, is being fought in and around this new nation.

The enemies of the Western world are supplying Israel's enemies with warfare weapons, yet Israel's friends stand by and speculate about the future. They concede that Israel can be used as a stumbling block to the spread of communism in the Middle East and Israel is willing to be used as this barrier. Yet while the Communist satellites deliver war weapons to the Arab states and prepare them for a possible war, which could wipe out the state of Israel, the Western powers have adopted a wait-and-see policy.

Waiting may prevent seeing. If Israel is not sold the arms necessary to protect herself against the enemies who surround her on all sides, the Western powers will find that they have lost their last democratic trench in the Middle East. Israel represents a tiny football in the international political game. It is being used by the East and West as well as by the Arabs in their internal squabbles.

There are American hands which are dirty and slimy with oil. The oil which they have taken out of the Middle East is sold at great profits to Europe and to American descendants of that band of hearty people, who in 1776 went through the process of declaring independence. Is our war for freedom so far behind us that we have already forgotten?

The United States and its western allies have already sold weapons and military materiel to dozens of other nations throughout the world. This has been done from the standpoint of giving our friends the necessary implements with which to defend themselves. Why don't we do the same for Israel? They are prepared to give up their daily bread so that they may buy self-defending weapons.

The State of Israel emphatically declares that it is not asking for our soldiers or our physical help. They are asking only that we sell them weapons so that they may be prepared if and when their enemies attack. The people of Israel are prepared to do their own fighting. They know their cause and they are prepared to stand and defend themselves. Theirs is so much like our spirit of 1776 that they could well be the Americans of the Middle East.

An American said, "Give me liberty or give me death." And Israelis are prepared to stand up and fight along that line. An American said, "I regret I have but one life to give my country." And Israeli boys and girls are serving in the armed forces there. An American said, "I'll be back." And the Israelis have come back to their promised land.

The most welcome news that the State of Israel could get on this, their eighth anniversary, would be an announcement from the United States that we are prepared to sell them the weapons they need for their self-defense and preservation. Not give but sell. Delivery of such materiel would mean the insurance that Israel is here to stay, to grow, to aid the Western Powers, to stop the flood of communism into the Middle East.

To help Israel today is to help ourselves.

The Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, last week we debated one of the most important legislative proposals to come before the House in this session of Congress. The omnibus farm bill which was presented at that time was a genuine disappointment to me in view of the urgency with which I regard the problems of American agriculture today. It was my hope that the conference committee would present to the House a bill embodying the far-reaching and constructive recommendations which the President and his administration formulated in a sincere effort to assist the American farmer. My strongest disappointment sprang from the insistence that rigid price supports be reinstated on basic crops even for the 1-year period provided in the bill.

The appalling consequences of the rigid price support plan are felt by every farmer in the Nation today who is experiencing lower prices for his commodities because of the fantastic surpluses which have been created through 10 years of rigid price supports. I have opposed the further extension of rigid price supports in the past and my opposition has not diminished. I believe that any thinking individual who is sincere in his concern for American farm prices must conclude that we must abolish these surpluses and with them the rigid price support program which has fostered and stimulated them.

It is my belief that American agriculture must continue to be based upon the production of the small family farmer. While rigid price supports have offered only inconsequential direct benefits to this type of farm operation, the program has greatly benefited the large commercial type farm. This has stimulated these large commercial operators to grow more and more of the crops already in surplus. The result has been the piling up of more surpluses which have, in turn, depressed market prices and created a serious economic hardship for the small farmer in southeastern Ohio and throughout this country.

Last week when this bill came to a vote in the House, I hoped that it could be returned to the conference committee to remove the objectionable and somewhat contradictory provisions it contained. I favored the motion to recommit the bill for the purpose of removing those provisions. That motion failed. Returning to the conference report, I recognized the value of placing the soil bank proposal in operation this year so that American farmers could have its benefits without delay.

The bill also contained a provision whereby farmers might exercise greater freedom from acreage restrictions with respect to wheat grown and used on their farms. This provision is of particular importance to hundreds of small farmers in my congressional district who have experienced difficulty under past restrictions.

My bill, H. R. 4570, would allow farmers freedom from such controls and, although a similar measure has been passed by the Senate, there seems little or no likelihood that the House Committee on Agriculture will take affirmative action this year on my proposal and similar bills introduced by a number of my colleagues.

With these provisions in mind, I reluctantly supported the conference report when it was brought to a vote on the floor of the House a week ago. Admittedly, it was a difficult decision. The balance seemed nearly even.

Assuredly, it was a difficult decision for President Eisenhower when the bill came to his desk for study. He weighed those same factors in the balance and, based upon his information, the bad outweighed the good. Furthermore, he has shown a determination to fight this thing through. He has indicated that the forces of his administration will be employed in wresting a workable farm bill from a reluctant Democrat majority in the Congress.

The President's veto of this bill and his reasons for the action he has taken are, in my opinion, cogent and sound. They are based upon a concern for the problems of the American farmer which transcends any immediate partisan gain

which his approval of the bill might have obtained. I support his action.

In his veto message, the President has urged the Congress to enact legislation authorizing the establishment of the soil bank proposal. In this I heartily concur and wish to express my conviction that the Congress, if it is motivated by an honest concern for the American farmer, will act quickly on this measure. There are no acceptable reasons, in my opinion, why this cannot be done and done now without any more verbiage. Political intransigence will be understood by our people when they evaluate any failure of the Congress to enact the soil bank legislation. Election year politics is no substitute for positive and constructive action by the Congress this year.

I recognize that the soil bank proposal may not, in itself, bring great direct benefits to many small farmers. Its benefits, however, will be appreciable and real when we consider that this program will reduce the surpluses and cause a general rise in the price of farm commodities. The decline in farm income is our problem today. Since the soil bank proposal will contribute to the solution of this problem, its benefits will be felt by all farmers in the prices they receive for basic crops. We must meet this challenge by formulating our solutions directly and honestly.

I wish to urge that the Congress enact a soil bank proposal bill immediately.

Military Justice Under Consideration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the House Armed Services Committee is now holding hearings on H. R. 6583, a bill to amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the statement of Chief Judge Robert E. Quinn, of the United States Court of Military Appeals, on this bill before the committee:

STATEMENT OF CHIEF JUDGE ROBERT E. QUINN, OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS, BEFORE THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE ON THE BILL, H. R. 6583, TO AMEND THE UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE

Mr. Chairman and members of the Armed Services Committee, article 67 (g) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice directs the Judges of the United States Court of Military Appeals and the Judge Advocate General of the Armed Forces to meet annually and submit to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives recommendations relating to the Uniform Code of Military Justice. The Committee has over the 5-year period of its existence, complied with that direction and in the report for the period ending December 31, 1953, 17 recommendations for changes in the law were made to the Congress. Those recommendations were endorsed by all members of the committee at that time and presently they represent the views of the court. The present bill goes beyond these recommendations. It contains provisions which cannot be justified by experience, reason or logic.

Judge Paul W. Brosman was present and participated in all committee meetings held during the years 1951 to 1955, inclusive. Because of his untimely death, only Associate Judge Latimer joins with me in this statement and the comments and criticisms which I present to you have his endorsement. However, every proposed change was considered by all three judges and the views expressed represent the collective judgment of the court. In addition, they are supported by 4½ years of experience on the court and a review of some 8,000 cases; by innumerable appearances before service schools, but association meetings and veterans organizations; and by repeated discussions with military commanders and military and civilian lawyers. While there have been some fair criticisms of certain procedural deficiencies in the Uniform Code of Military Justice, I need not defend its basic and beneficent provisions, for by any unbiased appraisal, it has proven that Congress was wise indeed in extending to members of the armed services the additional rights and privileges granted by that law.

In regard to the proposed amendments contained in bill H. R. 6583 now under consideration by your committee, I believe that to place the provisions in their proper perspective, a short reference to their historical development will be useful. Since its creation, the Code Committee has considered questions concerning, and problems involving, almost the entire field of military law. Immediately after the court organized, ideas for improvements were continually suggested. Some had merit; others were without value. On August 20, 1953, The Judge Advocate General of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and the General Counsel of the Treasury, submitted a report incorporating a number submitted a report incorporating a number of recommendations which they thought would imporve the administration of military justice. Those recommendations may be found in exhibit D, page 30, Annual Report of the Code Committee for the period ending December 31, 1953. Most of the suggested changes had been the subject of discussion at meetings of the Code Committee but unanimity had not been reached on some of the proposals.

On February 15, 1953, the court appointed a civilian committee of outstanding lawyears consisting of Whitney North Seymour, chairman, Ralph G. Boyd, Henry T. Dorrance, Felix E. Larkin, Joseph A. McClain, Jr., George A. Spiegelberg, Arthur E. Sutherland, and Donald L. Deming. The committee was set up by the court because the judges were of the opinion that sounder recommendations could be submitted to Congress if all suggested changes were studied and evaluated by both civilian and military lawyers. Considering that The Judge Advocate General of the Services and the General Counsel of the Treasury represented the service community and the court committee members represented the civilian viewpoint, it is obvious that the court was thoroughly apprised of the military and civilian views. After receipt of the recommendations of the Judge Advocates General, referred to above, the proposed amendments were referred to the civilian committee for consideration and comment. That committee met with The Judge Advocates General of the Services, and was, therefore, fully aware of the service contentions. It is of interest to note that 17 recommendations are the only changes of the many considered which have the unanimous endorsement of The Judge Advocates General, the General Counsel of the Treasury, and the judges of the United States Court of Military Appeals.

Since the proposed changes were first submitted to Congress, there may have been a change in position by some of the Judge Advocates General because the present Defense Department bill contains some proposed amendments which were either rejected by the court members of the committee or were not presented to the committee for consideration. I, of course, do not quarrel with the right of a member of a committee to change his mind, but I respectfully suggest that any amendment to the code should not, at this time, go beyond the recommendations unanimously agreed upon by the code committee.

I start with the premise that unanimous recommendations submitted to Congress are sound and desirable and, in my opinion, they should be enacted into law. They will expedite the administration of military justice without denying the accused any right, privilege or benefit granted to him by Congress. Generally speaking, I oppose the other recommendations for the reason that almost every suggested change restricts a right conferred by Congress upon members of the military services. I consider it unnecessary to take up the time of the committee in discussing those provisions about which there is no controversy.

Appended hereto is a comparison chart of the proposed changes, setting out the present law, the proposed change and the code committee recommendation, if any. Also appended hereto is an analysis of changes contained in the bill, which have not been either considered by, or approved by the code committee.

If the committee desires a detailed explanation of the items in the bill not specifically recommended by the court, Judge Latimer will be glad to discuss these matters at length.

I would like to talk about one matter which is outside the provisions of the present bill, but which is of importance to military justice. When the Uniform Code of Military Justice was passed by the House of Representatives, article 67 provided that the members of the United States Court of Military Appeals—should hold office during good behavior and should receive the compensation, allowances, perquisites, and retirement benefits of judges of the United States Courts of Appeals. Subsequently, that section was amended by the Senate and the present term of 15 years was substituted. Several bills have been introduced in the House and Senate to reincorporate that provision. Apparently, no committee action has been taken on any of these bills.

The principle of life tenure has been approved by the Department of Defense; by the American Bar Association; by many other distinguished legal scholars; and life tenure for the judges was provided in the bill as originally reported from this committee and as approved by the House of Representatives.

Title 28, section 451, of the United States Code defines a court of the United States as "any court created by act of Congress the judges of which are entitled to hold office during good behavior." A similar definition of a judge of the United States is contained in this legislation. It can be argued, therefore, that a judge of the Court of Military Appeals is not a judge of the United States, and that the tribunal itself is not a court of the United States. Many reasons can be advanced in favor of eliminating the present uncertainty and granting the court full judicial stature. Undoubtedly, the members of the committee are familiar with the reasons for life tenure, but, if not, I am certain the author of the bill will supply any member with the complete information on this subject. I rsepectfully request the committee to put this court on the same level with other Federal courts. It can be done now without any political implications because the next regular vacancy does not occur until May 31, 1961.

Finally, by reason of the present term provision, the court has been held subject to the rules and regulations of civil service. In my opinion, Congress did not intend to make this court subservient to that agency, and if I am correct in my belief, then some remedial action should be taken. This court should have the same tenure, independence, standing, and dignity as other Federal courts. It should be permitted to conduct its own affairs without supervision by the Civil Service Commission.

In Answer to Pettiness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, almost daily the people of the United States are subjected to petty criticism of any relaxation of our great President. The following mature and penetrating article by David Lawrence, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of April 18, 1956, looks at the whole subject in proper perspective and I commend its reading to the American people:

A PRESIDENT IS ALWAYS ON DUTY—CRITICS OF EISENHOWER TRIPS FORGET UNITED STATES IS JUST HOURS WIDE BY PLANE

(By David Lawrence)

The horse-and-buggy days have long since gone but, judging from some recent comments criticizing President Eisenhower for not staying in Washington during a flare-up in the Middle East, it might be supposed that some people do not know that the airplane and the telegraph and the telephone make it unnecessary for any Chief Executive to remain in the National Capital all the time.

As a matter of fact, those who wanted President Eisenhower to cancel his recent trip to Augusta, Ga., didn't realize that such a step would in itself have set off an alarm around the world. Stock markets would have been affected, and nervousness about a new call-up of the draft would have ensued.

Actually, nowadays a President of the United States can be anywhere in this country and take care of an international crisis so far as military or diplomatic messages or instructions are concerned.

For some years now it has been well known in Washington that only one man—the President—has the authority to order use of the atomic bomb in case of sudden attack. Naturally, if a President goes from city to city, as he has to do occasionally during his term of office, arrangements have to be made for instantaneous communication with him. These have always been carefully planned to meet any emergency operation.

Wherever the President goes there are telephone or radio contacts, and he can even be reached aboard a plane and hold a conversation with his subordinates while traveling in the air. When Mr. Eisenhower goes to Augusta, he has the same setup on a communications basis that President Truman had at Key West, Fla., during the Korean war—and there were some acute phases in that war.

The telephone and telegraph lines are private. They are for the use only of the President and they connect continuously with the White House telephone switchboard and with the telegraph room there. The same preparations are made many weeks in advance whenever the President is planning a visit to Denver or to any other place across the country where he makes a stop. The communications equipment at the President's farm at Gettysburg has been established for several months and can be put into operation at a moment's notice. Conferences by telephone nowadays can be held with 3 or 5 or more persons at the same time, and 2-way conversations are possible among all the participants.

There are folks who think that when an international situation gets in the headlines the President should station himself in his office and wring his hands while the photographers take pictures of him "meeting the crisis." The truth is that a President needs time to read the constant flow of messages that come to him from all parts of the world, and he can do a better job of concentration and can think things through with far more objectivity when he is detached from Washington's pressures. Any officials needed for a personal conference can always be summoned in a few hours' flying time.

When Mr. Truman went to Key West a few years ago, this correspondent wrote somewhat the same exposition of the presidential communications system and defended Mr. Truman from similar criticisms. Unfortunately, there seems to be a tendency to criticize Presidents when they try to get some exercise or rest. They never really take vacations except for a few hours at a time.

The theory that a Chief Executive can do a good job only in the midst of Washintgon's whirl is a fallacy. A President deserves all the time he can possibly take for golf or any other recreation. Past Presidents have had their hobbies, and the Nation never begrudged the vacations of Grover Cleveland or of Herbert Hoover, both of whom liked to go fishing.

One thing is rarely publicized. It's that a President often works long into the night and on weekends. The time he spends reading important messages from all over the world and memoranda from his associates is unknown to the public generally—but, whether it's at Augusta or Gettysburg or Denver, the time spent by the President on the golf course is reported. Also, if he tosses out the first ball at the opening of the baseball season, it's widely covered—and, of course, if he doesn't go to the initial game, it offends the fans. Yet the time he spends at this desk during the day or in his bedroom at night reading official papers never gets into the newspapers. It often means a 50-hour week for him.

It is the pettiest kind of partisanship and narrowmindedness to criticize any President for taking a vacation or trips away from Washington. It would be better for America if all Presidents spent more time traveling around the country rather than tie themselves down to the White House continuously for 12 months a year.

Pan American Airways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, there have been many speeches before this body recently concerning the proposed certification of this or that air carrier for a new air route between the New England States, New York, and Florida. That this service must be necessary is manifested by the fact that the Civil Aeronautics Board has been holding proceedings for a considerable length of time and that the CAB examiner in the case emphasized the need for a new carrier on this highly important and highly traveled route. The matter is presently before the CAB.

The Commerce and Industry Association of New York has, for the first time, expressed an opinion regarding the selection of a particular air carrier by the CAB. While reluctant to depart from past policy the board of directors of that association, after most careful consideration and deliberation, is convinced that of all the applicants in this proceeding, certification by the CAB of Pan American as the third carrier would be in the best interest of New York and, therefore, in the best interest of the public.

Actually, the Commerce and Industry Association does not have a local perspective on this additional service to Florida nor is it motivated by local political consideration. Of its membership of 3,500 firms representing a cross-section of business and industry, some 2,000 of these firms are directly engaged in international commerce. As this association points out it is greatly concerned with any new service which will facilitate the movement by air of passengers and cargo to and from Latin America and between Europe and Latin America via New York.

Of all the applicants competing for this route only Pan American, in the opinion of the association, can do the complete job well enough to satisfy the demands of international commerce.

Mr. Speaker on April 16, Mr. Joseph A. Sinclair, secretary of the association, wrote to Mr. James R. Durfee, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, urging certification of Pan American on the New York-Florida route.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Sinclair's letter be included in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY
ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK, INC.,
New York, N. Y., April 16, 1956.

Subject: New York-Florida Proceeding
Docket No. 3051, et al.

Mr. JAMES R. DURFEE,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board,
Department of Commerce Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DURFEE: The Commerce and Industry Association of New York wishes to express to you and the members of the Civil Aeronautics Board its views with respect to the initial decision of the examiner in this proceeding. This association, which is the recognized service chamber of commerce in the New York metropolitan area, has a membership of some 3,500 firms representing a cross-section of business and industry in the New York area, including some 2,000 firms directly engaged in international commerce as well as a number of the airlines which serve New York.

Our primary interest in this proceeding is the economic importance to New York of adequate service both for passengers and cargo to Miami and intermediate points, and also, in view of New York City's importance as the international trade center of the country, the movement by air of passengers and cargo to and from Latin America and between Europe and Latin America via New York.

We agree with the examiner's views as to the need for a third carrier on this route. The selection of that third carrier by CAB is of outstanding importance to New York and, since this area is the largest source for both passengers and cargo, we urge that the economic interests of New York be given proportionate weight in arriving at the Board's decision.

We feel strongly that the selection of a third carrier by you and the other members of the Board should be made on the basis of service to the communities involved rather than giving first consideration to the possible effect on one of the present operators. Therefore, the strongest available competition should be selected in the public interest as being more productive of adequate and efficient service.

This association has never in the past expressed an opinion with regard to the selection of air carriers by CAB and we have never taken a position favoring one applicant in any parallel transportation situation. However, while reluctant to depart from past policy, our board of directors, after most careful consideration and deliberation, is convinced that of all the applicants in this proceeding, certification by CAB of Pan American World Airways as the third carrier will be in the best interests of New York and, therefore, in the best interests of the public.

Study of the initial decision of the examiner only strengthens our view that Pan American Airways is the logical choice of applicants. Many of the points made in the examiner's report point to that conclusion; the immediate availability of suitable equipment; the early use of jet aircraft now on order; the reverse seasonality of Pan American's present operations as compared with the east coast route; the examiner's acceptance of Pan American't estimates of the traffic it would carry both passengers and freight and the consequent reduction or elimination of several million dollars of Government subsidy; and the high percentage of passenger and cargo traffic which originates in or is detined for Latin America or Europe.

The examiner makes no comment on the present competitive disadvantages of Pan American relative to foreign airlines. It would seem unlikely that loss of business to foreign carriers can be overcome through any interchange arrangement. Such loss of traffic means, of course, that thousands of passengers who might come to New York on a through plane service will not be providing business to our hotels, retail shops and other business establishments.

We take exception to the examiner's statement (p. 109): "It seems clear that there is now sufficient service available or potentially available, to provide for freight needs and that certification of Pan American between Miami and the Northeast to provide all cargo service is unnecessary and not required by the public convenience and necessity." As stated previously, some 2,000 firms of this association are engaged in international trade operations. Many do business with Latin America and must ship goods by air to satisfy the needs of their overseas customers and to meet European competition. Without exception shippers have expressed dissatisfaction with present cargo service via Miami, an opinion which was fully confirmed by them at the hearings in this proceeding. The number of complaints with regard to the inadequacy of air cargo service to Latin America due to the present hiatus between New York and Miami has been increasing in proportion to the increased use of international air freight service. It is difficult to understand the basis on which the examiner arrived at the above-quoted conclusion in view of the large percentage of that traffic which moves between the Northeast and Miami by rail and truck. The amazing feature is that with the resultant loss of time under the present setup, the volume of international air freight from the Northeast via Miami continues to increase so strongly.

Neither of the two present carriers have shown an interest in cargo service or any indication that they expect to do so. We do not find anywhere in the examiner's report that Delta contemplates any all-cargo service if certificated for this route. In contrast, Pan American has stated that they will schedule two cargo planes a day and that the freight rate will be lower than the present combined rail and air rate to Latin America.

Although the examiner expresses the opinion that through plane service can be provided under interchange arrangements, such arrangements can only be considered as temporary expediences which can hardly be expected to result in the same efficiency of service as single carrier operations. This is particularly true in connection with cargo service when one party to the interchange agreement shows so little interest in developing freight business.

The Examiner makes the point that "with additional carriers in the market, there will be increased traffic solicitation, promotion and development which will necessarily generate new traffic * * *." In this regard also, Pan American is certainly the outstanding choice for a third carrier. Not only does Pan American have a solicitation and promotion organization throughout this country, but their overseas offices likewise would be in a position to develop new business over the East Coast route. The fact that almost 20 percent of the present traffic to Miami is destined to or from Latin America indicates the effectiveness of Pan American's promotion activities and the contacts which they have for developing new business.

Likewise, because such changes will benefit air service from New York, we urge elimination of the provision that Eastern Airlines may serve Boston only on flights originating or terminating south of Richmond, Va., or west of Charleston, and of the present compulsory stop at Atlanta on Eastern's New York-Tampa service.

Also, because of the effective competition and improved service which should result, we urge the Board's approval of Trans-World Airline's application for extension of its service from New York to Boston, Philadelphia and Washington, without the restrictions suggested by the examiner.

We believe also that approval of United Airlines application to engage in nonstop operations from New York to Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Washington, without restriction as to the origin of flights will result in improved service to the traveling public and will fill a need for better service between those cities.

We request your favorable consideration of the views expressed above.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH A. SINCLAIR,
Secretary.

President Remains Strong With Independent Voters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the recent Gallup poll on the strength of President Eisenhower as against Adlai Stevenson or ESTES KEFAUVER has been released in this morning's Washington Post.

It demonstrates again the tremendous strength which President Eisenhower has among independent voters only. As a rule of thumb, we say that there are approximately one-third of all voters in the country who vote independently, or what we call a split ticket.

Among the independent voters, President Eisenhower maintains a margin over Mr. Stevenson of 71 percent as against 23 percent. The President maintains a lead among independents of 66 percent as against 26 percent for Senator KEFAUVER.

This is indeed a tribute to President Eisenhower, because as a rule these independent voters do not vote consistently with any one party. In a Presidential election, the year generally termed by political experts to hold the balance of power.

Other Gallup polls taken during the last 3 years indicate that the President has stood very high on each poll with the independent voters.

Appended herewith is the complete poll as released by the American Institute of Public Opinion, April 18, 1956:

PRINCETON, N. J., April 18.—Which of the two leading Democratic candidates, Adlai Stevenson or ESTES KEFAUVER, runs the strongest race against President Eisenhower as of now?

When the 1952 contenders are matched in an institute trial-heat race, voters questioned in a survey throughout the country say they would vote as follows:

Ike versus Stevenson

	Percent
Eisenhower	61
Stevenson	37
Undecided	2

Eliminating the 2 percent who say they are undecided today, the above figures become: Eisenhower 62 percent, Stevenson 38 percent.

Running against President Eisenhower, Senator KEFAUVER polled the following vote, as reported previously:

Ike versus Kefauver

	Percent
Eisenhower	59
Kefauver	38
Undecided	3

Excluding the undecided vote, the figures were: Eisenhower 61 percent, KEFAUVER 39 percent.

In the 1952 presidential election, Eisenhower polled 55.4 percent of the major party vote compared to Stevenson's 44.6 percent.

One interesting sign of political cross-currents at work shows up in an analysis of the two trial heats.

While on a nationwide basis KEFAUVER and Stevenson run about even against Eisenhower, it is interesting to note that of the two Democratic candidates, excluding the undecided vote, Stevenson does better against Eisenhower in the South than KEFAUVER does.

Here is the vote today of Independents in the Eisenhower versus Stevenson race:

Independents only

	Percent
Eisenhower	71
Stevenson	23
Undecided	6

By way of comparison, here is how Independents divided on Eisenhower versus KEFAUVER:

Independents only

	Percent
Eisenhower	66
KEFAUVER	26
Undecided	8

Following is a comparison of the results of the two surveys in the South:

South only

	Percent
Eisenhower	50
Stevenson	47
Undecided	3

South only

	Percent
Eisenhower	53
KEFAUVER	44
Undecided	3

In 1952, President Eisenhower polled 49.1 percent of the major party vote in the South compared to Stevenson's 50.9 percent.

Persons who classify themselves as Republicans in today's survey overwhelmingly prefer Eisenhower to Stevenson, as follows:

Republicans only

	Percent
Eisenhower	98
Stevenson	2
Undecided	(1)

[1] Less than ½ of 1 percent.

This closely matches the vote among Republicans in the Eisenhower versus Kefauver trial heat, which found 97 percent preferring Eisenhower, 2 percent Kefauver, and 1 percent undecided.

Among persons who classify themselves as Democrats, both Stevenson and Kefauver outpoll Eisenhower by a margin of better than 2 to 1, as follows:

Democrats only

	Percent
Stevenson	69
Eisenhower	29
Undecided	2

Against Eisenhower, KEFAUVER got 70 percent of the Democratic vote, Eisenhower 26 percent with 4 percent undecided.

Cross-section surveys, such as those conducted by the institute, are not to be confused with ballot-in-the-paper, post card and other similar polls, in which no attempt is made to see that each segment of the voting population is represented in its true proportion.

An accurate cross section must include the proper proportions of young and old, rich and poor, city dwellers and country folk, grade school, high school, and college educated, labor union members, and non-members, men and women, and so on.

Farm Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of today carries an article by Walter Lippmann in which he discusses the farm bill veto. This article in my opinion accurately and effectively expresses the issues and differences of viewpoint which existed between the President and Congress in connection with the consideration and disposition of this legislation.

As Mr. Lippmann well points out, these differences are not differences of principle, rather there is a substantial agreement upon principle, but a difference in the degree and extent to which relief should be afforded.

I feel that this article should be read and considered by every Member of Congress. The veto of the President and the administrative action which has been taken to increase support prices does not by any manner or means settle the issue nor would it have been settled if the bill had been allowed to become law by the President. However, as is well known, I believe that the bill passed by Congress more adequately met the present situation.

In my opinion the passage of the soil bank bill introduced by a number of the Members of the House and Senate on yesterday would be of further assistance at this time.

The article follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

THE FARM BILL VETO

The President had no choice but to veto the farm bill that Congress sent him. Had he signed it, he would have had to repudiate not only his own public statements but the whole record of his Secretary of Agriculture and the actions of the two Republican leaders in Congress, Senator KNOWLAND and Representative MARTIN. Does it follow that the original program which he sent to Congress in January was adequate and satisfying and that all would be well if only Congress had accepted it?

It does not follow. The President's own actions when he vetoed the bill recognize that the basic complaint of the congressional opposition to his original program was about halfway justified. Where the bill would have subsidized farm prices to the tune of aboue $1 billion, the President is going by administrative action to subsidize farm prices to the tune of about $500 million. He has vetoed the very high and rigid price supports. He is going to put into effect high but not quite so high theoretically flexible supports.

The issue between the President and the congressional opposition is not really one of principle. It is whether farm income shall be subsidized at the congressional rate or at the administration rate.

The farm bill is in its details a very complicated business. But what has happened since the President's special message in January comes down, I think, essentially to this. In the administration's mind the crucial and fundamental "problem is," as the President said in his veto message, "price-depressing surpluses," caused by "wartime incentives too long continued." From this it follows that the basic principle of a sound farm policy is to reduce production in order to reduce the surpluses.

The opposition in Congress, consisting of the Democrats and most of the Republicans from the farm States, is primarily concerned with the decline of the incomes of the farming population. Their total income from farm and nonfarm sources has declined 26 percent since 1947, while the total national income has increased by 36 percent. The congressional opposition recognizes that there is a problem of surpluses. It does not accept the view that it is the only or the paramount problem. The paramount problem is the decline of incomes which may be due not only to the wartime supports, but to the technological revolution which has increased so enormously the productivity of agriculture.

The administration, its eyes fixed on the surpluses, has been interested primarily in the soil bank, which is a device for reducing production. The opposition, its eyes fixed on the fall in the income of farming population. wrote a bill which used every available gadget for pumping out larger subsidies to the farmers.

The President, though he has vetoed the bill, has tried to go about half way as far as the bill.

In the long run it may well be that the character of the President's veto marks the acceptance of the principle that in the great transition through which agriculture is passing, it is a national obligation to cushion the effects on the farmers. There is a stern theory that prices should be set in the market and that in this price structure the more efficient farmers should survive and the less efficient farmers be forced out of farming. But no public man could or would think of acting on this theory, no matter how many times he has made speeches about free enterprise. The hazards of farming during the technological revolution now in progress have become a social obligation, in principle akin to the social-security system which deals with unemployment and old age.

The day will come, let us hope, when we shall have a farm policy based candidly on this principle of social security. The enormous increase of agricultural productivity in this generation, even more than the high parity supports, is producing the great price-destroying surpluses. To eliminate these surpluses millions of acres now in wheat, corn, and cotton will have to be taken out of production. This will mean that several million farmers will have to go off the farms. It is to slow up, to soften, to alleviate this painful human readjustment that the social-security principle will have to be applied to farming.

When it is applied, then it will no longer be necessary to maintain artificially high farm prices. For the artificial prices are only an indirect and cumbersome way of subsidizing farm incomes. It will be better to support the incomes of the farmers, as we do those of the industrial population, on the principle of social security, and to let prices become genuine as determined by the markets.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*----
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*--6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*-------4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*---
Albert, Carl, *Okla*--------
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*--
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*---------
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*---
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*---------University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*---4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*-
Andrews, George W., *Ala*---3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*----
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*------4915 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*---
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*---
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*--Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*-113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*---
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*---

Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*-
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*---
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*-
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*--2601 Woodley Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*----
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*-------
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*----------
Bates, William H., *Mass*----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*-
Beamer, John V., *Ind*------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*-----
Belcher, Page, *Okla*-------
Bell, John J., *Tex*---------
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*---1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*----5804 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*---
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*-------2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*----
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*----
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*--
Boggs, Hale, *La*-----------
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*---
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*------3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*---2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*----
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*--The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*-----
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*-------4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*------
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*-----The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*------
Bray, William G., *Ind*------
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*-------
Brooks, Overton, *La*-------4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*--Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*----------Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*-
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*------
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*--
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*---
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*--
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*------2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*----
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*--------
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*----
Byrne, James A., *Pa*-------
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*-----1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.

Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*-----
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*------
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*-----The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*----
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*-----
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*-
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*-----The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*---Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*-
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*----------
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*-
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*--1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo*.
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*---------
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill*. 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*-------3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*-----The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*----1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*--
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*----2480 16th St.
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*----------
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*--------The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*-----
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*---
Cramer, William C., *Fla*---Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*--
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind*.
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*--
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*-----

Dague, Paul B., *Pa*--------
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*---
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*------4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*------2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*-------
Dawson, William A., *Utah*--
Dawson, William L., *Ill*---
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*----
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*----
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*--2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*--
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*-
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*-
Dies, Martin, *Tex*---------
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*-The Congressional
Dingell, John D., *Mich*-----
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*-
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*----
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*----
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*----3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*--The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*-
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*--
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*----
Dowdy, John, *Tex*---------
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*--------3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*-----The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*-3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*-----
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*---------
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*----4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*--------3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*-------5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*-----
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*-----
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*-
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*-------3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*--200 C St. SE.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*-------
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*---------Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*-----
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*-------The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*-----
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*-----3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*------4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*--514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*-------
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*------The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*--Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J*. 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*----
Fulton, James G., *Pa*------

Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*---
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*---
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*-----
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*-------6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*--------
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*--------
George, Myron V., *Kans*---3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*----
Granahan, William T., *Pa*--
Grant, George M., *Ala*-----4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*------
Green, Edith, *Oreg*--------
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*--
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*------2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*-
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*--------
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*---
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*----

Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*------
Hale, Robert, *Maine*-------2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*-------
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*---4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*------
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*-----The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*-----
Harris, Oren, *Ark*---------1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*------4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*--
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*--------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*---------314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*------The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*------
Healey, James C., *N. Y*-----.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*-----104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*--
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*----
Heselton, John W., *Mass*---
Hess, William E., *Ohio*-----
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*--
Hill, William S., *Colo*------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*--
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*-------
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*--100 Maryland Ave NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*---Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*---
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*------
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*------
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*--------
Holt, Joe, *Calif*-----------
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*----
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*----3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*--------
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*-------
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala*.
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*-------
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*-------.

Ikard, Frank, *Tex*---------

Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*--
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*----200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*-------
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*--The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*------
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*------2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*-
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*------630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*----3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*-
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*--------3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*---
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*--
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*----3083 Ordway St.

Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*----
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*-----2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*-
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*-----Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*-1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*-----
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*---
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*-------
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*-The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*-------3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*-------
King, Cecil R., *Calif*-------
King, Karl C., *Pa*----------
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*--
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*-----
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*---
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*------
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*------
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*-----112 Schotts Court NE.

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass.*
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga.*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y.*
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich.*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*
Long, George S., *La.*
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak.*—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa.*
McCormack, John W., *Mass.*—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif.*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C.*—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill.*—The Coronet
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill.*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash.*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash.*
Mahon, George H., *Tex.*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif.*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn.*
Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass.*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill.*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
Meader, George, *Mich.*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H.*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*
Miller, A. L., *Nebr.*—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md.*—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif.*
Miller, William E., *N. Y.*—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio.*
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va.*
Morano, Albert P., *Conn.*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*
Morrison, James H., *La.*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., Jr., *Calif.*
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo.*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y.*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa.*—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill.*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*
Natcher, William H., *Ky.*—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine.*
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass.*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg.*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark.*—2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y.*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill.*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.*—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn.*—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.*—4201 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y.*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La.*
Patman, Wright, *Tex.*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn.*
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*
Pfost, Gracie, *Idaho.*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*
Phillips, John, *Calif.*
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga.*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y.*
Poage, W. R., *Tex.*—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va.*
Polk, James G., *Ohio.*
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y.*
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga.*
Price, Melvin, *Ill.*
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn.*—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*
Quigley, James M., *Pa.*
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich.*
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y.*
Rains, Albert, *Ala.*
Ray, John H., *N. Y.*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex.*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn.*
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y.*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans.*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.*—1650 30th St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa.*—1809 Franklin St. NE.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*
Richards, James P., *S. C.*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y.*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C.*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C.*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala.*—6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va.*
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky.*—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J.*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass.*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.*—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y.*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif.*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex.*
Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn.*
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y.*
Saylor, John P., *Pa.*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio.*—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa.*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans.*—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill.*
Shelley, John F., *Calif.*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif.*
Short, Dewey, *Mo.*
Shuford, George A., *N. C.*—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J.*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky.*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa.*—5205 Lawn May, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill.*—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss.*
Smith, Howard W., *Va.*—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis.*—2480 16th St.
Smith, Wint, *Kans.*
Spence, Brent, *Ky.*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill.*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*
Steed, Tom, *Okla.*
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo.*
Taber, John, *N. Y.*
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa.*—4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y.*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex.*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex.*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.*—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich.*
Thompson, T. A., *La.*—1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo.*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex.*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash.*
Trimble, James W., *Ark.*
Tuck, William M., *Va.*
Tumulty, T. James, *N. J.*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz.*
Utt, James B., *Calif.*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio.*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis.*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa.*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Velde, Harold H., *Ill.*
Vinson, Carl, *Ga.*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio.*—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill.*—The Congressional
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa.*
Watts, John C., *Ky.*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr.*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash.*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y.*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla.*
Widnall, William B., *N. J.*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn.*
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass.*—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss.*—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y.*—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La.*
Wilson, Earl, *Ind.*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss.*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis.*
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich.*—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J.*—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex.*
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev.*—2705 Westminister Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y.*

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), *Alaska.*—1718 33d Pl. SE.
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R.*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
J. Chester Wilfong, 225 17th St. NE.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 1200 North Stuart St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 You Place, SE.

Appendix

Address by Rudolph G. Pesata, National Commander of the AMVETS

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Rudolph G. Pesata, national commander of the AMVETS, delivered before the Cook County Council on April 14, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF SPEECH BY RUDOLPH G. PESATA, NATIONAL COMMANDER, AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II, BEFORE THE COOK COUNTY COUNCIL, AMVETS, NATIONAL COMMANDER'S BANQUET, APRIL 14, 1956

Normally I do not resort to a prepared text. You folks who have known me know that I like to speak extemporaneously. However, tonight I hesitated to speak so informally, perhaps because I wanted to put my best foot forward among such close friends, or perhaps because I wanted to carefully express a thought which is dear to my heart.

I know that you will agree that I am not the kind of a guy who is frequently at a loss for words. Yet the very warm welcome you have given me has put some hesitancy into my speaking. One difficulty seems to be that I feel more at home out there with you folks than up here at the headtable. I know that I certainly found it easier to help work out seating charts for this table than to occupy one of the chairs.

In all seriousness, it's wonderful to be home in Cook County. While I have had an opportunity to visit our great State of Illinois several times since assuming office, tonight I feel is the highlight of my term as commander.

I know how hard AMVETS in Cook County have worked in the past to make this annual banquet a real tribute to AMVET Commanders. And because I know of the tremendous amount of effort and coordination which goes into this affair, I am perhaps more grateful than my predecessors for the fine reception which so many of you have given me this evening.

In all humility I stand before you to thank each and every one of you for making it possible for me to attend this banquet as the honored guest. Had it not been for the untiring efforts and devotion of so many of you in the days prior to our last national convention and the seemingly unending days and nights in Philadelphia, I would not now have the joy and the inspiration of serving as national commander of the greatest veterans organization in America.

Many men from Illinois have served AMVETS in top leadership roles since the inception of our organization. Many more have been the nucleus for the local growth and expansion which has seen our State lead all the rest year after year. Even more have worked on the hundreds and hundreds of resolutions and policy statements which have become the mandates of AMVETS and have gained for us the reputation of a thinking group of young veterans.

It's quite a challenge to follow in the footsteps of devoted men such as these. And whatever small success I may have had in equalling their performance has been due in large measure to the fact that once again Illinois has come through with membership gains. Once again your advice and suggestions are helping to formulate policies which are meeting the commendation of the Congress. Once again Cook County AMVETS are showing the Nation what our organization believes about Americanism * * * about service to veterans * * * about all of those matters which affect the veteran and nonveteran alike * * * and which confront us as leaders in the veterans' field.

With this support to draw upon, I am proud of the record we are establishing for AMVETS this year. The enhancing of our reputation on Capitol Hill, with the Defense Department, with the State Department * * * our sizable membership increase * * * all clearly prove to me that the wonderful cooperation that I have received from you—my close friends in AMVETS—made this record possible.

Here in the midwest where we are justifiably proud of our prestige on the gridiron * * * and where many of our football heroes have been named to the all-star teams throughout the country * * * may I say that each and every AMVET in the Department of Illinois should be named to the All-American team of AMVETS. You are real team workers and I'm glad you're playing on my side.

The great midwest holds a tremendous attraction for people from all across the Nation. In the Halls of Congress, our elected representatives play a major role in the guidance of our Nation on both a domestic and an international level * * * and it's a successful leadership role. Our States are looked upon as exemplifying all that is good in America. Here one can truly say is America. And because you are such an integral part of our country, the message I want to leave with you tonight is about America.

In my travels as your National Commander, I have had the opportunity to view at first hand a situation which disturbs me. Where I have not seen it with my own eyes, I have learned it from discussions with the many individuals I meet.

We seem to have become a nation of extremes as opposed to the simple premises on which we were founded. We have gone through a fear complex stage which posed dire threats to our constitutional liberties for which we fought to preserve.

We have gone through the other extreme of not being sufficiently aware of * * * and alert against * * * the insidious dangers of communism within our borders.

And the disturbing thing is that we seem to find it almost impossible to grasp the clear-cut picture of Americanism which is in front of our eyes * * * and at our fingertips * * * and in the back of our memories.

Going back to my school days, I can remember beginning each day with a recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. I can also recall that at least several mornings of the week, we sang a lusty * * * if not musical * * * rendition of the Star Spangled Banner. And it seemed to me then that the Salute to the Flag and the singing of our national anthem had a revered and deep meaning which sobered even the most precocious of us and set us to thinking for a while.

Yet today I have discovered educators who feel that it is not necessary to take time to recite the Pledge of Allegiance in our classrooms. They feel it is not necessary for our children to know and understand the meaning of those words.

There are among us today those who do not believe it is necessary to display the flag in classrooms and on public buildings. They say: "Oh, everyone knows what the flag stands for."

There are others who feel that the teaching of the fundamentals of civics and government need not be a major part of our educational standards. They would have you believe that youngsters today learn enough of the basics of democracy from their everyday life without making civics and history mandatory subjects in our schools.

I take exception to all of these critics.

And I say to you that we, and our children, not only do not understand the Pledge of Allegiance—but we don't even know it. I say to you that only a few of us can accurately state what the colors and the stars and the stripes of our flag stand for * * * and even a smaller percentage of our children are learning these symbols of our heritage in classroom, USA, 1956.

In 1776 the American flag with its 13 stars and 13 stripes was the focal point around which Americans rallied in their first struggle for liberty. The desolate winter at Valley Forge had taken a grave toll in men and supplies from General Washington's small army. But those 13 stars and those 13 stripes were the new born hopes of men, and those hopes sustained that small army and carried it on to victory.

In the War of 1812, the mere sight of the American flag * * * now with 15 stars * * * caused Francis Scott Key * * *captive on a British ship off of Fort McHenry * * * to pen the immortal stanzas of the Star-Spangled Banner.

And in our own war, the dramatic triumph which showed in every strained muscle of the men who participated in the raising of the 48-star flag on Mount Suribachi became a buoyant spirit of victory in the minds of Americans.

Our flag has led us through countless military victories. But what is amazing to me is that it seems that only in crisis * * * only when our precious freedoms are physically threatened * * * do we become so sharply aware of it * * * and what it represents in our heritage.

Instead of an acceptance of * * * and a belief in * * * the symbols of our flag, we more frequently hear that such a display of patriotism is flag-waving and old-fashion. If that is true, then I plead guilty to both charges. Perhaps it can be flag-waving and old-fashion * * * but where the best interests of my country are concerned, I take pride in being accused of believing in my Nation.

Frankly, the most conclusive evidence that we have that there is a lack of understanding of Americanism being taught in our homes and in our schools can be obtained from the files of the Defense Department.

The shooting war that was the Korean conflict is over. But how many of you will soon forget that many of our men were taken prisoners by the Communist hordes. And how many of you will forget that some Americans in uniform knew so little about the values of the American way of life that they were unable to dispute the lies with which the Reds confronted them.

The records show that many of our young men were unable to withstand those falsehoods and became victims of what is commonly called brainwashing.

I do not mean this to be an indictment of our youth because our young people will grow as they are led. But history does prove that we do need to understand our American heritage not only to properly prepare us for the normal responsibilities of citizenship but for emergency ammunition in meeting those forces which would destroy our freedoms.

The Advertising Council of America is reviewing a nationwide campaign on phases of this subject and with the talents readily available to the council, a booklet has been prepared with a title so simple that it is almost all-encompassing. It's called: "The Miracle of America—the Better You Know America, the Better the Future Looks."

How can anyone say that this simple truth is old fashioned? How can they say that belief in the principles of what our flag stands for is what they sneeringly call flag waving?

Look around the four corners of the world today. Conflict and near conflict is the rule rather than the exception. And it would seem to me that in such an atmosphere of cold war, we have the responsibility of making very certain that the liberties which our ancestors established for us and which we have helped to preserve are living symbols to every man, woman, and child who holds a share in the future of our Nation.

And if we don't assume that responsibility we may eventually have to assume the blame for a repeat of the defections which were seen among our troops in Korea.

We in AMVETS are cognizant of the need for a positive Americanism program. We have our own goals for reaching the 48 States with instruction programs which will remind adults of the forgotten struggles to form this still young country of ours. The pilot seminar will be held here in Chicago next month.

We sponsor a community flag program aimed at more widespread use of our national banner in our daily lives.

And we are encouraging our school officials to renew the daily pledge of allegiance among our youngsters. Let those who are too young to fully understand the meaning and significance of our majestic flag, learn to explore the reasons for that pledge.

And we're going further than that in the field of youth. We're taking active roles in the guidance of our local boys clubs. We're sponsoring Boy Scout troops and Girl Scout troops. Especially in Illinois, we're working with Worchids and in other ways are lending guidance to the youth who will be our leaders of the future.

I would entreat AMVETS to try to do all in our power to make these efforts successful. We, who have been in battle, who know what it means to take arms, and to undergo the trials and tribulations of war, should have an even greater interest in the return of American thinking to the principles of justice, government of the people, and personal liberties which our flag symbolizes.

It's our job to remind the 160 million citizens who share in the future of America that their's is a future to be proud of, to be cherished, and the responsibilities which go with that future should be willingly and enthusiastically accepted by all.

When next you hear or speak the words of the pledge of allegiance, listen carefully, or speak them thoughtfully:

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Simple words which say so much. And back of them lies the American's creed which sets forth distinctly, concisely, emphatically what we mean when we say "and to the Republic for which it stands." Written by William Tyler Page and formally adopted by the Congress of the United States, the creed should be the promise of every American:

"I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed, a democracy in a republic, a sovereign nation of many sovereign states; a perfect union one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes. I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it, to support its Constitution, to obey its laws, to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies."

This is not old fashioned. It's new as tomorrow. It is not flag waving. It is the devotion which you and I owe to this land of many opportunities for ourselves and our children. And it's the simple definition of Americanism which will stand up against all of the foreign ideologies which are woven into governments for governments, rather than governments for peoples.

This is American patriotism—a renewed challenge in a restless world.

Proposed Extensions of Northeast Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Northeast Air Line 'Knows the Answers,'" which appeared in the Manchester Union Leader, Manchester, N. H., on Friday, April 20, 1956. This editorial comments on a recent CAB examiner's decision which is adverse to New England interests.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTHEAST AIRLINE KNOWS THE ANSWERS

If not among some Federal bureaucrats, Northeast Airlines certainly has champions and advocates in nongovernmental circles. For instance, the New Bedford Standard-Times declares editorially that "the spontaneous expressions of support for Northeast Airlines by the people of New England during the last 2 weeks should give the Civil Aeronautics Board some idea of the high esteem earned by the airline. The endorsements for Northeast were in protest of the report submitted April 3 by CAB Examiner Thomas L. Wrenn, who suggested that Delta Airlines be named as the third scheduled passenger carrier to operate between New York and Florida."

And, curiously, although Wrenn has somehow failed to endorse Northeast, another representative of the CAB, V. Rock Grundman, counsel for the CAB's Bureau of Air Operations, has approved the line's application for the New York–Florida franchise.

As the Standard-Times remembers, all 12 of New England's Senators have protested the Wrenn opinion. In the House, Democratic Majority Leader MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, has spoken in favor of the airline's application, urging the CAB to "Ignore the examiner's absurd findings. * * * The ringing praise which has arisen for Northeast from all over New England leaves no doubt that Northeast knows the answers, operates an outstandingly good airline and is capable of giving excellent service."

In the face of the record, how can the CAB do otherwise than renounce the Wrenn finding? How can the CAB do otherwise than grant Northeast Airlines its New York–Florida franchise?

Certainly it is good to know that the determination for fair play is growing throughout New England. Here in New Hampshire, as local cases in point, six influential State groups have now protested Wrenn's discriminatory viewpoint. If the CAB heeds public opinion, injustice to Northeast will not prevail.

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, last week, on April 12, Governor Averell Harriman addressed the annual convention of the American Jewish Congress. His address was on the subject of foreign policy, with detailed reference to American policy in the Middle East. His speech was an incisive one, reflecting Governor Harriman's broad background of experience in foreign affairs.

I hope his address will be widely read and will be given the attention it deserves by the Department of State.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY GOV. AVERELL HARRIMAN AT THE CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS AT THE HOTEL BILTMORE, NEW YORK CITY, ON APRIL 12, 1956

I am delighted and honored to participate with you in your National Biennial Convention particularly because you have dedicated it to the memory of a great American and a great Jew—Justice Louis D. Brandeis—on the 100th anniversary of his birth.

Brandeis truly exemplified the American tradition which recognizes no artificially created boundaries to man's aspirations. We can recall the outcry of the bigots when he was named to the United States Supreme Court. Yet he served on that bench with luminous distinction and left a heritage which will never be forgotten. He helped to strengthen the faith of the American people in one of its integral institutions, the Supreme Court, and I say that those who seek to weaken this arm of Governemnt do injury to the cause of American freedom.

In past months, there has been great speculation about the so-called changes in the Soviet Union.

The new Soviet leaders are trying to dissociate themselves from the years of horror under Joseph Stalin. This they began almost the day after his death. They are claiming

they have supplanted the tyranny of one-man rule with collective leadership.

For my part, I cannot help but remember that all this has happened before. It's like seeing the remake of an old movie—same plot, new cast. The slogan "collective leadership" was heard a quarter of a century ago, when it consisted of Stalin, Zinoviev, and Kamenev. But that collective leadership didn't last and it became Stalin, Rykov, and Bukharin. Then came the nightmarish purge trials and the executions of Zinoviev, Kamenev, Rykov, and Bukharin—and only Stalin remained.

With Stalin's death, we heard about collective leadership again—this time Malenkov, Molotov, and Beria. Within a week, Malenkov had been pushed out as head of the Soviet Community Party and Khrushchev took his place. A few months later, Beria was executed, Malenkov resigned as Premier, Molotov admitted that he didn't know what socialism was; Bulganin appeared on the scene. This is the new collective leadership we hear about now. You can't tell the players without a scorecard.

The truth is that collective leadership is just a slogan designed to trap the unwary—and nothing more. But its very nature, communism is a dictatorship. The Soviet system cannot work without a final voice of authority.

Certainly the Kremlin walls have revealed cracks behind its mythical monolithic facade—but that is a tribute to the hundreds of millions of human beings behind the Iron Curtain. It is because among these Russians, Ukrainians, Poles, Czechs, Balts, Hungarians, Rumanians, there is still a spark of resistance, a small but inextinguishable flame of hope. It is because of this that the Khruschchevs are busy trying to explain away the degrading, inhuman history of the last 30 years, a history which they helped to make, a history which is written in the blood of many millions of people for whose deaths they, as well as Stalin, are responsible.

Khrushchev himself, after all, was the instrument of Stalin's policy in making the Ukrainians bow to the tyranny.

In the words of the Prophet Isaiah, we can say to Khrushchev, "For your hands are defiled with blood, and your fingers with iniquity; your lips have spoken lies, your tongue hath muttered perverseness. None calleth for justice, nor any pleadeth for truth; they trust in vanity, and speak lies; they conceive mischief, and bring forth iniquity."

Stalin was not a pathological case. I knew him. He was ruthless, cruel, and unscrupulous—but he wasn't crazy. He was determined to gain his objectives, and to him the end justified the means regardless of cost or human values. But in achieving these ends he was a man of great capacity. During the war, he dominated every phase of Soviet military operations and civilian life.

Then why is Khrushchev telling the Soviet people that Stalin was a lunatic? In order to persuade the that the ghastly years of the Stalin regime had nothing to do with communism; that with Stalin dead, they claim Soviet communism represents safe and healthy progress.

These so-called changes in the Soviet Union are intended not only to strengthen the dictatorship at home but to increase neutralism abroad. They are aimed at the psychological disarmament of free peoples. Soviet aims of world conquest are part of the Stalin master plan of Lenin and Stalin which Khrushchev has not and will not repudiate.

A quarter of a century ago, a Soviet spokesman of high rank, Dmitri Manuilsky, stated before the Lenin School of Political Warfare in Moscow:

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fists."

You can see this very thing happening now. And if you read carefully what was said at the 20th Communist Party Congress in Moscow, you will find no change of any consequence in their revolutionary doctrine.

They told us then their aim was to destroy the North Atlantic Treaty, drive American troops and arms out of Western Europe, reshape Germany according to Soviet design, probe for weakness wherever it exists in the free world, and win country after country by conspiracy and subversion through popular fronts or otherwise.

Unhappily, the administration is not acting as though it understood fully all these dangers. Running through the Eisenhower administration is a streak of naivete on this central issue of international communism.

We saw this last summer, at the Geneva conference. There President Eisenhower, sitting in the center of the spotlight of world publicity, publicly credited the new Soviet rulers with a desire for peace no less earnest than that of the West.

Nothing could have served the purposes of Khrushchev more than that. Neutralist and pro-Communist elements were strengthened throughout the world. Free nations relaxed their efforts to build strength against communism. The Soviets scored a psychological breakthrough that they have been exploiting ever since with economic and political penetration of the Middle East, South Asia, and the Far East.

Yet after all this, last week, on April 3, Secretary Dulles was saying:

"The fact that the Soviet rulers now denounce much of the past gives cause for hope, because it demonstrates that liberalizing influences from within and without can bring about peaceful change."

And remember how he told a Senate committee that the Soviet Union was changing because of internal weaknesses and the failure of its policies.

There have been changes—but hardly brought about by true liberalizing influences—in the Soviet Union. Khrushchev is leading not from weakness but from strength—military, economic, industrial. And his policies, unhappily, are not failing. Throughout the world, Soviet economic and political penetration is moving forward while from Washington comes word everything is under control.

I will begin to believe in Mr. Dulles' liberalizing influences within the Soviet Union when something better appears than exonerating murdered comrades—when the right of opposition is recognized for the living and not just for the dead. We need to see real moves toward:

1. Free elections, under U. N. supervision, in Soviet satellites, as well as in Korea and Germany, so that the peoples of those countries can choose their own governments.

2. Abolition of slave-labor camps in the Soviet Union and its satellites and freedom for political prisoners.

3. Peaceful coexistence of other political parties in the Soviet Union with a free press and access to other means of communication, and the organization of free trade unions.

4. Cessation of subversive activities through the Cominform and its agencies.

Some may say that such changes are inconceivable. Khrushchev says such changes will come when a shrimp learns to whistle. The conscience of mankind cannot accept the Soviet professions of change so long as this bondage endures. And our own freedom will not be secure until the freedom of all people is secure.

I have said consistently that I have faith that changes can develop behind the Iron Curtain. Certainly while the Soviets are expanding, their system will not be weakened. But if the unity and strength of the free world are developed so that Soviet penetration is checked and thrown back, I have confidence that the strains and pressures behind the Iron Curtain will grow and can lead to an eventual undermining of the Kremlin itself.

The present Communist drive comes at a time when the credit we have had among free peoples, accumulated during the previous administration, is becoming exhausted and overextended. The signs of bankruptcy in American foreign policy are multiplying with perilous speed, while the faith of our friends and allies is sorely shaken. Yet we are the nation that gave inspiration and leadership to the whole world through the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, and point 4. We know that there are still great opportunities, and immense need, for economic growth throughout the free world, for assisting newly independent countries to achieve freedom from economic colonialism and to progress. What is needed is new inspiration and new vision.

Nowhere, perhaps, is our diplomacy more barren in dealing with the Soviet menace than in the Middle East.

Up until 1953, the United States had a policy which produced stability and progress. In the Tripartite Declaration of 1950, we had made it perfectly clear, with Britain and France, that Israel was here to stay and that any aggression by either side would be met with instant defense.

But in the past 3 years, even before the Communist arms deal with Egypt last fall, events had been permitted to dim the force of that declaration and raise doubts as to whether we meant what we had said. This had encouraged the aggressive elements in the Arab States and it had bred fear in Israel, and these had given rise to violence and retaliation and counter-retaliation.

Then came the Communist arms deal with Egypt. Anyone who has dealt with the Kremlin knows that when the Soviets embark on a new adventure, the way to meet it is directly and at once. When the Soviets intervened in the Middle East with their sale of arms to Egypt, we should have met it by immediately honoring Israel's request for defensive arms. Instead, there has been agonizing indecision. Finally, the administration has devised a straddle—of which nobody can be proud—this country will not sell arms itself but we will not object if our allies do. Is that the kind of leadership in a crisis that one should expect from our great country?

This week, the President expressed himself on guaranties. But instead of clarification, there was more ambiguity. The words of the statement he approved were so unclear that they had to be officially explained later, and they were explained to mean that the statement was limited to commitments under the United Nations Charter—no mention of the 1950 pledges, where action was promised "within and outside" the United Nations.

There is so much to be done in the Middle East—so much that can be done, if peace and stability can be restored. Then we can help with economic development, in Israel and the Arab States alike—with the resettlement of Arab refugees, with development of the Jordan River and with other water projects in the Arab countries.

Finally, we must never forget that our fight for peace and freedom is twofold—at home as well as abroad. To give meaning in the free world to our belief in the worth and dignity of the individual, regardless of race or color, requires more than ever before, that we live by that belief at home.

I am proud of the progress we are making in the battle against discrimination here in New York State. We have put new life into our State commission against discrimination, and we have extended its scope to include discrimination in the field of housing—not only publicly assisted housing but homes built with FHA and VA mortgage guaranties. We are taking steps to make private mortgage credit available to minority groups where it has not been available heretofore. Through these means, we are striking at a particularly injurious form of discrimination—which affects the ability of a man and his family to find a decent place to live and which breeds congestion and slums.

Equal rights to employment, to education, to public accommodations, to housing—these are the pillars of a program to assure equal opportunity to all Americans. And how steadfastly we protect these rights will determine not only how well we live with our own consciences here in America but how great will be our prestige and effectiveness in our struggles for peace and freedom all over the globe.

Tonight is the 11th anniversary of the passing of a great American—Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He set us on the course that we must still follow—to strive for more freedom, more justice, and more democracy—not only for all of the people of America but for all the world.

Committee on Foreign Trade Education, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following excerpts from the testimony of the Committee on Foreign Trade Education, Inc., of 104 East 52d Street, New York 22, N. Y., in regard to H. R. 5550:

H. R. 5550 has a simple purpose, simply stated. The bill would authorize the President to "accept membership for the United States in the Organization for Trade Cooperation." In addition, H. R. 5550 would authorize appropriations to finance this country's share in OTC's expenses and to maintain a United States delegation with OTC. Secretary Dulles indicates that the United States share of OTC expenses would not exceed $120,000 a year.

OTC, itself, is equally clear cut. According to article 3 of the Agreement on the Organization for Trade Cooperation, OTC will administer the general agreement on tariffs and trade and in so doing, facilitate "intergovernmental consultations on questions relating to international trade; * * * sponsor international trade negotiations; * * * study questions of international trade and commercial policy and, where appropriate, make recommendations thereon; * * * (and) collect, analyze and publish information and statistical data relating to international trade and commercial policy."

The administrative function which OTC will undertake is of high importance. GATT, to which the United States is a contracting party for the purpose of accomplishing the aims of the Reciprocal Trade Act, has had no administrative arm. The negotiations of the contracting parties have been principally confined to rather sporadic sessions, the only attempts at achieving continuity being through the means of various improvisations. Although GATT has been very beneficial to the United States, as we will, in part, note below, its efficiency has for obvious reasons been impaired by the lack of continuing administrative machinery. OTC will fulfill the need.

OTC will carry out its function by the creation of an Assembly, an Executive Committee (on which the United States will have a permanent seat), and a Secretariat.

The Agreement on the Organization for Trade Cooperation, also, provides the means for the waiver of certain contracted obligatoins (art. 13) and procedure by which, in the instance of the withdrawal of a trade concession, compensation can be instituted (art. 14). These features identify, with principles of our own reciprocal trade agreements. They have, also, been part of GATT. And, in passing, we recall the high value that the waiver facility in GATT has had for the United States.

* * * * *

Both Secretary Weeks and Secretary McKay have, also, pointed out the degree to which concessions won from Germany and Belgium through GATT have aided in the notable improvement the coal industry experienced in 1955. Incontestably, GATT has been a significant aid to our national economy. For that reason alone, OTC, which will perfect GATT, should be, without fail, enacted during the session of the Congress.

The long delay of the enactment of H. R. 5550, or its defeat, will produce truly grave consequences. In terms of its delay, which is freely predicted in some quarters, we ask if the United States can afford waiting another 12 months, during which the Russians will, in effect, be able to say "We are doing the job, while the United States just talks and talks and talks."

The possible defeat of OTC would obviously be even more dangerous. And it would produce a somewhat paradoxical situation, which, we believe, should be given serious consideration. The defeat of OTC would not take the United States out of GATT. Instead, the defeat of OTC would only confuse and depress the international trade situation and compromise United States world leadership. The defeat of OTC, we suggest, to those who have opposed the general progress of United States foreign economic policy during the last several years, would not be turning the car in the opposite direction, but rather, would be like slashing the tires and watering the gas.

The new Russian regime has proved themselves to be pragmatic and tough. The outstanding authority on Russian politics, the New York Times' former Moscow correspondent, Harrison E. Salisbury, has observed that the Soviet bosses, by throwing out a lot of dialectic scrap, have emerged possessing a new and menacing flexibility.

Can the United States match that flexibility in its fight for survival as long as it is tempted to yield to forlorn, out-of-date high tariff longings?

The Alaska Mental Health Bill, H. R. 6376

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from the American Medical Association addressed to Senator MURRAY, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. In view of the fantastic and scurrilous charges that are being made concerning the Alaska mental health bill, H. R. 6376, a bill passed by the House unanimously and now pending in the Senate, I think the facts should be on the RECORD. In the light of the facts these wild rumors are exposed as the absurdities they indeed are. Some of the most important of these facts are contained in this statement presented by the American Medical Association in support of this bill:

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., April 17, 1956.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing in further reference to your recent request for the views of the American Medical Association on H. R. 6376, 84th Congress, a bill to provide for the hospitalization and care of the mentally ill of Alaska. Our committee on legislation has now considered this measure, and the executive committee of the board of trustees has adopted a position on the bill.

With the reservations hereinafter discussed, the American Medical Association supports and recommends the enactment of H. R. 6376, 84th Congress.

Three studies of the situation of the mentally ill in Alaska have been made in recent years. The earliest of these, in 1948, was conducted by the American Medical Association. The report of the group of physicians which visited Alaska in the course of this investigation was critical of the existing commitment procedures and the lack of facilities in Alaska for the care and treatment of mental patients. It recommended the establishment of a centrally located hospital to provide for the needs of the Territory. Accordingly, the American Medical Association supports H. R. 6376 insofar as that bill modernizes existing archaic commitment procedures and provides for the establishment of adequate local facilities for the care and treatment of the mentally ill of Alaska.

With respect to commitment procedures, I should point out that a very difficult medicolegal problem is involved in the enactment and administration of any commitment procedure. From a medical point of view, it is desirable to institute a course of therapy as early as possible and with the least possible disturbance to the patient. From a legal point of view, it is essential that the civil rights of persons alleged to be mentally incompetent be fully protected. This variation in approach to the problem must be considered in connection with the pending bill as in all commitment acts, but in our opinion, the procedures set forth in H. R. 6376 are on a par with the better procedures adopted by the several States, and are superior to those presently followed in Alaska. However, since the American Medical Association does not presume to speak with authority on the legal aspects of commitment, it may be desirable for your committee to obtain and consider the recommendations of a legal organization, such as the American Bar Association.

It is apparent that a widespread misconception of the purpose and effect of section 119 of the measure exists. As we understand its provisions, this section is an authorization for the transfer of residents of Alaska or of other jurisdictions back to their jurisdiction of residence for treatment when they are adjudged mentally incompetent elsewhere. Such a provision, of course, is common between the several States today. Section 119 (c), providing for the reciprocal assumption of expenses for the care and treatment of the mentally ill in those cases

where transfer to their jurisdiction of residence is not accomplished, seems to have been widely misunderstood. In view of this fact, we recommend the insertion of clarifying language.

It is our understanding that the original bill contained a section providing for criminal penalties for willfully causing, or conspiring with, or assisting another to cause the unwarranted hospitalization of any individual, or for the denial to any individual of any rights granted him under the provisions of the measure. While we recognize that the existence of such a penal provision might impede the discovery and hospitalization of some persons who are mentally ill, we feel, in balance, that it is a desirable safeguard in a measure of this nature. Accordingly, we recommend that a similar safeguard be incorporated in the measure by your committee.

I am pleased to have had the opportunity of presenting the views of the American Medical Association on this measure. If we may be of any further assistance to the committee, it is our sincere desire to do so.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE F. LULL,
Secretary and General Manager.

Results of the Questionnaire Mailed to Northern Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a tabulation of the votes I have received from the 10th Congressional District of Virginia in response to a questionnaire.

During February and March of this year I mailed 107,200 questionnaires to all legal residents of my district distributed as follows: Alexandria, 25,000; Arlington, 40,000; Fairfax, 40,000; Falls Church, 2,200.

The following letter accompanied the questionnaire:

DEAR NEIGHBOR: In accordance with my established policy, I am again consulting with you on major legislative proposals which may be considered by Congress in this session. Your advice through past questionnaires has proven extremely valuable to me as your Representative and I would be grateful if you would again take the time to let me have the benefit of your views on the 10 questions listed on the reverse of this letter.

As you well know, there are far more than 10 major issues to be decided upon by Congress. However, these are important ones on which I would particularly like to have your opinion. I believe these are questions which vitally affect us as individuals, as citizens or northern Virginia, and as citizens of the United States.

With knowledge of your thinking on these questions, I am confident I will be better able to represent you not only on these issues but also on the many other decisions which will be made in the House of Representatives.

Please indicate your vote by checking the proper space on the opposite side and return it to me at Post Office Box 1300, House of Representatives, Washington 25, D. C., at your earliest convenience. Your cooperation and assistance in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Approximately 15,000 replies have been received and I am very grateful at this fine indication of the interest taken by the residents of northern Virginia in their Government. I have congratulated them on their unusual awareness of the acute problems facing the Nation and their community. The low percentage of "no opinion" ballots and the high percentage of total returned are both tributes to the civil responsibility and participation of citizens in this area.

In addition, thousands of those who responded took the additional time and effort to enlarge on their views by letter and comment written on the questionnaire blank. These have indeed been of value to me as their Representative and are being considered along with the tabulations.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
1. A reduction in Federal taxes this year even though it might mean an operating deficit and an increase in the National debt	16.6	79.5	3.9
2. Continued foreign economic aid	57.2	33.2	9.6
3. Federal financial assistance to the States for school construction	65.2	27.9	6.9
4. President Eisenhower's Soil Bank Program and continuation of flexible farm price supports, in an effort to reduce the $8 billion surplus and increase farm income, rather than the high rigid support program	76.7	9.6	13.7
5. Proposed Federal super interstate highway construction program	76.9	13.9	9.2
6. Federal Government participation in a nationwide health insurance program	42.0	45.7	12.3
7. Liberalization of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act	31.9	45.9	22.2
8. Postal rate increase as recommended by President Eisenhower to assist in cutting down postal deficit (now over $1 million per day) and improve the service and facilities	77.7	17.0	5.3
9. Creation of a Metropolitan Washington Authority to operate and improve transportation, airport, and harbor facilities in this area	72.3	12.5	15.3

The following question applies only to Federal employees:

10. There are two principal proposals to increase annuities of Federal employees. These are listed briefly below. Please check the one you prefer:
   (a) Inclusion of old age and survivors insurance (social security) coverage with the civil service retirement plan as proposed in the Kaplan report 17.0
   (b) Change the method of computation within the framework of the present civil service retirement system in order to increase the benefits 83.0

Government Assistance To Meet the Nation's Health Needs—Excerpts From Address by Gov. Adlai Stevenson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in the course of his current campaign tour in Florida, Gov. Adlai Stevenson spoke, on April 12, on the subject of Government assistance to meet the Nation's health needs. It was an important and constructive speech, on a subject which during the last 2 years has received all too little attention both in Congress and from public platforms.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from his very instructive address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXTRACTS FROM ADDRESS OF ADLAI E. STEVENSON, MIAMI, FLA., APRIL 12, 1956

Eleven years ago today a very great man died at Warm Springs, Ga. He had given greatly to this country, to this century, yes, to civilization. I wonder sometimes what America would be like today if it hadn't been for Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

President Roosevelt was at Warm Springs as he had been so many times before because of the cross he had to carry through the last 24 years of his life. For he was a victim of crippling infantile paralysis.

And today on this anniversary I want to pay my respects to the memory of this beloved man by talking with you for a few minutes about this matter of disease and sickness, of our war as a people against the killers who strike inside our bodies, of what we are and should be doing on this human battlefront.

We have within the past 2 years made dramatic and almost unbelievable advance against the particular enemy that attacked Franklin Roosevelt. But the plain facts are that we are doing pitifully, inexcusably little about finding answers to the other cruel mysteries which cause human misery and untimely death.

With 10 million American men and women suffering from heart disease, we spent last year only $16 million on research in this field or $1.60 for each person presently afflicted.

One of every seven of us, as things are, will die of cancer. Yet we spent last year on cancer research only $25 million—15 cents apiece per person.

With mental illness costing incalculable suffering and almost $1½ billion a year, we are spending $11 million, less than 1 percent of that cost to combat it.

Last year we invested about a penny a person for research on arthritis and rheumatic diseases, cripplers of 10 million Americans.

The pennywise policies of the present administration so far as medical research is concerned are a shameful cost of what they call a businessman's government. A man wrote me this in a letter the other day: "Where cancer and heart disease alone killed more Americans under the age of 65 last year than were killed in the Armed Forces of this Nation during the Second World War and the Korean war together, it would seem that we should spend substantially more than we are to stop this toll upon life." I agree.

I am here asking your support in my candidacy for the Presidency of this Nation. I have refused in my campaign to make promises as a candidate I couldn't keep as President. I say to you that if I am elected to this office I propose to use the powers and resources of this Nation to cut down killing and crippling disease with all the vigor we

use to stop the killing and crippling which comes from war. A healthier Nation is after all a stronger Nation.

There are other things which must concern us if we are to fight back effectively against sickness and disease.

Roughly, a million American families will have to spend over half their income this year for medical care. In over 500,000 cases catastrophic accident or illness will consume the entire family income. And today there are 8 million American families in debt for medical care with much of this borrowing being at high interest rates from personal finance companies. In too many American homes a parent at some time or other looks down at a sick child, knows that something should be done and that there just isn't the money. It is high time that we advise a positive program to enable everyone who wants to have protection against the sudden and devastating costs of illness.

I have never proposed to socialize medicine and I am not in favor of national health insurance. There are other alternatives which are workable and in my opinion preferable.

Three out of every five people in this country are now enrolled in voluntary private prepayment insurance programs which cover health. Yet studies show that this membership includes mostly middle and high income families and all too few of the low income families who need it most.

I believe that these private insurance programs can be developed further so they will be attractive and within the reach of an eevn greater percentage of our people. And I urge further consideration of governmental programs to provide long-term low interest rate loans to groups which are organizing prepayment insurance plans and perhaps other forms of financial assistance to help to cover the initial costs of setting up such plans.

And surely the social-security program should be revised to provide that its benefits shall be paid in cases where covered employees become completely and totally disabled before reaching the usual retirement age. These are the cases of catastrophic illness in which the cost burden falls most heavily and often on those least able to carry it.

It is time, too, that we really do something about the shortage of doctors, particularly in some of the rural areas. There are today fewer doctors in proportion to the population than three were a hundred years ago. And there are fewer medical-school graduates today than there were half a century ago.

We ought to take immediate steps to expand assistance to medical, dental, and nursing schools so that enrollments can be increased and standards still maintained. Legislation is now before the Congress providing for Federal aid for the construction and expansion of medical schools. The present administration opposed it last year. Now, in election year, the administration has seen the light of day and has come out for a program of Federal aid for medical training. But its program is wholly inadequate to meet the critical shortage of medical personnel. There is ample basis in immediate need to support the Democratic proposals now before Congress which call for the appropriation of $340 million over a 5-year period to assist in the construction of medical schools and for more adequate teaching and research facilities.

We must also speed up our hospital-construction program, with particular emphasis on building more hospitals for mental patients.

I know the complaints of the businessman's government now in Washington. This all costs too much, they say, adding that it isn't really the Government's business, anyway.

Well, I say to you that the one thing this great Nation can't afford is to let people die or suffer when it could be prevented.

And as for whose business it is, I say it is ours and that the Government is our servant.

It was Ralph Waldo Emerson who said that "humanity asks the Government shall not be ashamed to be tender and paternal." And it was Woodrow Wilson who added that "you will notice that whenever the United States forgets its ardor for mankind it is necessary that a Democrat should be elected President."

The Alaskan Mental-Health Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a tremendous interest has developed in the so-called Alaskan mental-health bill, which bears the number H. R. 6376. I have heretofore inserted in the RECORD some material on this measure which has come to my attention. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD additional articles which have been published in the Tablet, the official organ of the diocese of Brooklyn, N. Y. These were forwarded to me by Mr. Patrick F. Scanlan, the managing editor; and I include them for the information of the Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATORS STUDY ALASKA PROJECT FOR UNITED STATES SIBERIA—RESOLUTION FOR HOSPITAL FOR MENTALLY ILL ALSO PROVIDES FOR POLITICAL DISSENTERS—HOUSE PASSES THE BILL—UNDER TERMS ADMINISTRATION OFFICIALS CAN RAILROAD ITS CRITICS TO NORTHERN EXILE

(By Francis Carroll)

WASHINGTON.—Those who enjoy an excursion into the land of fantasy will like this story.

But it is not fantasy. It is about House Resolution 6376, which was passed by a voice vote in the House of Representatives on January 18 of this year and which is now before the United States Senate.

House Resolution 6376 would provide 1 million acres of United States territory in Alaska for a hospital for the mentally ill—an insane asylum.

On July 1, 1956 $6,500,000 of American taxpayers' money would be handed over to the Territory of Alaska to begin work on this insane asylum. Another $6 million would be given over a period of 10 years.

NOT FOR ALASKANS ALONE

Now Alaska, according to a proponent of the resolution, Representative WILLIAM A. DAWSON, of Utah, has approximately 350 mental cases.

The acreage to be appropriated is half again the size of the State of Rhode Island.

But this insane asylum is not for Alaskans alone, or even for Americans resident in Alaska. It could be for any one of us, for House Resolution 6376 provides (section 119 (c)) that the "Governor (of Alaska) is hereby further authorized to enter into a reciprocal agreement with any State providing for the care and treatment of mentally ill residents of Alaska by such State, and for the care and treatment of mentally ill residents of such State by Alaska."

A "mentally ill individual," according to House Resolution 6376, is defined (section 101 (i)) in extremely elastic terms: "An individual having a psychiatric or other disease which substantially impairs his mental health or an individual who is mentally defective or mentally retarded."

Who of us could not be put away under such a definition?

WORDING IS UNEQUIVOCAL

And who could put us away? An "interested party" or "interested parties," which are defined in the resolution (section 101 (g)) "the legal guardian, spouse, parent or parents, adult children, other close adult relatives, or an interested, responsible adult friend of a mentally ill individual or a patient."

The wording of the resolution is blunt and unequivocal. Section 103 (b) reads:

"Any individual may be admitted for care and treatment in a hospital upon written application by an interested party, by a health or welfare officer, by the Governor, or by the head of any institution in which the individual may be, if the application is accompanied by a certificate of a licensed physician that, on the basis of an examination held not more than 15 days prior to the individual's admission, such individual in his opinion is mentally ill and because of his illness, either (1) is likely to injure himself or others if allowed to remain at liberty, or (2) being in need of care or treatment in a hospital, lacks sufficient insight or capacity to make responsible application in his own behalf."

You or the writer or anyone else who might incur the displeasure of the administration in power would have little to say from this point on, for section 104 (a) and (b) provide:

"(a) If the certificate by a licensed physician under section 103 (b) states a belief that the individual is likely to injure himself or others if allowed to remain at liberty, any health, welfare, or police officer or any person deputized by a United States commissioner, shall have authority, upon endorsement of the certificate for such purpose by the Governor or by a United States commissioner, to take the individual into custody, apply to a designated hospital for his admission, and transport him thereto.

"(b) Any health, welfare, or police officer who has reason to believe that an individual is mentally ill and, because of his illness, is likely to injure himself or others if not immediately restrained pending examination or certification by a licensed physician or pending endorsement of such certification as provided in subsection (a) of this section, may take the individual into custody, apply to a designated hospital for his admission and transport him thereto. The application for admission shall state the circumstances under which the individual was taken into custody and the reason for the officer's belief."

CAN ORDER EXAMINATION

Further, any "interested party" or any health officer may apply for the hospitalization of someone by court order. All is needed is "a written statement by the applicant that the individual has refused to submit to examination by a licensed physician."

Upon receipt of the application, the United States commissioner does not even have to notify the victim if he "has reason to believe that notice would be likely to be injurious to the proposed patient."

The United States Commissioner then may appoint an examiner to examine the proposed patient. Should the examiner report back that "the proposed patient refuses to submit to an examination, the United States Commissioner shall give notice

to the proposed patient and order him to submit to such examination."

Before the commitment, a hearing is to be held, but the "proposed patient shall not be required to be present, and the United States Commissioner is authorized to exclude all persons not necessary for the conduct of the proceeding."

The Commissioner can bar, at his discretion, friends of the victim from testifying in his behalf.

That the 1-million acre lunatic asylum would be available for "patients" from "the States, the District of Columbia, the Territories and possessions of the United States, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico" is made specific in the bill (sec. 101 (m)).

The resolution presented to the House was amended in two significant instances with no debate. As a matter of fact there was no debate at all. Representative LEO W. O'BRIEN, of Albany, was the leader in lauding the resolution and 14 other Congressmen and the delegate from Alaska joined only to commend the bill and Representative O'BRIEN's presentation of it.

One amendment killed section 123, which would have punished anyone "who wilfully causes or conspires with or assists another to cause (a) the unwarranted hospitalization of any individual * * * or (b) the denial to any individual of any rights granted to him under the provisions of this title * * *"

Why this clause was objectionable to the sponsors of the resolution can only be surmised.

The other amendment raised the acreage from 500,000 to a million acres.

The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held hearings on H. R. 6376 February 20 and 21.

On the first day, the Senators heard Representative EDITH GREEN, of Oregon, and 5 administration officials in approval and 1, Mrs. S. Williams, of Burbank, Calif., in opposition.

On February 25, Senator Richard L. Neuberger, of Oregon, Representative James B. Utt, of California, Mrs. Paul A. Hartz, of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, and Alaska Delegate E. L. Bartlett favored the resolution.

Dr. George L. Snyder, of Los Angeles; Robert H. Williams, of Santa Ana, Calif.; Mrs. Ernest Howard of the 30th Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense; John Kaspar, of Camden, N. J.; Mrs. Lee Birkland, of Van Nuys, Calif., and George C. and Charles P. Finn of Hollywood, Calif., opposed it.

Hearings were then recessed subject to call.

STATES ABETTING BILL IN CONGRESS ON MENTALLY ILL—NEW YORK STATE NOW HAS LAW LEGALIZING DEPORTATIONS OF CITIZENS TO ALASKA—OTHER STATES ALSO ACT—PUBLIC ALERTNESS SEEN ONLY POSSIBLE WAY TO PREVENT SENATE PASSAGE OF BILL

(By Francis Carroll)

Four weeks ago, we wrote an article on legislation, passed by a voice vote in the House of Representatives, to allot 1 million acres of land and $12,500,000 ostensibly for an insane asylum to care for approximately 350 mentally ill people in Alaska. The article opened:

"Those who enjoy an excursion into the land of fantasy will like this story. But it is not fantasy. It is about H. R. 6376. * * *"

To those who perused the article and still withheld judgment because of the seeming incredibility of the facts presented, the recommendation is offered that they obtain a copy of H. R. 6376 and that they scrutinize particularly section 119 (c), which reads:

"The Governor (of Alaska) is hereby further authorized to enter into a reciprocal agreement with any State (of the United States) providing for the care and treatment of mentally ill residents of Alaska by such State, and for the care and treatment of mentally ill residents of such State by Alaska."

STATES ENACTING LAWS

But, it may be objected, a State cannot legally send an alleged mentally ill person out of the State to Alaska. Of course not, but let us suppose the State Legislatures legalize such a proceeding. What then?

But no State Legislature would enact such a law. No? Well, let residents of New York State obtain a copy of chapter 30, New York State Laws, 1956, titled "An act to amend the mental hygiene law in relation to enacting into law and making this State party to the interstate compact on mental health and providing for matters relating thereto." Their assemblymen and State senators who passed the legislation may also be interested in reading the bill now that the sessions in Albany are concluded and they have more time. Governor Averell Harriman approved the legislation February 27.

The same has been proposed before the other State legislatures and passed by some. In Connecticut the bill, known as Public Act 76, is law. It was, we understand, attached as a rider to the flood-relief bill. Pennsylvanians may inquire about House Bill 1990. Residents of other States may check with their own legislators.

Like H. R. 6376, the bill in the State legislatures is based upon a Draft Act Governing the Hospitalization of the Mentally Ill, published (at taxpayers' expense) by the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency in 1952 and written by George S. Stevenson, M. D., medical director of the National Association for Mental Health and former treasurer of the World Federation for Mental Health.

POLITICIANS IN CONTROL

The bill before or passed by the State legislatures, like H. R. 6376, makes it possible for the administration in power to have a political nuisance transported to the 1-million-acre Alaska insane asylum.

It legislates that "duly accredited officers of any State party to this compact, upon the establishment of their authority and the identity of the patient, shall be permitted to transport any patient being moved pursuant to this compact through any and all States party to this compact without interference."

State is defined in the legislation as any State, Territory, or possession of the United States. the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Political appointees of the administration in power have complete control over the disposition of individuals who may be harassing the administration. Article X reads:

"(a) Each party State shall appoint a compact administrator who, on behalf of his State, shall act as general coordinator of activities under the compact in his State and who shall receive copies of all reports, correspondence and other documents relating to any patient processed under the compact by his State either in the capacity of sending or receiving State.

"The compact administrator or his duly designated representative shall be the official with whom other party States shall deal in any matter relating to the compact or any pateint processed thereunder.

"(b) The compact administrators of the respective party States shall have power to promulgate reasonable rules and regulations to carry out more effectively the terms and provisions of this compact."

PROMOTERS CONFIDENT

In the light of the foregoing, this passage from article XIV may be of interest:

"Pursuant to said compact, the Governor is hereby authorized and empowered to designate an officer who shall be the compact administrator and who, acting jointly with like officers of other party States, shall have power to promulgate rules and regulations to carry out more effectively the terms of this compact.

"Said compact administrator shall serve subject to the pleasure of the Governor."

The promoters of what has been described as a potential American Siberia are quite confident. They expect an unsuspecting United States Senate to pass H. R. 6376 without undue comment or fuss as the House did. The act, if voted upon favorably and signed by President Eisenhower, will become effective July 1 of this year.

Meanwhile, State legislatures will have concurred in implementing section 119 (c), thereby facilitating the transportation to Alaska of any individual the administration may feel is interfering with its political program.

This shall be law unless the American public alerts itself without delay. The representatives of the American people in Congress are too busy to study 43 pages of legislation which, upon a glance, seem to pertain only to mentally ill Alaskans.

Members of the various State legislatures cannot take the time, with hundreds of bills before them, to peruse carefully a bill authorizing and directing the Governor "to execute an interstate compact concerning mental health."

Unless the Members of the Congress and the State legislatures are alerted by their constituents, any administration in power will be able legally to send its opponents and dissidents to a Siberia in Alaska.

From the above it is, or should be, obvious that this movement is not a clearly humanitarian project devised solely in the interests of mentally ill Alaskans any more than the movement to fluoridate the water of communities in the United States is necessarily due to a concern for healthy teeth in our children's mouths.

In our earlier articles we have analyzed the sections, paragraphs, and sentences of H. R. 6376, but we omitted one pertinent aspect of the legislation that has been expressed succinctly by Dr. George A. Snyder of Hollywood, Calif., in a recent open letter:

"President Eisenhower was sent south to a warm climate to get well—any doctor knows a warm climate is best. Sending sick people to Alaska as per Alaska bill H. R. 6376 is a medical atrocity. * * * To relate this to a health system is as dishonest as sending President Eisenhower to the cold climate of Alaska to recuperate would have been."

Dr. Snyder continued:

"I ask you, Mr. President, if you belong to an elite that is sent south at public expense and in return allow a bill to pass without comment that sends the same public, when sick, north to Alaska into secrecy, without trial, without proper representation, or even without knowing they have had a trial."

OPPOSITION RISES AGAINST H. R. 6376—ALASKA INSANE ASYLUM PROJECT IS DEFENDED BY CABINET HEAD

(By Francis Carroll)

WASHINGTON.—Two weeks ago this writer pointed out what appeared, and still appears, to be dangerous potentialities in House Resolution 6376, which was passed in the House of Representatives by a voice vote on January 18 and is now in the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The resolution would provide a million acres of land in Alaska and a total of $12,500,000 for an insane asylum.

There was no debate, as such, in the House. Most of the talking was on the desperate plight of the mentally ill in Alaska, a problem every American would like to see solved. A few questions were asked and the replies of Representative LEO W. O'BRIEN of Albany, N. Y., were acknowledged with polite grati-

tude. There was no opposition to the resolution.

SMALL TYPE IGNORED

The resolution took up 14½ columns of small type in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In the printed form it carries over on to page 43. After studying the text and perusing once more the contributions to the "debate," the impression is inevitable that the Congresmen could not have read the resolution.

Their concern was only with the admitted lack of facilities for the mentally ill—estimated at about 350—in Alaska. They indicated no suspicion of any disturbing implications in the wording, which should have been obvious to anyone who had scrutinized the bill.

The article in The Tablet of March 3 summarized the frightening—the term fantastic was used—possibilities in the bill. Each statement was documented with quotations, in context, from the resolution.

Readers of the article wrote to their Congressmen and Senators and copies of the replies forwarded to the Tablet indicate clearly that Members of the Congress have not read the text of the resolution.

A number of them sent their constituents a copy of a statement issued by the Secretary of the Interior which was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Representative JAMES B. UTT, of California, on February 14. It neither disproves nor meets the issues raised in the Tablet article of March 3. One-third of the statement is on the present plight of the mentally ill in Alaska, a problem, as has been observed, which has not been questioned or denied.

The Secretary of the Interior does refer to the appropriation of a million acres—half again as much as the acreage of Rhode Island. He said the land "will not be set aside as a hospital site, but it is the purpose of the legislation that the revenues and income from the sale or lease of the lands will be used to help the Territory of Alaska meet the costs of caring for its mentally ill."

Perhaps the Department of the Interior has an advance tip on a real estate boom on the million acres. If it has, it should make the fact known, for there has been no rush for the property heretofore.

Undoubtedly, the Territory does contain minerals which could be of great value to the United States if men could be obtained to mine it, but the Secretary does not mention this possibility.

A House amendment is H. R. 6376 killed section 128, which provided punishment for those who would cause "the unwarranted hospitalization" of an individual. The Department of the Interior "feels that this provision should be retained and has recommended to the Senate that it be restored." He did not say who killed that particular section alone or why.

DOES NOT DENY CHARGE

The Secretary did note, however, section 119 (c) which authorizes the Governor of Alaska "to enter into a reciprocal agreement with any State providing * * * for the care and treatment of mentally ill residents of such State by Alaska."

The Tablet article of March 3 observed, with reference to section 119 (c), that "this insame asylum is not for Alaskans alone, or even for American residents in Alaska. It could be for any one of us * * *." The statement of the Secretary of the Interior does not question this, but merely says:

"This provision was included so as to authorize treatment at Alaska's expense (or that of the State concerned) in instances where repatriation would not be in the best interest of the patient. This provision must be read in connection with subsection (d) which states that 'due consideration shall be given to the relationship of the patient to his family, legal guardian or friends, so as to maintain relationships and encourage visits beneficial to the patient.'"

A study of the wording of the resolution seems to justify the conclusion that you or I, if we are deemed political nuisances to the authorities in power, can be, according to this and other provisions of H. R. 6376, judged mentally ill and transported by the United States Government to the site in Alaska.

Yet Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, in a statement on the subject sent to those opposing H. R. 6376, declares:

"In no case and under no circumstances could a resident of New York or any other State be shipped up to Alaska against his will. A resident of any State would have to be in Alaska at the time he became mentally ill in order to be treated in Alaska, and even then he would have the right under the bill to return to his home State, or his family or next friend could assert this right for him."

FAILED TO QUOTE BILL

Senator MURRAY should have supported this guaranty by quoting from the bill itself and by giving an explanation of section 119 (c). If the resolution is adopted, the legislation will be carried out according to the wording, not according to Senator MURRAY's personal interpretation.

(Editor's note: As the Tablet goes to press, a letter has been received from Senator MURRAY in which he says:

("Let me assure you that no resident of New York, or any other State, possibly could be shipped to Alaska as a mentally ill person. If he were in Alaska at the time he became mentally ill, he could be treated in Alaska, if he or his next best friend wished, provided there was a reciprocity agreement with New York whereby a resident of Alaska who became mentally ill while in New York could be treated in New York.")

The Secretary's statement assures that "the bill does not authorize star chamber proceedings. Notice is required (sec. 108 (f)) to be given at least to the legal representatives, friends, and other interested parties and the patient, his guardian, and other interested parties are afforded an opportunity to appear, testify, and to present and cross-examine witnesses."

The statement does not go to the end of section 108 (f). The subsection at greater length follows:

"The proposed patient, the applicant, the legal guardian, and other interested parties as determined by the (United States) Commissioner shall be given notice and afforded an opportunity to appear at the hearing, to testify, and to present and cross-examine witnesses, and the United States Commissioner may, in his discretion, receive the testimony of any other person. The proposed patient shall not be required to be present, and the United States Commissioner is authorized to exclude all persons not necessary for the conduct of the proceedings."

This sentence is also in the same subsection: "The United States Commissioner shall receive and maintain a record of all relevant and material evidence which may be offered concerning the mental condition and the residence of the proposed patient and shall not be bound by the rules of evidence."

Early in February an editorial was sent to editors of all Scripps-Howard papers in support of H. R. 6376. It was titled "Poison Penwomen" and accused fanatics of attempting through scurrilous literature to hold back the progress of Alaska, our great and vital northern Territory."

The editorial accused the poison penwomen with deluging newspapers and public officials with a crude circular denouncing H. R. 6376. It, too, bemoaned the plight of mentally ill cases in Alaska and emphasized that the bill is supported by the Eisenhower administration and by leaders of both parties in Congress, as well as by virtually every organization which is concerned with Alaska's progress.

EXECUTIVE BRANCH HELPED

Last Saturday the New York World-Telegram and Sun carried a portion of the editorial and also an article on H. R. 6376.

The article attributed to Representative O'BRIEN the charges that protests against H. R. 6376 are based on a distortion of the purposes of the bill, and that those protesting employed such bitter phrases as "treasonable proposal" and "you ought to be shot by a firing squad." It labeled the protests "condemnatory missives."

The article quotes Representative O'BRIEN as saying, "If the lunatic-fringe elements opposing this bill succeed in getting it killed, my faith in democratic government will come close to being destroyed."

The article contributes one fact that may, or may not, have some significance, namely, that although the bill was introduced by Representative EDITH GREEN of Oregon, it actually was the outgrowth of an administrative proposal worked out by no fewer than three executive departments—Justice, Interior, and Health, Education and Welfare.

The World-Telegram and Sun seemed to ignore section 119 (c) in telling its readers the section applied only to Alaskans or the Alaska residents of the States.

The provisions of H. R. 6376 need to be clarified and frankly presented to the American public. Those who have studied the 43-page legislation appear to be on sound ground in opposing it in its present form.

Nor are they satisfied with Senator MURRAY's assurance that "our Senate committee had 2 more days of hearings, at which everyone who made timely request was heard in full."

The speciousness of that lies in the fact that only a few Americans knew the bill had been passed by a voice vote in the House and sent to Senator MURRAY's committee. The press did not alert the people and even those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, after perusing the seemingly innocuous discourses during the debate on the resolution, would hardly have taken the time to study the 14½ columns of fine print that followed.

No committee hearings were held in the House of Representatives. The resolution was in the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs but was brought to the floor of the House by Representative WILLIAM M. COLMER, of Mississippi, by a special resolution. The debate was not to exceed 2 hours.

Congressman O'BRIEN, Senator MURRAY, and other supporters of H. R. 6376 are men of many responsible tasks and it is surprising that they express indignation and not welcome upon receiving the counsel and suggestions of American citizens who have studied the resolution.

The Situation in the Middle East—Excerpts From Address by Thomas K. Finletter

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, there is an organization, of which I was pleased to be one of the founding members, called the America-Israel Society, whose

purpose it is to promote cultural relations between the United States and the Republic of Israel.

At its annual dinner on April 17 one of the principal speakers of the evening was my good friend, the Honorable Thomas K. Finletter, former Secretary of the Air Force. Mr. Finletter delivered a most penetrating and thought-provoking analysis of the present Middle Eastern situation, and submitted a series of proposals for action which commend themselves to me, at least, as some of the most comprehensive and constructive I have heard. Mr. Finletter's analysis of the military situation is certainly an authoritative one, and worthy of our most earnest attention. Mr. Finletter urged, as I have on numerous occasions, that arms be furnished to Israel.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from this arresting address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THOMAS K. FINLETTER AT AMERICA-ISRAEL SOCIETY, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 17, 1956

Governor McKeldin, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am glad to be here tonight, in this week which marks the eighth anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Israel, in these days of tension and danger for the Republic. I welcome the opportunity of paying tribute to the creative, courageous people of Israel.

Many of you have visited Israel and know at first hand what has been accomplished there. But even those who have not trod the ground itself know that in the short time of 8 years a State has been created; three-quarters of a million immigrants have been received and settled; a system of representative government as free as any in the world has been set up; a vigorous economy is developing, and educational and religious institutions are growing stronger as the months pass.

All this would be amazing under any circumstances. What makes it almost incredible is that it has been accomplished in an atmosphere of hostility and under the constant threat of war.

We Americans have a moral identification with Israel. We have a stake in the well-being and safety of this sister democracy.

* * * * *

The best way for us, this evening, to pay tribute to the creative spirit of the people of Israel is to consider what can be done to release that spirit from the worries and dangers which beset it so that it may be free to fulfill itself in all its full power.

Peace is what Israel needs, just as the whole world needs peace. Israel's need for peace is immediate and critical.

But Israel needs help if she is to have peace, because Israel is at the focal point of battle in the current Russian offensive against the Free World. The Russians have moved their attack, for the moment, away from Korea, the Strait of Formosa, and the Vietnam, and are driving hard in the Near East. Israel is their tactical target. Israel is in danger on behalf of all the Free World.

What are we, the United States, going to do about it?

* * * * *

Well, we have, immediately pressing us, a dangerous emergency, and then later, if we all survive, the longer-term problem of a general Near Eastern settlement.

We will do well to talk first about the emergency or there won't be anything to settle in the settlement.

You all know what has happened. The Russians, taking advantage of the jealousies among certain states of the Near East caused by American and British support of Iraq in the Northern Tier or Baghdad Alliance, jumped over the Northern Tier and injected themselves into the affairs of the Near East. They invaded, that is, the home territory of the Free World.

The device the Russians used for this invasion was to make a deal with Egypt to sell her, in exchange for Egyptian cotton, a considerable number of Russian MIG–15 jet fighters and Russian IL–28 twin-engine jet bombers, both superb modern aircraft, as well as other war materiel.

With these modern jet aircraft Egypt will dominate the skies over Israel and will be able to destroy the urban life of Israel in a matter of hours—unless Israel gets the necessary high-class defensive aircraft which can handle these Russian fighters and bombers.

The Government of Israel is asking us, I understand, for some of our surplus F–86, Sabre jets, which have shown in Korea that they can handle the Russian MIG–15s.

The Israelis must have these aircraft. They must have whatever is necessary to enable them to defend themselves against annihilation by the Soviet airplanes. If they need them the Israelis must have not only these obsolescing F–86 day fighters, but the finest and newest all-weather defensive fighters in the possession of the United States.

The Israelis must have also whatever other war equipment is needed to enable them to defend themselves against the weapons the Russians have given to the neighbors of Israel—whether this be antitank guns to defend against the Russian tanks, or subchasers to operate against Russian-made submarines; or whatever.

* * * * *

Let us understand clearly the reason for arming the Israel forces. It would not be alone our sympathy, our identification with, this courageous, free people facing huge numerical odds and, now, superior modern war equipment furnished to Israel's neighbors by Communist Russia. It also would be that to give defensive arms to Israel would be the most effective way of deterring the outbreak of war in the Near East.

Other measures, of course, will have to be taken and I shall mention some of them in a moment. But the most practical immediate step to prevent shooting in the Near East is to give the Israeli forces the means with which to defend their country against these Russian airplanes, tanks, and submarines which the Russians are giving to the neighbors of Israel.

Let us not worry about starting an arms race. The race is already on, with Russia well ahead. Let us get Israel in a position to defend herself and then, when there is a balance, let us demand from the Russians that we all embargo the sending of further arms to any State of the Near East.

Let us not worry either that the Israelis cannot win an arms race becaues they are but 1,700,000 in number against fifty-odd million others in the Near East. The spirit counts; and the Israelis showed 8 or so years ago that if they have the arms they are quite capable of defending themselves.

Nor do I see any point in letting our British, French, and Canadian friends do the job of equipping the Israeli forces, while we pretend not to take notice of this invasion of the Near East by Russia. Let us do openly, ourselves, what is right.

There is only one power which will profit by the destruction of Israel. That is Russia. No country yet has helped itself by taking favors from the Russians. Favors from Russia are the prelude to slavery. I suggest that we do our part to block this Russian scheme for enslaving the peoples of the Near East.

* * * * *

There is something else we have to do to handle the present emergency. It is that the United States reaffirm unconditionally the Tri-Partite Declaration of May 25, 1950. I speak of reaffirmation by the United States because there is no doubt about the two other parties to the declaration, Great Britain and France, standing by their commitments. But there have been some statements recently by the United States Government which may be taken to throw doubt on our position.

Under this declaration, you will remember, the three powers, Great Britain, France, and the United States, in effect guaranteed the armistice boundaries between Israel and her neighbors against any violation by force in either direction.

This is a solemn undertaking by the United States Government on behalf of the people of the United States. I cannot believe that this country ever will default on its given word. I cannot believe that if there is an attack on Israel this country will do otherwise than honor its signature.

I add that by making it indubitably clear to Egypt and to Israel and everyone else that the United States will not allow a breach of the peace in the Near East, the United States will thereby reduce, I believe, to the vanishing point, the likelihood of anyone starting a war in that part of the world. I add too that the converse is true: To allow any doubt to arise as to what the United States will do if anyone violates the boundaries of Israel will add greatly and dangerously to the likelihood that someone will start such a war.

There is, though, no use putting our heads in the sand about the fact that some of the recent statements of United States officials may give the impression that we may stand by inertly if an attack is made against Israel or, equally bad, that we will not move until after an aggression has taken place and then only to mediate a settlement betwen the rival parties.

Thus, a recent statement by the White House press secretary, said to be made "with the full approval of the President," states that United States policy in the Near East crisis is to consist of three points: (1) support of the Hammarskjold mission; (2) the observing by the United States, within its constitutional means, of its commitments under the charter of the United Nations to oppose any aggression in the area; and (3) to "support and assist," whatever that may mean, any nation which may be subjected to aggression.

All this, you will note, contains no reference to the 1950 declaration. Is this intentional? Is the 1950 declaration repudiated by exclusion?

Then too, various recent official statements of United States officials give the impression that it would be better practice that a commitment such as the 1950 declaration be submitted to Congress for ratification in accordance with the precedent established by the resolution on the Formosa Strait. Is this another doubt cast upon the binding effect of the obligations of the United States under the declaration of May 1950?

I deeply hope not. Such doubts would only encourage those men who think they can get away with violence, those men who may rely on the slowness to act of the free democracies. Doubts of this kind about the 1950 declaration can only increase greatly the likelihood of war, a war which in all probability would bring in, too late, the United States and perhaps all the rest of the world on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

Meanwhile, until all shadows of doubt upon the 1950 declaration are removed, we can only watch and pray, and read the daily dispatches from Tel Aviv and Cairo and Beirut and Amman, fearing each day to read of that fatal spark which will light the tinderbox of the Near East and set the world aflame.

Let us not allow this to happen. Now is the time for the United States to act on high principle. Now is the time for the

clearest kind of official statement by the Government of our country that we will not tolerate a breach of the peace in the Near East. In the name of our passion for peace, in the name of right and our own self-respect, let us make it indubitably clear that the United States intends to stick to its word and that we will not allow war to happen.

* * * * *

You may ask: Why should we pinpoint our policy on the 1950 declaration which in essence operates outside the United Nations; why should not the threats to the peace in the Near East be handled entirely by the United Nations?

There is, I think, good reason for not changing our policy of relying on the 1950 declaration.

Of course, the U. N. must be supported and made a world vehicle for peace. Unless we all back the U. N. and give it more and more power there will be no lasting peace. We must support the work of the present Hammarskjold mission and all future efforts of the U. N. to help avoid war.

But we should not now cast on the world organization the main responsibility for the problems of the Near East. We will be doing harm to the U. N. if we ask it to handle matters for which it is not prepared. To ask the U. N. to bring about a solution of the problems of the Near East at the present time is to ask it to mediate between the great powers; and the U. N. is not ready to take on this, the most difficult of tasks. We will serve the U. N. better if the free world settles its own problems in the Near East and establishes stability in the area. We cannot, I believe, deal with Russia in the Security Council until this stability has been established.

* * * * *

With determined action of this kind we may retrieve a dangerous situation. Then will come the time for the long-term program.

It seems fruitless to talk of long-term projects now, when the house is afire. I shall suggest only some broad lines of the long-term solution.

The first and most important thing to do is to get a definitive peace treaty signed between Israel and Israel's neighbors.

As long as there is no peace treaty the emergency will continue, the threat of war will be with us, and we cannot think of long-term solutions.

The boundaries in the peace treaty should be the armistice lines which were guaranteed by the 1950 declaration, with only minor mutually agreed upon adjustments.

The peace treaty must solve the refugee problem. The United States must be prepared to help financially in this solution, and so must Israel within her capabilities.

The responsibility for the Arab refugees is wider though than this. The reestablishment of the refugees in Israel is completely inconsistent with the continuation of the State of Israel. The Arab refugees are world responsibility, just as the plight of the Jews in Europe and north Africa was and is a world responsibility. The Arabs should now join the United States and Israel and the rest of the free peoples by accepting a special share of the responsibility for the reestablishment of those who have been displaced.

I think too that the peace treaty should call for a substantial measure of disarmament among all the states of the area. The present armaments of the Near Eastern countries are enough to enable them to fight each other but are not enough to enable them to defend themselves against an invasion from without by Russia.

Once the peace treaty is signed the conditions for peaceful progress will exist. Then we can set up a great cooperative effort for the development of the economy of the area for the benefit of all the peoples who live there.

There is, I think, no point in discussing the form such an arrangement might take. It is sufficient to say that there must first be the willingness of the peoples of the area to work for their common good, and that it is for those outside the area who are able, such as the United States, Great Britain, France, and I hope India, to contribute to the peoples of the Near East whatever material help these people may wish, all to be given, I may add, without strings and without any attempt whatsoever to gain influence by the aid which is given.

But none of these things will be possible until the conditions of peace are established. The definitive peace treaty is therefore the critical point which will establish whether we can or cannot go forward to develop the Near East for the benefit of all the people who live there, and thereby to solidify the cause of freedom in that part of the world.

All of this is for the longer run. The immediate steps must be the arming of Israel and the firming up of the stand of the United States on a policy of seeing to it that there shall be no violence by anyone in the Near East.

With these two policies firmly carried out by our country I believe that we may look forward to many more celebrations in honor of the courageous, pioneering spirit of the people of Israel.

Americanism: Its Positive Aspects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address entitled "Americanism: Its Positive Aspects," delivered by Judge Irving R. Kaufman at the dinner concluding the annual Americanism seminar of the American Legion Department of Minnesota, at St. Paul, Minn., on April 14, 1956.

This is an outstanding address by a distinguished jurist and a great American. I feel that it is worthy of the attention of the Members of the Congress and the general public.

The Public Printer has advised me that the cost of this insertion will be $240.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICANISM: ITS POSITIVE ASPECTS

(Address by Judge Irving R. Kaufman at the dinner concluding the Annual Americanism Seminar of the American Legion, Department of Minnesota at St. Paul, Minn., April 14, 1956)

Man's liberties never appear so precious to him as when he is in danger of losing them. Thus it is, that in times of our Nation's greatest crises, we as a people have become acutely aware of our heritage of freedom.

All of us here tonight have lived through at least two terrible wars, many of us can remember a third. As former servicemen, you each have your own most vivid memories of those harrowing years, but all of us share in common the vivid memory of those first agonizing months after Pearl Harbor when all we loved stood endangered. There is not one among us who did not pause at that time to take stock of the wonderful way of life that was ours.

Today, we are again engaged in a mortal struggle which has been thrust upon us. In this dread struggle, often called the cold war, our weapons are political, economic and ideological. This means that in the present conflict, even more so than in former ones, it is vitally necessary that we fully understand this heritage that is America, so that we can make it understandable to those whose trust, friendship and support is vital to our survival. The importance of our awareness of the meaning of our heritage and the necessity that we all have an understanding of our constitutional system can best be demonstrated by a consideration of the problems we face in this all-out struggle we call the cold war.

In a conventional war, the problems of the combatants are relatively simple. We know the enemy and the goal is to destroy him. But with the advent of hydrogen bombs and intercontinental ballistic missiles, it has become increasingly apparent, even to the Russians, that neither side can win another hot war. It is clear that a third world war probably would lead to annihilation of both sides, and destruction of civilization as we know it. The fantasies of science fiction writers who describe the ruins of a post-atomic world are becoming less fantastic day by day, as word is revealed to the public of the invention of more and more destructive and ultimate weapons against which there is no defense, leaving us only to guess at the scope of the implements of destruction still shrouded in a veil of secrecy, created either by us or by the masters of the Kremlin.

This is not to say that the Russians have completely abandoned all thoughts of another hot war; a nation which has not hesitated to liquidate millions of its own citizens cannot be expected to shrink from the thought of destroying lives elsewhere. But, if we maintain our constant military vigil, Russia will undoubtedly continue to keep our struggle at the political and economic level.

Indeed, the recent new line emerging from Moscow indicates quite clearly that the new Communist line is to co-exist capitalism to death. At the recent 20th Communist Party Congress, Nikita Khrushchev admitted that "coexistence is only a means to an end—the world transforming * * * complete triumph of communism."

Speaking of the 900 million members of the Communist conspiracy throughout the world, he proclaimed that they were "in a position to capture a stable majority in Parliament and to transform the latter from an organ of bourgeois democracy into a genuine instrument of the people's will." If Russia plans to convert the world to communism by so-called parliamentary methods, this clearly means that Russia will aim a barrage of Communist propaganda and espionage at freedom-loving countries, the like of which we have never seen.

That these tactics have been successful in the past was clearly pointed out last year by the able Gen. David A. Sarnoff, chairman of the board of RCA, and now Chairman of the National Security Training Commission by appointment of the President. He said:

"Moscow has brought one-third of the human race under its iron control by means short of a hot war—by shrewd diplomacy, deception, propaganda, the blackmail of threats, fifth-column subversion, guerrilla forces, and, where expedient, localized shooting wars. These political and psychological methods—the cold war—have paid off, at smaller risk and infinitely lower cost than a hot war would entail.

"Accordingly they are being applied without stint to the conquest of the rest of man-

kind. For world communism, with its high command in the Kremlin in Moscow, the cold war is not a temporary or holding operation, nor a prelude to a hot war. It is the main bout, the decisive offensive, conducted on an unlimited scale, with total victory as its goal."

The question is, therefore, how can we beat the Russians at their own game and with this main bout. Beat them, we can, for most assuredly, our way of life if properly and honestly portrayed has infinitely more appeal than that found in the countires behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. Basically, all people the world over want a decent home and a decent job—a chance to live free of fear and free from want, and an opportunity to exercise their religious beliefs freely. These are the ends which our way of life has been providing for Americans—and it is essential that the whole world know our success story.

Since, unlike our Communist opponents, we do not rewrite history or suppress news of the mistakes we make and the problems we cannot resolve, these men and women whose understanding and friendship we seek have constant access to the stories of our failures, stories which are always grist for the Communist propaganda mill with its branches throughout the world. Every time these people hear of the isolated race riot, or of some overzealous police officer running rampant over the rights of an accused, or of a trial conducted in an atmosphere of prejudice, our counteroffensive suffers a serious setback, as the Communists jubilantly point out that we Americans don't practice the liberty we preach. Working to insure a climate of social and political opinion where these failures cannot occur is my idea of a program of positive Americanism, the results of which will be felt throughout the world.

Essential to any such program of positive Americanism is an understanding of just what that term implies—a reevaluation of our American heritage. That you and I are in agreement as to the need for such constant reevaluation is shown by your gathering here tonight—and I am privileged to have the opportunity to discuss such a program with this fine group, for you who are veterans of the wars we have waged to retain our freedom have demonstrated your dedication to the American way of life on bloody battlefields throughout the world.

Further, when you returned to your peacetime pursuits, you were among those who realized that the fight to preserve decency and democracy was not yet over—and indeed would never be over—and as sober responsible citizens who understood full well that the duties of citizenship mean much more than a periodic trip to the polls, you joined the American Legion and assumed an obligation under the preamble of its constitution "to inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, State and Nation" and "to foster and perpetuate a 100 percent Americanism."

Since then, as veterans, legionnaires, and responsible citizens you have constantly been attempting to evaluate just what "100 percent Americanism" is because, unlike other isms, Americanism has no one narrow creed, no one comprehensive solution to all the world's ills.

America's heritage is diversity, and the breath of her life is constant progress—new ideas and new horizons. As members of a veterans' group whose sole yardstick for membership is war-tested citizenship without regard to differences in rank, race, creed, color or birth, you are aware of the wide variety of cultural and ethnic patterns from which our Nation has sprung—and from your work through your national organization, you have become aware of the differences in viewpoint between Americans of different walks of life who live in settings as dissimilar from each other as the crowded sidewalks and subways of New York City and the rolling pasturelands and sparkling lakes of this fair State.

Yet, through all these differences, you have perceived a sense of unity, a common set of goals, ideals and aspirations that link the city dweller to the farmer, and the northerner to the southerner in ties that bind so closely that their other local differences cannot pull them apart.

At this day-long seminar, you have been attempting to probe into this sense of oneness that is America, and to evaluate its credo in terms of Americanism, and in terms of a philosophy of everyday life. This awareness of our country's diversity and faith in its unity is a basic necessity to any program of positive Americanism. Tonight, I would like to go further into this program of evaluation of our American heritage and of our living by the Constitution.

The basic feature of our constitutional system is that the rules by which we live have been written down so that no ruler or government can ever say that certain rights are not ours. This idea of a written embodiment of rights can be traced to the 13th century—to the Magna Carta—when the British barons forced King John to grant them certain rights—and they put these rights in writing, under his sign and seal, so he could never renege on his promise.

When our own young country was formed, not only was its basic governmental document set forth in writing; but, despite the fact that the Federal Government was to be one of strictly limited powers, the First Congress insisted upon 10 amendments to the Constitution which set forth certain basic liberties of the people with which the Government was forbidden to tamper. Thus, the slogan of the wise businessman, "Put It in Writing," has in a sense been the slogan of our country's political heritage—"Put It in Writing"—so that all men may know their rights and know the rules by which they live.

In considering the importance of understanding these rules by which we live, I am reminded of the story of the boy of very tender years who presented something of a problem to his troubled parents. Although they had tried every known inducement, they simply could not get him to eat. After a number of meals at which the boy sat indifferently fingering his tableware, the concerned father used as a last resort the promise that the boy could have anything he wanted to eat. After thinking a bit, the boy said he wanted a worm for dinner. After the initial shock had subsided, the father left the table fuming, and said that if that's what the boy wanted he would have it. He thereupon went to the garden, dug up the fattest worm he could find, and dashed back to the house with it. Slapping the worm on the boy's empty plate, the father told him that there it was and now he was to eat it. The boy set up an immediate howl and said he would not eat it unless it were fried. At that, the father jumped up from the table and flung the worm into a frying pan with a piece of butter. When it was done to a crispy brown, the worm was put back on the empty plate with the admonition "Now, eat it." But again the boy howled. The father indignantly demanded that the boy eat the fried worm, as that was what he had asked for; but the boy refused, protesting that he wouldn't eat until has father first ate half.

With purplish countenance and shaking hands, the father grabbed a fork, whacked the worm in two and gulped half. Now, with victory at hand, the father lifted the plate with the uneaten half on it, held it under the boy's nose, and demanded that he eat. The boy burst into a rage of tears and refused. Seizing him by the shoulders the father roared to know why after his every demand had been met, he now refused to eat the worm. "Because," the boy triumphantly smiled through his tears, "you ate the half I wanted."

Homely anecdotes often yield powerful themes—and to me this story is a classic reminder that it is a good idea to check the rulebook before getting into the game. Similarly, when we attempt to formulate a program of positive Americanism, it is wise to look to the constitutional rulebook.

A reading of the provisions of the Consitution which comprise a comprehensive scheme of governmental checks and balances, and of the Bill of Rights with its safeguards for freedom of the individual and the individual's right to speak—and a knowledge of the way that, from its inception, this constitutional blueprint has been effectuated by a system of opposing political parties—make it apparent that a basic rule of our form of democratic government is the agreement that there is a right to disagree.

Our Constitution provides a framework within which all men are free to express their opinions and to advocate their acceptance in the free market place of ideas. So long as the dissenter, the dreamer, or the dissident is content to purvey his ideas in this free market place, not attempting to stifle others, but to answer them, and so long as he does not attempt to destroy this constitutional framework by force and subversion, but rather is content to work within that framework and seek changes through the ballot box, we have a duty to let him be heard.

And when we do not perform that duty, when we fail to speak up for the rights of what I will term the honest dissenter, we not only fail to live up to that heritage of freedom which our ancestors have fought to preserve, but we lose another round in the battle of words and ideals we are waging with Moscow. As I mentioned earlier, we are, in a sense, attempting to sell democracy to the world, and the best way to sell democracy is to show that it works—to show that unlike the masters of the Kremlin who also utter high-sounding phrases about freedom, we here in America actually practice what we preach.

When the Russians speak of their country as democratic, we call them hypocrites, because under their system, no man is free to disagree with the regime. When the party line changes, all too often those officials whose views are no longer considered orthodox lose their lives as well as their jobs. But when we stifle honest criticism and when we ostracize the well-meaning dissenter, we are not practicing democracy either, but are adding fuel to the Communist fire. We must never forget that it is the underlying belief of our democracy that in a free and open encounter of opinions, truth will ultimately prevail over falsehood. And it is a second basic concept of our democracy that it is only when the people are given free access to all the different competing viewpoints that they can recognize the truth and thus choose wisely.

The phenomenal advance of our country in its relatively short history is due in large part to the fact that to our shores have come men of vision, men with new ideas—social, economic, political, and scientific—who felt stifled in the Old World, and came to this land of youth and opportunity to make their dreams a reality. And as our young country grappled with the many problems that arose over the years—the question of slavery, the rise of industry, the threat of monopoly and the struggle of labor and farmers for better conditions—there were always many voices urging different solutions—pointing out evils and suggesting remedies. Had their voices been stifled—our country could not have grown, as time and again our history has shown that the starry-eyed dreamer of today is the conservative of tomorrow. You here

in Minnesota need little reminder of the Farmers Alliance, the Grangers, and finally the Populist Party which in 1892 campaigned in the national elections with a platform far too radical to be adopted by either major party. Among measures urged in their program were Government loans to farmers at low-interest rates, a graduated income tax, tariff reduction, postal savings banks, shorter working hours, laws protecting labor unions, and popular election of Senators. Today the most conservative members of all political parties would never dream of advocating the abolition of any of these once progressive ideas.

It is because our Constitution contemplates these continual variations in political and social opinion, and provides for peaceful elections to carry out the ever-changing mandate of the people, that we have no need for, and cannot permit groups to organize who advocate violent changes in our form of government. For those who advocate the overthrow of our Government by force must admit that their program does not have popular appeal, and cannot win out in the free and open exchange of ideas—were their ideas capable of such a victory, violence would be unnecessary.

We are all well aware of the fact that the Communists are such a group. This fact was forthrightly recognized by the late Justice Jackson of the United States Supreme Court in 1950. Concurring in the decision which upheld the requirement of the Taft-Hartley Act, that union leaders file non-Communist affidavits, he said:

"The goal of the Communist Party is to seize powers of government by and for a minority rather than to acquire power through the vote of a free electorate."

He added: "The American Communists have imported the totalitarian organization's disciplines and techniques, notwithstanding the fact that this country offers them and other discontented elements a way to peaceful revolution by ballot."

Because of the resort by Communists to violence, treachery, and intrigue as the means to their ends, he maintained, Congress has rightly decided that they should not be permitted to occupy key posts in the labor movement—from which positions they could attempt to paralyze the country economically.

Similarly, measures have been taken to prevent Communists from serving in sensitive positions in government and in our public schools, and the Supreme Court has approved these measures. Further, by security checks, Communists are prevented from obtaining positions in industrial plants vital to our Nation's defense. These decisions and security measures are sound, and we must constantly maintain our vigilance against those who seek to destroy our heritage—but we must always remember that basic to these decisions is the fact that the Communists would use violence in their attempt to make us accept a regime which they know will never gain acceptance by constitutional means.

In urging that while you maintain your vigil against Communist subversion you maintain equal vigil to insure that not all who disagree with the majority, politically or economically, are blindly labeled Communists, I realize that I make no simple request. It is complicated by the fact that while on the one hand, Communists often parade in false dress as advocates of liberal causes, on the other hand, we cannot permit a worthy movement to be defeated merely because a few Communists are attempting to infiltrate it. We cannot let certain worthwhile causes become Communist property—and yet we are in danger of doing so. The Communists, who we know have abolished all civil rights in the countries under their yoke, will often be heard hypocritically in defense of certain of our precious liberties—but these liberties do not become any the less precious because the Communists have temporarily decided to pay them lip service. Yet, all too often, others who then speak out in favor of those same vital rights are branded as Communists, or fellow travelers, for some believe in the old saying that: "Where there is smoke there is fire." I urge you, the next time you hear that familiar theme, don't rush blindly with an ax at the smoke thus created—you may chop at a firefighter instead of at the fire. When we strike blindly at all who espouse an honest and decent cause merely because the Communists are also paying it lip service, we play right into the hands of the Communists both here and abroad.

All the Communists need to do is take refuge behind the very civil rights which we know they are pledged to destroy, and then others fearful of being labeled subversive, will shun the term "civil rights" as a Communist label.

A specific case in point is the fifth amendment. If our Founding Fathers had been told that there would come a time in American history when many would urge the repeal of the privilege against self-incrimination, they would have been numbed with disbelief that we could so easily suggest relinquishing a right that was won by a slow and costly process in the fight against tyranny and torture. The idea that a man should not be compelled to bear witness against himself has been fundamental to our idea of justice in the courts, to our belief in man's inherent dignity, and to our tradition that a man is innocent until proven guilty. But the consistency with which Communists have been invoking this privilege in recent years has led some peoeple, in their justifiable frustration, summarily to condemn the whole doctrine, to urge its abolition, and to label as Communists many who speak out in favor of retaining the privilege. And when we react in this manner, we fall into the Communist trap by endangering the very liberties which they seek to destroy. As farmers, many of you know that if a borer attempts to eat into your prize apple tree—you eliminate the borer—you don't chop down the tree.

This need for not letting worthy causes fall into Communist hands by default, and the necessity for perceiving the difference between Communist dogma and solid American ideals being perverted by the Communists, and the importance of differentiating between Communists and honest liberals in our fight against communism was pointed out by that very able and dedicated American, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in an article published in Newsweek magazine as far back as June 1947. He opened by saying:

"Our best defense in the United States against the menace of communism is our American way of life."

He continued: "We can successfully defeat the Communist attempt to capture the United States by fighting it with truth and justice implemented with a few 'don'ts.'"

He then proceeded to list 10 "don'ts."

"Don't label anyone as a Communist unless you have the facts.

"Don't confuse liberals and progressives with Communists.

"Don't take the law into your own hands. If Communists violate the law, report such facts to your law enforcement agency.

"Don't be a party to the violation of the civil rights of anyone. When this is done you are playing directly into the hands of the Communists.

"Don't let up on the fight against real Fascists, the KKK, and other dangerous groups.

"Don't let Communists in your organization or labor union outwork, outvote, or outnumber you."

On this last point, I might add, that Mr. Hoover's advice means that if a few Communists try to infiltrate your local organizations—don't abandon ship and hand them the organization as a gift. Fight back and clear them from your group. But in order for people to be able to follow this advice, it means that all of us must distinguish between the Communist dominated group, and the group which a few Communists are trying to infiltrate. To the members of the latter group, who are trying to combat this infiltration, we must lend our wholehearted support, and be careful of where we pin the Communist label. And yet we must do this while following Mr. Hoover's other "don'ts."

"Don't be hoodwinked by Communist propaganda that says one thing but means destruction of the American way of life. Expose it with the truth.

"Don't give aid and comfort to the Communist cause by joining front organizations, contributing to their campaign chests or by championing their cause in any way, shape, or form.

"Don't let Communists infiltrate into our schools, churches, and moulders of public opinion, the press, radio, and screen."

As I mentioned earlier, we are living today through one of the free world's most trying periods; the intense global nature of the Communist conspiracy confronts us with threats within and without our border. We must not grow weary and frustrated at the continuing high cost imposed upon us in defending ourselves against this threat. Too often as these frustrations mount, we hear seductive voices from within ourselves, as well as from our fellow men. These voices call upon us to take short cuts, to invoke expedients, strike for what seem to be quick and easy solutions. When these seductive voices tell us, "Deal with the enemy or suspected enemy within our midst the way he would deal with us, and strip him of his rights the way he would have stripped us"—these voices are actually spreading Communist doctrine.

We must never become so completely consumed with this ever-present Communist threat that our thinking is motivated by what we hate rather than by our love of the American way. Unfortunately, some of us have begun to hate each other—particularly when we are in disagreement over some fundamental issue. It was this condition which led a contemporary philosopher to warn that, "If we permit our hatred of Russia to replace our love of the American dream as the motivation of our lives, we will have accorded communism the greatest tribute to which any dogma may aspire, the power to dictate the thinking of its enemies."

It is interesting to note, that Mr. Hoover, who has been in this fight against communism longer than most Americans concluded his list of the 10 ways to fight communism with the following admonition:

"Don't fail to make democracy work with equal opportunity and the fullest enjoyment of every American's right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

This necessity for faith in our democratic processes and for constant vigilance against both extremes which Mr. Hoover expressed so ably, keeps us engaged in a difficult and trying process. Over 100 years ago, an old American political leader, Fisher Ames, described democracy with pardonable vulgarity. He said "Democracy is like a raft. You never sink but damn it, your feet are always in the water." And I believe, and I am sure you do too, that our democratic system is well worth the discomfort of constant wet feet.

Striving to create a better America would be sufficient end in itself were there no Communist menace, but such actions take on new importance in the context of the cold war. Every time a group of Americans take positive action to prevent some miscarriage of justice, that means there is one less incident for the Communists to seize upon in their current propaganda offensive—and it

also means that there is one more incident that an alert American press can seize upon to aid us in our cold war offensive.

And on this point, I might add that I believe we should reorient our thinking toward the part our press should play in our national and international life. We should recognize that it not only reports news to Americans, who, as citizens, are anxious to learn of mistakes which have been made that need correction, and who usually take it for granted that no news on any issue means good news. Rather, our press today also serves as source material for foreign news services, and this latter role means that equal emphasis and equal space should be devoted to reporting accomplishments in our country which we here take for granted, and to relating the numerous small instances of Americanism in action which occur throughout the Nation. I urge this because if our news reports lay more stress on our occasional miscarriages of justice than they do on the good we practice daily, there will be conveyed to the world a distorted picture of American life.

In this regard, I am reminded of a heartwarming incident which was related by Dr. Mordecai Johnson, president of Howard University in Washington. It seems that, while Dr. Johnson was on a train trip in the South, not too long ago, he noticed a fellow passenger, a young Negro boy, who seemed very upset and ill at ease. When Dr. Johnson asked what was troubling him, he replied: "I am the first Negro to be admitted to the University of Arkansas and I don't want to enter. I feel that I will have a most unpleasant experience, but all my relatives and friends insist that it is my duty to go there." The boy's anxiety increased as the train drew closer to Fayetteville, Ark., where the school was located, and he became deeply concerned when, looking out the train window as he pulled into the station, he saw 35 white boys waiting on the platform. He was sure that the only motivation which could have brought that group to the station was to give him a hostile reception—a confirmation of his worst fears. However, his concern quickly turned to relief when, as he stepped from the train, one of the boys approached him, extended his hand, and said: "Last night a group of us were talking about you and how you would feel on coming to the university, and we decided to come here and offer you our friendship." Those students were practicing positive Americanism in its best and truest sense. They were not antisegregation crusaders, but southerners born and bred who had been brought up to believe that segregation was proper. But now that its end was decreed, they had come as fellow human beings and fellow Americans to offer their friendship to one whose struggle to adjust to the new way of life seemed to be just that much more difficult than their own.

It is a story like this that makes one proud to be an American, and I believe that it is vital in this cold war that we give a fair measure of publicity to these heartwarming incidents which occur day by day in all our communities, and in all types of situations, and which make our American tradition so wonderful.

Perhaps one way to summarize the thoughts that I have attempted to convey to you tonight is to briefly delve back into history. During the 16th century, an Italian named Machiavelli wrote a handbook for despots, called The Prince. In telling rulers how to obtain absolute power and then retain it, he advised them to be guided by the principle that the ends always justify the means. Ever since that time, tyrant after tyrant has resorted to Machiavelli's theme. In those earlier days, these absolute rulers made no pretense about the fact that they wanted power for power's sake; modern libertarians, however, have made it impossible for dictators to confess that their ends are self-seeking. Instead, in recent years we have seen the rise of several totalitarian movements, nazism in Germany, fascism in Italy, and communism in Russia. All three groups have professed that their purpose was to better the lot of their citizens.

In particular, the Communists made claim to being the representatives of the downtrodden—their revolution was to herald a brighter day, a classless society.

But then, they urged, since their ends were so glorious, all means conducive to them should be employed. Thus began an era of horror while the Russians collectivized their farm citizens, shooting rebellious kulaks and herding thousands of others off to Siberia. Similarly, they purged many of the middle class intelligentsia who challenged their actions. Dissent was stifled, and many of the men who had suffered so long for the sake of the revolution were shot as traitors by the heirs of that revolution—all as I say, in the name of progress and what the Russians called democracy—all on the theory that the ends justify the means.

Conversely, our Anglo-Saxon heritage has always been one of insistence on proper procedures. Our police cannot make arrests without warrants—unless of course they actually come upon a crime being committed. Our criminal defendants are given every procedural aid, and are deemed innocent until proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Men of all shades of political opinion are free to express their opinions verbally and in writing. Because we have a truly representative Government, and our Congressmen represent diverse views from all over the country, our legislative processes move slowly—and we don't all agree with every law. Our courts impose rigid checks to make sure that no man is deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law—which means without proper procedures safeguarding his interests.

If this insistence on proper procedure sometimes seems cumbersome, if we cannot make decisions with the lightning rapidity of totalitarian governments—we have always felt that this was a small price to pay for liberty. And this is something we should never forget.

When, with our eyes fixed on a wonderful goal, we insist on short cuts in the name of expediency—when we stifle honest dissent while we preach safeguarding freedom—we are taking a page from Machiavelli's handbook. Democracy can only be preserved by democratic methods—slow and plodding though they be—for democracy is based on a calculated risk—it is based on a belief that free men exercising a free choice out of various competing ideas will exercise the wisest choice possible, and our country's history over the past 175 years has justified continued faith in that belief.

Marshall Field National Awards for Contributions to Childlife

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, Mr. Marshall Field, who is one of our great philanthropists and civic leaders, has established a program of national awards for contributions to childlife. This is another demonstration of Mr. Field's outstanding public service. I congratulate him very heartily on making possible this fine program, which I am certain will be very effective in bringing the needed manpower and money into the field of furthering the well-being of children.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement outlining the establishment of the awards be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARSHALL FIELD ESTABLISHES NATIONAL AWARDS FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO CHILDLIFE

Marshall Field announced today the formation of Marshall Field Awards, Inc., a nonprofit organization, "to recognize and reward fundamental and imaginative contributions to the well-being of children."

Six to nine awards will be made annually to individuals, organizations, and communities in the fields of education, physical and mental development, social welfare, and communications. Each award will consist of $2,000, a scroll, and a statuette. The winners will be selected by a board of directors which is composed of recognized authorities in child life. The first awards will be made this year.

In announcing the awards program, Mr. Field stressed the considerations that led to its establishment: "Although few would quarrel with the controlling importance of children to America's future, I believe we have not done all we can or should to assure for our young people the opportunity for their fullest physical, mental, and social development. I think the reasons for this deficiency are: first, that we have not devoted a large enough portion of our national resources in manpower and money to the professional fields which serve children, and, second, that we have not made those professional fields sufficiently high in prestige or reward to attract adequate numbers of top-notch personnel needed to make new and important contributions to the well-being of children.

"Our awards are designed to help meet these deficiencies. It is our hope that they will focus public attention on children's needs and on the areas in which improved services are urgently required. The awards will call attention to constructive programs which set an example for others to follow. We hope, too, that the granting of these awards will, in some measure, raise the status of the professions devoted to children and will stimulate the making of additional significant contributions to the betterment of childlife."

Mr. Field has long been active in work devoted to children both through the Field Foundation, which he established in 1940, and, as president, since 1951, of the Child Welfare League of America.

Nominations for possible award winners will be solicited by the new organization on a nationwide basis. All nominations will be screened and final selections will be made by the board of directors. International awards may also be granted at the discretion of the directors.

The following criteria will be used in judging work nominated for awards:

1. Does it directly help children?
2. Does it benefit a large or significant group of children?
3. Can it be applied or adapted for use by others?
4. Is it consistent with professional standards in the field?
5. Does it represent an original or extraordinary service?
6. Will it promote sound development of children?
7. Will it stimulate public interest in the needs of children?

8. Does it open new dimensions in the lives of children?

9. Is it being recognized nationally for the first time?

10. Are those who did the actual work being rewarded?

The members of the board of directors in addition to Mr. Field are: Leona Baumgartner, M. D., Commissioner of Health, New York City; Mrs. Richard J. Bernhard, president, Arthur Lehman Counseling Service, New York City; Sarah Gibson Blanding president, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; James Brown IV, executive director, the Chicago Community Trust, Chicago, Ill.; Hon. Ralph J. Bunche, Undersecretary Without Department, United Nations, New York City; Martha M. Eliot, M. D., Chief United States Children's Bureau, Washington, D. C.; Ruth Pruyn Field, New York City; Leonard H. Goldenson, president, American Broadcasting-Paramount Theaters, Inc., New York City; John Gunther, writer, New York City; Herold C. Hunt, the Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C.; Charles A. Janeway, M. D., Professor of Pediatrics, Harvard University Medical School, Boston, Mass.; Clark Kerr, chancellor, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; Mrs. David M. Levy, president, the Citizens' Committee for Children of New York City, Inc., New York City; Ernest K. Lindley, director, Washington Bureau, Newsweek, Washington, D. C.; Leonard W. Mayo, director, Association for the Aid of Crippled Children, New York City; William C. Menninger, M. D., the Menninger Foundation, Topeka, Kans.; Hon. Justine Wise Polier, judge, Children's Court, New York City; Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg, Public and Industrial Relations Consultant, New York City; Howard A. Rusk, M. D., associate editor, the New York Times, chairman, Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, New York University, Bellevue Medical Center, New York City.

The areas in which awards will be made cover a broad range of activities related to children: Education, programs and services associated with formal and informal schooling; physical and mental development, health, medical care, nutrition, recreation, rehabilitation; social welfare, private and public programs in adoption, foster care, delinquency, institutional and day care, maintaining family income; communications—publications, advertising, movies and films, radio and television.

Under the program, children are defined as those who have not yet reached legal majority.

Offices for the new organization have been opened at 598 Madison Avenue, New York City. The deadline for nominations for the first awards is October 1, 1956.

GOALS

Marshall Field Awards, Inc., has been established by Marshall Field to recognize and reward fundamental and imaginative contributions to the well-being of children.

These awards will help focus public attention on children's needs and on the areas in which improved services are required. It is hoped that they will raise the status of the professions devoted to children and stimulate the making of significant contributions to the betterment of childlife.

AREAS

Awards will be given to individuals and organizations in four general areas:

Education: Programs and services associated with formal and informal schooling.

Physical and mental development: Health, medical care, nutrition, rehabilitation.

Social welfare: Private and public programs in adoption, foster care, delinquency, institutional and day care, maintaining family income.

Communications: Publications, advertising, movies and films, radio and television.

Children are defined as those who have not yet reached legal majority.

ADMINISTRATION

The program is directed by a national committee of eminent leaders in the fields serving children and young people. Working with the national committee are 4 committees—1 in each of the 4 award areas. Any individual or organization may submit nominations. The committees will screen all nominations and will recommend to the national committee a selection of possible award winners.

THE AWARDS

Each award will consist of $2,000, a scroll and a statuette. A minimum of six will be available for each calendar year. The annual distribution of the awards among the various areas is at the discretion of the national committee. Awards will be on a nationwide basis. International awards may also be granted at the discretion of the committee.

The committee recognizes that many excellent ideas and activities take considerable time to develop and show results. Therefore, eligibility for an award will not be restricted to work begun and completed during a single calendar year.

CRITERIA

The committee will judge work nominated for awards on this basis:

1. Does it directly help children?
2. Does it benefit a large or significant group of children?
3. Can it be applied or adapted for use by others?
4. Is it consistent with accepted standards in the field?
5. Does it represent an original, extraordinary service?
6. Will it promote sound emotional development of children?
7. Will it stimulate public interest in the needs of children?
8. Does it open new dimensions in the lives of children?
9. Is it being recognized nationally for the first time?
10. Are those who did the actual work being rewarded?

TIMING

The first awards will be made in December of 1956. Nominations and supporting materials for this year must be submitted by October 1.

Address nominations and requests for further information to: Miss Elma Phillipson, executive secretary, Marshall Field Awards, Inc., 598 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AS OF MARCH 1, 1956

Leona Baumgartner, M. D., commissioner, Health Department, New York City; Mrs. Richard J. Bernhard, president, Arthur Lehman Counseling Service, New York City; Sarah Blanding, president, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; James Brown IV, executive director, the Chicago Community Trust, Chicago, Ill.; Martha Eliot, M. D., Chief, United States Children's Bureau, Washington, D. C.; Marshall Field, New York City; Ruth Pruyn Field, New York City; Clark Kerr, chancellor, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; Leonard W. Mayo, director, Association for the Aid of Crippled Children, New York City; William C. Menninger, M. D., The Menninger Foundation, Topeka, Kans.; Hon. Justine Wise Polier, judge, Domestic Relations Court, New York City; Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg, public and industrial relations consultant, New York City; Howard Rusk, M. D., professor and chairman, department of physical medicine and rehabilitation, New York University, College of Medicine, New York City.

MARSHALL FIELD AWARDS, INC., 598 MADISON AVENUE, NEW YORK, N. Y.

Nomination blanks, 1956, for fundamental and imaginative contributions to the well-being of children

Nominee: Name of individual or organization being nominated.

I nominate for a 1956 Marshall Field award:

Name _____

Address _____ City _____

Telephone _____

Field of endeavor: Area in which work nominated was performed. Check one.

—— Education.
—— Social welfare.
—— Communications.
—— Physical and mental development.

Contribution: Brief description of the work done to merit an award.

Supporting evidence: Please enclose materials which, in your opinion, will aid the committee in reaching a decision.

Nominator: Person or organization submitting nomination:

Name _____

Address _____ City _____

Telephone _____

Related organizational affiliation, if any: _____

Date _____

Signed _____

Marshall Field Awards, Inc., reserves the right to make such use of materials submitted in support of nominations as in the judgment of the national committee will further the purpose of the program. Manuscripts and personal documents will be returned upon request. Nominees must consent to their names being submitted.

ELMA PHILLIPSON,
Executive Secretary.

Death of Six Marines at Parris Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Parris Island Tragedy," which appeared in the New York Times on April 12, 1956.

This editorial points out the danger of making preliminary judgment with regard to the tragic incident resulting in the death of six marines, and it warrants the attention of all Americans.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PARRIS ISLAND TRAGEDY

The death of a young fighting man in peacetime seems somehow to wrench the heart more violently than in war. So the whole Nation is shocked, grieved and angry over the tragedy at Parris Island, S. C., in which six young Marine Corps recruits marched to their death in a tidal stream in after-dark training exercises last Sunday.

General Pate, the Corps commandant, asks that "premature opinions" be withheld, pending the court of inquiry's decision. But nothing that this court delivers will assuage the sorrow in the homes of these lost boys, all under 21, or diminish the sympathy that the public feels for the families bereaved. None said better what we all now feel than the sergeant who led his men into this fatal maneuver: "I can't find words to express my grief."

This sergeant, Matthew C. McKeon, was only 31 years old, but he had begun his military service at the age of 16, in the Navy, and was a veteran of the Korean war. His zeal seems to have exceeded his judgment, for he acknowledged that he had not been in the area before and had not been familiar

with the tides. Thus he had committed a basic military error; he had not familiarized himself, to the fullest extent possible, with the terrain into which he planned to lead his troops. He had not reduced chance to the irreducible minimum. It was a mistake from which heroism—his own included—could not make a recovery.

The Marines take pride in the "toughness" of their training and its product, for which the Nation has good reason to feel deep gratitude for services performed on many a beachhead. It would be a serious mistake of judgment if the deep feelings stirred by this Parris Island incident were allowed, through pressures created, to soften unduly the basic training, in any of the services, that equips a man to survive. After all, the services are preparing young men for war, if the need comes. Nor should one failure, disturbing as this one was, be allowed to discredit a general policy of dispersal down through the ranks of authority to take command and initiative.

This was a sad, a ghastly error. But no service to our fighting men will be performed by drawing wrong lessons from it, merely to make a showing of drastic, responsive action.

The Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the marked improvement in the state of health of the American merchant marine during the last 4 years has been truly outstanding. Of course, much remains to be done. A splendid editorial dealing with recent improvements appeared in the Baltimore News-Post of April 12, 1956. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IKE REVIVING MERCHANT MARINE

(By E. F. Tompkins)

The Eisenhower administration has started an unprecedented resurrection of the American merchant marine on a sound economic basis.

This country entered World War I under an immense difficulty—lack of an adequate merchant fleet as part of the national defense. At a cost of billions of dollars, a wartime merchant marine was improvised, and we found ourselves in 1921 with 17,026,000 tons of civilian shipping. Then the fleet was allowed to deteriorate, even though Congress passed the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. In 1939 we had only 1,379 commercial vessels, totaling 8,125,756 tons.

IMMENSE DIFFICULTY

Consequently, we entered World War II under an immense difficulty—lack of an adequate merchant fleet. Again a wartime merchant marine was expensively improvised, and the return of peace found us as late as 1953 with 3,439 ships aggregating 25,835,000 tons. But that fleet has been two-thirds abandoned.

We have 2,000 cargo-carrying Liberty ships rusting in idleness, or used only to store surplus grain accumulated under the Federal farm-subsidy system. So we might enter world war III, should it occur, under an immense difficulty—lack of an adequate merchant marine—and be compelled a third time to improvise at prodigal cost.

Taught by tedious repetition, Congress and the Maritime Administration are taking corrective measures in cooperation with the shipping industry.

SHIPBUILDERS GET UNITED STATES AID

Large passenger and freight liners are being constructed, with Federal aid, for private operation under the Merchant Marine Act. New oil tankers are coming off the ways. And the Government has instituted another program—modernization of the Government-owned Liberty ships for operation by American companies on our overseas trade routes.

This refurbishing of the Liberty ships, giving them increased speeds and improved mercantile usefulness, has several merits:

Protracted time and large capital investment are required to build and launch an ocean-going vessel. Relatively little time and much smaller capital, besides a saving in materials, are involved in improving an existing Liberty ship and restoring it to the sea-lanes, where it belongs.

HELP NULLIFY OBSTACLE

Because of our high wage levels, foreign-laid ships are much cheaper to build than American vessels. This is a competitive disadvantage that has seemed to doom an American merchant marine. Rehabilitation of Liberty ships serves to nullify the obstacle.

The entire program will keep our shipyards intact.

The necessary merchant marine auxiliary to the Armed Forces will be provided, in being and almost automatically, as a heritage from the Second World War.

Restoral to service of 2,000 Liberty ships not only salvages a huge wartime expenditure; it is also a magnificent contribution to our foreign trade and national security.

An Honest Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent editorial entitled "An Honest Veto," which appeared in the Houlton Pioneer Times, one of Maine's outstanding weekly newspapers, on April 19, 1956, may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN HONEST VETO

The President of the United States has again shown that he is not to be persuaded by political expediency into doing something that, in his judgment, is contrary to the best interests of any segment or segments of the Nation's economy.

There may be those who will observe that it took courage for President Eisenhower to veto the controversial farm bill. We do not take that viewpoint. In our judgment the measure met with Presidential rejection solely on the basis of its lack of merit adequately to do the job for which it was intended.

We cannot believe that the farmers of this country are so abjectly in need of governmental aid that they will urge legislation to divert millons of dollars into their own pockets and out of the general funds. Especially do we not believe that any such fantastic reasoning is true when the full truth of the matter is the farmers themselves are largely responsible for the situation the politicians now want the Government to correct by direct appropriation.

It is also our considered opinion that the threats of reprisal at the hands of the electorate, which are being tossed about rather recklessly by some headline hunters, will not materialize when the chips are down. We just cannot believe that farmers will react that way.

As a political issue, it is probable that ammunition has been furnished gratuitously to those who shall stoop to use it. But we cannot find fault with the sincerity of the President, so fearlessly motivated by a determination to do what is right, according to his own honest convictions, regardless of political pressures.

It doesn't seem to us this country can go very far wrong with that kind of leadership; nor does it seem that honest and right thinking Americans can find it in their heart to vote against that kind of statesmanship.

We are perfectly certain that the farmers of Aroostook County are in accord with the thinking of those who have branded this measure as unsound and a bad bill for the farmers themselves as well as consumers, and we believe the majority will wholeheartedly applaud the forthright action of the President.

Regardless of the political capital the opposition is certain to try to make out of this action, we firmly believe that nothing but praise can, in the long run, result from such an honest and bipartisan veto as this particular definitely is.

The first reaction to be noted was, of course, the prompt mobilization of the President's potential opposition next November. As was to be expected Estes and Adlai moved in immediately with vigorous denunciations of the veto and attempts to portray Eisenhower as "the enemy of the farmer."

The goal of making political capital out of a probable opponent's high integrity and devotion to a principle may have its advantages but, in this instance, the possible gains seem attainable only at the expense of personal honesty.

The way is now clear, it seems to us, to work out this vexing but vitally important farm problem in a sane manner that will be for the best interests of the majority of the populace as against the advantages of a selected group. Now that the debris has been swept from the congressional doorstep, perhaps the legislators can coordinate their efforts in terms of national rather than sectional or personal benefit.

Visit to England of Bulganin and Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Two Clever Guys," from the Manchester Union Leader, Manchester, N. H., dated April 21, 1956. I believe this editorial is right to the point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO CLEVER GUYS

Bulganin and Khrushchev now on a visit to England have once more revealed their astuteness. Before they reached London, they put out a notice designed to sweeten the atmosphere. They announced that the Cominform—set up in 1947 to fight the Marshall plan—has been dissovled. And then they called on Israel and the Arab nations to refrain from any action that might lead to war.

This was a particularly clever gesture designed to destroy any hostility that might exist in England. But it is generally recognized that the announcement of the dissolution of the Cominform doesn't have much practical meaning. Soviet domination in the satellite countries can be expected to go on just the same, with Soviet promotion of espionage and subversion. It makes no different by what name the process is called.

So far as the Middle East statement goes, it simply indicates that the Soviets are in the Middle East to stay. Otherwise, they would not offer to join in keeping peace. One of the basic elements in British and American policy in the Middle East for years has been to keep Soviet Russia out. But the Soviets now consider themselves in.

They have maneuvered their way around the Baghdad pact and other attempts to erect barriers against them, and by giving arms to Egypt, and now to Sudan, they have got there feet firmly planted in the area. They can now afford to call on the Arabs and Israel to keep the peace and thus assert their influence in that area.

That has been their objective, and now having won it, nothing will be lost in using it. This simply means that the Western Powers, that have directed affairs in the Middle East for a long time, have lost tremendously, and if the Soviets have their way they will lost a lot more. By shifting their support from the Arab side to an apparently impartial position in the Arab-Israeli conflict, they hope to strengthen their stand more than by simply giving arms to the Arabs.

The Recent Trip to Brazil by the Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mr. Gabriel Luiz Ferreira Filho, one of the most prominent businessmen of Brazil, to Mr. Vance Brand, a director of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, containing an appraisal of the trip made by Vice President NIXON to Rio de Janeiro.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIO, *February 20, 1956.*

Mr. VANCE BRAND,
Export-Import Bank of Washington,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BRAND: The day we met at the American Embassy in Rio you asked me to inform you of the reaction of the responsible people in this country to Mr. NIXON'S mission. As I told you at that moment no impressions would be then valuable because the best way to determine people's opinion is the press and our press was still under censorship at that time.

Now I am in a position to inform you that Mr. NIXON, as well as the other members of the American delegation, did an excellent job in clarifying the position of your country at this particular moment of our political and economic situation. The reaction of the responsible people in this country has been entirely favorable.

The Government officials acknowledge that the United States is well aware of their responsibility toward the hemisphere and of their willingness to help our economic development. But the important thing in my opinion is the reaction of business circles. For the last few years our businessmen were becoming more and more skeptical about American willingness to help our effort toward industrialization. The gap was quickly filled by Germany, France, and Japan. The withdrawal of the United States was far more important than one might be led to think. I give you an example: No communistic propaganda has been able up to now to deny the fact that if we have a steel industry we owe it to American help, right from the beginning, when Volta Redonda was nothing but a big risk. Everybody realizes that, down to the most illiterate man. Now, suppose that you had refused or delayed the last loan to expand Volta Redonda and we would be forced to go to Germany for that loan. The Germans were only waiting for it, for strictly business reasons, but Moscow was also waiting for entirely different reasons. Mr. NIXON hit the jackpot with announcement made at Volta Redonda.

This is the kind of weapon we need in this country to fight communism. Not that this is enough. A lot of things we have to do ourselves to increase the standard of living of our people. But it is a lot more easy for our Government to concentrate in the work for the general welfare backed up by our traditional friends of the hemisphere than to have the additional trouble to extripate the anti-American feeling that was just beginning to spread among us. Of all the countries in the world perhaps Brazil is the one where anti-American feeling is less spread. An American can leave in this country without that uncomfortable sensation of being watched like the rich member of the family. Americans are not envied nor hated by Brazilians, as they are in certain countries for whom you have done a lot more than for us. I was nearly killed once in a street riot in Europe just because I was driving an American car, and my license plate was black and yellow. Here it is altogether different because the Brazilians are conscious of the potential possibilities of their country. We do not have to choose between being grateful or ungrateful. We feel stimulated by your achievements and we know that one day we will make this country as big and as powerful as yours. We feel like partners in a big adventure. You started first and we want to learn from you as the younger brother learns from the older one.

This is what is in the back of the mind of most Brazilians. But as an inner feeling it can be overcome by more apparent ones. You cannot give your friendship indefinitely to anyone who ignores you. You would rather accept help from a stranger than starve.

Up to now our Government and our leaders didn't have any trouble to enroll our people on your side. Things won't be that easy in the future. As an American himself views the situation:

"Today inside the City of the Poor the issues of war and class are underscored by the universal demand for rapid economic progress. Its achievement has become essential to political stability. Thus a worldwide assault on this aspect of the problem of class is now an integral part of the solution of the problem of war.

"At Bandung we saw that on this subject every government in Asia, Africa, and South America today is on trial. In the next few years these governments must demonstrate to their people that they can provide not only progress toward political freedom for each individual, but also steady and even spectacular economic growth. Those which fail this test, however honest and anti-Communist, may eventually go under." (Chester Bowles, The New Dimensions of Peace.)

This quotation describes very exactly the drama of our present government. I have talked to many officials recently appointed and each one of them is conscious of that fact.

Among the businessmen, as I said before, a new faith was born with Mr. NIXON'S statements. As a corporation lawyer, I can watch it from inside at board meetings and business conferences. Not less than three different projects of basic industries requiring foreign finance have been submitted to our office for consideration and legal advice, since you left.

The press in Rio, reflecting the people's concern, is watching the Government very closely. Even the friendly papers cannot disguise their anxiety. Strange as it may seem the newspapers antagonistic to the Government do not criticize it for its large plans of economic expansion. Everybody seems to agree on that. The more they say is that they doubt the flow of foreign capital will come in at the speed required by Mr. Kubitschek's plans.

I believe there is no exaggeration to state that this comfortable sensation we experience today that something will be done at last, is largely due to Mr. NIXON'S encouraging words. I suppose this answers your question. If there is any further information you want from me please let me know.

With best regards to Mrs. Brand and yourself, I am

Sincerely yours,

GABRIEL FERREIRA.

Alaska Mental Health Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD the following letter which is an excellent example of what happens when the plain, simple facts about the Alaska mental-health bill, H. R. 6376, are studied. The District Federation of Women's Clubs has made a careful inquiry into the facts and the results speak for themselves in this letter:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: A special meeting of the District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs was held on April 19.

The purpose of this meeting was to reconsider our previous action taken on the Alaskan mental-health bill, H. R. 6376.

At this meeting 32 to 8 voted in favor of this bill.

I am happy to make this report.

Very sincerely,

EDNA DAVIS
Mrs. Arthur G. Davis,
President, District of Columbia
Federation of Women's Clubs.

Schoolchildren Being Let Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent column entitled "Schoolchildren Being Let Down," by May Craig, which appeared in the Portland Press Herald on April 17, 1956, may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSIDE IN WASHINGTON—SCHOOLCHILDREN BEING LET DOWN

(By May Craig)

WASHINGTON, April 16.—It is incredible that the United States, the first to turn to mass production, to mechanization that can give people so much comfort, so much leisure, so much health, so much security—does not see that we are keeping our children in little red one-room schoolhouse era. And that this can be fatal to us and our type of civilization. The more we mechanize, the more highly educated our people must be. To swing an ax, to follow a horse-drawn plow, to build a log cabin, to chip a canoe out of a log—these things take hardly more than a strong arm and a little commonsense.

But to operate the machine, the electronic age, the age that has split the atom, that aspires to rockets to the moon—this requires education, a great deal of education, widespread, advanced. We do not have it. There is no sign that we will have it. Yet our enemy, the Communists, are specializing on education for this kind of a world today. Every child either has now, or soon will have, free education to the limit of his or her ability to learn. Bright ones are helped and pushed. Jobs that will use special gifts await them when they come out of school. Scientists, teachers, engineers are the aristocracy of the Soviet world. They get good pay, honors, respect. They are turning out 3 or 4 times as many a year as we are, and increasing this lead. Surely, they get education from the state, it is an education within the limits of Communist doctrine. But it is education. The Russians are turning out so many technicians, scientists, engineers, that they not only can staff their own industry, defense, laboratory, but can lend them to other countries. With Soviet offers of money, machinery, war planes, go the trained men—and they are evangelists for communism, spies, propagandists.

In the United States the shortage of teachers is so acute that if we started today on a new school building program, tripled the pay, we could not give our children the education they should have. All over this country there are children in antiquated schools, many drop out in high school, the teachers are so scarce that they can do no more than keep some kind of order, with little time to teach.

We value teachers so little that they are leaving the profession which many of them deeply love—but they have to live in an expensive world; they owe something to their families. If they received the honored place that teachers should have, and the consideration, they might put up with the low pay—but we pay doll-faced teen-age movie stars more than we do the President of the United States, not to speak of teachers—and doctors.

When do we wake up to what is happening because of our own stupid apathy? Our armed forces say they get fewer and fewer qualified young men and women in the services—because this advanced scientific defense requires education. Even the bodies of our youngsters are not up to par. More and more are turned down by the draft. We are a Nation of spectators and the strong bodies to house trained and disciplined minds are not being produced, for all our medical science that prevents disease. We need discipline that will send children to school, keep them there, see that they take the "hard subjects" that underlie the ability to function in the mechanized, electronic age.

What are we doing about it? We have talked for years about Federal aid to education. We said we could not have Federal control of the minds of our children. We are afraid of a Hitler. So we did nothing about Federal aid for schools, including teachers. We did think maybe we could have Federal aid to build school buildings; that would not involve what was taught in the schools. There should be no idea that we get Federal aid for nothing. The Government has no money except what it takes away from you and me in taxes. The advantage of Federal aid is that it would be spread evenly, that it would be taxed away from people who maybe would not choose to put it into schools locally, who might prefer cars or chewing gum or yachts, to schools.

This Congress has a school construction bill before it. There was a good chance that it would be enacted and we could get started on it. The President recommended school construction legislation. It looked like a beginning—small compared to the program, but a beginning.

But it is blocked by the determination of Negro Representative POWELL, of New York, to tack on a rider saying there shall be no segregation in such buildings. The South refuses to agree to any such rider. So—no bill, so far. Perhaps not at all.

Meantime, in the rest of the world, they get on with education. In Latin America they are getting on with it. I asked, "Are they not afraid of thought control?" They looked at me in surprise. "But the purpose is to get our children educated," they said. The rest was detail and they considered themselves able to handle that. Education in many Latin American countries is free through college. Is the United States to let the world go by? Are we so stupid, so cowardly that we cannot devise a way to educate our children without losing freedom? Are we willing to become a "backward nation" because our children are not getting the education necessary in this new world of science and machines?

Proposed Extension of Northeast Airlines to Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Rightful Protest," which appeared in the Concord Daily Monitor, Concord, N. H., on Friday, April 20, 1956. This editorial deals with the adverse decision of the CAB examiner on an application of Northeast Airlines. The decision is a blow to New England.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIGHTFUL PROTEST

The recommendations of a Civil Aeronautics Board examiner that Northeast airlines be denied an extension of its lines to Florida is being vigorously protested by the New England delegation in the Congress, and by various other groups in New England, and rightfully so.

Northeast was the pioneer airline in serving much of New England, with connections to Quebec and the Maritime Provinces. But it remains primarily a local operation, though CAB has permitted transcontinental lines to run into Boston, thus tapping the principal source of revenues available to Northeast, the Boston-New York run.

Northeast needs a long line connection, and such an extension to Florida is a natural because much of the traffic in and out of Florida is from the northeast.

Northeast began with Boston as the hub of its lines. Flying habits of passengers are such that today the real hub of its operations is New York, from which its lines fan out over New England. But there is no handle to the fan. Traffic originating in New England which is carried into New York feeds the transcontinental lines, but they in turn don't feed Northeast to the same extent because some of them extend into New England.

Airline passengers don't like to change planes en route to their destinations if that can be avoided. Making connections is precarious and time consuming and people travel by plane because of the speed.

Airlines need reasonably long runs to balance out the short hauls, which are more expensive operationwise. Northeast has only relatively short hauls, with frequent expensive stops.

This pioneer New England airline has a remarkable safety record considering the terrain it serves, and it has developed local service within New England to about its maximum. It has used often inadequate airports to do so, and much of its traffic is obviously of the fringe type which costs more to serve than it yields. This has to be balanced by traffic which is profitable, or, over a period of time, Northeast will be compelled to reduce the local service it gives this region.

The Constitutionality of American Participation in the Proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation (OTC) and in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an enlightening and useful report prepared by the Committee on International Law, and approved by the executive committee, of the Association of the Bar of the city of New York.

The report follows:

THE ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK—THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF AMERICAN PARTICIPATION IN THE PROPOSED ORGANIZATION FOR TRADE COOPERATION (OTC) AND IN THE GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE (GATT)—A REPORT BY THE COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL LAW

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) is a multilateral trade agreement which was negotiated in 1947. The United States and 34 other countries are now parties. It consists of (1) tariff concessions granted by the participating countries to one another, (2) a set of general trade rules, and (3) certain administrative provisions.

Participation in GATT was effected by the President of the United States under the powers delegated to him by the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934. GATT was never presented to the Congress for its approval. It was originally expected that the trade rules and administrative provisions of GATT would be superseded by the provisions of an International Trade Organization (ITO). The ITO was also to deal with subjects not included in GATT and not strictly within the field of commercial policy—full employment, foreign investment, restrictive business practices, and international commodity agreements, ITO was presented to Congress for its approval. Congress took no action, however, and the ITO never came into existence.

In the absence of the ITO, there was no organization to administer the tariff concessions and trade rules of GATT. The administrative articles of GATT provided for periodic meetings of the contracting parties, but made no provision for the administration of the GATT between these meetings. There was no adequate machinery to cope with a host of continuing problems. Moreover, the absence of congressional approval of GATT left doubt about the extent to which Congress considered itself bound by either the trade rules of GATT or its administrative determinations.

On March 30, 1954, President Eisenhower, following the recommendations of his Special Commission on Foreign Economic Policy (the Randall Commission), informed Congress that the administrative provisions of GATT would be severed from the rest of the agreement and submitted to the Congress for its approval. In the winter of 1954–55 GATT was renegotiated by the contracting parties to carry out this objective and also to make certain adjustments in the trade rules which experience had proved necessary. The main administrative provisions of GATT, supplemented by new administrative machinery, were grouped together in an agreemnet on an Organization for Trade Cooperation (OTC).

At the last sesison of Congress a bill, H. R. 5550, was introduced authorizing United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation. In requesting its approval, President Eisenhower stated:

"I believe the reasons for United States membership in the proposed organization are overwhelming. * * * Such action would serve the enlightened self-interest of the United States. * * * Failure to assume membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation would * * * strike a severe blow at the development of cooperaive arrangements in defense of the free world."

Congress did not act on OTC during its 1955 session. In his state of the Union message on January 5, 1956, President Eisenhower repeated his appeal to Congress for speedy approval of American participation in the Organization:

"I most earnestly request that the Congress approve our membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation, which would assist the carrying out of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to which we have been a party since 1948. Our membership in the OTC will provide the most effective and expeditious means for removing discriminations and restrictions against American exports and in making our trade agreements truly reciprocal. United States membership in the Organization will evidence our continuing desire to cooperate in promoting an expanded trade among the free nations. Thus the Organization, as proposed, is admirably suited to our own interests and to those of like-minded nations in working for steady expansion of trade and closer economic cooperation. Being strictly an administrative entity, the Organization for Trade Cooperation cannot, of course, alter the control by Congress of the tariff, import, and customs policies of the United States."

At its meeting in Philadelphia in August 1955 the American Bar Association approved the following resolution:

"V. *Resolved*, That the bill, H. R. 5550, authorizing the President to accept membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation is hereby disapproved on the grounds (a) that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934 (Tariff Act of 1930, sec. 350) confers no such power on the President, and (b) that neither the President, nor Congress has the legal authority under the Constitution, to delegate the regulation of our commerce with foreign nations to a foreign controlled group, and the committee on customs law is hereby authorized on behalf of the American Bar Association to present these views to the Congress and that the president of the American Bar Association be authorized to select a representative or representatives to appear before the proper congressional committees."

On March 26, 1956, after 2 weeks of hearings, the House Ways and Means Committee recommended passage of H. R. 5550. A central issue in the hearings was the constitutionality of United States participation in GATT and OTC.

The present report is the result of a detailed study of this question. It concludes that there is no doubt about the constitutionality of American participation in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade or about the constitutionality of H. R. 5550 authorizing American participation in the Organization for Trade Cooperation.

It should be emphasized that this report deals only with the question of constitutional power. It does not attempt to pass upon the desirability of American participation in GATT and OTC on policy grounds.

The constitutional position which emerges from the research upon which this report is based, and which is more fully elaborated in the following pages, may be summarized as follows:

I. The President had the necessary authority to agree to United States adherence to and participation in GATT under the authority delegated to him in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

A. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which authorizes the President to alter American tariff rates and other import restrictions by making for trade agreements, is a constitutional delegation of congressional power.

B. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act provides authority for United States participation in GATT.

1. The act authorizes the President to enter into multilateral as well as bilateral agreements.

2. The act provides authority for the general trade rules in GATT as well as the individual tariff concessions.

3. The act provides authority for the administrative provisions in GATT.

II. Congress may constitutionally authorize United States participation in OTC by H. R. 5550.

A. American participation in OTC would violate no provision of the Constitution.

1. Neither GATT nor the OTC agreement gives to international bodies or foreign nations any of the constitutional power of Congress "to regulate commerce with foreign nations" or any other power of Congress.

2. The powers given OTC and the contracting parties of GATT have ample precedent in international organizations already entered into by the United States and are less extensive than many of the powers possessed by some of these organizations.

B. There is ample precedent for congressional authorization of United States participation in an international organization by majority vote of both Houses.

ARGUMENT

Point I

The President Had the Necessary Authority To Agree to United States Adherence to Any Participation in GATT Under the Authority Delegated to Him in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

H. R. 5550 is a bill authorizing American participation in the Organization for Trade Cooperation. While it makes reference to GATT, it contains no language purporting to authorize United States participation therein. It might be thought, therefore, that constitutional questions about H. R. 5550 could be completely resolved by consideration of the OTC agreement alone. While this may be technically correct, a thorough study of the constitutional problem must be wider in scope. The primary function of OTC is to administer GATT. It would make no sense for Congress to authorize American participation in OTC if GATT itself were not a valid international obligation of the United States. An inquiry into the constitutionality of present American adherence to GATT is, therefore, a prerequisite to considering the constitutional authority of Congress to approve OTC.

American adherence to and participation in GATT was effected by the Executive Department of the United States Government without specific congressional approval. This has been described by some critics as an unconstitutional usurpation of congressional power. They point to the fact that the Constitution gives to Congress the power "To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises" (including tariffs) and "To regulate commerce with foreign nations." In reply to charges of unconstitutionality the executive department maintains that Congress, in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934, made a delegation to the executive of its power to make tariffs and to regulate commerce with foreign nations and that this delegation provided ample authority for the executive to undertake American participation in GATT.

A. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is a constitutional delegation of congressional power: The first question to be decided is whether the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is a constitutional delegation of congressional power. No court has yet had an opportunity to pass directly upon this question. Nevertheless, the constitutionality of the act rests on a solid foundation of judicial authority.

It is well established that Congress may delegate its constitutional powers to the Executive when it lays down an "intelligible principle" to guide the Executive in the exercise of such powers. In the domestic field, Congress has made numerous delegations to administrative agencies of its power to regulate interstate commerce. The courts have upheld the constitutionality of such delegations even where the administrative agencies were left free to operate within principles as broad and indefinite as "public interest" and "public convenience, interest, or necessity."

In the tariff and foreign trade field, two leading cases establish the constitutional validity of delegations of congressional power. In *Field* v. *Clark*, the Supreme Court upheld a section of the Tariff Act of 1890 which

authorized the President to suspend the duty-free status of certain foreign products whenever he found that the countries exporting those products maintained "reciprocally unequal and unreasonable" duties on American products. In *Hampton & Company* v. *United States*, the Supreme Court upheld a section of the Tariff Act of 1922 which authorized the President to vary American tariff rates in order to "equalize the differences in the costs of production" of domestic and foreign articles. In both these cases the quoted statutory provisions were held to set standards definite enough to constitute a valid delegation of congressional power.

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act authorizes the President to enter into "foreign trade agreements with foreign governments" and to proclaim modifications of existing United States tariffs and other import restrictions in accordance with those agreements. In exercising his authority under this legislation, the President must find—

(1) that "existing duties or other import restrictions of the United States or any foreign country are unduly burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States" and

(2) that the exercise of his authority will promote the purpose of the legislation, i. e., that of "expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States."

The principle laid down here is certainly no less intelligible than the principles upheld in the Field and Hampton decisions. As Senator GEORGE declared during the original congressional debates on the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act: "No fair-minded person can say that the principle of bargaining to open the lanes of distribution and markets of consumption by the Chief Executive in aid of the domestic producer is not as intelligible and practicable a principle within the rule announced in the Hampton case as that of equalizing the costs of production the world over as compared with prevailing costs in the United States."

The constitutionality of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act becomes particularly clear when attention is focused on the area of the governmental activity that is here involved. We have already noted that the courts have upheld extremely broad delegations by Congress of its constitutional power in the domestic field. They have been even more willing to sanction such delegations when the legislative powers overlapped—as they do here—existing executive powers in the field of foreign affairs. As the Supreme Court declared in *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Export Corporation:*

"It is important to bear in mind that we are here dealing not alone with an authority vested in the President by an exertion of legislative power, but with such an authority plus the very delicate, plenary, and exclusive power of the President as the sole organ of the Federal Government in the field of international relations—a power which does not require as a basis for its existence an act of Congress, but which, of course, like every other governmental power, must be exercised in subordination to the applicable provisions of the Constitution. It is quite apparent that if, in the maintenance of our international relations, embarrassment—perhaps serious embarrassment—is to be avoided and success for our aims achieved, congressional legislation which is to be made effective through negotiation and inquiry within the international field must often accord to the President a degree of discretion and freedom from statutory restriction which would not be admissible were domestic affairs alone involved."

The constitutionality of the delegation of congressional power contained in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was fully and carefully considered by the Congress itself when the act was first enacted. The House Ways and Means Committee gave "particular attention to questions of constitutionality presented by the proposed bill." It concluded that "the proposed bill goes no further than many previous enactments of the Congress; in fact, it follows a current of legislation enacted from the earliest days of our history." The same committee in later years supported not only a renewal but a broadening of the delegated powers and reaffirmed its conclusion that "the Trade Agreements Act involves no improper delegation of legislative power." Representative Fred Vinson, later Chief Justice of the United States, was particularly vehement in asserting that the constitutionality of the act was beyond question:

"For the life of me, I cannot understand how this defense would be set up at this time. * * * The matter is really not debatable. The placing of this discretion in the Chief Executive of the United States is not an unconstitutional delegation of power."

As a concluding point, it should be noted that Congress has extended the authority delegated to the President by the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act 10 times since the act was first passed in 1934. There could scarcely be more impressive evidence that Congress regards the act as a constitutional delegation of its own power.

B. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act provides authority for United States participation in GATT. The case against the constitutionality of American participation in GATT is not based solely on the charge that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is unconstitutional. It rests also on the alternative charge that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, even if constitutional, does not provide authority for American participation in GATT. Three arguments have been advanced to support this latter assertion:

1. The act authorizes the President to make bilateral trade agreements, but not a multilateral trade agreement like GATT;

2. The act authorizes the President to make agreements embodying tariff concessions but not embodying the general trade rules in GATT; and

3. The act does not authorize the President to make agreements embodying the administrative provisions contained in GATT.

Each of these arguments must be examined in turn.

1. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act authorizes the President to conclude multilateral as well as bilateral agreements. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act authorizes the President to enter into "foreign trade agreements" with other governments for the purpose of "expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States." Special note should be made of the phrase "foreign trade agreements." The legislation does not specify bilateral agreements only. There is no evidence in the legislative history of the act to indicate that the Congress wished to confine the executive in this way. It must be considered, therefore, that the Congress wished to leave the executive free to conclude either bilateral or multilateral agreements, whichever would best promote in the given circumstances, the purposes for which the act was passed.

That the purposes of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act would be promoted by multilateral rather than bilateral agreements was clearly demonstrated in the first decade of the act's history. In that period the President exercised his authority by negotiating bilateral agreements with 29 countries. Under these agreements the United States made reductions in its tariffs in return for reductions in the tariffs of its various trading partners. The agreements also provided limitations on the use of trade restrictions other than tariffs (such as quantitative restrictions and internal taxes) which might be used to nullify the effect of the tariff reductions.

This system of bilateral trade agreements revealed serious limitations. The agreements naturally provided for unconditional most-favored-nation treatment—a principle of commercial policy adopted by the United States and most other countries as a necessary basis for nondiscriminatory and friendly trade relations. This provision meant that the concessions made by the parties to each agreement were granted generally to the trade of other countries. In the system of bilateral agreements, the most-favored-nation clause produced a certain amount of difficulty. Parties to a particular bilateral agreement were inhibited in granting tariff concessions to one another by the fear that countries not parties to the agreement would obtain benefits from those concessions without giving any concessions of their own in return. Parties to a bilateral agreement were also reluctant to agree to general trade obligations in the absence of assurance that other countries would assume the same obligations themselves.

Accordingly, in planning for international trade cooperation after the Second World War, it was decided to abandon the bilateral method of tariff bargaining in favor of a multilateral approach. Under the new system the world's trading nations would all meet simultaneously to conclude their various sets of tariff bargains. They would thus be able to make substantial concessions with the assurance of knowing just what would be the sum total of concessions afforded by all the other nations in return. They would also be able to agree upon a common set of trade rules to protect and supplement those tariff concessions.

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade was nothing more than the name for the agreement which embodied this new approach. Considering both the unqualified authorization of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to make "foreign trade agreements" and the proven shortcomings of the bilateral approach as a means of achieving the act's objective, it is only reasonable to conclude that the authorization included the making of a multilateral agreement.

2. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act provides authority for GATT's general trade rules. GATT contains a number of general trade rules as well as individual tariff concessions. These rules cover such subjects as unconditional most-favored-nation treatment, internal taxation, customs administration, and quantitative restrictions. There can be no doubt but that the President had the authority to conclude a trade agreement embodying such rules. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act provides the general authorization to the Executive to enter into foreign trade agreements for the purpose of expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States. The purpose of the act could not be achieved unless the President were empowered to deal in his negotiations with the whole range of restrictions which effectively impede American exports. This factor was specifically recognized in the act when it authorized the President to proclaim modifications of other import restrictions as well as tariffs.

On numerous occasions before the passage of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in 1934 the President—in some cases even without congressional authority to make agreements on tariff matters—entered into trade agreements embodying general rules of trade policy.

The Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives took special notice of these agreements when it reported in 1934 on the bill which became the original Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. The committee referred to these agreements as precedents for the validity of the agree-

ments about to be authorized by the Trade Agreements Act, and clearly indicated that it considered general trade rules a proper part of the trade agreements to be entered into under the legislation.

During hearings before this committee Secretary of State Cordell Hull made a point of asking for the delegation of "full authority, otherwise, in respect of the things that are declared in purpose and effect and intended as a substitute for the ordinary name and function of tariffs, we would not get anywhere." After hearing testimony such as this, the committee emphasized that authority was being given the President to proclaim changes in other import restrictions as well as tariffs and that this authority was "designed to cover the various types of measures for the retardation of trade with which the President will be expected to deal in his negotiations with other countries."

Following this clear declaration of congressional intent general trade rules were incorporated in bilateral agreements concluded by the President under the authority of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. In renewals of the act committees of Congress referred with approval, to the inclusion of such trade rules.[86]

3. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act authorizes the administrative provisions of GATT: We have now seen that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act provided authority for the President to participate in a multilateral tariff agreement and also to adhere to GATT's general rules of trade policy. The only other provisions in GATT (except for the statement of objectives) are those of an administrative character. Some critics have suggested that by participation in an international agreement containing these provisions the Executive has made an unconstitutional delegation to an international body of the power of Congress "to regulate commerce with foreign nations." Since Congress delegated to the Executive the power to enter into foreign trade agreements and to proclaim changes in tariffs and other import restrictions, the question is really whether the Executive has redelegated to GATT any powers of Congress, and, if so, whether such redelegation was constitutionally proper.

It is difficult to see how the administrative provisions of GATT involve any redelegation by the Executive of congressional power. The Constitution gives to Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations." The contracting parties to GATT, operating under the administrative provisions, cannot impinge upon this power. They have no authorty to make commercial policy for the United States. They cannot change a single American tariff rate, nor any other American law relating to the import or export of goods.

With the exceptions to be discussed below, the administrative provisions of GATT are purely mechanical arrangements defining the obligations of the agreement and the rights of the contracting parties inter se. These have not been the object of serious challenge.

The charge that the administrative provisions of GATT delegate to the contracting parties the power of Congress "To regulate commerce with foreign nations" is probably inspired by certain powers of interpretation and waiver given the contracting parties in the two administrative articles not yet dealt with.

These articles (with a summary of their most important provisions) are the following:

Article XX—Nullification or impairment.

This article authorizes the contracting parties as a group to investigate controversies between particular contracting parties and to make recommendations and rulings thereon. It empowers them, in serious circumstances, to authorize one contracting party to withdraw concessions from another contracting party or parties to the extent that the group deems appropriate. The contracting party from which concessions are withdrawn is free to withdraw entirely from the agreement upon 60 days' notice in writing.

(These provisions are transferred by the revision of GATT to the OTC agreement.)

Article XXV—Joint action by the contracting parties.

This article provides for meetings of the contracting parties and lays down procedures for such meetings. It also provides that in exceptional circumstances the contracting parties can grant one another waivers of their GATT obligations by two-thirds vote.

(These provisions are transferred by the revision of GATT to the OTC agreement.)

It will be seen that the above articles give to the contracting parties as a group certain powers to interpret GATT and to authorize particular contracting parties to withdraw from their obligations. In the 1954–55 revision, the powers of interpretation and waiver were removed from these articles and transferred to the OTC agreement. In their amended form, the articles are simply the same kind of mechanical arrangements as the other administrative provisions of GATT discussed earlier and are not open to serious question. Whether Congress can constitutionally approve American participation in the OTC which has now been given these powers of interpretation and waiver has still, of course, to be decided.

Consideration of the constitutional implications of these powers of interpretation and waiver might therefore be entirely deferred until discussion of the OTC itself. Two reasons, however, militate against such a procedure. First, the President agreed to United States adherence to and participation in a GATT which, in its original form, contained these provisions of interpretation and waiver. It could be conceivably argued that, if the inclusion of these provisions violated some constitutional provision, American participation in GATT as a whole was invalid. Second, until OTC is approved by the United States Congress, the contracting parties to GATT will continue to exercise the powers of interpretation and waiver. For these reasons it is appropriate to consider what authority the executive has to participate in an executive agreement containing such provisions.

The attack on the legality of the provisions for interpretation and waiver appears to take the following lines. With respect to interpretation, it is contended that the contracting parties, by majority vote, can interpret the obligations of the United States under the agreement and thus, in effect, deprive the Congress of its constitutional power to make American trade policy. With respect to waiver, it is contended that the contracting parties, by their power to pass upon American requests to be released from GATT obligations, and by their power to release other countries from the obligations which those countries have undertaken vis-a-vis the United States, can usurp the constitutional power of Congress "to regulate commerce with foreign nations."

All these contentions are devoid of merit. The power of the contracting parties to interpret the obligations of the United States and other countries under the agreement impinges upon no power of Congress. The contracting parties have no power under the agreement to increase the obligations of the United States. They canont force the United States to alter a single tariff rate or other item of legislation. In short, they cannot force the United States to act in accord with their interpretations. At most they can, in extreme cases, when the United States refuses to accept their interpretation of its obligations, authorize other countries to withdraw concessions from the United States. Whether this involves some unconsitutional usurpation of congressional power will be presently discussed. But it is clear that the act of interpreting does not itself involve the exercise of congressional power.

We are brought, therefore, to the charge that the power of the contracting parties to authorize other countries to withdraw concessions granted to the United States involves an exercise of the constitutional power of Congress "To regulate commerce with foreign nations." This charge involves an obvious fallacy. The power to regulate commerce between the United States and foreign countries by tariffs and other restrictions imposed by such foreign countries on imports to and exports from their own territories is a power which exists in those countries alone. It is not a power of the American Congress. The Constitution of the United States cannot and does not vest in Congress such authority. To hold otherwise would be to assert that the American Congress can legislate for the entire world. One cannot attribute such absurdity to the framers of our Constitution. The axiom that the powers of Congress do not include the making of legislation for other countries has been repeatedly recognized by our courts. It follows that the power of the contracting parties to authorize waiver of the obligations of other countries vis-a-vis the United States involves no delegation of congressional power.

The same is true of the power of the contracting parties to grant waivers to the United States. We have already seen that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was a constitutional delegation to the President of the power to make foreign trade agreements. By such foreign trade agreements the United States, as in all international agreements, voluntarily assumes the obligations to do or not to do certain things in return for corresponding obligations assumed by other countries. The power of the contracting parties to relieve the United States from its obligations gives the United States more rather than less freedom than it would otherwise have. Without GATT's administrative provisions the United States would be inflexibly bound by the obligations it had contracted. With them, it has an opportunity of escape. This opportunity of escape obviously involves no usurpation of congressional power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations."

In short, therefore, the administrative provisions of GATT for interpretation and waiver involve no power of the American Congress and, therefore, no redelegation of such power by the President. They involve rather a systematization by mutual agreement of a power over commerce between the United States and foreign nations which is not a power of the American Congress or of any branch of the United States Government.

Once the charge of "redelegation" is rejected, there can be little doubt about the President's authority to negotiate the administrative provisions of GATT. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act gave the President authority to make "foreign trade agreements." As we have seen, this included the authority to make multilateral agreements containing not simply tariff concessions but general trade rules as well. It must also have included the authority to negotiate the administrative provisions necessary to accomplish the act's objectives. No foreign trade agreement—certainly not a multilateral agreement embodying general trade rules—could operate effectively without some mechanism for interpretation and for adaptation of the general rules to changing situations. It is doubtful whether any country, including the United States, would commit itself to obey a set of trade rules unless some provision were made for release in special circumstances. To put it in another way, the

administrative provisions of GATT at which criticism is directed are precisely those which permit the United States Congress to free itself from the tariff and trade commitments which it has previously authorized the President to make.

The inclusion of administrative provisions in trade agreements made by the President without specific congressional approval is no new development. It has ample precedent in American history. An early example of a trade agreement containing such provisions is the executive agreement with France which Elihu Root signed on behalf of the United States on January 28, 1908. Article III of this agreement provided that complaints as to the application of customs regulations should be considered by two commissions of experts to be appointed by the Governments of the United States and France. The Commissions were to confer and report to their respective Governments with a view to modifying the objectionable regulations. Article I of the same agreement gave to the President of the French Republic the right to withdraw certain concessions "whenever additional duties beyond those now existing and which may be deemed by him unjust to the commerce of France shall be imposed by the United States on products of France."

In recent years, bilateral agreements negotiated under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934 have included administrative provisions similar to those included in GATT. The agreement with Mexico, for example, contained an escape clause authorizing the withdrawal or modification of concessions under specified circumstances. The clause provided that, before concessions could be withdrawn or modified, the country intending to act had to afford the other government an opportunity of consultation with respect to the proposed action; if agreement could not be reached, the entire trade agreement could be terminated on short notice. The clause placed no limitation on the extent of the modifications which the parties might make in tariff concessions and other obligations during their consultation in order to avoid termination of the agreement. This provision of the Trade Agreement with Mexico was accepted by implication by the House Ways and Means Committee in 1945 when it approved a statement by administration witnesses that like provisions would be included in future trade agreements.

It must be noted, of course, that the administrative provisions of GATT are embodied in a multilateral, not a bilateral, trade agreement. This fact appears to be regarded as significant by some critics. They argue that, whatever the validity of the administrative provisions in bilateral agreements may be, such provisions are inadmissible in a multilateral agreement where the United States has only 1 vote in 35. They regard the latter arrangement as a dilution of American sovereignty significantly greater than that involved in a bilateral system. Accordingly, they describe it as an unconstitutional redelegation of congressional power.

This argument rests on a fundamental misunderstanding of the operation both of bilateral agreements and of GATT itself. In a bilateral trade agreement, occasions may arise when one party undertakes a measure which the other party considers to have violated the agreement. Under customary international law, the complaining party, if it has a valid grievance which cannot be resolved by negotiation with the first party, has the right to retaliate. If the first party concedes that its action would violate the agreement, it must, if it wishes to avoid possible retaliation, secure a waiver from the other party of the other party's rights under the agreement.

Under GATT, on the other hand, the decision as to whether an American action does or does not violate treaty obligations is not made unilaterally by the one other nation directly affected; it is made by a majority vote of the contracting parties, many of them disinterested in the controversy. In the event that the United States is found to have violated its obligations, the measures of retaliation by the complaining country do not lie within its discretion alone; they are determined in accordance with recommendations of the contracting parties as a group. Finally, if the United States asks a waiver for a legislative measure clearly in conflict with its obligations, it does not have to gain approval (as it does under the bilateral system) from each country adversely affected, but only from two-thirds of the contracting parties. Thus the administrative provisions of GATT involve less restriction of United States freedom than the administrative provisions of bilateral agreements whose constitutional validity has long been accepted.

The legal objection to the inclusion of administrative provisions in a multilateral trade agreement is mainly inspired by fears about the political implications of such an arrangement. It is claimed that the United States has less bargaining power as 1 nation among 35 than in negotiating with individual trading partners. The experience with GATT and with bilateral agreements has demonstrated the unsoundness of this claim. The influence of the United States on decisions of the Contracting Parties has not simply been that of a nation having 1 vote in 35; it has fully reflected the position of the United States as the world's foremost economic power. Striking evidence of this fact was the broad waiver which the United States received from the Contracting Parties to employ quantitative restrictions, otherwise prohibited by GATT, on agricultural imports. Unfortunate indeed would have been the prospect of confronting the United States had this country been forced to secure the waiver in bilateral negotiations with 34 different trading partners.

It must be concluded, therefore, that the administrative provisions of GATT involve no surrender of American bargaining power and no dilution of American sovereignty. Clearly they involve no improper redelegation of congressional power.

Point II

Congress May Constitutionally Authorize American Participation in OTC by H. R. 5550

We have reached the conclusion that the President had authority to agree to United States participation in GATT under the powers delegated to him in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934. For reasons of policy, however, the administration has removed the main administrative provisions from GATT and placed them, strengthened by new administrative machinery, in an Agreement for an Organization for Trade Cooperation. Congressional authorization for OTC is now sought in the form of majority action by both Houses of Congress. There can be little doubt about the constitutional power of the Congress to authorize United States participation in OTC and to do so in this way.

A. Congress has the constitutional power to authorize American participation in OTC. The purpose of OTC is to provide permanent arrangements for the administration of GATT. The Organization would exercise the functions formerly exercised jointly by the contracting parties in their periodic meetings. It would also be empowered to sponsor international trade negotiations and serve as an intergovernmental forum for the discussion and study of other questions relating to international trade.

The OTC would have an assembly, consisting of all the states which are parties to GATT, and a 17-member executive committee, to which the assembly would delegate powers to handle questions arising between sessions of the assembly. Under the criteria for election to the executive committee, the United States would be assured of a permanent seat.

The OTC Agreement specifically provides that the Organization shall have no authority to amend the provisions of GATT or impose on any member any obligation which that member has not specifically agreed to undertake.

Two articles of OTC contain, in virtually identical form, the powers to interpret GATT and to authorize releases from its obligations which were formerly contained in the two main administrative articles of GATT. Article 13 empowers the assembly, in exceptional circumstances, to waive by two-thirds vote an obligation imposed upon a contracting party by GATT. Article 14 authorizes the Organization to investigate and rule on complaints and in serious cases to authorize a contracting party to suspend the application to any other contracting party or parties of concessions under GATT. The contracting party from whom concessions are thus withdrawn is free to withdraw from the Organization after 60 days' notice in writing.

Can the United States Congress authorize American participation in an organization which has such powers?

We concluded in our discussion of GATT itself that the provisions for interpretation and waiver involved no exercise of congressional power. The same conclusion applies to these provisions now that they have been transferred to OTC. There is, therefore, no basis for the charge that by approving OTC the Congress would be surrendering its constitutional power "To regulate commerce with foreign nations."

The constitutionality of OTC is also supported by reference to historical precedents. Congress has approved American participation in a number of international organizations having powers identical with or similar to the above-mentioned powers of OTC.

With respect to the power of interpretation, there can hardly be serious question. On numerous occasions—going back to the Jay Treaty of 1794—the Congress of the United States, either by two-thirds vote of the Senate or by majority vote of both Houses, has approved agreements containing provisions for interpretation of United States obligations by an international body. The Senate alone has approved treaties providing for 26 different arbitral tribunals.

As the result of congressional action, the United States now participates in organizations like the International Labor Organization, whose constitution provides for submission of disputes to the International Court of Justice, and adheres to international agreements like the narcotics conventions, which provide for the determination of certain questions by technical bodies.

The United States has accepted the so-called optional clause, article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, under which this country is obliged to accept the jurisdiction of the Court in certain broad categories of cases (including disputes as to the interpretation of treaties) in relation to any other state accepting the same obligations. It is true, of course, that this acceptance has been qualified by a reservation that the United States will not recognize the jurisdiction of the Court as to any matter considered by the United States to be within its domestic jurisdiction.

Virtually every international organization to which the United States belongs has power to interpret the obligations of the parties. Examples are the International Civil Aviation Convention, the Articles of Agreement of the International Monetary Fund, and the United Nations Charter itself.

There remain to be considered only the provisions empowering OTC to relieve members of their obligations in certain circumstances. There is ample precedent for such

provisions. Several examples can be found in the Articles of Agreement of the International Monetary Fund. Article VIII provides that "no member shall, without the approval of the fund, impose restrictions on the making of payments and transfers for current international transactions." Under this article the fund can, by giving the necessary approval, release a member from its obligation. The fund can release members from the same obligation under article VII, the so-called scarce-currency clause. This clause gives the executive directors of the fund the power to determine that the dollar is a scarce currency and to authorize the members of the fund to impose discriminatory restrictions against American goods.

The International Wheat Agreement also contains provisions authorizing the release of parties from their obligations. It empowers the International Wheat Council to relieve a party of its obligation to import or export a previously agreed quantity of wheat if it finds that fulfillment of the obligation would endanger the party's balance of payments or monetary reserves, in the case of an importing country, or is prevented by a short crop, in the case of an exporting country.

It should be clear from this discussion that the OTC provisions for waiver of obligations have close parallels in other international agreements. Indeed, history provides precedents of an even more striking kind. The United States Congress has approved American participation in international organizations having powers (specifically denied to OTC) to increase the international obligations of the United States.

The Inter-American Coffee Agreement of 1940 created an Inter-American Coffee Board and gave it "authority to increase or decrease the quotas for the United States market in order to adjust supplies to estimated requirements." The delegate of the United States on this Board cast only 12 of the 36 votes allotted to the delegates of all participating countries. In general, the decisions of the Board were to be taken by a simple majority of the votes. An emergency increase in the United States quota, however, could be authorized by a one-third vote. While such considerable restraints on America's freedom to set its own trade policy engendered many misgivings during the Senate debates, they produced not a single objection on constitutional grounds.

Other international agreements to which the United States is presently a party also give to international organizations the power to increase American obligations. The International Monetary Fund in certain circumstances can require a country to sell its currency to the fund for gold, or to buy its currency from the fund with gold or other currencies. The International Wheat Council can require parties to the International Wheat Agreement, in certain circumstances, to undertake exportations of wheat specified by it. The 1953 Opium Protocol empowers the Central Opium Board to impose upon countries an embargo on the import or export of opium. The United States Senate voted approval of this protocol without a dissenting vote, despite the fact that (unlike the OTC agreement) it involves a delegation of the constitutional power of Congress "to regulate commerce with foreign nations."

In view of the fact that Congress has approved American participation in an international organizations with such powers as these, it can hardly be maintained that it has not the power to authorize in OTC.

B. Congress may authorize American participation in OTC by majority vote of both Houses: The Congress has approved participation in a number of international organizations by majority action of both Houses. Among them are the International Labor Organization, the International Monetary Fund and Bank, the World Health Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization, and the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. It is well settled that the United States Congress can approve United States entry into international organizations in this way.

CONCLUSION

The argument set out in this report leads to the following conclusions:

1. The President had the necessary authority to agree to United States adherence to and participation in GATT under the authority delegated to him in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

2. There is no constitutional impediment to congressional enactment of H. R. 5550, authorizing United States membership and participation in OTC.

Respectfully submitted.

Committee on International Law: John V. Duncan, chairman; Amory H. Bradford; Florence Brush; Thorold J. Deyrup; Francis X. Downey; Thomas K. Finletter; Ernest A. Gross; E. Douglas Hamilton; Ethan Allen Hitchcock; James N. Hyde; Dennis C. Mahoney; Cyril C. Means, Jr.; Stanley F. Reed, Jr.; Hayden N. Smith; John R. Stevenson; Edward Everett Watts, Jr.; Richard N. Gardner, consultant.

MARCH 7, 1956.

Proposed North-South Student Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, behind the great present constitutional and legal process of spelling out the rights of every American to be free from legal segregation or other discrimination because of the color of his skin, there lies the most challenging problem of human relations to confront our Nation. The legal equality which is now being nailed down in case after case is important, and its unqualified recognition is almost a century overdue. However, these constitutional rights of our minorities of colored skin will not become truly meaningful and effective until they are recognized and understood by the majority in all our communities.

This struggle for equality and for true democracy will be fought out in the minds of the coming generation of Americans, the children who are now spending their formative years in the schools over which the central battle wages. In an editorial in the Oregon Statesman of March 21, 1956, Mrs. Marguerite Wright has made a new proposal for one step which might be taken to improve the mutual understanding and the lines of communication between our Northern and Southern communities, before the present bitterness of some members of the older generation causes a serious rift between them. Mrs. Wright takes her suggestion from the success of the student and teacher exchange programs which have established a slender but important bridge between our country and many foreign countries. She proposes an exchange program for white high school students between communities of the South and the Northern and Western States. Such a program would give northern and western students a year's experience with the life, the culture, and the problems of the South, and it would give southern teenagers a year's experience in communities in which they can see that Americans of different racial backgrounds can in fact live together, without discriminatory laws for racial segregation and discrimination, the loss of which so many adults in the South now fear so much.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial from the Oregon Statesman, entitled "North-South Exchange Students," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH-SOUTH EXCHANGE STUDENTS

One of the most universally acclaimed postwar programs to acquaint the world with the American way of life—with democracy in action day after ordinary day on Mainstreet, U. S. A.—has been the exchange of students and teachers between the United States and foreign countries. It has enabled young people and those who influence future leaders of each nation to broaden their viewpoints, gain perspective and understanding, and perhaps to modify somewhat the provincial attitude that "our way in the only way."

This writer proposes that a similarly well-planned and purposeful exchange program between northern United States high schools and colleges, where children of many races and national backgrounds attend school together without undue friction, and schools of the south where integration is feared and fought so desperately.

Both sections of the country would gain by a better recognition of each other's attitude. Enlightened southerners agree that change must come to the South, that eventual granting of equal civil rights to negroes is inevitable, but they urge a very gradual process of reeducation on grounds that the South is not yet ready for any drastic change. They warn that attempts to hasten progress or enforce race tolerance will only make matters worse and will be fought vigorously by such terrorist tactics as the revival of the Klan-like White Citizens Councils.

Since the south's feeling about negroes seems to be a sort of regional miasma that infects those born and brought up there, one way to dissipate the disease might be to bring into the south more individuals who have become immune to extreme racist emotions through exposure to non-Caucasians in a healthier atmosphere of tolerance, and bringing to the north a realization that the problem can't all be settled overnight. The student exchange would be a low-pressure method as contrasted to the high-pressure promotions of the NAACP, for instance, and it is hard to see how the south could object.

Most of the south's own proposals for a solution to their problem are either projected so far into the future as to be delusive or are clearly impractical, such as the Alabama senate's resolution calling for Federal funds to resettle southern negroes in the north and west "where they are wanted and can be assimilated."

Such schemes miss the crux of the problem; it is not the Negro, it is the white man's attitude. It is the now-dominant white man who is deciding the fate of the Negro in the United States; it is the southern whites whose minds must be won over to democratic concepts; and it is the northern whites who largely live and work peacefully with colored neighbors on an equal basis who can best show—with humility, not self-right-

eousness—that "it can be done." That is why the exchange students, of course, would all have to be white.

The unfortunate thing about this proposal is that it wasn't implemented long ago.

Bipartisanship of Slums

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I heard our distinguished colleague the gentlewoman from Ohio, Hon. FRANCES P. BOLTON, address the National Housing Conference at the recent meeting in Washington. It was a great speech. I commend it to your attention:

BIPARTISANSHIP OF SLUMS

You have heard from the experts this morning on the subject of urban renewal and low-rent public housing. I wish it had been possible for me to share the meeting with you.

I have been given a subject that intrigues me—Bipartisanship of Slums. It is a subject on which I feel strongly.

I have long been proud of the leadership that my city of Cleveland has brought to our State and to the Nation in the long, tough attack on slums, and in behalf of better housing for all families, for Cleveland had the very first local public housing authority, and Ohio was the first State that put a public housing law on its books. We have been blessed with the dedicated leadership of my old friend Ernest J. Bohn, who by the way, is a Republican colleague. Ernie Bohn has dealt always in human terms. This has given him the backing of community interests and leaders, business men and labor, Republicans and Democrats. Our accomplishments in Cleveland have been team victories. They must continue that way.

It hasn't all been easy going. We have met powerful opposition, but step by step we are winning this fight. We are winning it because we have a positive approach. We waste no time attacking those who attack us. We try to understand the needs and desires of our people, and we do our utmost to meet them. We have no faith in miracles. We know that our job is long and difficult, but so long as we unite our forces, and in our planning for each new day we rise above greed and the pettiness of partisan advantage, we know that our progress will one day bring us to our goal of an adequate home for every family in Cleveland and in America.

In the House of Representatives, where I have served since 1940, I have listened to some bitter debates on the subject of low-rent public housing. We have won some ringing victories and suffered some stinging defeats. But always we shall do well to remember that there is wide bipartisanship among both the proponents and opponents of public housing. Whenever we get into wrangles over public housing, I find myself wishing that I could take my colleagues by the hand and lead them through the jungles of the slums of our cities and let them feel and smell what it is we are talking about. Will you forgive me if I say that it always seems to me that you people who are today within the reach of my voice haven't done all that you could do back home, to bring understanding to Members of the Congress of the humanitarian programs to which you devote your lives.

You can bring a real knowledge and so a better understanding to the House of Representatives, if you will make it your No. 1 job this summer to see to it that your Representatives in the Congress know and understand the job that you are doing. Don't bother about the political affiliation of your Congressman, or how he has voted in the past! Think of him as just another good American who wants more than anything, to represent honestly and well all the people of his (or her) district. We Congressmen are just ordinary folk! We are your next-door neighbors. If we fail to seek your counsel, provide it freely anyway, and do it when we are at home where we can see and feel what it is of which you speak. No Member of Congress is too busy to find out how his constituents live.

I was impressed with President Eisenhower's forthright message to this, yours 25th annual meeting. Let us repeat what he said: "Our Nation's progress in the housing field must continue. To renew our cities and towns, to prevent and clear slums, and to raise the living standards of all our families, the individual citizen, the community, the State, private industry, and the Federal Government must work together. Such cooperation is exemplified in communitywide programs for urban renewal that have been generated by the Housing Act of 1954.

"I am confident that in the years ahead your Conference will continue to give strong support and encouragement to this common effort."

You are called upon by our President, for continuing support and encouragement. I have read the administration's housing proposals for 1956, as introduced by SENATOR CAPEHART in the Senate, in which he was joined by request by SENATOR SPARKMAN, and by REPRESENTATIVE WIDNALL in the House. I am aware that the National Housing Conference has taken the position that the administration recommendation of 70,000 units of low-rent public housing to be contracted for over the next 2 years, is inadequate as weighed against the housing needs of families of low income. It is not my wish to discuss statistics or housing needs, but I must say one thing with all of the force at my command:

All of us know that the task of slum elimination and the rebuilding of our cities is staggering beyond belief. Our administration has shown a willingness to attack this problem in a practical way. One cannot wave away the fact that a majority of the House of Representatives has shown itself many times to be opposed to the low-rent public housing program as it presently operates. That is an unfortunate fact with which we have to deal. Yet the administration makes it perfectly clear that it will move ahead with the gigantic task of slum clearance and urban renewal. The administration also says frankly that this job cannot be accomplished unless there is some public housing to rehouse low-income families that are displaced through slum clearance. It asks for a program that it believes it can persuade the House of Representatives to approve. That means progress, not stagnation. It means that we are headed forward, not backward, and it takes us to the place where the future rests with you.

If you are right in saying that the recommended program is too small to meet existing needs, then I feel that it is your duty to prove your point with local facts and figures. I know that the National Housing Conference prepared and presented a study of housing needs, using facts from the 1950 census and other data. That was fine as far as it went. It was an excellent statistical document presented by a national organization. It was helpful to those of us who are on your team anyway, but far more than that is required if we expect to achieve any kind of a balance between authorized programs and need.

National figures are interesting, but if I'm going to be moved to act, I need to know Cleveland's situation from the mayor, the housing officials, and from civic leaders. I need to see the actual conditions under which some of our citizens have to live. My colleagues from Georgia, Texas, California, Massachusetts, and New York need to know the same thing. How can those of us who are on the Hill really know the situation except through you? We in Congress should not be called upon to ask you, and somebody in Washington shouldn't have to do the job for you.

If, what the administration is asking is too small; if the cities of our Nation demand more in order to do a job that is essential to the welfare of our people, then tell us the facts and do it quickly, because time moves ahead relentlessly. That is my message to you. It is from a Republican Member of the Congress who is on your side. I am confident that my Democratic colleagues will tell you the same thing.

I am almost envious of the opportunity that is yours to help destroy slums, and to help create communities in which millions of American families can find a new way of life and prepare themselves to graduate as full-fledged members of our proud, self-supporting, economically free body politic. It was my great priliege to spend many years in the field of social service and education, specifically in public health nursing and in nursing education. I began right in the districts where life is hard and the light of hope is often very dim. I speak from personal experience, and from a full heart. I believe I understand your objectives and your problems. It is this that brings me here.

To me, the so-called housing problem is a composite of many things. It is complicated, because it is so personal. It is related to a vast range of intensely human problems that confront not only slum dwellers, the aging, veterans, minority groups, but all of us, every day that we live.

The housing problem cannot be explained away with easy clichés: the greedy landlord, the maniac tenant who destroys property for the fun of it, the slum dweller who would put coal in the bathtub if he had one; or the slick mortgage-foreclosing banker versus the poor widow, nor the Communist agitator versus the strong, sturdy, upright private enterpriser.

Housing is so much more than just the fact that you can't find a place to live; it is all tied up with the problem that when you do find a proper house, you may have to cut down on food to pay for it—and then lose it anyway when you are unemployed for a few months. Or it may be quite simply that you can't afford a house with a back yard when the children are young and need the space and the sun, but must wait till you get that raise and the doctor's bills are paid * * * and by that time the children have grown up. No matter how dearly you love your parents, living together in a crowded flat often stretches your patience and theirs beyond the breaking point.

Housing is doubling up and sharing the bath and cooking over a hotplate. It is why so many young people, who got married in a romantic rush during war years, couldn't turn their marriage into something solid and enduring and so took the only way out that they knew: separation-divorce. It is why colored and whites throw rocks at each other in some overcrowded cities where otherwise there seems to be a general and sincere desire to get rid of discrimination and live

peaceably with your neighbors whoever they may be.

Housing is the fire that trapped a sick woman in the old three-decker, the bowed legs and pale face of the little girl in the tenement, the epidemic that started in the shacktown with no sewerage connection, the boy gang in the alley aping the older gang in the pool room * * * and it is the cost of all of these things to taxpayers and society as a whole, against which we all rebel.

Housing is the fact that, even if there were no shortage and you had plenty of money, you would have to choose between renting a noisy apartment in a crowded neighborhood, or buying a suburban house that is pleasant and open, and an hour from your work where you can't find a place to park.

Housing is the fact that the house and the neighborhood you used to take pride in are now run down, undesirable for anything but cheap boardinghouses, funeral emporiums and quack doctors; it is finding a place with a nursery school nearby, a place where older children won't have to cross dangerous highways or pass filthy dives. It is the fact that dirt and noise and danger dreariness and high tax rates made you move to the suburbs, but that did not improve the conditions you left behind. Housing is the fact that your child in the suburb and the child in the slum or low-rent housing project tend more and more to see only their own class and kind, in a country whose historic strength is a lack of built-in class barriers. It is one reason why the farmer's wife grows old before her time and his children go to the city, where they won't have to thaw out the pump on zero mornings. It is why the big producer cannot get enough men to pick his crop before it rots. Housing is people, and all of their problems and frustrations. Housing is also their dreams, their hopes, their prayers which all too often end in anguish and despair.

You are brave people indeed to devote your lives to an effort to help solve our housing problem. You have become dedicated people. You know as few do that human problems are common problems which cannot be solved except as a completely bi-partisan task. You are dealing with all kinds of people, and with all of the emotions of the human race. May Heaven grant you ever-increasing understanding and wisdom as you continue with patience and determination toward our common goal.

It is thrilling to know that you are making progress, for you are. We, on Capitol Hill want to help. We need your guidance, your advice and the facts that only you can give. Where Federal aid is required to find the answer to this complicated problem it must and will be forthcoming. Keep your courage high. I suggest that the people are on your side.

Perhaps the Housing Act that will pass in 1956 will not be all that you desire, but I predict that one will pass and that it will mark progress toward the goal that we mutually seek. I express the hope that the National Housing Conference will continue its long fight for slum clearance and better housing. When you meet 25 years from now to celebrate not 25 but 50 years of public service, I feel certain that you will be able to look back and say: "It has been a long, steep road, but we have never ceased to climb."

Once more I venture to predict: That when most of America is properly housed because of the work that has been done by Republicans and Democrats together in true bipartisanship the deeper meaning of freedom will be brought home to all who can call themselves Americans, and our wonderful representative Republic will be the symbol of men's understanding of those basic human needs which mean growth and happiness and peace.

The Plight of Our Aging Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Livingston Manor Times, a most excellent weekly newspaper in my district, is worthy of deep consideration by all Members of this House.

The plight of the World War I veteran is a matter we need to be reminded of, although it is a matter that we should never have forgotten.

Mr. H. Capron Battey, the author, has done well to bring to our attention the treatment received at present by this gallant and dwindling group of veterans:

THE PLIGHT OF OUR AGING VETERANS

The plight of our World War I veterans might well be compared to that of the forgotten man. Most of them today are nearing the age of 60, and some of them ar close to 70 years of age, and unless they are fortunate enough to have acquired property, they are in a country where they will find it difficult to live even under ordinary standards due to high prices. The chances of a man over 50 year of age finding himself a job, if suddenly thrown out of work, are very slim, and he is even in a far worse plight if he tried to live on the slender pension, which he may get from a "grateful" Government.

The American Legion is now working on a veterans' security bill, which it is believed would help these elderly men live like human beings if it is passed, and would cost the Nation only $77 million by the year 2,000, according to the Veterans' Administration, which is strongly opposing the bill due to its cost.

Any country that can throw $11 billion to Russia, billions more to France and England, and can give away costly battleships and planes to foreign countries can afford to take care of its veterans. There are no wails of anguish from Congress in giving many millions to the farmers, and in other large subsidies to most everyone else, but when it comes to the elderly veteran, they are strangely silent. We hear the argument that many of them are veterans also, and we do not forget that recently they raised their own salary by a comfortable margin.

Today a veteran over 65 may be paid a modest pension, provided he is virtually helpless. The amount of the pension is $78.75, and some of them are getting less than that. The Government demands certain living standards for families on relief, but Mr. Citizen, Mr. Congressman, Mr. Senator, and Mr. Top Brass in the Pentagon, how would you like to try to live on that for 1 month at today's costs.

Those elderly veterans were granted an adjusted compensation after the war. The mustering out pay was $60 and there was inflation then, so that the money went, usually before a man could land a job. The adjusted compensation went for hospital bills, and cost of living in bringing up sons, who only a few years ago served their country in France, England, the Philippines, and in Korea. That was a "subsidy" that paid back well to the country.

We hear there were abuses and some veterans received pensions who were not entitled to it. We think we can blame that on faulty examination by those doctors connected with the Veterans' Administration.

A World War I veteran in order to get needed hospitalization in a Veterans' Administration Hospital must virtually declare himself a pauper, and then is barred from receiving treatment if there are no beds in that particular hospital, and if his illness, is not service connected.

Service-connected cases of World War I are difficult to prove as wounded men were often received in such numbers that medical records were disregarded in attempts to give relief to those in suffering. Now many of their buddies who might help prove war disability, are no longer here.

Let us remember the World War I veteran was not paid after his discharge, while he was looking for a job, he "panhandled" or sold apples and took what he could get. No "grateful" Government gave him a college education and took care of his family while he was receiving instructions; no "grateful" Government helped him to purchase a home, by aiding him with a loan at a low rate of interest.

We hear some of our great Senators are in anguish over the plight of the displaced persons, tear their hair over the "poor farmer," and give away billions for aid to some Asiatic or European country, but when it comes to aid for the aging veteran, they are strangely silent.

On an Even Keel and Moving Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my own remarks and to include extraneous material, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the April 17, 1956, issue of the Tallahassee Democrat entitled "On an Even Keel and Moving Ahead." I am very proud of the continuing progress being made by the State of Florida as outlined in this editorial:

From the State chamber of commerce comes still another set of figures to show Florida's growth.

The chamber says that during 1955:

Retail sales gained 14 percent.

Income rose 13 percent.

Population increased 4 percent.

Gross farm income was up 10 percent.

Bank debits in 7 financial centers were up 18 percent.

Department-store sales increased 15 percent, and so did sales-tax receipts.

Gasoline consumption was up 12 percent.

Electric-power production was up 10 percent.

Construction expenditures rose 17 percent.

These are good, solid figures showing sound economic growth. There is no runaway boom attached to them. It is the sort of growth that testifies to the confidence of our own people and of immigrants from other States in our State and its government.

Nothing succeeds like success, and this sort of growth plus the State's promotion efforts are largely responsible for another report in which the Manufacturer's Record magazine showed Florida led all other Southern States with establishment of 17 new industries during February.

Excerpts From the Remarks of Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, at the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Dinner, Saturday, April 21, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from the remarks of Speaker SAM RAYBURN, at the Woodrow Wilson centennial dinner, Saturday, April 21, 1956:

Tonight we honor Woodrow Wilson, the first effective great liberal to occupy the White House in the 20th century. Woodrow Wilson should be with us again at this hour. We need again his great soul and his stern voice and prophetic insight into the troubled hearts of men and the tremendous affairs of nations. In his first inaugural, I was a freshman Congressman, and the words he spoke then come back to me again in this hour and are applicable to much that is happening among us today. He said:

"The great Government we love has too often been made use of for profit and selfish purposes, and those who used it have forgotten the people."

Under Wilson's leadership we Democrats determined that this should not be a nation of giant machines overshadowing men. We decided that machines were made for men, and not men for machines. He said, "We must believe the things we tell the children."

Once the Republicans had a liberal in the White House—Theodore Roosevelt—but he was not effective. He had his troubles with the old guard Congress.

The Republicans now have in the White House a man who has indicated liberal tendencies, but the old guard Republicans in Congress have done little but thwart them. As always, when they are in control of the executive branch of the Government, the Republicans are content with the status quo, nullification, and negation.

I am speaking from a position of personal knowledge. We Democrats in Congress have had a difficult time in getting the Republicans to go along with a modicum of President Eisenhower's legislative program when he advocates Democratic measures in the interest of the people.

The Republicans are boasting privately to their big-business friends that they are responsible for defeating their President's proposals while at the same time they are proclaiming to the public that we Democrats are doing nothing to put through his program.

The truth will out sooner or later. Meantime, it appears to me that the Republican President has little discipline in the rank and file of his forces.

The Republicans are not even in step with their Commander in Chief.

The Republicans have not changed in a hundred years. They still have the old Hamiltonian theory that the way to make the country prosperous is to make the rich very rich and that prosperity will trickle down to millions of workers and farmers.

Many of us have been around here for a long time and we have been waiting for the Republican trickle-down theory to trickle down to us.

Our Democratic theory is, and always has been, that the way to keep the country prosperous is to assure the working man, the working woman, and the farmer the earning power and the purchasing power to produce prosperity for all.

Our theory proved right in 20 years of Democratic administrations. We raised the national income from $39 billions in 1933, when we took over, to $290 billions in 1952.

The tremendous prosperity that the Republicans are now boasting of could not have come about if we Democrats had not laid the sound foundation for it during the 20 years we were responsible for the destiny of our people.

Certainly there has been nothing in the Eisenhower program that could have laid the basis for this prosperity. The Eisenhower administration has not originated any major change. About the only think it can claim is that it asked for and has been granted extension of programs instituted originally in the Wilson, Roosevelt and Truman administrations.

But the Republican brand of prosperity, and the Republican policies of administration, have developed certain weaknesses. The major one, of course, is the plight of the farmers. Every depression has been preceded by a drop in farm income.

And there are other indicators: The growing number of failures of small-business enterprises and the current drop in home construction, to mention only two.

Now everyone remembers that during the 1952 campaign, the Republicans went all over this country talking about Democratic programs being socialistic. They implied, at least led the people to believe, that they were going to rip our programs out of the Government by the roots.

I challenge any Republican, in any position of responsibility from the President down, to point to a single major law that we passed in 20 years, that they have even proposed to repeal.

So, I say, if the Democratic enactments were socialistic in 1952, then they are socialistic today, and that if the Democratic Party was socialistic in bringing them into effect, then the Republican Party is equally socialistic in keeping them on the statute books.

No, the Republicans have not had the temerity to attack our programs directly. But I'll grant this—they have through negation and nullification, prevented our programs from protecting small business and the farmers.

In contrast, they have done much for big business, as all Republican administrations have done in the past.

They have encouraged mergers of businesses.

They have fostered concentration of wealth into a few huge corporations, and have permitted the big ones to gobble up the little ones. This occurred not only in business but in farming. Under the Eisenhower administration, we have seen millions of small farmers leave the soil. The family farm, in contrast to the corporation-owned farm, is one of the bedrock foundations of our social system and the American way of life. The Republicans are making its survival more and more difficult. We have seen many small businesses sell out to octopuses that stretch their tentacles into the lives of communities far afield.

The Eisenhower administration has turned its back on the farmers in the face of conditions that forecast the loss of prosperity to many. It seems to ignore the fact that the net income of farmers declined from more that $14 billion in 1952 to around $11 billion last year. Furthermore, the Eisenhower administration, through Secretary Benson, has made the city populations believe that the farmer is responsible for his cost of living. That is just not so. The price spread between producers and consumers is growing under policies of this administration.

That Republican policies are bad for this country has been proven time and again. It was proved before Woodrow Wilson was elected President in 1912. I was here when that great liberal and genius of democratic government was inaugurated. The country, after many years of Republican big business, including a panic, was in dire straits. Millions were idle. Farmers were broke. Our foreign trade had fallen. Businesses were closing.

In 10 minutes, I cannot even list briefly the many peacetime accomplishments of the Wilson administration. But the Congress passed Mr. Wilson's Underwood Tariff Act, that restored export markets for our farm and industrial products. It approved the Clayton Antitrust Act, to set standards for enforcement of the Sherman Act; and took the management of the Nation's money from private individuals by establishing the Federal Reserve System, a financial agency that has stood the test of our times.

In Mr. Wilson's own words: "The control of the system of banking and of issue which our new laws are to set up, must be public and not private; must be vested in the Government itself, so that the banks may be the instruments, not the masters, of business and of individual enterprise and initiative."

Through the great wisdom and vision of Woodrow Wilson, this Nation made a transition from a primarily agricultural nation to the industrial age. He saw the need for a national highway system, of a merchant marine, aid to farmers, protection of workers through shorter hours and higher wages. These accomplishments were coupled with the 16th amendment to the Constitution, which made possible the graduated income tax based on the "ability to pay," and the 17th amendment, which made the Senate, as well as Members of the House, subject to the democratic process of direct elections.

The Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Tariff Commission, and the Federal Power Commission were instruments of good government created in the Wilson era to protect trade and the natural resources of the Nation.

Woodrow Wilson led us through World War I, and upon its successful conclusion, he went to Europe with his great conception of a league of peace.

Isolationism, emerging from Republican spawning grounds, arose to defeat this high aim of a man who gave his life for his cause.

Wilson's dream of world peace—theretofore unparalleled in the concept of man, died with his prediction that if the United States did not join with the Allied Powers, the world would again be plunged into conflagration within 25 years.

The Wilson concept resulted in the United Nations after the second great war. Our Presidents Roosevelt and Truman cemented this organization in the scheme of the world's peace plans.

No one can say that in the 20 years that our party governed this Nation, that we did not bring prosperity out of chaos; that we did not give this Nation the strength to make it the most powerful on earth.

When the Republicans took over in 1953, our foreign policy was respected throughout the world. We had prevented the Communists from taking over Europe and the Middle East, and we stopped them in Korea.

Our foreign policy was condemned in the 1952 campaign by the Republicans. Now it is not known here or abroad exactly what our foreign policy is. Under the Eisenhower administration, there is the utmost confusion, and it is evident, despite all the State Department propaganda and conflicting statements, that we are losing ground and losing friends in world affairs to a nation that harbors only ill will toward us.

I regret to say that in my opinion, the way this administration has handled our foreign affairs, the free world stands in the direst danger it has ever faced.

We Democrats must unite for the forthcoming campaign for control of our govern-

ment. In the words of Woodrow Wilson, the people will not give a divided political party the responsibility of running the Government. If among us there are different views, let us compose them among ourselves and not let our political opponents use our intra-party differences to defeat us.

I believe the Democratic Party is the best party to govern this Nation in the days ahead. Woodrow Wilson believed, as did Roosevelt and Truman, that our party was the best equipped in philosophy and character to do so, because our party has the ability and vision to see into the future and find solutionst to meet the needs of our people.

The People Must Retain Responsibility of the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important battles the American people have today is to maintain a government by the people. More and more efforts are being strengthened to extend control of the Government by bureaucrats from Washington and with each step in extenting Federal control the people lose some of their rights. The following editorial from the Amarillo Globe-Times should be carefully read by all Americans:

GREAT WHITE FATHER

You, the people, are a part of the Government of the United States as government is defined by the United States Constitution.

True, there are many places in which the right of the people is defined, and there is one powerful phrase: "The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people." But certain definite responsibilities are also outlined.

Is it because of the bountiful gifts poured out by the Great White Father from his multi-million-dollar tepee on the Potomac that we have seemingly forgotten that it was "We, the people," who ordained and established the Constitution and the Government that has derived thereof?

We purposely have described the Federal Government in the term used by the Indians, those vanishing first Americans who were pushed back onto reservations, deriving all rights, privileges and bounty from a Great White Father.

Sometimes we feel that the American of the mid 20th century has come to the same frame of mind—by the Great White Father's consent he lives in the several reservations called States, and he accepts his bounty of doles, subsidies, free services, pensions with the same sense of gratitude.

How far can free men fall from the high peaks of self-sufficiency and responsibility of action?

We heard a college professor say recently that no one could regard the corruption an ineffectiveness of State governments without recognizing that the minorities and individuals must turn to the Federal Government for redress and comfort.

For a piece of fuzzy, sleazy thinking, we offer the prize to that one.

If State governments, much nearer the people than that on the Potomac, are corrupt and ineffectual and cannot be cured of such cancerous growth then how in tarnation can we hope to control a Federal Government, which of course will become as corrupt and ineffectual as the State governments, if the people who ordained all government units under our Constitution refuse to carry their share of responsibility?

If citizens cannot take the trouble to clean up the Augean stables in their own backyards, why believe that they will tackle those far enough away that the stench is carried off downwind?

No. There is no escape. Under the Constitution, the people have definite responsibilities, as well as rights, and if the people will not assume these responsibilities, they produce a failure of government as sure as that which has been practiced lately by a Supreme Court which arbitrarily has assumed legislative powers.

You don't know how to assume your rightful responsibility? Tomorrow we tell you how really simple the apparent complexity of government is—and how you, the people, can have the ultimate word in government if.

The "if", too, is simple: If you prefer a paternalistic Great White Father, you are confined to the reservation; if you prefer freedom, it carries a price tag—responsibility.

The Farm Bill Vetoed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Tuesday, April 17, 1956, entitled "The Farm Bill Vetoed":

President Eisenhower's veto of the farm bill was an act of political courage founded on sound principle.

This measure, with its restoration of fixed price support at 90 percent of parity, its revival of a discriminatory dual parity formula and its other appeals to particular crop interests, may have been shrewd congressional politics, but it was bad economics.

For it would have renewed and strengthened a price-support system which encourages the diversion of manpower and soil resources to the production of crops which the Nation does not need. It would have continued a system of legislative favoritism to a few well organized farm blocs. It would have sacrified progress toward a healthy and effective farm policy to the immediate need for improvement of farm income.

So the President was justified in sending the bill back to Congress without his approval. He mingled principle with a dash of political expediency when, in doing so, he announced that price supports for the major crops will be set this year at no less than 82½ percent of parity, while the support for manufacturing milk and butterfat also will be increased. This means $2 wheat, $1.50 corn, and $4.50 rice, moderate increases over the present support levels.

By thus increasing support prices in order to improve farm income this year, the President admits what his administration has been loath to admit before—that the farm situation does call for immediate remedies. The soil bank would not have improved farm income this year. By taking land out of production at rentals amounting to half the support price for crops, it would have reduced immediate income instead, though promising a long-range improvement through curtailment of surpluses.

It was on the premise that something else was needed to bolster income now that the Democrats in Congress—with some indispensable Republican support—insisted on restoring price supports at 90 percent of parity. Now that the President has accepted their premise, his program will be subject to fair criticism if it fails to improve the farm situation. Neither the farmers nor the Democrats will overlook the fact that the administration did not offer 82½ percent of parity until after Congress had tried to legislate 90 percent.

How far short the price-support system falls of being a sound farm policy was indicated when the President remarked, in his radio-TV address, that more than half of farm income comes from livestock—which benefits from price supports only indirectly, if at all.

The truth is that neither the administration nor the advocates of high, fixed price supports have faced up to the implications of this crucial fact. If farm income is to be sustained by Government action, as nearly everybody seems to agree, what kind of action will be effective in those areas where price supports are not?

Mr. Eisenhower mentioned the possibility of purchase programs for beef, hogs, and other perishables. But Secretary Benson's pork-buying program last winter was a joke. It made no perceptible difference in the price of hogs. Something else will be needed—perhaps a food stamp plan and other ways of stimulating consumption, perhaps some form of direct payment to livestock producers, perhaps a combination of both.

Both Republicans and Democrats would do the country a favor if they started debating farm policy in these terms instead of merely debating the level of price supports.

1926–56

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Farrell Line News of February 1, 1956:

1926–56

In history's measure and life's span 30 years is but a generation. Among privately owned American-flag, offshore shipping enterprises three decades is a respectable age. Accordingly, the recent anniversary of January 27, 1926, may warrant comment and the maturity attained excuse a look both ahead and astern.

Time and fortune have favored us in all things save one. Few remain who shared the thrill of the inaugural voyage of steamship *West Isleta*. A small but faithful band, we rejoice with those who have earned their leisure in retirement. We save our fondest memories for those who have embarked for Fiddlers Green.

Looking back we recall countless causes for satisfaction. The greatest of these are not to be found in ledger balances.

Trade and service have expanded sixfold. Area served has more than tripled. Employment directly provided at sea and on shore has been multiplied by six. The present fleet—4 times larger, twice as fast and half as old—represents an investment of

more than 30 times the original capital subscribed. And this increase has come from plowed-back earnings only. We are proud of this record and of everyone who ever contributed to it. We hold that the results obtained are adequate compensation for all the effort and anxiety necessary to their accomplishment.

In all humility our greatest pride is that in war and peace we have served the best interests of our Nation, its allies and of all our friends in Africa, south of the Sahara.

Looking forward we are refreshed. If courage, imagination, and industry measure up to opportunity, the past can be rendered insignificant by the future.

What I Owe My Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following essay by Joyce Williams, Van Wert High School, Van Wert, Ohio:

WHAT I OWE MY COUNTRY

(By Joyce Williams, Van Wert, Ohio)

I was born an American, and my debt is great. With no effort at all on my part, I was born free and equal in a land where opportunities are numberless. I, a tiny baby, unable to reason, unable to think, was born with the very advantages that my ancestors fought and died for. They fought and died, leaving their mark of blood and sweat on the pages of history. I did nothing. I was born an American, and my debt is great.

Our minds can scarcely fathom the toil, the sacrifice, and the intellect that went into the building of our Nation. The Pilgrims, who sailed across the turbulent Atlantic to escape religious persecution, laid our foundation. The sincere and brilliant statesmen who framed our documents, laid our cornerstones. The men and women who dedicated themselves to the task of making America a better place to live in, shaped our destiny.

My country has given me everything. May God forgive me if I, through idleness or ignorance, fail to utilize my talents and fail to be worthy of the name "American."

My debt is great. I owe my country my utmost.

I owe her my respect and admiration:

To stand erect and sing proudly her national anthem.

To respect her flag and support her creed.

I owe her my loyalty:

To speak for her in the face of adverse criticism.

To stand up for her no matter how trying the times.

To be with her and strengthen her in times of trial and tribulation.

I owe her citizens my understanding and tolerance:

To treat them as human beings, all equal and one.

To respect their ideas and beliefs though they differ from mine.

To love them and work with them in true brotherhood.

Last but far from least I owe my service:

To perform my duties of citizenship to the best of my ability.

To keep informed of national affairs at home or abroad.

To live a clean and a decent life, striving always to do my best.

The men and women who have shaped this land have given me much.

I, in turn, owe my country much. Of course, I'll make mistakes and fail along the way, but with the help of God I'll rise again, stronger than before—stronger and abler to serve my country.

"Breathes there the man, with soul so dead,
Who never to himself hath said,
This is my own, my native land."

—*Scott.*

This is my country.

Four Million Five Hundred Thousand Dollar Investment in Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an article appearing in Nation's Business for April 1956 entitled "$4,500,000 Investment in Tomorrow." This article has to do with what we in South Carolina refer to as Bushy Park. I think it has the greatest promise of any site in America for modern industry. The major attraction to present-day industry is water—nothing else is so important. In my district and close to my birthplace, there is more water for modern industry than any place in America, unless Niagara Falls is an exception.

Credit for this project goes to many people. But credit for having this story on Bushy Park told to the Nation in Nation's Business must be given to Charleston's distinguished representative on the United States Chamber of Commerce, Joseph P. Riley. It was Mr. Riley who called this project to the attention of Alden H. Sypher, editor of Nation's Business. Mr. Riley, a director in the national chamber and a member of the national chamber's construction and civic development committee, prevailed upon the distinguished editor of this official organ of the United States Chamber of Commerce to send a representative to Charleston to write on this project. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith an article from the Charleston, S. C., News and Courier, along with the reproduction of the article I have heretofore referred to:

[From the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier]

BUSHY PARK STORY IS TOLD BY MAGAZINE—NATION'S BUSINESS ARTICLE IS CREDITED TO JOSEPH P. RILEY

The story of Charleston's Bushy Park project—"$4,500,000 Investment in Tomorrow"—appears in the April issue of Nation's Business, official publication of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

The article, including a description of the most recent construction activity at Bushy Park's earthfill dam and canal, was written by Philip Gustafson who visited Charleston earlier this year for an on-the-spot survey of the project.

In this illustrated article on the vast industrial water project, author Gustafson calls Bushy Park Charleston's water triumph.

SYPHER INTERESTED

The editor of Nation's Business, Alden H. Sypher, became interested in the Bushy Park story through Joseph P. Riley, of Charleston, a director of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and a member of the national chamber's construction and civic development committee.

Riley is also past president of the Greater Charleston Construction and Civic Development Committee.

Riley impressed editor Sypher with the na-Charleston Chamber of Commerce.

Riley impresed editor Sypher with the national significance of the Bushy Park project and in May of last year the editor agreed to a story.

RILEY IS PRAISED

Praise for the article and for Riley has come from Edward Kronsberg, president of the Greater Charleston Chamber of Commerce and Arthur M. Field, chief engineer of the Charleston Development Board.

Said Kronsberg: "We are deeply indebted to Mr. Riley and to Nation's Business for this excellent story on one of the Nation's greatest industrial sites. This information in the hands of prospective industrialists should prove a boon to greatly expanded industrial development in the Charleston area."

Engineer Field commented: "Such favorable publicity in national publications can give impetus to the project and result in much faster development. We believe that Mr. Riley has rendered a great service to our area and the entire South through his efforts to focus the national spotlight on Bushy Park."

[From Nation's Business of April 1956]

FOUR MILLION FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLAR INVESTMENT IN TOMORROW—CHARLESTON, S. C., COMBINED THE FLOW OF TWO RIVERS TO GIVE THE CITY AN ALMOST UNLIMITED FRESH WATER SUPPLY

(By Philip Gustafson)

Industry today uses 80 billion gallons of water a day. By 1975 it will need 200 billion.

It takes 15,000 gallons of water to make a new automobile; 65,000 to produce a ton of steel; 320,000 gallons for a ton of aluminum; 600,000 gallons for a ton of synthetic rubber.

To keep pace with the country's expansion since World War II cities are reaching out with pipelines, building dams and reservoirs, and probing the earth as never before. Ohio is drilling 2,000 wells a month. Baltimore has just completed a new reservoir holding 23 billion gallons of water. Dallas will build a reservoir costing $20 million. Texas is even talking of importing water from the Mississippi River; the expansion of New York's water supply of about 500 million gallons cost more than $500 million. In other parts of the country other cities are going after water by use of measures ranging from the orthodox to the unique.

Among the most unusual of these methods are those used by Charleston, S. C. Ingredients of Charleston's water triumph include:

An unusual geographic situation.

An engineer with imagination.

A rugged, hard-hitting Scotch mayor who gets things done.

An eccentric, craggy-browed contractor with a big western hat.

A fat Chesapeake Retriever.

Charleston is a proud southern city situated on a peninsula formed by the Ashley and Cooper Rivers. It is a city of contrasts. At the south end of the peninsula are old colonial houses surrounded by gardens of azaleas and camelias; spreading out to the north is a fast-growing colony of modern, diversified industry.

Charleston prospered in World War II. Its 35-foot depth harbor was rediscovered and reequipped; it swarmed with shipping and

shipyards, its navy yard was revived, while industry was enormously expanded and population was doubled.

The city made earlier provision for its industrial potential by uniting the Cooper and Santee Rivers to form two huge lakes with more than 800,000,000 gallons capacity in a giant $56,000,000 hydroelectric project 40 miles above Charleston. It is the 10,000,000,000-gallon-a-day tailrace canal flowing from this great reservoir that feeds the Santee-Cooper River and now brings a fresh, uncontaminated water supply to Charleston's back door.

When World War II ended, the Charleston war boom died, too. With the navy yard laying off workers by the thousands and wartime activities folding, Charleston faced stagnation. In the face of the crisis, 300 firms joined to form the Charleston Industrial Development Board. They brought in a solid and slow-spoken industrial engineer named Arthur Maxwell Field to improve the city's industrial picture.

In 10 years, Charleston has added 100 diversified industries, raised its industrial capitalization 100 percent and built itself up to become the largest cotton importer as well as the hub of the southern wool industry, the leading petroleum port and the first port of call for ships from South America. Industrial payrolls have jumped from $3,000,000 to $30,000,000 and family incomes have risen 60 percent.

Though Charleston was lacking in some of the natural resources Mr. Field would have liked—such as oil, salt and sulphur—it has others—a fine harbor, good truck, rail and air transportation, labor supply, a favorable tax picture and a growing market in the Southeast.

Mr. Field showed these assets to officials of U. S. Steel in 1948. U. S. Steel had developed a new source of ore in Venezuela and wanted a new plant location as near as possible to the source. Principal requirements: Deep sea frontage and 400,000,000 gallons of water a day. Mr. Field immediately thought of the 10,000,000,000 gallons a day flowing down the Santee-Cooper.

Here was abundant water, except:

At high tide, the ocean backed up into the Santee-Cooper and made the river water unusable.

A dam across the mouth of the Santee-Cooper to keep out salt water seemed the obvious solution. But, miles of dam and extensive ship locks would be needed. This would make the venture almost impossibly expensive.

Then, flying over the area one day, Mr. Field found the answer to Charleston's water problem.

Between the forks of the Santee-Cooper and the Back River—a marsh-bordered tidal stream that rises about 2 miles west of the Santee-Cooper and flows parallel with it for about 7 miles before turning sharply east and joining is—is a high, 4,400-acre wooded tract known as Bushy Park, after one of the old plantations. Upstream from this tract, Mr. Field spotted a low place. He realized that a shallow canal, dug for about 4 miles, could connect the rivers. Thus fresh water from the upper Santee-Cooper could be diverted into the Back River. A dam at the lower end of the Back River would hold out the sea water—this one not prohibitive in cost. Thus, by reshuffling a couple of rivers, Charleston could not only get a tremendous water supply but open up Bushy Park and some 10,000 acres across the Santee-Cooper from it—all of it land hitherto inaccessible. Mr. Field told county and city officials about it.

"I convinced them we had a tremendous source of water in the Santee-Cooper reservoir and that we ought to have firm plans for its development," he says.

But to make sure, the Charleston Commission of Public Works obtained a $175,000 loan from the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency and employed Ford, Bacon & Davis, New York engineering firm to survey the water prospects in the area. Ford, Bacon & Davis declared the Bushy Park project entirely sound and estimated the job, including the Back River canal and dam and an 8-mile tunnel to the property across the Santee-cooper would cost $5,900,000.

As the project finally crystallized, it added up to this:

The 10 billion gallons of fresh water flowing daily from the Santee-Cooper hydroelectric plant could be diverted into Back River by means of a canal. Back River could then be closed by an earth-fill dam at its lower end. This dam would serve a two-fold purpose:

First, it would serve to prevent salt-water intrusion into the fresh-water reservoir.

Second, it would carry a railroad spur connection between the heart of the Charleston industrial area and the Seaboard Air Line Railroad.

The dam would also serve as a highway, giving access to Bushy Park from the south. The Black River would serve as a reservoir from which Charleston would draw fresh water which it would discharge into the Santee-Cooper, the latter providing ocean frontage for ships from all over the world.

Sound as the project was, it languished until the middle of 1953. As Mayor William McG. Morrison of Charleston put it:

"Everybody was talking about Bushy Park but nobody was doing anything. We had managed to get Berkeley County and Charleston County—the two land areas involved—to combine forces in the joint Bushy Park Authority but the financing stumped us. Nobody had the kind of money it took to get this thing off dead center.

"So there we all were scratching our heads for a cheaper way. Then one day a character in a big western-style hat walked into my office in his shirt sleeves with a big brown dog at his heels. He introduced himself as Robert E. Lee and said he'd do our construction job for us.

"I asked 'How much?'

"He figured for a while on the back of an old envelope and came up with a number of his own.

" 'Six hundred and fifty thousand dollars in cash and $2 million in bonds.'

" 'That's fine,' I said; 'but, Mr. Lee, I don't know you from Adam.'

" 'O. K., so look me up then,' he said.

"I made some telephone calls and found that Mr. Lee, accompanied by the dog, Major, had built roads and bridges and dams all over the United States. He claimed to be a descendant of the famous Civil War general of the same name.

"According to Mr. Lee, Major is an essential member of the firm.

" 'He protects me from varmits and snakes when I walk through the swamps and there's a lot of work we just couldn't do without him.'

"Major's contribution to the Bushy Park development was to swim and test the current at critical times when the dam was building.

"I said, 'O. K., I'll tell my people about it.' "

Investigation and conferences crystallized a plan to build the project for an estimated $4,500,000 including cost of the land. But still nothing was moving.

At this point, Mayor Morrison took the bold step that got the whole project off dead center. He arranged for the Bushy Park Authority to authorize $4,500,000 worth of long-term bonds. He talked the commissioners of public works of the city of Charleston into backing $1 million worth of the Bushy Park bonds with an issue of public works bonds which had a recognized market value. These were turned into cash.

The mayor ran into public opposition to his scheme but he laid his political future on the line and stood up for his convictions. In this he had the backing of some of the local financial leaders, among them President Hugh Lene, of the Citizens Southern Bank.

"I saw that this was an ingenious system which would give Charleston an unlimited water supply at such low cost that it would always be able to sell water at a profit," Mr. Lene says. "The city's municipal water supply would be guaranteed from then on."

Engineer Lee agreed to accept $650,000 of the $1 million in cash and $2 million in Bushy Park bonds, to be paid off over a period of years from the sale of land and water. For this, he agreed to build a dam across the Back River and a canal to divert the fresh water of the Santee-Cooper millrace into the headwaters of the Back River. He also agreed to build a bridge across the canal and an 8-mile road across the dam and into the Bushy Park area, connecting with a nearby highway.

Another essential cog in this low-cost financing deal was P. O. Mead, owner of the 4,400-acre Bushy Park tract, who also gave credit to help the cause. He agreed to take $200,000 in cash and $800,000 in Bushy Park bonds to cover the $1 million purchase cost of the land.

Mr. Mead has unlimited faith in the Bushy Park development.

"God Almighty created this situation for us," he told me, "but we had to have sense enough to see opportunity knocking at our door. I predict that this thing will bring 1 million people here within the next 10 years."

When Mr. Lee got to work on the dam, it was easy to see the basic reason why the Bushy Park engineering job could be done so cheaply. That reason was Cooper marl.

Marl is an earthy substance containing clay, limestone, and sand. Ordinary marls disintegrate in water but when Cooper marl is exposed to air and water, the exposed surface case-hardens and becomes practically erosion-proof. Because of Cooper marl, which underlies most of the area, Charleston has been able to dig water-supply conduits at incredibly low prices without the necessity of laying pipe. By the same token, water tunnels dug through the marl are expected to convey Back River water economically to any new industrial developments around Bushy Park.

Mr. Lee had to dredge the Back River anyway and he used the marl he brought up from the river bottom to build the 6,000-foot dam. In spite of this, tricky tidal conditions made the job a spectacular feat of engineering. These were described by Joseph Moore, consulting engineer for the Bushy Park Authority, who is credited by Mr. Lee with putting the project over.

"The dam closure required split-second timing," Mr. Moore says. "It had a tidal flow from the ocean which mounted into the Back River. Then the water had to get out. As you made the opening smaller, you had a high head of water with a differential of 6 or 7 feet. The millrace flooded out the fresh material as fast as you could put it in. No dam I know of was built under such tidal conditions with the water flowing both ways."

The dam was completed at midnight February 15.

So the water development which Charleston has been dreaming about for 10 years, and actually planning for 5, has become a reality. The dam, the canal, and the bridge over the canal are finished. Fresh water is being diverted into that huge natural reservoir—the Back River. The tides are being held out—down below the marl dam. A natural effluent disposal agency the Santee Cooper lies ready to carry away the wastes of the industries coming to Bushy Park. A road across Bushy Park and across the dam

is under construction with a railroad spur to come.

Charleston is convinced that its big bargain—a potential 10 billion gallons of water a day for only $4,500,000—is the best buy any municipality has ever made for anything of the kind. For a while, the city will divert 2,500,000,000 gallons but minor engineering developments will allow the later use of the whole.

The expansion of Charleston has already begun. United States Steel, which started the whole thing, went to Trenton to be nearer its markets, but the United Piece Dye Works, of Lodi, N. J., is bringing in a $2 million plant to dye, print, and finish synthetic fabrics and the West Virginia Paper and Pulp Co., already one of the Charleston areas's major industries, has announced a $56 million expansion program. West Virginia came to Charleston in 1938 when the city agreed to supply it with the necessary water through new reservoirs and tunnels, this supply was later expanded to provide the 50 million gallons a day which the company now uses, but it couldn't tackle the new expansion until more water was guaranteed.

"But now they're certain there's adequate water for anything they want to do," says Mr. Field.

Charleston doesn't expect the final chapters of Bushy Park to be written for 5 or 10 years until—it hopes—industries will cover the 4,400 acres of Bushy Park proper and the 10,000-plus acreage adjacent—across the Santee-Cooper River.

What I Owe My Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, today the Ohio delegation has lunched with the 12 youngsters who are winners in the American Legion essay contest in our State, and it has been a wonderful and refreshing experience.

My pleasure was enhanced by the fact that Bill Muffley, a ninth grade student from Uniontown High School, in the 16th District, is one of the statewide winners. This is the first time in several years that a boy from our district has won in the Ohio contest.

I join with his friends and members of the Howard D. Miller Post, No. 436, the American Legion, in extending congratulations to Bill Muffley for his outstanding essay. Congratulations also to Bill's family and his teachers in the Uniontown schools who have helped to give him the fine understanding of American principles that is revealed in his splendid essay. I think a word of tribute is proper also to my friend E. F. Marlowe, of Greentown, who has encouraged many youngsters, including Bill, to participate in this contest.

Under leave to extend, I include Bill's prize-winning essay, and commend it to your attention:

WHAT I OWE MY COUNTRY

(By Bill Muffley, Uniontown, Ohio)

My country offers to everyone liberty, freedom from oppressions, freedom from want, and freedom to be ourselves. It is our duty to keep this high form of democracy at any cost.

First of all I owe my country for my liberty, which is one of the most valuable blessings that heaven has bestowed upon mankind. Perhaps we rest our hopes too much upon constitutions, laws, and courts. Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women. When it dies there, no constitutions, no laws, and no courts can do much to help. Liberty is not the freedom of the ruthless or the freedom to do as one likes, because where there is no check upon it, freedom becomes the possession of a savage few. The spirit of liberty is the spirit that seeks to understand the minds of other men and women, and weighs their interests, alongside its own without prejudices. The spirit of liberty is the spirit of Him who, nearly 2,000 years ago, taught mankind that the least shall be heard and considered side by side with the greatest.

I also owe my country protection for the freedom from oppression for which our forefathers died. History records no nobler venture of freedom than the Pilgrim band, who in weariness and painfulness, who in hunger and cold laid the foundation that every man through countless ages might have freedom to worship God in his own way.

Next, I am indebted to my country for the opportunity to maintain one's own prosperity. My country is a fabulous country; it is the one place where miracles not only happen, but where they happen all the time. It is the land of opportunity. Regardless of race, creed, or color, everyone has a chance to work and obtain a higher standard of living than people of any other country. The average American today owns his home, a car, a refrigerator, and a television set, as well as other items which only a select few in any other country could enjoy. It is up to each one of us to work so this country can always be a free and prosperous one.

Last, but not least, we owe our country gratitude for the privilege to be ourselves. No man is free who is not master of himself. Today we have an equal chance to grow, to develop, and to lead the lives we choose to lead, not lives mapped out for us by some dictator. We have the choice to share and work with other men, no matter what their race, creed, or color, or economic or social level.

Since my country stands for all of these principles, it is my duty to uphold these standards so that my country shall continue to be the greatest country in the world.

Federal Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech which I delivered before a Conference on Management and Taxes held by the American Management Association at the Plaza Hotel, in New York, on April 20, 1956:

Last year a subcommittee of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report conducted a study of our Federal tax policies as these policies relate to economic growth and development. There were two things unique about this study. First, the venture of a congressional committee into an area of what might be termed philosophical political science. Second, the method of conducting the study. I have used the word "study" to describe the procedure adopted by the subcommittee. It was not an "investigation" nor a "hearing" as these congressional committee procedures have come to be known. Yet it contained elements of both. In April 1955 in preparation of the studies the staff of the subcommittee prepared a list of names of some hundred students of taxation and economics, men in the academic world, in the business world, in labor and in agriculture. The subcommittee agreed upon the names of around a hundred persons chosen from this list and from additional suggestions received. Invitations were extended to these experts to come to Washington in May to go over with the subcommittee the project in mind. Around 70 of the persons did appear for a briefing with the subcommittee.

The broad topic was divided up into subtopics and each person was assigned to a subtopic within a subtopic. A great deal of attention was paid to the individual person's suggestion of proper subtopics and to his choice of subtopic he would like to develop.

Each person was asked to prepare a paper on his subtopic to be ready for printing by the first part of October. The purpose was to have all of the papers printed together and circulated among all of the 84 persons who participated in preparing papers and the members of the subcommittee. This was done, and I might say this thousand-page volume of prepared papers has become a best seller in the Government Printing Office.

In early December panel hearings open to the public were conducted on the papers by the subcommittee. The subtopics were grouped under chapter headings as appears in the printed document containing the papers. Those persons having papers covered by a subtopic heading appeared together on the same panel. Each person was given introductory time to point out the highlights of his paper and to comment upon the highlights of his fellow panelist's paper. The subcommittee members then began interrogating the panel upon their papers and invited further participation by the panel in questioning their fellow panelists.

The fact that the written papers had been available sufficiently ahead of time so that the subcommittee members and the panelists had a chance to read and to study the papers made these panel hearings vigorous and meaningful. These printed hearings, of course, are also available to the public and students of this subject.

The subcommittee reached some conclusions in a brief report it made on these studies. One of these conclusions, in my opinion, had more to do with keeping the subject of tax reduction out of the political arena this second session of the 84th Congress than any other single thing. The subcommittee concluded unanimously, as did most of the panelists who discussed the subject, that during an expanding economy, with times good and the Federal debt at the height it is, any excess of revenues over expenditures should be used to reduce the Federal debt rather than to reduce taxes.

However, it was not the conclusions that the subcommittee reached that appears to me to be the most important or the most significant thing about the subcommittee's work. The most significant thing is that a decision was made to study this area objectively through the procedures of a congressional committee. That decision proved to be practical and of tremendous value to our knowledge of this important subject. I think it is very important that this work be continued by the subcommittee and that other areas of economic-political operations be subjected to a similar technique of study.

A study of international trade or of the economics of our domestic agriculture industry along these lines would be of inestimable advantage to coming up with intelligent solutions to the problems that exist in these areas.

There is ample room for drawing up sides along political lines after an objective study has been made. In fact, after an objective study has been made the areas of proper disagreement are sharpened. But above all, the loose demagoguery that exists where ignorance exists fill be lessened considerably. The demagoguery that presently exists in the nationwide public discussion of the agricultural industry and the political programs in relation to it has its roots in ignorance. Playing upon ignorance through the emotions certainly will harm, not help, our society in solving the farm problems or any other problems.

So it could have been with tax cutting in the 2d session of the 84th Congress. We could easily have picked up where we left off in the 1st session of the 84th Congress by appealing to this group or that group in suggesting tax cuts here or tax cuts there. There is ample room for real political differences on the subject of our tax laws; I am satisfied with the studies of the subcommittee available to the Congress and the people, intelligent political lines can be drawn on the subject of the kind of tax laws we should have. It is interesting to note that the preconceived lines of political differences in this area have been to a large degree dissipated simply by casting knowledge on the subject. It will take a little time, I suggest, before we do draw up political differences.

I hope the time will be soon because I believe that through the two political parties taking positions which differ on important issues the matters best can be discussed publicly and resolved intelligently.

With this lengthy introduction I want to discuss some of the basic things that were brought out in our studies of the economic effects of Federal taxation. Neither the staff of the subcommittee nor my colleagues quite agree with the conclusions I am going to express.

I want to start the discussion by referring to the title adopted by the committee for its study, "Federal tax policy of economic stability and growth." This was not the title I suggested at the time I was urging these studies to be made and a subcommittee established to make them. The title I used and still like to use to refer to these studies is: "The economic effects of Federal taxation."

The difference in these two titles reflect a basic difference in political philosophy. The overtones in the title "Federal tax policy for economic stability and growth" imply that the Federal tax policy can be used deliberately by the political government to promote economic stability and growth in our society. Many of the papers presented by the panelists assumed without posing the question that the Federal Government deliberately should use its taxing power to promote economic stability and growth. There is another political philosophy however which says, granted that any tax or any system of taxation has economic effects and so affects economic stability and growth, nonetheless the purpose of taxation should remain solely that of raising revenue, therefore the tax or tax system which has the minimum effect on the economy is the better, to that extent.

It can be argued in these days of high Federal expenditures brought on primarily by the carried over costs of World War II and the present high cost of military preparedness in the cold war era, that the difference in approach does not effect the results. In other words, our tax take being as high as it is has a very great impact on our society whether we regard the taxing power as solely a method of collecting revenues or whether we regard it as also a proper tool for intentionally producing economic results. Granting that the tax take has this impact, under either theory it would be the proper objective to set up the tax structure to produce the maximum amount of stability and growth in our economy.

The difference lies, perhaps, in the frame of mind one has toward the amount of governmental expenditures. The person who looks upon the taxing power as an affirmative means for affecting the economy recognizes that the larger the tax take, and the higher the tax rate the stronger is the taxing power as a device for affecting the economy. Accordingly, he views the amount of governmental expenditures with equanimity. If he is a Fabian socialist he actually pursues the course of bringing about greater governmental expenditures because he pursues two concurrent courses. The more government spends, whatever the purpose, the greater control the Government has over the economy through the control of expenditures; likewise the more it spends the greater the taxes and so the more effective is this other powerful weapon of governmental control. This is not just two courses moving in the same direction; it has a built-in spiraling effect. The more functions the Government assumes, which is synonomous with the Government spending more money, the less functions private enterprise assumes. Private enterprise is the tax base, so as government expands in ratio to the overall economy, private enterprise or the tax base ratio declines. As the tax base declines, the tax rate must increase in order to maintain the same high tax take. It is essentially the tax rate which provides the energy for the control the taxing power exerts over the economy.

Let me illustrate. What would be the effect of a certificate of necessity if the corporate tax rate were 20 percent instead of 52 percent or what would its effect be if all corporations were permitted to set up their own depreciation schedules for tax purposes? The certificate of necessity is a neat, effective way of producing a direct economic result, i. e., the building of a new plant for a specified purpose. The advocates of private enterprise have not been alarmed at the use of the tax power here because they see in it a less dangerous procedure, to their way of thinking, than direct subsidies or even more dangerous of direct participation by the Government.

I used the illustration of the certificate of necessity out of the many illustrations I could have used, for a specific reason. I wanted it to be quite clear that the use of the tax power to produce economic effects has about it a great attractiveness. It is neat, quiet, easy to administer, and effective It is a constant temptation for Government officials to resort to it. Let me illustrate further. Farmers ought to build more ponds on their farms. The Government, instead of persuading through education or ordering through police powers, simply presents an attractive offer—if you do build ponds you can take a tax deduction. The attractiveness of the offer is directly in proportion to the rate of the tax from which exemption is granted.

By referring to many of the beneficial uses of the taxing power to produce economic effects we easily could come to the conclusion that the taxing power should be used deliberately to produce certain economic results including providing for more stability and growth in our economy. Of course, we could look at other economic results the taxing power has produced and begin to wonder. For example, I believe that the excess-profits tax did more to hurt and stunt the growth of small and new industries than any single economic or political thing. I believe the double taxation of the corporate form of doing business has done more to hurt the growth and stability of corporations than any single thing, by placing, as it does, a premium on financing expansion through debt or retained earnings instead of through floating new equity issues.

Much of the economic effects of our tax structure has not been planned. In fact, our subcommittee studies revealed that not only had the effects not been planned, in most instances the effects were unknown, and even with our studies the effects remain unknown and only give rise to dispute as to what they really are. However, everyone agreed that the effects are considerable and that the proportionately great tax take of today lies at the bottom of the effectiveness of the tax structure on our economy.

However, there are certainly those who would like to engage in economic planning, and for their purposes the Federal political government is the best place to do the planning. The dispute that arose over the use of a single word in the Employment Act of 1946 which created the President's Board of Economic Advisers and this Joint Committee on the Economic Report brings out this fact forcefully. The word in dispute was the adjective "full" used to modify the noun "employment." The word finally adopted in the Employment Act was "maximum." Now what is the difference between saying that the Federal Government shall do all in its power to produce full employment instead of maximum employment. The use of the word "full" imposes upon the Federal Government the responsibility for employment of its citizens rather than upon private enterprise. The adjective "maximum" means "fullest attainable" and, therefore, raises the question of what is attainable. Raising this question throws into discussion the question, How do we maintain employment of our citizens? Through the private economy regulated by the political government or through the political government? Persons like myself, who believe that the only way to continuing growth is through the trial-and-error methods, which I regard in economics as synonymous with private enterprise, maintain that private enterprise is the only way to maintain maximum employment over a period of years, and that at best all the Federal Government can do is to assist from time to time on short-term programs and help on long-range programs by preserving a system of free and true competition.

The argument over the responsibilities of private enterprise and political government for the employment of its citizens was brought out to some degree at the time the ILO set out its bill of rights among which was the so-called right to work. This is certainly a brave new world, if we have decided that we know enough about sociology, economics and psychology that we can have political governments guarantee "the right to work." Our constitutional forebears were more humble in their day when discussing the right to happiness, they limited the Governmenty guaranty to the right to pursue happiness. So I would suggest that we are only at the stage of human knowledge and development that we can talk about granting the right to pursue full employment. That means that Government's role is ancillary. That Government can set up rules of procedure for its citizenry in the economic fields which if followed would permit every one to receive his just dues from the sweat of his brow.

But to get back specifically to taxes. Aside from the implications brought to light about the use of the taxing power there were two other basic matters about taxes brought to light. Like the first factor which I have been discussing the other two require considerably more thought and study than have been given them.

The first matter is inflation. Our panelists who discussed what inflation is, under my questioning agreed that in essence inflation is a form of taxation. It takes purchasing power from the individual and transfers it to the political government. Of course, if the Government is essentially a creditor

and not a debtor this would not be the effect, but this is certainly an academic point in modern times. Perhaps in any times because political government by its nature will be always a debtor to its citizens.

But inflation also transfers purchasing power from one citizen to another. Now what has this to do with a discussion of our overall Federal tax structure and its economic effect? There are two basic things I want to point up. First, though inflation is a way of federally financing projects, it is a good way? Second, after reviewing the thousands of requests for changes in our present tax laws to bring about what is always referred to as equity and fairness I have concluded that 90 percent of these present-day inequities arise from the tax of inflation. . For example, the cry about "locked in" investments stems largely from the effects of inflation on our other tax laws. The change made in our tax laws to permit homeowners to sell an old house to buy a new one to escape the tax on the capital gain from the sale, the extra exemption given to people over 65 because after all those on retirement and other fixed incomes were the ones hit the hardest by the inflation tax, the problems of business inventories and the use of LIFO, the present problems of tax treatment of replacement of capital equipment, the general problems involved in capital depreciation are all examples of inequities brought about by the tax of inflation.

I am satisfied that if we would trace through most of the recent requests for tax relief we would find that they have their origin in the economic effects resulting from our Government's resorting to the tax of inflation to finance World War II.

When all is said and done I believe one of the most important principles that any Federal tax policy must follow is to preserve the integrity of the dollar. Just as the standards of our weights and measures used in evaluating physical lengths, widths, thickness, quantities, and bulk must be kept exact and constant so must our standards for evaluating economic events and economic trends be kept exact and constant. The dollar is the most important of all the measuring standards in the field of economics. A tax system that fails to protect the exactness and constancy of economic standards cannot promote real growth and stability in an economy.

The third matter is as basic as the question of the use of the tax power and the question of the use of inflation as a method of taxation. The third matter has to do with the taxation of two different dollars, the consumer dollar and the investment dollar. This was a matter consciously posed by many of the committee's panelists. Organized labor's panelists expressed the view that our present tax structure was hitting the consumer dollar too heavily and that it was the plentitude of the consumer dollar that lay at the base of any expanding economy. That given the consumer dollar the investment dollar would always appear. In other words, given the demand for production the capital formation necessary to provide the production would be forthcoming. Organized labor's panelists expressed the thought that obviously the tax on the investment dollar was not excessive, because we were doing all right, but that to continue to do all right we had to continue to relieve the consumer dollar from the burden of taxation.

However, labor's spokesmen failed to appreciate, it seems to me, that when consumer demand outstrips production inflationary forces are created which can become strong enough to break through any governmental system of brakes and controls to produce full-fledged inflation which is, of course, essentially a consumer's tax. The investment dollar, unfortunately, does not always flow to areas where there is a consumer demand. Even if there are plenty of investment dollars the channels may be clogged by governmental action. Furthermore, there is such a thing as clogging up the source itself. Right at the present time we have been experiencing a demand for cement, glass, steel, nickel and other metals and basic materials which is greater than the production facilities. This could be the result of tax deterrents on the investment dollar. I'm not sure that it is, but I emphasize, it could be.

Industry's spokesmen argued that the investment dollar was being too heavily hit now and that there was not sufficient capital formation to bring about the continued growth and stability we should be able to look forward to in our economy. It was pointed out that around $14,000 capital investment is needed to keep one man employed in our American society of today, and that multiplying out the increasing labor force in America from population increases the necessary capital formation to keep labor employed did not seem to be in the offing.

One factor in this discussion was not fully touched upon in my opinion. After all, what is a consumer dollar can be shifted readily to an investment dollar, and likewise what is an investment dollar can readily be shifted to a consumer dollar. The determination of what is to be a consumer dollar or an investment dollar lies in the psychological makeup of our 165 million people. Obviously as long as basic living needs must be fulfilled for a person, that person is not going to convert his dollar into an investment dollar. Equally obviously, if the Federal Government taxes the investment dollar too heavily there will be considerable incentive to convert it into "living it up" as my kids now term it.

I want to mention another factor which seems to me is basic but was only touched upon in the hearings by my line of questioning of the panel witnesses. I was disturbed to conclude from the answers I received to these questions that not very many people had been thinking about the position Government capital formation has been playing in our present-day economy. A discussion of this factor will bring me right back to the beginning of my talk. The labor economists said there was adequate investment capital available because we were doing all right. The industry economists said maybe so, but if we need $14,000 capital investment to provide a job for each person coming into the labor market in the future we had best take heed now.

Now I pose the question, has there been sufficient private capital formation in the immediate past to carry forward our economy and to build solid growth? The housing industry has grown to a large extent on the basis of Government capital formation, not private capital formation. Certainly FHA and VA guaranties and Fanny Mae and most of the other Government housing programs are indirect financing. But what industry can operate without the economic function of insurance being performed by some capital formation? In my panel questioning to bring out my point, I referred to an insurance function being performed in the private economy which is a type that Government today is constantly performing in other economic areas without much comment. This particular operation, I might add, is one of high speculation and not of conservatism as we in this country have come to view the insurance field. I referred to the commodity exchange. To illustrate, Purina Mills, located in my district, is a big buyer of grain, but Purina in its operation wants to minimize the speculation involved in the cost of the grain it must buy * * * the grain futures market, private speculators, performs this economic function—this insurance function for it.

In other words, the question is: How much capital formation required to support our present day economy in all its varied ramifications has been supplied by the Federal Government? Until we know this we are hardly in a position of commenting with any intelligence on whether or not the investment dollar has been affected adversely by our Federal tax policies.

The argument for 20 years in the congressional committees and on the floor of the House has been, private enterprise isn't doing the job, the performance of the job is a social necessity, therefore Government must move in to do the job. Whether you talk about rural electrification, housing, medical attention, building municipal food markets in Philadelphia, the pleas are all this way.

Now there can be two basic reasons why private enterprise is not doing the job: (1) Because private enterprise lacks the initiative to do it, or (2) because Government through its own policies has hampered private enterprise from doing the job. Shut off speculative capital and you can cut off private endeavor most effectively. Again, this is part of the Fabian Socialists plan. Emphasize the social need for the service (and this can be built up emotionally by the demagogues to a point where it gets beyond all control), hamper private enterprise from doing it, then cry Government must do it.

To a degree, I am a liberal Republican but I have had little chance to demonstrate it since I have been in Congress. I am perfectly willing to have the Federal Government perform certain economic needs for our society provided (1) the need is clear, (2) private enterprise is not fulfilling the need, and (the point always overlooked in these discussions) a study reveals that private enterprise cannot fill the need, (3) that Government's entry is on an emergency basis and that plans simultaneously are set up to eliminate the reasons which have prevented and do prevent private enterprise from doing the job.

I am regarded as a conservative because with my small and to date ineffective voice I continue to harp on the last point. I shall close upon it. The question is: How does our Federal tax system hamper the economic growth and stability of our economy? And how can we reduce such hampering to the minimum? The question is not how does our Federal tax policy promote economic growth and stability and how can we increase that promotion. In my judgment, herein lies the solution to our problems of providing maximum employment and maximum happiness for our people, for the answers to the attainment of both our economic and spiritual values lie in providing the maximum amount of freedom for the individual person in his society.

A Lesson in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend for the attention of the American people the following fine article by Frank R. Kent, which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star, April 22, 1956:

THE GAME OF POLITICS

(By Frank R. Kent)

DEMOCRATS' FARM STRATEGY BACKFIRES

It is now clear that the Democratic strategists at last have found an issue upon which they can unite against President Eisenhower in the campaign this fall. It is also clear that, now they have found their issue (to wit, the one created by his veto of the so-called farm-relief bill), the most astute among them, including several presidential aspirants, are not too happy about it.

Outsmart themselves

The simple fact is that they seem to have outsmarted themselves. This frequently happens in politics as in other avenues of human endeavor, and is almost invariably due to underestimating the basic superiority of right over wrong. In this case the Democratic conspiracy—for that it is admitted to be—against Mr. Eisenhower began soon after he decided to run for a second term. That decision was as uplifting to the Republicans as it was discouraging to the Democrats. Unable to make a successful attack on Mr. Eisenhower personally, their efforts to find a campaign goat in either Vice President NIXON, now sure of renomination, or any member of the Eisenhower Cabinet, were redoubled. However, despite the raucous voices of Chairman Paul Butler, of the Democratic National Committee, and his persistent little predecessor, Stephen Mitchell, these efforts came to nought and in recent months all the Democratic leaders and all the Democratic publicity talent seemed concentrated upon exploitation of the discontent among the farmers.

On the surface this seemed a shrewd move, indeed. The troubles of the farmers were real and not imaginary. The administration, indorsing the soil-bank theory, which was widely supported by many farm leaders, had offered a program. With a majority in both House and Senate the Democrats proceeded to load the Eisenhower-Benson bill with amendments so fantastic as to make it utterly unworkable. Then, loudly shouting for 90 percent parity, they proceeded to pass the bill, thus putting it up to the President. Basing this strategy upon the fact that no President had ever dared veto a farm relief bill in an election year, they chortled over the spot onto which they had maneuvered the President. Either he had to accept a thoroughly bad and unworkable bill or he had to bear the blame for having stood in the way of relief for the farmer.

That is what they thought—but apparently it is not working out that way. It seems now that they made two fundamental mistakes. The first mistake was in regarding the American farmer as an incurable boob. This he is far from being. Already there are evidences that many farmers see through the politics which the Democrats have played and are still playing with this bill. And the biggest and most respected of all farm organizations in the country—the American Farm Bureau Federation—opposed the bill, approved the veto and indorsed the Eisenhower-Benson attitude. So have most of the influential newspapers.

The second mistake was in the assumption that this President lacked the courage to veto a farm relief bill in an election year. This President may check short in some things, but political courage—or any other kind—is not one of them. As things are working out this veto, which clearly was in national interests as well as the farmer's interest, is likely to promote the President politically rather than detract from his strength. Whatever the final outcome of the struggle in Congress, it appears now that the Democratic leaders have put themselves on the defensive instead of the President.

Fail to trap President

What they really did was to give him a beautiful opportunity again to demonstrate not only his courage and sincerity but a very real knowledge of his subject, which was inherent both in his message and in his broadcast. In addition the leading Democratic presidential aspirants—Stevenson, Kefauver, and Harriman—also ex-President Harry Truman—all find themselves committed to a legislative and economic monstrosity, enactment of which would not have relieved the farmer and in which only the foolish farmers believe.

It was an interesting and instructive political episode in which the politicians who played what seemed a very smooth game were politically bested by the politician who fearlessly stood firmly for what he believed to be right and refused to consider politics at all. The longer the Democratic leaders study this situation the worse they are going to feel. Even now the reaction is clearly unfavorable. None of the things they hoped for and planned have occurred. Their efforts to trap the President have uniformly failed. The reasons are obvious. But they keep trying.

United States Attorney Carries Through

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a former Member of Congress, who served here with distinction, is continuing his public service by ably, fearlessly, and without discrimination performing his duty as United States attorney at St. Paul, Minn.

When a congressional committee left uncompleted a task which had been assigned to it, George MacKinnon took over the job and is well on the way in his effort to protect the honest, conscientious worker from some of those who would rob him not only of his dollars but of his constitutional rights to earn a livelihood for himself and his family, spend his earnings as he might desire.

From the Minneapolis Star, I quote a news story, which reads as follows:

GUILTY VERDICT RETURNED IN ADM-TEAMSTERS CASE—JURY FINDS AGAINST FIRM, 5 INDIVIDUALS—SENTENCING LATER FOR EXECUTIVE, 4 TEAMSTERS

The Archer-Daniels-Midland Co., 1 of its vice presidents and 4 AFL Teamsters Union officers were found guilty by a Minneapolis Federal court jury today of violating the Taft-Hartley law.

Judge Edward J. Devitt immediately referred the cases to the probation department for presentence investigation.

After deliberating less than 2 hours, the jury returned guilty verdicts against the company, James W. Moore, vice president; Sidney L. Brennan, Jack Jorgensen, Eugene J. Williams, and Gerald P. Connelly, officers in the teamsters union locals.

The verdict carries a maximum penalty of a year's imprisonment, a $1,000 fine, or both, on each of 5 counts.

Trial of the case had required nearly 3 weeks, during which time the Government produced 40 witnesses.

Essence of the case was the charge that Archer-Daniels-Midland Co. provided $5,000 to help settle a strike by the United Mine Workers of America Union against its southeast Minneapolis oil plant in May 1953.

The Government charged that the company, Moore and Connelly were guilty of a conspiracy to provide the sum.

Of the total, the Government charged Brennan, Jorgensen, and Williams each got $1,000 and Connelly $900.

Through the testimony of its witnesses, the prosecution traced the $5,000 through the firm of the Stavis Oil Co., St. Paul, to Connelly's 24-year-old son, Gerald, in Chicago, to the La Salle National Bank, Chicago, and to the union defendants.

After the Government completed its case, the defense rested without putting any witnesses on the stand or offering any evidence.

Motions to the court to order a directed verdict of acquittal failed. Closing arguments were made Monday, and the court instructed the jury this morning.

The jury got the case shortly after noon, ate lunch, and returned its verdict about 2:45 p. m.

Ohio Department of American Legion Sponsors Essay Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, in these days of conflicting isms and ideologies throughout the world, it is of special importance that we stop and cherish the thoughts about what this great Nation means to us. Many times we are prone to point out and discuss what is wrong with America, when we should be thinking about all the wonderful characteristics of what is right in America.

Men and women throughout the history of our Nation have fought, suffered, lived, and died that we might enjoy all those precious freedoms that, at times, many of us take for granted.

The American Legion is one of our greatest patriotic organizations that has, as one of its fundamental principles and purposes, th preservation and continuation of an America where these precious freedoms of ours will live on for generations yet unborn.

The Ohio Department of the American Legion, as a part of their program to foster these high principles, conducts an essay contest each year among the high-school students of Ohio. The subject of this essay contest is, What I Owe My Country. The winners of this contest are given a trip to Washington, the Capital of our great Nation, where they may see their Federal Government in action and where they may visit many places of great and significant interest. During their visit to Washington, these essay contest winners are entertained at a luncheon in the Speaker's dining room sponsored by all Members of Congress from both political parties in Ohio. This luncheon was held today.

Mr. Speaker, the more I have the privilege to associate with our high-school students today, the happier and more convinced I am that the future of America will be in good hands. These young

people are serious minded students and they are quick to determine when they feel that any of us are taking our obligations lightly or are permitting ourselves to base our decisions on expediency. It has been my privilege to discuss the affairs of Government with many high-school groups and I have been tremendously pleased with their knowledge of Government and its problems, and their keen analysis of the vital problems faced by their Representatives here in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly proud and happy that a very charming and able young lady from Dayton, Ohio, is one of the three statewide champions from the 10th grade.

She is Miss Elizabeth Richards, of 1713 Richard Street, Dayton, Ohio. Miss Richards is a 10th grade student in Dayton's Wilbur Wright High School. Her thoughtful essay shows very clearly how completely she dedicates her abilities and talents to our great Nation and reveals her determination to serve our country.

Under unanimous consent, I request that her prize-winning essay be made a part of these comments and recorded in full:

WHAT I OWE MY COUNTRY

Many years ago my ancestors came to this country. They fought, worked, and some died to help establish this great Nation. My generation is now enjoying the fruits of their labors.

With humility I say I owe my country, the United States of America:

My hands, to build and to mold a stronger nation in which to live.

My eyes, to see our natural blessings, to look upon and to appreciate all that God his given us, to help me search for and to see new and better methods that will help my community and my country.

My ears, to hear the wisdom, to hear all viewpoints so that I can better choose my path in life.

My voice, to shout the advantages of our democratic way of life, to speak out for my country, to teach others what I know to be good for our Nation, to speak against all evil and wrongdoers.

My heart, to love what is good, to sympathize with those less fortunate, to feel and understand suffering, to be a part of every worthy cause and to be strong against all evil.

My mind, to seek wisdom, to further my education, to search for truth and to judge for myself. Yes; the best from my body and my mind I owe and give to my country.

My soul belongs to God. How I use the blessings God has given me will determine what kind of a citizen I am and shall be. To be a good Christian citizen means to have faith in God.

We people today have so many blessings for which to be thankful. These are the results of hard work. Work that could not have been accomplished without the hands and hearts of our people. We must not look upon the standards of others with criticism. It took fight and work to accomplish our high standards. Let us set an example for those less fortunate. The poor will be with us always, as will the bad be among the good.

I owe my just taxes to help finance our armies, the poor, the wounded—our schools and other civic projects. I shall vote, when age permits me.

I love my country, the United States, and will try to live up to every word I have written.

A Justified Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the attached editorial, A Justified Veto, which appeared in the April 18 issue of the Anderson (Ind.) Herald:

A JUSTIFIED VETO

The Democratic leadership in Congress this week accomplished exactly what it set out to accomplish.

After weeks of needless delay, the Democratic leadership finally permitted a crazy-quilt farm bill to reach President Eisenhower's desk—a bill so repugnant to the principles upon which the Eisenhower administration rests that the President had no practical alternative to a veto.

In declining to sign the bill, the Democrats already are saying, Mr. Eisenhower is demonstrating his callous disregard for the plight of the American farmer.

We agree that someone on the national political scene views the farmers' plight with callousness. But we think that guilt belongs at the doorstep of the Democratic Party and its congressional leaders, who have shown the Nation beyond any reasonable doubt that they are more interested in manufacturing some kind of issue for this election year than in taking any step that might alleviate the hardship of the farmer or soften his discontent.

Let's look for a moment at the history of this farm bill that Mr. Eisenhower vetoed Monday.

President Eisenhower indicated his concern for falling farm prices and rising farm costs during the first week the present Congress was in session. On January 9, he sent to Congress a special message on agriculture—a message containing a series of specific recommendations.

The heart of his program was a soil-bank program, designed specifically to combat farm surpluses and to strengthen the cause of soil conservation. This phase of the program alone would have put more than $1.2 billion into the hands of our farmers this year alone.

There is no reason why the soil-bank phase of the President's program would not have become law by March 1 so that its benefits could have begun accruing to the farmers immediately. Even the Democrats in Congress found no fault with the soil bank, as evidenced by the fact that they left this single item of the President's program virtually intact.

But alarmed by the prospect that Mr. Eisenhower might get credit for helping the farmer, the Democratic leaders went to work. Their one motive was to keep farm dissatisfaction alive until November, no matter how harmful it might be to the farmer or to the Nation.

Finally, after weeks of debate and delay and compromise, they let a farm bill get through. The Eisenhower soil bank was still a feature of it. But tacked on was a provision for the reinstatement of high, rigid price supports, the very price supports that have served to depress farm prices by accumulating larger and larger surpluses, the very surpluses the soil bank is designed to combat, the same sort of surpluses the American people are paying $1 million a day to store.

It is almost criminally wasteful to urge our farmers to produce what they cannot sell. Yet that is precisely what the Democratic leadership proposes.

Mr. Eisenhower made it clear Monday night that he is far more interested in serving the long-range interests of the farmers and of the American people than in winning votes in November. Once our farmers understand the facts, Mr. Eisenhower and his party will have nothing to fear.

Speech of Hon. James C. Davis, of Georgia, in Defense of Constitutional Government, State Sovereignty, and Commonsense, Delivered at West Memphis, Ark., March 31, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the constitutional crisis forced on us by the Supreme Court's Black Monday decisions, and subsequent attacks upon States rights is the most serious threat to our form of government since the War Between the States. Almost equally important is the irreconcilable social problems created by these decisions, which threatens to destroy completely the peaceful relationships that have existed between the races for the last hundred years.

It has been virtually impossible for the South to present its side of the controversy to other parts of the country because of a biased press which deliberately suppresses the arguments of southern leaders.

Recently, in a speech at West Memphis, Ark., our distinguished colleague from Georgia, Hon. JAMES C. DAVIS, presented what I consider to be an irrefutable argument for the preservation of segregation, and the need for protecting the rights of the States against the unconstitutional usurpation of power by the Federal establishment. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of Mr. DAVIS' address and commend it to Americans everywhere. Its thought-provoking contents should serve to open the eyes of those who have been blinded by the misleading arguments of South-hating propagandists:

SPEECH OF REPRESENTATIVE JAMES C. DAVIS DELIVERED AT WEST MEMPHIS, ARK., MARCH 31, 1956

I am glad to come from Washington to talk to you tonight. We have a common interest. The bold and brazen attack now being made upon constitutional government calls for organization, for unity of purpose and for unity of action.

Every Member of the House and Senate from Arkansas signed the Manifesto in Washington on March 12. It is necessary—it is imperative that you people back home be unanimous in your action. This fight has 2 fronts—the 1 in Washington and the 1

at home. On each front there must be organization, unity, and work.

The theme of the message which I want to bring to you tonight is this: The time has come for action.

We have been a tolerant people, tolerant to the point of gullibility. The average American, if given a choice between peace on the one hand, and strife on the other, will choose peace. He is long suffering. He will endure with patience an unbelievable amount of injustice and mistreatment.

In his spirit of tolerance your people and my people in the last 25 years have seen our constitutional rights whittled away little by little, and the whittling has been done by those whom we had a right to trust.

In our upbringing we were taught to respect our Government—to believe in the integrity of public officials.

Ingrained in us was the faith and confidence that the United States Supreme Court was a bulwark for the preservation of constitutional government; that it would always stand, as it had stood in the past, a fortress of strength, against which anyone would dash himself to destruction who sought to weaken or destroy the instrument of our liberties, the Constitution of the United States.

For nearly a century and a half the Court deserved the respect which it received. It justified the confidence of the people that it would uphold the Constitution and would proclaim its provisions as written, knowing that it was not in the province of the Court to change the Constitution by one jot or tittle, that the Court could not add anything to the Constitution or take anything from it; recognizing that if changing and modern times call for a revision of the Constitution, either great or small, then the Constitution itself declared how the change must be made.

In the structure of our Government there is no fact more certain than this; the nine justices of the Supreme Court cannot change our Constitution.

The Congress with its 531 Members of the House and Senate, cannot change it.

The President of the United States, with all his power, cannot change it.

Neither one of these alone can amend the Constitution. All three together cannot amend it.

It can be changed only by an amendment voted for by two-thirds of the House and Senate and by three-fourths of the sovereign States of the Union.

Any attempt to change our Constitution in any other manner is a gross fraud—a fraud which it is the duty of all patriotic citizens to expose and to prevent.

It was to restate, reaffirm and support this well-known doctrine that the congressional "Declaration of Constitutional Principles" also called a manifesto, was written and signed by 100 Representatives and Senators in Washington on March 12.

We prepared and signed this document in Washington because we realize that the time is here when we must, as free men, defend the constitutional Government which is ours, or, as unworthy descendants of those who fought at Bunker Hill and Yorktown, sit by in silence and in cowardice while our hard won rights of State and local self-government are struck down illegally by the would-be social reformers on the Supreme Court.

We signed it because the time is here to defend free government, or to surrender to judicial dictatorship.

The principle involved here goes far beyond our right to operate our schools, although that in itself is a valued right, and a right we do not intend to surrender because the Supreme Court undertakes to usurp power it does not possess.

But the real issue is: Shall we permit the Supreme Court, one department of Government, whose powers are defined and limited by the Constitution, to successfully assert the power to change that precious document, by reading into it language it does not contain, and which those who wrote the Constitution and its amendments, never intended it should contain.

The question is, if changing conditions require a change in the Constitution, shall it be changed as the Constitution says, by drawing an amendment with definite and specific language, which shall receive the people's stamp of approval through a vote of two-thirds of the Congress, plus three-fourth of the States? This is the legal way.

Or, shall it be amended by the arbitrary act of nine men, to whom this authority has not been given, who are not elected, and who can in no sense of the word be said to represent the will and wishes of the people regarding amendments to the Constitution. We have amended the Constitution 22 times in the past by following legal and regular procedure. The 22d amendment was proposed in 1947 and certified in 1951. What has happened that we no longer must submit amendments to the Congress for a two-thirds vote and to the States for a three-fourths vote?

We have not yet lost this right to have a voice in adopting amendments to the Constitution, or in rejecting them. But this Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954, is a brazen effort to destroy this right.

If the Court can today strike down the accepted and declared meaning of the Constitution; if it can nullify a construction on the exact point involved, which has been followed and approved in dozen of instances, by the Supreme Court itself and courts of many other jurisdictions, and in doing so rely upon nothing but its own arbitrary will, to support the decision, then it can tomorrow or next month strike down any other provision which does not conform to its sociological beliefs. While it may be Georgia or Arkansas which suffers today from such wrongful usurpation of authority, next year it may be Oregon, Maine, or Illinois.

While the subject today is schools, its next usurpation may involve taxes, or criminal law, or the right to own property. Once the precedent is established—once we have acknowledged the right of the Supreme Court to trifle with the Constitution, there is no limit to its possibilities.

Those of us who support local self-government and States rights have been slow to believe that we could lose these precious rights. We know now that we must fight for them.

There are many conditions which must get worse before they can get better. This is true because so many of us are apathetic to danger until we come face to face with it. To most of us a condition must become an emergency before we make even the first move to meet it. It is human nature not to take medicine until we get sick, although the sickness might be avoided by following some simple precautions in advance.

The segregation problem is one of those things that had to get worse before it could get better. It has now reached the emergency stage. The problem is so urgent that even the most indifferent can no longer ignore it. We can no longer shrug this problem off with the thought that it is the problem of the Federal Government, or the State government, or the school officials. It has come much closer home than that. It is my problem. It is your problem. I must do something about it. You must do something about it.

What is it that you and I must do, and do now, to save our schools, our States rights, and our constitutional Government? We must organize. We must organize with our neighbors. We must organize on the local level. We must organize on the county level and on the State level. We must present a massive, united front against the fraudulent attempt to take away from the people and the States our constitutional rights to conduct our own affairs in the way we choose to conduct them. You will find, if you have not already found it, that your neighbors are ready to organize with you, and we will have this massive, united front, if we organize with like-minded people.

Those of us who signed the Washington manifesto represent States having a population of nearly 40 million people. Do not let any loose-tongued, radical promoter of social equality tell you that this great segment of the American people, nearly one-fourth of the total, is helpless and powerless as we demand that which rightfully belongs to us. Do not let any mealy-mouthed traitor, whatever may be his motive, tell you that we must meekly accept this brazen usurpation of power as a legal exercise of its powers by the judicial department.

We are supporting a position which is sound and correct. We are supporting a position acknowledged by one and all to be sound and correct throughout the 178 years of our country's existence from 1776 to 1954—namely that the control and operation of schools belongs to the States and not to the Federal Government. Our position on local self government has been supported by decisions of all the courts during that entire period. It has been supported by the statesmen of all the periods of our history, by Lincoln, Washington, Jefferson, their predecessors and their successors.

Franklin D. Roosevelt recognized the soundness of segregation when he, in 1928, provided in a deed to land at Warm Springs, Ga., that the land conveyed should not be sold, rented, or disposed of to any Negro or other persons of African decent, or to a corporation owned or controlled by Negroes. After he became President he executed a deed containing the same provision.

The right to be segregated goes back for thousands of years before our Government was established. That right was never challenged until this present Supreme Court decided to make new law on the subject. Yet the Court is not a law-making body. Congress alone has the right to legislate and introduce new matter into the body of our law. Congress, in the proper exercise of its function, has time and time again refused to make new law on this subject. There is no question about the fact that Congress alone can change the law and that the Court cannot.

The 100 Members of Congress in the House and Senate who signed the Washington manifesto have united in this declaration which challenges the right of the Court to change our Constitution. We are unified in this matter, and are standing solidly together. If you people at home will organize and do likewise, together we will defeat this attempted usurpation of power—this attempted judicial dictatorship.

But let me warn you that the strength of the resistance in Washington will depend upon the strength of your organization at home. You cannot expect to have a unified strong front in Washington unless you have a unified, strong front at home. The vigor and enthusiasm with which this fight is carried on in Washington will depend in great measure upon the vigor and enthusiasm which you show back home.

The separate States of this Union have not been operating their State governments under any hazy misconception of powers. State and Federal officials alike have known from the beginning their respective powers, their duties and their limitations, and have governed themselves accordingly. The right of self-government belongs to you and to

me under the Constitution. The 10th amendment reads:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Without this saving clause in the Constitution, it is doubtful that the States would have ratified the Constitution at all.

This is an all-inclusive, express reservation to the States and to the people of all the powers not delegated to the Federal Government by the Constitution or amendments to it.

There is nothing in the Constitution, or any amendment, which authorizes the Supreme Court to say that segregation is unconstitutional. When the Constitution was written in 1787, segregation was universally practiced. Its practice continued to be universal. The thought that the Constitution might prohibit segregation never occurred to those who wrote it or adopted it.

When the 14th amendment was adopted in 1868, segregation was universally practiced. It continued to be universally practiced. No one contended that the 14th amendment would make segregation unconstitutional. In Washington, D. C., the seat of the Federal Government, there were schools in operation, and they were segregated before, during, and after the adoption of all the amendments to the Constitution. The very Congress which voted the 14th amendment enacted legislation dealing with segregated schools in the Nation's Capital. Segregated schools continued in Washington down to the year, 1954, as the Supreme Court and courts of other jurisdictions in decision after decision declared them to be constitutional. It was only in 1954 that the Supreme Court, wholly without authority, arrogated unto itself the right to change the law of the land, which only the Congress has the power to do, and to amend the Constitution, which can only be legally be amended when the amendment is proposed by two-thirds of the Congress and ratified by three-fourths of the States.

For the nine men who sit upon the Supreme Court to usurp these powers which do not belong to them, but which belong exclusively to Congress and to States, is a monumental fraud which is shocking, outrageous, and reprehensible.

Such fraudulent conduct imposes no obligation upon the States to acquiesce, or upon the people to bow the neck to this new form of tyranny.

Let me say to you, as we counsel together, do not be concerned about what is said by the Communists, the pinkos, the radicals, the NAACP, the ADA, the one-worlders, and all that motley group of crackpots who are clamoring for desegregation and mongrelization. These groups of organized minorities are chanting a chorus that opposition to the fraudulent order of the Supreme Court is defiance of law. Of course that is not true. The decision of May 17, 1954, is not law. It is an attempt to make law where none existed before, by a non-law-making body. The defiance of law comes from the other side of this dispute. It is an arrogant defiance of law for the Supreme Court to usurp authority which it does not possess.

This claim that opposition to, and criticism of, the fraudulent Supreme Court decision is "defiance of law" is a sham. It is intended to draw attention away from the truth in this matter. That truth is that the Supreme Court is boldly and brazenly attempting to change the form of our Government.

The left-wing press, left-wing columnists and writers, the left-wing commentators on television, and radio, together with all of the left-wing organizations in the country beginning with the Communists and ending with organizations that are merely crackpot, are staging a massive campaign of super-brain-washing propaganda having a twofold purpose. These purposes are, first, to sell law-abiding American people the false idea that no one has the right to question a pronouncement of the Supreme Court, and second, that those who have any pride of race are bigoted, prejudiced, narrow-minded, racists, and hate-mongers. It is almost an understatement to say that this is a massive campaign of super-brain-washing propaganda. Radical newspapers and magazines from every section of the North and East have been sending writers, photographers and columnists to bring back slanted and derogatory tales Northern white people. Some of these are false; many are half-truths; most of them are slanted. The left-wing Washington newspaper, the Post and Times Herald sent such a writer named Jim Bishop on a tour through the South to write a series of articles supporting the Supreme Court's constitutional amendment. His venom and prejudice was so ill-concealed that he was unable to do the white people of Mississippi the courtesy of referring to them as white people. He consistently and repeatedly called them "red-necks." He did, for what reason I do know, capitalize the words "red-necks." To this left-winger the citizens councils are cruel and brutal; the National Association for the Advancement for Colored People is a splendid organization doing a fine work. To the left-wingers who write the slush for Look magazine, organized efforts to lawfully resist a wrongful Court decision make a pattern of defiance and bring a prediction that the back of the rebellion will be broken. Look magazine's writer of slanted material named Joe Morschauser who went to Albany, Ga. to sympathize with a Negro soldier named Joe Foster, was dumbfounded and couldn't believe his ears when Joe Foster told him he liked Albany. Morschauser, in total disregard of truth, theatrically describes the enterprising city of Albany, which would be a credit to any section of the United States as "a pretty little town cut in half by fear, ignorance, and the remains of a dead civilization." Joe Foster, Negro, said "It's my hometown, and I'm proud of it."

Morschauser expressed surprise that Joe Foster, having lived on terms of forced equality with white people in the Army, could be so dumb as to go back to segregated Albany, Ga., and enjoy living with Negroes. Undoubtedly, Morschauser in his ignorance of human relations in the South was amazed. After reading Morschauser's article, I am convinced that Joe Foster has more sense than Morschauser. And incidentally, racial integration in the Armed Forces is forced; it is not voluntary.

A lot of this slanted drivel and doctored propaganda which is being poured out upon us now has about as much sense to it as Gertrude Stein's famous masterpiece: "A rose is a rose is a rose is a rose."

A stock contention of the integrationists and mongrelizers is that a Court decision is the last word in the law, and must be accepted; that the Court's function is to expound the law.

As long as the Court sticks to the law its decisions will be accepted. When it flies in the face of the law, as the Court has done in this instance, it commits a wrong and perpetuates a fraud upon the people. It commits as grievous a wrong as a tax collector commits when he demands more than just taxes from a taxpayer. It commits a wrong as grievous as a warden of a penitentiary commits who would seek to imprison a convict beyond the limits of his legal term. It commits as grievous a wrong as any other public official who seeks to assert and use authority which he does not possess or to exceed the authority which he does possess. No right-thinking citizen can acquiesce in brazen usurpation of authority by any public official.

Free Americans are under no obligation whatever to permit any public official to take from them that which is theirs merely because that public official occupies a seat of authority, and attempts either through ignorance or malfeasance to go beyond the bounds of that authority.

We owe allegiance to the Constitution of the United States. That instrument is the bedrock upon which our structure of government is built. It is our guaranty of liberty. But the allegiance we owe is to the Constitution which was drafted by the Constitutional Convention, and ratified by the sovereign States and to such amendments thereto as have been legally proposed by two-thirds of the Congress and ratified by three-fourths of the States.

There are some who say that the Constitution means what the judges say it means. But that is not true. The Constitution itself proclaims its meaning. No court or judge possesses any authority to change the language or meaning of any phrase or word of the Constitution in the slightest degree. It is only when the wording of the Constitution is ambibuous or needs interpretation that the judicial department of the Government has authority to go into the question of what it means. And the judicial department never has had, and never will have, authority to add anything new or take anything old from the instrument. That can only be done by amendment.

So the Constitution is not, as some would have us believe, "what the judges say it is." It has no such unstable or uncertain meaning. The Constitution, and all of its amendments, is the compact of the sovereign States who consented to its operation. It is the document under which we live—which we understand, and which the courts have understood for years and generations. Its meaning has been proclaimed again and again. It is the document which every public official is sworn to uphold, and to which the loyalty of every public official is due. And let us never lose sight of this fact—that our loyalty is to the Constitution itself—not to a perverted opinion of nine men who happen for the moment to be occupying seats in the Supreme Court, and who seek because of that fact to change the true meaning, the established and accepted meaning, of our Constitution. That authority does not belong to these nine men. It belongs to two-thirds of the membership of Congress and to three-fourths of the States, joining in concurrent action.

The members of the Supreme Court have also sworn to uphold the Constitution. They owe the same loyalty to the Constitution that every other citizen does. The Constitution does not mean one thing yesterday, another thing today and something else tomorrow, and they have no right to so hold.

If the logic or reasoning employed by the Supreme Court in order to reach this decision is allowed to become standard practice; if the Constitution means one thing today and something entirely different tomorrow, then actually we have no Constitution at all.

And when anyone, whether he be President, legislator, or judge, deals with the Constitution unlawfully, it is the part of patriotism, and in keeping with loyalty to the Constitution, to protest and oppose such unwarranted action. The preservation of our Government depends upon it. Our Government cannot survive in any different climate.

George Washington, the greatest American of all time, in his wisdom and experience, anticipated that the time would come when the judicial department of the Government would chafe at its restrictions, and would become ambitious to exceed its authority.

In his Farewell Address on September 17, 1796, he warned us to be on guard against attempts to wrongfully change the Constitution by usurpation of authority. In that Farewell Address he said:

"It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those entrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. * * *

"The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be, in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment, in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by unsurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil and partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield."

The advice and counsel of George Washington is as sound today as it was then. The time has come when the encroachment which Washington feared is being attempted.

The Supreme Court and the NAACP have created strife and turmoil where no strife and turmoil existed before. Their joint action has increased tension between the races, and has caused hatred and hostility where before there was good will and harmony. This strife is chargeable to, and responsibility for it, must rest with the Court and the radical NAACP, which has been encouraged by the Court's action to stir up hostility between the races.

A good example of the destruction of good relations between the races is the irresponsible talk of a Negro NAACP official quoted in the Memphis, Tenn., Commercial Appeal of January 30, 1956. A Negro attorney, said to be a leader in the Memphis chapter of the NAACP is quoted as having said at a meeting of that radical organization, "rock more boats and create more storms in the fight for equal citizenship. * * * If it's necessary for us to stir up more tension and more unrest to win our fight, I'm willing to do it."

I have been talking to you about the Constitution and the legal phase of this question. I want to say something now about the human side, and the moral justification we have for insisting upon segregation. The average southern white person does not intentionally say things to hurt the feelings of Negroes. White people do not ordinarily talk of the differences between the races. But this is a time to bring out the facts.

Much false propaganda has been spread within recent years, and much effort has been made to brainwash the public with the utterly false doctrine that there is no difference between whites and blacks. It is time to look behind this brainwashing propaganda, and have a straight look at the facts.

There are obvious and well-known differences between whites and blacks which no amount of glossing over and covering up by subversive so-called "anthropologists" and pseudo scientists can hide.

Let's have a look at some facts from the record which have a direct bearing upon the question of desirability or undesirability of integrated schools, aside from the legal aspect of the problem.

Among the many other reasons why the white people object to their children having this close association with Negro children are health, the Negroes' high crime rate and disrespect for law, the lower mentality level, and the high rate of illegitimacy among Negroes.

It is well-known that the crime rate among Negroes far exceeds that of whites. In Washington D. C. Negroes have every advantage they could ask for. The schools and colleges are open to them; also hotels, restaurants, theaters, parks, swimming pools, tennis courts. They buy property and live in any section they choose. The President and his appointed city commissioners apparently want to make a second Harlem out of Washington, and they boast that Washington is a model example of a nonsegregated city.

But Washington is noted for the great number of serious crimes committed in its limits. Its crimes of violence are more than twice the number of those committed in Boston, a city of comparable size, more than twice those of Milwaukee, and nearly twice as many as New Orleans, La.

Negroes are responsible for this high crime rate. Crime statistics show that throughout the years the Negroes in Washington have committed the bulk of the crimes of violence, although they have constituted about one-third of the population. In 1955 out of 11,072 crimes of violence, or part I offenses, 9,056 were by Negroes. This is 82 percent of the total, and the precentage for the last 3 months of 1955 was 88 percent of the total.

Let's look at the District of Columbia health records. A report for the year 1955 made by the District of Columbia Department of Public Health of venereal diseases, in children of school age and under, showed 834 Negro children 17 years and under treated for gonorrhea, as compared with 20 white children. Of the 834 Negro children, 10 were under 6 years of age. The total cases of gonorrhea of all ages, children and adults, for 1955 were Negro 10,243, or 97.5 percent of the total; white 271, or 2.5 percent.

These are repulsive statistics, but they show some of the impelling reasons for segregated schools, and what a tragedy it is for white children to have integration forced upon them.

From the standpoint of mentality, the Negroes have not been able to keep pace with the white children of the District of Columbia. This has resulted in lowering of educational standards.

Achievement tests were recently conducted in the Washington public schools, and revealed that this forced integration has downgraded scholastic standards below the national average.

The retarded learning ability of Negro pupils in a given class is holding the entire class back. White children are being denied the education they are capable of receiving.

One of the loud claims of the promixers has been that integrated schools would reduce costs of operation. They claimed the taxpayers would benefit from the combined schools. Experience shows exactly the opposite to be true They claimed there would be no friction, and that pupils would learn as well as in segregated schools.

In Washington experience has proven that nonsegregated schools cost more to operate; that the Negro children cannot meet the educational schedule or keep pace with the white children, and that friction exists to a greater degree than ever before.

Conditions have reached such a deplorable state in Washington that the superintendent of schools has recently requested an additional 229 "special teachers" for next year. The mentally slow learners—predominately Negroes—would fall within the province of these "special teachers." This would cause an extra burden on the taxpayers, most of whom are white.

The Washington integrated school system is asking for next year $33,740,000, plus $9,178,900 capital outlay, as against $28,130,000, plus $4,473,300 capital outlay, the appropriation for this year. This ten and a half million dollar requested increase knocks the props out from under the integrationists economy argument.

School Superintendent Hobart Corning has repeatedly denied that integration has forced scholastic standards down. But the records tell a different story. Integration has produced lower standards and poorer instruction for the white children.

And it becomes more and more evident that the integration experiment in Washington public schools is a dismal failure, its proponents, looking for something to excuse the failure, come up with the claim that segregated schools in the past have deprived Negro children of an equal opportunity. This claim will not hold water. This is the second year of nonsegregated schools in Washington.

For years Negro teachers and white teachers have been paid according to the same salary schedule. The same rules have applied to both systems. The failure of Negro children to learn under these conditions proves one of two things; either Negro teachers cannot teach as well as white teachers, or Negro children cannot learn as well as white children. No place in America offered a better opportunity than Washington, D. C., to determine whether white and Negro children could be taught successfully in the same classes.

Repeated warnings were made that Negro children could not meet the competition. The Negroes loudly denied this and claimed that Negro children only needed a chance. The white social-equality do-gooders and radicals supported them in this claim.

They were mixed in all the schools in Washington in September 1954. To such lengths was the integration craze carried out that a Negro woman was made Superintendent of the elementary schools and a white woman was made her assistant.

Thadeus Stevens in the darkest days of reconstruction never exhibited a more cruel and vengeful spirit than those now in charge of integration in the Washington public school system. They do not intend to have one school all white or one school all colored. They have therefore placed one white girl pupil with 711 Negroes in Carver school, one white boy with 326 Negroes in Langston school, one white boy with 815 Negroes in Grimke School, one white boy with 712 Negroes in Burville school. To carry out this infamous plan of mixing the races in all schools, this is the pupil arrangement in 23 other Washington schools:

HIGH SCHOOLS

Cardozo: 4 white boys, 2 white girls, 1,698 Negroes.

Dunbar: 1 white boy, 964 Negroes.

Spingarn: 1 white boy, 1,592 Negroes.

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

Randall: 2 white boys, 3 white girls, 771 Negroes.

Elliott: 1 white boy, 84 Negroes.

Langley: 1 white boy, 33 Negroes.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Bell: 3 white boys, 2 white girls, 378 Negroes.

Birney: 2 white boys, 3 white girls, 990 Negroes.

Blow: 2 white boys, 3 white girls, 337 Negroes.

Bruce: 6 white boys, 3 white girls, 614 Negroes.

Cleveland: 1 white boy, 1 white girl, 535 Negroes.

Cook: 1 white girl; 657 Negroes.

Garfield: 1 white boy, 489 Negroes.
Harrison: 9 white boys, 1 white girl, 714 Negroes.
Hayes: 2 white boys, 1 white girl, 290 Negroes.
Kenilworth: 1 white boy, 235 Negroes.
Ludlow: 3 white boys, 2 white girls, 237 Negroes.
Monroe: 1 white boy, 2 white girls, 503 Negroes.
Morgan: 1 white boy, 1 white girl, 691 Negroes.
Mott: 2 white boys, 1 white girl, 956 Negroes.
Parkview: 2 white boys, 3 white girls, 1,001 Negroes.
Perry: 2 white boys, 2 white girls, 346 Negroes.
Taylor: 3 white boys, 293 Negroes.

May Almighty God pity the poor white children who are being made the guinea pigs for this rotten experiment. I do not think Hades has a spot hot enough for those responsible for this outrageous treatment.

The integration bug bit the Baltimore officials and they abolished segregated schools about the same time Washington did. But the authorities in Baltimore at least had some consideration for the wishes of the people and permitted the children both colored and white to attend the schools of their choice. Under that plan, only 1,576 colored pupils entered formerly all white schools, while 55,488 colored entered or remained in colored schools. Sixty-one schools remained all white and 80 schools remained all colored. Forty-eight schools, formerly all white, received some colored pupils, but in most instances the number of colored was very small. The proportion of colored pupils went above 10 percent in only five schools, all of them on the elementary level. In the high schools, the largest number of Negroes in predominately white high schools was at Southern High School, which had 39 Negroes in a student body of 1,788. These figures are given in the official reports dated July 1955.

As a result of the bull-headed policy followed in Washington, the Washington public schools are now in a state of complete chaos.

Now after nearly 2 years, the governing authorities are realizing that Negroes and whites cannot be educated in the same classes on the same basis, with the same results.

Because of the confusion in Washingtons' public schools on March 10, General Thomas A. Lane, one of Washington's three city commissioners, issued a statement proposing a mass demotion next September of Washington school children who are showing "educational lags." He suggested testing all the city's 106,000 public school pupils, and reassigning them next September according to the achievement level shown by each child's tests.

Regarding the proposal to hire more teachers Commissioner Lane said that would be "only applying a poultice to a cancerous condition." He said drastic action is required by the achievement problems.

He also said that "it appears that our problem has reached unmanageable proportions," and that to hire more teachers would be "lulling our parents into an illusion that bringing in more teachers would cure our ills, when, in fact, it is not even addressed to the heart of the problem."

Apologists for the Negroes will claim that this achievement lag is the result of a segregated system in past years. But again that claim will not hold water. The lag is the result of Negro mentality.

This is substantiated by the report of the selective service system regarding soldiers drafted in World War II. The report showed that of the draftees inducted during World War II the number of Negroes rejected for educational and mental reasons ran in a smaller proportion in Georgia, where segregated schools were operated, than in New Jersey and New York City where nonsegregated schools were operated. In Georgia Negro rejections on these grounds, educational and mental, ran about 2½ to 1 over white draftees; in New Jersey about 4 to 1, and in New York City about 3 to 1. This disproves the absurd claim that Negroes learn better in nonsegregated schools.

Veneral disease showed up again unfavorably for Negroes in the selective service records. Rejections on this ground for Negroes were about 8 to 1 over whites in New York City, 4 to 1 in New Jersey and 7 to 1 in Georgia.

So far as illegitimate children are concerned, the regard which Negroes have for the sacred bonds of matrimony is indicated by the fact that of 11,905 nonwhite births in Washington 3,128, or 26 percent were illegitimate, as compared with 617 of 20,441 or 3 percent of white births. Official reports show that the relative percentage runs pretty much the same in Georgia.

These are some of the many valid reasons why white people are justified in the position taken regarding segregation.

I have given you these facts about the situation in Washington because in the wake of the Supreme Court decision to integrate schools, the President declared that Washington would be an example of how good integration would be. The present sickening conditions of the Washington schools are mute testimony to this example.

In spite of every effort to deny it—and in spite of the censorship and suppression of the facts surrounding the Washington school situation—the truth is that integration has been a complete failure.

Not only have mixed schools been a scholastic failure but as an experiment in human relations it has been a nightmare.

Last December, principals in high schools and junior high schools found it necessary to hold "shake-down" inspections of their students, in compliance with numerous complaints that students were carrying knives.

Two cases of attempted assault by Negro boys on white girls were reported in 1 day at 1 junior high school. These cases involved language and actions so vile and so sordid that it staggers the imagination.

We cannot afford to subject our children to such a malignant experiment. The same integrationists and mongrelizers have stated that they only want equal rights and opportunities for the Negro. Yet the radical NAACP, has repeatedly declared that their ultimate goal is intermarriage and complete mongeralization of the American people. The fact that this is also the identical aim of the Communist Party of the United States is more than just coincidental. If they are successful in cramming this school decision down our throats, they will follow it with a decision invalidating our marriage laws, and that will be the end.

With full knowledge of the irreconcilable harm they are doing to the people of Washington, and are trying to do to the rest of the country, the Executive Department and the Supreme Court persist in their efforts to integrate the races in our schools here in the South.

They continue to pander to and knuckle under to radical left-wing organizations like the NAACP, completely disregarding the majority of the people in this country who are white.

In a step-by-step process the Supreme Court in collusion with the Executive Department has bypassed the Legislative Department and distorted the Constitution to mean what it was never intended to mean.

Through a series of Executive orders and so-called judicial decrees they have denied the people the voice in the Government through their elected representatives, which the Constitution provides. These orders and decisions are part of a pattern.

In two Supreme Court cases in the early 1940's (*U. S.* v. *Classic*, 1941; *Smith* v. *Allwright*, 1944) the Court struck down white primaries. Suddenly private political associations were classified as agents of the State. No longer could men of common political belief band together as a political party and set the rules for its own membership. The Supreme Court had decided that only the Court could determine the rules.

Throughout this Nation, for generations, property owners have protected themselves and the value of their property by restrictive clauses in their deeds prohibiting the sale to Negroes of the real estate conveyed in the deed. In 1948 (*Hurd* v. *Hodge*) the Supreme Court struck down these protective clauses and jeopardized the value of every man's property.

In 1951 the Supreme Court, having been fully packed with New Deal politicians, handed down the absurd decision that associations were an integral part of education, and consequently Negroes were being discriminated against when not allowed to associate with white people in the professional schools. Every one should ponder the philosophy of that decision for one moment. On the one hand Negroes zealously demanded full social equality, and on the other hand maintained that association with their own people is degrading and discriminatory. This was the case of McKissick against Carmichael and it opened the door for the University of North Carolina to be invaded by Negroes.

When the United States Supreme Court rendered its opinion in the school segregation case of May 17, 1954, it departed from 86 years of judicial precedent. It absolved itself of any affiliation with legal authority, and chose instead to quote so-called modern scietific authorities as the basis on which to render its opinion. One of these so-called modern scientific authorities quoted by the Supreme Court was a book by a Swedish socialogist named Gunnar Mydral entitled "An American Dilemma." This is the book in which Mydral stated, and I quote, "the Constitution of the United States was impractical and unsuited to modern conditions" and its adoption was "nearly a plot against the common people."

Sixteen of the contributors to this book have lengthy records of pro-Communist activity in the files of the un-American Activities Committee. One of the chief contributors to this book, one W. E. B. DuBois, a Negro educator, has 72 such citations against his name in the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

In Virginia the law prohibits interracial marriages which is the case in 28 of the States of this Union. The Virginia Supreme Court pursuant to that law, declared invalid a marriage between a Chinese seaman and a white woman, and annulled the marriage. The Chinaman appealed the case to the Supreme Court, and asked that Virginia's marriage laws be declared in violation of the 14th amendment.

I do not think the Federal Supreme Court would hesitate to strike down the marriage laws of Virginia and 27 other States if these experts in sociology felt that public opinion would accept such a shocking decision. They know that public opinion would not accept it, and they want to kick the case back and forth for a while between Washington and Richmond to give the Communist Daily Worker, the NAACP and other integrationists and mongrelizers some time in which to condition the public mind for a "judicial decision" striking down the last legal barrier which stands in the part of mongrelization. The Supreme Court entered an order vacating the judgment, and sending the case back to the State court, for further action, saying that it wanted additional evidence as to whether Virginia's courts had jurisdiction in the case.

In a bold and courageous stand, the Virginia Supreme Court on January 18, of this year notified the Federal Supreme Court that it refused to take further action on the case, and wound that case up. But another will come along.

The Federal Supreme Court with both ears attuned to the political drum beating of the NAACP and other radical left-wing organizations has engaged in a program of deliberate usurpation of legislation functions. This usurpation in effect is designed to dissolve the separate States and foster an all-powerful central Government under the joint-exclusive dictatorship of the Supreme Court and the executive department. It would destroy our State governments. It would destroy our county governments, city governments and school district governments. These local officials would become powerless puppets, and all our directions and instructions would come from bureaucrats in Washington.

The actions of these two agencies of the Federal Government constitute not only a threat to the laws and traditions of the South but also to the foundations of our republican form of Government, and to State and local government in all sections of the country.

The time to end this judicial usurpation is now. The time to restore the Constitution to the people is now.

Otherwise, no longer will our sacred rights and institutions and our honored way of life be protected according to commonsense, custom, and tradition. If our children are to have the same freedom we inherited from our fathers, then now is the time for every man to stand up and be counted. Now is the time for aggressive organization; organization that is wise, and unalterably determined to preserve our States rights, our individual freedom, and our personal liberty.

The only way our leadership can effectively voice our determination to resist is through organization. We must organize into one strong, unified, and determined group.

We must organize on the county level, on the Statae level, and on the National level.

We must prepare to carry our message to every section of the country. It is imperative that we mobilize our strength and take the offensive.

The fight we wage must at all times be legal and honorable. There is no place for violence or lawless acts. They will do irreparable harm to our cause and turn public opinion against us.

I have given you tonight, in brief, a picture of the deplorable situation in Washington. I have seen there the tragic results which come from the breakdown of segregation and substitution of an integrated public-school system.

This same thing can happen, and will happen here, if the people meekly accept wrongful usurpation of power, and a Supreme Court dictatorship, as they did in Washington.

It need not happen, and it will not happen, if we as free, liberty-loving Americans band together to retain our constitutional rights.

By organization at home you can give inspiration to your public officials who must lead in this fight—to your Governor, legislators, public-school officials, all those who must lead in this fight here at home, and to your Senators and Representatives in Washington. They have all signified their determination to fight this battle to a successful conclusion. But you have a most important part to play. It is your individual struggle, and your neighor's individual struggle. Let me urge you to accept your responsibility, and to do your part. Urge you neighbor to do his part. This is a time when it is true as never before, that "united we stand, divided we fall." This is a fight which can be won, and I pray that it is the will of Almighty God that it will be won. But it will not be won by default.

Plato said many years ago:

"All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing."

Let us not lose sight of this truth in these critical times. Let us remember that the fight is ahead of us—not behind us.

Education: Businessmen's Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, all informed citizens today realize that there is a crisis at hand in American education. Shortages of teachers, shortages of classrooms and problems connected with the onset of the atomic age beset our Nation's educators on all sides.

To help meet this crisis President Eisenhower envisioned the idea of a White House Conference on Education. It was held last November 28 to December 1 and produced numerous substantial achievements.

So great was the success of this conference that a conference on higher education is being planned for the future. It is to be hoped that such a conference will produce similar positive results.

Neil McElroy, president of Procter & Gamble, was chairman of the White House Conference on Education. It was in large measure due to his leadership that the meetings were such a success. In the April 1956 issue of Dun's Review and Modern Industry he has written a most illuminating report of the background and conclusions of the conference. He then goes on to suggest how business can play its part in following up on these conclusions.

It is only through the work of civic-minded and far-sighted leaders such as Mr. McElroy that we will be able to utilize the White House Conference as it was intended; that is, as a springboard for solution of our school problems. The task now is to stimulate as many of our citizens as possible to take action on the local level. Mr. McElroy's article clearly indicates the path business and industry can follow.

No discussion of the White House Conference would be complete without mention of Marion B. Folsom. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare brought to his office a long record of distinguished service and he has performed the duties of his new office with great distinction. Secretary Folsom worked hand in hand with President Eisenhower on the White House Conference and was the guiding genius in its progress. He is also largely responsible for the impetus given the movement for a White House conference on higher education.

It is to be hoped that the business segment of our economy, as well as large portions of the rest of our population will take up the torch lit by Secretary Folsom and his associates and go to work to improve the status of America's schools. I commend Mr. McElroy's most rewarding article to the attention of all Members:

EDUCATION: BUSINESSMEN'S BUSINESS

(By Neil McElroy, president, Procter & Gamble Co.)

(The chairman of the recent White House Conference on Education reports to business on the accomplishments so far in meeting the crisis in the schools. Here is what some companies are doing now to help themselves by helping the schools, and what still remains to be done.)

To a greater degree than ever before, business men today are turning their attention to the problem of education and seeking ways to find much-needed solutions.

Company after company is recognizing the pressing financial needs of our institutions of higher learning and working out plans to provide scholarships, fellowships, grants, or contributions in other forms. Since colleges form an important source of executive material, and since the recruiting of young graduates brings the businessman into frequent contact with colleges and universities, it is not surprising that business is increasingly recognizing the fact that these institutions need help, and finding ways of coming to their assistance financially. This interest and support is needed and commendable.

When we turn to our elementary and secondary schools, however, the businessman is not so apt to be aware of the problems and needs. Our schools seem to keep running; children go to them and are not turned away; education is always there available to all. Until recently, few business men have realized how much their interest and attention are needed if we are to have in this country the kind of schools we want to have and must have for our children.

It is easy to recognize the need for the educated men turned out by our colleges and the trained scientists graduated from our technical schools and to forget that higher education must rest on a solid basis of elementary and secondary education. The shortage of chemists, physicists, and engineers cannot be solved by our technical schools alone; it is in the secondary schools that the young mind must be stimulated and guided, and the rudimentary courses in mathematics and science taught.

But the businessman's stake in education goes much deeper and further. If we are going to ask the individual citizen up and down the street to make decisions on national policy or to select wisely leaders who will do so, we must provide all the people—not just some of them—with the means of acquiring knowledge and of understanding it. Our citizens must be able to understand the words they see and hear, and thus select the sound from the unsound. They must, in other words, be educated.

The case can be stated in terms of economics as well. It has been demonstrated that a worker's earning power matches his education almost directly. Census Bureau figures show that men with high school or college educations earn 80 percent of the incomes over $7,000—and men with only an eighth-grade education or less earn 77 percent of the incomes under $5,000. Men capable of filling the higher paid jobs, skilled labor to operate our highly industrialized economy—these men must come from the ranks of those who have had the basic education provided by good schools.

Despite the fact that the need for an educated citizenry has been an important part of our country's thinking from the very start, we as a people have allowed our schools to

become inadequate. A decade of depression followed by years of war saw the physical plant deteriorate without adequate replacements. Hundreds of thousands of teachers, siphoned off for service during the war, did not return to the classroom. After the war high wages in business and industry attracted thousands of young people who in ordinary times would have entered teaching. Rising costs in the postwar years put the squeeze on school districts where revenues seldom come close to keeping pace. And while the postwar baby crop added immeasurably to the strength and prosperity of our country, it flooded our ill-prepared classrooms.

The picture was not, of course, one of unrelieved gloom. The educational profession itself strove mightily to meet the challenge. Many civic and educational organizations like the PTA rose to the occasion with vigor. And the National Citizens' Commission for the Public Schools was chartered in 1949 for the express purpose of arousing the American public to support its schools.

In spite of the magnificent efforts of many individuals and organizations, however, not much of a dent had been made by 1953 on the enormous job to be done. The Nation was faced with an educational crisis of truly epic proportions.

To help meet this crisis in the schools President Eisenhower launched the idea of a White House Conference on Education. In his state of the Union message to Congress in January 1954, he issued the appeal for a national stocktaking of our schools:

"I hope * * * a conference on education will be held in each State, culminating in a national conference. From these conferences on education, every level of Government—from the Federal Government to each local school board—should gain the information with which to attack these serious problems."

Nearly 2 years later, from November 28 to December 1, 1955, the national conference envisioned by the President was held. Every State and Territory had already held its own conferences and had reported its conclusions to the White House Conference Committee. In addition, thousands of local communities, county school districts, and even attendance areas within school districts had held their own little White House conferences to analyze their local school problems.

These community and State conferences followed diverse patterns. Many of them were organized in small round-table discussion groups like the White House Conference itself; others followed the pattern of the town meeting. Nearly all of them sought a democratic exchange of views on the part of the participants.

The White House Conference in Washington brought together nearly 2,000 delegates from every State and Territory to sit down at round tables of 11 citizens each to seek solutions to the problems of the Nation's schools. After electing its own chairman, each table spent 1 half-day session on each of the 6 major problem areas: the goals of education, the organization of the schools, school-building needs, the teacher shortage, financing the schools, and obtaining a continuing public interest in education.

Discussion at the conference was limited to the problems of education at the elementary tnd secondary levels. The decision of the White House Conference Committee on this matter was taken not because higher education does not face major problems but because time was a limiting factor and because the problems of the public schools are so immediate and pressing. The population wave that will hit the colleges in 10 or 12 years is inundating our elementary schools right now. One conference could no consider all the major issues even of elementary and secondary education which affect most Americans directly. We may hope that other similar conferences will take up the problems of higher education in the near future.

The report of the White House Conference Committee is not yet written and the results of the Conference itself won't be clear for many months, but some conclusions are justified.

WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY?

At the simplest level, the conference provided a means for publicizing the schools—for making their problems more widely known than ever before. More importantly, perhaps, it dramatized effectively once more the responsibility of every local citizen for his own community's schools and their affairs.

Another striking result was the proof it afforded that a cross-section of America could sit down at the conference table and hammer out agreements in the heat of debate. Citizens from every part of the country, representing every educational philosophy and every political stripe, with backgrounds and personalities as diverse as the Nation itself, met, argued, and compromised their differences—not their principles—in true democratic fashion.

Finally, it introduced many hundreds of people to an effective means for tackling school problems—the round-table discussion meeting. This is not a new technique—the National Citizens' Commission for the Public Schools, for instance, has used it for years in local, State, and regional workshops, and many educational organizations have used variations of it—but it was new to many people. As Educational Trend reported:

"Many observers believe that the process of the Conference, that is, the way it operated, was as great a contribution to education as the Conference findings. For, it demonstrated that it is possible to gather together a large group of laymen and educators, and to channel their diversified approaches to the problems of education into some common agreements." And Education Summary predicted that "education's conferences—small and large—will henceforth reflect the highly successful procedures used in this Washington Conference."

Not everyone, of course, was equally happy about the results of the White House Conference. Any procedure designed to permit 2,000 persons to exchange views and reach agreements on a set of complicated questions is bound to fall short of complete satisfaction. But when the Conference was over, hundreds of people—including many who originally doubted that a Conference of 2,000 people could be organized into small discussion groups successfully—were inspired to attack their local school problems with renewed vigor.

The White House Conference was a springboard—but many thousands more citizens must take the leap into school affairs before it can really pay off. School issues aren't solved at the national level.

This is the job that remains: to stimulate citizens in every community to come together, talk over their schools' problems, and agree on workable solutions.

Executives of business and industry have a double responsibility to promote the welfare of the schools. Like other citizens they should support public education as individuals. As caretakers of American enterprise both enlightened self-interest and a sense of civic responsibility should lead management into school affairs. Either as individuals or as business executives there are few opportunities for the investment of time or money that will pay such big dividends in public welfare and private satisfaction.

But the phrase "support your schools" is often misunderstood. It does not necessarily mean the contribution of funds—although it may—nor does it mean uncritical acceptance of the schools as they are. It does mean a constructive attitude toward public education which finds expression in positive action.

As individuals you can contribute nothing more valuable than your time, intelligence, and experience. Get acquainted with your local school district and find out what problems your school board is wrestling with. If your community has a citizens' committee, find out what it's doing and what you can do to help. Become familiar with the program of your State citizens' committee and see where your talents and experience can help out. The hardest thing to give is yourself. But it is also the most valuable—and it offers the biggest potential returns.

As for a critical attitude toward the schools, all democratic institutions need constant reevaluation to keep them dynamic, flexible, and healthy. The schools are no exception. In fact, because of the special positions they occupy in our society it is possible that they need more criticism than most. But is must be informed and constructive. The taxpayer who opposes every attempt to improve his local schools, and then complains bitterly because they are not more effective, does not contribute to good education.

As representatives of business and industry you can find other effective means for working toward the same end. The National Planning Association has published a guide called The Manual of Corporate Giving which includes a chapter on the public schools. Here you will find suggestions ranging from cooperation with the United States Chamber of Commerce's Business-Industry Education days to financing the most esoteric educational research. But much of the most effective cooperation you can offer is simpler and begins closer to home.

The important thing is the determination of business management to do something. An outstanding example in this direction was set by Standard Oil of New Jersey when its board of directors in 1954 adopted a resolution clearly giving encouragement to its employees to participate in school activities. The resolution started with the statement, "The importance of our public school system to the growth, prosperity, peace, and security of our country can scarcely be overestimated at any time. * * * American business enterprise is aware of its own great debt to the public school system of this country, because it is essential to its own survival and growth." The resolution then went on as follows:

"The right and duty of the individual to support our public school system is clear. One such duty is, of course, that of paying taxes. But it seems to us clear that the obligation of each of us as an individual runs beyond mere payment of taxes.

"Over the years many Jersey Standard employees have participated actively in their local school programs. The company would like to see more of its people take an active interest in the problems and opportunities facing the public schools in their own communities. Obviously, the conditions affecting the individual's ability to participate in school activities will vary, but our company encourages its employees as good American citizens to undertake this important work."

General Electric also has for a number of years encouraged its employees to participate in local school affairs. As a result the company lists on its rolls many school-board members, PTA members, and active workers in local and State citizens' committees.

As a minor example of how a company can help, several years ago the citizens' school committee in Cincinnati held a workshop to mobilize citizen interest in the area. A Cincinnati company supplied needed secretarial help during the course of the meeting after it learned that even so small a contribution to school affairs would be welcome.

Some executives may hesitate to make certain types of corporate contributions toward better schools. However, there is one area of financial support (aside from those listed in the Manual of Corporate Giving, mentioned above) about which there can be no question—the support of citizen organizations working for the improvement of the schools. I mentioned above the need for a followup on the White House conference in order to realize the full benefits it could offer.

Many local and State citizens' committees are planning just such followup conferences during the next year. Virtually all of these committees are hampered by lack of funds. They offer an opportunity to make a small investment pay large dividends in public welfare and private good will. Some of these committees are temporary—set up to plan and hold one or more conferences. Others are permanent committees carrying on broad programs for school betterment over a period of years and they merit your continuing support.

The New York State Citizens' Committee for the Public Schools is an example of such an organization. It is more fortunate than most because it has secured a fund-raising committee of leaders in business and industry from all over the State. Unfortunately, the New York committee is almost unique in this respect, but its experience suggests that management can help greatly by contributing both funds and the technical know-how on fund raising.

Some of the committees planning conferences in the next few months—and years—will doubtless receive some financial aid from State or local governments. Most of them probably will not. Virtually all will need some help.

If business and industry get behind this program of citizen conferences and the subsequent plans for local and State school improvement there is no doubt that America's educational crisis will be met. In the process, President Eisenhower's hope for the White House Conference will be fully justified. But most important, the Nation's schools will be better able to cope with the tremendous responsibilities our society places on them. And, incidentally, business and industry will receive dividends in terms of better employees and a population with a steadily increasing capacity to consume the output of American productivity.

Some Things That Ike Hasn't Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland Plain Dealer has combined brevity and wit in its recent editorial entitled "Some Things That Ike Hasn't Done." I include it in the RECORD for the edification and enlightenment of my colleagues:

SOME THINGS THAT IKE HASN'T DONE

Now we have heard everything, or almost everything. President Eisenhower is a "do-nothing President" and the authority for this is none other than former President Truman.

Alas, poor Ike, for Mr. Truman may have something there. It is true, and we are compelled to admit it, that there are some things Mr. Eisenhower hasn't done. For instance:

President Eisenhower did not get us into a war and then decline to win it.

He did not appoint a Secretary of State who waited for the dust to settle in China, or anywhere else. (To tell the truth, Ike's Secretary of State is on the move so much the dust never gets a chance to settle.)

Mr. Eisenhower did not promise a labor leader that he would not invoke the Taft-Hartley Act in case of a strike which imperiled the national security. To be sure, he has not had any occasion to invoke that act, but his antitrust division has been even tougher on business monopolies than preceding administrations.

Mr. Eisenhower did not illegally size the steel industry.

He did not say that the Alger Hiss case was a red herring, or that House Un-American Activities Committee should be abolished.

He did not say it was "asinine" when men in his administration were accused of improprieties. Instead he got rid of them.

And the President did not rob the people of their savings, or depreciate the value of their insurance policies, bonds and pensions by espousing fiscal policies which accelerated inflation.

No, Mr. Eisenhower has done none of these things, so he must be a "do-nothing" President. And Mr. Truman did all of them, so he must be quite a guy.

Cross-Florida Barge Canal Seen as Needed Defense Measure as General Spaatz Says Red Submarines Are Rising Peril

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to a report in the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., April 20, which clearly shows again that there is an urgent need for this country making a more adequate defense against Soviet submarine warfare. As has been previously pointed out, the massive submarine strength of the Soviet is obviously established for aggressive, not defense purposes. Submarines are not defensive weapons. Our experience in World War II with a much smaller German submarine fleet shows that we should not delay any longer the beginning of construction of the cross-Florida barge canal. The canal would justify its construction costs many times from the savings which might be made against submarine-incurred shipping losses should we ever have another war. It is foolhardy to delay this project, and I sincerely hope that actual construction of this Congress-approved project can begin at the earliest possible moment. The report above referred to is as follows:

RED SUBMARINES POSE RISING PERIL, SPAATZ SAYS

(By Cecil Holland)

Gen. Carl Spaatz said today the Navy should stop spending money on supercarriers and concentrate on meeting the threat of a submarine attack on the United States.

The retired Air Force Chief of Staff described Russia's growing submarine power—he estimated the Soviets have 400 submarines and is a serious menace to this country.

General Spaatz and Adm. Robert B. Carney, retired Chief of Naval Operations, testified before the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee investigating this country's air and missile programs.

Before they testified, Senator SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, subcommittee chairman, said the inquiry was being broadened to include naval aviation.

HUNDREDS FEWER IN UNITED STATES

No specific figure was given on the number of American submarines but Senator SYMINGTON said it was hundreds less than the Soviets have.

General Spaatz added that he would rather have "a few too many than a few too few" planes. He also suggested that work on developing an intercontinental ballistic missile be given the highest priority.

Admiral Carney, who left his naval post last summer, did not specifically discuss the Russian submarine menace. However, he said that the Soviets possess a navy "of such strength that it cannot be ignored" and one strong enough now to challenge the supremacy of the seas."

The admiral said an atomic stalemate may result so that there will be no general atomic war. He emphasized the importance of maintaining balanced forces to meet any threat.

FEARS LOSS OF UNITY

Admiral Carney also suggested that new Russian tactics may soften up Western unity. On this point General Spaats said "Russian leaders Bulganin and Khrushchev may soft soap the western powers to the point that they think no attack will come." Then, the general said, the surprise attack will follow.

Both General Spaatz and Admiral Carney agree that Russia has narrowed or closed a gap with the United States in weapons and technological advantages.

General Spaatz indicated the Soviets are ahead of this country in submarine forces and declared:

"I still don't believe we are adequately prepared to meet the threat of a combined air power and submarine attack."

RECALLS U-BOAT HAVOC

He recalled the devastation brought by 30 or 40 German submarines along the American coast during World War II and emphasized the seriousness of the Soviet submarine threat by saying this number could be multiplied 10 fold with undersea craft armed with guided missiles carrying atomic warheads.

The testimony of General spaatz, who retired in 1948, recalled the bitter service controversy after World War II between the Air Force and Navy over long-range bombers versus aircraft carriers.

General Spaatz also assailed the military setup and suggested a new defense chief of staff and a general staff to direct the country's military effort. He testified that not enough money is being spent for defense under the present setup, but said it would be adequate if the Defense Establishment were overhauled.

The general said he does not believe Soviet Russia has developed guided missiles with atomic war hears so far. But he emphasized that this does not mean that they will not have it by the time the aircraft and missiles for which money is being appropriated now are in operation.

For what the country may need 5 or 6 years from now, Genearl Spaatz said he did not believe defense spending is large enough. He recommended:

1. More air bases for greater dispersion of aircraft.

2. More money for research and development.

3. Speeding up the building of long-range bombers.

Senator JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, asked General Spaatz why it took the Defense Department 11 months to increase the production of the B–52 long-range bomber.

"I'd say the Defense Department is pretty unwieldy," he said.

Another 50,000 Farmers Polled on Benson, Soil Bank, Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Farm Management magazine for April 1956:

ANOTHER 50,000 FARMERS POLLED ON BENSON, SOIL BANK, POLITICS

If substantial farmers of the West could sit down with Ezra Taft Benson for an old-fashioned crackerbarrel visit they'd apparently bombard the Secretary with some pretty convincing arguments against price supports.

Farm Management's widely-quoted poll has now reached out to 100,000 western farmers, and a continuing flood of farm policy comment, suggestion, and criticism is pouring in. It's considered one of the Nation's most significant surveys of farmer opinion on the vital issues of price supports, the soil bank, and politics. News service released nationwide stories on the results as published in Farm Management last month, and editors across the country commented and quoted from the poll.

Free markets are still favored over supports, Benson was endorsed by 64 percent, and restriction of payments under the soil-bank plan was favored by 50 percent of the voters. Opinion among the other half was divided. Republicans were far ahead, with 66 percent balloting for the GOP, against 34 percent for the Democrats.

Political opinion was surprisingly restrained; however, a few caustic comments were penned on ballots by party enthusiasts.

"I would guess that you have (Republican) Chairman Leonard Hall conducting this poll," wrote F. L. Gaffrey, from Sprague, Wash.

Countered J. E. Storm, Gridley, Calif.: "I feel that the Republican Party will do the best job for agriculture over a long period, and make a better agriculture for my sons and future generations."

NOT POLITICAL

But it definitely was not conducted as a political survey—and was recognized by most participants as an objective job of ascertaining exactly how the majority of the West's commercial farmers feel about the vital agricultural issues facing the Nation today.

Summed up Fredde John of San Luis Obispo: "No one person nor one party can adjust our present price problem. It is simply a problem that an expanding nation must face."

"The problems facing agriculture are of an economic nature," agreed Dick Markarian of Fresno, Calif. "The solution to our problems cannot be found by either electing Democrats or Republicans, but rather in getting representatives who realize no political solution can be very sound."

And 38 percent of the voters thought the problems could best be solved through free markets for all farm production, with 26 percent favoring flexible supports, 21 percent asking for 90-percent supports and 15 percent desiring the 2-price plan.

"None of the present price supports are of use to the small farmer," said C. M. Bright of Rigby, Idaho. "In our area the only crop that is supported is wheat. On my farm of 120 acres I am allotted 6 acres of wheat. Of what use is that to me? I don't grow cotton, tobacco, corn, or peanuts. Why should some crops be supported and others not?"

This opinion was shared by Cecil Sturgill of Baker, Oreg., who said, "If they can't find a way to help all classes of farming, then don't help any. All farmers have just as much right to help as a favored few."

BENSON CONTROVERSIAL

The controversial question, "Is Benson doing a good job?" provoked more comment than any other portion of the poll, with 64 percent giving the Secretary of Agriculture a vote of confidence, 36 percent turning thumbs down.

Typical of pro-Benson was Keith Masterson, Almira, Wash., who asked farmer support for Benson with, "Let's everyone give this man support instead of opposition—work with him instead of trying to cut him down."

Many felt Benson was struggling to do his best in the face of big obstacles.

"I respect and admire him," said Thomas E. Barker, Tollefson, Ariz. "I think he is a great man and has served the Nation to the very best of his ability at all times. However, I feel that he has let the farmer down."

Barker felt Benson had succumbed to pressure groups in Washington.

"I believe he has a job that is impossible," said Frank Bensel of Hermiston, Oreg.

"Benson is doing a pretty good job under a lot of pressure," said Robert Gill, Dixon, Calif. "He did not cause the mess and is doing the best he can."

"Benson could never be a good Secretary of Agriculture because he does not know anything about farming," wrote Douglas Rose, of Weston, Idaho. "He had a farm 10 miles from Weston and could not make a go of it. Then he was county agent of Franklin County, Idaho. When he makes a survey of the farms, he does not visit the family-size farm."

OPINION DIVIDED

Only 7 percent of those polled opposed the soil bank; but opinion was divided as to how it should be administered and regulated. Restriction of payments obtained a 50-percent vote; 13 percent favored Government payments for land taken out of cultivation and 30 percent wanted free choice by farmers as to what use is made of diverted land.

"The soil-bank proposition is stupid," said William A. Bartholomae, of Fullerton, Calif. "It can only result in bureaucracy and cheating."

Not so, said a reader from Wagon Mound, N. Mex. "The soil bank is a wonderful step toward soil conservation and good farm management."

"Most sensible idea of Government help ever proposed," chimed J. McKissack, of Merced, Calif.

On the issue of restricting Federal payments according to the income of the recipient, 34 percent favored making such payments to all without income restrictions. Restricting payments to those with an income of less than $15,000 received a 32-percent vote; less than $25,000, 20 percent; less than $50,000, 14 percent.

The question of income set off heated debate over the family farm versus the big operator.

Said George W. Stedman, of Sonoma, Calif., "If so-called farmers cannot make a living farming, let them find a job or start some other business. Why should the taxpayers support a lot of inefficient people?"

DOING THEIR BEST

"We have done our best to operate efficiently, carefully, intelligently," replied Mrs. Charles Chowen, Manson, Wash., "but we have been hard hit by low prices. We're small farmers, practically moneyless. We are going to have to start borrowing soon. If we lose all we have gained from scratch in the last 12 years, whom do you think will get the bulk of the blame? But don't think for 1 minute that we will give up easily and go on the labor market. We will fight to the last ditch, to hang on.

"We live in the most wonderful country in the world," concluded Mrs. Chowen. "And have utmost faith in the most wonderful Government in the world."

Her Government was concerned, too. From the floor of the House of Representatives Congressman J. ARTHUR YOUNGER, introduced the full text of last month's Farm Management report into the United States CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and Congressmen throughout the West read the report, requested additional information and tabulations on the final returns.

At Farm Management's office these returns were being carefully compiled. Editors, impressed with the many sound ideas set forth, were carefully reading every letter and penciled notation. Unfortunately, only a small portion of the comment can be published; however, all communications are being studied, some will be passed on to our lawmakers, others used in future Farm Management presentations.

HOW WESTERN FARMERS VOTED

This questionnaire has been mailed to 100,000 farmers throughout the West in Farm Management's survey to determine how farmers feel about national farm policy.

	Percent
Farm price supports:	
90 percent supports on all major farm products	21
Flexible price supports	26
Two price plan	15
Free market, no supports	38
Soil bank:	
Government payments for land taken out of cultivation	13
Restricting such payments to those who do not graze livestock on diverted land	50
Free choice by farmers as to what use is made of diverted acres	30
No soil bank at all	7
Restrictions on Federal payments:	
Restrictions governing price support or land diversion payments to farmers with annual incomes of less than:	
$50,000	14
Less than $25,000	20
Less than $15,000	32
Making such payments to all without income restrictions	34
Political party preference:	
Democrat	34
Republican	66
Third party	
Secretary Benson:	
Is doing a good job	64
Is not doing a good job	36

Los Angeles Needs Passport Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years, efforts have been made to establish a passport office in the Los Angeles area. San Francisco, Boston, New Orleans, New York, Chicago, and Washington have such offices at the present time. The number of passport applications in Los Angeles has increased by huge percentages in recent years. These applications must still be processed in Washington, 3,000 miles away, which results in considerable delay, difficulty, and confusion for more than 5 million residents of the Los Angeles area.

It is my hope that favorable action will be taken by the State Department in this matter.

I am enclosing two recent editorials from the Los Angeles newspapers which discuss this problem. The editorials follow:

[From the Los Angeles Examiner of April 16, 1956]

PASSPORT JAM

No better proof could be offered that the State Department and its passport division should establish in Los Angeles a branch empowered to issue passports, than the current flood of applications that has overtaxed the local clerk's office.

Under the antiquated system now in force, the applications normally are routed to Washington, and only when emergency needs are recognized, routed to San Francisco for approval—a procedure that wastes time and causes inconvenience if not hardship.

Yet more than half of all passports granted in the entire Western area are issued to residents of Los Angeles and neighboring cities.

For years Washington has closed its eyes and ears to requests for a Los Angeles passport office.

The pleas of city and county officials, chambers of commerce, California's congressional delegation and even Federal judges of the northern district have been in vain.

Apparently, neither the State Department nor its passport division is yet aware of some things: That Los Angeles is the hub of constantly increasing foreign travel originating here; that the Southland is now a vast metropolitan area and no longer a corner of the great American desert, and that public conenvience and necessity are being badly served locally in passport matters.

We repeat these palpable facts in the hope that Washington's passport authorities will soon realize the obligation to render proper service where it is most needed.

[From the Los Angeles Mirror-News of April 19, 1956]

LOS ANGELES NEEDS PASSPORT OFFICE

The State Department should establish a Los Angeles passport office which could handle directly and quickly all passport applications originating here.

Instead we have just a transmittal office. All applications have to be sent on to Washington or—and this is in cases of emergency only—to the nearest passport agent who is in San Francisco.

This results in long delays and inconvenience and in many cases added expense, due to long-distance telephone calls that must be made to hurry up the proceedings.

The situation is definitely unfair to a city which originates more foreign travel than any other in the West.

Some 200 passport applications are processed here every day.

For 1955 the number was 22,448, an increase of more than 70 percent over 1951 when the total was 13,064.

Foreign travel from here is zooming sharply this year and will continue to increase in the foreseeable future.

Public officials and civic organizations have frequently urged establishment of a passport office here to serve one of America's foremost metropolitan areas.

The next move is up to Washington and it should come promptly.

The Battle of the Classrooms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, in recent months we have been receiving an increasing amount of information that Russia is rapidly overtaking us in the so-called battle of the classrooms. Not long ago, for example, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy issued a report indicating that our past superiority in scientists and engineers—the very superiority upon which our preeminent position among the world's powers rests—is quickly disappearing.

In view of these facts it is extremely gratifying to hear that President Eisenhower has chosen to meet the problem head-on by appointing a National Committee for the Development of Scientists and Engineers. This distinguished and varied group will be under the leadership of Dr. Howard L. Bevis, president of Ohio State University, and it will attempt to find a solution to our dilemma.

This is a most laudable and positive undertaking. We wish the committee godspeed as they embark on an inquiry into a siuation which holds great importance for each and every one of us.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the following editorial from the Washington Star of April 12, which delineates the whole situation in clear, concise terms:

A WAR WE'RE LOSING

President Eisenhower has taken a good and timely step in appointing a committee of distinguished citizens to deal with the problem of our country's serious and potentially grave shortage of scientific and technological manpower.

The new group is the National Committee for the Development of Scientists and Engineers. Headed by Dr. Howard L. Bevis, president of Ohio State University, it is made up of 19 outstanding individuals representing all the key segments of our American community, including education, industrial management, labor, and local and State governments. Its primary responsibility, as Mr. Eisenhower has declared in a letter to Dr. Bevis, is to promote an imaginative and vigorous effort by both governmental and citizens organizations to "maintain for us the technological superiority upon which our economy and our national security so critically depend."

This superiority—which is especially vital, militarily and economically, in a superscientific age when our population is increasing at a rate of almost 25 million every decade—has made us unique among nations in the 20th century. But the distinction is fast slipping from us. In the President's words, "as a result of our continuing shortages of highly qualified scientists and engineers, we are running the danger of losing the position of technological preeminence we have long held in the world," and the power that threatens to supplant us in that respect is the Soviet Union—a country which up to now has dedicated itself to using science chiefly for purposes of aggression and global conquest.

The seriousness of the situation has been effectively demonstrated in numerous authoritative studies, including a particularly sobering one released recently by the Joint Congressional Atomic Committee. The studies leave no room for doubt that the United States and its Western allies—although they may at the moment enjoy a superiority in the number of scientists and engineers available to them—are rapidly falling behind in what has been called the cold war of the classrooms. This is so because the Soviet Union is turning out a much bigger annual crop of scientific and engineering graduates than are our own country and free Europe combined.

A problem of this sort, of course, cannot be ended merely by appointing a committee. But the group named by the President is an impressive one, and if it works hard at its job, it can point the way toward a sound solution. If it achieves only that much, it will be rendering fine service to the Nation.

After 8 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Paterson Evening News of April 21, 1956:

AFTER 8 YEARS

The people of Israel temporarily laid aside their troubles to celebrate their independence day. There was folk dancing in floodlit squares throughout the country. National leaders spoke of permanent survival despite the threat of another war. Generally it was an occasion for rejoicing over Israel's 8 years of successful struggle against heavy odds.

Eight years ago, this little republic was established under United Nations sponsorship in face of bitter opposition from hostile Arab States. It actually owes its existence to the United States, Britain, and France, and, especially to the United States which used its power and influence to assure the creation of this new democracy in the Middle East.

It has been no easy task for the hardy, pioneering zealots to transform the wastelands of Bibical Palestine into a fertile, productive nation patterned after the western parliamentary system. There Jews find a homeland for the first time since the Hebrews in 1000 B. C. established a monarchy in what to them then seemed a land of milk and honey, only to be overrun time and again by aggressors, and after conquest by the Byzantine Empire, falling into Egypt's

hand in another conquest in around 634 B. C.

As in olden times, the Israeli people were compelled to fight their way to newly won freedom and independence against ancient enemies. Free people everywhere admired their courage in that war and their dedicated efforts in building a modern, progressive, high-spirited nation in the heart of one of the world's most backward areas.

Now, Israel is alarmed, but undaunted, by gathering storm clouds. It has made remarkable advances in 8 short years, in spite of economic boycott, blockade, and border raids by enemies who refuse to recognize its existence. As the Israelis celebrate their anniversary, with hopes for a permanent peace that will allow them to live and prosper in freedom from these dangerous harrassments, the good wishes of all free people go with them.

Never in the world's history has 8 years done so much for any country. The British, whose mandate began it; the United Nations, whose assumption of responsibility followed; and American Jewry, whose funds have made development possible; these have combined with the Israeli spirit of devotion and sacrifice to bring Israel very far in 8 years, creating an oasis of progress in the barren deserts of north Africa.

Have They Died in Vain?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the Belleville (Ill.) News-Democrat of April 11, 1956. The editorial entitled "Have They Died in Vain?" follows:

The Defense Department can't fathom why soldiers and sailors, airmen and marines refuse to reenlist when their hitch is up. This situation keeps top brass in a dither, vainly shaking the bushes to turn up ways and means of making military life more attractive so that trained officers and enlisted men can be enticed to sign up for more of the same. The turnover, which has reached alarming proportions, has turned out to be an item of astronomic expense to our Nation.

The tragic incident at the United States Marine Corps base at Parris Island, S. C., should clew out the Pentagon's worriers as to why so many Americans loathe military servitude and get out of it at their first opportunity.

Sunday night, six trainees were taken out and drowned as punishment for some alleged (and probably imaginary) infraction of corps discipline. The judge, jury, and executioner in this case turned out to be a sadistic drill sergeant, drunk with power, who routed out his whole company in the middle of night and forced it to wallow for hours in the Carolina muck.

No doubt this psychopathic noncom will be crucified. We hold no brief for him. But the guilt in the death of the six young Marines is not his alone. It belongs as much to the booby, who vested life-and-death control over a company of 80 raw recruits in this individual—demonstably incompetent to be in charge of anybody. And it extends all up the chain of command to the top martinets who countenanced, if not cultivated, this outrageous system of chicanry which apparently prevails in all basic training camps. We hold no brief for them, either.

The distorted magnification of insignificance which culminated in disaster at Parris Island might have happened at almost any basic training camp operated the auspices of the Defense Department. For the same radically un-American principle is diligently pursued by the Navy, the Army, the Air Force, and the Coast Guard.

Theoretically, basic training is intended to separate the men from the boys. In practice, however, this initial phase of military service is conducted to transform recruits into docile sheep, but inevitably the grueling process makes goats of many.

It is this crucial period when the civilian is being introduced to the frustrations of the "Army way" that sows the seeds of disgust with the military in general and everything connected with it. From the start the taste is bad, with all the wanton brutalizing, inhumanities and indignities the new hands are subjected to. After that they never can develop a zestful appetite for this dish.

It has become abundantly clear that basic training procedure is long overdue for drastic overhauling. The unforgivable shame of it all is that six fine, robust, young Americans were drowned before their countrymen woke up to the deplorable conditions which prevail throughout our country's Military Establishment.

Our National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the speech delivered by Adm. Arthur Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, before the 65th Continental Congress of the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution in Washington, D. C., on April 17, 1956. I feel this address will be of interest to all Members of Congress:

NATIONAL DEFENSE OUR GREATEST TASK

Tonight I want to limit my remarks to our one greatest task. The task is national defense—the defense of our freedoms and our way of life. No other problem is as important or as decisive as this one.

This task of which I speak involves more than military defense. It is more than organizing, equipping, and training Armed Forces for prompt and sustained combat operations.

For the task is also one of supporting the broad purposes of our Government and the United Nations in working for freedom, justice, and peace. It is one of strengthening our national fiber and reestablishing contact in our daily lives with proven fundamentals. And, it is one of making ourselves better able to live our lives, educate our young, and pray our prayers, all in freedom and self-respect.

Our great task is all these and more besides. In essence, our task is to strengthen our freedoms and safeguard them for the generations to follow.

Now some of us may feel that we are able to isolate ourselves or escape responsibility for this task. But none of us really do—we only think we do. It would never be enough for only a relatively few to be responsible for the defense of these United States. It never could be.

The reason is simple and clear. If many Americans were to isolate themselves from responsibility for the well-being of this Nation, we probably would fall into the doldrums of apathy, complacency and self-satisfaction. We would be inclined to look at communism and then write it off the books in the belief: "It cannot happen here." Unconsciously, our guard would be lowered, and our vulnerabilities increased.

Ladies and Gentlemen: We "can" be destroyed by a lack of active patriotism. Liberty is always in danger. History is filled with instances proving that nations who take liberty for granted are apt to fall prey to tyrannical forces from within as well as from without.

Any serious deficiency or lack of active patriotism should be regarded as a menace to national security. We simply cannot afford to take freedom for granted. Complacency and smugness are completely out of place at a time when nearly a billion people from the Baltic to the Pacific are under Communist control.

In this regard, we should remember that freedom is not solely American. Love of liberty is not something unique to us alone. Out of that billion people now behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, there probably are many who long for liberty and who try to keep alive the flame of faith. I feel sure that for those who have lost freedom, there is no reparation or sacrifice that can even faintly reflect its true value.

Communism is not only a powerful organization militarily and industrially, but it is also an extremely skillful and unscrupulous ideological opponent who is at work every day selling his goods around the world. Its base, its head, and its heart are in Moscow; but its objectives are worldwide. Its successes are achieved in part by the subversive appeal of an artful logic effectively spread by organized zealots.

As a result, people of satellite states are either persuaded or regimented to accept a set of principles and values based on the individual's subservience to the state.

Let's face it. Communist leadership can recruit people who will risk their lives, live in one suit of clothes and on one meal a day—all in order to spread Communist doctrine.

In answer to their ideology, we who are free are sometimes outmaneuvered. Too often we seemingly lack the understanding conviction with which to defend our way of life. Sometimes we overemphasize material things in life, and talk too much about our aircraft, automobiles, highways, refrigerators, television, gadgetry and money—the products of our way of life, and not its foundations.

Are these what we value most? I say "No," though at times some of us may think we do. These are the fashionable surface desires. Possess them all, and you still would not have satisfied your life.

The real answer is found in the heart, the mind, and in the spirit of America. What people want is the pride which springs from the freedom and dignity of the individual. They want to establish and identify themselves with liberty, an achievement which fundamentally is very much up to the individual.

As I see it, our responsibility is unmistakable. Freedom is the personal responsibility and action of an individual. It is comparatively easy to legislate freedoms, and almost impossible to legislate individual actions and responsibilities. Yet one's value to oneself and to society varies in direct proportion to the extent he or she assumes responsibilities toward others.

For women, this is indeed an important mission, and it is traditional. It is traditional for women to help conserve the best elements of our heritage. Especially is it

traditional for you Daughters of our American heritage.

By your influence in the home, church, and school, you shape the character of our youth, who in their day will be called upon to assume their share of responsibility. By your influence in the home and Government, you provide the balance which so often helps us hold fast to the right course.

On that analogy is another hope for raising the moral and spiritual fiber of the home and of the Nation. It always will be your role to give consideration to world problems, and at the same time, strengthen the place of families in building a secure Nation.

Tonight, I congratulate the Daughters of the American Revolution for their outstanding service to the cause of freedom. You have advanced the vital hopes of freedom for the future.

I congratulate you on being the recipient of Freedoms Foundation special award for 1955 in recognition of your active work to maintain our historic heritage. It was my good fortune to present this coveted award to your first vice president, Mrs. Kenneth T. Trewhella, in ceremonies at Valley Forge, Pa., on the 22d of February this year.

It may interest you to know that your citation contained only four sentences, but each sentence contained some world of action—words like "dedication," "efforts," "intensely," "work," and "results." The act of doing something was inherent in every part of that citation, as though action in the service of your country is implicit with each of you.

So it is with us in the Armed Forces. Liberty is our heritage, too. It is one national asset that is irreplaceable; and like any possession of value, it must be protected and made secure.

All Americans, in or out of uniform, have a stake in the spiritual, moral, and cultural well-being of our Nation. We in the Armed Forces join with you Daughters of the American Revolution in serving in the forces which guard our country and our way of life. Your efforts and ours are part of the strategy in defense of our liberty. Together, let us always be actively and patriotically militant about our liberty.

Vice President Urges Firmness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to your attention an interesting editorial which appeared in the Whittier (Calif.) News on April 14, 1956. It points up the necessity of our giving particular attention to the Far East and the importance of our diplomacy in that area.

The editorial refers to an address by Mr. Virgil Pinkley, publisher of the Los Angeles Mirror. Mr. Pinkley is well equipped to discuss this problem and has made an important contribution to our country by bringing first-hand information to the leaders of our Government concerning this vital area.

The editorial follows:

WHY MUST WE WAVER?

Is it the difference between shirt-sleeved and silk-stockinged diplomacy? Is it saying one thing out of one corner of our diplomatic mouths and meaning still another thing out of the other corner?

What is the elusive something that makes our foreign policy so ineffective at times?

Why do most Americans ultimately come to the conclusion that, regardless of the political party in the White House or in Congress at the time, we are forever pulling boners in dealing with both friends and foes in foreign countries?

Los Angeles editor Pinkley, who addressed the annual Whittier Chamber of Commerce dinner, may have supplied the answer. He was relating a conversation he had with the Japanese Foreign Minister, Mamoru Shigemitsu.

The Minister told him in reply to a question that so far as Japan is concerned the United States needs to do but one thing: be firm and stay that way.

Shigemitsu listed as an example our plans for using Pacific islands to test future atomic weapons, as we have in the past. His recommendation, said Pinkley, is that the United States say exactly and specifically what it proposes to do with such testing, and then stand by what it says. Instead of veering with every whim of diplomacy that occurs to our representatives abroad, said the Japanese (who certainly must be a friend of ours to be so candid), we ought to take our position and then stick unwaveringly to it.

Such a policy may be exactly what we need in the Far East, together with one other method suggested by the editor.

He thinks our diplomats ought to do more like the Nixons did when they visited the Orient—get out and shake hands and mix with the people themselves, not the governmental leaders only. This, too, makes sense because it is practical. We know that it works in our hometowns here in America; otherwise, none of us would have many personal friends.

It can work all around the world because a majority of people everywhere are friendly and want to be accepted as friends. Why our diplomats have not sensed this is a mystery, except possibly because they have been held to the old British diplomatic customs and traditions that have been falling like tenpins in the death throes of colonialism in recent years.

Ike's Veto of the Farm Bill Indicates He Has Written Off the Farm Vote for 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a recent editorial from the Capital Times of Madison, Wis.

Following is the full text of the editorial:

President Eisenhower's veto of the farm bill providing for 90-percent support prices indicates that the Republicans are confident that they can lose the farm vote and still get elected next November.

In 1952, when the President didn't have this confidence, he was talking a different language about 90-percent supports. At Brookings, S. Dak., on October 4, Candidate Eisenhower had this to say about price supports:

"The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of the 90-percent parity price support and it is pledged even more than that to helping the farmer obtain his full parity, 100-percent parity, with the guaranty in price supports of 90."

The President's veto adds substance to the report that the Republican high command believes that it can ignore the economic plight of agriculture and look to the urban areas, where conditions are good, to pull them through the election. While they may be right in their political analysis, as it appears from some of the presidential primaries, they are taking a reckless gamble with the future of the economy.

It is nonsense to pretend, as the President seems to be doing, that the soil-bank plan, which he endorses, will do anything substantial for the farmers, whose incomes have dropped $1 billion a year since the advent of the Eisenhower administration. The danger is that this gathering depression on the farms will soon be felt in the cities, where consumer credit has already reach a precarious height. The result will be total depression.

The Eisenhower-Benson argument is that 90-percent supports produce unmanageable surpluses. They argue that flexible-price supports will reduce production and cut down on the accumulation of surpluses.

This is one of the biggest frauds put over on the American people. The Bensonites argue that they inherited huge surpluses from the Democrats which piled up under the rigid price-support program. Actually, there is a grave question of whether the surpluses then in existence were excessive.

As for cutting back production under the flexible program, the President need only look at the figures supplied by his own Department of Agriculture. Between 1952 and 1955 support prices on milk dropped 17 percent but production went up 9 percent. The disparity is even more pronounced in other farm commodities, except on those where production controls were imposed. The production of sorghum grain, for example, rose 173 percent in the same period while its support prices fell 24 percent.

If Secretary Benson understood the farmers end, instead of the processors, who have been making unprecedented profits, he would know that when a farmer's income falls he immediately moves to produce more.

The blunt truth is that Secretary Benson represents the philosophy of the big industrialized farm interests, who are out to make American agriculture a more efficient operation. This is going to be done by forcing the small inefficient farmers off the farm and into the factory. If there are some economic pains that go with this, so be it.

Some of Benson's advisers have frankly and publicly espoused this philosophy, seemingly unaware that they are creating a social and economic upheaval that could bring economic chaos. By his veto, the President is playing their game, though he is probably no more aware of its implications than he has been of some of the other things done in his administration.

Pulaski League of Nassau County, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, due to previous commitments, I was unable to speak before the Pulaski League of Nassau County at New Hyde Park, on April 22, 1956. My friend, Mr. Louis S.

Backiel, an outstanding American of Polish ancestry, appeared in my stead and delivered my address, which is as follows:

As you know, this is the first annual banquet of the Pulaski League of Nassau County. I want to welcome you to it in the hope that this banquet is the first of a long series of get-togethers.

This social and fraternal organization, is performing a very much needed service. It is helping and encouraging Americans of Polish descent to get acquainted with their local and State leaders. To know their local and State leaders is the duty of every voter, because it is at the local level that political campaigns are won and American Presidents elected.

Your State and local leaders are as important to you as the national representatives that you send to Washington. I congratulate Americans of Polish descent for supporting so strongly such an organization as the Pulaski League of Nassau County.

Many, perhaps all of you people here tonight, have relatives and friends in Poland. And I know that you will want to hear how President Eisenhower and his supporters feel about that unhappy country, especially now that the Soviet leaders are trying to sell their "new look" to the free world.

In the first place, no matter what you read in the papers, or hear from opposition sources, President Eisenhower is not fooled by the smiling faces which Khrushchev and Bulganin are now showing the world.

And he is not going to believe that they have had a change of heart until they free all the satellite nations, and most especially Poland.

You know, of course, under whose administration Poland was first sold to the slavery of the Iron Curtain.

But one thing is certain, if Polish history—a history of incredible heroism and fortitude—means anything, it means that Poland will be free again.

The Polish will to be free surpasses any love of liberty shown by any other European nation in world history.

Those famous words, "liberty or death," well might have been spoken by the combined voice of the Polish people.

And I say this to Messrs. Bulganin and Khrushchev, "As long as the Polish nation is kept in slavery behind the Iron Curtain, you are holding to your bosoms a dagger that will eventually destroy you. You cannot enslave the unconquerable Polish spirit. You cannot make henchmen of souls whose longing for freedom transcends their passion for life itself."

President Eisenhower and his administration inherited the present Polish tragedy. They cannot undo this dreadful wrong overnight. But, they are not fooled by the honeyed words now coming out of Russia. They are not fooled by the current destruction of the myth of Stalin. They have known all along that Stalin was the bloody murderer he is now proclaimed to be.

They know that the present leaders of Russia were his followers while he lived and so are as guilty as he was.

They will not weaken in their stand against Russia until the Iron Curtain is destroyed and Poland a free nation once again.

President Eisenhower is the first President in over 20 years to face Russia boldly. His Cabinet members reflect in their speeches and actions that strong bold policy.

Secretary of State Dulles proclaimed that for aggressors, we had up our sleeve the ace card of massive retaliation. He proclaimed for all the world to hear, that in the event of aggression anywhere in the world, we meant to use massive retaliation.

As a result, the Korean war was ended and Russian aggression brought to a halt. For the first time in over 20 years, communism was stopped dead in its tracks. History has shown that all dictatorships hold the seeds of their destruction. The moment they stop growing, they start to decay. We are determined to stop the growth of the Communist evil—we are determined that bit by bit, the Iron Curtain shall be rolled back. We are determined that 1 day Poland shall be free. To that end I pledge my labors in your behalf.

The Highway Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following brief summary of contents of H. R. 10660, new highway bill.

The highway bill, to be reported on the floor of the House shortly is H. R. 10660. This is a combination of H. R. 8836, the Fallon bill, which is the highway authorization bill reported by the Public Works Committee, and H. R. 9075, the revenue raising bill, the Boggs bill which was reported by the Ways and Means Committee. The first title of H. R. 10660 relates to the authorization as contained in the Fallon bill as amended.

PRIMARY, SECONDARY, URBAN

Sections 101 through 107 of the bill are approximately the same as the 1954 Highway Act which deals with the primary, secondary, and urban systems of roads as now in effect, with the exception that the funds involved are increased in the new legislation. The amount authorized for the primary, secondary, and urban systems, in addition to the $700 million already authorized for 1957 by the 1954 act is increased by $25 million.

It is established as the intent of Congress that starting in 1957 and continuing through 1969 the total amounts intended for the primary, secondary, and urban systems be progressively increased in the amount of $25 million per year. Thus the total Federal funds involved for these systems during this period is $11,375,000,000.

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW

It was the opinion of the committee that the Congress should review every 2 years the authorization on the primary, secondary, and urban systems.

Included in the sections up to 107 are increases for forest highway roads, trails, national parks, and so forth, and also some clarifying amendments relative to Indian land and other Federal domain roads. These sections also include a $30 million authorization for an emergency fund for highway repairs in disaster areas.

INTERSTATE SYSTEM

Section 108 to section 201 deals with the interstate system as set forth in H. R. 8836, the Fallon measure as amended. The authorizations of this section establishes a Federal expenditure, over the 13-year period 1957 up to and including 1969, for the Interstate system of $24,825,000,000. The matching as it deals with the interstate system is 90 percent Federal funds and 10 percent State funds. In reality the total expenditure of the two programs as far as Federal funds are concerned is approximately $36,500,000,000.

MAXIMUM AXLE WEIGHT LIMITATIONS

In the bill will be found new subject matter relating to Federal axle weight limitations on vehicles using the highways. From available information, and taking into consideration the sponsor of the amendment, it would be my opinion that it was submitted upon the recommendation, and with the approval of, the trucking industry. This section would deny Federal funds to the interstate system in any State which permits single axle loads in excess of 18,000 pounds or tandem-axle loads in excess of 32,000, or which exceeds present State statutory regulations in effect July 1, 1956, whichever is the greater. The enactment of this provision will not deprive any vehicle of any legal right it presently enjoys. It is an effort on the part of the Federal Government to insure that the highway facilities to be constructed with this large sum of Federal money shall serve out their economic life and not be prematurely destroyed by excessive loads and the question of safety for the traveling public shall be properly recognized. The bill takes into consideration the research that is now going on, the results of which will be known to Congress not later than March 1, 1959, and instructs the Secretary of Commerce to make recommendations to the Congress not later than March 1, 1959, with respect to maximum desirable dimensions and weights of vehicles using the public highways.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR CERTAIN HIGHWAYS

The bill contains a section instructing the Secretary of Commerce to do necessary research regarding reimbursement of funds by the Federal Government to those States that have completed sections of the interstate system whether toll or free, subsequent to August 2, 1947, and meeting standards required on the interstate system and to report to the Congress his findings not later than January 2, 1958. It was recognized by the Committee that possibly there was equity in the reimbursement feature but sufficient factual data was not available to permit the establishment of a fair formula either in dollars or miles credited.

PREVAILING RATE OF WAGE

The bill contains a provision for bringing under the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act contract work performed on the interstate system. This provision requires that the Secretary of Labor determine the prevailing wages to be paid on all contracts involving interstate sections of the program.

RELOCATION OF UTILITY FACILITIES

The bill as written sets forth that whenever a State shall pay for the relocation of utility facilities necessitated by the construction of a project in the Federal-aid primary or secondary system, or on a national system, Federal funds may be used to reimburse the State for such costs in the same proportion as Federal funds are expended on the proj-

ect. The term utility includes, publicly, privately, cooperatively owned utilities, which, of course, includes sewer systems, water systems, gas, telephone including REA, light and power. This leaves the determining power entirely in the hands of the States.

FREE COMPETITION

Other provisions relate to the filing of periodic reports on the progress of the interstate system; the use of rights-of-way incident to the interstate system and provisions which will insure that the users of the interstate system will receive the benefits of free competition in purchasing supplies and services at, or adjacent to, highways in such system;

CHECK BY CONGRESS

The bill provides that departments and agencies of any State and the executive branch of the Government shall furnish to the Committee on Public Works of the Senate or the House, or a subcommittee of each, such information as may be requested relating to the construction of the new interstate system.

TITLE II—REVENUE FEATURES

In corporates the recommendations of the House Ways and Means Committee as contained in H. R. 9075 by Congressman Boggs. This revenue section, which in all probability will come to the floor of the House under a closed rule, contains provision for a 1-cent gas tax increase; a 1-cent diesel and special fuels increase; a 3-cent increase on all rubber used by highway vehicles; 2-percent ad valorem tax increase on trucks, buses, and trailers—which makes a total of 10 percent as now being paid by automobiles.

The bill places a new tax of 3 cents a pound on camelback or retreading material and a new permit fee of $1.50 per thousand pounds on vehicles in excess of 26,000 pounds.

The total yield anticipated from the revenue measure over a 15 year period is approximately $38 billion. It is to be noted that nonhighway users on all of the above taxes are exempt.

This revenue section recognizes the withdrawal from general revenues after July 1, 1957, of one-half of the total yield of the 10 percent ad valorem tax on trucks, buses, and trailers and the total yield of the rubber tax on tires and the assignment of these revenues to the highway program. Prior to July 1, 1957, the revenue measure recognizes the dedication of only the 2 percent increase in ad valorem tax on trucks, buses, and trailers and the 3 percent increase in rubber taxes.

This means, in a general statement, that a large amount of money that is now going to the general revenue fund will be designated to the highway trust fund after 1957.

PAY AS YOU GO

After study and attempting to analyze whether or not the revenue raising feature will meet the authorization, it is the considered judgment that in the overall program we will be short about $3.5 billion. However, it is the belief that possibly this amount can be collected by increased sales and use of the highways so I think, in all fairness, it should be said that the revenue bill as submitted by the Ways and Means Committee and incorporated in title II of this bill will meet the authorization and expenditures as set forth in title I.

In summary, the proposed legislation has the merit of providing for review by the Congress and the correction of any inequities that may develop as the program progresses. The bill is not perfect, but I think the general public wants a highway bill and, in my opinion, the controversial features contained in this legislation are the results of various segments of our society compromising to obtain that which the people are asking, namely, better roads.

Wheat Farmers Want the Domestic Parity Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill that would incorporate in our farm program one of the desirable features of the conference report on H. R. 12 which, among others, prompted me to vote for that measure. In so doing, I am joining with our distinguished colleague, the Honorable CLIFFORD HOPE, of Kansas, who was chairman of the House Agriculture Committee in the 83d Congress. This bill has the support of the National Grange, and the National Wheat Growers' Association. I am confident that it would meet with the approval of our administration.

Wheat is one of the basic crops grown in western Nebraska, and it is the only crop readily and profitably adaptable to the soil and climate of large areas of my State. If other crops could be grown economically, I can assure you they would be grown because the farmers in my district would like nothing better than to rid themselves of Government controls.

Existing wheat programs are unrealistic and unacceptable to the farmers in western Nebraska. Their land is highly susceptible to wind erosion, and moisture is scant. It is absolutely necessary to maintain a cover on the land to prevent blowing and to catch and hold every bit of snow and rainfall; as a result, nearly every farmer follows summer-fallowing practices whereby one-half of his land must lie idle each year. The prudent farmer is severely penalized by the present wheat program because his acreage allotment has been established on the basis of the number of acres he plants, and the 2 or 3 acreage cuts decreed in past years have reduced his wheat base to such an extent that he is able to use scarcely more than 30 percent of his farmland. In the case of the small farmer this has been disastrous. This is his dilemma: If he stays in the program, his wheat base is too small to permit him to operate profitably; if he chooses to overplant, he cannot afford to pay the penalty imposed.

The domestic parity bill I have today introduced is a desirable improvement.

First, it will eventually remove the hand of the Federal Government from control of the wheat farm. The farmer would not be penalized if he plants more than the Government permits, because the Government will not be able to tell him how much he can plant.

Second, since the support program applies only to the wheat used for domestic food purposes and marketing quotas are based on annual consumption of wheat as food, the multifarious problems and the $350 million annual expense connected with storage will be sharply reduced and eventually wiped out.

Third, the supported wheat will be produced primarily for the domestic market, and not for sale to the Government. The Government will be eliminated in due time as the world's largest wheat warehousing and marketing establishment.

Fourth, the cost of operating this program will be considerably lower than the present catchall operation.

The mechanics of the domestic parity program are quite simple. On the basis of the information available to him, the Secretary of Agriculture determines the number of bushels of wheat that will be consumed in the domestic food markets in this country during the coming year. Using this figure as the base, he then establishes bushel quotas for each of the wheat-producing States in terms of their history in the preceding 10 years. County and farm unit quotas are than established by appropriate State and local organizations, using as criteria the past wheat acreages, the normal yield, crop-rotation practices, type of soil, and topography. The wheat farmer subsequently receives a marketing certificate which will assure him 100 percent of parity for this bushel quota. If he chooses to produce more wheat, it is his privilege to do so but the wheat must be sold at the market price, consumed, or fed on the farm, or stored back against future crops.

The cost of this program to the consumer of wheat products would be negligible. Prices now paid for good milling wheat traditionally exceed parity, and the wheat content of many of our staple foods contributes little to its retail cost. For example, the cost of the wheat in a loaf of bread is about 10 percent of the total. Wheat produced for sale in excess of the domestic quotas would receive no support and would have to seek their own level on the market.

This plan for wheat would dovetail nicely with the administration's soil bank; it would work exceedingly well with the bill I have introduced emphasizing the industrial use of agricultural commodities. It would serve the best interests of the wheat farmer and the general public. Surplus crops can be converted into alcohol, rubber, and other industrial items. This legislation should be adopted this year.

Three-Star Extra Specialist Reports on Political Situation in Midwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point a three-star extra report by Mr. Fred Morrison, outstanding news analyst and commentator on Wisconsin, Iowa, and Minnesota. The conclusions and observations made by Mr. Morrison are strictly his own. His forthright reporting, however, might serve as a tonic to those Republicans in the Midwest who are complacent:

FRED MORRISON, FROM MADISON, WIS., APRIL 9, 1956

The Republican political organization, here in the State of Wisconsin, is moving into this year's election campaign with two strikes already counted against it.

In the first place, when the campaign gets rolling, it will be facing the most powerful Democratic combine this State has seen in a long time. The Democratic Party, allied with the CIO, the Farmers Union, and various cooperative groups, already is plastering the State with an anti-Republican barrage.

Wisconsin farmers wake up in the morning to a CIO radio program which is carried on a State network of stations. The program hammers on the theme that the farmer is being victimized by the Republican farm policies. The Farmers Union has a companion broadcast which is carried on a different network of radio stations, and which hammers on the same theme. In addition to that, they blanket the State with various publications, all supporting the Democrats and opposing the policies of the Eisenhower administration.

To try to counter this Democratic combine, the Republicans will put into the field here an organization which is tottering from low morale, split by factions, and short of money.

Republican leaders here, who are willing to speak frankly, say the blame for their present difficult plight must fall on the White House in Washington. They don't blame President Eisenhower directly, but they say he must take part of the blame because he has permitted the situation to develop.

Their chief complaint is against those around the President who consider politics something which must not be talked about. Those advisers, these Republican leaders say, have screened away from the President all of the political workers who need his support.

Their recommendations for job appointments have been ignored, and in many cases the appointments have gone to persons who never had any connection with the Republican party. They have received almost no support from Washington in their efforts to counteract the farmer dissatisfaction over the farm program. They are left almost completely on their own without recognition from the administration they helped elect.

The result is that the morale of the party workers is shot. Their prestige has been damaged, and they now are having difficulty collecting the money they need for their local operations.

That's the situation inside the Republican party here in Wisconsin as the new campaign begins. They don't doubt that President Eisenhower will be able to carry the State this fall. But they very much doubt they can recover any of their badly needed seats in Congress.

This is Fred Morrison in Madison, Wis.

FRED MORRISON, FROM DES MOINES, APRIL 10, 1956

The Republican Party has muffed the ball on the biggest, if not the only, election campaign issue here in the Middle West. That is the opinion of many Republican workers and leaders I have talked with both in Wisconsin and here in Iowa—workers and leaders, incidentally, who will be called upon to deliver the farm vote for the Republicans this fall.

They say the Republican organization has stood by and permitted the Democratic Party and its allied groups, such as the CIO and the Farmers Union, to create a political furor over the farm situation. They say that not only is the furor not justified by the facts, but that it could have been stopped had the Republican organization and the administration in Washington taken any effective, organized steps to stop it.

These party leaders do not minimize the present difficulties of the farmers. They say there is no question many of them are caught in a serious price squeeze. But they take the position the farmer is a reasonable fellow who understands the problems and will listen to a logical explanation.

They say that if the administration and the national Republican organization had made a determined effort to show the farmers that their program is the only sound program, the political effects of the farm problem would not be what they are today.

Instead of doing that, however, they complain that the Republican Party split on the issue, with some Republicans joining the opposition and criticizing their own administration's policy. The result has been to add fuel to the opposition's drive to build the farm situation into a big campaign issue. These local Republican leaders are far from happy with some of Secretary Benson's public statements, but they say there is no serious opposition to his program.

What the farmers want, they say, is to be assured that their interests are being protected to the best of the Government's ability. But when they see the Republican Party split on its own policies, they begin to have their doubts.

Most of the persons I have talked with contend that the farm problem has been greatly exaggerated. The price squeeze is on, of course, but the farmers are far from being in a disastrous state. I am told that the big majority of them are in a position to wait the situation out if they are convinced the problem is being solved.

To check that, I went over to the local offices of the United States Treasury here in Des Moines to see how Government bond sales are going in this area. Iowa has been described as one of the States hardest hit by the drop in farm prices. I found that in spite of that, Iowa farmers are investing in Government bonds at a record rate. They bought more bonds in 1955 than in any other peacetime year and sales for the first 2 months of this year are at about the same level.

Iowa, with its 2¼ million people, is seventh among the States in bond sales. It is topped only by such popular States as New York, Illinois, Pennsylvania, and California. The farmers of Iowa, with all their problems, buy more bonds than the entire State of Texas. That may indicate that they are not facing bankruptcy and are in a position to wait for a solution of their problems if they can be convinced that a solution is on its way.

This is Fred Morrison in Des Moines.

FRED MORRISON, FROM MINNEAPOLIS, APRIL 11, 1956

A battle royal is shaping up inside the Republican Party, here in Minnesota, on the issue of the administration farm program. It will be a test of strength between the local party leaders and the veteran Republican Members of Congress from this State, who have refused to go along with the farm policies of Secretary Benson.

The local Republican leaders here are irate over the position taken by all their Republican Congressmen, with the exception of Representative WALTER JUDD. All of them, including Senator THYE, have consistently opposed the Benson farm program, and have joined the Democrats in voting and speaking against it.

The Republican leaders here take the position that the Benson program is a good program, and that it would have the support of Minnesota farmers if there were any candidates willing to support it and explain it to them. They are now making the issue very clear—that either the present Republican Members of Congress change their position and support the administration or they will be opposed by their own organization leaders in the September primaries.

These leaders say that is the only position they can take if they hope to win the election in Minnesota this fall and win back some of the congressional seats they have lost to Democrats in past elections. They say that, under present conditions, every time one of their own Members of Congress makes a speech in this State it is a speech against the administration, and a speech for the policies advocated by the Democrats. They say it is very clear that the Democrats here, under the leadership of Senator HUMPHREY and Governor Freeman, are trying to destroy the administration program, and, as the situation now stands, the Republican Congressmen are helping them do it.

These local Minnesota leaders are very unhappy with Washington's leadership of the party. They say that no effective steps have been taken by the White House, the leaders in Congress, or the national leaders of the party, to make the Republicans in Congress work as a team, and what they are trying to do now is to force some teamwork, at least in their own State.

Both State and county leaders with whom I have talked feel that Secretary Benson could win the confidence of the farmers if he were given a chance. But, they say, he has been fighting a lone battle. He is being smeared by the Democrats, the CIO, and the Farmers Union in this State, and even the Republicans refuse to support him. In spite of that, they say, every time he has come into the State in recent months, he has greatly impressed the farmers who heard him.

Minnesota's Republican Congressmen have one last chance this week to avoid the continued wrath of their own State leaders. But, if they fail to support Benson in the final congressional action on the farm bill, they will be marked men.

This is Fred Morrison in Minneapolis.

FRED MORRISON, FROM MINNEAPOLIS, APRIL 12, 1956

The great farm depression which is being built up as the overriding election-year issue, here in the Middle West, comes dangerously close to being an outright political hoax.

It is a hoax to the extent that it is being magnified far out of proportion to its true seriousness. Farm income is down. There is no question about that. Some farmers are in financial trouble, and all of them are having to watch their expenditures more closely.

But nowhere can you find support for the disaster statements made by the political critics of the administration in this area.

Minnesota's Democratic Governor Freeman said recently that the Eisenhower farm program has resulted in "misery and terror among the farmers of the Middle West." The left-wing Farmers Union, which blankets this area with its propaganda, has been telling the farmers that they are facing disaster and that the administration's farm program is the reason.

Actually the farm cash income in the Minnesota-Dakota-Montana area was down only 2 percent in 1955. And that covers all farmers, whether their operation is efficient or not.

On the whole, the well established, efficiently run farms are in pretty good shape. It is the smaller, marginal farms, and the farmers who have gone into the business recently and have heavy debt burdens, that are in trouble.

One farmer gave me his version of the situation. He said that during the past 15 years, all farmers made money. He said a lot of inefficient ones got into the business during that time, and were able to make a go of it because of good conditions. Now with the squeeze on, he said, they are in trouble.

All of these facts are used by the Farmers Union and the politicians to support their charges that the Benson farm program is ruining the area.

One farmer told me that he, personally, was getting along all right. But he said that when you are told day after day that you are being victimized and that everybody has prosperity but you, you might begin to believe it after a while.

The Farmers Union's answer to the farm problem—and they hammer away at it day after day—is a return to rigid price supports. They blanket Minnesota with propaganda of that kind. Yet more than 70 percent of Minnesota's farm income is from livestock products, which have no Government supports. The Minnesota farmer gets only 2 percent of his income from wheat and only 10 percent from corn, both of which are supported by the Government.

There is a farm problem in the Middle West. The farmers do need something to boost their income. But the situation is nowhere near as bad as it is pictured by the politicians * * * and with many of the Republican Congressmen in the area joining the Democrats in their barrage against Secretary Benson, there are very few on hand to give the other side of the picture.

This is Fred Morrison in Minneapolis.

FRED MORRISON, FROM MINNEAPOLIS, APRIL 13, 1956

Most of the steam behind the opposition, here in the Middle West, to the farm program of President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson is generated by the Farmers Union.

This leftwing farm organization sprawls across Montana, the Dakotas, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. Its political line on farm legislation is the same as that followed by the Democrats in this area. It is against the administration farm program, and it's bitterly anti-Benson.

The Farmers Union membership in this area is comparatively small—not more than 125,000. But its power is tremendous, due to a huge business combine which operates within it.

The largest of these business organizations are the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association and the Farmers Union Central Exchange. They do millions upon millions of dollars worth of business with the farmers annually. They buy and sell grain, livestock, feed, fertilizer, tractors, and almost all other farm supplies. They even are in the oil business with their own refineries.

A very considerable part of their operation is what they call advertising and education. But much of it takes the form of outright political campaigning. They operate their own radio network and publish newspapers and magazines. They hold meetings all over the area. They are for high price supports and they minimize the importance of the huge farm surpluses which Mr. Benson contends are caused by the high supports.

All of those operations are carried on as a part of their business expense. In addition, the two big organizations give out to the State organizations of the Farmers Union 5 percent of their total earnings of $10 million a year. This money is used by the State groups to carry on the same campaign in the same way.

Some Republicans here charge that the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association has a special interest in farm surpluses—that they are in the grain storage business and collect huge storage fees from the Government.

I asked the officials of the Grain Terminal Association about that charge. They said they are for high price supports because they are best for the farmer. Their own figures show, however, that they do carry on a large Government storage business and they collect fees for storing crop surpluses of about $2 million a year.

This is Fred Morrison in Minneapolis.

Israel's Eighth Anniversary

SPEECH
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to extend my most heartfelt and sincere felicitations to the gallant people of Israel on this the occasion of the eighth anniversary of the State of Israel as a free and independent nation.

The tremendous social, political and cultural accomplishments that have transpired in Israel since its independence was declared in 1948 are an inspiration to every democratic form of government in the world as an example of what free men can do under the flag of democracy.

Today the State of Israel stands as the bulwark of democracy in the Middle East.

Yet, in the face of all these accomplishments, this tiny democracy is confronted with an alarming situation which affects not only the peace and tranquility of the Middle East, but the peace and tranquility of the entire free world. This crisis in the Middle East has been brought about by the steadfast refusal of the Arab states to recognize Israel as a democracy, recently aided and abetted by the creeping shadow of international communism.

We cannot permit this nation to fail at the hands of the Communist conspirators. We in the West are faced with the necessity of taking decisive steps to prevent an all-out war in this area. This can be done quickly and effectively if the Arab countries can only be made to realize that Israel herself is interested only in peace. If the Arab leaders can be convinced of this, and be persuaded to make peace with Israel, the economic, spiritual and social benefits reaped by all the countries in the areas will be overwhelming.

Statement of George J. Burger, Vice President, National Federation of Independent Business, Washington, D. C., Before Subcommittee No. 5, House Judiciary Committee, April 18, 1956, Subject: H. R. 11

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, may I have the privilege of inserting in the RECORD the remarks made by Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, before the House Judiciary on April 18 on the subject of H. R. 11. Mr. Burger is the recognized spokesman for small businessmen in the Nation's Capital, and joins wholeheartedly in every effort to get this bill passed.

The statement is as follows:

I am George J. Burger, vice president and Washington representative of the National Federation of Independent Business. I am appearing here solely for the membership of the federation.

We represent independent business and professional people in all vocations from all parts of the country. We have the largest directly supporting membership of any business organization in the country.

Our position on legislation is dictated directly by our membership. We poll our members on all important issues, and are committed by their majority vote.

Our members desire enactment of H. R. 11. We take this position because of their vote, in mandate No. 193, on S. 1357, 82d Congress. Eighty-two percent of our members who voted on that issue favored it. The bill is substantially the same as H. R. 11 which you are now considering.

As you know, H. R. 11 is intended to reverse the 1950 decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Indiana Standard case. There, the Court ruled that a supplier may defend himself completely and finally against charges of unfair price discrimination, springing from the grant of special low prices to one but not all his customers, if he can show that he offered the special low price in good faith to meet an equally low offer by a competitor. This defense would hold regardless of injury created among his customers denied the special low prices.

We do believe there is need for this bill to become law. Here's why:

For instance, let's consider the following situation which could easily arise: a large supplier is selling through both a giant, mass-merchandiser and a large number of smaller, independent retailers competing with the mass-merchandiser. Due to certain economies, the supplier is extending a lower price to the mass-merchandiser than to his independent outlets. But the differential does not give the mass-merchandiser unfair advantage over his independent business competitors, and is defensible under the antitrust laws.

Fine and good.

Then a second large supplier decides to cut in on this mass-merchandiser and offers a much lower price than the merchandiser is receiving. The first supplier has the choice of either holding his price and losing the account, or of cutting the price to meet competition. Quite humanly, he decides to do the latter.

But for one reason or another he decides against cutting prices proportionateley to his other outlets, the independents who are competing with the mass merchandiser. The differential between them and the mass merchandiser has become so big they can't cope with it, and are squeezed profitwise and forced out.

This would be the situation: A large supplier cutting his prices in good faith to meet the competition of another supplier, a giant mass merchandiser customer receiving the benefits of the price cut and reflecting them in its selling, many smaller, independent business competitors not receiving any reductions are being pinned to the wall.

Under the law as it now stands, these independents would have no recourse, no protection at all—theirs would be put to stand and die. And after they had died, perhaps, the law could be used to break up a full-blown monopoly.

H. R. 11 would change this situation, would give such independent businessmen the protection they need. As we see it, the bill offers no doctrinnaire approach to or solution of the problem. It recognizes that there are real and honest needs for meeting competition. To this end, it allows the "good faith" meeting of competition to remain a full and complete defense to unfair pricing charges were one, or a few unfavored firms are injured. It attempts only to cope with widespread injury such as is described above.

And make no mistake, gentlemen, such monopoly damage has occurred due to unfair pricing. With my own eyes I have seen it in the tire industry. Others have seen it in the grocery and yet other fields. What has happened before can happen again.

That is basically why our members favor this bill and urge it be enacted into law.

Now we realize it may be argued that by preventing such meeting of competition in good faith the interests of the firm involved may be injured. We are not happy about this, for we wish no one damaged. But we think that such firm has an obligation to maintain such efficiency that it can meet competition, and when lowering prices to one customer lower them to all. Within the past year one large firm testified before Congress that, as a matter of policy, when it cuts prices for one customer it cuts them for all. What it can do others should be able equally to do.

It may be argued, too, that perhaps the firm trying to take this business away may itself be discriminating among its customers in offering the lower prices and confronting the first firm with an unfair situation. Our only observation here is that to guard against such contingency Congress should equip the antitrust agencies with ability to meet and curb such an occurrence.

But even if this is not done, if it is not practical, then we think basically what you gentlemen of this committee are confronted with is a problem involving the weighing of damage to one against damage to the other, of benefits and protections to one against benefits and protections to the other.

Frankly our members believe that our small, independent business structure is the real backbone of our country, and moreover, is one of the main economic underpinnings of our very liberties.

For this reason we believe that when any balancing is done, if this is considered necessary, the scales should definitely tip in the direction of independent, smaller businessmen.

I have watched patiently the operations of the Robinson-Patman Act these past 20 years. In the first instance, when it became a law I held to the premise the Magna Carta for small business had arrived for the first time in our Nation's economy. It is my belief that thousands upon thousands of small businesses held to the same view, and I must confess, after observing the scene for 20 years, that small business of this Nation has been disappointed in the resuluts obtained under the law as a result of (1) the many interpretations placed on the act by the courts and (2) what can be commonly called a 50–50 decision action in the Federal Trade Commission.

Big business interests have consistently fought against this law. It is self-evident from their action they realize that for the first time efficient small business would be placed on parity with others so they could fairly compete.

So it behooves members of your committee, if they are desirous of maintaining the free enterprise system and the millions of small businesses of all descriptions, to take every action to protect the overall good of the Robinson-Patman Act, and that no attempt, direct or indirect, be made to weaken or nullify this major law.

In view of this we urge your favorable action on H. R. 11.

Who's Out of Step?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of April 23, 1956:

WHO'S OUT OF STEP?

President Eisenhower talks about cold war victories. He insists the new Soviet economic and political challenge in the Middle East, Africa, and Asia is a Kremlin confession of failure of old policies.

But Adlai Stevenson says we are losing the cold war. He insists the administration is bankrupt of ideas in foreign policy and is misleading the public with claims that everything is dandy.

If such a black-and-white difference were widespread, the remarks of these two candidates for the Presidency could be dismissed as campaign oratory. But it is not. Most expressions of informed opinion, unhappily, more nearly agree with the grimmer appraisal of Mr. Stevenson.

Our allies, our own ambassadors abroad, American correspondents in foreign countries, returning businessmen—these and many others irrespective of political labels warn daily that the United States has lost the initiative to the Kremlin's traveling clowns. The members of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, before whom the President and Mr. Stevenson spoke, thought, by a 2-to-1 vote, that the United States was losing the cold war.

The contrast between the Eisenhower and the Stevenson speeches makes it appropriate to examine the broad picture of foreign policy.

Without agreeing with all the proposals Mr. Stevenson made, we do not hesitate to say—as we have been saying in effect for a long time—that Mr. Stevenson's appraisal of the state of the world makes a lot more sense than President Eisenhower's.

Any cursory study of foreign affairs shows that the Soviet Union has made vast gains in the last year or so.

The Soviets have leapfrogged into the Middle East—fulfilling a 350-year-old czarist-Communist dream. Is that a victory for us?

The Soviets are successfully stirring up trouble all the way from Morocco to Indonesia, embarrassing us with the challenge to our colonial allies. Is that a victory for us?

The Soviet New Look is more and more appealing to neutralists and uncommitted countries. Ceylon and Cambodia have jumped in that direction. Is that a victory for us?

All the time the Soviet dictatorship—collective but still dictating—maintains an economy geared to war production * * * increases its armaments * * * woos friends by buying their surpluses and promising aid * * * prods and subverts * * * challenges even the United States in the scientific, technological, and industrial fields. Are those our victories?

The exact score in the cold war may be debatable—and not necessarily important in itself. What is important, however, is the basis of our foreign policy.

If American foreign policy is being conducted upon the belief—as the President says—that the recent successful Soviet actions are the result of past Soviet policies failing, a rude awakening is due.

The time has come for the Eisenhower administration to get out of its complacent mood, to throw away its rose-tinted glasses, to tell the American people the real facts, however unpleasant, to warm the world that the new men and the new policies of the Kremlin are far more subtle and dangerous than the bluster of Uncle Joe.

Stop all this nonsense about the Soviets failing. We are failing.

Enough of patching up old programs and rejuggling old, obsolete policies.

The United States needs new policies to fit the new facts.

President Eisenhower and his Secretary of State need to get in step with these facts.

Transportation of Alcoholic Beverage Advertising in Interstate Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I have received the following letter on behalf of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air:

HELENA, MONT., *April 11, 1956.*
The Honorable LEE METCALF,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Re Alcoholic beverage advertising

DEAR SIR: You are respectfully requested to consider the attached petition, and then kindly insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Yours very truly,
DOROTHY J. KINDRICK.

Enclosed with this letter was the following petition, signed by 15 residents of Helena:

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition you to exercise the proper discretion vested in you by passing legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air, a practice which nullifies the rights of the State under the 21st amendment to control the sale of such beverages.

At a time when 1 out of 10 drinkers is becoming an alcoholic there should be no en-

couragement to increasing the use of such beverages. Children and youth are being misled to consider them harmless, especially by the audio and visual suggestion of radio and television.

What I Owe My Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following essay by Judy Weber, Gorham-Fayette School, Fayette, Ohio:

WHAT I OWE MY COUNTRY
(By Judy Weber)

"Thank God I—I also am an American," the words of Daniel Webster, should ring from the heart of every youth in our country. Because I am an American, it is my duty to my country to love it, to support the Constitution, to obey its laws, to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies.

I must love my country. This is America where I can play, where I need not fear, where I can find both self-respect and peace of mind, where I know no hate, where at its worst America is far better than any other nation on earth. For these I give my undying devotion.

I must support the Constitution. By it, many rights and privileges are mine: I may think as I please; I may speak or write as I please; by my right to vote, I may choose public servants; I have the right to a prompt trial by jury; I may attend a free public school; I may worship in whatever church I choose. As an American, I have the right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." For these I thank God who guided the authors of this great document; for these I shall do my utmost to support and uphold the Constitution of the United States of America.

It is my duty to obey my country's laws. To accomplish this I must fully understand how our Government operates and what its laws mean. I must exercise my right to vote, for it enables me to help elect capable men to formulate these laws. In obeying these laws, I protect myself and fellow citizens, I help insure peace, I strengthen the power of our democracy. Therefore, for my own good and that of my country I abide by its laws.

It is my duty to respect the flag. It is said that red stands for valor, white for purity, and blue for justice. These represent the characteristics of our Nation's birth and life. By the valor of our ancestors, the purity of our democracy, and the justice of our laws, America answers the cry of every human being for freedom. The red, the white, the blue wave o'er us as a symbol of the freedom and opportunity no other land has ever known. With pride I salute the Stars and Stripes, with sincerity I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America.

If need should arise, it is not only my duty but my privilege to defend America. A million or more of my countrymen have died for freedom, have died that "government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth," have died that I might enjoy the peace and liberty of the greatest Nation on earth. The youth of America are the torchbearers of liberty, so I am proud that, in peace or war, I can take my place in the defense of my country.

America has given me a heritage that I must carry on. It is for the future generations that I must love my country, uphold the Constitution, obey my country's laws, respect the flag, defend America. In doing these things I know I can become the best possible citizen. I am glad to be free to work and play and love and pray as I believe. I thank God I can say as Daniel Webster did, "I shall know but one country—I was born an American; I live an American; I shall die an American."

Outline of Thoughts on the 165th Anniversary of Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, freemen everywhere will salute the Polish people on the 165th anniversary of their constitution day. They do so in honor of Poland's early recognition and adherence to the principle of the equality of man.

Since that day in 1791, constitution day has been commemorated by the Polish people. It has unified the people into a nation dedicated to freedom and democracy.

It is no surprise therefore, that when the Kremlin's puppets came to power in Poland, they abolished constitution day. Moscow's puppets felt they had to destroy this proud memory so that they could trample underfoot everything it stood for.

Today, there are no constitution day celebrations in captive Poland. The equality proclaimed by the constitution in 1791, has been replaced by a police state, where Communist terror divides the people into the rulers and the ruled.

Fat Communist functionaries live in luxury, while the oppressed population lives in squalor.

The dictatorship of the proletariat, supported by slave labor camps run by the Bespitzka, knows only blind obedience to the party and its functionaries.

Nowhere in the world is there less equality, greater class distinction, than in the Communist-controlled countries.

Maybe the Communist have a point when they call for a relentless class struggle. People everywhere sooner or later will join in the struggle against the most oppressive class in the world, the Communist bosses, who represent the climax of reaction.

One hundred and sixty-five years ago, the Polish constitution called for the transformation of tenant farmers into peasants owning their own land. Today, Communist reactionaries disposses the peasants by forcing them into collective farms.

The 1791 constitution abolished the peasant's obligation to work for his landlord. Today, the Communist state is a worse landlord, imposing compulsory delivery quotas.

This is what the Communist call progress, when they deny the people the very freedom, those rights, which they won over a century ago.

Although the Communists suppressed thet celebration of constitution day, they can never suppress its spirit which lives on in the hearts and minds of the people.

Poles never bowed to foreign rule or oppression. They always stood in the front ranks of those who fight for freedom and the right of man. They fought Hitler hordes, while the Communist Red Army twice stabbed them in the back; first by invading their country, and later during the Warsaw uprising. Today, they are engaged in an equally uncompromising struggle against communism. Their resistance to the regime takes many forms and is adjusted to the ability of the individual to do his best under most difficult circumstances.

This resistance is manifest in a few overcrowded churches; in those brave escapees who cross the minefield and barbed-wire fences to reach freedom; in the parents who will not let their children forget the proud history of their country; in the millions who withstand Communist pressure and coercion in their daily life.

To all of them we here pledge that we shall support them to the best of our ability in their unceasing struggle to retain that freedom, that equality, which their own constitution proclaimed so long ago.

Plans Completed for 1956 Congressional Tour of New York City and West Point, May 11, 12, and 13

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, plans have been completed for the annual congressional tour of New York City and West Point for May 11, 12, and 13 for Members of both branches of Congress and their families. The annual tour provides for 3 glorious days in New York at a cost of $37.50 for adults and $32.50 each for children between the ages of 5 and 12 years.

So that the membership may have some idea of the schedule of events for the tour, the following itinerary will be of interest:

SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

Friday, May 11: 9:45 a. m. daylight time we leave Washington via Pennsylvania Railroad (please note change in leaving time). Luncheon will be served in dining car. We arrive New York Penn Station at 1:45 p. m. daylight time and immediately board motor coach for tour of lower New York, including a stop at city hall for reception by the mayor, Hon. Robert F. Wagner. We also stop at the United Nations for a 1-hour tour. We arrive at the Paramount Hotel at about 5:30 p. m. daylight time. At 6 p. m., cocktails and buffet dinner will be served in the Oceanic Room off the lobby to the left of the

elevator. The evening will be open for Members to attend the theater or enjoy the bright lights of Broadway.

Saturday, May 12: 8 a. m., motor coaches will leave for La Guardia Airport where the American Airlines will serve us breakfast in the air—plus an enjoyable air trip over the city of New York, the Hudson River Valley, the State of Connecticut, Long Island Sound, and other points of interest. Eleven a. m., motor coach will take us to the Brooklyn Navy Yard where we will see the largest aircraft crrier in the world—U. S. S. *Saratoga*. Then we step aboard the New York Port Authority steamer for trip around Manhattan with a descriptive tour of New York Harbor docks and facilities. Luncheon and refreshments will be served aboard ship. Four p. m., motor coaches will transfer our party from dock to the Paramount Hotel. At 6 p. m. cocktails and buffet dinner will be served at Hotel Pierre, overlooking Central Park. Motor coaches will transfer our party from the Paramount to the Hotel Pierre. The evening will be open for members of our party to attend the theater and other places of amusement.

Sunday, May 13: Don't forget it's Mother's Day. Nine a. m., motor coaches will take us for our visit to United States Military Academy, West Point on the Hudson. We visit the information center, the museum, Washington Hall, tour kitchens, meet cadet escorts, luncheon, USMA Library, dress parade on the Plain (weather permitting), tour of post, Trophy Point, Cullum Hall, and cadet chapel, including brief organ recital. Motor coaches to Penn Station where we meet at east gate No. 13 to await train departure at 5:30 p. m. daylight time.

I should like to emphasize that this tour is for Members of the Senate and House and their families, and reservations should be made immediately by calling Miss Patricia Bryan, extension 366 or 1830.

Secretary Folsom Gets Blame for Eisenhower Opposition to Social Security Improvements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Capital Times of Madison, Wis., explains very well on one matter how President Eisenhower escapes responsibility of the administration's actions.

The full text of the editorial follows:

One of the mysteries of modern politics is immunity President Eisenhower has from criticism for the mistakes of his administration. It has been most noticeable where the farm problem is concerned.

It was the President who promised the farmers of this country 90 percent of parity in his campaign speeches in Kasson, Minn., and Brookings, S. Dak., in 1952. But when the 90 percent support program was junked, it was Secretary of Agriculture Benson who got the blame from the farmers, although Benson could not possibly have made the decision without Eisenhower's approval.

Another example of this occurred recently when Secretary of Welfare Marion Folsom appeared before a congressional committee to testify against a program to change the Social Security Act to allow women to retire and receive benefits at the age of 62 rather than 65 and allow totally and permanently disabled people to collect social security at the age of 50.

Obviously, Folsom was speaking for the President, who keeps urging liberalization of the social-security laws but who never seems to get around to doing anything about it. Folsom couldn't have been speaking for himself. In the past he has taken a very strong position in favor of these improvements to the act.

As a matter of fact, Folsom, as a member of the social-security advisory board, has pushed for a program that would allow working women to retire and receive benefits at the age of 60, 2 years lower than the present bill provides.

As chairman of the social security committee of the United States Chamber of Commerce, Folsom supported a move to pay benefits to all totally disabled persons.

But now he is Eisenhower's Secretary of Welfare and must represent the President's views. It has, therefore, been necessary for him to reverse his own position on social-security improvements and to speak for the Eisenhower administration against them.

What is remarkable about this situation is that Folsom, in private life, is an executive in one of the biggest banking institutions in the country, National City Bank of New York. It appears that this banker has to tone down his liberal views when he takes a spot in the Eisenhower administration.

The baffling part of it all is that Folsom, like Benson, is getting the blame, while the President seems to be beyond the responsibilities of his office.

Russian Communism Versus Human Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD an address I delivered in Cleveland, Saturday evening, April 21, at the State of Ohio Catholic War Veterans' 11th Annual Convention, held at the Hotel Carter, on "Russian Communism Versus Human Freedom":

It is a great pleasure for me to be with you this evening. I know how each one of you is guided by an unswerving love of God and country. By the very nature of your organization, it is immediately apparent that you are concerned with the preservation of Christian civilization and the American way of life.

I know too that the hardships of life which so many of you have endured in support of those noble ends have taught you the necessity of understanding the forces of evil at work in the world and the folly of looking at the world arena through rose-colored glasses. All of this, of course, gives me assurance that you expect me to talk right from the shoulder and put before you the facts as I know them with respect to the status of Christian civilization and the American way of life, together with an estimate of the prospects for the future.

As a starting point, we might ask ourselves—what is the greatest, the fundamental issue facing all mankind today, and then we should ask ourselves—is this issue the greatest one which confronts all the American people? The need to maintain a healthy and prosperous agricultural economy is certainly an important issue. So also is it important to have an adequate housing and health program throughout the country. No one can deny that we must assure a strong and healthy climate for the growth of organized labor and the free-enterprise system. Most people recognize the need for us to forge ahead in the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy in order that our people may fully benefit from the great scientific advances and the bounties of nature of our generation. Important as each and every one of these issues are, I believe that none of them is the basic or fundamental issue facing our civilization. I believe that the gravest issue of our times is summed up in the case of Russian communism versus human freedom. This issue is all the more fundamental to the American people because the ominous threat of further Communist aggression has caused us to drain from our national resources each year, upwards of $40 billion to keep us in a state of preparedness and to provide our allies the wherewithall to defend themselves against the predatory Russians. If this issue could be resolved beyond any doubt and human freedom would emerge as the sturdy victor, much of these public funds which now go to national defense could be directed at the happy resolution of the other important issues which I have cited. Moreover, the taxpayer could be given a long overdue relief because it is a fact that over 60 percent of the tax dollar must now go for national defense.

I believe on the basis of this logic, that the central issue of our times is the case of Russian communism versus human freedom.

We Americans have been hoping and praying that communism with all its evils and threats to the peace could be banished from the face of the earth. Communism carries with it the seeds of its own destruction, but it appears that the small, tightly organized regime which controls the lives of the people who inhabit one-third of the earth's surface, is well cemented in the Kremlin. Moreover, that group of criminals is now embarking upon a new type of warfare against all civilization. I speak of the Communist claims to "peaceful coexistence" with free nations and people of the world.

On the one hand the Kremlin, through its vast network of propaganda organs, is seeking to convince people everywhere that it seeks peaceful coexistence as a means of relieving world tensions. The Russians hint that they believe in a policy of live and let live. The late Communist Dictator Stalin is now being defamed and undeified by the very men who, for several decades, were his eyes, ears, and willing accessories in carrying out a long list of crimes against humanity. It seems there is no extreme to which the present directorate of world communism will not go to gain acceptance of their proposal of peaceful coexistence.

There are people in our midst today who unfortunately are willing to accept the Communist overtures for peaceful coexistence. Such people attempt to deceive us into believing that the conspiracy of world communism has undergone fundamental changes since the death of Stain. They say that the day of the one-man dictator has ended and that a new day has dawned over the empire of communism in which collective rule will reduce the outrageous inhumanities of the past. These people hold the unfounded conviction that changes can be effected in the basic nature of communism by the process of evolution. Some are so imbued with this false notion that they predict that within 25 years communism and human freedom will fuse and then evolve into a utopia here on earth.

There are others who hold that so fundamental are the changes now taking place within the Russian Communist empire, as to give hope that the tyrannical rule of communism may be superseded by some new

type of government. This new type of government might be similar to the court of the czars, and the likelihood is presented that the so-called military career men will occupy the throne. It is in these circumstances that Marshal Zhukov is now being presented to the American people as the hope for the future, the key to peace, or the balance wheel against those elements in the Communist conspiracy which have been responsible for armed aggression and open war.

We must also recognize that the Russian leaders are quick to take advantage of any opening in the armor of the free world to advance their nefarious cause just as we must be willing to recognize that certain Western leaders have been made unwitting helpers in the present Kremlin offensive of peaceful coexistence.

You will recall the story that was prevalent immediately before the so-called Geneva Conference to the effect that Anthony Eden had to commit himself to such a meeting in order to assure victory at the polls in the British elections. As a result of that Geneva Conference the Russian leaders, Krushchev and Bulganin, are now in Great Britain where they are certain to do great harm to the free world alliances and to further delude the unsuspecting into believing that they are not the arch criminals who were in fact associated with Stalin in his reign of terror over the preceding 20-odd years. I cannot constrain myself from saying that there are some politicians and pseudo statesmen who consider no price too great to pay, either by them or by their native land, in order to win an election.

The evidence as to whether or not the Russian Communists have undergone any fundamental changes following the death of the Dictator Stalin is overwhelmingly conclusive that no change whatever has taken place as to policy or worldwide objectives. The goal to communize the world and to make abject Russian colonies out of every nation of the world remains unchanged.

The Communist determination to use any and all means to destroy civilization and to replace it with the rule of the jungle remains unchanged. There has been a slight shift in Communist tactics calling for louder talk about peace, disarmament, coexistence, and open competition with free governments. The noisy little Russians have proven themselves experts in this field.

The Communist doctrine of peaceful coexistence was originated by the first Communist dictator, Lenin. Twenty-five years ago the official line on peaceful coexistence was laid down by a disciple of Lenin, Dimetry A. Manuilsky. Here is what he said:

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard of concessions. The capitalistic countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fists."

That Communist doctrine has not been altered one iota since the day it was uttered. Communist Party boss, Khrushchev, in a speech before the so-called 20th Congress of the Communist Party during February of this year, restated and confirmed that basic doctrine when he called for a greatly stepped up propaganda, economic, political, and cultural offensive against the free world. He clearly stated that the usual methods of violence would be used only in those countries where the resistance to communism is strong and that the Communist take-over of the neutralist nations could be easily accomplished by what he described as "parliamentary methods" and the deception of the popular-front type of government. For countries well informed on the truth about communism, he ordered an increase in internal subversion through the Communist Party Cadres already organized for that purpose, in order to bring about conditions of extreme violence and lawlessness. It is apparent, therefore, that the United States is marked for violent treatment by the conspiracy of communism rather than the conciliatory and friendly approach the Kremlin leaders have been claiming so loudly of late. Khrushchev, speaking for world communism, removed any hopes there may have been for an end to the cold war and made it clear beyond any reasonable doubt that the Communists are convinced they are moving into an advanced stage of their blueprint for world conquest. To accomplish these objectives all Communist organizations, agents, and fronts have been ordered by Communist Party boss, Khrushchev, to "intensify our efforts in Communist education of the masses and in eliminating the survival of capitalism in the minds of men, make fuller and more active use, to this end, of all the ideological media—propaganda, agitation, the press, radio, cultural and educational organizations and institutions, science, literature, and art."

Amidst the high degree of organized confusion which has descended upon our Nation and other free nations as a result of the campaign for so-called peaceful coexistence being carried on by the noisy little Russians, and the subterranean efforts on the part of some American to secure peace at any price, the true nature and the hideous record of communism seems almost obliterated. The public mind is diverted from the cruel facts and directed toward an illusion of peace. The outstanding accomplishment of the Geneva Conference in my opinion was to humanize the evil little despots who reside in the Moscow Kremlin. Through the Geneva Conference the blood of millions of martyrs was wiped from the guilty hands of Khrushchev, Bulganin and company. The vast benefits which derived from the campaign of truth in which the United States engaged for so many years were brushed aside in one sweep of a hand, grasping a martini cocktail and raised up in a display of comradeship with communism. Bulganin has since reminded the world that the spirit of Geneva gave birth to the martini road—the road to a life worse than death.

I should like to make it clear that I believe President Eisenhower sought the opposite results in Geneva. I am reasonably certain he is as unhappy about the results of the so-called summit as you and I are. But the fact remains that the advisers around him, who should have known better than to lead him into an impossible situation with the Russians, cannot escape responsibility for the terrible setback to the free world and the cause of a just and lasting peace.

Despite the Russian camouflage and the barrage of words supporting the allusion of peace, the record of communism stands as an indelible mark on the conscience of all mankind. This record cannot be brushed aside by pleas for peaceful coexistence or by the clinking of martini glasses, even if those martini glasses are held by the chiefs of state of the western powers.

The evil record of communism must be righted else all mankind will pay a frightening price.

The ugly earmarks of communism are many, and the record of its inhumanities over these past 38 years, if put side by side, would overflow the largest archives in this country.

I believe it will be useful to discuss what I consider to be the outstanding characteristics of communism in practice.

The first is that communism, in order to survive, must destroy whatever civilization it occupies. Communism cannot afford honest and open competition of any type.

Communism still holds to the goal of a utopia on earth, and that utopia is the graveyard of nations. To the communists, all sense of nation and nationhood must disappear and be replaced with a faceless society in which the Russians will be the elite and all else will be hapless slaves.

Man is considered nothing more than an animal, to be used by the state as the state alone sees fit. To the Communist, man has neither dignity, destiny, nor a hereafter.

Man-made famines in which millions of people are caused to die are considered a necessary step toward communization of the world. This accounts for the man-made famine in the Ukraine in 1932–1933 and in Turkestan in 1934, which brought about the death of over 5 million human beings.

The crime of genocide was born and perfected under communism. This is the crime of liquidating an entire nation by the process of forced deportation and dissemination to the four winds. This accounts for the destruction of the Crimean Tatars, the Chechen-Inguish, and the Kalmuk nations, in the course of 24 hours by the cruel process of forced deportation of these people to the barren reaches of Russian Siberia.

Mass murder is a standard practice of communism. In cases where towns, villages, or large areas openly resist communism, mass murder generally follows. For example, the Vinnitzia massacre in Ukraine in which the leaders of a whole region were all executed and buried in mass graves.

The deportation and murder of leadership elements in the nations occupied by communism is standard practice. It is a known fact that whenever Russian communism occupies a country, the first step undertaken by the tyrants is to round up the leaders in all walks of life. These leaders are then deported to slave labor camps in Russia under circumstances in which husband is separated from wife, and children are separated from parents. Specific evidence to this point is provided in captured secret Russian MVD Order No. 001223, signed by General Serov, and carried out in 1941, which sets forth detailed instructions on who was to be rounded up in the Baltic States and how their cruel deportation was to be carried out in the darkness of the night. This is the same General Serov who only several weeks ago was sent by Khrushchev and Bulganin as their trusted friend, to make advance security arrangements for their visit to Great Britain. Another case in point is the infamous Katyn Forest massacre, in which over 10,000 Polish officers, the cream of Polish manhood, were murdered by the Russians and buried in mass graves. These are only two examples of Russian methods used to destroy leadership elements of the nations they occupy or intend to occupy. There are hundreds of others. As a member of a congressional investigating committee, I heard, here and abroad, sworn testimony by eyewitnesses to the inhumanities of communism.

Brainwashing is a new and evil science developed by the Russian Communists as a means of advancing their objective of world empire. This technique has been applied both to individuals and to entire nations. It is standard operating procedure with Communists everywhere. The Russians taught it to their stooges in China, who then applied it to American prisoners of war, missionaries, and other American civilians living in Red China. The Russians also taught this evil technique to their stooges in Hungary, and other captive nations as evidenced by the farcical trial of the beloved Hungarian patriot, Cardinal Mindzenty.

Still another example of brainwashing on a mass scale is evidenced by the techniques of the Russian Communists of calling for peace one day and engaging in threats of armed aggression the next day. By the constant pounding of the slogans of peace and war, peace and war, and peace and war, they hope to break down the resistance of the free people and utterly confuse the nations of the free world.

To me, the standard symbols of communism are, on the one hand, a murder victim with a bullet hole in the back of his head, hands tied by wire behind his back, dumped into a mass grave; and the other is the statue which stands in Moscow of a Russian teen-age boy, who was made a Soviet hero because he betrayed his father to the secret police for withholding grain from the farm collective and for attempting to interest his son in religion.

For the next several weeks our press will likely carry feature stories about the visit of Communist Party boss Khrushchev and "Charlie McCarthy" Bulganin in their tour of the British Isles. No doubt considerable space will be given to the statements made by both these jolly conspirators as they make pleas for a lessening of international tensions, the need for immediate disarmament, and devious pleas for peace—Russian style. We may be certain that the two Russian circus performers will get their deceptive message across to vast numbers of the people of Great Britain and other countries of the free world despite efforts of the British Government to prevent this tour from becoming an overt propaganda campaign.

That is the way the free press works and that is the calculated plan of the Kremlin leaders to use the free press to carry their false message to unsuspecting millions throughout the world.

The British once proudly claimed that the sun never sets on the British Empire. I believe it would be most appropriate at this time for the British to point out that the only real colonial empire left in the world is that of the Russian Communists and the sun never rises over any part of it.

An effort has been under way for some time here in the United States to smooth the way for a visit by Marshal Zhukov. The Red Army has been described as a new force emerging within the power struggle in Moscow. The false notion has been advanced that somehow the Red army is to be distinguished from the criminal conspirators in the Kremlin, and that the Red army leaders are free from the many sins of the elite class of communism. Zhukov himself has been built up in this country as the one likely to emerge as the strong man of the Soviet Union. By a strange process of reasoning, he has also been built up as a hoped for guardian of the peace. Neither one of these assumptions can be supported by facts. To begin with, the Red army and its commanders are as integral a part of the international Communist conspiracy as is the MVD, the MGB, the Russian diplomatic corps, and the Communist Party in the United States. All of them are dedicated to the singular goal of communizing the world. None of them have differences as to how this goal shall be accomplished. They all subscribe to the belief that any and all means must be used to attain the goal of world empire. Zhukov has no more freedom of individual action than Molotov, Molotov has no more freedom of action than Mikoyan, and so it is with any and all of the Communist oligarchy.

Yet, with all of this, there are disturbing signs that Zhukov may be invited to visit our beloved country sometime in the late summer or early fall to be given the welcome of a comrade in arms. His visit may even be scheduled as a personal one, and the fulfillment of a hope that he expressed in the flush days of victory shortly after the fall of Berlin. Whatever the reason or the climate engineered for this visit, in the background will be draped the illusion of peace.

I am sure the American people do not want peace at any price. I am certain that the building of false illusions of peace can lead us nowhere except to a cruel and devastating war. I remain convinced that we can only prevent war and find the way to just peace by adopting a course of action which excludes the use of rose-colored glasses in charting that course.

I believe that we must maintain a completely adequate and battle-ready national-defense force. That force must be buttressed by the maximum utilization of all the scientific advances which will give us assurance that we can quickly and completely defeat any enemy who attempts aggression or, indeed, the destruction of the United States. I believe that it is imperative that we stand by our proven allies, that we extend to them necessary military and economic assistance so that they will be strong allies when needed. I believe equally that we must not squander our great natural resources upon nations whose reliability is questionable and who have yet to prove their friendship for the United States springs from allegiance to those great moral and political truths which have inspired mankind down through the ages.. I believe it is flirting with disaster to engage in any trade whatever with the Russian Communist Empire, which, in my judgment, includes Communist occupied China. I also believe that the United States Government must undertake an all-out campaign to accomplish these two objectives on a worldwide basis—

1. To inform all the people of the world concerning United States hopes and aspirations for them and our desire to bring about a genuine world peace and to restore the family of nations into which every nation, large and small, has en equal sovereignty.

2. To reawaken the conscience of all civilization to the cruel record of inhumanities which stand as the earmarks of communism everywhere it has festered and taken root. It it our moral duty as good neighbors and brothers to other people of the world to alert them to the true facts of communism and what it does to all religions, all cultures, all languages, all traditions, and every nation.

It has long been my belief that we are losing the worldwide struggle for the minds of men. This has not been the fault of any administration or any individual. It has, in my judgment, resulted from the fact that we, as a Nation, have not yet come to realize the full power of ideals and ideas when they are applied to the many medias of mass communication. We should make an honest evaluation of what the Russian Communists have done in this regard. I believe it is fair to say, in the case of communism, that never have so many people been fooled and misled by an appeal which has so little to claim or hold adherents.

For these reasons I introduced in the last session of Congress a resolution calling for the establishment of a joint committee of Congress on United States international information programs. That resolution makes clear that the time has come for us to make maximum use of an international information program in the struggle for the minds of men. I believe that Congress, through such a joint committee, can make an ever increasing contribution in the direction of a just and lasting peace and the prevention of war. I am hopeful that Congress will establish such a joint committee and that we can go forward with a winning program against the latest Communist propaganda offensive which they are carrying out under the slogan of "Peaceful coexistence."

This is a cause in which we must not hesitate. The survival of Christian civilization and the American way of life hangs in the balance. The hour is already late. I am confident that despite the organized confusion which has descended upon us, we will soon awaken to the grave danger of the latest Russian propaganda offensive and go on to win victory in this worldwide struggle of ideals and ideas.

Selling America Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, my recent visit to the Soviet Union impressed upon me the need for supplying our representatives behind the Iron Curtain with the very latest in American automobiles and technical equipment in order to give an outward indication of our advanced standard of living in America.

The Communists have a modernistic society. They are impressed by the latest American technical equipment because it shows them what actually can be done under the capitalistic system which they have been taught to hate and ridicule. I was amazed during my visit to the Soviet Union and five satellite countries to find that our Foreign Service and personnel were driving antiquated automobiles while diplomats from other western countries had later and more efficient cars. A modern day automobile driving through the streets of Moscow can do much more than most westerners can imagine to make the Russian people realize that the standard of living under our capitalistic society is far better than the Russians have been taught.

Fortunately, action was taken recently to provide a better automobile for the American Ambassador in Moscow, and I hope that consideration will be given to further improvements in this field.

Mr. Wayne W. Parrish has written a thought-provoking article in the April 9 issue of American Aviation which discusses this situation.

The article follows:

PERSONAL VIEW

(By Wayne W. Parrish)

IT'S THE SEASON FOR GOING OFF ROCKERS

What in the world has happened to the perspective of newspaper reporters, columnists, and radio-TV commentators, to go so far off the beam in reporting the arrival in London of a Russian-modified jet bomber?

Give full credit to the Soviets for everything they've been trying to do in the air world, but the Tu-104 transport isn't quite the millennium which the British reporters hailed it to be.

For grown-up, supposedly experienced and alleged mature writers and commentators to go so extravagantly overboard as to say that the Russians have moved ahead of the aircraft builders of the West is the greatest sort of nonsense.

Have the British reporters forgotten completely the commendable advances made by their own country in jets? And have the

American commentators decided to overlook all of the enormous progress made in this country?

The hysteria and panic surrounding every Russian air advance in childish. It seems particularly so ever since we visited the Soviet Union a few months ago.

We remember vividly an incident in San Francisco a few years ago. A Norwegian airline friend who had visited Russia in 1946 was on the west coast and in a few hours we undertook to give him a quickie tour of one of the world's most spectacular cities. Naturally the tour led to the Top of the Mark, the cocktail lounge on top of the Mark Hopkins Hotel.

My Norwegian friend walked slowly around the four sides overlooking San Francisco Bay and the city. It was dusk and the lights were coming on everywhere. He didn't say a word until he had taken in the entire view. Then he stopped, thought a moment, and said: "And America is afraid of Russia."

There was a lot of impact in that one sentence. Europeans especially cannot understand why the great and powerful United States cringes every time the Soviets make some particular advancement, because the gap between the two economies is enormous. Certainly the Russians are trying hard; certainly they've made strides in nuclear and military aircraft fields. It would be strange if they didn't. But for British and American reporters—and such superficial commentators as TV's Dave Garroway—to imply and state that the Russians have forged ahead of the West is both juvenile and dangerous.

All of this points up the stupid approach this country has made in its relations with the world, especially toward Soviet Russia. It is now clear that the rivalry has moved over more to the economic and political realm rather than military. And how are we acting? As usual, behind the times.

Take a simple matter like automobiles. The United States is deservedly proud of its enormous automobile production and all of the glitter, appeal, and power of the new models. But what sort of automobiles do you think are operated by Americans in Moscow? Our American Ambassador has an old black Chrysler. Most of the other cars are old, dark Chevrolets. But even these old cars attract attention in a Russia which has lagged decades behind in automobile development.

Wouldn't you think that one of the most dramatic demonstrations of this country's economic power would be to place at the disposal of the American diplomatic force in Moscow one each of our latest models? They would be sensational. Crowds would surround each one of these cars wherever they stopped in the city. The only—repeat only—reasonably up-to-date American car in Moscow is a blue-gray Ford owned by a Canadian.

What a showcase we could have behind the Iron Curtain. But has any American automobile manufacturer stepped up to offer one each of his models as demonstrations of American free enterprise behind the Curtain? Has a single bird-brain of the State Department made a move to cut through redtape and get some modern cars where they can do some good? No indeed. It is very difficult to penetrate the Iron Curtain with any sort of information about America. Automobiles would be one of the most effective.

And here is another demonstration which would cause a terrific sensation behind the Iron Curtain. Fly those automobiles to Moscow in Globemasters. The Russians have never seen an airplane like the big Globemaster. Under diplomatic license, the Soviets could scarcely refuse a request by the United States to deliver supplies to its own people in Moscow. (Believe it or not, but C–47's now do the job.)

A Globemaster flying to Moscow airport with 2 or 3 cars plus other supplies, would be one of the most dramatic and effective bits of public relations propaganda this country could do. Word of such a feat—unheard of in Russian airpower—would be passed along all over the country. Why hasn't it been done?

And for a final point, on the basis of our own trip to Russia, we would recommend inviting Messrs. Bulganin and Khrushchev to visit the United States. We would like to have them see the tremendously great city of New York, then quickie visits to Washington (by air over the vast industrial complex en route), then over Pittsburgh to Cleveland and Detroit, then Chicago and hopping to Denver, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Dallas, and Fort Worth, then a drive 20 miles up Collins Avenue in Miami Beach in daytime and return at night.

Ignorance is one of the most dangerous things in this world. If the top Russian leaders ever got a good first-hand glimpse of this great country, a lot of nonsense would cease. Or at least they would know whereof they talked. Contrariwise, we recommend for every British and American writer and commentator who praised the Tu–104 into heavenly extravagance a 2-weeks trip to Russia. It's time a little sanity and reality came into the loose talk going on about the Soviets against the West. When Russia completes paving the only highway between its two biggest cities, then there will be ample time to start making a few comparisons.

Disposition of Land Utilization Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to present herewith a resolution unanimously adopted by the Claiborne Parish School Board at its meeting of April 2, 1956. I feel this resolution is important to my congressional district and I commend it to the attention of the Members of Congress:

The Claiborne Parish School Board met in regular session at its office in the town of Homer on the 2d day of April 1956, a quorum being present, and at which meeting the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"RESOLUTION

"Whereas it is reliably reported that the Interior Department of the United States Government has under consideration the release of the Cornie Lake project in the State of Louisiana, Parish of Claiborne, better known as LA–LU2, to either a private concern or a State body; and

"Whereas this property originally belonged to the citizenship of those communities therein involved; and

"Whereas the people sold this property to the Federal Government with the understanding that it would be developed for the betterment of the adjoining communities; and

"Whereas it is the understanding of the Claiborne Parish School Board that the Claiborne Parish police jury has applied to the Interior Department as a Claiborne Parish agency to obtain through gift or purchase the entire LA–LU2 project, better known locally as the Cornie Lake project; and

"Whereas it is the belief of the Claiborne Parish School Board that this land should be returned to a local government agency where it can receive more personal interest and better administration: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Claiborne Parish School Board pledges its support and efforts in close cooperation with the Claiborne Parish police jury and all other civic organizations in their efforts to obtain this project in the name of the Claiborne Parish police jury; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay, Congressman Overton Brooks, Senator Russell Long, Senator Allen J. Ellender, Representatives Hale Boggs, F. Edward Hébert, Edwin E. Willis, Otto E. Passman, James H. Morrison, T. A. Thompson, and George S. Long."

Motion for adoption of the foregoing resolution was made by E. I. Buckner, seconded by Otis Welch, and unanimously adopted on roll call.

I hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true, correct, and exact copy of a resolution adopted by the Claiborne Parish School Board, Claiborne Parish, La., on the 2d day of April 1956 at a regular meeting of that body.

This the 16th day of April 1956.

F. C. HALE,
Secretary, Claiborne Parish School Board.

Mom and Dad and the Tax Season

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago when Congress advanced to April 15 the deadline for filing income-tax returns, I think we may have overlooked one very unhappy result of this postponement. The following letter from a 14-year-old constituent of mine seems to me worthy of serious consideration:

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *April 16, 1956.*

DEAR MR. REUSS: Lately mom and I have been discussing my father and the Government. Mom has been confined to the house during the past few days and so was unable to work with dad down at the office. Dad is an accountant. Lately I have thought a lot about taxes. I suppose everybody comes in contact with them, whether it be through paying them or by jokes and cartoons about them. Then there are the kids of lawyers and accountants who know tax season as a time when dad or dad and mom (as in my case) work 7 days and 6 nights a week. Always, however, there was a time when it would end, usually March 15.

As I got older (about 11 or 12 years—I'm 14), I began to take on the responsibility of making supper for my sister and brother so mom and dad could work longer. Then about 2 years ago an announcement was made. Now us kids of lawyers and accountants must wait another month before we can see and get acquainted with our parents.

I'm not kidding when I say "get acquainted" with them. I hardly know my father because he is gone nearly all the time. On rare occasions he'll come home for dinner (this is only during tax season). When he does come home, what do I see? I see a man with bags under his eyes that would have rivaled Fred Allen's. His face is lined with worry and fatigue. He's beat. The first

thing he does when he gets home is go upstairs to sleep before supper. Then he takes his stomach medicine (so he doesn't get ulcers), and all during supper he talks of tax returns. After supper (every night except Sunday) mom would go to the office with him until 12 midnight, leaving me to take care of the house.

Being the oldest of three children, I think I notice more than the others. I don't like what I see. It seems that since the change the years have gotten worse. Dad finds less and less time to be with his family and relax. This year was the worst.

Now that the date was moved up, dad has no time to relax because after the season ends everybody's payroll must be figured. After that is through something else comes up. He doesn't get a chance for a vacation until late June or July, sometimes not even until August or September. (Before the change dad took a vacation right after March 15.) I'm terribly worried that this sort of schedule is going to ruin his health, both mentally and physically.

Often I've thought of writing to you for help, but I just never got around to it. When mom injured her eye, thus making herself unable to help dad, I felt that something must be done.

You've probably guessed what I have been leading up to: "Couldn't you do something to change the date back to March 15?"

I hope you will give my plea more than just a passing glance and try to do something. I guess I'm not just asking for myself, but for all the worried kids of lawyers and accountants who would like to get acquainted with their moms and dads (during tax season).

Sincerely,

KAREN WEINER.

Earn Anew Our Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, George E. Stringfellow, a native of Virginia, and a director and senior vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc., was for many years a daily business associate of Thomas Alva Edison.

No one, of course, could associate with Thomas A. Edison for long without becoming a bigger and a better person, but George Stringfellow was born with certain elements of greatness in him. He was endowed with a good mind, a healthy body, a searching conscience, and untiring industry. I can truthfully say that he is one of the sweetest characters and noblest men I have ever met.

Because of his innate sterling qualities he has become a member of the board of directors of some of our largest American corporations, and has unselfishly devoted his time to the building of good American citizenship. Many institutions of culture and of learning have bestowed upon him great honors and he has freely given of his time and substance to the building of a stronger and better America.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the following address which George E. Stringfellow recently delivered before a distinguished group of fellow countrymen:

EARN ANEW OUR HERITAGE

(Remarks by George E. Stringfellow, senior vice president, Thomas A. Edison, Inc., West Orange, N. J., and imperial assistant rabban, AAONMS, before the 20th annual Masonic communion breakfast, Millbrook, N. Y., April 8, 1956)

Brother Charles W. Tripp, chairman, 20th annual Masonic communion breakfast of the Masonic fraterny of Dutchess County, N. Y., distinguished guests, and brother Masons:

I am highly complimented by Brother Tripp's introduction, by your reception, and by your invitation to address this large gathering of topflight citizens of Dutchess County.

May I at the outset pay my respect to Capt. Maurice M. Witherspoon, grand lodge officer of the Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons of the Empire State. Brother Witherspoon is one of the most effective citizens I have ever known. It is an inspiration to be associated with him in any endeavor.

Now a word about my genial host, Brother Hugh G. Collins, one of your outstanding citizens at whose home I enjoyed the rare privilege of spending last night. Brother Collins and his charming counterpart possess the rare ability of making one feel at home, away from home. I appreciate their hospitality no end.

I have selected as my text the 28th verse of the 22d chapter of Proverbs: "Remove not the ancient landmark, which thy fathers have set."

Amid the hills and valleys of rugged New Hampshire a visiting minister, scanning the time-worn inscription on the old tombstones of a cemetery, read these impressive words: "My son, that which thy father hath bequeathed, you must earn anew if you would keep."

Would that this truth, carved in old New England granite, were etched today in the minds and hearts of every American.

No people in history have enjoyed as great a physical heritage as we. Resources of mine and soil, water, field and forest, have been given to us in prodigal abundance. The power and wealth which have arisen from the use of these resources are beyond comprehension, unrivaled by any empire, past or present. Every American has a material heritage whose equal is to be found nowhere in the world. Truly, God has been good to us.

We are, however, the possesors of spiritual heritage, which transcends our physical heritage as the sun surpasses in all its splendor the faintest star.

The Mayflower Compact was the first of the notable documents marking the birth of our Republic. Its opening sentence: "In the name of God, Amen," is followed by these spiritual and significant words: "We have undertaken for the glory of God and the advancement of the Christian faith."

In the stormy days of 1620, haunted by privations and tortured by anxieties, God was the refuge and the everlasting hope of our Pilgrim Fathers and so He is today. It is difficult for us, in our comparative comfort and prosperity, to appreciate the hardships endured by those first settlers.

They established here the right to worship God according to the dictates of our conscience. Moral conviction motivated their decisions as it should ours. They built here a society which would reverence and serve God. He, therefore, supplied life and strength to their activity.

A century and a half following the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers, the signers of our Declaration of Independence (many of whom were members of our craft) held that moral laws are beyond the power of Government to alter or override. In the opening sentence of that passport to freedom, our forefathers grounded their purpose and faith in the conviction that the laws of nature and nature's God must prevail. In the final paragraph it appeals to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of their intentions. In its closing sentence, their trust in God was revealed in words which will ring through the corridors of time, or as long as men cherish liberty: "We mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

George Washington while presiding at the Constitutional Convention debates rose at a critical moment and exclaimed: "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair; the event is in the hand of God."

God had a hand in the development of the Constitution which made us a free and prosperous people. Gladstone described our Constitution as the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man.

In his Farewell Address, almost a decade later, Washington reminded his fellow countrymen that religion and morality lead to political prosperity. This is an admonition we should never forget—religion and morality lead to political prosperity.

Our fair land was born and nurtured as a religious community and dedicated to human liberty and the dignity of man. Our Founding Fathers were brave because they were God-fearing men and men of intellectual integrity. They had iron in their backbone and granite in their character. They prayed to God and their prayers and efforts brought forth a form of government that wise and free men hold dear.

We are the possessors of a great spiritual heritage. If it is to endure, it must be earned anew by each succeeding generation.

Have we earned anew that which was bequeathed to us?

There is disquieting evidence that many of us have drifted from the principles that made ours a great country.

For example, when flagrant political abuses were called to the attention of a high public official, he remarked, "We have violated no law."

One assumes that he meant man-made law. I would remind him that there are moral laws which have traditionally transcended man-made laws.

We Masons understand that as citizens we are bound to obey the laws of God as well as those made by man, and that when man-made laws conflict with those of God, His laws must prevail.

George Mason, distinguished author and leading lawyer of his generation, said, "The laws of nature are the laws of God, whose authority can be superseded by no power on earth. A legislature must not obstruct our obedience to Him from whose punishments they cannot protect us."

We must be ever mindful that our Nation is a gift from God, and that we are His people.

"People who are not governed by God," said William Penn, past grand master of Masons of the Keystone State, "will be ruled by tyrants." The grim proof of this statement stretches from Herod to Hitler.

Our forefathers built on this continent a nation which, for prestige, wealth, and power has never had an equal. But our material success has brought with it major hazards.

In our material gains we have suffered grave spiritual losses. We have too often placed temporal things above spiritual values. In a large measure, we have lost the sacred convictions which were powerful factors in the lives of those who laid the foundation of America.

However, there are hopeful signs of better life for our country. The Scouts and "Y" groups continue to grow. Public schools now stress moral values. Church attendance is increasing. In the period from 1945 to 1955 the number of church members in the United States increased from 72 million to 97½

million—an increase of 36 percent, as compared with an 18½-percent increase in the Nation's population. Today, 59 percent of the population of the United States are church members, as compared with 16 percent in 1850, when the record was first available.

During the last 10 years, the Masonic population has increased from 2,868,000 to 3,965,000—an increase of 38 percent. There is significance in the fact that growth of Masonic membership is in direct ratio to the increase in church membership.

If we are to retain and be worthy of our spiritual heritage, there is much for each of us to do. We must place God first in our lives. We must obey the laws of God and man, and when the latter conflicts with the former, work for their repeal. We must give our churches our time—our talent—our treasure. Incidentally, this will help increase the membership of our fraternity.

We must be stewards of the precious gifts God has given us. We must discharge our duties as citizens, voting faithfully and intelligently. We must always place the welfare of the people ahead of that of any political party. We must concern ourselves with what is right, rather than with who is right.

If we would save the world for democracy and decency, we must emulate St. Paul, who, crying that the days were evil, labored to improve them. We must not follow Hamlet who cried that the days were evil and cursed them.

"With God all things are possible." Apathy can be changed to action. We Masons can help make ours a better country and a better world for our children and their posterity.

Let us remember the everlasting words of that great Chinese philosopher, Confucius, who 2,400 years ago said:

"With righteousness in the heart, there will be beauty in the character;

"With beauty in the character, there will be harmony in the home;

"With harmony in the home, there will be order in the nation;

"And with order in the nation, there will be peace in the world."

If we earn anew our spiritual heritage, we need not fear the future.

Broadly speaking there are three kinds of minds in the world which we might generally classify as follows:

1. Little minds that think in terms of people, personalities, and pettiness.

2. Medium minds that think in terms of the immediate past and current events, and

3. Big minds that think in terms of principles and ideals.

Our fraternity and our way of life were conceived and implemented by men of big minds. Let us as Masons emulate them.

Skilled Manpower and National Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a study made by Dr. Harry H. Ransom, professor of defense studies at Harvard University, entitled "Skilled Manpower and National Strategy":

SKILLED MANPOWER AND NATIONAL STRATEGY—THE RACE FOR SUPERIORITY IN A VITAL SECRET WEAPON

(By Dr. Harry H. Ransom, Harvard University)

On a blustery day in late March (1956) a sleek, twin-jet Tupolev-104 [1] passenger plane came down through the rain clouds to land at the London Airport. Its main cargo was "Ivan the Terrible" Serov, chief of Russia's security services, who had been transported to England in a 3½-hour, 1,564-mile flight from Moscow.[2]

The TU-104 plane excited more attention than the appearance of General Serov, in England to supervise security arrangements for the visit by Khrushchev and Bulganin. Aeroflot's [3] jet airliner was "new evidence of the remarkable advances in aircraft design made by Russia during the last few years," according to a leading American aviation publication.[4] It is powered by two of the largest turbo-jet engines operating in the world today. Its design is said to be similar to that of the standard Russian medium jet bomber—the "Badger."

Some months earlier, in a seemingly unrelated and far less publicized activity, an admiral of the United States Navy made a speech to an East Orange, N. J., conference, sponsored by the Edison Foundation Institute. In this speech, Rear Adm. Frederick R. Furth, Chief, Office of Naval Research, warned that Russia had begun to outgain the United States in the training of scientists, engineers, and technicians. He noted a specific symptom of the problem when he said that in the fall of 1955 only 125 new college-trained physics teachers were available for the 28,000 high schools in the United States.[5]

While there is obviously no direct connection between the Soviet achievement of producing the TU-104 jet transport and last fall's shortage in the United States of high-school physics teachers, there is, however, a relationship here of crucial importance to the Nation's long-range strategic plans for security.

WINNING THE TECHNOLOGICAL RACE

United States Armed Forces today are engaged in a technological race with the Soviets. The outcome may affect national survival. America's defense-policy-makers, both civilian and military, now are showing increasing awareness that this race may be won or lost in the field of research and development, and ultimately in the nation's classrooms. This awareness is evidenced by a considerable amount of publicly expressed alarm not only about Soviet weapons systems achievements but also over the long-range implications of an impending United States shortage of high-quality scientific and engineering manpower.

Any projected strategic plan to contain Soviet expansionism or to deter aggressive war by the Communists obviously must be based on a careful calculation of Soviet military potential. And plans to win a war we cannot deter must be the result of the most precise estimates possible of national strategic capabilities.

Students of strategy know that a nation's economic potential is one of the most relevant indicators of strategic capability. Competent analyses of the foundations of national power have always taken into account scientific and technological skills—a basic ingredient of national economic strength and military potential. These skills now must be accorded an even greater importance in estimates of the future strategic capability of a nation.

NEED FOR AN ACTION POLICY

An essential ingredient in an action policy for national survival thus must include the building of an educational framework which will assure the required amount of skilled manpower. The increasing shortage of this essential element of national strength now must be given a very high priority as the Nation begins to implement its strategic plan for the long haul.

The many immediate specific scientific problems involved in the development of complex weapons today tend to obscure the long-range consequences of our increasing skilled manpower disadvantage vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. Current problems with strategic implications include how to put successfully a man-made satellite in an encircling orbit around the earth; how to develop missiles with intercontinental range and accuracy; how to build atomic reactors to power ships and planes, or economically to heat, air condition, and light future cities; and how to solve the problem of the Nation's dwindling natural resources.

Our success in these and other projects will constitute an important variable in long-range strategic calculations. The strategic doctrines, composition, size, and missions of our Navy, Army, and Air Force of the future also will be profoundly affected by our achievements in these projects and by other unpredictable technological breakthroughs. Whatever develops, it can be predicted with confidence that the need for well-trained scientists and engineers, both in and outside the military services, will increase constantly.

This resource will become increasingly important as a measure of our own military capability, as well as that of the potential enemy. But the alarming fact is that we are not insuring the supply of this vital human resource in the future.

And the published facts of the growing scientific and engineering capability of the Soviet Union are equally disturbing. Some encouragement may be found, however, in the increasing, if belated, attention now given this problem by United States policymakers.

SOME SIGNIFICANT FACTS

Here are a few of the more significant cold facts, made public in recent months by Government officials:

Universities and technical institutions in Soviet Russia are graduating engineers in numbers some 2½ times greater than are similar institutions in the United States.

The United States is now training only one-half its required number of engineers and scientists.

A recent report of the congressional Joint Atomic Committee (March 1956) reveals that the combined total of engineers and scientists of the United States and 15 Western European nations is about 1,150,000. The Soviet Union total is 890,000 scientists and engineers, not including the satellites and Red China. The Soviet total exceeds that of the United States, and is more than three-fourths the number available in the free nations of Europe combined with the United States.

Most experts seem to feel that Russian scientists and engineers in most fields cannot be considered inferior to our own.

In the decade 1950–60, the Soviet Union is expected to produce 1,200,000 trained engineers and scientists compared to our 900,000.

Even the combined advantage in this regard which the United States and countries of Western Europe has held is being seriously threatened by the Soviet Union.

Half of our high schools teach no chemistry or physics. And much of the mathematics and science is being taught by teachers untrained in these fields.

The number of qualified science teachers in the United States high schools has fallen off 53 percent in the past 5 years, while high school students have increased by 16 percent.

In 1890, 2 generations ago, 1 in every 5 high school stndents in the United States studied physics. Today the figure is about 1 in every 22.

Footnotes at end of speech.

In the category of engineers alone, the Soviet have multiplied the numbers tenfold since 1930, when records show they had 41,000 engineers.

The following chart gives a graphic indication of how United States production of scientists and engineers compares with Soviet Russia. The most disturbing aspect of this picture, of course, is the trend line beyond 1956.

(Chart omitted.)

The absolute accuracy of figures on Soviet technical manpower cannot, of course, be assured. Not only do Soviet statistics sometimes have a questionable validity, but there is also the problem of measuring quality. One might normally discount the kind of chest thumping evident at the recent Soviet 20th Party Congress in Moscow (February 1956) over their claimed superiority in scientific personnel. Premier Nikoli Bulganin referred to technical experts as the Soviet Union's gold reserve. The current 5-year plan calls for 4 million new specialists by 1956. This would exceed the Soviet combined output of the two previous plans.

Yet obviously we do not have to look to Communist propaganda to discover cause for concern. The words of our own Government officials—both civilian and military—and the unclassified facts, such as those above, are alarming enough.

THE CATFISH AND THE HERRING

The British historian Arnold J. Toynbee tells the story, in the context of discussions of the free world-Soviet struggle, of the catfish and the herring. It is the tale of the fisherman who continually returned to port with a catch of herring far fresher than that of his colleagues. Thus his fish brought a higher price. Eventually the other fishermen learned the secret. The cagey fisherman always dropped a live and hungry catfish into the tank containing his homebound load of herring. The herring were thus kept active on the voyage to market by attempting to avoid the jaws of the catfish. A few herring was lost en route, but most of them arrived in port alive, fresh, and highly marketable.

The Soviet "catfish" has brought critical self-examination to the West in many fields. These include our sea power, the missile program, and airpower. None the least of these in long-range importance, however, is the need for more trained scientific and engineering personnel than are now being produced or projected for the future. This has become a crucial national security problem. This need is more often discussed today in terms of development of weapons in the armament race with the Soviet Union. And weapons, of course, constitute an urgent consideration in view of notable Soviet achievements in this field. But this is only one side of the coin.

Recently such officials as Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and Atomic Energy Commission Chairman Lewis L. Strauss have been explaining that the long-range security of the United States, and perhaps even the outcome of the cold war, may be acutely affected by a continuing shortage of scientists, engineers, and other technicians.

EXPORTABLE TECHNICIANS AND THE COLD WAR

The armaments race implications of this shortage are obvious, but there is an equally important factor less recognized. That is the prospect, as expressed by Secretary Dulles and others, that the Soviet Union's ability may surpass ours to raise and disperse a force of technical assistants all over Asia and Africa. Looking ahead 10 years, Secretary Dulles has voiced concern, not that the Soviets will have a true, exportable surplus of capital or goods, but an exportable surplus of technicians. And note, also, that these will not be just qualified scientists and engineers but the same individuals will be well-trained in the art of political subversion.

The United States, already running short of scientists and engineers, under present trends may not be able to compete effectively with Soviet offers of this kind of technical aid to those so-called uncommitted areas. The solution to this grave national security problem demands attention in the highest councils of Government.

Those concerned with the implications of scientific and engineering manpower to national strategy will do well to consult two important and easily available recent publications relating to this problem. These are the report of Congressman MELVIN PRICE's Subcommittee on Research and Development, Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Engineering and Scientific Manpower in the United States, Western Europe, and Soviet Russia (March 1956); and Dr. Nicholas DeWitt's (Russian Research Center, Harvard University) Soviet Professional Manpower: Its Education, Training, and Supply (National Science Foundation, Washington 1955).

Even in the unlikely event that "peace breaks out" as a result of feasible East-West disarmament agreements, it should be added that the need for more scientists and engineers would then possibly be greater even than in the present partial-war economy.

STOCKPILING A VITAL HUMAN RESOURCE

The Soviet "catfish" is incentive enough, nonetheless, to justify a program of stockpiling scientists and engineers with at least the same degree of national urgency, and with the same generosity of funds, brought to bear in recent years on stockpiling critical war materials. The precious human resources needed to fill future national security needs cannot, of course, be ersatz or jerry-built.

The future security of the nations of the free world will depend to a certain extent upon their educational equipment for engineering and scientific training. This, in turn, depends upon the number and quality of educational institutions, their teaching staffs, curriculum, and student enrollment, and their financial support. These are the vital secret weapons for which those responsible for national strategy must develop an urgent action policy.

TOWARD A SOLUTION

An action program, although urgently needed, must be based on the most careful examination and diagnosis of the causes of the present and impending shortages of skilled manpower. No crash program can magically produce the numbers and quality of trained personnel needed for the Nation's future prosperity and military security. These can be produced only as the result of carefully prepared plans for readjustment of our total educational system. But such an alteration must come only after a collection and full analysis of all relevant information. This can best be done by a Presidential commission or a congressional committee.[6]

There is a mass of information now available, however, which offers clues toward a solution to the problem. It is well known that millions of American youth have been denied adequate educational opportunities. Millions of words have been written, and hundreds of pages of testimony taken, about the urgent need for more schoolteachers, more school construction, and improved curriculums. Because of complex political, social, and economic factors, however, these needs are being met only with agonizing slowness. The matrix of federalism, intergovernmental competition for the tax dollar, unhealthy condition of many State and local financial structures, and disagreement on solutions both among professional educators and among politicians, seem at first glance to be insurmountable obstacles. Yet these significant elements in the problem must be faced before adequate solutions can be found.

There is information already available indicating one important area where weakness exists. It is known that in the United States only half of the high-school graduates who are potential science and engineering students enter college. And less than half of these who embark on science and enginering studies actually complete their work for a college degree in these fields. There is obviously a high degree of loss, then, in high school, between high school and college, and in college. This amounts, in fact, to an 80 percent wastage of potential enginering and science talent, for of every 10 high-school students with theoretical capacity for potential careers in science and engineering, only 2 actually earn the college degree.[7]

A major factor in this attrition is an economic one. College education is becoming increasingly expensive. Although the availability of scholarship money has increased, the education "buying power" of scholarships has decreased. It is clear that this aspect of the problem can only be solved with increased financial aid from private corporations, the educational foundations, individual donors, and the Federal and State governments. Surely, the Federal Government's role will have to be a major one in the provision of scholarships, teacher training and physical plant. Attention must not be directed, however, at the college level alone, for the problem also has roots in the secondary, and even elementary, school systems.

There is a long and disturbing history of decreasing interest at the high school level in subjects basic to college study of engineering and science, such as mathematics, chemistry and physics. What seems to be a decreasing interest, however, may only be the result of two major factors: a shortage of competent teachers and an overemphasis, in planning the curriculum, on "generalized" education.

For many complex reasons the number of college-trained scientists and engineers also is steadily declining. Graduates in engineering and science who received degrees with the class of 1950 comprised nearly 25 percent of the entire class. In 1954, these represented about 18 percent. According to predictions, those of the class of 1960 will comprise a bare 15 percent of the total number of college graduates.[8]

REPAIRING THE EDUCATIONAL FABRIC

It is abundantly clear that the total fabric of our educational system needs repair. It is somewhat surprising that in an age of technology this Nation, whose technology surpasses all, should find itself facing serious shortages in such a vital resource as skilled manpower. This argument, parenthetically, should not be taken as one for deemphasing liberal arts education, particularly the social sciences. To the contrary, it should be noted that the increasing complexity of our technological society demands extra attention by social scientists. This developing "cold war of the classroom" obviously cannot be won without effective action on the basic ingredients of victory: students, teachers, the curriculum, adequate finance and educational facilities.

It is all too clear that our chief competitor, Soviet Russia, has long since faced this problem with a dogged determination not to be caught short in these vital resources. Russian technological achievements—such as that TU-104 which landed in London last March—are an indirect result of an intensive kindergarten to graduate school program over the past several decades to assure an adequate supply of scientists and technicians. If they surpass us in this human resource, they have gained a crucial long-

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

range advantage in a primary element of military and industrial strength.

THREAT COMPARABLE TO HYDROGEN BOMB

We may take some comfort in the faith that our spirit of academic freedom, which does not exist in Russia, is a built-in guaranty of superior quality. But this gives us no excuse for complacency. For Russia's classrooms, laboratories, and ambitious and currently effective plans for mass education pose a threat to our future security comparable to her hydrogen bomb and delivery systems.

---

[1] Andrei N. Tupolev is a leading Russian aircraft designer. Tupolev recently wrote in Pravda that his jet airliner has a 2,000-mile range; cruising altitude of 33,000 feet; and cruising speed of 500 mph.

[2] General Serev later returned to Moscow in the TU-104. The trip was completed in 3 hours and 15 minutes, which the United Press reported to be a new record time for the London-to-Moscow hop.

[3] This is Russia's civil airline, which plans to use the TU-104 (said to be in quantity production) on the Moscow-Peking route and routes connecting Moscow with European capitals.

[4] Aviation Week, April 2, 1956, p. 28.

[5] New York Times, November 22, 1955, Soviet Outstrips the United States in Training Scientists.

[6] On March 28, 1956, Representative MELVIN PRICE, Democrat, Illinois, stated that his subcommittee on Research and Development, Congressional Joint Atomic Energy Committee, plans public hearings on this problem. And since this paper was first drafted President Eisenhower has appointed a National Committee for the Development of Scientists and Engineers to survey the problem. See New York Times, April 4, 1956, p. 13.

[7] Engineering and Scientific Manpower, pp. 33-34.

[8] Engineering and Scientific Manpower in the United States, Western Europe and Soviet Russia, p. 33.

Address by National Commander of the American Legion, J. Addington Wagner, Before Canton Post No. 44, Department of Ohio, Canton, Ohio, April 19, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, my home city and Canton Post No. 44, the American Legion, were honored last week to have the national commander of the American Legion, Mr. J. Addington Wagner of Michigan, as our guest.

Appropriately, Commander Wagner recognized the interest of Canton legionnaires in the injustices that are being done to our servicemen under the NATO Status of Forces Agreement, and delivered a forceful and brillian discussion of that subject.

Commander Wagner's address again called attention to the urgent need for revision or modification of this treaty, and I again call attention to the fact that House Joint Resolution 309, which is still pending in the Foreign Affairs Committee, is a proper and appropriate vehicle to bring about such revision.

Under leave to extend, I include Commander Wagner's Canton speech:

It is a real pleasure being with you Canton Post Legionnaires and auxiliary unit members tonight. I feel right at home because of your wonderful hospitality. It is everything and more than I have been told it was.

Canton Post No. 44 is known throughout the American Legion. The distinguished leaders whom you have furnished to the American Legion have helped to spread the fame of this post. Crete Anderson is one. For I can assure you that Crete and your other members who have given so unselfishly of their time and efforts in the service of your national organization have not been bashful when it comes to talking about this post.

But the principal reason for your renown has been your steadfast dedication in carrying out the American Legion's programs of service for God and country. You have not only supported our basic programs of veterans rehabilitation, child welfare, national security and Americanism, you have also taken the lead in formulating and crystalizing the American Legion's position on such important issues as the Status of Forces Agreement.

I would like to talk to you tonight about this agreement which denies basic citizenship rights to America's fighting men stationed overseas in all but one of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries. You are no strangers to this issue. You and your fellow legionnaires here in Canton originated the resolution on the Status of Forces Agreement that was adopted by our 1954 national convention and reiterated by our 1955 convention as the official policy of the American Legion.

Incidentally, I would like to point out that your action in originating this resolution has a significance quite apart from the issue involved * * * the issue of whether there is any basis for the arbitrary denial to our military personnel of rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. It illustrates perfectly how an idea initiated on the post level can and does become the national policy of the American Legion. It shows exactly how American Legion policy is established and directed by the blue-cap legionnaire in Hown Town Post, United States of America.

July 15, 1953 is a tragic date in American history. It was on this date that the Senate of the United States ratified the Status of Forces Agreement. This agreement established a new status for certain members of our Armed Forces. It placed American Armed Forces personnel unfortunate enough to be stationed overseas in the NATO countries in the status of second-class citizens.

Since then the United States has entered into similar agreements with Japan and other countries, until today we have bargained away the citizenship rights of American military personnel in 49 foreign nations throughout the world. But I would like to limit my remarks this evening to the Status of Forces Agreement because this is the blueprint for all other arrangements. It is the granddaddy of all giveaways of constitutionally guaranteed United States citizenship rights.

The Status of Forces Agreement was negotiated and has since been defended on the grounds that the United States had no alternative. Apologists for this agreement argue that we had to grant NATO countries the right to prosecute and punish American servicemen for criminal offenses committed in their countries, because they demanded this right, and we had to give in to them in return for the privilege of basing American military personnel in their countries.

You and I need not be told how the presence of American troops in NATO countries does, in fact, contribute to our own security. The American Legion has always supported NATO and similar collective-security arrangements. But we do not agree with the architects and apologists of the Status of Forces Agreement who seem to believe that the presence of our troops overseas is solely in our own self-interest.

American troops, along with vast quantities of material and dollars have gone overseas for one dominant purpose: to strengthen the free world's frontline defense against Communist aggression. We see nothing in that fact for which to apologize or make amends. Nor do we agree with those responsible for conducting American foreign policy who seem to think that they should be more concerned about the reaction of foreign governments than about the rights of American citizens.

The American Legion firmly believes that the Status of Forces Agreement in its present form would never have come about if the United States had insisted on the right to try and punish American military personnel for any criminal offenses committed by our troops. We believe that the NATO nations would have been willing to trust the United States to see that justice was done in every case involving our forces if we had not surrendered on this vital issue.

Most important, we believe that there is still time to revise the Status of Forces Agreement and similar treaties and agreements as provided in House Joint Resolution 309, introduced in the Congress last year by your own distinguished Representative, FRANK T. BOW.

As I am sure you know, this resolution provides for the revision of the Status of Forces Agreement and similar treaties or international agreements, or the withdrawal of the United States from such treaties and agreements, so that foreign countries will not have criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within their boundaries.

Too many of our Government officials appear to be obsessed by the fear that we will be asked to withdraw our troops from the NATO countries if we insist that they grant us jurisdiction over our Armed Forces personnel stationed within their borders. We submit that these nations might well do as Greece has done, if we are firm in our request.

Greece, a member nation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, has waived the rights granted under the Status of Forces Agreement and has returned to the United States Army complete criminal jurisdiction over our troops stationed there.

What has happened in Greece can happen in other NATO countries. But it can only happen if our Government stands up for the rights of American citizens serving in our Armed Forces in the NATO countries. It can only happen if those responsible for the conduct of our foreign policy recognize that our men in uniform are the victims of a bad bargain.

To date, no such recognition has been evidenced by official spokesmen of the State, Defense and Justice Departments.

In their last appearances before a committee of the Congress, these officials protested that the Status of Forces Agreement meets the civilized standards of justice. They virtually ignored the fact that it violates the United States Constitution which grants to all of our citizens, including Armed Forces personnel through the uniform code of military justice, the right to a trial by their peers, and to protection against double jeopardy and self-incrimination. It denies our soldier-citizens the right of appeal. It does not prohibit excessive fines

or cruel or inhuman punishments, as does our Constitution. Under the Status of Forces Agreement there are no guaranties protecting the accused by a presumption of innocence. He can be found guilty by less than a preponderance of the evidence. A confession procured by any means, however irregular, including force and duress, may be used against him. And, of course, the writ of habeas corpus is unknown.

I don't care how many so-called standards of justice the Status of Forces Agreement meets. It is indefensible as far as the American Legion is concerned, as long as it fails to insure for American military personnel the rights guaranteed them by the Constitution of the United States.

The Constitution of the United States where American citizens are concerned, is the first and dominant standard. It's about time that our Government officials let their own thinking be influenced by this greatest guarantee of freedom in the history of man.

Those who defend the Status of Forces Agreement also argue that without it the Communists could score a great propaganda victory by accusing us of colonialism. Aside from the fact that the mere presence of our troops overseas has been interpreted by the Communists as an act of imperialism, since when does Communist propaganda, real or potential, justify the denial of citizenship rights guaranteed by the Constitution?

If the Status of Forces Agreement is allowed to remain in force for this reason, then we have reached the point where the end does justify the means * * * where freedom can be denied in the name of freedom.

The argument that few American soldiers have actually been tried and punished under this agreement has also been advanced as a justification for its continuance. This argument is just as ridiculous as maintaining that it is perfectly all right to jail a man without charges, to convict him without a jury trial, or to use a forced confession or other illegal evidence against him because such miscarriages of justice are few and far between.

The fact that the agreement provides that we shall retain jurisdiction over our personnel in crimes committed while on duty or in the performance of duty is meaningless. Who is to say that the man was on duty? How can this provision be enforced if, in fact, local police authorities have arrested and hold in custody an American soldier for a crime committed in their jurisdiction? We have the right to request that they release him. But suppose they refuse? What can we do? Nothing. Absolutely nothing.

To argue that American military personnel often get off with a lighter sentence under this agreement than they would for the same offense under our military courts is to admit that essential discipline and authority within our Armed Forces is jeopardized and compromised by the Status of Forces Agreement.

I could go on citing the arguments advanced by the architects and apologists of the Status of Forces Agreement. But they all add up to the fact that this agreement cannot be justified on any grounds.

It denies to American military personnel stationed in the NATO countries, with the exception of Greece, and incidentally, to their dependents as well, rights guaranteed them by the United States Constitution.

It flies in the face of history and of monumental decisions in International Law by such outstanding authorities as Chief Justice Marshall of the Supreme Court, who said the armed forces of a friendly nation stationed within the territory of another, with the latter's permission, are not subject to the local laws of the host country, but are subject only to the laws of their own country.

It compels our military personnel and their dependents to stand trial in courts where they cannot understand a single word of the language used.

And it penalizes the soldier unfortunate enough to be stationed overseas in the NATO countries or in other countries with which we have similar agreements. He doesn't enjoy even the same protection of his fellow soldier stationed in the United States.

On every count the Status of Forces Agreement is indefensible. It must be repealed. It can be if we Legionnaires stand firm * * * if we retain the courage of our convictions.

Let's make certain that our national convention resolution * * * the resolution originated in this post * * * becomes the law of the land. It must if the freedoms guaranteed by the United States Constitution are to be returned to America's fighting men now manning the frontline bastions of freedom throughout the world.

Thank you.

Ned Brooks, Three-Star-Extra Commentator, Reports on Political Situation in the Midwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Ned Brooks is one of the foremost commentators and newsmen in the Washington area. Recently, he and his colleague, Mr. Fred Morrison, went to the Midwestern States under the auspices of three-star-extra news-report program.

Mr. Brooks reports from Detroit, Chicago, and Indianapolis on the political situation in Michigan, Illinois, and Indiana. The observations by Mr. Brooks are timely, and Republican leaders in those States are now on notice as to the political situations there:

NED BROOKS, FROM DETROIT, APRIL 9, 1956

The biggest handicap facing the Republicans here in this pivotal State of Michigan is the highly effective political operation of organized labor.

The Republicans have been outgeneraled, outmanned, and outfinanced in their struggle to counteract the round-the-clock propaganda campaign waged under the leadership of the United Auto Workers Union.

On top of this the Republicans have been plagued by internal differences and feuds in the State organization. As a result, campaign contributions fell off. Only recently have these factional difficulties been overcome by a new campaign setup.

Because of the concentration of union members in the automobile centers, Michigan has become the No. 1 testing ground of labor activity in politics.

The Democratic Party, not only in Detroit but in the State, has been taken over by labor's political leaders.

The President of the Michigan Labor Council is on record as saying that the unions never will support Republican candidates.

The union members are under a constant barrage of shop newspapers and pamphlets attacking the administration in Washington and Republican leaders in Michigan.

Outlays for radio and television, using the same type of material, runs into hundreds of thousands of dollars.

The Republicans have nothing comparable with which to fight back and don't have the money to undertake a full-scale counteroffensive.

Right now the Republicans are having difficulties finding a suitable candidate for Governor to oppose Democrat G. Mennen Williams, who has a record of 4 victories in a row and is now out for No. 5.

Each time, he has been elected by the labor machine and potential opponents have developed a healthy respect for his past performance.

Republican leaders would like to have as their candidate the popular, nonpartisan Mayor of Detroit, Albert Cobo, but so far he has declined.

Two Congressmen are possibilities in the Governor race—GERALD FORD and ALVIN BENTLEY.

Even with President Eisenhower heading the ticket, Republican leaders here are not at all sure about gaining any Congressional seats in the November election.

There appears to be an outside chance of upsetting Democrats in two districts, but there's also a chance that from 1 to 3 Republican seats will be lost.

It would be a mistake to count on Michigan to help upset the present control of the Democrats in the National House of Representatives.

This is Ned Brooks, reporting from Detroit.

NED BROOKS, FROM DETROIT, APRIL 10, 1956

Workers entering the automobile plants here in Detroit are being handed small cards bearing the heading "Employee Record."

At first glance they appear to be some kind of a company record. But a closer inspection shows that the employee is Dwight D. Eisenhower and the employer the United States Government.

His job classification is listed as "retired general," and the card shows what purports to be his record of days absent, days on vacation, and days on sick leave.

At the bottom is a mark indicating "do not reemploy" and the reason given, chronic absentee.

It's another one of the ingenious campaign gimmicks cooked up by the political wing of the AFL-CIO; a sample of the antiadministration propaganda that is being circulated around the clock here in this key State of Michigan. This is the laboratory for labor activity in politics and the Republicans are finding themselves hard pressed.

On a limited scale they're beginning to fight back, but they have neither the manpower nor the financial resources to combat the continuous barrage of words being injected into the campaign in printed material and over the air waves.

The Republican State chairman, John Feikens, is now setting up labor committees led by workers who object to having money they pay in membership dues spent to promote candidates whom they oppose.

Feikens says union members are being compelled to contribute to the campaign fund of the Democrats as a condition of employment.

In order to hold his job, a man must belong to the union and pay dues. Since the union supports only Democrats, the member kicks into their campaign whether he wants to or not.

Feikens says he isn't trying to prevent unions from taking part in politics, but he is trying to protect the freedom of the individual.

These membership dues pay the bill for some 60 shop newspapers and other publications filled with articles berating the administration in Washington and Republicans in general.

For those who don't read these papers there's plenty of the same material on radio and television.

The star performer is Commentator Guy Nunn, well known in this area. His two daily broadcasts on some twenty-odd Michigan radio stations are paid for by the Auto Workers Union.

He's on the air at 6:15 in the morning, when the men are going to work; again at 7:15 in the evening; Sundays on television.

The Republicans are talking of having some broadcasts of their own if they can raise the money. But as of today, Mr. Nunn has the field to himself.

This is Ned Brooks, reporting from Detroit.

NED BROOKS, FROM DETROIT, APRIL 11, 1956

Much of the difficulty under which the Republicans are laboring in this key State of Michigan can be summed up in one word, money.

They never seem to have enough of it.

But the Democrats, leaning heavily on contributions from organized labor, enter this year's campaign with the promise of a well-filled treasury.

Labor is the tail that wags the dog here in Michigan. The nominal Democratic leaders take the back seat while Walter Reuther's organization calls the shots and provides most of the money.

The so-called voluntary contributions—$1 per head from the union members—represent only a part of the funds available for political spending.

The remainder comes directly from the dues of the union members and it is spent to help candidates whom the individual member may, or may not, wish to support.

The member may be a Republican, but his money is used to promote Democrats.

This procedure was what led to an indictment of the United Auto Workers Union by a Federal grand jury. A Detroit judge later dismissed the case, but his decision is now being appealed by the Department of Justice.

The union carries on its political operations through a very curious system of bookkeeping.

In 1954—in the election in which Republican Senator Homer Ferguson was defeated—the State Democratic Party reported spending only $88,000 against $450,000 by the Republicans.

But if you look at the records of the auto workers union you find that it spent more than $2½ million on activities which were almost entirely political.

For example, $1,100,000 for what is called the "citizenship" fund.

Now the UAW defines this as chiefly an activity for getting out the vote. But, since the union supports no Republicans, it's to be assumed that the drive was concentrated on getting out the Democratic vote.

Other expenditures: Educational fund, including radio broadcasts, $678,000; research, $160,000; editorial (that would be newspapers and magazines), $590,000.

For one series of broadcasts featuring Commentator Guy Nunn, the UAW bought time on some 20 Michigan stations at an annual cost of $227,000.

The Republicans have had trouble raising money just to monitor the broadcasts to keep track of what Mr. Nunn was saying about them twice a day.

The figures show that in the 1952 campaign, more than 5 times as much money was spent to elect Democrats as was spent for Republicans.

Money isn't everything in a campaign, but the Republicans say it's a mighty big factor here in Michigan.

This is Ned Brooks, reporting from Detroit.

NED BROOKS, FROM CHICAGO, APRIL 12, 1956

Republican leaders here in Illinois would have little else to worry about in the November election if they could be sure that the farm vote will stay with them.

The industrial centers are booming, giving political meaning to the GOP claim of prosperity.

It's the small, marginal farmers, mostly in southern Illinois, who give the Republicans the most concern.

There has been some grumbling among them over the administration's farm program, and over the absence of effective salesmanship by Secretary Benson.

But much of the uneasiness over the farm vote was removed by the results of this week's primary election.

The returns showed no evidence of revolt among the farmers, in spite of efforts by the Democrats to stir up trouble.

Percentagewise, President Eisenhower ran a stronger race against Adlai Stevenson in the farm counties downstate, than he did in the general election in 1952.

There is other evidence that discontent among the farmers has been overmagnified.

In Congress yesterday, only 2 out of 12 Illinois Republicans voted to set aside the administration's program of flexible price supports.

What Republican leaders are afraid of is a weakness on the part of the administration in defending its program in the days ahead. A hard-hitting drive by the Democrats could make inroads in the farm sections.

Leading Republicans tell me President Eisenhower retains a high degree of popularity, and there is strong sentiment for Vice President NIXON.

Four years ago, Illinois was solidly behind the late Senator Taft for the Presidential nomination. And the lingering bitterness over Taft's defeat was perhaps stronger in this State than anywhere in the Nation.

Today—due largely to the efforts of Governor Stratton, Senator Everett Dirksen, and former Senator C. Wayland Brooks, the national committeeman—the Republican high command has been transformed into a solidly Eisenhower organization.

It has made inroads on what has been a strong Democratic source of strength, the Negro wards of Chicago.

In the industrial centers there's the usual close alliance between the Democrats and the political wings of the labor organization.

As I found earlier in Michigan, the Republicans are far behind in matching the missionary work being done on behalf of the Democrats by labor broadcasters.

Two daily programs sponsored by labor are carried on the radio station which specializes in reaching the farmers.

And, no opportunity is overlooked to exploit whatever discontent can be found among the farmers.

This is Ned Brooks, reporting from Chicago.

NED BROOKS, FROM INDIANAPOLIS, APRIL 13, 1956

Hoosiers have way of reducing their political problems to simple terms.

When you ask why the Republicans seem to be losing ground in sections of this normally Republican State, the answer comes back, blame it on corn and hogs.

Which means that the farm vote is the uncertain quantity.

The more prosperous farmers, those who have their land paid for, can be counted on to stay with the Republicans.

But among those who are in debt and hardest hit by lower prices there are signs of gains by the Democrats.

Some Republican leaders tell you privately they're not certain, as of today, that President Eisenhower will carry Indiana.

Gov. George Craig, a strong Eisenhower supporter says this talk is nonsense.

He tells me his prediction is that the President will win by nearly as large a margin as he did 4 years ago, which was 335,000.

Governor Craig acknowledges that farm relief is the critical ieeues, especially among farmers with small acreage and thin soil.

But he says farmers are not blaming the Eisenhower administration for their troubles; rather, they feel that the former administration did not have the fortitude to deal with their problems.

I found other Republican leaders less confident. This week 6 out of 11 Indiana Republicans in Congress voted against the administration's position on the farm bill.

One of them was Senator HOMER CAPEHART who faces a rugged battle in November against the former Democratic Secretary of Agriculture, Claude Wickart.

Republicans have not forgotten the surprising setback they suffered last year when Democrats won the elections for mayor in 83 out of 105 cities.

Governor Craig says local issues caused the upsets. Other Republican leaders say the trend was too definite to be lightly dismissed.

Along with other worries Indiana Republicans are disturbed over the continuing battle for control between Governor Craig and United States Senator WILLIAM JENNER.

JENNER has frequency disagreed with the Eisenhower administration.

The Governor says JENNER is enjoying a dwindling popularity.

But he says their differences won't affect the November vote. He told me, "We Republicans always patch up our troubles by election day."

That's the story from Indianapolis. This is Ned Brooks reporting.

Farmers O. K. Farm-Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include in the RECORD an article from the Wayne County Press, of Fairfield, Ill., which is published in the heart of the farming area of my district.

The editor of this newspaper, Mr. Tom Matthews, sent his reporter out to make a random survey, calling on the farmers direct, the day after President Eisenhower vetoed the farm bill, in order to get the true sentiment of real farmers with reference to the President's veto. I believe the brief opinions expressed by many farmers should be of interest to the Members of Congress. You will note that the great majority of them praised the President for having the courage to veto what these farmers branded a bad bill.

FARMERS HERE O. K. FARM BILL VETO—PRAISE EISENHOWER FOR HIS COURAGE; MANY AGAINST THE 90 PERCENT PARITY PLAN

Farmers in Wayne County think President Eisenhower acted wisely in entering his veto of the farm bill.

At least such is the indication following a random survey of farmers in this area by press reporters Wednesday.

Of those interviewed only two thought the President acted unwisely.

Many expressed views against the 90 percent parity program while others said they do not think the proposed soil-bank plan is the answer to the small farmer's problem.

The question asked was: "What do you think about President Eisenhower vetoing the farm bill * * * was a good or bad thing?"

EXPRESS VIEWS

Here are the answers:

Mrs. Darrell Blessing, route 1: "I think President Eisenhower's action was for the best. It seems to me there were two parts of that farm bill and they were working directly against each other. Certainly that would accomplish little."

John Bayler, route 4: "I admire President Eisenhower for having the courage to veto the farm bill in an election year. It seemed the bill wouldn't serve the purpose of the average size farmer. It was designed to help the big farmer. I think we need a farm law that sticks more toward conservation practices."

Clifford Hubble, Enterprise: I've talk to quite a few about this and from all I hear it seems it was the best thing to do."

Ralph Finley, route 1: "I was mighty sorry to see the President veto that farm bill. I think it was a bad thing when he didn't sign it. Certainly it would have meant more money for the farmer and we all know he needs help. Yes, I favor the 90 percent of parity program * * * matter of fact I'm for 100 percent of parity for the farmer. We all know that every other group is doing better today than the farmer. It can't go on that way."

Emory Dickey, route 6: "I was glad President Eisenhower vetoed the farm bill. Truly it was a bad bill, designed by the Democrats to help the big shots who would have got the money and done little for the small farmer who really needs the help. Look how Ike ran in the primary last week. That many people wouldn't have voted for him if they didn't have respect and confidence in him and now the way he vetoed this bad farm bill makes us realize more than ever what a man of courage and character we have in the White House."

Hylman Vanway, route 4: "I'm in favor of the President doing just what he did, veto that farm bill. I'll back him 100 percent on that. A wise move. I can't say I'd back him 100 percent on the soil bank plan. It's for the bigger farmer, in my opinion. I say a farmer with less than 200 acres ought to be exempt from any soil bank plan."

Ivan Feller, route 2: "It was a good thing. Any guy who will do something against his better judgment just because it's politically expedient is not fit to be President. And right there is where Ike stood up. He vetoed that bill knowing it might cost him votes. Heaven knows we farmers are paying right now for 2 or 3 bad farm bills and we don't want another one on the law books. Anybody who thinks can understand exactly what they were trying to put across. It's these acres they've taken out of wheat and cotton and put back in corn that is hurting us Illinois farmers today. No, I say I'd rather have 50 cent corn on this side of the ocean than $2 corn and be over there in a war. Hurrah for Ike."

Jesse Rush, route 4: "I think the President was right in vetoing the bill. We just can't keep piling surplus up on top of surplus and that's what the bill would have continued. We've got to adjust to the situation sometime. No, I don't think the soil bank plan which has been presented so far is any solution either. It would help mostly the big farmer and there's an awful lot of small farmers who need help more."

Ford Harris, route 1: "That farm bill had little in it to help the small farmer. I think a veto was the only logical action the President could take."

Floyd Templeman, route 1: "I'm a bit ashamed to admit but I've been so busy with other things I haven't had time to follow all the debate over the farm bill which was passed by Congress and then vetoed by Mr. Eisenhower. I've read a little about the soil bank plan and I think basically it is a good idea. I'm a little doubtful, however, on getting it into practical realization."

James R. Taylor, route 3: "There are important men on both sides of the fence who have given the farm problem a lot of study and they think they're right as to a solution. I'm sure President Eisenhower gave the matter very serious consideration before he vetoed the bill. Sure, maybe even 100 percent of parity would be good for me right now but somebody along the line's going to have to pay for it all. You can't expect something for nothing. As to the soil bank plan, I don't know. We may have to try it out before we know what it can do."

Chester Witter, route 2: "I think the President was right in vetoing the bill. I'm not much in favor of parity payments. We've had them a long time and we've still got our farm problem, haven't we? I'm doubtful about the soil bank plan as a solution either."

Frank Mason, route 2: "I'm not sure that I understood all the details about the farm bill which the President vetoed, so I would rather not express opinion. I think that the soil-bank plan is sound. Don't know that it's important for this part of the country, so I don't believe we contribute so much to the surplus ourselves."

Mrs. Glen Liston, route 3: "My husband isn't here right now but I feel sure that it's his opinion that the President knows what he's doing in vetoing the farm bill."

Raymond Lyons, route 1: "I'm not sure what I think about the President's veto of the farm bill. It rather looks like to me he's stalling on the farm problem. I haven't any opinion on the soil-bank proposal, not being too familiar with details of it."

Roy Fearn, Cisne: "Personally, I think the President did the right thing in vetoing the bill. As to the Farm Bureau's position on the bill, here's American Farm Bureau President Charles Shuman's verdict on the bill, 'Utterly bad farm legislation.' The bill contained a three price wheat structure which would have dumped wheat on the feed market and the 90 percent of parity requirement is what's got us in dutch up to the present. Most people I've talked to are in support of the Presidents position. As the soil-bank bill has been proposed, with all its attached features, it doesn't stand up as a good bill either."

Francis Troyer, route 2: "I really don't do much farming anymore, so I haven't given too much thought to the matter. Generally, however, I'd go along with the President on his veto of the bill as a pretty good idea. I'm not very informed on the soil-bank plan, so I'd better not comment on that."

Fred Clark, route 4: "I think what the President did was a good thing."

Miss Margaret Cline: "Marshall Sork farms our ground now and I don't keep up on these things much anymore, but I do know the farmer needs some help and they should pass some law that would do the job."

Lowell Cline, route 3: "They've been trying to get a farm bill for 10 or 12 years that would be workable and still they haven't done it. This one Ike vetoed would have helped the big farmer and done little for the small farmer. I'd like to see them pass a law that would help the poor man as well as the rich."

H. H. Glick: "I respect President Eisenhower more now that I see he had the intestinal fortitude to veto the farm bill."

Tell It Not in Gath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Time magazine of April 23, 1956:

TELL IT NOT IN GATH

When northern newsmen covering the Negro boycott of Montgomery buses swarmed into the city room of Alabama's Montgomery Advertiser (circulation 60,144), Editor in Chief Grover Cleveland Hall Jr., 41, did his best to answer their questions. He also asked questions—and decided from the answers that the North's own racial sins were being covered by its press in a conspiracy of silence. To prove his point, Hall launched a daily series on northern discrimination. Said he: "Whatever we reveal will not solve any problem Alabama has. Our purpose is to point out to the self-righteous North that it's not doing so damn well either in solving the race problem."

To get the series, Reporter Tom Johnson and other staffers telephoned northern editors and public officials to ask about discrimination in their areas. They found plenty, and Hall let the stories sprawl over his editorial page under the standing rebuking headline: "Tell It Not in Gath, Publish It Not in the Streets of Askelon."[1] When the Advertiser questions screwball Mayor Orville Hubbard (Time, March 5, 1951) of Dearborn, Mich., he bragged that not a single Negro could get a place to live in his city of 114,000, though 15,000 of them worked there. Said the mayor: "I am for complete segregation 1 million percent, on all levels."

DIRTY WASH

The Advertiser's series also reported that Chicago had assigned 150 police to the Trumbull Park development (Time, May 17, 1954) to prevent violence over an influx of Negro residents. Hall's wry comment noted that Chicago race relations "seem incredibly violent to a southerner," since "in all the Confederacy, there's not a single Negro family I know of that needs police protection."

Last week Hall angrily charged the Detroit press with burying news of the Rouse case (Time, April 16), in which a part American Indian family was forced to move out of a Detroit neighborhood after a mob rioted around the house in the belief that they were Negroes. Commented Hall: "One paper ran it on page 3, one on page 16, and one on page 60. One story was only three paragraphs long. Anything like that happening in Montgomery would have made the lead story in all of those papers. Yet they ignore their own dirty wash. It makes me mad."

Both in Detroit and Chicago, Hall found, editors deliberately play down racial troubles in their own cities. The papers feel that full coverage of racial outbreaks might make them worse. By common consent, newspapers, and radio stations in Chicago publish nothing about a tense race situation during its incipient stage; if a riot actually

[1] Thus David voiced the wish (II Samuel 1:20) that the slaying of King Saul and his son Jonathan in battle with the Philistines could be kept from the Philistines themselves lest they rejoice.

breaks out, they report it, but in the past tense as if it had already blown over, even if it should still be raging. Concludes Hall: "The race issue is not a southern dilemma but a national problem. Discrimination is discrimination everywhere, not just when it happens under a southern magnolia."

MIDDLE GROUND

Editor Hall's father, editor of the Advertiser before him, won a 1928 Pulitzer prize for editorials attacking the Ku Klux Klan. Young Hall worked as a police reporter, capital correspondent, and columnist before he took over the editor's chair in 1947. He was soon running one of the Nation's liveliest editorial pages. He has editorialized wittily, and sometimes savagely, on everything from post-office pens to international policy—with plenty of attention in between to blasting Alabama's Gov. James ("Kissin' Jim") Folsom. ("This untaught knave * * * lacks the grace and prudence to keep zippered his flapping mandible to conceal his void.")

On integration, Hall has taken a middle-ground position; he thinks it unfeasible for years to come in the Deep South, but he avoids preaching resistance. He has rapped the White Citizens' Councils as "manicured Kluxers," and given the Negro bus boycotters a fair shake in his news columns. But his latest campaign is drawing praise from southern extremists, and it won a laudatory resolution from the Alabama Legislature. Admits Hall: "I am, unhappily, comforting a lot of people I don't want to comfort."

Yet Hall's series is also turning the North's eyes on its own vulnerability. In an exchange of open letters, Hall prompted Editor James Wechsler of the New York Post to assign Reporter Ted Poston to do a series on anti-Negro discrimination in New York. This week, describing how it feels to be a Negro up North, Reporter Poston, a Kentucky-born Negro, agreed that there is no real Mason-Dixon line to American race prejudice. But he also made an important distinction that has slipped past Hall in his series thus far. Wrote Poston: "Prejudice up here is often a reflection of individual bias and ignorance. But it has neither the backing of the State nor the power of public opinion behind it."

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*——Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*——
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*——6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*——
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*——The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*——
Bender, George H., *Ohio*——120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*——
Bible, Alan, *Nev*——
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*——The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*——
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*——
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*——
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*——The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*——The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*——Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*——
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*——4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*——3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*——The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*——
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*——
Daniel, Price, *Tex*——
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*——
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*——
Duff, James H., *Pa*——
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*——
Eastland, James O., *Miss*——5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*——
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*——
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*——
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*——
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*——
George, Walter F., *Ga*——The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*——
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*——
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*——University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*——
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*——
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*——5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*——
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*——Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*——
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*——
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*——
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*——
Jenner, William E., *Ind*——
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*——
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*——
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*——4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*——
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*——
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*——
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*——
Laird, William R. III, *W. Va*——
Langer, William, *N. Dak*——2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*——Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*——
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*——
McClellan, John L., *Ark*——
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*——
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*——The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*——The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*——
Martin, Edward, *Pa*——
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*——4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*——
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*——
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*——5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*——122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*——The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*——
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*——
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*——Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*——
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*——
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*——
Purtell, William A., *Conn*——
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*——
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*——
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*——2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*——
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*——
Smathers, George A., *Fla*——
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*——Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*——
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*——4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*——
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*——
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*——
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*——
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*——4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*——2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*——
Wofford, Thomas A., *S. C*——
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*——Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Johnson of Texas, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Barkley, Anderson, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Morse, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Wofford, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Laird, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Wofford, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Laird, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Scott, Wofford, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Appendix

American-Canadian Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, coming from the State that has the greatest tie with our good neighbor to the north—Canada—I have been quite interested in, and have devoted much of my time and thoughts to, American-Canadian relations. We of the State of Maine know what wonderful people the Canadians are. The blood of Canada flows heavily in the veins of Maine.

Because of this, I was much interested in a recent speech made by a very prominent American who has reached the pinnacle within his own industry—or, more accurately put in the plural, within his own industries—Cyrus Eaton, originally a native of Canada, whose first paying job was as waterboy for a railroad construction crew in his native Nova Scotia.

What Mr. Eaton has to say on American-Canadian relations bears considerable study not only by Members of this legislative body and Americans generally, but also by members of the Canadian Parliament and Canadians generally. I invite close attention and consideration of his observations; and I ask unanimous consent that his speech of April 10, 1956, to the Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, in Quebec City, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Canada's vast unoccupied continent to the north constitutes both the fiercest challenge and the brightest promise that have ever fallen to one nation's lot in recorded history.

To occupy this now empty northern empire, master its rough terrain, conquer its stubborn climate, wrest its rich mineral resources, harness its mighty water powers, call for dynamic new pioneering. The leaders of this northward trek must not only be men of courage and vision, like the explorers and settlers of old, but must also command a broad knowledge of the miracles of modern science and a profound understanding of their practical applications.

TWENTIETH CENTURY BELONGS TO SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS

Truly, the 20th century is the age of the scientist and the engineer. And I am keenly aware that, in addressing this distinguished meeting of the Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, I have the privilege of speaking to a highly select group of the technical experts whose thought and action are exercising a profound influence on the course of Canadian and world history.

Let us examine the role of men of science in these exciting times in which we are living. On the constructive side, I like this tribute that one of the large mining companies recently paid your profession:

"An engineer is a trained, productive scientist who works with his hands, head, and heart to combine resources, materials, and techniques for human well-being. The mining, metallurgical, and geological engineers have pitted their skills, imagination, and perseverance against the challenges of resources locked in the earth."

On the somber side, the scientists, pure and applied, have invented the instruments of total annihilation. Science has, in fact, reached the advanced point where we may use it to lay civilization in ruins or to enter into an era of unprecedented plenty.

MODERN SCIENTIFIC MIRACLES DEMAND NEW NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL CONCEPTS

The scientist is trained to be objective in his work, and to seek and accept the truth, however it may conflict with preconceived hypotheses. In his dedication to his specialty, he perhaps holds himself more aloof than he should from the broader consequences and implications of his findings. I should like to see the physicist, the engineer, the metallurgist, the geologist, the astronomer, the biologist and the chemist also devote themselves, with their trained detachment, to discovering how we can overcome international and racial hatreds and move on to the life of peace and plenty for which all mankind yearns. While science has given us increasing power over our natural resources, we have made little progress in the arts of government and diplomacy. But the scientific miracles and technical advances of our times necessitate new thinking to arrive at new relationships between nations and within nations. The scientist should play a full part in the shaping of these fresh national and international concepts.

You can readily see from the broad responsibility I am suggesting you assume that I do not subscribe to the limited view that a witty Frenchman took when he described the main items of equipment of a geologist, for instance, as industry and a pair of legs. Scientific and technical training does not preclude knowledge and appreciation of art, literature, music, philosophy, religion, and nature, any more than it closes the door to the practice of politics and diplomacy. The scientists bid fair to become the aristocrats of the future, in fact, if they so choose.

In a world where most nations are plagued by pressure of population and scarcity of basic raw materials, Canada presents a happy paradox. Her area of 3,800,000 square miles, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the Great Lakes to the North Pole, ranks her second only to Soviet Russia in continental size. Long a world leader in mining, she has barely scratched the surface of her limitless mineral resources. Her manufacturing industries are growing by leaps and bounds. Her electric power industry, upon which mining and manufacturing depend for their energy requirements, is capable of almost infinite expansion. The spirit of venture enterprise is increasingly capturing the imagination of her 15,500,000 able and vigorous people.

CANADA COMES INTO HER OWN

As Canada comes into her own, opportunities galore beckon to everyone willing to work. No longer is it necessary, as was so commonly the case in my Canadian boyhood, for young men to go to the United States for gainful employment. No longer is it necessary, moreover, for Canadians who have made their mark in business and industry to go to England to accept a title in order to belong to the artistocracy. In some quarters, I realize, there is a smoldering aversion to any concept of Canadians as "hewers of wood and drawers of water." I have always considered these and kindred occupations as stepping stones to higher places. In fact, I am proud to profess that my first paying job was as water boy for a construction crew when the old Inter-Colonial Railroad first pushed into our part of Nova Scotia, while my second employment for money was in the lumber woods of my native province.

A man's first moral obligation is to earn his living, and his second is to be intelligent. If, while he puts his back into his work, he keeps his mind alive and learns everything he can about the industry with which he is associated, he can almost certainly count on steady advancement to a well-paying position of importance and responsibility. The curse of today's big corporations, and big government bureaus as well, is the intellectual indolence that lets most employes content themselves with confining their perception to only what immediately concerns their own small department. Lack of broad knowledge of the business is often defended on the ground that a man does not want to encroach on a fellow worker's department, but this is merely a lame excuse for mental laziness.

CANADIAN NORTH OFFERS RICHEST REWARDS

For men who love to work, and who take supreme satisfaction in meeting and overcoming formidable obstacles, the Canadian North offers the richest rewards, spiritual, and material. This is no playground for the easygoing and fun-loving folk who find their greatest happiness in the sultry pleasures of southern climes. But neither is it the barren and inaccessible wasteland, unfit for human habitation, that unimaginative and effete observers from a distance stamp it.

I have been fascinated by the northern tip of Quebec known by the romantic name of Ungava, with its mighty rivers and great mineral resources, especially its large tonnages of iron ore that roll right down to tidewater. Ungava means far away, and the Ungava country is tough as well as distant. The iron ore undertaking there will be a prodigious task. But I have been greatly encouraged by the forward-looking attitude of the government of Quebec, by the cooperation of its department of mines and of the geologists, engineers, and metallurgists of its great Laval and McGill Universities, and by the cordiality of the press.

STEEP ROCK SETS PACE FOR NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Let me illustrate the unlimited possibilities of the north by recalling the history of our Steep Rock Iron Mines. Steep Rock, of course, is not north in the same sense as the Yukon, the Northwest Territories, Ungava, and Labrador, but, topographically and cli-

matically, it provides a close parallel. Fifteen years ago Steep Rock was still a remote wilderness lake surrounded by moose pasture. Informed opinion in both Canada and the United States held it an engineering impossibility to uncover whatever iron ore lay buried deep beneath the bed of the lake. Jules Cross, the late Joe Errington, the late General Hogarth, Pop Fotheringham, and I took a different view, for which, I might add, we were branded as impractical visionaries.

It is an old and forgotten legend, now that Steep Rock has become one of the world's major iron-ore producers, possessing high-grade reserves recognized as ranking among the most extensive and valuable that are known. The success story started when Jules Cross supervised a handful of Indians in staking the original claims. Then Pop Fotheringham, a youthful graduate engineer with 7 years' experience in the Canadian gold-mining industry, took his young and pretty bride, also a university graduate, to live in a one-room log cabin on the shores of Steep Rock Lake. Snowshoes were their customary wintertime mode of transportation, and hungry bears and wolves were more frequent visitors than human beings. A dedicated all-Canadian team of geologists, engineers, chemists, metallurgists, and miners was gradually gathered at Steep Rock and they, with their wives and children, have made of nearby Atikokan a bustling, modern residential and business community. Such essentials as schools, water, sanitation, hospital, library, and recreation facilities have been evolved as joint projects of the community and the Steep Rock Co.

RECREATION AS WELL AS WORK STRESSED AT STEEP ROCK

Let me say a particular word about recreation, which I believe is almost as important as work. For the manner in which people spend their spare time has an important bearing on the freshness and enthusiasm with which they tackle their work. Reading is a pastime that can be pursued with pleasure and profit year around regardless of the weather. Real winter weather, such as we enjoy at Steep Rock, brings ideal conditions for invigorating diversions like skating, curling, hockey, and skiing. Fishing, hunting, baseball and swimming are among the popular sports of the warmer seasons.

Community growth and improvement have been substantially fostered, I believe, by my insistence that the headquarters of the Steep Rock Co. be located at the mines. There were those who advanced persuasive arguments in favor of Toronto or Montreal, or, indeed, Cleveland, which is the iron ore capital of the world. The location of top management at the scene of operations makes for greater efficiency and responsiveness and, at the same time, gives assurance of intelligent and sympathetic participation by these men and their families in community affairs. The telephone and the airplane have largely nullified distance, so that it is possible to keep in close and constant touch with metropolitan centers. Steep Rock's policy of on-the-job management can be adopted advantageously to create splendid new towns in the Canadian North.

AID TO STEEP ROCK HAS PAID OFF FOR FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS

The Federal Government played a necessary part in the Steep Rock development by building a spur from the Canadian National Railways' main line to the mines and erecting an ore dock at the head of Lake Superior, and the CNR realizes a lucrative return from these facilities. The Ontario government made its first major contribution to Steep Rock's beginnings by bringing in electric power, on which the Ontario Hydro Electric Power Commission now makes a handsome profit. More recently the provincial government has linked the once isolated area to the lakehead by highway; and automobiles now abound in Atikokan.

CANADA NEEDS OUTSIDE CAPITAL FOR DEVELOPMENT AND EXPANSION

One serious limitation on Canada's material progress lies in the finding of the tremendous capital funds required to finance new and expanding mining and manufacturing projects, as well as provide the electric power and transportation facilities to serve these new ventures. Money is simply not available in adequate amounts from private and public sources in Canada to meet the gargantuan demands of the many mines to open, factories to erect, oil wells to drill, roads to build, railroads to extend, airports to construct, harbors to improve, rivers to make navigable, telephone lines to string, and water power to harness. Certainly Canadian investors should be encouraged to put their funds in Canadian enterprises, and Canadian wage earners should be educated to the advantages of stock ownership in the companies in whose success they play a vital role. The Federal and Provincial Governments must also meet their full share of the cost of economic expansion. But outside capital will still be urgently needed to get the job done.

In the case of Steep Rock, the responsibility for financing not only the first mine but also most of the subsequent expansion has largely devolved upon American capital. A strict condition of the Canadian Government's initial cooperation with the Steep Rock project, in fact, prohibited the raising of any funds by the sale of securities to Canadian investors. Later, when this restriction no longer obtained, Canadian investors for some time displayed considerable reluctance to support the lusty Steep Rock infant.

COMPETITION FOR NEW CAPITAL IS KEEN IN UNITED STATES

Money from across the border may not be so easy to come by in the years immediately ahead, unless it continues to receive a cordial welcome from Canada. American industry has its own ambitious plans for expansion, at a cost running well into the billions within the next 5 years. Take railroads, electric power, and steel, three of the industries with which I am associated. The class I railroads of the United States are contemplating capital expenditures and material purchases totaling nearly $13 billion in the years 1956 through 1960. My own Chesapeake & Ohio Railway alone anticipate an outlay of $561 million during this 5-year period. The United States electric power industry estimates its capital requirements for the next 5 years at more than $22,500,000,000. The American steel industry must raise $3,500,000,000 in the same years to provide added annual capacity of 18,500,000 tons. Where will all the money come from for these and the many other growing industries of the United States, and for their Canadian counterparts? Obviously, in this tremendous competition for capital, Canada will find it in her own interest to maintain a friendly attitude toward would-be American investors.

FOREIGN CAPITAL AN IMPORTANT FACTOR IN UNITED STATES ECONOMIC GROWTH

When the United States was in its earlier days of economic growth, foreign capital was essential, and flowed in generous amounts from Great Britain, Holland, France, Germany, and Switzerland. Then London was the financial capital of the world. The sponsors of a new or large enterprise, whether located in North or South America, Africa or Asia, automatically looked to London for money. Two world wars have practically impoverished England, weakened her capitalistic system and shifted the banking leadership of the world to America. Fortunate it was for the free nations that the new world had attained sufficient financial strength to be able to carry on where the old world was forced to leave off. Now that America has assumed the mantle, there is this significant difference that deserves to be weighed with care: However much American money pours into Canadian enterprises, the United States has neither the desire nor the power to reduce Canada to the status of a small and dependent crown colony that she unhappily occupied at the turn of the century.

CANADIAN-UNITED STATES RELATIONS CHARACTERIZED BY COMMERCE, NOT CONQUEST

Canada and the United States have for more than a hundred years enjoyed the unique distinction, among neighbor nations of the world, of peacefully sharing an unfortified boundary of almost 4,000 miles. What they need from each other in raw materials or finished products, they obtain by commerce, not conquest. The two countries are the chief custodians of democracy and capitalism. In the postwar world, they stand out as the young and rapidly growing economic and political giants of the free world.

On the other side of the curtain, Soviet Russia has also emerged as a modern economic and political colossus determined to drive forward as rapidly as her 216 million people can be inspired and persuaded to develop and utilize the immense and varied resources of her 8,500,000 square miles stretching across two continents from the North Pacific Ocean to the Gulf of Finland, and from the Arctic to the Black Sea. Though the quickest and biggest economic effort in human history, under the communistic system of complete state ownership, Russia has reached the status of a major industrial power in a remarkably short time. Now she is relentlessly continuing to raise her production sights with the obvious intention of outstripping the rest of the world.

By 1960, Russia aims to increase her 1955 coal output of 390 million tons by better than 50 percent to 593 million tons, her 1955 steel output of 45 million tons by better than 50 percent to 68 million tons and her 1955 electricity output of 170 billion kilowatt-hours almost 90 percent to 320 billion kilowatt-hours. To grasp the full significance of these figures, compare them with 1955 American production of 470 million tons of coal, 117 million tons of steel and 546 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity. The Russians are also engaged in a concerted effort to educate and train industrial and technical experts. By 1960, the goal is 1 million graduates from universities and secondary technical schools. Russia now has 890,000 engineers and scientists compared with 760,000 in the United States. While the United States graduated 53,500 of them in 1954, Russia graduated 104,000.

RUSSIA'S MAMMOTH INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION MUST BE VIEWED DISPASSIONATELY

My purpose in citing these statistics is not to arouse hostility toward Russia, because I fervently believe that the most dangerous of sentiments is international hatred. War has never provided a satisfactory solution for international problems. The almost 40 years that have passed since World War I have given us sufficient perspective to appreciate the utter folly and futility of armed conflict among nations. The United States, believe it or not, entered into World War I on the side of France and Great Britain with high idealism. In the words of Woodrow Wilson, America felt that this was "a war to end wars" and fought "to make the world safe for democracy." The Allies were completely victorious in 1918. Yet, within a short time, there arose three of the most conspicuous dictatorships the world has ever known—Hitler, Mussolini and Stalin, and within 21 years, the world was plunged into another war more destructive and devastating than any catastrophe that had previously occurred in history. Again the Allies were victorious, and again the world is experiencing uneasy semi-peace, punctuated constantly by small "hot" wars here and big "cold" wars there.

The nations of the world, and the peoples within them, have always differed widely in

their economic, political and religious beliefs. We know from bitter experience that the irrationality of war cannot settle these differences. We must further recognize that, in this atomic age, warfare will more likely than not lead to the annihilation of both aggressor and defender. Mankind's survival rests upon the frank exchange of ideas and the sincere respect for one another's convictions.

CANADA BEST QUALIFIED NATION TO PROMOTE WORLD PEACE

Canada is probably in a better position than any other nation to exercise a profound influence for constructive world peace. She is admired and well liked throughout the world. With the United States, she has given a century-long demonstration that two nations can live side by side in amity. Within her own borders, she has long peacefully embraced two major races, representing two languages and two religions—both, of course, accidents of birth. This Canadian example of living in admiration and respect at home and abroad holds tremendous hope for the whole family of mankind, whose choice has narrowed down to coexistence or extinction.

Wait a Minute, Ave

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the House an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on Sunday, April 22, 1956, entitled "Wait a Minute, Ave" as follows:

WAIT A MINUTE, AVE

Gov. Averell (Honest Ave) Harriman gave a New York audience the lowdown the other day on what is wrong with the White House's foreign policy. One of its shortcomings, he explained, was the way that President Eisenhower went to Geneva to talk over the issues of war and peace with the leaders of the Soviet Union.

Thinking it over, here's how this strikes the New York governor now:

"Nothing could have served the purposes of Khrushchev more than that. Neutralist and pro-Communist elements were strengthened throughout the world. Free nations relaxed their efforts to build strength against communism. The Soviets scored a psychological break through that they have been exploiting ever since with economic and political penetration of the Middle East, south Asia, and the Far East."

His analysis must have been kind of a surprise to his audience. At least to those whose memory span is long enough to recall the events that led up to the Geneva conference last summer.

When the Kremlin began throwing out hints that it was eager to meet the Western leaders and "ease East-West tensions," the administration was castigated by Democratic spokesmen in Congress. They were critical because the White House wasn't leaping at the chance.

Some rather acid remarks were aired about the "rightwing" GOP warmongers who would rather plunge the Nation into war with the Russians than talk with them peacefully over the conference table.

In this Democratic version of then current events, Secretary of State Dulles was dragging his heels when he should be encouraging the plan to parley with Khrushchev and company.

In fact, it was the elder statesman of the Democratic Party in the Senate, Senator WALTER GEORGE, of Georgia, who made headlines by urging strongly that the administration meet with the Soviet leaders—to see if the threat of war couldn't be eased by talking things over. Shortly after, the White House agreed to do just that.

Whether the Geneva parley turned out well or not, let's don't brainwash the public, and rewrite history, to rearrange the facts to suit the political purposes of an election year.

The Air Pollution Control Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to announce to the Congress that the annual meeting of the Air Pollution Control Association will be held in Buffalo, May 20–24. Buffalo looks forward with eager anticipation to being host to over 700 scientists, engineers, and other representatives of industry and of the Federal, State, and local governments who will participate in the important meetings scheduled during the convention. Buffalo also invites the visitors to bring their wives and other members of their families, for there is no finer vacation spot in all the land—particularly in the spring of the year.

Members of the Air Pollution Control Association are largely responsible for the monumental progress that has been made in cleaning up the air in and around industrial communities. They have worked with industry, with government, and with individual citizens in an effort to obtain the closest cooperation in dealing with the air pollution problem. While there is still a long way to go, particularly because of the constantly increasing industrial activity in our country, the efforts of this association are reflected in improved conditions in scores of American communities.

Members of the APCA have helped to develop new and improved methods of checking air pollution. They have worked closely with public-spirited business leaders who were willing to invest millions upon millions of dollars in new equipment in the job of combatting the air pollution nuisance. The APCA has taught the public that, regardless of what type of fuel is used, unnecessary pollution can be eliminated when proper combustion methods are employed in the right kind of equipment. Among the many accomplishments of the air purification engineers is their successful attack on fly ash. Modern design and combustion methods provide for capturing these minute particles before they get out of the stacks. Furthermore, the fly ash itself is now being put to good use, particularly as a reinforcing agent in cement. In all, the APCA has made remarkable progress through the years and is determined to continue its outstanding work toward eliminating so far as possible the man-made pollutants in our atmosphere.

The Buffalo convention will attract representatives of industry and government from every section of our Nation and from Canada, for air pollution is not confined to any single area. The convention will feature papers by outstanding engineers and scientists, displays by manufacturers of air pollution control equipment, and plant tours in Buffalo, Niagara Falls, Lackawanna, and Tonawanda. As a lake front city with a population of 600,000 persons, Buffalo itself will offer an interesting study for the APCA visitors. We are an important railroad center and a lumber market, and we produce flour and grain mill products, plastics, steel, and chemicals. We also have manufacturers of busses, electric equipment, and rubber products. Buffalo has foundries, machine shops, meat-packing houses, refineries, and a variety of other manufacturers.

A local committee, whose honorary chairmen are the mayors of Buffalo and Niagara Falls, has been set up to provide the necessary arrangements for the 1956 APCA convention. Buffalo is proud to be the site of this event, and I am certain that the association will be happy that it has chosen this city for this convention.

Reaction to the Farm Bill Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL M. HARDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, now that President Eisenhower has vetoed the farm bill passed by this body over my opposition and over the opposition of a great many other Members from the midwestern Corn Belt, it might be well to assess public reaction to the farm bill controversy. Personally, I believe reaction to the President's courageous action was very good, for the American people admire an honest man and the President certainly proved that he fits that description when he vetoed what he and many of us knew to be a bad farm bill.

I have clipped 4 editorial viewpoints on the veto from 4 of the leading newspapers in the district I represent—the Sixth Indiana District. Only one of these newspapers, the Terre Haute Star, represents a major metropolitan area. Plainfield, Noblesville, and Clinton are not large cities but they are trading centers for the rich agricultural counties of central Indiana. The editors of these papers, Mrs. Ellen Curtis of Plainfield, Jim Neal of Noblesville, and George Carey of Clinton, know farming and they know their farmers. These are their views:

[From the Plainfield (Ind.) Messenger of April 19, 1956]

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO

(By Mrs. Ellen C. Curtis, editor)

Whether or not you argee with the decision made by President Dwight D. Eisenhower to veto the farm bill (H. R. 12, designated as the Agricultural Act of 1956), every-

one will have to admit that he did not hesitate to do what he honestly believed was best for the country; that he did not hesitate because it was an election year; that in no sense of the word, did he make a political football out of the bill, and that his words of explanation rang with sincerity and honesty.

We can remember no President who has been more honest with the people of the country or who has always placed the welfare of the entire country above personal gains and above the welfare of minority groups. He explained carefully the parts of the bill which he felt would prove detrimental to both the farmer and the country and he expressed his keen disappointment in the failure of Congress to pass the soil-bank legislation without the additions and subtractions which made it impractical.

The President told Congress in his veto message and the people in his radio and television explanation later that his decision had been reached only after "thorough consideration and searching my mind and conscience." He made some bold and decisive statements but even his critics can never say that he did not make himself clear as to the reason for the veto.

The commonsense and somewhat old-fashioned law of supply and demand, a plan as old as time, can still be applied in the realm of economy with more degree of success than any other yet found. The big problem facing the agricultural world today is research and the Agriculture Department has allotted approximately $100 million for the purpose of finding new uses for the farmer's products so that industry will absorb any surpluses which result after the food and feed demand has been supplied.

If all governemntal appointess, elected officers, and men and women in authority would follow the example of President Eisenhower before making decisions, the country would be better served and in the long run much, much better satisfied.

The President has set an example in all his decisions that might well be emulated in every branch of Government and by every person, who in any way, is indebted to the people of the United States for his high position of trust.

[From the Noblesville (Ind.) Daily Ledger of April 18, 1956]

THE COUNTY LINE

(By Jim Neal)

IN THE BEST INTEREST

In November of 1952, when the American people elected Dwight D. Eisenhower President of the United States by the greatest vote in history, they felt that they had finally found a man who could rise above partisan politics and serve as the leader of all the people, not merely the Party he represented.

Yesterday he proved, as he has time after time in the intervening months, that he could not govern by "political expediency." This Nation has been governed that way so long that most Americans have come to accept it as a replacement for truly democratic processes.

Signing the farm bill, a poor compromise of a serious problem, would have been "politically expedient." But the bill was not the answer. The President knew this and, despite the inability of the Democratic majority in Congress and many Republican leaders to see beyond political advantage, he vetoed the bill.

He vetoed the bill because it resumes the very same system which created the problem in the first place. Although the bill established the President's requested soil bank, it defeated its purpose by reestablishing high, rigid price supports on basic crops.

It's a simple economical enigma. You attempt to reduce production by taking land out of cultivation and at the same time encourage the farmer to produce more by guaranteeing him a subsidy for his production. You pay him for "banking" his land, but is there any farmer who would not intensify his cultivation through fertilization and produce as much, if not more, on the land he has left—if he is subsidized?

The farmer may pocket a few more dollars temporarily, but has anything been solved? The taxpayers have spent millions of dollars, but the situation is just as critical as it ever was.

No one seems to agree, including the farmers themselves, on exactly what should be done. But the President has presented a substitute program offering up to a billion dollars to be used this crop year. This program offers not only emergency relief for the distressed farmer, it also offers a solution to the problem. In challenging Congress either to override his veto or to pass a better bill, the President has made it clear that he will not stoop to partisan politics even at the expense of losing farm votes.

There is every reason to believe that new uses for agricultural crops and an expanding population will eventually solve this problem of supply and demand—a basic principle in the free enterprise system. But it is essential that the Government preserve the family farm in the interim. The Eisenhower administration is dedicated to that end.

Unfortunately, others are dedicated to gain political victory and party control. This would seem to be the sole criteria on which partisan politics functions in an election year.

[From the Daily Clintonian, Clinton, Ind., of April 17, 1956]

(By George L. Carey, editor and publisher)

If the American people needed any further proof that President Eisenhower places his duty to his country above his own personal welfare or that of his party, they have it now. Probably never before in the history of the Nation has a President been forced into such a clear choice as was Ike when he decided to veto the hybrid mess that was presented to him under the guise of a farm bill.

It would have been the easiest thing on earth for the President to give Congress a verbal dressing down for passing such a bill * * * and then to have signed it. It would have been the politically correct thing to submit to the pressure of cheap politics and legislative cowardice and to have signed the bill. Almost any other man in political office in the United States would have done so * * * but not Ike.

The bill was had and he knew it. It would undo some of the advances toward sanity in agricultural relief already made, his economic advisers told him * * * but to sign it would be good politics.

Many of us wondered what the President would do. Would he have the nerve to do what he knew to be right, even in the face of the certainty that his action would be widely misunderstood and would be used as ammunition by the opposition, which had almost nothing worth anything to throw at him in the coming campaign?

Could any of us have withstood similar pressure? We can answer that for ourselves, but the President wrote his own answer in bold strokes and without any apology.

He expressed only his intense disappointment and regret that a good farm bill could not have been passed.

"Our farm families are suffering reduced incomes. They had a right to expect legislation to help solve their problems," he told the Nation "This bill does not meet their needs."

That was the only consideration that was worth anything to Ike. It was not whether signing or not signing would add to his political popularity and help him be reelected next fall. It was a bad bill, "contradictory and self-defeating. It would lead to such serious consequences in additional surpluses and production controls as to further threaten the income and welfare of our farm people."

So the bill in Ike's opinion had to be vetoed for the best interests of the Nation. He did just that.

Cheap politicians now have the campaign material they have wanted so long. They have something * * * however thin and distorted it may be * * * that they can throw at Eisenhower. They had hoped to use his health as a campaign issue * * * but his health was never better. They had hoped to find some taint of dishonesty among his associates, but anything they could dig up was so slight in the light of what appeared almost every day under the Truman administration, as to be worthless.

But they have their issue now, for Ike has vetoed the farm bill. They maneuvered and worked to get him into the spot where he was, hoping he would have the old-fashioned guts to do just what he did. Now they can make the best of it and it might work * * * except for two little things.

In the first place the American farmer isn't as dumb and as greedy as some politicians think he is. He wants to find his way back to economic soundness and he knows that he will never find it as long as artificial subsidies create additional surpluses to plague him. The modern American farmer is a businessman with a surprising knowledge of what is good business. By and large the American farmers have recognized the economic soundness of what Ike and his administration have been trying to do for them.

The second thing the boys who sacrificed the farmers' welfare in order to force the President to veto a bad bill forgot is that Americans admire sincerity * * * and they know it when they see it.

Every American farmer, no matter how much he wants or deserves a better break economically than he has been getting of recent years, knew that Ike was 100 percent sincere when he said he had vetoed that farm bill "only after thorough consideration and searching my mind and my conscience." It takes a wise man, a conscientious man and a strong man to do what Ike has chosen to do. It takes the kind of a man the American farmer can look to for a permanent solution to the farm problem.

We all know that Ike was right. We know that it was foolish to attempt to set up a soil-bank plan to remove land from production and attempt to cut down surplus while, on the other hand, we shot parity payments up so high as to furnish an incentive for more overproduction and spell defeat for the soil-bank plan. We all know that there can be no solution of the farm problem as long as surpluses are encouraged and stored to hang as a threat over the market.

In the not-too-distant future the farm problem will solve itself when population has grown to such an extent that food consumption will balance production in this country. That time is not more than a decade away. In the meantime, the only solution is either to cut down on production or to find new uses and markets for the farmers' products. The so-called farm relief bill that President Eisenhower had the personal bravery to veto would have done neither. It would only have gone back toward ways and means that have been tried and found wanting.

It was a political measure * * * a hybrid monstrosity, for which many Members of Congress would not have voted had they not been pretty sure Ike would have the intestinal fortitude to veto it. They'll never override his veto. You can be sure of that.

[From the Terre Haute (Ind.) Star of April 17 1956]

THE FARM BILL VETO

(By Mr. James Benham, editor)

The nation—and that includes the farmers—can be thankful that President Eisenhower possessed the intelligence and courage to veto the so-called farm bill concocted by Congress in an election-year spell of jitters.

The bill was not a farm bill in the first place. It was a concoction of compromises stirred up by scared Congressmen who were afraid not to throw some kind of political sop to the farmers on the eve of an election. It made no difference that at least a very large percentage of farmers wanted nothing of the kind offered.

The farmers who have given any study to the problem have long since realized that the answer to whatever problems they have lies not in the Government paying a subsidy for the accumulation of more surpluses with every increase in surpluses standing as an increase in the threat against gearing farm income to the trend of the remainder of the national economy.

Many Republicans were shedding tears in their beer last night over the imagined repercussions of the Presidential veto. As this is written, we have not heard the President's own comment on the veto but certainly he has many avenues of defense for his action. His action was not a gesture of throwing the farmer to the economic wolves, nor was it a demonstration of narrow egotism—my way or none.

The truth is that the President still has a chance to get his personal nine-point program adopted. There was only one point of his program incorporated in the bill which he vetoed—the soil bank. Competent legal opinion holds that this plan may be started by the Secretary of Agriculture under existing authority.

Congressional Quarterly to which the Star subscribes and which keeps a very accurate and close watch on all matters relating to Congress, gives us the following review of the status of the eight other points in the President's program as of last weekend.

Stepped-up surplus disposal: No action.

Strengthened commodity programs, 9 separate provisions: Two enacted (school-milk program, extension, easing acreage restrictions for durum wheatgrowers); 1 passed by both Chambers and in conference (Sugar Act extension); 2 in the farm bill passed by the Senate, but deleted in conference (exemption from wheat-marketing quotas where entire production is used on the farm, and a requirement that parity prices for cotton be computed on the average quality of the crop); 1 deleted by a Senate amendment (expansion of the noncommercial wheat area); 3 unacted upon (quantity allotments to replace acreage allotments for cotton, authority to sell low-grade Government wheat for feed, elimination of a minimum national acreage allotment for peanuts).

Dollar limit on price-support loans to individual farmers: Approved by the Senate, but deleted by the conference committee.

Rural-development program for low-income farmers: No action.

Great Plains program: No action.

Increased funds for research: No action.

Reorganization of the Farm Credit Administration: No action.

Exemption of farmers from the Federal tax on gasoline used on the farm; signed into law.

Spearheading the argument that Benson could set up a soil bank right now without further congressional approval is Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Republican, of Utah. He filed a statement January 24 with the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee prepared by the American Law Division of the Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service.

WATKINS said the two competent legal opinions he got from the Service convinced him Benson could go ahead with a soil bank under authority granted in the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936 and the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act of 1948.

So a veto, along with a promise to salvage what little he likes in the farm bill by pressing for separate legislation may well boost President Eisenhower's chances with farmers instead of making political hay for the Democrats.

And, of course, the veto does not just leave a void. It allows continuance of the flexible farm-price supports enacted in 1954.

Our Home and God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which I was requested to write earlier this year for the National Sunday School Association for National Family Week.

The editorial has been printed in a number of church and Sunday school publications.

There are three institutions that are basic in the fundamental growth and strength of our great Nation, namely, the home, the church, and the school. It is essential that we protect and preserve the family life in order that we may have strong churches that will care for the spiritual needs of our people and good schools that will continue to provide for us an intelligent citizenry.

The family life is also most important in the upbringing of our youth, who will be not only the future citizens of this Nation but in the immediate future will take over the preservation and protection of this great Nation of ours.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Blessed are they who build families
For they are the builders of the world."
—*Leland Foster Wood.*

The home is the basic unit of our society and someone has truly said, "as goes the home, so goes the Nation."

Far too often parents have left the responsibility of the early training of their children to the church, the public school, and the community.

While the above-mentioned institutions and agencies are important in the life of our children, the childhood training in a home determines largely the adult life of the individual.

The fundamental responsibility of every father and mother is the nurture of the religious life in the home. Fortunate indeed is the child that is nurtured in a home where the family altar is preserved in the worship of their Heavenly Father. As these children grow and reach adolescent age, they will have a knowledge of their Creator and an abiding faith in their Lord and Saviour. These will serve as an anchor and be of inestimable value when trials and temptations beset them—as they most certainly will.

Some years ago a very prominent man told me how important he felt the early home training and Sunday school had been in helping his own son through the age period of 14 to 18 years. This man stated if our young people have the background to get through this period, we can feel that their future is secure. This has been my personal observation.

Not only that, I am deeply indebted to my parents, who have gone to their heavenly reward, for the early training in a Christian home—for the hours my mother spent in giving me instruction in the Scriptures—for their parental prayers and for a home where the atmosphere was conducive to the development of Christian character.

While it is true that there have been many changes in our home life within the last 50 years, the fact remains that the stability of our economic, social, and religious life still depends on the family affections and a devotion to spiritual ideals.

If we are to continue to enjoy the heritage left us by those who have given us this great Nation, we must again restore the family altars in the home and give our children and their children the same sound, fundamental Christian training for which we are indebted to those who have gone before. We break faith with them and with God if we do less.

Youth Looks at the Constitution of the United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an oration, one of the finest I have ever heard, delivered by Edmund C. Toomey in the American Legion oratorical contest of 1956.

At a luncheon given by Mayor John B. Hynes, of Boston, on March 17, 1956, at which luncheon I was the guest of honor, this young man delivered the oration. It electrified the several hundred persons who were present. It is very evident that, as long as we have young men like Edmund Toomey, the State is secure and the preservation of our Nation is assured.

This young man, Edmund C. Toomey, is 16 years of age; he is an honor student in the senior class of the Gate of Heaven High School, in Boston. This school, under its pastor, Rev. John T. Powers, is staffed by the Sisters of St. Joseph. Last year, as a junior, Edmund was judged the winner in the intermediate division of the Archdiocesan Catholic Youth oratorical contest, the first one he ever entered. This year, he was selected as the city and State winner in that national Voice of Democracy contest.

Sponsored by the Michael Perkins Post, South Boston, Mass., Edmund has gladly entered the National American Legion oratorical contest to tell as many as possible how he, a youth of this wonderful country of ours, felt about the Constitution of the United States.

Edmund C. Toomey, son of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph F. Toomey, 41 M Street,

South Boston, Mass., is an American youth we can well be proud of.

The oration delivered by this fine young man is as follows:

YOUTH LOOKS AT THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"The torch you threw to us we caught,
Ten million hands will hold it high."

These memorable words of R. W. Lillard in his answer to the challenge of Flanders Field have a very deep meaning for Americans. For indeed, we have as our heritage something which not only should be held high but must be held high. And yet, when we consider it, we sometimes disagree on just who are the "we" who must hold aloft the light of our treasure.

As a youth of America, as a son of liberty, and as a lover of freedom, I claim the right of recognition in that number, I claim the privilege of shouting to the world, "Yes; it is mine and it can be yours—it is—the Constitution of America." Oh, yes; today as never before in all history the United States Constitution stands steadfast as a brilliant beacon of hope to the downtrodden masses of the world. It is a blessing from God for which we are both humbly grateful and justly proud. It is perhaps our most precious possession and yet it is not ours. Rather, the Constitution is something we must share more and more of and, at the same time, increase its benefits one hundredfold.

Ah, yes; it is a strange thing—this Constitution. But then it was founded by strange men. Men who left prosperous jobs, good homes, and came to a land inhabited by savages. You ask, what could they expect to find here which they did not already possess? They hoped to find God—and they found God—and in return for their faith and love, He gave them through their leaders, this magnificent thing of which we speak.

But just what is this Constitution and what specific connection has it with America's youth?

As you consider the Bible to religion, you may consider the Constitution to material living. It is the cornerstone of democracy, the essence of liberty. The Constitution is our citizenship. It guarantees to us the full exercise of our divinely granted personal rights. This magnificent document is both tangible and abstract. It is tangible in that it is a written document insuring for us the right to petition and assembly, free speech, free press, and worship. It is abstract in that it is the invisible characteristic which separates America and its individualism from certain other types of government and their slavery. It is the smile on an American's face, the twinkle in his eye, the laugh in his heart.

And as youths of America—yes, as youths—indeed, there are numerous things brought about by the Constitution, for which we, as young Americans are to be infinitely thankful—little things and big things, insignificant and essential—our very lives—for not one of us can deny that the Constitution guards us from undue war and unjust oppression, the right to go to the corner drugstore for a coke, or to the empty lot to play baseball, or to go to school. Ah, to go to school. What other country in the world offers such educational facilities to her youth? What other country offers such reward for studious endeavor? To worship in whatever manner of our choice, to show allegiance to our parents and our friends, instead of being the absolute servant of the state. These things seem common, everyday things to us. But stop a while, lift your eyes to our brothers across the seas. Do these things belong to each and every one of them? Is their life a book of happiness or is it an endless story of misery? Only by doing this, by comparing ourselves with those less fortunate, can we appreciate what our life under the American Flag is and will be. Only by doing this, can we realize how much in need of prayer are our poor brothers bonded in lifelong servitude.

Yes, all of these things from beginning to end are our precious heritage from our beloved Constitution.

To us—the youth of America—falls the joyful task, burdened with the sweet toils of love, of living and understanding the Constitution in our young lives now, so that should it ever become necessary to defend it with our lives, they, being a very part of it, will leap at the chance to drench the world with the blood of freedom. Optimism, the special attribute of youth makes us well fit for this job, for, with light hearts and high ideals we set out on the road of life armed with the Constitution, the banner of justice and smiled upon by the source of all justice.

It is indeed a heavy burden placed on our young shoulders. For, as children of today and leaders of tomorrow, there rests with us the fate of the world. Yes; we youth need encouragement and we need courage, but above all, youth must fight. You may have heard the saying, "With every privilege comes a responsibility." And so it is with youth and the Constitution; we enjoy its advantages and it is our responsibility to preserve these advantages. It is for this that we must fight.

Unfortunately, there are powers in the world today which would destroy our beloved Constitution. They are ever envious of the fact that for over 150 years this mere piece of paper, as it were, has governed a people justly, and paved the road for the universal acceptance of the dignity of man.

And we who are not yet accounted men, who can offer neither expert skills nor brilliantly trained minds for the furtherance of the Constitution, have, what I consider, a far more precious gift to offer—the eagerness and enthusiasm of youth qualify us as front rank soldiers. It may well be said that the motto of youth could be, "Ours is not to reason why." Our complete trust in and undying love for the Constitution make us ideal defenders of it. Armed with unselfishness, our one desire is to spread the doctrine of democracy, as written in the Constitution, throughout the whole world. Oh, not as a conqueror who brings new ways and new customs but as a loving brother who shows by his good example the joy of virtue and the bliss of goodness.

This, yes, this, is the work of youth in behalf of the Constitution. This is what millions of voices cry out day by day, "Come, and see it. Come, and partake of it. Come, and learn to love it. It is freedom. It is America and its Constitution."

Oh, yes; may it ever rule. May it ever reign. The very essence of patriotism.

God save the Constitution of the United States of America.

In Memoriam of Carl J. Trauerman, Secretary-Manager, Mining Association of Montana

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the mining industry of the West, as well as that of Montana, will miss the guiding hand of Carl J. Trauerman, secretary-manager of the Mining Association of Montana, who passed away in Butte December 17, 1955. Known to thousands of mining men throughout the country, Mr. Trauerman always was in there pitching whenever work was to be done and policies to be formulated at meetings and conferences for the benefit of the domestic mining industry.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a memorial to this outstanding citizen of Montana.

There being no objection, the memorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN MEMORIAM, CARL JOSEPH TRAUERMAN, 1885–1955

Carl J. Trauerman, for many years the secretary-manager and guiding spirit of the Mining Association of Montana, died at his home in Butte on Saturday, December 17, 1955, following a heart attack a week earlier. The mining industry, the State of Montana, and the Association in particular, have lost an able engineer, a highy respected citizen, and a devoted worker and leader.

Mr. Trauerman was born in Pittsburgh, Pa., on October 5, 1885, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Bernard S. Trauerman. He was educated at the Pittsburgh Central High School and at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology where he studied mining and metallurgy. After 2 years of engineering experience in Pittsburgh, he was drawn to western mining and came to Butte in 1906 as an assayer for F. Augustus Heinze. In the next few years he gathered valuable experience by working in mining and metallurgical ventures throughout the West, including periods in Montana, Idaho, Colorado, Utah, Nevada, California, Arizona, and New Mexico. In these years he was always close to the problems of the mine developer and operator, covering practically every phase of mining from the sampling of a prospect through mine development and management to the design and operation of mills and smelters. In this period he made a number of contributions to mineral technology, notably in the Rothwell-Trauerman designs for thickeners and drum filters. During World War I he was a manganese and tungsten producer and is credited with being the first to concentrate pink manganese successfully for the steel industry.

In 1920 Mr. Trauerman extended his interests to include the oil and gas business in Montana, and in 1923 he became editor of the Montant Natural Resource Bulletin, a service which provided mineral information to hundreds of newspapers and business publications. In 1926, he opened a brokerage firm in Butte and maintained his interest in this firm until 1938. Meanwhile he still had active interests in mining, and in 1935 purchased control, for himself and a group of associates of the Ruby Gulch Mining Co.

In the midtwenties Mr. Trauerman turned his attention more and more to problems of mining, finance, management, taxation, and law. These activities soon drew him into publicity work, and he became a familiar figure and public speaker on the economic aspects of mining. Out of this background he and others saw the need for a new and active association of mining men and companies in Montana, and thus was born the present Mining Association of Montana. Mr. Trauerman served seven terms as its president before becoming secretary-manager, a position which he held until his death. His experience in the Association made him an influential adviser on mining legislation. He appeared before many legislative and congressional committees, and he served for many years on the resolutions committee of the American Mining Congress. He joined the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers in 1912, and also held

membership in the Northwest Mining Association, Idaho Mining Association, Colorado Mining Association, Last Chance Gulch Mining Association, Madison County Mining Association, Beaverhead County Mining Association, Montana Society of Engineers, and about a dozen public-service groups such as the YMCA and the American Red Cross.

In the late 1930's and the 1940's Mr. Trauerman became associated with the Montana Bureau of Mines and Geology in Butte supervising the Bureau's Mineral Resource Inventory of Montana. The results of this work were published by the Bureau in three volumes: A directory of Montana mining properties, published in 1940 and revised in 1949; and a similar directory of oil and gas industries, published by the Bureau in 1943; and a bibliography of Montana geology and mineral resources. After he completed this work he discontinued his official connection with the Bureau, but to the day of his death he was one of the Bureau's strongest and most loyal supporters.

His writing was extensive. In addition to the Bureau publications just mentioned, he founded this newsletter of the association in 1945, and for many years served as Montana correspondent of the Wall Street Journal and some 30 other papers.

In 1944 he was appointed chairman of the committee on mine finance of the Western Governors' Conference, and in 1953 he became one of the original delegates to the newly formed Western Governors' Mining Advisory Council. In November 1955 he attended the Minerals Policy Conference sponsored by the council in Sacramento, and was instrumental in drafting certain parts of the report, especially those relating to public relations. Three weeks later, though not yet rested from the strain of the Sacramento meeting, he felt that he should not miss the business meetings of the Northwest Mining Association in Spokane. He stood the pressure for a few days after the Spokane meeting, and in that time he checked the draft of recommendations written at the Sacramento meeting, and transacted other association business. But the strain began to tell, and his heart, weakened a few years earlier, suffered another attack from which he rallied temporarily, only to come finally to rest on December 17, 1955. Thus ended a life which was given with single-minded devotion to the support and improvement of the basic industry of mining.

Mr. Trauerman is survived by his wife, Mrs. Frances Sullivan Trauerman, to whom he was married in Missoula on April 28, 1913; by a sister, Mrs. Nathan Rothschild of Fort Wayne, Ind.; by a niece, Miss Madeline Rothschild, also of Fort Wayne; by a nephew and niece, Mr. and Mrs. Everett Griffin of San Francisco; and by a brother-in-law and sister-in-law, Mr. and Mrs. John A. Sullivan of Oakland, Calif.

Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a growing problem in our country is the increasing amount of crime and delinquency among our young people. Professional studies have been made by many persons and groups, and National and State legislatures have struggled with solutions to this problem. I would like to call the attention of all those interested in solving the problem of juvenile delinquency to an article written by Joseph Paul Bitzer of the high-school faculty in Lemmon, S. Dak. Mr. Bitzer wrote this report after careful study and it has commanded much attention in educational circles. I hope the ideas he has presented will serve to stimulate action in other areas.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

(By Joseph Paul Bitzer)

Juvenile delinquency is considered to be one of the big social problems throughout the United States today. Cooperation and understanding are needed to solve it, and just as soon as the day comes when young people will know that they can no longer get by in doing things which are considered to be wrong, delinquency for the juvenile will no longer be the serious problem it is today.

DEFINITION

Today, juvenile delinquency includes the young people or teen-agers who do not live according to the mores or the customs of those persons living in their particular neighborhood, area, and in many situations the entire United States. It used to be that juvenile delinquents were only concerned with misdemeanors but today they are also very active with felonies.

CAUSES

It isn't that young people do not know right from wrong, but the trouble is that most of these teen-agers realize that if they do violate some rule or custom that in many situations little or nothing will be done about it. At this time it should be made clear that juvenile delinquents when caught and when they are punished, they are usually poor sports.

Older persons who are to bring up and train the young people properly often do not take an interest in this very important task—giving the child an opportunity to live a good life by being raised properly from the time born until ready to assume mature responsibility. Many persons who have the responsibility of raising children properly are not qualified to do so and in such situations the children are often an improvement over the parents or guardians.

CORRECTION

Have a responsible person or organization take charge of the delinquent and with proper management of the boy or girl, it is surprising how quickly the person involved will no longer be a delinquent. Correction can only be effective if patience and understanding are included in the qualifications of the person or the group doing the correcting. Often persons who should know the answers haven't the slightest idea of what is going on and in such situations the delinquent becomes worse rather than better.

Good home life is very important but it isn't always the answer. There are many factors which enter such as the school, places of entertainment, other environments, and a natural desire on the part of many to copy from others in doing things which will gain recognition of some sort. Society as a whole is responsible for juvenile delinquency. Every human being today can do something to prevent delinquency and every human being can do something to help correct it. And when correcting or preventing, everyone concerned must be very sincere. Again as mentioned before, too many delinquents know only too well that many parents and other responsible persons or should be responsible persons do not care. And many delinquents also realize that many supposed to be parents, etc., who are supposed to be shining examples of what is good and proper are only a "bunch of phonies" and know it is ridiculous to even pay attention to them. The effective way to correct a bad situation is to correct it now—do something about it.

PREVENTION

Prevention should be considered even before correction. It may appear to be more expensive in the beginning but it will be more economical for everyone concerned in the long run. "An ounce of prevention is still worth a pound of cure." People are more conscious of juvenile delinquency today because of the different environments or the "conditions of life." Things are different from what they were years ago and today we notice these things much more. We probably had some bad offenders years ago the same as today, but the world was still smaller at that time—we didn't have the rapid means of communication and the swift means of transportation we have today. Again the conditions of life, today, are making this social problem, delinquency, more noticeable than ever before. Young people are more aware of what other young people are doing and they are going in for big activities the same as the country is going in for big business, etc. If each of us would do his part in preventing delinquency, it is surprising how few teenagers would even think of doing something they should not be doing.

THE SCHOOL PROBLEM

We hear a great deal about the school and juvenile delinquency. We also realize that there is a school problem throughout the Nation. Delinquency gets a good beginning in the school because here is a center where many students are forced to assemble for supposed-to-be-learning purposes. Many types of personalities and ideas are represented in the school and students have learned one thing for sure and this is that school authorities in most cases are more afraid of the students than the students are of the school authorities. These students are not born bad but when they are together they realize, by cooperation, they can really go to town and have a good time and worry little about getting caught and being punished.

It is surprising how successful adults could be if they would practice some of the splendid cooperation for the good which the delinquents carry on for the supposed-to-be bad. Young people are quick to notice that in many situations adults who are to be playing the game fair are just as rotten if not more so than they themselves are.

Students are usually very honest in explaining what they are up to and why. A group of students told me the other day that they realized that they were not acting properly but why worry when they will win out anyway. These same students told me how they saw to it that every year new teachers would come to the school and they also explained how they got rid of the teachers they didn't care for. The interesting thing is that the students knew what they were talking about and they had confidence in themselves.

Here is a typical pattern. Certain students do not care to study or perhaps they just do not care for a certain teacher. Rather than come to school and give the teacher a chance and perhaps learn something from the teacher, the students go home, make up a story of some sort which will shock the parents and then the parents go to the school board, and the school board doesn't care for any trouble, so the superintendent is questioned and he and the other administrators feel it best to avoid trouble so the teacher is fired—does not get a contract for the next year and then the teacher is given sugar-coated explanations which are to build up his ego rather than have him feel that the students don't want him, and the school board and administrators do not care to back him up, even if the teacher could be right and the students wrong.

Students are not always entirely to blame for things they shouldn't do but do. At times teachers who are jealous of administrators and other teachers actually encourage the students to do things which should not be done. It is not unusual to find school people who "double-cross one another" and then put the blame on the students. In this way the public feels that it is the students—bad boys and girls—and not much is said about it. Again, the students have little to worry, if any at all, because they know how things have gone in the past.

Here is a typical situation. A teacher was stabbed with a knife by a student. This is terrible. If the teacher would have stabbed the student instead of the way it was, public opinion would have formed a lynching party or would have at least had thoughts of one. The student admits that he killed the teacher, any now the wheels of justice start moving. The result, the student got one-tenth of the penalty a person usually would get for murder, and in many cases the student would receive no punishment whatsoever, and the student is made a hero in any situation.

Another problem in school is that students are supposed to live a certain life in school and while in school they are to be trained for good citizenship when their time comes to be responsible citizens and leaders of the community and the Nation and the world. These young people are almost forced to live two lives. They know what life is like on the outside and when they spend 6 hours or so under artificial school conditions they become confused and ask themselves why worry or take the just don't care attitude.

Schools could and should be practical and often teachers and administrators could learn a few lessons from the students, but generally speaking the school should be operated so students go to school to learn to do what they are told, know what is meant by responsibility, and by this procedure the students will be able to "give and take" much better when it is their turn—when they are in charge of things themselves.

Many persons put all of the blame on the school board. School board members, in many situations, are not supposed to be professional educators. And if the administrators would do their part and the teachers would cooperate, and the students would be trained to do their part, our schools would then be functioning in such a way that the school problems of today would be a thing of the past and students could actually say it is a privilege to go to school and they would also learn something and then they would qualify for their important role in life when the time came. Cooperation and understanding are needed.

CONCLUSION

Juvenile delinquency is one of the major social problems in the United States today. The only way we can remedy this evil is to let the offenders know that they can no longer get by with the things they have been doing and are doing. The evil is recognized and now it is time to do something about it—put a stop to it now.

Mandatory Inspection of Poultry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, one of the most vital pieces of proposed health legislation before Congress today is a measure to provide mandatory inspection of poultry for wholesomeness and cleanliness. Such legislation is long overdue. It is important for the welfare of consumers, the poultry workers, and the poultry industry.

The General Federation Clubwoman, the official publication of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, carried an excellent article on the need for this legislation in its March issue. Under the title "Is the Poultry You Buy Good Enough To Eat" the magazine described in vivid terms the flow of filthy and diseased poultry to market. I believe the article, written by Earl W. Jimerson, president of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, AFL–CIO, provides an excellent summary of the conditions existing in a part of the poultry industry and the consequences of these conditions to the consumer.

The article advocates the enactment of S. 3176 as the means for coping with the problem of diseased and contaminated poultry. I am happy to be the sponsor of this measure.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article from the General Federation Clubwoman printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The legislative fight to drive filthy and diseased poultry from the market is on.

Activity in both the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States is numbering the days when refuse-littered and rodent-infested processing plants can send contaminated and adulterated poultry into interstate commerce.

Because poultry, unlike most major foods, need not be inspected for wholesomeness, chickens and turkeys with sores, swellings and other signs of disease are allowed to be sold. Dust, dirt and fecal matter, which are on the bird, or become attached to it in unsanitary processing, may remain.

These conditions are absent in the majority of the industry. Many processors attempt to maintain high standards. However, the mushrooming poultry-processing industry unfortunately, does contain men whose only value is the fast buck. These are the men who are responsible for the health hazards and make legislation extremely necessary.

Part of the problem is due to the new buying habits of Mrs. Housewife. Years ago, she would get her poultry from the farmer, or dealer, and almost invariably saw it alive before her purchase. Although she had no guaranty against its being diseased, she could get some inkling from the chicken's or turkey's looks. Further, she generally watched while her poultry was cleaned or processed in the market or she cleaned it herself in her home.

Today, however, Mrs. Housewife buys her poultry virtually ready for the oven. It is completely processed and perhaps cut up. She has no idea whatsoever about the poultry's wholesomeness or cleanliness. She knows nothing of what went on during the processing. Visible signs of filth and disease have been removed, but danger may still lurk.

Therefore, Mrs. Housewife often unwittingly buys what is truly garbage and serious consequences develop. Following are a few results:

The Public Health Service has found that an average of one-third of the reported cases of foodborne poisoning are traceable to poultry or poultry dishes. In 1953, this number was as high as 44 percent.

Some 26 diseases are transmissible from poultry to man. These includes the pneumonialike and sometimes deadly psittacosis or ornithosis, the infection, salmonellosis and the viral Newcastle disease.

Some of the diseases, especially psittacosis-ornithosis, cause dangerous outbreaks cyclically. Thus, in 1954, turkey flocks in Texas came down with ornithosis in epidemic proportions. Nearly 200 cases of human illness, mostly among poultry workers, and 1 or 2 deaths, resulted.

Poultry processed in unsanitary conditions can become the carriers of some eight serious diseases. These include paratyphoid fever, dysentery and chemical poisoning.

The moral of this situation is obvious. Inspection by trained men and women is needed during poultry processing to guarantee the consumer a wholesome and clean product.

The General Federation of Women's Clubs is in the forefront of the drive to gain this inspection, as it has always been in battles to improve food and drug legislation. It is of extreme satisfaction to us, of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen (AFL–CIO) that our organization and the General Federation are allied in this most worthy campaign.

The current state of poultry inspection is indeed shockingly sad. A voluntary Federal program does exist, but it covers only a fraction of the processing plants, even in interstate commerce. To make matters worse, it is thoroughly ineffective, because of conflicts of interests and other reasons, in even the parts of the industry it does cover.

Obviously, the job is an immediate one for Congress. Happily, a number of Senators and Congressmen have taken up the task.

Representative J. PERCY PRIEST, of Tennessee, chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives, has introduced H. R. 8599 and Representative DON HAYWORTH, of Michigan, H. R. 6009, to cope with the problem. Other Congressmen plan similar action.

In the Senate, Senator JAMES MURRAY, of Montana and seven other Senators have introduced S. 3176. Early hearings are already being planned in the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

These measures are excellent. They provide that the Food and Drug Administration establish a Poultry Service which would inspect poultry both before and after slaughter. This type of inspection, according to health authorities, is the only means of guaranteeing wholesomeness to the consumer.

In addition, the bills would have the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare establish rules for sanitary standards and practices in poultry plants. An inspector would refuse to mark a firm's poultry as wholesome if the plant failed to abide by these standards of sanitation. The poultry, therefore, could not be shipped in interstate commerce.

The bills absolutely bar the shipment, sale, or receipt of any poultry in interstate commerce, other than that marked as wholesome by inspectors of the FDA Poultry Service. Injunction proceedings and penalties are established against this and other punishable acts.

This Federal legislation is vital to the health of the Nation. It would solve many of the poultry health problems which now scourge Americans. Its enactment would be one of the most significant steps in public health in decades.

These bills, therefore, truly deserve the active support of every woman who is concerned with the health of her family, neighbors, and Nation.

America and the Free-Enterprise System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Omaha World-Herald under date of April 15, 1956, entitled "The President's Prof." I believe this fine and thought-provoking article will be of interest to my colleagues.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S PROF

A side remarks by Mr. Eisenhower at a press conference last month has made Massimo Salvadori just about the most famous college professor in the country. He's going on TV, writing for Reader's Digest, and being widely quoted in the papers.

The President said that he liked the way this foreign-born professor—he's British and Italian—described America and the enterprise system. It turns out that Professor Salvadori thinks the American way is pretty fine, as it is—that all it needs is proper appreciation from Americans who share its blessings.

Europeans, he says in effect, don't know straight up about the American system. They believe the United States is prosperous solely because of its natural resources; that it is controlled by a few rich people who let the poor have enough crumbs to stave off revolution, and that foreign aid is tribute to stave off foreign revolution.

Professor Salvadori says the resources argument is bunk. Australia has great resources and a stagnant economy. Canada is vastly rich but hasn't taken full advantage of its resources. The same applies to Latin America. But America blooms. Why?

Because, says the professor, of the peculiar determination, energy, and capability of the American people.

Foreign critics say the American economy is inefficient and wasteful. Professor Salvadori says it is very likely the most efficient in the world—several times more efficient than Russia's.

Foreigners say the few rich dominate through profits. Professor Salvadori says there are many millions of American capitalists, and that profits are the spur that makes people do more than is necessary to survive.

As for outlook, he says the European attitude is, "Why change; we're doing all right." But the American view toward something new is, "This appears to be a good thing; let's try it."

The result, says Professor Salvadori, is not only marvelous prosperity but the world's best school system, a true separation of church and state without a loss of religion, a great diffusion of reading matter and general knowledge.

But, he goes on, too many foreigners don't know these things. Or if they have heard them, they often discount them as propaganda. What can be done?

This Smith College professor says foreigners are interested in facts and figures about America, rather than general claims. He says graphs and charts showing the rise in family income, the widening distribution of wealth, and the like are not wasted on the people who influence policy in foreign lands.

He believes in personal exchange of information—a group of touring labor leaders from abroad getting information firsthand in Detroit and Pittsburgh. And the thousands of Americans who go abroad every year can do their country some good by having facts and figures at hand. They should know something about their country and not be bashful in talking about it.

Professor Salvadori's views carry a lot of weight. "The President's professor," as he is called, talks good sense and rephrases a lot of sound advice in new terms. We hope he gets a wide hearing.

The Textile Industry in Peril

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New Hampshire Sunday News entitled "Textiles in Peril," concerning the very vital textile industry in this country, but with particular reference to New Hampshire and New England, and their economic future.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Hampshire Sunday News of April 22, 1956]

TEXTILES IN PERIL

A communication in an adjoining column, written by the able and respected operating head of Manchester's Chicopee textile mills, Mr. Charles S. Parsons, deserves the study of everyone concerned in the economic future of New Hampshire and New England.

That includes, by all means, the congressional delegations of our six-State area.

The principal point to be noted is the enormous increase last year in Japanese textiles. We were not ourselves aware, until Mr. Parsons called attention to it, that these exports jumped 72 percent in 1955, and in some important areas of textile manufacture are now equal to some 40 percent of United States domestic production.

While textile wages in this area are certainly not high in comparison to postwar increases in the cost of living, it is worth noting that they are higher than some of the vaunted hard-goods industries with which we are constantly urged to replace them. (As though it were a simple matter to replace an industry accounting for no less than one-third of our total manufacturing employment.)

The disturbing wage comparison is the one Mr. Parson makes between Manchester and Japan, where textile workers get as little as 10 cents an hour.

Not even our southern textile mills can stand this kind of competition. So serious is the situation in the South that—we learn elsewhere than from Mr. Parsons' letter—at least three States have recently adopted legislation requiring mercantile establishments to post signs saying "Japanese textiles sold here." This horrifies the one-worlding New York Times, which condemns South Caroline, Alabama, and Mississippi for "clear contravention of the spirit of our treaty of amity and commerce with Japan." We sympathize somewhat with the Times' fear of driving Japan into the arms of the Reds by restricting her foreign markets, but we don't think the American textile workers should be made the sole sacrificial goat of a foreign policy designed to keep the Japs friendly. The United States is not, and has never been, Japan's natural textile market. The people who cut off Japan's natural outlets were the same people who sold Chiang Kai-shek down the river and turned China over to the Communists. Japan will never be more than a beggarly dependency until we develop a foreign policy which succeeds in restoring her Asiatic markets.

Meanwhile, however, the congressional delegations of the textile States should unite to pressure the administration into retreat from a present low tariff policy which threatens imminent ruin to millions of Americans. If Japan must be artificially propped up and carried on our backs for a generation, let the burden be distributed over all American industry and all workers and taxpayers, not just the textile industry. The tariff has never had any validity other than as a means of encouraging domestic manufacture, and, especially, protecting the livelihood of American workers. Both these principles are at stake here, and both are being suicidally violated by, of all people, an allegedly Republican gang in Washington.

What I Owe My Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, I wish to include an inspiring essay written by Mr. Martin Berkins, of Beachwood, Ohio, which won high honors in the recent American Legion essay contest.

The essay follows:

WHAT I OWE MY COUNTRY

As a young American, I feel I am entrusted with the responsibility of being a good citizen. Good citizenship must originate in the individual. A country can only be as good as its citizens, for it will be the individuals who will shape the destiny of our country.

I must be loyal to myself by trying to be an honorable person with a keen sense of right and wrong. I must keep myself physically fit and morally straight and live up to the Golden Rule.

I must be loyal to my parents and family; to do my part in making our home a place of peace and refuge, for a happy home is the basis of a peaceful world.

I must be loyal to my community by voting to put the best person in public office and to take an active part in as many civic duties as possible.

I must be loyal to my country and be willing to fight to uphold the principles that make it great, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. These things must be protected and fought for if we are going to continue to live in freedom in this great country of ours and not to let it become poverty stricken and communistic like some of the countries in Europe have become. This great country is our heritage and we must be proud of it and be willing to uphold it for the cause of freedom.

I also feel that each individual person must contribute his skill to help in furthering the progress of the country. Each one should accomplish this in whatever manner he is best qualified, whether it is farming, education, medicine, engineering or in the field of atomic energy. Each person should develop his own particular ability to the farthest reach of his talents. Only then

will our country become as great as it can be made to be. If everyone works together doing this, our country will benefit all mankind and make great strides toward world peace.

I owe my country the promise that I will be a good American; that I will be a benefit to my country in every possible way; I will uphold all the principles for which my country stands; I shall try to better my country in every possible way that I can to make my country greater, if possible, than it already is and to be proud that I am an American. These things are what I feel I owe my country.

With Whose Money?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following article from the April 20 issue of U. S. News & World Report, by David Lawrence, entitled "With Whose Money?":

WITH WHOSE MONEY?

(By David Lawrence)

Every now and then a curious sort of propaganda line criticizing American foreign policy comes back from abroad in the form of anonymous interviews, impressions, suggestions, and findings derived in good faith from persons who profess to be thinking only of the good of the United States—some of them our own officials stationed in foreign countries.

The substance of it all is a complaint that America isn't spending enough abroad in economic aid. It is apparent that the persons who feed such views to American newspapermen are absorbing the ideas of foreign officials who realize that the "gravy train" is running down and needs to be greased up again.

The propaganda is too palpable to be deceiving. It starts out usually with the criticism that America is putting too much emphasis on military alliances, that America is attaching strings to its grants of aid, and that America is trying somehow to destroy or impair the hard-won independence of the newly created states—now known as "uncommitted" and "neutralist."

On top of this is the curious allegation that Americans are talking too much about war and too little about peace, and that our foreign policies are too rigid or too inflexible.

Boiled down to hard realism, it means that Uncle Sam's pocketbook has become too inelastic and rigid. They are beginning abroad to suspect that there will be difficulty this time in getting billions out of the United States.

This is the right moment, incidentally, to talk about the American people's money. The American taxpayer this very week is making his quarterly payment of income taxes and finds he is giving up a huge proportion of his earnings. The taxpayer in the past has been told it's necessary to furnish aid so as to resist communism and strengthen our overseas defenses.

But now the new propaganda line from Europe and Asia says that America puts too much stress on resisting communism and that this isn't a menace after all. Even the Socialist Premier of France minimizes it.

Our official spokesmen have for a long time now been talking about peace and the renunciation of force, and decrying bad colonialism, but evidently the Asians haven't heard us talking. Their ears are stopped up with glowing tales of Communist virtue.

It's strange in all these surveys, too, how little mention there is of Communist colonialism and Communist-imposed slavery in the satellite countries, which once enjoyed their independence. Yet Soviet policies in Asia are praised as exemplary.

The unnamed spokesmen in Asia hint that we should scrap our Southeast Asia treaties, discard the 1 million troops on our side in Formosa and in South Korea, and recognize Red China. What a military coup for the Communists that would be.

We are reminded in these new surveys that Asians have lived in poverty for a long time and have been exploited by Europeans. We are warned that, while Asian peoples like help, they are very proud and don't want any conditions attached to gifts.

Somehow, it is asserted, Russia does the thing better—she gives no gifts, she just participates in trade arrangements. But she does manage to exchange her rubles for concrete things. The first condition that Russia makes usually is that she get something worthwhile in return. But, ah, America, she must not think of such things—America must give away her money quietly, anonymously, and ask no questions. As for Mr. Dulles, he is referred to in the surveys as a bad Secretary of State—probably because he's a good American.

It is easy to read between the lines of what these supposedly informed observers say, there's nothing wrong with the American policies abroad which a few billions of financial aid wouldn't cure. If only there were more Marshall plans, more economic agencies, more give-aways, everything would be rosy.

There is one question we might venture in all candor to ask: How do these so-called observers who have the temerity to give such pointed advice to America, expect to carry on new and enlarged programs of economic penetration? With whose money? Certainly not with the American taxpayers' money.

If underdeveloped countries are so blinded by pride that they don't know the difference between Communist tyranny and American generosity, it's time to stop injuring their pride any longer with gifts of American dollars.

If the Communist menace is, after all, a myth, then let the countries which feel that way protect themselves as best they can.

America should continue, of course, to help faithful and appreciative allies in Europe and Asia. There is, however, no obligation which requires the taxpayers of the United States to become paternalistic guardians of the neutralist world. If there is no military reason for American aid to certain countries who now scorn it, then America's billions might better be expended within this country for more schools, for aid to farmers, for relief of the taxpayers' burdens.

The Farm-Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to represent an agricultural district, consisting of seven counties, where corn is the principal product. To my people the existing farm problem is all important.

My people recognize that the farm problem is not something that developed overnight. It is indeed the result of surpluses that have been accumulating over the years and failure to deal realistically with the situation.

My people know that there is no panacea that can meet the problem. And they are not being deceived by the attempts that have been made to concoct a panacea. They recognize the farm bill that was sent to the President for exactly what it was—nothing more than a political maneuver.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD editorials which appeared in the three leading daily newspapers in my district: The Bloomington Daily Pantagraph, the Danville Commercial-News, and the Kankakee Daily Journal.

These papers serve a farm area, and each of them condemns the farm bill sent the President and commend him for his veto. I am proud that I voted against the bill and proud that I voted to sustain the veto, believing as President Eisenhower that this is not a time for politics but a time for courageous statesmanship.

The editorials follow:

[From the Bloomington Daily Pantagraph of April 19, 1956]

SOIL BANK PLAN STILL NEEDED

Persons really interested in the well-being of the Nation and a strengthened agricultural economy will applaud President Eisenhower's courageous action in vetoing the farm bill. It was a hodgepodge which would ultimately do more harm than good. It would hurt farmers of the Corn Belt.

While veto of the bill in this politjcal year took moral courage, we believe it will ultimately work to Mr. Eisenhower's advantage. The veto message brings the real farm issue into focus. Clear thinking farmers are not going to be "taken in" by the cry that the administration isn't ready to help the farmer.

They can hope that the Democratic controlled Congress will now speedily pass the soil-bank plan, which Mr. Eisenhower asks. True, it was included in the farm bill but was nullified by a hodgepodge of amendments aimed at votes rather than the benefit of our farm economy.

High, rigid price support has produced unmanageable farm surpluses and has depressed farm prices. The soil-bank plan, which the President asks, would reduce these price-depressing surpluses by temporarily retiring land from production. Other undesirable provisions of the vetoed bill were dual parity, two-price plans for wheat and rice, and higher price supports for dairy products and other commodities.

It is perhaps wishful thinking to hope Congress will give the President what he asks. They have played political football with the farm problem for months. Yet their decision to make the farm problem a major campaign issue may prove a boomerang. The farmer can see who his friend really is.

[From the Danville Commercial-News of April 18, 1956]

THE PRESIDENT SHOWS COURAGE

Risking the embarrassment the Democrats obviously wanted him to face, President Eisenhower has vetoed the fraudulent and fuzzy farm bill put over in both Houses of Congress. For that we cheer him and pay tribute to his integrity.

This something-for-everybody-without-regard-to-the-effect bill had to be vetoed. Apparently many Democrats misjudged the President. Adhering to principles rather

than political expediency, the Chief Executive did what all his admirers thought he would do.

The measure favored large wheat, corn, and cotton producers at the expense of the consumers and dairy farmers. The Democrats believe they now have Mr. Eisenhower at a political disadvantage. In control of Congress, they will not permit enactment of any other measure, especially one incorporating the wanted soil bank but excluding rigid 90 percent price supports.

There are 15 Republicans in the Senate and 48 in the House who deserted the party on this issue. They are also guilty of putting the welfare of agriculture and of the Nation secondary to the demagoguery to lure farm votes.

The vetoed bill, distorted by crude political conniving in an election year, would have sacrificed the urban worker, consumer, and taxpayer. It would have created only the tenuous illusion of helping the farmer.

It is a sad commentary on the moral and intellectual caliber of the majority in Congress. It should make the voters wonder whom purported representative government represents, while making them happy. Mr. Eisenhower with his courage and honesty is the final authority.

[From the Kankakee Daily Journal]

FARM BILL BOOMERANG

(Chicago Sun-Times)

Democrats thought they had put President Eisenhower on a political spot when they presented him with a bill that was an outright effort to buy the farm vote. If he vetoed it, they figured, his stock would go down in rural areas. If he did not, Democrats would take credit with farmers for putting more money in their pockets.

Today we have a hunch that the Democrats played it too smart and that their political trick is boomeranging against them. For in vetoing the monstrous farm bill Mr. Eisenhower showed such courage, statesmanship, and good sense in his arguments against it that he has risen to a new high stature in the minds and hearts of his countrymen—and we believe that must include many farmers, too.

The President did what he thought was right. He refused to be swayed by panicky warnings from some Middle West Republican politicians that the GOP would lose the farm vote unless it went along with the Democratic grab-bag bill.

We have a firm conviction that when the President does what he believes is right, regardless of political consequences, the mass of the people, farmers included, approve. Americans are a moral people. They believe in doing "what's right." In the words of Daniel O'Connell, nothing is politically right that is morally wrong. We believe the President, in his message to the people, made a convincing argument that the overt effort to bribe the Nations farmers was morally wrong.

The bill, for example, pretended to go along with President Eisenhower's program to eliminate the huge mountain of surplus food and fiber that depresses the market and costs farmers and taxpayers millions of dollars a year. But the bill actually included a return to the very farm program that created the surplus in the first place. The President nailed this gross breach of public trust by describing the bill as a hodgepodge in which bad provisions more than canceled out the good.

In the long run, the bill would have hurt all farmers, even though for a short time it would give them the illusion of more income. Moreover, the bill was an anticonsumer bill because it would have perpetuated artificially higher food prices by the use of taxes without getting to the heart of the basic farm problem.

The problem at the moment, as the President said, is the fact that farmers are not sharing proportionately in the Nation's record-breaking prosperity.

The soil bank plan, to reduce the $8 billion mountain of surplus that costs $1 million a day just for storage rental alone, would have bolstered farmers' income. But Congress dillydallied on the farm bill until it probably is too late now to fully put the soil bank plan into operation this year, even if Congress should pass an acceptable bill. So, to take some of the sting out of the veto and help distressed farmers, the President upped support prices on several products. Corn, for example, will be supported at $1.50 a bushel instead of the present $1.30. (Under the vetoed bill the support would have been $1.64.)

Of course, it is true that this compromise may tend to increase surpluses, but as the President said, the failure of Congress to enact the soil-bank plan makes it necessary for the administration to use what tools it has at hand to help the farmers. Moreover, if Congress will come to its senses and hastily pass an acceptable soil-bank plan, it would be possible for the administration to make payments to some farmers on the conservation of acreage reserve program shortly after July 1.

We shall now see how good friends of the farmer the Capitol Hill politicians really are. They should get on the ball and pass an acceptable farm bill. The farmers would rather have that than a lot of speeches blaming Ike for the farmers' plight.

As for the political aspects of the veto, to get back to our original premise, we believe the Democrats should worry about their standing with consumers and urban citizens as well as with farmers. The great source of Republican strength in the House lies in small and medium-sized cities, not in rural areas as is generally assumed. According to a study by Congressional Quarterly, a private Washington news analysis, medium and large cities will determine the makeup of the 85th Congress. The President did not hurt himself in those areas by the veto, and when farmers study his arguments, we are confident those who were not irretrievably lost to him before the veto will remain in his corner.

Addresses by Governor McKeldin, of Maryland, and Mrs. D. Ray Murdock, of Pennsylvania, at Maine Republican State Convention

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, it was the good fortune of Maine Republicans at their State convention on April 13, 1956, to hear two excellent convention addresses. These addresses keynoted an enthusiasm and spirit together with truly constructive attitudes that make for real Americanism regardless of party affiliation.

One address was delivered by Maryland's outstanding statesman, who surely someday will become a Member of this body—Gov. Theodore McKeldin. The other address was given by one of America's foremost women—Mrs. D. Ray Murdock, of Pennsylvania.

I ask unanimous consent that their addressees be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY THEODORE R. MCKELDIN, GOVERNOR OF MARYLAND, AT STATE CONVENTION OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY IN MAINE, PORTLAND, MAINE, APRIL 13, 1956

Good afternoon, fellow Republicans and friends of the Republican Party.

I am very happy to be here in this great maritime State, with interests so similar to those of my own State of Maryland, and with the same good concern for the promotion of trade among the nations of the world, and for the progress of business, industry, and agriculture.

I am glad to be here because the invitation came to me from your neighbor, my good friend, Fred Scribner, who has been assisting me so capably and so extensively in my chairmanship of the rules committee for the national convention of our great party. I am very grateful to Fred.

It pleases me to be among you now because I sense the fighting determination that is yours to recover the governorship for the Republican Party and again place the State government of Maine on the side of domestic progress and international enlightenment, as represented so magnificently in the distinguished person of one of the truly great men of all time—the President of the United States—Dwight David Eisenhower.

But I am most grateful for this opportunity to contribute what I can to the arousing of our people everywhere to the importance of the great decisions to be made in this important election year—one of the most important in the history of our Nation.

I entertain no doubt that the electoral votes of Maine will be recorded for Dwight Eisenhower.

But, because of the proud place Maine holds among the States and Commonwealths, in being the first to give voice to its sovereignty each even year, it is of extraordinary importance that that voice be loud and decisive.

While the fumbling opposition concocts counterfeit comfort from various versions of significance in primary elections, it is important that all America be made aware in September of the sound thinking of a whole people in a great State.

Yours is a voice that will be heard around a waiting world, because it is important, too, that the peoples of all nations be advised that the United States of America is not wavering in its leadership toward a better, saner world.

What are the issues that make the elections of 1956 so significant to the people of the Nation?

What are those that give our decisions such urgency to the people of the earth?

Agriculture? Business? Government finance? Rate of employment? Highways? Waterpower? Flood control? Internal security? Integrity in Government?

Certainly, all of these in a Nation as diversified as ours. Certainly, they demand public and official interest—and certainly the Eisenhower administration will stand with pride on its record and its proposals on each of them.

Foreign relations? Foreign trade? Progress of depressed nations toward economic recovery? Immigration?

Why, of course, all of these must figure extensively in the sphere of our Government's activities—and, of course, the administration of Dwight D. Eisenhower is the beneficiary by far in any comparison of the records.

But paramount to all of these and, indeed, encompassing them within its mighty breadth is the greatest issue of our times—the progress of civilization.

No; I am not about to say that those who cling so tenaciously to control of the opposition party are uncivilized men. They are, indeed, civilized within their individual selves.

I am not about to say that they are opposed to civilization. They are not savages.

But I will say that in the long years of their power that is past, they demonstrated a most discouraging ineptitude in the advancement of civilization.

They geared the economy of the Nation to war—and could see no hope for prosperity without war.

They vacillated—to use the more gentle term—in their dealings with the uncivilized, would-be conquerers of the world.

They condemned themselves by taking the cynical view toward the promise of the Republican candidate for President in 1952—Dwight Eisenhower—to go in person to Korea on a mission of peace—to accomplish the cessation of the slaughter there.

They showed their ineptitude toward establising peace and maintaining a strong America when they chose to disregard the disloyalty which was so obvious within the Government.

They showed it when they tried in vain to make political issue out of the brink of war article—they who never knew how to avoid plunging over the brink and into the bloody drink.

They show it in the present posing of their political hatchetmen as experts in the field of guided missiles.

Even now in the bitterness and the bickering among their candidates for their presidential nomination—their neglect of the bigger issues and the welfare of the country in the pursuit of their personal ambitions—they show their unfitness for the highest office in this land and for a place of leadership among the nations of the world.

Yes civilization retrogressed in the years of their reign—for war is retrogression—and the constant threat of war was a wall which stymied progress.

But the world called for a man to master the crisis, and the American people answered the call with the election of Dwight David Eisenhower.

Here was the great soldier, experienced in the horrors and heartbreaks of war who brought an end to the war in Korea.

Here was the man whom friendly nations could trust and whom dictators had to respect.

Here was the man who bolstered collective security in Europe by obtaining German sovereignty and the Austrian peace treaty.

Here was the man who closed the gaps in our defense wall through the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, the Korean Treaty, the Free China Treaty and others.

Here was the man who directed the maintenance of peace at Formosa, Trieste, and Iran.

Here was the man who abolished Communist influence in the Government by the United States.

Here was the man who saw and used the advantage of peace conferences in times of peace—for the maintenance of peace—not just to end another war.

Here, today, at the head of the world's most powerful nation is the man who led great armies to victory over tyranny—the man who commands the greatest military potential and the most powerful weapons the world ever has known—but here is a man who glories not in the prospect of crushing a foe, not in the contemplation of conquest in battle, but in the consistent pursuit of a lasting peace, in the relegation of war and its barbarism to the pages of history, in the advancement, if you please, of a true and enlightened civilization.

Yes; here is a man, who while not neglecting our stockpiles of defensive force, is the spearhead and recognized leader of the whole magnificent movement to apply atomic power to peaceful uses—for industry, for transportation, for medicine, and for all purposes to better the living and add to the welfare and happiness of humanity.

Here is a man whose wise policies on foreign and international trade have spurred the economic recovery of all nations, dispersing much of that gloom and despair which too long had fertilized the fields where wars were grown.

Compare the widespread despondency of a few short years ago with the international economic optimism that exists today.

Look at the prospects for that unfailing index of prosperity the production of steel—the confident estimates that the output will rise, within the next 4 years from some 297 million tons a year to more than 384 million tons. Consider the fact that the preparation for this production is worldwide. Take into account that the primary motivating force is the rising demand by growing populations for more consumer goods—automobiles, refrigerators, small appliances, and general household items.

This is a story of growing abundance and popular contentment—the stuff of which peace is made—the stuff that discourages the would-be makers of war.

And for those who fear the industrial rise and economic progress of other lands, let it be known that about 17 million tons of the increased steel production will be in the United States—added to the 128 millions tons of our annual production now.

With the economic progress of Europe and Asia, the threats of a shooting war have dwindled, and the pattern of the cold war with communism has become one of economy.

Because weak spots still exist in the international picture and because the maintenance of the new economic strength of friendly nations still depends on our help, the new circumstances call for increased foreign aid—not less as some of the President's opponents now advocate.

With this increased aid, we need administrative flexibility in its use—not tighter long-range controls.

We must use available foreign aid funds in this gentler type of war—this economic war—as we would use armies in the old-fashioned shooting war—stationing some of it on a more or less permanent basis at persistent spots of danger—keeping more of it for quick and strategic deployment where trouble areas appear.

Can we afford it?

We could not afford to stop it.

The financial cost could never be as great as the cost we would bear in sending our sons to war.

And even if we consider the whole project in fiscal coldness, it is a good investment. It helps our American economy by increasing our foreign trade.

Sometimes, perhaps in a rather distant future, the foreign aid phase of the economic war can be brought to an end—but not the phase of competition for trade. The competition is good for the world, good for the economy of nations, and good for the prosperity of the people.

The long-existing problems of American agriculture appear to bring some comfort to the opposition because they can find nothing else.

They offer no solution, but they insult the farmers by attempting to buy their votes with handouts.

The Eisenhower administration, aware of the farmer's pride and dignity, has refused to look upon him as a mendicant. The Eisenhower administration recognizes the farmer as a businessman in a business which needs help, not charity, to meet the changed and changing conditions of our entire economy.

The farmer's problem, stated in its simplest form, is this: He gets too little for the things he produces and pays too much for the things he buys.

Government cannot and should not force a reduction in the cost of the machinery, equipment, clothing and other articles that are bought for the farms and the people who live on farms. Those prices are regulated by the wages and other costs that contribute so much to our generally sound economy. The farmer, whose best market still is urban America, would not want this healthy outside economy diminished.

The solution, therefore, lies in seeing that the farmer derives an adequate income from his produce.

Large surpluses in storage are the greatest drawback to adequate farm prices.

The most logical first step would be to stop adding to those surpluses. This never could be accomplished by the high, rigid price supports insisted upon by opponents of the President's farm plan.

It could be accomplished to a considerable extent by the President's soil bank proposal, through the adjustment of crops both to accumulated stocks and to potential markets.

The soil bank would have the additional value of temporarily removing from cultivation or pasture use lands that now are poorly suited to tillage—lands which thus could be conserved and built up for use at some future time when our growing population may require their fruits.

The rest of the President's farm program is designed, too, for the long-range cure of farm ills—not for the buying of farm votes in an election year. It includes methods for disposing of existing farm surpluses, strengthening of commodity programs, rural development programs for low-income farm families, and a stepped-up program of research that emphasizes ways and means of reducing production costs, the finding of new uses for farm products, the development of new crops, the expansion of markets, and price supports that are adjustable to the needs of a given time.

This then is no ward-healing program such as has, from time to time in the past two administrations, been foisted upon the men and women in the business of producing our food and the raw materials for some of our clothing.

It is a program largely designed along those lines which have given American industry its leadership in the world—modern sales methods, avoidance of excessive inventory, development of markets, alertness for new products and constant research.

It is a program that would not tear down one part of the economy to help another. It is a program that looks to this and future generations of the land—not just to the next election.

I urge that when you go from this convention of republicanism to your towns, your cities, your counties, and your districts, you go with a high sense of pride in the accomplishments of which you are a part—with an even greater determination to see that Maine speaks with resounding emphasis on election day—to see that the first electoral votes recorded in this decisive year are recorded for Dwight David Eisenhower.

See to it, too, that a governor is elected in Maine with the philosophy of an Eisenhower—and that you send to the Congress those with the vision and the foresight to join Dwight Eisenhower in his great crusade for a strong economy and a lasting peace.

Indeed the Nation will be watching and the world will be watching for your vote—the significant vote of Maine—for every office on your ballot. Leave no doubt on any issue or any office.

Remember the high honor that is yours—the raising of the first banner of 1956—the sounding of the first glad cry of forward march in the advance of civilization with a leader second to none in the temporal history of the world—Dwight David Eisenhower.

EXCERPTS FROM THE ADDRESS BY MRS. D. RAY MURDOCK, REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEEWOMAN FOR PENNSYLVANIA, MAINE REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION IN PORTLAND

Just to join with you here in your Maine Republican convention is, indeed, a real pleasure, and to share the platform with your distinguished statesmen and women and our celebrated keynote speaker gives me a feeling of great warmth that only Republican Party members can generate.

People in every land today know and respect our great President Eisenhower. They trust him because he is an honest man. There is no power on earth that can surpass honesty.

Now let's look at the President's record and take one promise that he made to the people of America—in fact, to the whole world—that he would go to Korea in order to bring an end to the shooting. The mothers and fathers and families and the military men fighting in the Korean war learned to know a true leader and will remember President Eisenhower always for this one act alone.

The women were firmly back of the President in 1952, and in 1956 we are convinced that we need him more than ever in the White House.

The President promised the women that they would receive recognition on all levels of Government, and according to figures of February 1956, we have 109 top women appointments. Just to name a few of the top posts held by women today, Ambassadors; Treasurer of the United States; superintendents of the United States mints; representatives to the United Nations in various capacities; Director of the Passport Division, Department of State; members of National Advisory Boards and Commissions; assistants to department secretaries; collectors of customs, etc. A number of these appointments are firsts to be made to women. "We like Ike."

Today we have facts and figures indicating a notable increase in the number of women now in Government service, both elective and appointive positions.

First, I want to pay the highest respect to your own United States Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH. It is a recognized fact that women in the 48 States bask in the reflected glory of Senator SMITH's brilliant and courageous statesmanship. The women of Pennsylvania are devoted to Senator SMITH and have followed her scintillating and inspiring career very closely. As time marches on she can depend on the Pennsylvania women to be in there pitching for her for President—maybe in 1960.

Serving in the 84th Congress we have 16 women which tops by 2 the previous high in the 83d Congress, but this score squares 8 to 8 only because the Republicans have Senator SMITH. We hope to increase our average this year because there are more women congressional candidates than ever before. Women throughout the 48 States have held every State elective office down through the years.

In the State of Vermont Consueleo Bailey is their lieutenant governor. Where we see our greatest gains is in county office. Pennsylvania elected a well-qualified county commissioner; of course, in our State we have many women in row offices. Many women are elected to municipal office, even to the office of mayor.

The State of Maine and Pennsylvania have much in common with our Democratic Governors. Our general assembly has chalked up the longest drawn-out session in the history of our State. The controversy has been over a State-tax program. The Governor was elected on his campaign promise that there would be no sale tax nor any new taxes. He was not wise in the business of government—if the pople do not pay for their government just who will pay the bills when they become due? The National Democrat Party has been using the Pennsylvania Governor for campaign cannon fodder. You know in the State of Pennsylvania a governor cannot succeed himself.

Now for some campaign facts. Our 84th Democrat-controlled Congress has put the Democrat Party on record as having a "do nothing" Congress. The Democrats are the chairmen of all congressional committees. The Democrats are in control of all legislative bills under consideration and this being an election year the Democrats want to make doubly sure that the Democratic Party gets full credit for any legislation that may be adopted.

The Eisenhower program calls for more schools, more highways, more hospitals, more child-welfare services, better working conditions, higher wage standards, more homes, but with this "do nothing" Democrat-controlled 84th Congress the people of the United States will not reap the benefits they so richly deserve during this session.

The Republican Party can point with pride to the record on security. Do you know $1,000 put into the bank in 1953 is worth $1,000 today. Under inflationary policies of the Democrats $1,000 deposited in 1939 was worth only $522 in 1952.

The work of the Republican Party is clearly defined in this campaign. The Eisenhower program can only be accomplished by reelecting President Eisenhower and a Republican Congress. With the tremendous popularity of the President it is still up to the party workers to get busy in their own voting district. It is true you are never any better in your political party than you are in your own voting district. Registration is paramount, you can't vote if you are not registered. Many people only get the urge to vote on election day and then find they cannot vote because they are not registered. Now is the time to put on that door-to-door campaign and get the stay-at-home voter active.

Only through you can we tell the story of what the Republican program means. This is the time to use your supersalesmanship and make it count, on election day votes. Let's show our devotion and our dedication by winning victory in November for President Eisenhower and his team. You can do it and will do it. Best of luck to you all.

Aid to Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I enclose copy of the resolution introduced in the Massachusetts State Senate by the Honorable Daniel Rudsten, State senator from the Sixth Suffolk District of Massachusetts, and recently adopted by the Massachusetts State Senate upon motion of the Democratic leader, Hon. John E. Powers, who ably represents my senatorial district in the Massachusetts State Senate. The resolution adopted by the State Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is a most timely one and I congratulate Senator Rudsten upon introducing it, Senator Powers upon moving its adoption, and the members of the Massachusetts State Senate in adopting the same.

The record of the State Senate of Massachusetts, March 26, 1956, and the resolution adopted follows:

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE

RESOLUTIONS

Congress—Aid to Israel, etc.

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to grant certain aid to Israel and to implement the joint declaration of the United States, Great Britain, and France guaranteeing the peace and security of Israel (Senate, No. 575); and, under the rule, they were referred to the Committee on Rules.

Subsequently, the same Senator, for the said committee, reported that the resolutions ought to be adopted, and they were considered forthwith, under a suspension of the rule, moved by Mr. POWERS, and adopted.

The resolutions were as follows:

"Whereas the Governments of the United States, Great Britain, and France by a tripartite declaration, have guaranteed the territorial integrity of the State of Israel; and

"Whereas certain Arabian countries by the acceptance of arms from Communist countries have provided the Soviet Union with the opportunities to advance Communist influence in the Middle East; and

"Whereas the influx of arms into Arabian countries disturbs the military balance of power in the Middle East, and thereby threatens the peace of the world; and

"Whereas the United States has recently shipped tanks to Saudi Arabia in direct violation of the declared United States policy of discouraging an arms race in the Middle East; and

"Whereas the State of Israel has requested from the State Department of the United States permission to purchase certain arms and supplies in order to meet the threat of certain Arabic countries, which request has not been acted upon, after a period of 4 months from the time of such request: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to take immediate action to insure the discouragement of a potential arms race in the Middle East; that the United States authorize the sale of arms and supplies to Israel in order to provide for the security of Israel and to establish a balance of military power between Israel and the Arab nations; that further shipment of arms to Arab nations be prohibited; and that steps be taken to enforce the provisions of the tri-partite declaration of the United States, Great Britain, and France thereby insuring the territorial integrity of the State of Israel, and that such action be taken as may best promote peace between Israel and the Arab countries and throughout the Middle East; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the United States Secretary of State, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress of the United States and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth."

The Foreign Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, in view of the current economic course of the cold war and the need for

training young Americans for a part in these tests of economic strength, I should like to insert in the RECORD a very fine letter received by me today from the Honorable Robert C. Hill, Assistant Secretary of State:

APRIL 23, 1956.

The Honorable LEO W. O'BRIEN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. O'BRIEN: I have read with care your address to the House of Representatives on April 17, 1956, concerning recruitment to our Foreign Service. As a former member of the Service, with experience as consul in India and Ambassador to Costa Rica and El Salvador, and presently an official in the Department, I want to express my deep appreciation for your interest in this vitally important subject and for the valuable time which you have devoted to it for many years. I am confident that, to a greater extent than ever before, the fate of our own national future and the future of most of the free world rests upon the Foreign Service of the United States.

I heartily agree with your position that the success of our Foreign Service system depends in large part on our ability to stimulate interest among the most promising young people in our country. The Department of State has been engaged over the past 19 months in a comprehensive program to improve the effectiveness of the administration of the Department and the Foreign Service, based upon recommendations of the Secretary's public committee on personnel composed of distinguished American citizens selected on a nonpartisan basis from various walks of life. A vital part of the overall program is the program for recruiting, at the bottom of the Foreign Service, the most able young men and women in the country who we hope will, through training and experience, hold top diplomatic, consular, and departmental positions in the future. This recruitment program entails extensive college-relations activities. When I inquired into the effectiveness of this system, I was gratified by the information I received. During the calendar year 1955, 60 officers of the Department made 435 visits to colleges and universities in every State of the Union and Hawaii. I find that a total of 9,898 persons applied for the two examinations given in 1955, whereas 1,261 applied for the examination in 1954.

Greater emphasis is also being placed upon the training of the Foreign Service by strengthening the Foreign Service Institute and providing for the training of departmental and Foreign Service personnel while on duty at their posts. We are striving to effect, so far as possible and practicable, an integration of the various categories of officers in the Department and the Foreign Service into a single Foreign Service Officer Corps. This should provide a group of Foreign Service officers experienced both at home and abroad in the conduct of foreign affairs and prepared to serve at any place in the world.

The Department's efforts in this direction have been supported by both Houses of the Congress, and have been greatly facilitated by the legislation enacted last year in the form of amendments to the Foreign Service Act of 1946. There is now pending before the Committee on Foreign Affairs the bill (S. 3481) recently passed by the Senate, which embodies further improvements considered to be essential to the security of the United States and to our effective representation abroad.

I have mentioned, of course, but a few aspects of the program to improve the Foreign Service and the Department. The Director General of the Foreign Service, Mr. Raymond A. Hare, has expressed his gratification at your interest in the Service and requested that I inform you that he would be very glad to discuss the subject with you in more detail at your convenience. His telephone extension is 4131.

I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of this letter to Representative Bow, in view of his interest in the subject.

I recently took Thruston Morton's job in the Department, and I should welcome the opportunity to be of service to you.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. HILL.

Against Servicing Alcoholic Beverages to Passengers Aloft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include my address before the Subcommittee on Transportation and and Communications of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on Friday, April 20, 1956, in connection with my bill, H. R. 7922, which would prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to passengers in flight.

The address follows:

AIRLINES JOB IS TO FLY, NOT TO MAKE PASSENGERS SKY "HIGH"

Mr. Chairman, the practice of selling alcoholic beverages, in addition to the complimentary cocktails offered to passengers aboard commercial airliners, has aroused much public opposition.

On August 21, 1955, I asked the airlines to discontinue this dangerous custom by voluntary actions, serving notice that I would introduce a bill in Congress "to prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to passengers on aircraft in flight" if they failed to cooperate.

Previously the people whose immediate responsibility is to insure the safety and comfort of airborne passengers, namely, the members of the Airline Stewards and Stewardesses' Association and the Airline Pilots' Association, had called for an end to the risky policy of serving alcoholic beverages aboard commercial airliners.

Subsequent to my request the Civil Aeronautics Board failed to issue an administrative order that would correct this situation.

And the airline officials refused to adopt the minimum code of regulation that was recommended by the Air Transport Association.

In defiance of the mounting evidence, of which the following quote from an editorial in the Air Line Employee of September 1955 is a sample:

"To illustrate our point, we quote one recent incident experienced by a major carrier involved in this liquor problem. At the original station the captain canceled the flight because he felt that 18 of the passengers were so drunk as to constitute a menace to safe operation of the flight. Twenty minutes later the flight was reoriginated and 10 of the 18 were taken off. Two hours later it was necessary to make an unscheduled stop to put off the other 8. No passenger need to fear that he will be refused passage if he can crawl aboard. Once in the air, he can get refueled, either on the house or for a dollar a shot. The airlines are not stingy with their liquor, either. Every drink is a double shot, which has a potent punch at high altitude. A $5 bill will produce a proper jet-age wingding in the average air traveler."

Again, as one pilot reported concerning a December 18, 1955, flight:

"This flight could have had a disastrous ending. I feel that it is time to keep drunks and alcohol off from all aircraft. This practice should be stopped immediately."

Or must we wait for the inevitable, and avoidable, tragedy to happen before thinking of protecting passengers from the irresponsible and belligerent actions of those who become intoxicated as a result of "flying saloon" service that is more interested in profits than in safety?

One company tries to lure this type of patronage by advertising "champagne flights."

Seven American commercial airlines serve alcoholic beverages in flight on domestic routes. They are:

	Flights
Eastern Airlines	61
Northwest Airlines	38
Trans-World Airlines	18
National Airlines	16
American Airlines	11
Western Airlines	2
United Airlines	12

These airlines make the feeble defense that they try to observe State liquor laws. But who knows, at 25,000 feet where 1 State end, and the other begins? And what authority is there to enforce compliance?

The commercial airliner, as a public carrier, is faced with unique responsibilities, that do not pertain to ships or trains.

Passengers must travel in close and confined accommodations, with no support but the thin air, where one wandering and drunken passenger can jeopardize all.

Is it necessary for the airlines to defer to the wishes of the few who insist on getting alcoholic beverages to drink while the plane is in flight, in complete disregard for the many women, children, and men who should not have to endure the profanity, molestation, and scatterbrained conduct of the drunks?

I believe that the sober majority are entitled to protection.

The fact that one airline is reluctant to discontinue the practice for fear that its competitors won't, means that few of them will.

The answer to this is Federal legislation (constitutional under the powers to regulate interstate commerce) providing that: "No air carrier shall sell or otherwise furnish to its passengers any alcoholic beverage (including beer and wine) for consumption while in flight within the United States."

Polls of public opinion registered overwhelming opposition to the serving of liquor on commercial airliners, up to 1950, when such sampling of public opinion was discontinued because it ran so strongly against the policy of the airlines.

However, the unsolicited response my Washington office has received since I served notice last August that I would seek corrective legislation, has been almost unanimous in favor of such a bill.

The score:

Thousands of letters for my bill.

One letter and one telephone call against.

The lives of millions of passengers on our domestic airlines must be protected from the dizzy, disgusting, and dangerous conduct of those who become a public nuisance as long as the airlines run flying saloons.

The airlines have been given the opportunity to clean up their planes and have refused to do so.

The only solution is to enact H. R. 7922 into a nationwide law that will eliminate the menace of flying saloons.

America and Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, having in mind the problems confronting the United States of America and the free world under present tactics in the cold war, I include at this point in the RECORD under leave to extend my remarks, a thoughtful and powerful address entitled "America's Stake in Asia," made in Springfield, Mass., on February 8, 1956, by our distinguished and eloquent former colleague, the present Ambassador to the United States from the Philippine Islands, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo:

AMERICA'S STAKE IN ASIA

(Address by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo)

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, and friends; I must apologize to you for the delay tonight. Five days ago, I received an invitation from the White House for lunch today and, as you know, an invitation from the White House is an order. I thought I could make the 2:25 plane from Washington, but the President was so gracious as to make a speech, and so I had to take instead the 4:40 plane. It was late, and that is why I am here late, and I apologize to you all for having to wait for me.

Looking at our chairman, quite a tall fellow, I am reminded of the day we went back to reconquer the Philippines from the enemy. The American newspaper correspondents with us wired back to their respective newspaper offices here to inform them that General MacArthur, with General Romulo behind him, waded in water waist deep when he landed in Leyte.

One of the newspaper editors here in New York who knows me, upon reading that dispatch, called his foreign news editor and said to him, "Let's wire our correspondent in Leyte, because I am somewhat concerned. If General MacArthur, with General Romulo behind him, waded in water waist deep, Romulo must have drowned." [Laughter.]

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your very kind and generous words of introduction—undeserved. But every time I am introduced, I am reminded of the day I was in Peoria, Ill. I was in the hotel lobby trying to buy a newspaper, when I noticed that somebody was watching me very attentively. Finally, overcome by his curiosity, he approached me and said, "You are General Romulo; aren't you?"

I said, "Yes, I am." This was in 1950.

He said, "You are Foreign Minister for the Philippines?"

I said, "Yes, I am."

"You are President of the United Nations General Assembly?"

I answered, "Yes, I am."

"And you were military aide to General MacArthur?"

I replied, "Yes, I was."

He looked at me from head to foot—and that didn't take much time. [Laughter.] Scratching his head, he said, "I'll be dog-gone." [Laughter.]

So every time I want to be deflated, I think of that incident.

Well, my friends, 'way back in 1942 I came to the United States in the performance of a mission. At that time we were fighting in the Pacific and we were going from defeat to defeat. Those of us who were fighting there thought—erroneously, perhaps, but we thought—that we were not getting the men nor, at the time, the material and the planes we needed to step up the tempo of our offensive, because all of America's attention was being concentrated on Europe.

That was how the thought was born that perhaps a Filipino voice heard here then, across the length and breadth of this country, would help to bring home to the American people the dangers of the Pacific war. And so I came.

In the performance of that mission, I spoke in 466 different American cities, in every State of the Union. I didn't miss a single one—I even spoke in Alaska—at the same time selling war bonds, alerting the American people to the fact democracy was in danger, and freedom gravely menaced in Asia. That was 'way back in 1942.

Tonight, I come to you in Springfield no longer in the uniform of an officer of the Army of the United States, as I was then in 1942; but I come with exactly the same mission—to tell you that as of tonight democracy is seriously threatened in Asia and that freedom, as you Americans know freedom, is gravely menaced. And I come to tell you also certain other truths that need to be told.

So, if you came tonight expecting to listen to an ordinary lecture that would please you, amuse or entertain you, I am afraid you will be disappointed, for such is not my mission. If I had merely to say things to delight your ears, I did not have to leave my urgent duties in Washington and travel all this distance to your place this evening.

You are engaged these days in a life-and-death struggle in which your stakes are very high, and being a Filipino, I cannot be indifferent to your side of that struggle. My own country's territorial security, and the freedom itself of the Filipino people are inseparably intertwined with your cause. You have land, air, and naval military installations in the Philippines, and the experience of the last war has taught us Filipinos that in any emergency in which you are involved the Philippines might again be the first to suffer.

It is therefore imperative that I should tell you some truths that need telling and I will, to begin with, permit myself to take you back to the days immediately following the Second World War, when your Government was demobilizing your armies—rather very fast, in the opinion of some; too fast, in the opinion of others.

Whichever way that was—whether too fast or only very fast—it remains a fact of history that, while the United States went seriously into the business of demilitarizing itself and sending its troops to their homes, Soviet Russia stubbornly refused to discharge a single Russian soldier. That was the first clear evidence that the Stalinist dictatorship in Moscow found only one thing wrong with the Nazi war of conquest—namely, that it was Hitler who waged it, and not Stalin. From then on there has been no doubt about the Kremlin's intention to dominate the world with greater determination than the madman of Berlin.

I must emphasize to you this truth: whatever the zigs or the zags in the Kremlin's foreign policy, whatever the tactics it may pursue, frowning or smiling, communism's basic philosophy remains inalterable—the dictatorship of the proletariat—and its permanent objective is the conquest of the world. Let us make no mistake about that philosophy and that objective.

That was how the Soviet Union saw its opportunity, and quickly grabbed it, immediately after the war ended. England was in utter exhaustion, and France had been bled white. The only nation which could stop Russian designs at that time was clearly the United States—and the United States was disarming. Imagine the advantage that situation offered for the standing armies and military implements of Soviet Russia.

And so, what followed was all brutally logical. One by one, Albania, Latvia, Lithuania, Bulgaria, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Poland fell under the sinister shadow of the hammer and sickle. Millions of once free men were turned into robots of the Kremlin. The Iron Curtain was run down, the cold war started, and Soviet Russia embarked on its course of empire. You all remember that.

But there was one country in Europe which Soviet Russia particularly wanted, and that was Greece. Being a landlocked country, Soviet Russia had always coveted an outlet into the Mediterranean and that outlet was offered by Greece. And so, following the usual Communist pattern of subversion, so-called guerrillas from Albania, Bulgaria and other Communist satellite countries were ordered to infiltrate into Greece for the purpose of weakening the Greek Government, soften up its defenses, and finally overthrow it, thus gaining the badly needed outlet into the Mediterranean.

And why did Soviet Russia want that outlet into the Mediterranean so very badly? So as to cut the lifeline of the Western World in two and ultimately deprive you of the use of the Suez Canal. This was the plain purpose of the Soviet adventure in Greece, the country which offered the way out of Russia's containment on land.

It was fortunate that the United States was not asleep, that Washington saw clearly what Soviet Russia was aiming at. That was how you decided to send one of your greatest soldiers—Gen. James Van Fleet—to Greece. With him went a corps of civilian and military experts and together they trained the Greek troops and established Greek strategy.

American economic aid and military material began to flow into Greece, and the Greeks, seeing your genuine concern for their plight, gathered courage and stood up to the challenge to their national survival. They fought back and, with your help, succeeded in defeating the Kremlin's attempt to make their country another puppet state. Thus did American assistance frustrate Soviet Russia's plan to push itself into the Mediterranean, and thus was the first victory for the free world won in the cold war.

But in France, in Italy, in Belgium communism was way ahead and advancing. In 1946 and 1947 and 1948 those three countries lay devastated and helpless. There was widespread poverty and suffering, communism's most effective allies. We happened to be in Europe in 1948, my wife and I, when the General Assembly of the United Nations met in Paris, and we saw the electric effect which American aid produced on the European masses. American economic help came just in time to save millions from complete engulfment by communism. Yes; we saw it exactly as you saw it; American statesmanship and leadership, and American material assistance—all coming when they were most needed—produced their instantaneous effect on the morale of Europe and the Continent was saved.

That had to be, because of your common ancestry and common civilization with the peoples of Europe. But while all that was going on you were neglecting other things. Your sympathy for the Europeans made you forget the peoples of other parts of the earth, until one sad day you were stunned by the report from your radio commentators and in screaming headlines on the front pages of your newspapers, to the effect that on the other side of the globe a catastrophe had befallen democracy—China had fallen to communism. Six hundred and fifty million Chinese conquered by Moscow and lost to democracy—lost to you—before you knew it;

650 million human beings whom Soviet Russia could use to advance its nefarious ends.

This is no mere conjecture. We all saw how Soviet Russia fought the Korean war to the last Chinese soldier. Not one Soviet Russian soldier was engaged in Korea. Not one drop of Russian blood was shed in Korea, only Chinese blood. For, remember, Soviet Russia has 650 million Chinese now she can use as proxy for her wars. And sure enough, they will be used in compliance with what Nicolai Lenin wrote in black and white as part of the Russian strategy for achieving world conquest. Lenin wrote for all eyes to see, and for all ages, the following words: "The road to London and Paris is through Peking and Calcutta." By that he clearly meant that for Soviet Russia to achieve its objective of world conquest, it must first conquer Asia, not Europe.

In terms of 1956, in terms of the present ideological war, and in order to bring it nearer home to you, what Nicolai Lenin really meant is this: In order that Soviet Russia may eliminate the United States and thus be in a position to conquer the world, it must first conquer Asia. Hence the subject of my lecture this evening, America's Stake in Asia.

America's stake in Asia is nothing more or less than your national security, the safety of your lives and of your dear ones; the survival of the American way ol life. We are engaged today, as I said at the beginning, in a life-and-death struggle of global implications the like of which may not be found in recorded history.

Let us take a hard look at the balance sheet of democracy in Asia and see where and how we stand. We have lost China, 650 million Chinese—let us hope and pray, only temporarily. But as of tonight, we have lost that many—650 million Chinese.

Next to China, the most populous country in Asia is India—400 million Indians. And those 400 millions proudly proclaim that they are uncommitted neutrals, which means that they are not with us in our fight against Soviet imperialism.

Next to India comes Indonesia—100 million Indonesians. And they too, like the Indians, call themselves uncommitted neutrals. It simply means that we cannot count with us tonight the 100 million Indonesians and the 400 million Indians in our fight against Soviet imperialism.

Next to Indonesia, we have Burma, and Burma also says she is an uncommitted neutral. So the 18 million Burmese, like the 400 million Indians and the 100 million Indonesians, cannot be ranged with us tonight against international communism. So then, you have a total of 518 million Asians not with us and, added to the 650 million Chinese against us, you have more than 1 billion Asians not with you in this global struggle in which you are engaged.

What do you have left in Asia? Of course, the Philippines; your friends through fair weather and foul, 21 million Filipinos. Pakistan, yes; another friend and ally—80 million Pakistanis. Thailand, yes, another friend and ally; 18 million Thailanders.

So you have 18 million Thailanders, 80 million Pakistanis, 21 million Filipinos on your side of the fence, ready to stand up and be counted for democracy against Soviet imperialism; a total of 119 million Asians against at least a billion Asians not with you. That is not a pretty picture.

What do we have left in Asia? French Indochina is being nibbled away from us daily. British Malaya is in trouble. Korea is fighting for its life. Japan?

Now, we say that Japan has been democratized after 7 years of American military rule. Do we really believe that? Let me pose to you a hypothetical case which I hope will drive home another truth which you must know. Let us suppose in the Second World War you were defeated and Japan was victorious, so that the roles were reversed. Instead of our General MacArthur going to Tokyo, it was General Tojo who went to Washington; instead of an American army of occupation sent to Japan, a Japanese army of occupation was sent here.

Now, do you believe that after 7 years of Japanese military rule over your country, with General Tojo issuing decrees from Washington; do you believe that after 7 years of Japanese military rule here, you would be wearing kimonas and wooden clogs? Our chairman would look cute in a kimona. [Laughter.]

That your American women would be walking 3 feet behind their men? I know American women will never allow that. [Laughter.] That you would be worshipping at Shinto shrines, eating with chopsticks, bowing toward the west at sunset because you think your emperor is there?

Well, of course, you laugh and shake your heads and say that is impossible. Why, of course, I agree with you that is impossible. Then why do you think the reverse possible with the Japanese, a people much, much, much older than you are as a people. Long before Jamestown Colony was even thought of to be organized, there was already a cohesive, united Japanese people with their own culture and with their own civilization. No people is prouder of its country and its civilization than the Japanese, and none more arrogant. So what you think is impossible with you, how could you think possible with the Japanese? There is food for thought for you.

Before the Second World War, it was an ingrained belief in the Asian mind that the West was invincible—invulnerable in the use of arms. And perhaps, because of that, Asia was quiescent, meek perhaps. But after the Second World War, after Japan had you practically on the run for almost 2 years; after Japan held back the combined armies and navies of the United States, the United Kingdom, France, the Netherlands, and Belgium almost 3 years; after the so-called impregnable fortresses of the West in Singapore, Hong Kong, Batavia, Bataan, and Corregidor fell like a pack of cards before the Japanese onslaught; after Americans and Britishers and Dutchmen, Frenchmen, and Belgians were captured, imprisoned and tortured and humiliated and insulted by the Japanese; after the stalemate in Korea which, however, Peking radio continually dinned on the ears of the people of Asia as the victory of the Chinese troops over what it called the pick of the armies of 17 nations; after the fall of Dienbienphu, which Moscow and Peking continually proclaimed as the victory of the Vietnamese troops over the flower of the French Army—after all that, the once ingrained belief in the Asian mind in the invincibility and invulnerability of the West is gone, finished, forgotten. And much of what is happening in Asia today, springs from that fact. That, too, is a truth that you must know, and that is food for thought for you.

Why, then, do I say that America's stake in Asia is its national security, the safety of your lives and your dear ones, the survival of the American way of life?

To answer that question, I must ask you to look at your geography and see from the north, the Aleutians up north, the string of islands—Japan, Okinawa, Formosa, Korea, Guam, and the Philippines. That, in military parlance, is the American perimeter of defense. More commenly, it is called your Pacific chain of defense.

That is the chain that has been decided by your Pentagon, by your Congress, by your White House, by your State Department, as your defense. And that chain can only be as strong as its weakest link. If any of the links in that chain is destroyed or taken, by communism, your national security in Springfield, Mass., is seriously threatened.

You are spending on that chain of defense, now, billions of American dollars, your taxpayers' money, for the maintenance of vital naval, air, and land military installations. And that, my friends, is why President Eisenhower had to announce to the world sometime ago that America was ready and willing to defend Formosa to the last ditch—because Formosa is a link in that chain and you can't allow the link to go to Communist hands and the whole chain to fall to pieces that way.

That's why you fought in Korea, because Korea, too, is a link in that chain. And how well do we know this in the Philippines, we who were in the path of Communist aggression. In 1949 and 1950, the clear strategy of Soviet Russia was to conquer China the first; after that, the objective became Korea. If the Reds had succeeded in Korea, they would have swept on to Japan, Formosa, Okinawa, Guam, and the Philippines.

I say how well we were aware of all that in the Philippines where, as far back as 1948 and 1949, the so-called Huks, who were Communists, were there acting under orders from Moscow. Soviet Russia wanted to follow in the Philippines exactly the same pattern that she followed in Greece, where guerrillas tried to overthrow the government. The Huks were getting ready for the day when Soviet Russia was to win in Korea and then sweep southward, and Soviet Russia would have found in the Philippines its advance guards, the Huks, and my country would have been then a ripe fruit for their plucking.

How well, indeed, do we know in the Philippines, the Communist menace, we who fought the Communists with our lives. Our hospitals in Manila are still full of those wounded in the fight. We didn't fight communism with the radio or with newspaper editorials—we fought communism with blood, with our lives. That is how we know what danger communism is.

We are fortunate in having a President in the person of Ramon Magsaysay who has had the vision and the courage to face communism firmly. As you already know, he has stopped the Communists in the Philippines. In fact, the only man so far to have defeated communism in Asia is President Ramon Magsaysay.

And yet there were many who questioned America's role in Korea. Little did they know that the American boy who fought and died in Korea really fought and died for the safety of his sweetheart in Springfield, Mass. The American boy who fought and died in Korea really fought and died for the security of his relatives in Tallahassee, Fla. The American boy who fought and died in Korea fought and died for the safety of his dear ones in Boston, Mass. That, too, is a truth you must know, for if Korea had fallen, that whole chain would have snapped, and once your American perimeter of defense in Asia falls under communism, it is curtains for democracy.

That is why I must state with all emphasis your national security is at stake in Asia. Because, don't forget, the Pacific Ocean no longer affords you the protection that it did 10 years ago. Modern technology has annihilated the Pacific Ocean. Guided missiles, intercontinental ballistics, supersonic planes, snorkel submarines, the atom bomb—these have reduced the Pacific to the size of a pond.

So that, while in terms of mileage, the American perimeter of defense that extends from the Aleutians to the Philippines may be 10,000 miles away from Springfield, in terms of your territorial security that chain is your nextdoor neighboor, and if anything should happen to any of the links in that chain, your safety, here in Springfield, Mass., would be seriously menaced.

How important it is, therefore, my friends, that you realize the direct bearing of Asia on your national security. Asia was once

pictured by Odoric of Pordenone and Marco Polo as something enigmatic, mysterious, and dark. There is no truth in that. There is nothing enigmatic, nothing mysterious, nothing dark about Asia. The peoples there are simple folk, unsophisticated. And, because they are simple and unsophisticated, their thought patterns are simple too, and therefore they cannot be enigmatic nor can they be mysterious.

Asia wants your friendship, and you must try to understand Asia. You can make friends with Asia. You have done it once; you can do it again. You have done it in my country.

When you first went to the Philippines, we hated you. We fought you for 3 long years. You had to kill 350,000 Filipinos before we laid down our arms in defeat, in recognition of your material might.

My father happened to be one of those who fought you to the last. I was trained as a boy to hate you. As I said, we hated you as only an occupied people can hate an army of occupation. And you don't know what that means, because God has saved you from the humiliation of being an occupied people.

But what happened? Why is it that we are now your stanchest friends and most loyal allies in Asia? That is something important for you to know. For America, once in a while, should indulge in some national introspection. We are your friends now, and we are your loyal allies, and we proved it to you in Bataan, in Corregidor, even in Korea. We were fighting our Communists in the Philippines when we had to send out troops to Korea to fight side by side with yours. If that is not loyalty I want to know what loyalty is. And that is the loyalty of your Filipino allies to your ideals, to your democracy.

Why is that so? Because in your dealings with my people, you, the stronger nation, followed the Golden Rule: "Do unto others as you would have others do unto you." Because in your dealings with my people you, the stronger nation, respected the dignity of the human soul, and in the relationships between peoples, that is enough.

This American adherence to the Golden Rule set a unique policy for all of Asia. In the Philippines you announced as your fixed policy the utterance of your first civil governor, William H. Taft, to the effect that "America's policy here in the Philippines is epitomized in one sentence: 'The Philippines for the Philippines.' "

Well, there you have something unique, bizarre, unprecedented in Asia, because, in the countries surrounding us, the colonial powers were following a policy exactly the opposite of that.

Thus we saw gradually that your policy was, by and large, honest and just. You promised us independence; you set a date for that independence. There was a lot of opposition here against that. Powerful sectors of American public opinion, influential American newspapers campaigned against Philippine independence, supported by vested interests and strong sectors of your Army and Navy.

But the average Tom, Dick, and Harry of this United States, the rank and file of the people representing that clean, wholesome, honest American conscience, blind to the allurements of power and deaf to the tinkle of the gold dollar, stood by our cause.

And your Congress, faithful interpreter of the clean American conscience, was unswerving in its determination to keep faith with the Filipino people, and a day for independence was set, against the wishes of the powerful lobbyists working in Congress. Congress fulfilled its word, and that was how we Filipinos came to know that America's word was her bond.

How important that you did that in the Philippines, for now in the United Nations, whenever a Vishinsky or a Molotov or a Gromyko stands up to accuse America of imperialism, there your ambassador is already winking at me. [Laughter.] Because the ready answer is for me to stand up and say, "What are you talking about, 'American imperialism'? America could have stayed in the Philippines, but preferred to relinquish its sovereignty over us. We are exhibit A of the fact that America is not an imperialist country. America proclaimed Philippine independence before any other power ever though of doing the same."

That is your reply now against any charge of imperialism leveled at you. On the other hand, if you had not granted us independence in 1946, what reply could you give Molotov and Gromyko and Bulganin and Krushchev?

How inspiring it is once in a while for America to indulge in national introspection, to look back and to realize that her greatness does not lie so much in her material power, not so much on her atom bomb and military might, on the intangibles and imponderables of the spirit in which you as a nation are immeasurably rich. Let America look to her spirit, because that is where her power and her greatness lie.

Let there be no more boasting of America's might, because that does not make friends for America in Asia. But let America speak of how her forefathers in 1776 proclaimed to all the world the equality of all men. That is one proof of America's greatness.

When your forefathers in 1776 had the vision and the courage to say that all men are created equal, they uttered what at that time was a plain political heresy. You were laughed at and sneered at in other continents where kings and dukes and counts and princes were living way above the level of common man.

Not all men at that time were created equal. But your forefathers in 1776 had the vision and the courage to see and to proclaim that all men are created equal. And, mind you, they could have written—but they did not—that all men north of the equator are created equal. Or they could have written—but they did not—that all men south of the equator are created equal.

In short, what they proclaimed was the equality of all mankind, and then proclaimed it for all ages. That is the strength and might of America.

All that Asia asks is for America to see to it now that she is the world leader, that her allies should follow the pattern she set in the Philippines.

All that Asia asks is for you to continue to make your preachments dovetail with your deeds. All that Asia asks is for America to continue to make her ideals to coincide with her acts,

That, my friends of Springfield, is the message that this, your friend, has come humbly to convey to you tonight. [Applause.]

Address by Hon. Richard E. Lankford, of Maryland, Before the Government Employees' Council, Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am particularly pleased to include therein an excellent address made on April 18, 1956, by our distinguished colleague from Maryland, Hon. RICHARD E. LANKFORD, before the Government Employees' Council, in Washington, D. C. Congressman LANKFORD very ably and effectively addresses himself to H. R. 10237, introduced by our colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Hon. GEORGE M. RHODES. Convincingly, he presents reasons why H. R. 10237 should be enacted into law. The presentation made by our colleague the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LANKFORD] is one of the ablest I have ever heard presented in support of any legislation. It is consistent with the clear thinking evidenced by him on all legislation; it is consistent with the splendid manner in which he represents the people of his district.

I am sure that the employees of the Federal Government will deeply appreciate the position taken by our colleague the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LANKFORD] on this bill, as well as all other legislation, such as relating to wages, hours of employment, sick benefits, and retirement, as well as conditions of employment; also, that they are indebted to him for his vigorous advocacy of legislation relating to their best interests.

The speech follows:

I am delighted to have this opportunity of meeting with the Government Employees' Council. My remarks will not be lengthy, because I know your program is heavy.

As a matter of fact, I would much prefer to sit back and let you gentlemen conclude your deliberations. It is on the basis of your decisions and advice that I take my cue in matters affecting postal and other Federal employees in my district. And may I say that some of my colleagues in the House of Representatives might well follow the same pattern.

Take the case of pending legislation affecting your retirement benefits. I took a poll on what the employees thought of this legislation. It was not the same kind of poll some of my colleagues announced nor the kind proposed by others on the Senate side of the Capitol. I simply directed my inquiry to the headquarters of the employee groups and to the employees with whom I am in almost daily contact. There was no rhyme or reason to suggest a referendum or worldwide poll in order to learn something that could be ascertained by merely placing a telephone call right here in Washington and through daily conversations.

The answer I got from your council headquarters was to the effect that you gentlemen—speaking for your respective organizations—approved Senator JOHNSTON'S bill, S. 2875. That was the extent of my poll. All the facts were in as far as I was concerned. Anything beyond that was little more than politicking or "gamemanship" to use a more sophisticated term.

Of course, I am not opposed to consultation between Members of Congress and Federal workers or between the heads of departments and employees or representatives designated by them. I consult with Federal workers practically every day. But a poll is hardly consultation. Questions can be loaded and often produce not facts or opinions, but just about what the poll taker wants the answer to be.

I recall that no poll was taken a few years ago when the distinguished gentleman who heads up the Post Office Department attempted to put over his Fry report. There is no record of the White House polling the farmers of our Nation prior to President Eisenhower's veto of the farm bill.

As I said, I am not opposed to open channels of discussion. However, the way to

make certain that employees are given an opportunity to express themselves is not through polls, but through a bona fide labor-management procedure.

I sincerely hope we will be given an opportunity before this session of Congress adjourns to vote on the union recognition legislation your council is supporting. The bill introduced by Congressman GEORGE RHODES, of Pennsylvania, known as H. R. 10237, is fair and equitable to everyone. It does not suggest that the executive branch must forfeit or abandon its responsibilities to Congress or the employees. Nor does it intimate in the slightest degree that Government workers want to determine policy. As I understand the Rhodes bill, all you people ask is the right to sit down with the heads of departments to discuss working conditions, safety, in-service training, methods of adjusting grievances, transfers, promotions, demotions, and any other facet of your employment affecting the day-to-day lives of the people you represent. Following these discussions, you further request assurance that in the event of a serious disagreement both sides will accept the decisions of an impartial board of arbitration.

Frankly, it is difficult for me to understand how anyone can seriously oppose this legislation. Our Federal Government guarantees these same rights under one form or another to workers in private industry. Why should there be a distinction, indeed, discrimination against Federal employees?

I am not going to attempt a résumé of all the bills in which your council is interested. It was simply my intention to drop in and visit for a few minutes. However, I would not want to yield the floor without giving you my pledge to support your drive for better wages. The decision of your council announced early in March hit the nail right on the head. It is time Congrss started to legislate in terms of standard-of-living wages for Government workers. The old method of chasing prices and attempting to peg wages to living costs might have worked out, but it had no chance. It was always a case of too little and too late. By the time a wage settlement was made prices had spurted ahead and the gap between living costs and salaries was as wide as ever. I want to encourage the new approach you have adopted and again assure you that you have my full support. You need not worry that I will be inclined to take a poll of the Federal employees in the Fifth District of Maryland on that decision on my part.

Everybody Pays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, last, the Honorable Jesse M. Donaldson, former Postmaster General of the United States, testified in support of the postal rate bill, H. R. 9228, before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, at the invitation of the distinguished chairman, the Honorable TOM MURRAY of Tennessee.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared in today's Washington News, commending the very able case presented by Mr. Donaldson. The editorial follows:

EVERYBODY PAYS

Jesse M. Donaldson, who was Postmaster General under President Truman, has made a welcome contribution to the pile of evidence that postal rates should be increased. He would go even farther than the administration, advocating that rates on newspapers and magazines be increased by more than Postmaster General Summerfield has recommended.

Some Democrats in Congress have attempted to label postage rate reform as a Republican notion. It is nothing of the sort, as Mr. Donaldson's testimony makes clear. He asked Congress in 1951 to double the rates for second-class mail.

Party politics has no place in the pressing problem our chronic postal deficit presents. The cost of cut-rate mail service to business establishments is shared by all taxpayers, Democratic and Republican alike, and they all are interested in seeing the postal service pay its way.

Congressmen are fooling no one but themselves if they think the public doesn't know there is no such thing as free or bargain mail service, so far as the taxpayers are concerned. When a busines firm pays less than it costs the Government to carry its mail, the public pays the difference, in taxes. And this has been going on too long already.

Military Reserve Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I present herewith a brilliant address made by Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, Chairman, National Security Training Commission, at the Military Reserve Week luncheon, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., Monday, April 23, 1956. I feel my colleagues will be interested in reading this important address.

I am highly honored by the invitation of the National Security Committee to speak at this luncheon, marking the start of Military Reserve Week. The occasion is so pertinent to the major challenge of our times and our country's ability to meet that challenge that it is a privilege to participate in our common effort.

In sponsoring this important week, your committee and the member-organizations represented here today have given a significant example of citizen-leadership at its best. In a free country such as ours, the fate of any public program depends in largest measure upon public understanding of its purpose and operation. The inherent merits of an undertaking and the good intentions of its leaders are not enough to guarantee success, unless they are backed by popular comprehension and acceptance.

The National Security Committee, in launching this nationwide effort to bring about greater awareness of the need for a strong military Reserve, is therefore making a decisive contribution. I salute its public-spirited initiative.

In these days of atomic and hydrogen bombs, ballistic missiles, and artificial satellites, too many people rush to the conclusion that push-button warfare has pushed the GI right out of the picture.

The question is sometimes asked, "Why bother recruiting men for the Reserve? What good would men be in future wars?"

It strikes me that a far more relevant question is, "What good would all our new superweapons be without trained men to operate them, without men prepared to provide firm leadership on the homefronts?"

Should an enemy impose a conflict upon us, we must have the trained men to pilot the planes, drop the bombs, tend the radar outposts, launch the missiles, run the submarines.

To use the new weapons effectively, and to survive against them, we must be properly trained and conditioned. The pace of modern war has become so swift that in any future conflict, this training must come before the start of hostilities—and that, of course, means an adequate Reserve program.

It was Lord Nelson who said long ago, "Five minutes may make the difference between victory and defeat." Today we should edit his warning to read, "The first 5 minutes may make the difference."

THE CONTINUING COMMUNIST THREAT

There are some who would have us believe, in the light of recent events, that the mood of the Communist high command is changing from the old belligerence to a new benevolence. Among other things, they point to the fact that the dead despot of the Kremlin, Joseph Stalin, is being harpooned, lampooned, and cartooned by his successors. This view of the change in Moscow is a tempting one, but also a dangerous one, because it may encourage complacency and undercut vigilance.

Moscow has launched some new slogans and tactics designed to confuse and divide its selected victims. But its familiar strategy of probing for soft spots in the free world's material and moral defenses—of exploiting political, social, and economic difficulties—remains unaltered. Now, as in the past, the Communists are everywhere feeding and fanning the flames of discontent.

While ostensibly talking of peace, they continue to block peaceable solutions of century-old problems. In southeast Asia, in north Africa, and—especially right now—in the strategic Middle East, the Red mischief-masters are hard at work to make good their open boast that the 20th century will be the century of the triumph of communism. The fundamental realities of the present situation cannot be wished away or smiled away.

We have no rational alternative but to proceed on the assumption that the main Soviet objective remains to disrupt, and eventually to dominate, the free world. We must face up to the fact that we are not going to wake up next week or next month to a sudden thaw in the cold war. Far from relaxing, we must prepare ourselves for the long pull, and in this preparation our military reserves are more important than ever before.

Their importance is threefold: First, the Reserves are a bulwark for our Armed Forces. Second, they are a support for our civil defense. And third, they are a buttress for our cold-war efforts. Let us consider each of these points briefly.

BULWARK FOR OUR ARMED FORCES

As for our Armed Forces, we all know that the building and maintenance of a huge standing Army are contrary to our democratice concepts. And such an Army might well prove disastrous to our national economy.

What is the alternative? It is to prepare a large body of our citizenry to meet an enemy attack promptly, if and when it arises.

With a pool of reservists trained and ready to draw on, we could send our fighting men to combat areas as fast as our ships and planes could carry them. Without such a

Reserve force, we might be unable to hold our overseas bases and strategic free-world areas.

In addition, a trained Reserve gives us the strength we need at considerably lower long-range cost than a large standing Army. I certainly do not mean to suggest that we should skimp on our defense requirements; but we must recognize that one of those requirements is solvency. Any plan that can enhance our strength and at the same time provide substantial savings, has much to recommend it.

SUPPORT FOR OUR CIVIL DEFENSE

In any future war, the vitality of our home fronts may be as important as—indeed, even more important than—fronts beyond our shores. Besides reinforcing our active military units, the Reserves therefore have a second vital function. They can be a stabilizing factor in our civil defense. In an emergency, not all reservists would be called to the colors instantly—but every reservist would be a trained man on the scene in his own community.

He would be able to provide leadership in controlling panic, instructing neighbors in the elementary techniques of self-protection, participating in rescue teams and setting up emergency camps. Civil defense authorities tell us, rightly, that the most critical work would have to be completed within 2 to 5 days after the outbreak of hostilities. It is precisely during this tense period that the reservists would prove most valuable, no matter when the military found it necessary to call them up after that.

BUTTRESS FOR OUR COLD WAR EFFORTS

The third principal area in which a trained and adequate Reserve can have a powerful impact is our cold war effort—on the political, economic, and psychological fronts. Let none of us underestimate these fronts.

Consider, for example, the vastly important field of psychological warfare—or, as I prefer to call it, "psychological peacefare." Communist propaganda is trying insidiously to convince the world that the United States seeks war, that our military programs are aggressive in intent. Surely the Reserve program, as a wholly defensive measure, reflects our dedication to peace and our determination that no free country must purchase that peace at the price of freedom.

To enlist popular support abroad, to create confidence in the earnestness of our professions and policies, to strengthen hope and resistance among the peoples behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, including the peoples of Russia proper—it is not enough for us to reiterate our noble aims. These must be backed up with no less noble deeds. A strong Reserve would serve notice on the skeptical and anxious peoples of the freedom-loving world that we have the trained manpower to defend the ideals we—and they—believe in so fervently.

It would also serve notice on the Communists that we mean business. The very existence of a trained body of manpower ready to swing into action could not help but act as a deterrent to an attack on free countries. We have learned that to be weak is to invite attack; to be strong is not only readiness to meet it, but often insurance against it. Psychological and political efforts can be very important aids, but they are not substitutes for adequate physical power to defend ourselves against aggression.

THE 6-MONTH TRAINING PROGRAM

The National Security Committee and its member organizations have long recognized the crucial importance of having a trained and Ready Reserve. The entire Nation owes a debt of gratitude to these groups. It is largely through their efforts that we now have on the books the Reserve Forces Act of 1955. This act admittedly is not perfect, but it does represent a good start toward putting muscle into our Reserve.

A significant feature of this law is the 6-month training program. This new and practical concept of military service enables young men to fulfill their obligation to national security by being full-time civilians and part-time soldiers. Under this arrangement, a young man goes to a training camp for just 6 months. Then he returns to civilian life, where he spends a reasonable period in his hometown Reserve unit.

The potentialities of the 6-month training program for creating strong Reserve forces are tremendous. But the young men 17 to 18½ for whom it was designed are not as yet responding in sufficient numbers to support it. Why have the volunteers fallen short of the goals?

Our Secretary of Defense put his finger on the heart of the difficulty recently. "When the 6-month training program is generally known and understood," he said, "large numbers of young men will want to enter it. The big problem is to achieve broad public awareness of the need for and advantages of this program."

As Chairman of the National Security Training Commission, I have had occasion during recent months to observe closely the work of the Defense Department in this field of its activities. I am glad to say to you that Secretary Charles E. Wilson and Assistant Secretary Carter Burgess and their staffs are doing everything possible to put this Reserve program into high gear. They are dedicated to its purposes and objectives. And our Commission is receiving the fullest measure of cooperation from the Department of Defense.

ADVANTAGES OF THE PROGRAM

The 6-month training program has many advantages.

It gives the young man himself a chance to plan realistically for his future without worrying about when he will be drafted—and at the same time, to fulfill his legal obligation and patriotic duty.

It gives his family the assurance that he will be away from home for only 6 months instead of the 2 years required under the draft—and that he will not be called away for his training until he leaves high school.

It gives his home town a trained leader capable of helping in time of emergency, and capable, too, of making a real contribution to the labor force. The technical skills a young man learns in the service will help him get a job when he is ready and advance his prospects for promotion.

It gives his country a chance to fill out its Active and Reserve strength and to maintain the necessary stability of forces.

That is what the program has to offer. That is the message—and it is a highly appealing one. Our job now, during Military Reserve Week, is to get that message across to the young men of America and to their fathers and mothers.

The radio and television networks, the press, the motion pictures and all other media of communication have pledged their enthusiastic support for this effort and are cooperating magnificently. But everybody's help is urgently needed—not just on the national level, but on the State and local levels as well. The important thing is to get 165 million Americans to realize that the Reserves are vital to the security of our Nation—which means the security of each one of us.

The clock of history has struck 12 for those Cinderella fairy-tale thinkers who would have us prepare our defenses only after an enemy has attacked. In the present era we must have strength in Reserve if we are to survive as a free Nation—or, indeed, if we are to survive at all.

Croatian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 22, I took part in ceremonies in Cleveland, commemorating the 15th anniversary of the national independence of Crotia, at which Msgr. Tomislav Firis was chairman.

We Americans will never forget that during World War II our airmen who were shot down over Croatia found the Croatian legions true friends and protectors from the enemy. The same Croatians legions under the leadership of General Mikhailovich established and maintained an underground railway through which our airmen escaped from Croatia to the free world. It will also be recalled that when the Communist occupiers of Yugoslavia captured General Mikhailovich and were preparing to execute him, American veterans of that theater of war protested these actions and sought to prevent the murder of General Mikhailovich. All freedom-loving people were sad upon hearing the news of the murder of General Mikhailovich by the Tito Communists. These are some of the reasons, in addition to our basic political beliefs, which compel us to support the cause of the Croatian people in their aspirations for national independence.

Under leave granted, I include my address delivered at the Croatian Independence Day celebration:

I am very happy to be here with you today and to join with you in commemorating the 15th anniversary of the establishment of the independence day of Croatia.

As most of you know, I have, throughout my entire public life, stood for and advanced the policy of equality for people and for nations. In more recent years, I have led the fight in Congress against all forms of colonialism which today enslave nations and people.

Communism is, by its very nature, imperialistic, predatory, and inhuman. The two outstanding examples of imperialism and colonialism at work in the world today are found in the Russian Communist Empire and Tito's Communist Empire. The Soviet Union has long been called the graveyard of nations. The nations of central Europe were added to this graveyard of nations during and following World War II, but Yugoslavia is also a graveyard of nations. Tito's Yugoslavia enslaves 4 distinct nations and 1 of them is the Croatian nation whose independence day we honor today.

Croatia has every right to be independent and free of the Communist chains applied to it by Tito. We Americans believe in the principle of national self-determination for all people. We, therefore, believe the Croatians are entitled to national self-determination. It is a certainty that if the Croatian people were allowed to express their views today, they would be solidly against Tito's empire and in favor of a free and independent State of Croatia. Even Tito is aware of this fact, and accordingly, he will do everything in his power to prevent the world from knowing about the heroic

struggles of the Croatian nation to regain its national independence.

I again assure you that I shall continue to support, with all the vigor at my command, the right of all nations to self-determination, independence, and self-government. I shall also continue to fight against all forces that deny any people these natural rights. I shall continue to do what I can to expose Tito for the Communist stooge and Russian agent that he really is. The only loyalty Tito has is to the Russian Empire and the world domain of communism. He and the conspirators who surround him are no different than the evil men who live in the Moscow Kremlin. Both are equal evils and threats to the cause of peace.

Farm-Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the veto of the farm bill by President Eisenhower, and his subsequent radio-television broadcast wherein he sought to justify his action, have given editorialists a great deal of grist for their mills. One of the keenest analysis it has been my privilege to read was published by the Carlisle (Pa.) Evening Sentinel of April 11. The editorial follows:

FARMERS HAPPY OR UNHAPPY?

President Eisenhower, in an address to the people of the Nation, after he vetoed the farm bill, said that before he took the action he was told "what a risky thing in an election year." But, "I am no political expert, I will always resist any attempt to make the farmer and his problems a political football."

There is not the slightest degree of doubt that the President most sincerely believes what he said. It must be stressed, however, that acting on authority given through legislation approved in 1954, he has, at the same time, promised farmers that price supports will be increased to 84 percent on wheat and 86.2 percent on corn—and wheat and corn are the most important crops in the farm-belt States. Also he promised he will seek soil-bank legislation with a provision that would permit payment of up to 50 percent of the bank funds to farmers as early as July 1—which would give about $500 million to farmers before the election. It must also be remembered that the farmer has been calling for aid for a period of years, but to all practical purposes has been ignored until this, an election year.

During the 1952 campaign the general told farmers in the Midwest that he was not only willing to approve 90 percent supports (which the farmers were then receiving) but that he felt that farmers should have supports of 100 percent or more if necessary to keep their economy on a level with the rest of the Nation. The President, as is his prerogative, has changed his opinion since 1952 and, with Secretary of Agriculture Benson, has been convinced that lower, flexible supports are better for the farmer. But, though flexible supports, through congressional action, replaced rigid supports, the farmer's lot has steadily worsened.

It appears now that the President has again reversed himself on price supports—that he believes the farmers need higher supports. If not, then the President has promised higher supports for political expediency. And, if $500 million is pumped into the Farm Belt before fall, whether the President intentionally means to attempt to attract the farm vote with silver or not, that will be exactly what he will be doing. The soil bank in itself is a good plan. It is time that we begin conservation of our natural resources, else in a few short years we may find ourselves short on wood, good soil, et cetera, and forced to depend on other countries for that which we have today in abundance.

The principal trouble with the President's program for the farmer is that, at best, it is a stopgap, not the solution to the farm problem. With machinery now available the farmer can produce from only half of his land as much as he formerly produced a few years ago from all his land. He can cooperate in the soil bank and still will overproduce, so that there might still be surpluses. The only realistic answer to the problem apparently lies in proper distribution.

Everybody seems only too willing to tell us what the result of the President's action or futher congressional action will bring forth, but we are not convinced that the solution has yet been uncovered. Everybody is telling us also of the impact the President's courageous veto, planned boost of supports, distribution-in-advance of soil-bank funds and other moves might have on the fall elections. The majority opinion in this locality is that the President, while vetoing the bill, simultaneously made a political master stroke by his compromise pledges. Of what bearing his new program (if he can push it through) may have on the election results, we are not convinced. The Congress will bear watching. The solons have time to debate and act. Election time is far distant. Many things can happen to alter the present circumstances.

Are the farmers happy—or are the farmers unhappy? We do not presume to know. We do not believe that it would be wise for anyone at this stage to attempt to guess what aid the farmer will receive, or to presume how the farmer feels or will feel when he goes to vote, or to presume that Mr. Eisenhower or the Democratic candidate will win because of the farm vote. Farmers are patient, quiet men. They will await the verdict, then without fanfare they will go to the polls.

What we would like to see, naturally, is aid given to the farmer as soon as possible, aid that will increase the worth of his purchasing dollar, and see it done without political interference or manipulation. The prime objective should be to put the farmer back on a level of economy which tallies with the other segments of business. But, in this situation, everything reverts to the time-worn question: How eliminate politics?

Automobile Marketing Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, during the current congressional hearings on automobile marketing practices, automobile manufacturers have consistently opposed any legislation on factory-dealer relationships. One manufacturer alleged in his testimony that such legislation would only "weaken dangerously an industry fundamental to the Nation's economic growth."

Over the weekend I was pleased to learn that this sham plea has not deterred the Governor of the State of New York, the Honorable Averell Harriman. On April 20, 1956, Governor Harriman signed a bill amending the New York general business law, for the purpose of prohibiting automobile manufacturers from arbitrarily revoking the franchises of dealers in New York State. Under the law effective October 1, 1956, auto manufacturers are required to register with the Secretary of State. Manufacturers are prohibited by the law from terminating a dealer contract except for cause. A maximum penalty of $1,000 fine is imposed for each violation.

In his statement upon approving the bill, Governor Harriman called attention to the growing difficulties of small- and medium-sized independent businesses, and pointed out that the giant corporations have the economic power to decide the life or death of thousands of smaller businesses—not only their competitors, but their own suppliers and distributors. Governor Harriman further stated that, contrary to the claim of manufacturers that "the public interest is not sufficiently affected," it is his firm conviction that "it is very much in the interest of the people that small- and medium-sized business should be protected against unfair exercise of economic power."

I sincerely hope that the Congress will also heed the public interest and take the necessary action to correct the abusive practices in the automobile industry which have been uncovered in the current hearings before the Senate and House committees.

Depressed Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to make a plea that this Congress shall really do something to aid some of the economically depressed areas of the Nation, including my own depressed section in southeastern Kentucky.

The President himself has recommended that something be done. Many people are concerned. Time is running out and we should act to extend a helping hand to our needful areas right now.

I have offered a good bill that would help, H. R. 8283, by bringing about a three-way cooperative effort (a) by the communities involved, (b) by our Government through Employment Restoration Authority created by my bill, (c) by industries that would come and settle in our depressed areas under the plan of this bill.

Other good bills have also been offered and I hope the best ideas of all of these proposals will be chosen and welded into a good legislative instrument that would provide a bright star of good hope to some of our discouraged people in de-

pressed areas over the country. I have sent out about 90 copies of my own bill to Members of the House and Senate and have suggested and urged that we all act collectively and promptly on this serious problem that confronts many of our districts.

An official report that has recently come out of Kentucky says that the eastern part of my State is in "far worse shape in 1955 than 5 years earlier."

The same report says:

First. The average income in the area is 40 percent lower than that of the State as a whole;

Second. Employment in the area fell 18,322 since 1950, while employment in the State as a whole increased 33,591 in the same period;

Third. Earned wages in eastern Kentucky dropped to $51,400,000 last year, a decrease of $8,000,000 since 1950, yet statewide payrolls gained 40 percent during the same period;

Fourth. Harlan County alone, which is the most populous county of my district, lost $5,900,000 in annual wages during the past 5 years;

Fifth. Coal production furnished 25,152 jobs for men in eastern Kentucky last year compared to the 47,108 jobs it furnished in 1950 in the same area;

Sixth. Even last year, when the coal business increased to some extent, there was still a small decline in jobs for our people in eastern Kentucky;

Seven. Population losses in the past 5 years are 15,043 for Bell County and 12,327 for Harlan County and 8,197 for Pulaski County and 7,648 for Whitley County, to mention a few in my own district; and

Eighth. In some of these eastern Kentucky counties the per capita incomes are now among the lowest in the whole United States, the average being $749 in the year 1953 compared to a statewide average of $1,187 for the same year.

Now if a scourge should strike some part of the world or even some part of our own country, we would all be concerned and would gladly send our dollars and our aid to the affected areas without delay. Yet there is a great scourge of unemployment that has right now come over some of our own districts. So, it is time to become concerned about them. We should immediately stop importation of cheap, foreign residual oil into this country to compete with American workmen. And we should certainly converge our attention and our efforts upon early passage of a suitable bill to help the people in some of our districts "trace the rainbow through the rain" with clear assurance that their lands are not the forgotten spots of America.

The Editor's Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, on the night of Tuesday, April 17, those of us on this side of the aisle heard our great Vice President, DICK NIXON, introduce our President at a banquet concluding the national Republican conference. Mr. NIXON, in his introduction, extolled the many virtues of our President, emphasizing his courage.

It was quite a coincidence that in the Editor's Letter written by the publisher, Mr. F. F. McNaughton, of the Pekin Daily Times, should have pointed up in his column on the same date this wonderful quality of courage.

Under unanimous consent, I ask that the Editor's Letter be printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD:

THE EDITOR'S LETTER

(By McNaughton)

We have to hand it to Ike.

He has courage.

Recently we wrote a column in which we expressed admiration of the courage that gets a man ahead in war.

But we added that moral courage was on a still higher plane.

Moral courage makes the difference between a politician and a statesman.

A politician uses Federal money (the taxes you and I rushed to get paid yesterday) to buy votes.

A statesman risks the loss of votes and does "what seems right for America."

Fortunately in the past, such men have been found in both parties.

Happily, today such men are in both parties, but there are too many of the other kind in both parties.

Whether Ike's veto was right or wrong, it stamps him as a man of a high quality of moral courage.

The Scrub Has Lured Riders and Readers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my own remarks and to include extraneous material, I wish to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the April 21, 1956, issue of the Florida Times-Union, Jacksonville, Fla., entitled "The Scrub Has Lured Riders and Readers." The editorial follows:

THE SCRUB HAS LURED RIDERS AND READERS

A 3-day ride through the Ocala National Forest is underway this weekend with members of the Big Scrub Trail Riders taking part.

The riders are penetrating into a country of rare beauty and great loneliness. Both these aspects of the big scrub section were depicted for a nationwide audience in the writing of the late Majorie Kinnan Rawlings.

Mrs. Rawlings wrote in the tradition of regionalism and the local color school of American literature which began coming into prominence in the last half of the 19th century. But she transcended the limitations of that school, and her work is far more than local color.

The local colorists stressed the picturesque, as in the Louisiana stories of George Washington Cable, or the flamboyant as in the western tales of Bret Harte. They also made heavy use of dialect, as in the Pike County ballads of John Hay.

But sometime local color and the local accent were subordinated to universal truth, and when that was done greatness was achieved. The local flavor remained in a subdued fashion, giving realism and authenticity; but it was no longer obtrusive. Mark Twain's Huckleberry Finn illustrates how local color grew into something greater.

In such work as The Yearling, Mrs. Rawlings achieved this same dimension of universal truth. The love of the Cracker boy for the deer is something more than local color—it is a story of innocence and loneliness and the tragedy of loss.

Even in Cross Creek, which is not a novel and in which the emphasis is more upon the quaint and picturesque, Mrs. Rawlings generally avoided the temptation to caricature which vitiates so much of the work of local colorists. In Mrs. Rawlings Florida had a far greater novelist—because of her basic capacity for love—than Georgia has had in Erskine Caldwell; and who is actually the realist? Too many who seek to reflect a region actually distort and pervert its image.

The big scrub is the kind of landscape which inspires deep emotion and long thoughts. Though it is a lonely trail that the riders are following this weekend Marjorie Kinnan Rawlings had the insight to see that it was much like the trail which we all follow. Her achievement was in being a flawless mirror, so that the magic of the big scrub is forever enshrined in American literature.

The Fifth Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct to the attention of our colleagues Mr. Roscoe Drummond's column of April 15, 1956, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune for April 15, 1956. It is as follows:

WASHINGTON

(By Roscoe Drummond)

THE BILL OF RIGHTS AND SUBVERSION

The third branch of the Federal Government—the judiciary—is being heard from regularly these days on one of the most critical issues: how to safeguard the Bill of Rights without giving any aid or comfort to the Communist subversive. The Supreme Court's two latest decisions show that it is steadily building a wall of security around the basic rights guaranteed by the Constitution. I find no evidence that these decisions in any way weaken the capacity of the Government to cope with the trickery efforts of the Communist conspiracy. In the Harry Slochower case, the Court ruled that Brooklyn College could not dismiss the professor merely because he pleaded the fifth amendment, and that to do so was a denial of due process of law. This decision does not mean that Brooklyn College cannot dismiss Professor Slochower. It means only that it cannot dismiss him without evidence. It means that for a citizen to invoke his constitutional right cannot be accepted as evidence of guilt. Brooklyn College remains free to dismiss Professor Slochower on evidence that he is a Communist, but it can't substitute invoking the fifth amendment in place of evidence.

In the Steve Nelson case, the court ruled that protection of the Nation against sedition is a Federal, not a State, responsibility, and that, therefore, the State antisedition laws are unconstitutional.

This decision does not mean that the States can't help the Federal Government guard against subversion. It does mean that the responsibility for investigations belongs to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the responsibility for prosecution belongs to the Department of Justice.

The decision of the court rests on the premise that sedition against the United States is not a local offense, but is a crime against the Nation. It recognizes that centered responsibility will make for more effective, not less effective, enforcement.

It deserves to be noted that in striking down the Pennsylvania sedition act, the initiative did not come from the Federal Supreme Court. It came from the Pennsylvania Supreme Court which found the State statute to be unconstitutional. The Supreme Court affirmed the decision on appeal.

State sedition laws have been thrown out by other State courts. Alabama offers a revealing example. Here the legislature passed an act which required that all textbooks—the State buys all public-school textbooks—be certified by their publishers as containing no author and no mention of any author anywhere between the covers, whether in index, footnote, or bibliography, who belongs or might ever have belonged to an organization on the Attorney General's subversive list.

The publishers declared that such a condition could not be fulfilled, that such membership lists were either unavailable, unreliable or unproved. They declared it would mean a textbook blackout for the State of Alabama. The State legislature pushed the bill through, the publishers took it to the Alabama courts, and the courts threw it out.

Forty-two States plus Hawaii and Alaska have a medley of sedition laws which often exceed and sometimes conflict with the Federal laws. There have been a number of prosecutions, but the only evidence in any of the cases concerned sedition against the Nation.

"Out of all the voluminous testimony," said the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, "we have not found, nor has anyone pointed to, a single word indicating a seditious act or even utterance directed against the government of Pennsylvania."

This doesn't mean that people like Steve Nelson, whose sentence under Pennsylvania law is now quashed, will go free or will find it easier to ply their trade. Steve Nelson has already been prosecuted and convicted in the Federal court and is now under sentence.

J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has said: "The fact must not be overlooked that meeting the spy, the saboteur, and the subverter is a problem that must be handled on a nationwide basis."

What is needed is that all citizens and law-enforcing agencies report information directly to the FBI. The Supreme Court is simply avoiding the confusion of 50 or more competing headquarters from which to direct enforcement.

A $1.50 Calf

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Agriculture Department has announced that the farm income for the first quarter of 1956 dropped 5 percent from the postwar low of the first quarter in 1955. The Kentucky farmers who depend on income from livestock feel that the drop has been much greater. I have here a check to Mr. Sam Litton, Jr., route 1, Morehead, Ky., dated February 21, 1956, for one brown, white-faced calf. The gross price received at the Morehead Stockyards, Morehead, Ky., was $2.50. The net check, less 75 cents commission and 25 cents for insurance, was $1.50 for one veal calf. This is the price received by a farmer under the Eisenhower farm program of flexible price supports. The talk of continued prosperity combined with the Benson farm program does not help the Kentucky farmer to meet his bills when the price of a calf is scarcely equal to the truck charge for the hauling to market. The day of the $15 calf is long gone, it is now the $1.50 calf.

No. 1451

MOREHEAD STOCKYARDS, INC.

MOUNT STERLING, KY., *February 21, 1956.*

To Montgomery National Bank, Mount Sterling, Ky.

Pay the sum of $1.50 to Sam Litton, Jr., or order, Morehead, route 1.

MOREHEAD STOCKYARDS, INC.,
DONALD E. IRON.

Void if not cashed in 60 days from day of issue.

SALE BILL NO. 1451—MOREHEAD STOCKYARDS, INC.

Kind, brown calf.
Pen, 57.
Head, 1.
Mark, brown, white face.
Amount, $2.50.
Commission, 75 cents.
Net, $1.75.
Deductions, insurance, 25 cents.
Amount received, $1.50.

Will History Repeat Itself?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, permit me to direct to the attention of our colleagues the following remarks on Jewish history by Rabbi Bernard Twersky, which appear in the March 23, 1956, issue of the Jewish Press:

EGYPT-MOSCOW-JERUSALEM—THE LESSON OF PASSOVER

(By Rabbi Bernard Twersky)

Thousands of years have passed by since the exodus from Egypt until the present. The world has seen hundreds of generations come and go. It has witnessed the changes and transformations that have taken place from era to era, changes in ideas and basic concepts.

And yet the world is still the same and human beings are no different. Only the outward manifestations have changed, or better still, they have been adapted to the time.

It is the same order of master and slave, except that the chains are different. It is the same search of the human spirit, but the idols are different. It is the same world and the same mankind with all its weakness, but the outward appearances and conditions of life are different and new.

How true is the saying that "History repeats itself." But it is especially true where it concerns Jewish history with its repetition of historical events of Israel's ancient past in its various eras. Let us take, for example, the ancient story of the Exodus from Egypt.

As we review the history of that period we find that Egypt was the cradle of culture and civilization for the entire Near East. The Egyptians excelled in the fields of the arts and sciences, they spread culture throughout the world, her temples of science were renowned in the world, and so were also her 4,000 year-old architectual monuments and pyramids, which are to this day considered among the world's great wonders of art and technique.

This same Egyptian nation, which attained such a high cultural and spiritual level, at the same time was capable of becoming sadists and barbarians where it concerned Jews. They forgot completely their intelligence and science. With great sadism they oppressed and tortured the Jews, enslaved them, placed them outside the reach of the law. With the greatest of brutality they were bent on destroying and annihilating the Jewish people and forced them to withstand all sorts of persecution and oppression. The Jews groaned from the hard labor and from the heavy burden placed upon them.

Like Communist-Russia of a later day, so ancient Egypt never felt any gratitude to the Jews for all they have done for the country to improve living conditions there. They had forgotten about Joseph's new-deal and fair-deal social reforms which helped to stave off famine and death in the land. The Egyptians had lost all feelings of mercy and humanity in their attitude toward Jews.

As we contemplate the development of events in the past we cannot help but reflect upon the tragedy of our own times. I refer to the events in Germany only a decade ago. Germany, too, was a center of culture and civilization. It excelled in the arts and sciences and spread enlightenment throughout the world. But when it came to the Jews, the Germans emulated the Egyptians in their barbarism.

We are witnessing a similar tragedy in our own day. Russian Jewry has always fallen prey to the savagery of Russian officialdom and their cohorts. Russian Jewry, which at one time led world Jewry in scholarly accomplishment, is today in the throes of tragic spiritual destruction.

Not only have the Russian despots destroyed the culture of their own Jewish population but they are engaged in a campaign to undermine and stifle the creative development of Israel, which is the bastion of freedom in the Middle East. Russia is allying itself with the ancient enemies of Israel, such as Egypt and her "Murder, Inc.," accomplices. This alliance has been solidified for the purpose of conquering and enslaving the whole of the Middle East. Israel is in mortal peril from the brutal aggression of the Russian Gargantuan. The Russian dictators cannot endure the fruitful growth of Israel's political and economic edifice of liberty. Russia is the exponent of the grossest type of materialism and cannot bring to mankind the fruits of humanity and the exaltation of the spirit.

Education and science are no deterrents to an evil nature and a depraved character. Education can help to give man more knowledge and develop his abilities, but it cannot give him a kind heart, a clear conscience, and a refined soul. Only religion and a profound belief in God can give him these attributes.

Mankind and civilization are at the abyss of destruction in this atomic age. Unless mankind finds a way toward peace and justice, the principles of righteousness and human dignity, it will revert to complete darkness as in prehistoric times.

Passover has acquired a new meaning not only as a reminder of the great deliverance

of ancient days in Egypt, but as a hope and forerunner of liberation of Jewry from behind the Iron Curtain and other oppressed areas. With the help of the Almighty God it shall come to pass that our hopes and aspirations will be realized, as the Hagaddah says: "Next year we shall be free men."

Rev. C. Bertrand Bowser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend C. Bertrand Bowser, rector of St. Augustine's Episcopal Church in Lawrence, Mass., is retiring after 55 years of devoted service to the Creator of us all.

I grew up in the neighborhood of his church. One of my first and lasting impressions of this kind and understanding minister, was the inner sanctity that he radiated to every person that he met.

Although I worshiped at another church, the difference in our faiths became, not the separation but the bridge, that brought us close together in tolerance, respect, and friendship. To preach the divine word is the mission of all clergymen. To live it, is the supreme grace.

That is the inspiring story of the Reverend C. Bertrand Bowser, the good shepherd of St. Augustine's Church.

Although he is retiring from the active ministry, his presence and his example will help all the people of greater Lawrence to become better than they were, following the way of faith, hope, and charity. We are extremely grateful to the Reverend Mr. Bowser, and, in proof of our warm regard, I ask unanimous consent for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the following news report that appeared in a recent issue of the Evening Tribune, of Lawrence, Mass.

REV. MR. BOWSER RESIGNS AS RECTOR BECAUSE OF ILL HEALTH

Rev. C. Bertrand Bowser, dean of greater Lawrence clergymen and one of the oldest active Episcopal ministers in Massachusetts, announced his resignation as rector of St. Augustine's Episcopal Church to parishoners Sunday morning. Rector of that church for the past 50 years, Rev. Mr. Bowser told the congregation that, "It is with great regret that I find it necessary because of continuing illness to submit my resignation as rector to take effect July 1, 1956."

The rector, in announcing his resignation, told the congregation that he was grateful for "the many warm, personal associations that have developed through the years." He also expressed his thanks for the cooperation and help of the willing workers of the parish.

His announcement was as follows:

"It is with great regret that I find it necessary because of continuing illness to submit my resignation as rector of St. Augustine's Episcopal Church, to take effect July 1, 1956.

"During my 50 years of service at St. Augustine's, I have had the privilege of seeing the parish grow and prosper and become an increasingly active spiritual force in the community. I am grateful for the many warm personal associations that have developed through the years, for the cooperation and help given to me by the many willing workers at St. Augustine's and especially for the spirit of friendliness and good will which has always prevailed in our parish and has been one of our greatest assets.

"We have worked hard together for our church in bad and in good times and have known both failures and successes but in the end I think we can point with pride to our accomplishments in making St. Augustine's what it is today. I know the next 50 years will point the way to even higher goals and I leave you with my hopes and prayers for success in all your endeavors for the future."

Rev. Mr. Bowser is the only rector the church has ever had, going to that parish in 1906 when St. Augustine's was founded from the Grace Episcopal Church, where he had been serving as a curate.

Ordained in Trinity Episcopal Church, Boston, in June 1900, he has served in this city almost exclusively in his 55-year career as a clergyman.

The retiring clergyman was born in Sackville, New Brunswick, Canada, and moved to Wakefield in his early teens, and graduated from high school in that community. He furthered his education at Harvard College and Yale Divinity School where he received a bachelor of divinity degree in 1898.

His first 3 years as a minister were spent at Christ Church, Rochdale, until transferred to the Grace Episcopal Church in this community, serving as curate under Rev. Arthur Moulton, who later was named Episcopal bishop of Utah.

He has served here continuously since 1903, taking over as rector of St. Augustine's Church in 1906, the year of its foundation.

Rev. Mr. Bowser married Anstiss McDuffie in the same year. The couple have three children: Anstiss, wife of Richard Wagner, Ph. D., of Cambridge; Howard B. Bowser, of Readville; and Elizabeth, wife of Gordon Smith, of Manchester, N. H.

United Nations' Hymn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a poem by Milford E. Shields, Poet Laureate of the State of Colorado. Mr. Shields has written a poem concerning the United Nations, which I believe deserves our thoughtful consideration:

UNITED NATIONS' HYMN

(By Milford E. Shields)

One God creates all men of common clay
To dwell upon this earth in love and peace,
To labor on unto the shining day
When tyranny in all its forms shall cease;
Thus nations rise up in man's dwelling place,
Become united by God's living grace.

United Nations, rise with righteous might
Before oppressors who would slave the earth,
Meet force with greater force, meet might with right
And under God give freedom fuller birth;
Preserve man's high and holy dignity,
United Nations, keep all mankind free!

God of our fellow-men, we look to Thee—
Give us the vision and the range of sight,
Give us one strength and one humility
To labor on in one great love and light—
Give us the power, make our efforts whole
To work the full United Nations' goal!

American Bar Association Opposition to OTC-GATT

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a brief submitted to the Committee on Ways and Means in opposition to H. R. 5550, a bill to authorize the United States membership in OTC-GATT:

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION VIEWS IN OPPOSITION TO H. R. 5550, SUBMITTED TO THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, MARCH 8, 1956

(By Albert MacC. Barnes, designated representative)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Albert MacC. Barnes, of the New York bar. I am appearing here today as the representative of the American Bar Association, to oppose H. R. 5550. On August 24, 1955, at the annual meeting of the American Bar Association in Philadelphia, Pa., the house of delegates, the ruling body of that organization, approved the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the bill, H. R. 5550, authorizing the President to accept membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation, is hereby disapproved on the grounds (a) that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934 (Tariff Act of 1930, sec. 350) confers no such power on the President, and (b) that neither the President, nor Congress has the legal authority under the Constitution, to delegate the regulation of our commerce with foreign nations to a foreign-controlled group, and the committee on customs law is hereby authorized on behalf of the American Bar Association to present these views to the Congress, and that the president of the American Bar Association be authorized to select a representative or representatives to appear before the proper congressional committees."

This is not intended to be a fully documented brief but rather a collection of thoughts which we hope the committee may find useful.

Any consideration of H. R. 5550, by the very phraseology of that bill, necessitates consideration of the Charter of the Organization for Trade Cooperation (known as OTC, and the charter of OTC states that it is to implement and administer the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (known as GATT). It seems obvious, therefore, that H. R. 5550 and OTC and GATT must be considered together as part of a general plan to take away from Congress the constitutional obligation imposed upon it and delegated it to a supernational or international organization in which the United States, with 20 percent of the world's foreign trade, is relegated to a minor position. The United States must even obtain the consent of that body, in which it has one vote out of 35 and no veto, before it can attend to what may well be considered the sovereign right of the people to mind their own business.

Much talk has been heard and many warnings sounded about the disastrous consequences which will flow from refusal of the Congress to approve H. R. 5550. Much of this propaganda smacks of deliberate effort to pressure the Congress into approval of a course of action to which it is claimed the United States has already committed itself, seemingly without regard to the fundamental questions of whether the proposed action is in accord with the law of the

United States. Whether or not there be validity in such fears, the Congress must determine four basic questions:

1. Has the President any sovereign power to enter into an executive agreement to join a supernational or international organization designed to direct and control our foreign trade?

2. Can Congress under its constitutional power over foreign trade delegate to the President the authority to become a member of OTC?

3. Did the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as amended, delegate in advance an authority to the President to make and proclaim the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT)?

4. Has the President usurped a nondelegable power of Congress in creating GATT?

Discussion of these questions should be prefaced by refreshing the recollection of the committee as to certain specific provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

Article I, section 1, provides that: "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

Article I, section 8: "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises."

* * * * *

Article I, section 8, clause 3: "Congress shall have power * * * to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes."

Article II, section 2, clause 2 under powers of the President provides: "He" (the President) "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

The most casual inspection of these clauses forces the conclusion that so far as the matters involved in this foreign trade-control plan are concerned, the Constitution gives to the President only one power, i. e., "to make treaties with the advice and consent of the Senate." GATT has no status as a treaty.

Lest we lose sight of the main path, and drift off into the realm of sovereignty as a basis for so-called executive agreements, perhaps it would be well to again consider the phraseology of the Constitution. The preamble thereof states:

"We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution of the United States of America."

Sovereignty, wrested from the British Crown, was assumed by the people of the Colonies. It certainly could not have descended upon 13 separate collections of people whether known as colonies or states or territories.

The Declaration of Independence states: "When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another," and further: "We, therefore, the Representatives of the United States of America * * * in the name, and by the authority of the good people of these Colonies."

The concept of sovereignty, suffered a severe change from the old idea of the ruler being the state. No longer could one say, "The sovereign is dead—long live the sovereign." Here sovereignty for the first time was reposed in an indestructible and perpetual power—the people.

And so when the Constitution came to be written it was "We the people," who granted to officers and divisions of the Government established thereby, certain prerogatives of their sovereignty. To Congress they, the people, delegated the sole and exclusive right to legislate, and specifically mentioned the right to tax and to control foreign commerce. To the President they gave only one direct trade power—that, to make treaties.

It seems almost self-evident that the President has no rights of sovereignty from the British Crown or elsewhere unless they were passed through the people in the Constitution. Therefore, we must look to the Constitution only for the power to engage in any activity involving sovereign rights, as well as for any power involving foreign trade.

Any powers which Congres has under the Constitution must be exercised by Congress, and by Congress alone. What is not written in a delegation of authority cannot be assumed under any theory of a sovereignty in the President superior to that of the people or the Constitution.

The administration of laws can be delegated to the Executive or other agents of Congress, only in case Congress sets up an intelligible principle or legislative yardstick by which the delegate is governed. In *Panama Refining Co.* v. *Ryan* (293 U. S. 388) the Supreme Court passing on the question of delegation of authority in the National Industrial Recovery Act, and construing the exclusive power of Congress to regulate commerce under the Constitution, stated:

"The Congress manifestly is not permitted to abdicate or to transfer to others the essential legislative functions with which it is thus vested."

This principle is definitely applicable to GATT in spite of the dictum of Mr. Justice Sunderland in *United States* v. *Curtiss Wright* (299 U. S. 304). Certainly in that case the delegated power was sufficiently described and limited by Congress to be well within the established rule regarding legislative yardsticks, limits, or principles necessary in any delegation of power. Such cases as *Field* v. *Clark* (143 U. S. 649 (1892)); *Buttfield* v. *Stranahan* (192 U. S. 470 (1904)); and *Hampton* v. *United States* (276 U. S. 394) have clearly supported the principle that where Congress incorporates in a delegation of authority, phraseology establishing an "intelligible principle," definite limitations of activity and leaves nothing involving the expediency or just operation of such legislation to the determination of the President, the delegation is within the Constitution.

The delegation was not of the right to make law but to fill in the facts or conditions under which a congressionally made law was to take effect, be disregarded, or made inoperative.

H. R. 5550 provides only for membership in a so-called administrative body. The charter of that body (OTC) which must be considered a part of this legislation, contains no legislative yardsticks, limitation, or "intelligible principle" established by Congress. The operation is left to the discretion of the membership without any control by Congress. If GATT is to be considered a part of this executive program then it will be found that GATT goes far beyond the limitations of authority granted the President in section 350, Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

GATT was put into effect by signature to a protocol of provisional application. On behalf of the United States it was signed by a division chief of the Department of State. In our case the alleged delegation to the President was in fact redelegated by him to the Secretary of State, and redelegated by the Secretary of State to a division chief. Now it is sought to redelegate the power to an international or supernational organization. The President's proclamation, T. D. 51802, only amplifies the view that no such power was reposed in the President by the provisions of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

H. R. 5550 is a delegation of authority to the President to accept membership in the OTC. No limitations or control or statement of an intelligible principle accompanies this delegation. On the contrary, for example, the bill carries an appropriation to the Department of State of "whatever sums may be necessary" for the payment of the United States "share of the expenses" of OTC. These expenses are to be "in accordance with article 9 of the agreement referred to in subsection (a)", OTC Charter. But it is significant that this is a delegation of unlimited authority because the fixing of expenses and shares is left to the OTC assembly, by article 9. The delegation also carries with it the fixing of salaries on an unknown basis, and of employees in unknown number. It delegates to the Secretary of State the authority to fix "other expenses which he may deem necessary." The bill itself does not comply with any of the rules governing the delegation of an authority, and seems of itself to be unconstitutional.

OTC, article 9 (b): "The assembly shall apportion the expenditures of the organization among the members, in accordance with a scale of contributions to be fixed by the assembly, and each member shall contribute promptly to the Organization its share of these expenditures."

H. R. 5550 presents for congressional approval an international trade body to be known as the Organization for Trade Cooperation (OTC), designed to provide permanent administration and implementation of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), which in itself has not been approved by Congress. This GATT is, in turn, the creature of a broad interpretation by the State Department of the authority delegated to the President in the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act (sec. 350, Tariff Act of 1930), the constitutionality of which has been raised in two cases now pending in the courts: *Morgantown Glassware Guild, Inc.* v. *George M. Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury* (C. A. No. 876–55), United States District Court for the District of Columbia; *Star Kist Foods, Inc.* v. *United States* (Bruno Scheidt Inc., party in interest, protest 258737–K, before the U. S. Customs Court).

It will be remembered that an International Trade Organization (ITO), familiarly known as the Habana Charter, was denounced by the American Bar Association after recommendation by three of its committees and the association's position was presented to Congress in 1950. Public opposition to the ITO caused its ultimate withdrawal by the State Department.

This is the State Department's second attempt to create an international trade organization, in which the United States is 1 out of 35 nations represented; where it has 1 vote; where it has no veto; where it subscribes to a permanent policy of tariff reduction; deprives our elected representatives of control of our own foreign trade fiscal policies; commits the United States to review its own tariff rates and policies at the request of any one of the said members; and takes away even our right to vote on any question where we are one of the parties in dispute.

This bill, H. R. 5550, is simply a roundabout method of placing Congress in the anomalous position of indirectly approving GATT, a thing which it has several times specifically refused to do. GATT should not be approved indirectly by subterfuge, but should be thoroughly aired before legislative action takes place. The reasons for such airing become apparent when consideration is given to the subject matters dealt with in GATT. Many of them vitally affect our domestic laws and international trade practices. For example—

1. Internal taxation (GATT, pt. II, art. IV, par. 8).

2. Identifying marks of foreign merchandise (art. IX (3) (4) (5)).

3. Bases of customs valuations (GATT, art. VII (2) (3)).

4. Antidumping law (GATT, art. VI (4) (6a) (6b) (6c)).

5. Countervailing duties (GATT, art. VI (4) (6a) (6b) (6c).

6. Embargoes or quotas (GATT, art. XI (1) concluding unnumbered paragraph).

7. Currency restrictions (GATT, art. XII (1)—balance of payments—monetary fund).

8. Subsidies by Government (GATT, art. XVI, sec. A (3) (4)).

9. Emergency action on certain imports (clearly GATT, art. XIX (1a) (3a) is at variance with our safety device called the escape clause).

We would not be permitted to find that an industry of our own was injured by foreign competition, without submitting the contemplated remedy to the OTC for approval. This seems to be one situation in which the sovereign right to attend to our own business should not be abridged. Shall we abandon our Tariff Commission and its procedures for a foreign-dominated OTC executive committee?

The ITO (Habana Charter) was repudiated. The OTC contains many of its provisions in substantially identical form as disclosed by a comparison.

Comparison of articles of proposed organization and corresponding articles of Havana Charter for an international trade organization

	Article No. OTC	*Corresponding article No. ITO*
Structure	4	73.
The Assembly	5(a), (b), (c), (d), (e).	73(1), (7), 76(1), (2).
The Executive Committee.	6(a), (i), (ii), (iii), (b), (c).	78(1), (2), (a), (c), 80(1), (4).
The Secretariat	7(a), (b), (c), (d), (e).	84(1), (2), 85(1), (2), 88(1), (3).
Voting	8	75.
Budget and contributions.	9(a), (b), (c)	77(6), 91.
Status	10(a), (b), (c), (d)	89, 90(1), (3).
Relations with other organizations.	11(a), (b), (c)	87(1), (2), 86(1).

If the principle of control of our foreign trade by a foreign dominated group was undesirable when the ITO was before Congress in 1950, it is infinitely more undesirable today.

Certainly the Constitution contains no specific authority for the President or the Executive Department to enter into a so-called executive agreement transferring the policy and control of our domestic and foreign trade affairs to an international body, beyond the control of our legislators. Nor can such authority be spelled out as an incident of sovereignty.

If the President has such power it can only be by lawful delegation from the legislative branch of the Government.

Whether Congress itself has any authority under the Constitution to create such a foreign-controlled body having virtual charge of our foreign commerce, is at best highly doubtful, limited as that power is by article 1, section 8 of the Constitution granting solely to Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations.

The OTC charter contains in article 1 the following statement: "The Organization for Trade Cooperation (hereinafter referred to as 'the Organization') is hereby established to further, as provided for in the General Agreement and herein, the achievement of the purposes and objectives set forth in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (herein referred to as 'the General Agreement')."

The objectives of GATT are set forth as follows:

"ARTICLE I

"1. The contracting parties recognize that their relations in the field of trade and economic endeavor should be conducted with a view to raising standards of living, insuring full employment, and a large and steadily growing volume of real income and effective demand, developing the full use of the resources of the world and expanding the production and exchange of goods, and promoting the progressive development of the economies of all the contracting parties.

"2. The contracting parties desire to contribute to these objectives through this agreement by entering into reciprocal and mutually advantageous arrangements directed to the substantial reduction of tariffs and other barriers to trade and to the elimination of discriminatory treatment in international commerce."

This ambitious statement is strangely similar to the stated objectives of the National Industrial Recovery Act, which read substantially as follows:

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to remove obstructions to the free flow of interstate and foreign commerce which tend to diminish the amount thereof; and to provide for the general welfare by promoting the organization of industry for the purpose of cooperative action among trade groups, to induce and maintain united action of labor and management under adequate governmental sanctions and supervision, to eliminate unfair competitive practices, to promote the fullest possible utilization of the present productive capacity of industries, to avoid undue restriction of production (except as may be temporarily required), to increase the consumption of industrial and agricultural products by increasing purchasing power, to reduce and relieve unemployment, to improve standards of labor, and otherwise to rehabilitate industry and to conserve natural resources."

The NIRA was held to be a delegation of "unfettered discretion" to the President and was contrary to the Constitution. It was before the Supreme Court in *Panama Refining Company* v. *Ryan* (293 U. S. 388), and again in *Schechter* v. *United States* (295 U. S. 495), and in both cases held to be too broad a delegation, containing no legislative yardstick, nor enunciating an intelligible legislative principle.

The OTC without GATT is nothing—with GATT it raises the question of whether GATT has any legal authority for its existence.

This leaves for consideration the question of whether the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as amended, contains within it a legal basis for the delegation of authority therein contained to include GATT. That act, section 350, Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, provides as folows:

"(a) (1) For the purpose of expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States (as a means of assisting in establishing and maintaining a better relationship among various branches of American agriculture, industry, mining, and commerce) by regulating the admission of foreign goods into the United States in accordance with the characteristics and needs of various branches of American production so that foreign markets will be made available to those branches of American production which require and are capable of developing such outlets by affording corresponding market opportunities for foreign products in the United States, the President, whenever he finds as a fact that any existing duties or other import restrictions of the United States or any foreign country are unduly burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States and that the purpose above declared will be promoted by the means hereinafter specified, is authorized from time to time—

"(A) To enter into foreign trade agreements with foreign governments or instrumentalities thereof: *Provided*, That the enactment of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955 shall not be construed to determine or indicate the approval or disapproval by the Congress of the executive agreement known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

"(B) To proclaim such modifications of existing duties and other import restrictions, or such additional import restrictions, or such continuance, and for such minimum periods, of existing customs or excise treatment of any article covered by foreign trade agrements, as are required or appropriate to carry out any foreign trade agreement that the President has entered into hereunder."

It will be seen from the foregoing extract of section 350 that the purposes of that act were apparently broad enough to cover a complete reorganization of the world. But only two specific powers were granted to the President; (a) to enter into foreign trade agreements, and (b) to proclaim such modifications of existing United States duties and other import restrictions as are required or appropriate to carry out the agreement. There is no intimation here that Congress granted to the President any authority to enter into an international compact creating an international body to control our foreign trade.

It is significant that reference is made in paragraph 2 D (ii) to the fact that "The standards of valuation contained in section 402 of this act" (i. e., the Tariff Act of 1930) "(as in effect during the representative period) shall be utilized by the President, to the maximum extent he finds such utilization practicable, in making the determinations" required under combination ad valorem and specific rates, or a combination of rates producing an ad valorem equivalent above 50 percent. Thus again is raised a conflict of authority between Congress and the sections of GATT having to do with determination of dutiable values.

Article VII of GATT departs radically from the provisions of section 402 of the Tariff Act of 1930, and provides that the contracting parties recognize the vitality of the general principles of valuation set forth thereafter and undertake that they shall "upon a request of another contracting party review the operation of any of their laws or regulations relating to value for customs purposes in the light of these principles." This leaves the United States open to complaints by any of the members of GATT of any specific customs valuation scheme which we may adopt and obviously if we adopt one which someone does not like and we change it, someone else may not like the latest one, and so ad infinitum.

If authority is given to the President to become a member of OTC he must accept that membership with the full knowledge that he must abide by all the rules, regulations and policies of GATT—or walk out with all the caustic criticism or censure generally attached to such an action. It is better not to go in than to incur the displeasure of any of the world's friendly nations.

Authority is claimed under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to bind this Nation to GATT as an executive agreement (which authority stands at best on shaky ground), as evidenced by four congressional refusals to commit itself. Thus the present consideration of H. R. 5550 is probably as close as Congress will come to having GATT before it. Approval of H. R. 5550 carries with it, by implication, approval of GATT. Congress should not even consider passage of this bill without having GATT before it.

As the Supreme Court stated in *Buttfield* v. *Stranahan* (192 U. S. 525): "The power to regulate commerce with foreign nations is expressly conferred upon

Congress, and, being an enumerated power, is complete in itself, acknowledging no limitations other than those prescribed in the Constitution."

An analysis of GATT and OTC will readily show why Congress should not delegate its constitutional powers by direction or indirection to this international body.

In its preamble (which will now become article I) GATT lists its broad objects: "Raising standards of living, insuring full employment and a large and steadily growing volume of real income and effective demand, developing the full use of the resources of the world and expanding the production and exchange of goods." To this was added this proposed language in 1955: "and promoting the progressive development of the economies of all the contracting parties." These objectives are to be accomplished "by entering into reciprocal and mutually advantageous arrangements directed to the substantial reduction of tariffs and other barriers to trade and to the elimination of discriminatory treatment in international commerce."

This article I sets the theme for GATT: an international organization which is actually an attempt at a world-trade government in which we are merely a satellite having 1 vote in 35.

As a member of GATT we subscribe to at least one objective we have refused to espouse in our own domestic legislation. In the Employment Act of 1946 Congress was careful not to declare it to be the policy of the Federal Government to insure full employment, but instead to promote maximum employment, and there is a world of difference between those two phrases. To insure full employment—which means to insure everyone's having a job at all times—a nation must of necessity be either socialistic or communistic. Where everyone works for the state, jobs can be guaranteed or insured for all. On this point consider this excerpt from the constitution of Soviet Russia, chapter X, article 118:

"Citizens of the U. S. S. R. have the right to work, that is, the right to guaranteed employment and payment for their work in accordance with its quantity and quality. The right to work is insured by the Socialist organization of the national economy."

Under article II each member shall accord nondiscriminatory treatment to all other members with respect to import and export duties (with few exceptions). This seems to mean that if we make a special trade concession to Haiti, Communist Czechoslovakia must be accorded the same treatment. If this be so this provision presents a direct conflict with the policy of the Congress as expressed in the trade agreement statute, that Communist controlled countries shall not receive the benefits of reduced trade agreement rates. To get out of that difficulty it was necessary for the United States to get permission to withdraw Czechoslovakia from the list of nations entitled to most-favored nation treatment.

Under article II, no member shall alter its method of determining dutiable value or of converting currencies so as to impair the value of any of the concessions provided for in GATT.

H. R. 6040 now before the Finance Committee of the Senate changes most of our existing laws on the subject of customs valuations which were in effect at the time GATT was negotiated. If H. R. 6040 becomes law it may be found to be a violation of article III of GATT and will require at least the giving of compensatory concessions to any country interested.

Under article IV imported products must be treated the same as domestic products regarding all laws affecting their internal sale. There is a specific provision that would prohibit Congress from requiring that a certain proportion of a given product must be supplied from domestic sources.

Under article VI a Member may levy a special dumping duty if dumping by an export nation threatens the domestic industry—a provision generally in accord with our domestic dumping statute. On countervaling duties, however, the GATT requirement "material injury" to a domestic industry is not found in our law.

Quotas—embargoes—price supports: In this area GATT and our domestic policies and laws are in direct conflict. GATT has decided that the United States violates the general agreement article II and article XI when it applies quotas or fees under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, noting that "The United States Government has taken positive steps aimed at reducing 1955 crop supplies by lowering support price levels, or by imposing marketing quotas at minimum levels permitted by legislation," and has assured GATT that, "The United States will discuss proposals under section 22 with all countries having substantial interest prior to taking action."

Under this same prohibition against quotas the United States has been attacked and has been compelled to give compensating concessions where it obtained a waiver to impose quotas on dairy products. In return GATT authorized the Netherlands Government to suspend the application to the United States of its obligations under the general agreement to allow the United States to supply Netherlands a limit of 60,000 metric tons of wheat flour during the year 1955. (See Decisions, 3d Sup., Basic Instruments and Selected Documents of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, Geneva, June 1955, p. 46.) This in spite of the provisions in section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act that "no international agreement entered into by the United States shall be applied a manner inconsistent with this section."

In this area GATT is in direct conflict with our farm price support legislation formulated by Congress. It creates a definite conflict with H. R. 7925; H. R. 8954; H. R. 9595, and others.

Although no waiver has yet been requested, it is probably that our Export Control Act of 1949 also violates article XI. This act authorizes the President to prohibit or curtail export of any materials in order to protect the national security, or protect the domestic economy from excessive drain of scarce materials, or further the foreign policy of the United States. The act was originally scheduled to terminate June 30, 1953, and was subsequently renewed for another 3 years until June 30, 1956. If it is again renewed, one could hardly say it represents "temporary" legislation, and there would be a question as to whether it was being "temporarily applied" so as to come under the article XI exemption. But the exemption applies only to restrictions "temporarily applied to prevent or relieve critical shortages of foodstuffs or other products essential to the Nation involved." GATT thus cuts down the scope of Presidential action permitted under the congressional declaration of policy.

With so many provisions of GATT at variance with domestic policy or requiring approval or direction of domestic policy by the OTC–GATT, the question might well be raised as to whether it is not wiser to stay out of such an organization that will impede our domestic action, and enter into agreements on a point-by-point basis that is in keeping with congressional regulation of foreign commerce provided by the Constitution.

Under article XI, any nation that does place import quotas on agricultural products and receives an exemption because it similarly restricts domestic production must maintain the same ratio between the two as existed prior to the restrictions. Under article XIII, proper trade volume proportions among importing nations must be maintained when import quotas are invoked. It is probable that the OTC would supervise both these procedures to insure that importers did not suffer. Article XIII provides that a member shall consult with OTC regarding adjustment of such proportions, on request.

The interesting thing about GATT's quota ban is that apparently the United States is one of the very few of the members that would be forced to ask for a waiver—most of the rest have built-in exemptions either in article XI XII or XVIII. Article XII permits quotas where needed to prevent serious decline in monetary reserves or to increase them if they are low. Thus no so-called soft currency nation need worry about waivers when it imposes quotas. Article XVIII provides that increased tariffs or quotas may be used for economic development purposes by underdeveloped countries if the prior approval of OTC is obtained.

Article XVI deals with subsidies. There probably is inevitable conflict between these GATT regulations and our domestic subsidy program. It is provided that if a member maintains a subsidy which increases exports or decreases imports of any product, a report must be made to OTC. If the subsidy is causing a serious prejudice to another member's trade, consultations must be held. Recently added language would ban the use of export subsidies on nonprimary products or manufactures after January 1, 1958. Export subsidies on primary products may continue to be used but they must be applied so that the subsidizing country will not acquire more than an equitable share of the world export trade in that product. Just who determines this "equitable share" is left unsaid, but of course if would be the OTC–GATT.

Article XIX is the so-called escape clause provision. It provides that if as a result of unforeseen developments and of obligations incurred under GATT, a product is being imported into a country in such increased quantities and under such conditions that serious injury is caused or threatened to domestic producers, a member is permitted to suspend the obligation or modify the concession. If this is done, other affected members can suspend substantially equivalent concessions if the OTC approved. This escape clause differs from the one written into our own tariff law by Congress (Trade Agreement Extension Law 1951), in that, in order to suspend the effect of a concession, it is only necessary under our law that a product, as a partial result of the concession, is being imported into the United States in such increased quantities that serious injury is caused or threatened to the domestic industry producing like products. No "unforeseen developments" are required as under GATT. It is, therefore, entirely probable that we could take advantage of the escape clause in our own law and still be in violation of GATT. The conflicting interpretations of the two provisions may be measured by the storm of protests and second guessing on the facts by member countries of GATT following each of the few instances in which the United States has taken action to protect its own industries from injury under the escape clause provision of our laws.

Under the new language of article XXVIII, concessions are open for withdrawal or modification only once very 3 years starting January 1, 1958. However, the OTC may at any time, in special circumstances, authorize a member to enter into negotiations for modification or withdrawal, such negotiations to be supervised by OTC.

The new article XXIX (of GATT) gives OTC authority to sponsor tariff negotiations.

Although no member is obligated to participate in such negotiations, the moral suasion of paragraph 2 (b) of the article is of interest:

"The contracting parties recognize that in general the success of multilateral negotiations would depend on the participation of all contracting parties which conduct a substantial proportion of their external trade with one another."

Thus it could be said that a United States refusal to participate in negotiations sponsored by OTC would be in violation of the spirit of GATT.

Under the new article XXX, if a nation does not agree to amendments to articles IV to XXX of GATT already accepted by two-thirds of the members, it can be eased out of OTC, or remain a member, at the discretion of OTC.

Article XXV provides for OTC, which carries out the provisions of GATT as well as other activities set up by the OTC agreement.

It is most interesting to note here that although we can keep Communist China out of the United Nations through use of the veto, we would be powerless to ban Red China from OTC discussions if two-thirds of the membership voted against us. Furthermore, by a two-third vote Red China could be admitted as a member of OTC–GATT if she wished. OTC–GATT is an attempt at a world trade constitution without a bill of rights.

Next we come to article 13, where we find that waiver of an obligation under GATT can be granted by OTC if approved by a two-thirds majority, such majority to comprise more than half of the members. Congress thus delegates to OTC the power to allow any member to violate any provision of GATT. Such a delegation is unconscionable.

Let us briefly catalogue at least some examples of the extent to which Congress would delegate its rights under OTC–GATT.

1. Delegation of authority as to what questions of international trade and commercial policy to study, what recommendations to make, and what propaganda to publish in keeping with GATT's broad world-trade-state objectives (OTC, art. 3, GATT new art. I).

2. Delegation of authority to permit or forbid the United States to levy a dumping duty if dumping in the United States by another country injures an industry in a third country—say Cuba (GATT, art. VI).

3. Delegation of authority to permit or forbid the United States to enact import quota legislation. A general national policy against import quotas is one thing. Having to ask OTC for permission to enforce our laws—such as section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act—is quite another. Enactment of H. R. 8954 or similar legislation would send us on our knees to OTC again.

4. Delegation of authority to permit or forbid the United States to enact any other legislation contrary to provisions of GATT (OTC art. 13).

5. Delegation of authority to obtain from the executive branch of our Government numerous reports on various matters, including the steps taken in pursuance of the various provisions and policies set forth in GATT (e. g., GATT art. VII, Valuation for Customs Purposes; GATT, art. X, XVII).

6. Delegation of authority to cause the United States Government to review the operation of its laws and regulations in the light of provisions of GATT (GATT, art. VIII).

7. Delegation of authority to decide whether the United States, through giving subsidies on the export of a primary product, is gaining more than an equitable share of world export trade in that product (GATT, art. XVI).

8. Delegation of authority to permit or forbid the United States to suspend substantially equivalent concessions if another nation invokes GATT's escape clause (GATT, art. XIX).

9. Delegation of authority to decide whether the United States can put into force a customs union or free-trade area (GATT, art. XXIV).

10. Delegation of authority to force the United States to confer with a nation designed by OTC in addition to the nation with which the concession was originally negotiated if we wish to modify or withdraw a trade concession at the end of its term.

11. Delegation of authority to decide whether the United States is actually in violation of any provision of GATT, and to direct us to take corrective measures. That is one meaning of article 3 of OTC, saying that OTC will "administer" GATT. There is no appeal from OTC's interpretation of the facts. In the United States violation of a law would be determined by the courts. Not so here. This is contrary to our entire Constitutional concept of justice.

We realize that H. R. 5550 comes before this Committee as part of the President's program. But on that point we ask your indulgence for other quotations from the Panama Refining case, page 418 and at page 420:

"The Congress left the matter to the President without standard or rule, to be dealt with as he pleased. The effort by ingenious and diligent construction to supply a criterion still permits such a breadth of authorized action as essentially to commit to the President the functions of a legislature rather than those of an executive or administrative officer executing a declared legislative policy.

"The question whether such a delegation of legislative power is permitted by the Constitution is not answered by the argument that it should be assumed that the President has acted, and will act, for what he believes to be the public good. The point is not one of motives, but of constitutional authority, for which the best of motives is not a substitute."

And also from the Schechter case, in striking down the "codes of fair competition" sections of NIRA as unconstitutional delegations of authority, page 537:

"But Congress cannot delegate legislative power to the President to exercise an unfettered discretion to make whatever laws he thinks may be needed or advisable for the rehabilitation and expansion of trade or industry."

We think the conclusion forced upon us by a study of section 350 is that Congress never intended the President to use it as a basis for joining an association of "contracting parties" governed by majority rule without veto, amounting in every sense of the word to an international organization even though not denominated as such.

If OTC–GATT were made into a purely advisory international trade body without power to compel action; with no rulemaking power; with no decision-making authority; with no authorative regulatory power; with no voting; with no sanctions, and with no compulsion, it might be useful as a tribunal which could hear governments and individuals alike, and advise the governments as to the best course to follow to simplify, amplify, and promote international trade.

It is not necessary to have finality of judgment or enforceability of decree which in the last analysis cannot be enforced, and can only impel a noncomplacent nation to walk out.

Respectfully submitted.

THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION,
By ALBERT MACC. BARNES,
Designated Representative.

NEW YORK, March 8, 1956.

(NOTE.—It might be well for the Congress to consider the situation of the secret treaty and executive agreement culminating in the Lansing-Ishii Agreement with Japan in 1905. Mr. Lansing told your Foreign Relations Committee that the agreement had no binding force on the United States—but it took an international conference, two complete treaties, and a series of notes to get rid of it in 1921. (See Constitution of the United States of America, Revised and Annotated 1952 by Edward S. Corwin, editor, p. 426.))

No Public Official or Employee Can Serve Two Masters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address I made on WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Saturday, April 21, 1956:

They call it "conflict of interest" when a person goes to work for the Federal Government "with an ax to grind." To use his inside position to serve an outside interest.

We have laws to prevent such activities, but continuing vigilance is required to make sure that people in key positions do not direct Government policies for the benefit of any individuals, groups, or corporations.

An employee of the United States Government is expected to put the public interest above any and every private interest.

Ninety-nine percent of them do.

The 1 percent used their position in Government for the financial advantage of private enterprise.

Oftentimes this is difficult to pin down. It is not easy to trace the tipoff to one corporation, for instance, and concerning some change in Government policy, or the way in which contracts are awarded to a preferred company that has access to influential friends inside Government.

As to full-time Government employees, the majority observes the code of ethics, similar to the one promulgated by the General Services Administration. This requires that all employees of the agency so conduct themselves as to permit no possible basis for suspicion of unethical business practices. It prohibits employees from engaging in any outside business unless the approval of competent authority is first obtained. And it prohibits employees from taking any final action with respect to any matter in which the employee has any personal or financial relationships.

As to WOC's, meaning those who serve without compensation, such standards are difficult to enforce. The Government must avail itself of the best skills and talents, particularly on Government advisory groups and in the employment of WOC personnel by administrative agencies.

Certain advisory groups are composed of the principal executives of some of the most important business firms in the country. WOC's serving as Government officials in charge of divisions dealing with the particular industry often are important but subordinate officials of these same firms.

The Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary is concerned about this problem.

It wants to know whether this relationship leads to special influence on Government policy by industry through its control of advisory groups.

Unfortunately, many of the practices that are considered to be legitimate in the give-

and-take world of keen competition become abuses when done in the name of Government that is supposed to be the impartial umpire.

Businessmen, by force of long habit, are inclined to favor the interests of their own business or industry when they serve as advisers to Government.

During the past year the Government felt it necessary to disengage itself from the services of four high officials. If they had been rank-and-file employees, they would have been fired. But this is too harsh a term to apply to influential people. To save face, they are permitted to resign.

You see, it began to appear that these four officials were using their Government positions to favor firms in which they had a political or financial interest. Although no corruption was chargeable, there was much doubletalk in evidence. Their two-faced roles, as Government advisers and as possible financial beneficiaries, did not appeal to the public.

Their behind-the-scenes activities did not pay off—because the public is determined that no official shall try to serve two masters.

It can't be done in a well-informed democracy.

But how and where are we going to draw the line?

I recall the hue and cry that was raised when Charles E. Wilson, president of General Motors Corp., was appointed Secretary of Defense. He sold all his holdings in GM so that there would be no possible suspicion that his decisions as Secretary of Defense would in no way favor GM.

In view of the fact that the stock of GM has gone up considerably since then, Mr. Wilson made a very real personal sacrifice in accepting a Cabinet post.

This raises the serious question as to whether anyone coming into the service of the Federal Government should divorce himself completely from a business to which he has given most of his life.

The United States Government, which is the biggest organization in the world, must not be deprived of the best talent it can get.

But how can we be sure of attracting and holding this talent and, at the same time, make certain of its devotion to the public interest above all else? Especially those who serve without compensation.

Must we insist that a person sell all stock holdings in a business concern for which he worked to remove any temptation of furthering the interests of that business as against the interests of Government?

This is a hard question to answer.

Such drastic action would discourage many high-type men who might otherwise regard it as an honor and a duty to serve their Government.

At the same time, we must protect ourselves against the few who would exploit their Government positions to favor private interests.

Perhaps we need a stronger and more detailed code of ethics regarding such activities, supported by a wide-awake press that will keep the public informed as to whether standards are being maintained * * * to protect us against "conflict of interest."

As to present laws there are statutory provisions of the United States Code which affect Federal employees, or former Federal employees, in their conduct of private business activities. These statutes, better known as the conflict-of-interest statutes, are aimed at protecting the public interest by prohibiting Federal officers and employees from engaging in private activities which are incompatible with the duties and responsibilities of public office. Penalties for violation include both fine and imprisonment. Except as provided by these statutes, there is no legal prohibition against the conduct of private business activities for compensation by an officer or employee of the United States.

As to political activity, all employees in the executive branch of the Federal Government, including persons employed as experts or consultants, even on a part-time or intermittent basis, are subject to the political activity restrictions of the Hatch Act. This covers the full 24 hours of any day that the individual performs some services for the Government, rather than just the actual hours of employment. The Hatch Act prohibits the use of official authority or influence to interfere with or affect the results of an election, and active participation in political management or in political campaigns.

Supplementing the laws, we have directive such as the following one titled: "Steps Followed by the Business and Defense Services Administration To Avoid Conflicts of Interest."

1. The incoming WOC is advised during negotiations in connection with his hiring, that he will be expected to devote his full time and energies to Government work without the influence of any prejudicial interest.

2. Upon entrance, he is required to take the usual oath of faithful performance to the United States Government.

3. On taking the oath he is handed a document which sets forth his exemptions from the "conflict-of-interest" statutes and the limitations to such exemptions as set out in Executive Order 10182.

4. Shortly after reporting for duty the WOC is given a face-to-face indoctrination which includes a caution against acting upon any individual matter in which he or his company has any direct or indirect interest. He is told that he should withdraw from any matter which, if he acted upon it, would embarrass himself, his company, or the Government. In such cases, he is instructed to refer the matter to the chief career employee of the division, who is specified, and who is usually the deputy director. He is advised that, if there is any question in the application of this rule, he is to consult with the legal staff or chief administrative officer.

So far so good.

But laws and directives in and of themselves do not always guarantee compliance.

Human nature being what it is, partiality is apt to affect decisions.

As the Chairman drily observed, however, "I am not so much interested in directives. It is a question of whether the directives are followed."

Congress has added one new safeguard for the public by providing that private interests of WOC employees appointed under the Defense Production Act must be published in the Federal Register.

We have the feeling that much more can be done to separate conflicting interests.

John Lord O'Brian, whose experience and integrity command respectful attention, advises that heads of divisions should not come from industries in which they have an interest. In other words, if the Government wants an industrialist to head the Iron and Steel Division, it should not seek a man from that industry. In this way it will remove temptation from an official who heads a division in which his employer has a special interest—the temptation for him to serve the master who pays him rather than the master to whom he owes primary allegiance under these circumstances, namely, the Government of the United States.

There are several bills being considered by the Judiciary Committee designed to curb those who leave the Government and then use this previous Government experience improperly. These bills implement the rule of conduct as expressed in Canon 36 of the Canon Ethics of the American Bar Association.

Perhaps the cure for this whole problem would be to develop a genuine career service in Government. With adequate salaries to attract and hold the best talent, and with special leave provided each year for key employees to freshen up on current developments in those fields outside the Government, but related to its problems.

In this way we would avoid the alarming turnover in Government employment, and would not have to call in experts or advisers for temporary service.

This would eliminate the "in and outers" and their divided loyalties.

In the meantime we can help to reduce conflict of interest in Government service by keeping the bright spotlight of public opinion trained on those areas where temptation might occur.

Priest Hits Princeton Board Over Hiss Talk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a news article from the outstanding newspaper in the State of New Jersey, the Newark Star-Ledger of April 23, 1956, entitled "Priest Hits Princeton Board Over Hiss Talk." Father Hugh Halton's speech is indeed heartening. The article follows:

PRIEST HITS PRINCETON BOARD OVER HISS TALK

PRINCETON, April 22.—A Roman Catholic priest today unleashed a scathing attack from the pulpit against Princeton University's Board of Trustees for refusing to ban Alger Hiss' scheduled speech here Thursday night.

The Reverend Hugh Halton, chaplain of the university's Aquinas Foundation, said under the trustees' nonintervention plan Princeton students "might just as well invite prostitutes and embezzlers to discuss purity and banking."

He said the trustees' refusal to invoke authoritarian censorship in the student-planned speech is utter nonsense in this context.

"What is missing is authority and discipline," Reverend Halton said.

His remarks were made at mass in Princeton's Roman Catholic chapel, where he had delivered another stinging attack on Princeton administration officials last weekend.

"There is a kind of spiritual and moral subversion which will do a greater disservice to Princeton * * * and similar institutions than some of the threats we consider more immediate," Reverend Halton said of the forthcoming Hiss talk.

He said "a university administration and board of trustees which abandons its authority for informed and uncritical minds does not put the students on trial; it puts itself on trial.

"It is already judged," he added.

Reverend Halton called the university stand on the Hiss speech "hazy" and said school officials were now "clinging to a raft." He added that the school's board of trustees has committed itself to "the drift."

The priest charged there was "a decline of spiritual and moral values at Princeton practically and speculatively."

Reverend Halton told his audience "the mind should be treated as gently as the stomach. We don't put poison in the stomach," he said, alluding to the convicted perjurer's scheduled appearance.

The Hiss speech was scheduled by Princeton's Whig-Cliosophic Society, a 187-year-old debating group.

The Debating Carrer of Vice President Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a penetrating article written by William Lee Miller which appeared in the April 19 issue of the Reporter magazine:

THE DEBATING CAREER OF RICHARD M. NIXON

RICHARD MILHOUS NIXON is an able young politician who has got himself into an awkward and unpromising situation—except, of course, that he may at any moment become President of the United States. The talents that have brought him to this powerful position may some day undo him.

The chief of these talents is his ability in the art of public persuasion. If Adlai Stevenson is the high-minded commencement speaker in politics and Dwight Eisenhower the morale-building football coach, then Mr. NIXON is the bright young debater. Almost his whole life has been spent in the arguing business, and his success has been, in the language of his native southern California, supercolossal.

He engaged in his first debate, on the subject "Resolved, that insects are more beneficial than harmful," in the seventh grade. He won. In his California high schools he entered something called the Constitutional Oratorical Contest 3 times; 3 times he won. He led winning debating teams both in high school and in Whittier College, and when he entered the southern California Intercollegiate Extemporaneous Speaking Contest, he won that.

In 1946, the Congressman in California's 12th District, a well-liked Democrat named Jerry Voorhis, agreed one day to meet his young, unknown Republican opponent, RICHARD NIXON, in a series of five debates. The first one was held in a high school in South Pasadena, and after it was over Voorhis asked a friend how the debate had gone. "Jerry," said the friend, "he murdered you."

Four years later, in 1950, Congressman NIXON was running for the Senate against Helen Gahagan Douglas, and a leading California Democrat spoke for Mrs. Douglas in a debate with NIXON. "He knew every detail," says this Democrat. "The audience was with him, and he made a monkey out of me."

Two years later, in 1952, Senator NIXON was running for the Vice Presidency. "I come before you," he said earnestly one memorable night in late September, "* * * as a man whose honesty and integrity have been questioned. * * *" After the telecast, telegrams, letters, postcards, and even gifts of money came in by the thousands.

Two years after that, in 1954, Vice President NIXON traveled across the country in a campaign expedition that, in sheer expenditure of lung power, is probably unmatched by any in the history of American off-year elections. The President praised him; everybody credited him with Democratic scalps; midwestern party chairmen publicly thanked him for what he had done "for the American people and his party"; and a Republican columnist voiced the conclusion of many when he said "virtually singlehanded, he averted a GOP debacle."

Now, in 1956, just 10 years from the time he entered politics, Mr. NIXON has talked and argued and campaigned his way to the threshold of the most powerful office in the world. As one of the so-called "committee of 100" that first picked NIXON to run in 1946, has said, "I guess we didn't know what we had hold of. We knew DICK was smart, and we knew he could talk, but we didn't know that he was that smart or could talk that fast."

A SPUR TO DEMOCRATS

For all the Vice President's ability to persuade, there still are many Americans who remain quite unpersuaded about the man himself. The Democrats, who feel a special hostility to Mr. NIXON, say things like: "He doesn't give a damn about the truth"; "He's absolutely ruthless"; and "He doesn't have a shred of character."

The degree of opposition from one's enemies can be important to a politician, particularly when he is approaching the highest national office. Americans are not so neatly divided into parties that the deeply felt opinion of one group has no effect on the other.

Moreover, the strength of feeling against a political figure helps determine the power his opposition can mount against him. Many Democrats really like Mr. Eisenhower, and cannot get terribly excited about opposing him; therefore, he spikes the Democratic guns. Mr. NIXON's effect, however, is the opposite; he loads them. Against him the Democrats would unite and fight and work and give and organize and vote with a passionate response beyond that evoked by any other candidate. As one Democrat said, "If I think he may become President, I'll be really frightened. I don't mean just politically frightened, I mean really frightened about what it would mean for the country."

On most ordinary counts, Mr. NIXON does not appear to deserve this unrelenting hostility. Personally, those who know him say he is a nice fellow. His social philosophy contains nothing extreme enough to scare anyone very badly; it is, in fact, a little hard to know what his philosophy is, but that's no crime or novelty amidst the pragmatism of American politics. His voting record is a mixed and mildly conservative Republican one; it has to be carefully edited by the liberals who oppose him when they want to make it seem to be something fierce. He does his homework better than many members of the administration. His role in the Hiss case may not be quite heroic enough to justify the implication one sometimes discerns in his promotional literature, that a grateful Nation should ever after do whatever he recommends, but still it is impressive. He appears in the record as an alert, intelligent, and persevering investigator. After becoming Vice President he made a ceremonial trip to Asian countries that was considered a distinct success. It is repeatedly said that he has brought a new significance to the Vice Presidential office—a claim that has been made for several of his predecessors. He has performed his role as mediator within the administration in a way that William S. White of the New York Times would describe as "great, and on certain grave matters both signal and uncommonly courageous."

One can even find, from the calm between the storms of Mr. NIXON's campaigning, some quotations from his speeches that contrast with the usual list. He once admitted, with a little surprise aside noting that he was admitting it, that there had been great Presidents from both parties. In the fall of 1953 he chose to say in a St. Louis speech to the American Legion: "* * * let's recognize right now that the decision to go into Korea was right * * * on this issue President Truman was right, and he deserves credit for making that decision * * *." He also has said that "No party has a monopoly on patriotism or love of country."

Why then is there such a widespread distaste for Mr. NIXON?

HOW IT IS DONE

To understand the feeling against Mr. NIXON one must turn not to the substance of his politics but to the character of his polemic.

Though the early ones are now many years gone, none of Mr. NIXON's campaigns has been forgotten; each has left a memorable stain.

For all their victories and acclaim, the champions in the art of persuasion, from the days of the sophists to our own, have been under a bit of a shadow. After the applause has died down and a more reflective mood has set in, one is never sure just where conviction ended and sheer artistry began. In our time these ancient doubts have taken on a new dimension, as the persuasion of men in the mass has become not just an art but a science. Mr. NIXON, in the practice of that science, has gathered not only laurels but also the antagonism that men feel toward its more unrestrained practitioners.

Almost everybody has been made to look the fool by a glib debater, or been sold something he didn't want by a fast-talking salesman, or been put in the wrong before a crowd by the sincere and emotional appeal of an opponent. Such experiences are remembered when one listens to RICHARD NIXON.

Mr. NIXON's success has been extravagantly admired. His friend and campaign manager, Murray Chotiner, who is credited with developing many of the Nixon techniques, has been sent on a tour to tell Republicans how it is done. Mr. NIXON himself has given lectures on the subject, with such advice as: "If he asks you where you stand on Dulles, ask him where he stands on Acheson. If he asks you how you stand on the McCarthy issue, make him say where he stands on Mitchell and Bobby Jones, on Roosevelt and Condon * * *." But, in the long run, men are not satisfied with the technique of attack and counterattack, or convinced just by success; at the last, they do want to know where one stands. With Mr. NIXON, it is not easy to tell.

It is not that he hasn't taken positions; it is just that his arguing and persuading and his platform performances are much more central to his public personality than any clear political commitment; his articulate ability to sway a crowd is far more noticeable than any restraining set of values. The worthy things he may do or say appear to be, as in one of the devices that he uses in his campaigning, just the preliminary concession to truth or to the other side that one makes in order to win the audience, so that the final, calculated argument will be the more damning. It may just be a part of what you have to do to win.

GOOD GUY-BAD GUYS

The Vice President and his supporters have quite different explanations of the feeling against him. NIXON's own version came out clearly in the unguarded moment just after the Nixon fund story broke, and for some citizens the way he responded to the whole affair was more damning than anything about the fund itself: "Hold the train. You folks know the work that I did investigating the Communists in the United States [applause] * * *. After I received the nomination for the Vice Presidency, I want you folks to know—and I'm going to reveal it today for the first time—I was warned that if I continued to attack the Communists and crooks in the Government that they

would continue to smear me * * *." An essential part of Mr. NIXON's presentations is to present those who oppose him as an assortment of evil types—Communists, left-wingers, crooks—while his own resistance to them on the side of good is cast in the most personal and dramatic terms.

The current biography entitled, with admirable succintness, "NIXON," and written by the subject's friend, Ralph de Toledano, is a longer and more sophisticated development of that same heroic, good guy-bad guys theme. This sympathetic biography of him is composed in large part of attacks on his critics.

Sometimes this attack proceeds from very dark assumptions; Toledano says that "NIXON is hated most by those who most hate themselves." This strange item of high psychology is just tossed off in passing and not explained. But the main thrust of his argument is that his admired subject is disliked by left-wing intellectuals because, in two instances, the Nixon fund and the Hiss case, he showed them to be wrong.

The fund matter, however, was hardly a case of showing "intellectuals" to be "wrong"; it may have been a case of showing them to be in the minority, but that is hardly the same thing. It is interesting that Mr. NIXON's biographer should not notice the distinction, and, apparently like his subject, should conclude that right and wrong are determined by Hooper ratings.

The questions raised by the fund were not answered in the famous telecast, but were smothered in references to cloth coats, St. Patrick's Day, and Alger Hiss, and by elaborate details of the Nixon family finances. From the television speech and subsequent information about Mr. NIXON, a reader comes to feel he knows the NIXON's financial situation better than his own; there is even a little, faintly socialistic, complaints by Mrs. Nixon, possibly reflecting her background as a Democrat, about the prices that doctors charge the family now that its head is Vice President. But all this is irrelevant; the question about the fund, to paraphrase a distinction that Mr. NIXON made about Adlai Stevenson in 1952, does not have to do with NIXON's personal honesty, but with his judgment: He accepted a special fund from one segment of his constituency as a "salesman against socialism," and may thus have obligated himself to their ideological position. Amid all the dramatic, personal, and emotional details, that main question went unnoticed. Another debating device that can be learned from Mr. NIXON is that it is better to deal with an irrelevancy on which one can make an effective performance than with a relevant point on which one may be less compelling.

As to the Hiss case, the feeling of resentment that Mr. Toledano describes fastened much more on Whittaker Chambers than on NIXON. The doubts about Mr. NIXON began with the 1946 campaign before there was any Hiss case; they have grown with the 1950, 1952, and 1954 campaigns without reference to that case. They exist among conservatives—one who has felt them so deeply that he avoided contact with Mr. NIXON after the 1954 election, and who said that Mr. NIXON's "name is mud," is Speaker SAM RAYBURN. They are pretty widespread. The polltakers, when they were wondering if Mr. NIXON might run for President, found him running behind either Stevenson or KEFAUVER; Walter Davenport, of Colliers, recently crossed the country asking people about politics, and reported thus: "NIXON? The noes ran down the line like echoes. No NIXON. Why? Too young. Too emotional. Too slick. Not enough experience. Only now and then, from California to New Hampshire, was I to find Nixon votes. * * * Lacked stature. Just another opportunist. Didn't look the part. Just another slick politician."

"MR. REPUBLICAN"

The other characteristic of Mr. NIXON's public personality, related to his debating, also bears both a secret of his rapid rise to power and a possibility of his defeat; that is his ability to fit any of the major factions of his party while being identified with none. Even more than Mr. Eisenhower, he transcends the old, still bitter Dewey-Taft split in the party—and even the division over MCCARTHY. He manages to keep in touch with all sides of the party; he has been described by various commentators on his Vice Presidency as a bridge, cement, and a broker, among the different factions; this magazine once said he was all things to all Republicans. But whereas Mr. Eisenhower transcends the factions of his party by touching upon simple, clear, often platitudinous values that all Americans share, Mr. NIXON rises above the factions by emphasizing the practical necessities that all Republicans share; where Mr. Eisenhower comes close to finding the common denominator for the country, Mr. NIXON finds the common denominator for Republicans. That means most certainly the attack upon Democrats; on that all Republicans agree, and in that, he excels.

Mr. NIXON is thus perhaps deserving, as has been suggested, of Mr. Taft's old label, Mr. Republican. On him, however, it would mean something quite different. Where Taft defined Republicanism by a distinct philosophy to which he tried manfully, though unsuccessfully, to get the party to conform; and where he looked on those "me too" New Deal Republicans who did not hold to his orthodox position as some kind of an alloy—not quite real Republicans—Mr. NIXON is not so demanding. He has no discernible policy requirements for Republicans; he takes the party as he finds it and makes the persuader's case for what is given. He argues for CLIFFORD CASE against conservative Republicans; he argues for HENRY DWORSHAK against liberal Republicans; when he goes into Indiana after a bitter fight between JENNER'S forces and those of Governor Craig, an Eisenhower supporter, he has glowing words of praise for Governor Craig—and also for Senator JENNER. He says to assembled party workers: "We've got to get 48 votes in the Senate and let's get that into our heads." It is not surprising that party chairmen, from Leonard Hall on down (or up) really love him.

But the support he gets from Republicans concerned with policies and philosophies as well as partisan success is tempered with a note of wariness. A Taft Republican said: "I'm not sure that NIXON is as conservative as I would like, but when all the radicals began talking about dumping him, I was for him. I love him for the enemies he has made."

NIXON has combined the sides of the party not by a weak and compromising middle position, but by a sustained, vigorous attack that, waiving factional differences, concentrates on the common enemy.

PRIZES AND PUBLICITY

Yet he can be very winning, as when, introduced by a fumble as "President NIXON," he turned the error aside with a modest little disclaimer; he can also be a little frightening, as when he had a man who called but one sentence of heckling during a television speech brought forward afterward, held while he lectured him in front of the crowd, and then thrown out of the hall. In any case, he is full of smiles, sincere passages, pauses in the right places ("his [Eisenhower's] strength and his wisdom [pause] and his faith"), and audience contact: (NIXON: "He [Stevenson] makes speeches like Acheson. Do you want to promote Acheson to the Presidency * * *?" Crowd: "No.").

His campaigning also cannot be understood apart from the devices that accompany it. In 1946 there were telephone calls that Mr. Toledano tries now to say didn't exist, which said: "I know you will vote for NIXON, because Voorhis is a Communist," and there were 25,000 free thimbles given out which said: "Vote for NIXON and needle the PAC." In the closing weeks of the 1950 campaign fliers were dropped in great numbers in California cities, saying, "Win with NIXON: When your phone rings on Monday and Tuesday, November 6 and 7, pick it up and say 'Vote for NIXON,' and you may be the lucky winner of a valuable prize. * * * Prizes galore. Electric clocks, Silex coffee makers with heating units—General Electric automatic toasters—silver salt and pepper shakers, sugar and creamer sets, candy and butter dishes, etc. * * *"

In the 1954 campaign, NIXON's speeches in the West correlated with booklets on "Senator MURRAY and the Red Web Over Congress" and advertisements asking, "How red is John Carroll?" A candidate cannot, of course, be held responsible for all that is done by his supporters, but in Mr. NIXON's case what was done has been on a very large scale, with billboards, full-page ads, expensive public-relations firms, and fancy techniques, in very similar ways each time. It has always played on the same themes, helping create an atmosphere in which his meaning is understood.

Other Republicans have defeated Democratic opponents without incurring the special disapproval reserved for Mr. NIXON. Senator KNOWLAND, for example, who represents positions at least as far removed from those of many Democrats, expresses them in a campaign in a quite different way: "* * * no Democratic administration which follows the Truman administration could divorce itself from the mistakes of the past 7 years." Compare that stodgy, earthbound sentence with the higher flights of RICHARD NIXON on the same subject.

When Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER came to Washington, the Oregon Democrat gave a speech at the women's press club, with NIXON present, in which he criticized those who violate the ten commandments in their campaigning. He pointed to Senator KNOWLAND, who was also present, as an example of a man who had campaigned against him fairly. He didn't mention Mr. NIXON by name, and says that he didn't know he would be there, and was just saving what he had said and worked out long before. But everybody assumed he was attacking the Vice President, and the wife of a Republican Senator left the meeting in protest. Senator NEUBERGER says, "Apparently the shoe fit."

CONTROVERSIAL FIGURE?

Some Republicans know that the shot fits. Back in 1950, Earl Warren did not support him for the Senate, and there have been strong Republican rumblings against him in California throughout his career. Some eastern Republicans wonder about his appeal to the independent vote. This expert at making others into controversial figures has himself become one. In a time when partisans are suspect and independents praised, he may be too thoroughly Republican for the good of the Republican Party.

The President is "liked" with an affection that rises above parties; the Vice President is disliked with a hostility that also transcends political positions. Where the President has refused to use compound words built from a politician's name, such words ("Trumanism," or, as NIXON prefers, discredited Trumanism") are a major feature of Mr. NIXON's vocabulary. Where the President has refused to "deal in personalities," personalities have been Mr. Nixon's stock in trade.

Most politicians, unlike Mr. Eisenhower, do—and in some cases probably should—specifically mention their opponents. Plenty

of Republicans have called Democrats names, and plenty of Democrats have reciprocated. But Mr. NIXON's way of engaging in this autumn sport is his own. He does not say "Dean Acheson is a pink," or "spineless"; he speaks rather of "Acheson color blindness—a form of pinkeye—toward the Communist threat in the United States"; and of "Dean Acheson's spineless school of diplomacy which cost the free world 600 million former allies in the past 7 years of Trumanism." He does not say that Acheson and Stevenson are cowards or Communists or college intellectuals; rather he explains that Mr. Stevenson has a degree all right—a "Ph. D. from the Acheson college of cowardly Communist containment." Mr. NIXON's way is imaginative and deft. What does the word "cowardly" modify in that sentence? Just how does the word "Communist" fit in? He avoids a flat assertion that might offend some of even a sympathetic audience, but he achieves his desired effect and more by his careful phrase. That takes practice and planning.

Mr. NIXON's remarks are not, as with many blunt and adjectival campaigners, the crude, undisciplined, and exaggerated outpouring of outraged political emotions; they are rather the polished weapons of a skilled debater who knows exactly what he is doing, and who shapes his words primarily on the basis of a calculated strategy. There appears in Toledano's book, and again in a sympathetic article about Mr. NIXON in a Sunday magazine section, a remarkable little rule of thumb of his that is profoundly revealing: "The only time to lose your temper," he is quoted as saying, "* * * is when it's deliberate."

PLANNING YOUR SPONTANEITY

When you think about it, this premeditation, even about losing his temper, is a striking characteristic. Mr. NIXON has also said some interesting words about spontaneity. He told radio and television executives, in the fall of 1955, that candidates should make an intimate approach to the audience with a spontaneous, off-the-cuff speech. But, as the Times reported it, "An efficient 'off-the-cuff' appearance on television, creating the illusion of intimacy so desirable to win the viewers, according to Mr. NIXON, entails many hours of preparatory work." Mr. NIXON told about planning the spontaneous intimacy of his fund speech. The broadcast was put off from Sunday night to Tuesday for two reasons: To give him time to prepare thoroughly, and to build up the audience. "We wanted to create suspense."

A political worker who has seen Mr. NIXON in action says this: Most good stump speakers have a kind of intuitive feel of their audience, so that they play by ear, trying out themes as they speak, sensing what gets a response and developing it. With Mr. NIXON, however, it is a matter not so much of intuitive rapport on the stump as of post mortems, careful polls, and trial runs. It is more systematic, more a matter of calculation and testing. Mr. NIXON, as everybody says, works hard. He acknowledged in the early days of the 1952 campaign that his principal mission in barnstorming through Maine was to try out campaign techniques. One can see them developing—the scandal-a-day administration, the "four-headed monster that was Korea, communism, corruption, and controls," the boys dying in Korea while Mr. Stevenson makes jokes—and as Mr. NIXON gets the most effective phrases and themes worked out and polished, he then repeats them at each town. By the end of the campaign his speech has become a veritable masterpiece of planned spontaneity and deliberate loss of temper.

Some of his devices are traditional platform tricks: mock-serious "advice" to the opponent ("I would suggest to Mr. Stevenson * * *"); challenges to say whether he has stopped beating his wife (will he continue the "blindness and ignorance toward communism"?); thrusts to leave him with the burden of proof ("If that is not true, let them deny it"). Like everybody else, only more so, he uses metaphors ("Side-saddle Adlai * * * his feet stick out to the left"), rhymes ("MORSE * * * well, he acts just like a horse."), and alliteration ("Korea, communism, corruption, and controls."). His summaries of the differences between the parties can be breathtaking in their simplicity ("The Truman-Acheson policy got us into war; the Eisenhower-Dulles policy got us out").

LINKAGE

Mr. NIXON also uses the device of counting on the ignorance of the audience and making a simple, memorable charge, the answering of which would involve the opponent in too complex an explanation to be grasped in a swift exchange. Against Representative Voorhis, for example, NIXON's forces claimed that Voorhis' colleagues in the House thought so little of him that they had passed only 1 of the 132 bills he had introduced, and that that one—here comes a laugh—was the "rabbit transfer bill." This attack was infuriating to Congressmen who knew Mr. Voorhis as an exceptionally devoted and respected Member of the House, but Mr. Voorhis' patient effort to explain the rabbit transfer bill was not very effective.

In the Voorhis campaign one of the techniques more especially distinctive to Mr. NIXON began to appear, that of linkage. Mr. NIXON's experience in politics must have been disillusioning for a clean-cut American boy because everybody he has ever campaigned against has turned out, on his investigation, to be linked to somebody sinister. It must be very sad for him never to have had an opponent he could really treat as honorable. Mr. Voorhis was linked to the National Citizens PAC, which in turn was linked to the CIO-PAC, which in turn was linked to outer darkness. Voorhis was not endorsed by the CIO, and was surely anti-Communist, but the whole linkage was handily foreshortened to "A vote for NIXON is a vote against the PAC (and) its Communist principles."

Against Mrs. Douglas, in addition to allowing himself to wonder out loud about the state of her health, Mr. NIXON worked out and used as a major theme of his campaign a linkage with Congressman Vito Marcantonio—he had learned, apparently, that it can be more powerful to use a particular individual. The way this one was done was to list the votes on which Mrs. Douglas and Marcantonio had voted on the same side, to parade the total number, hence to equate their political activity, and to ask "Would California send Vito Marcantonio to the United States Senate?"

In 1952, just after the Democratic convention, other Republicans were a bit taken back by the candidate the Democrats had nominated. But Mr. NIXON, with a brisk professional competence, went right to work to find the linkage for Mr. Stevenson. At first, with the "captive candidate" theme he made the main link to Mr. Truman, with side links just in case: "He's Jack Kroll's candidate; he's Jake Avery's candidate; and—this is his greatest handicap—he's Harry Truman's candidate." Later on in the campaign, however, Mr. NIXON was to work out a much more useful linkage for Mr. Stevenson, one that he had got plenty of mileage out of before, and one he used for all it was worth: Alger Hiss.

An interesting little subordinate motif in his attack on the Democratic candidate was the "mouse" theme. Many of Mr. NIXON's edifying metaphors come from the animal kingdom: Communists are rats, MORSE is a horse, President Truman is braying about the country. In Binghamton, N. Y., he said Mr. Stevenson was a "waltzing mouse." In a speech in Joplin, Mo., he listed 10 reasons why Mr. Stevenson was "unfit" to be President ("His soft attitude toward the Communist conspiracy at home as proven by his defense of Alger Hiss * * * His cheap opportunism, as demonstrated by his willingness to help Harry Truman scrawl nasty words about Dwight Eisenhower on any convenient back fence * * *"), and included among them this one: "his mouselike dependence on Harry Truman." In a speech in East St. Louis he gave the "black record" of Stevenson in Illinois, contrasted him with Eisenhower, and ended with these stirring words: "The choice that must be made is whether we want to select as President of the United States a man or a mouse." As one of the newsmen who covered his trip reported, laconically, Mr. NIXON does not speak over the head of his audience.

Mr. NIXON's attacks have an intensely personal quality; other political figures call each other names, but usually just in the line of political duty, without overtones of real derogation of the other's character as a private citizen. Mr. NIXON's remarks, though, suggest that there is far more wrong with their target than just that he holds the wrong political position. For example, he has dwelt on the theme that Mr. Stevenson is "unfit" for the Presidency. In a speech wholly devoted to that subject, one reason was that his subject had a "character weakness that could prove fatal at this moment of history."

On the eve of the elections of 1954, Mr. NIXON issued a statement responding to a Stevenson speech in which he said: "Mr. Stevenson proved again that 34 million Democrats, Republicans, and independents were right when they found him unfit to be President in 1952." That is an interesting interpretation of what voters were doing when they voted for the Republican candidates, a little insulting to all concerned. One would have thought that some of these 34 million decided that, as between two "fit" candidates, they preferred Mr. Eisenhower.

SOME STAGE SETTINGS

It is not just opposing candidates, but the whole of the opposing party, that, in Mr. NIXON's campaigning, is connected with a sinister set of images. (Mr. NIXON said he possesses a "secret memorandum" to California Communist Party leaders, directing them to "fight out the issues within the ranks of the Democratic Party.") A major and continuing effort in Mr. NIXON's public presentations has been to connect the Democratic Party with war, subversion, and darkness. As a man trained to the platform, he heads straight for those issues on which the deepest emotions can be aroused: the blood of "our boys" in Korea, and Communist spies in our Government on the one side; peace, morality, innocence, and Eisenhower on the other—and in all the starkest terms. Part of this is done explicitly. But perhaps the more important part is done implicitly.

It is the essence of Mr. NIXON's method to say something without saying it. This can be done by a drumfire of adjectives and associations resolutely and incessantly connecting one's opponents with all that is bad and one's own side with all that is good. It is like the advertising device of making hidden associations by repeatedly showing one's product in pleasant surroundings—walls papered, teeth bright, people happy—and the situation without the product dismal in every way. It is crucial that these associations be repeated and repeated, drumming them into the hearer's subconscious. In Mr. NIXON's lexicon, for example, Americans for Democratic Action—an organization about which it may be assumed that 90 percent of Mr. NIXON's audience really know nothing at all—is always a "clique;" the way it "ruled" the Democratic convention in 1952 was always "ruthlessly." Here is a passage from Mr. NIXON that shows how it builds: "Stev-

enson's is a slave-labor program hammered together by a union clique that wants to continue holding workingmen captive to their selfish whim." In one short sentence Stevenson is associated with "slave labor," "hammered together," a "clique" (any organization on the other side from Mr. NIXON is a "clique"), "captive," and not just ordinary whims but "selfish" whims.

Here is another that throws in a little of the advertising man's appeal to the testimony of unnamed experts: "Let me speak tonight of Adlai the appeaser, the man whose slavish devotion (not just his ordinary devotion) to the dubious foreign policy of Truman and Acheson could bring on world war III. This is not idle scare talk. Seasoned experts, men who know, firmly believe the Truman administration is writing the ticket for another global war—which could well destroy the world as we know it." In addition to endangering the world as we know it, Mr. Stevenson and the Democrats are likened to those who appeased Hitler: "What we are seeing now is a tragic return to the gray days of 1938–39, when another dictator was being appeased by another set of confused little men. Remember Hitler? The appeasers thought they could 'contain' him by giving him Czechoslovakia. * * * It brought the bloodiest war in the history of mankind."

Mr. NIXON said all this in a speech in Evansville, Ind., in which he gave his warm endorsement to Senator JENNER. He explained about Adlai Stevenson holding his doctor of philosophy degree from Dean Acheson's college, and gave a list of Democratic foreign-policy failures, well covered with adjectives. "Saddled with such a heritage of complete failure, even Superman himself would fail. Few would call Adlai Stevenson a superman." Not content with that, Mr. NIXON added that the Democrats' choice was a second-rate presidential candidate.

TRICKS WITH WORDS

The finesse in Mr. NIXON's work is sometimes lost on unappreciative souls like Harry Truman, who persists in thinking that he was called a traitor, when, of course, Mr. NIXON really didn't say just that; sometimes it is lost upon a too unimaginative public and press, also, and someone has to follow after Mr. NIXON to explain his work:

In Oil City, Pa., in 1952, Mr. NIXON said that Mr. Eisenhower would have only one test: "Is it good for America?" "Compare that," he said, "with Harry Truman, Harry Vaughan, RFC Dawson, O'Dwyer, and all the rest of these crooks and these incompetents." Reporters asked his press secretary, James Bassett, whether Mr. NIXON really meant to call the President of the United States a crook. Mr. Bassett reported back that Mr. NIXON meant that in the administration around Mr. Truman there were crooks and incompetents, and that Mr. Truman was one of the incompetents.

In 1954, in Van Nuys, Calif., Mr. NIXON told about a "dangerous well-oiled scheme" with "plans for * * * socialized medicine, socialized housing, socialized agriculture, socialized water and power, and * * * atomic energy." "When the Eisenhower administration came to Washington on January 20, 1953," he said, "we found in the files a blueprint for socializing America." His press officer said later that he was not referring to any specific documents in using the term "blueprint" but was just using figurative language to describe the philosophy and proposals of President Truman.

In 1954, Mr. NIXON said, in Minneapolis, Omaha, and many other cities, that "the Eisenhower administration has kicked out the Communists and fellow travelers and security risks not by the hundreds but by the thousands." A press report said he gave this sentence very carefully. When Stephen Mitchell said that NIXON lied in claiming that Communists had been kicked out by the thousands, since only a handful of those who had been kicked out might conceivably be labeled as "subversive." NIXON's aids pointed to the words "security risks" which, including anyone against whom there was derogatory information of almost any kind, accounted for the thousands.

In February this year, the Vice President in a Lincoln Day speech spoke of Republican accomplishments on civil rights of the decision of the Supreme Court under a "Great Republican Chief Justice, Earl Warren." To the immediate indignation that he would make a partisan claim for a Supreme Court decision, his defender David Lawrence solemnly answered that there was an unquoted comma between the words "Republican" and "Chief," which separated the party designation from the office.

The niceties of punctuation and phraseology become very important when one is dealing in blueprints that turn out to be only figurative, crooks that turn out to be just incompetents, Communists that turn out to be just someone who went on a bat, and party accomplishments that just happen to have, incidentally put in their midst, a Supreme Court decision.

When a man has built his career this way, it is not surprising that many people do not relish the thought of his becoming President.

SOME QUOTATIONS FROM NIXON'S 1954 CAMPAIGN

DULUTH, September 22.—If the Democrats were put in control of the Congress, NIXON said, they would see to it that the Eisenhower program was "stopped at midmark—stopped cold, flat, and with malice aforethought." (Des Moines Register.)

September 29, Averill Park, N. Y.: "Ike," said NIXON, "found fair and effective means to smash the Communist conspiracy at home, to rout out the corruption that was gnawing like a cancer at the structure of our Federal Government and to halt the dangerous leftward swing toward socialism." (New York Daily News.)

October 11, Richmond, Calif.: "The previous administration's lack of understanding of the [Communist] danger and its failure to deal with it firmly abroad and effectively at home has led to our major difficulties today. The previous administration unfortunately adopted policies which were soft, vacillating, and inconsistent in dealing with the Communist threat.

"Abroad, this type of policy contributed to the loss of 600 million people to the Communists in 7 years. It contributed to the loss of China and if China had not gone Communist there would have been no war in Korea.

"At home we saw the results of the previous administration's blindness on this issue in the flow of secret State Department documents to the Communists through the Hiss and Bentley espionage rings, and in turning over of our atomic secrets to the Russians in such volume that they were able to develop the atomic bomb * * * years before they would have without the assistance of their Communist agents in the United States." (Contra Costa (Calif.) Gazette.)

October 18, Washington: "The people realize that the alternative [to a Republican 84th Congress] is a Congress unfriendly to President Eisenhower's administration, under the thumb of the ADA leftwing, which captured the Democratic Party at Chicago in 1952, and which is masterminding the current campaign. The people know from bitter experience that this clique is notoriously soft on the Communist threat at home and is blatantly advocating socialization of American institutions." (Baltimore Sun.)

October 24, Las Vegas: Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON says that if a Congress of Adlai Stevenson's choosing is elected, "the security risks which have been fired by the Eisenhower administration will all be hired back." He said the 1952 Democratic presidential candidate "has not changed since he testified for Alger Hiss." (UP dispatch.)

October 27, Los Angeles: "There is nothing the Communists would like better than a return to the Acheson policy of weakness, inconsistency, and compromise" or a return to "the Truman loyalty program under which Communist agents were cleared and hired."

November 1, Denver: "96 percent of the 6,925 Communists, fellow travelers, sex perverts, people with criminal records, dope addicts, drunks, and other security risks removed under the Eisenhower security program were hired by the Truman administration. What are they trying to cover? The terrible ignorance and blindness of the administration which shielded Harry Dexter White, which tried to cover up the treachery of Alger Hiss, and which in case after case refused to heed the warnings of the FBI and promoted rather than fired those with Communist records." (New York Times.)

Yes and No

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, this administration has a double standard on river basin development.

When he signed, as he should have, the bill providing for development of the upper Colorado River Basin, President Eisenhower said it represented "something I believe in" because it treated "river valleys as a whole thing."

Basinwide development of the upper Colorado, then, has Presidential approval. Basinwide development elsewhere, however, does not. One example is the Missouri Basin. Others include the Columbia and the Tennessee, as the St. Louis Post-Dispatch pointed out in the following editorial from the issue of April 16, 1956:

YES AND NO

President Eisenhower spoke some words of excellent wisdom in signing the Upper Colorado River Development Act. He said it represented "something I believe in" because it treated "river valleys as a whole thing."

The puzzle is that Mr. Eisenhower, while enunciating this fine principle for the Colorado, not not apply it elsewhere.

One of the President's appointees, General Vogel, chairman of the TVA board, is busily engaged in an effort to weaken the first application of the unified-development principle to an American river valley.

Another of President Eisenhower's appointees, Secretary McKay, who has just resigned to run for the Senate from Oregon, has been throwing the unified-development principle to the wolves in the Columbia River valley.

How can these contradictions between the Colorado, Tennessee and Columbia valleys—between words and actions—be explained? Thomas L. Stokes discusses this apparent enigma in an illuminating column on the opposite page.

The $331 million Federal project at Hells Canyon on the Snake River, a tributary of the Columbia at the Idaho-Oregon line, was defaulted by Mr. McKay to the Idaho Power Co. 3 years ago. One of the principal reasons

he gave was that "the cost * * * is not small and bears examination in the light of present efforts to balance the national budget."

Yet the cost of the upper Colorado project is twice as great—$760 million—and President Eisenhower was advocating its adoption even before the announcement of a balanced budget.

Why this double standard for different areas?

The partial and piecemeal development on the Columbia which President Eisenhower has so far viewed with complacency is wasteful of natural resources. It wastes an electric-power potential estimated to be as large as the entire prime-power output of Bonneville Dam, on the Columbia. It wastes this power potential in a power-hungry region whose development will be retarded by anything less than full realization of its waterpower.

Private design, construction and operation of three small dams at this site of a key project of the overall Federal development program will break up the very unification which Mr. Eisenhower finds so essential on the upper Colorado.

This obstructionism has been the objective of bitterly anti-public-power private utilities toward unified river valley developments generally. It has been pursued persistently in the Central Valley of California. If the Federal Government gives in to it elsewhere as at Hells Canyon, TVA will become the last unified development in this country as well as having been the first.

Nobody actually opposes unified development, as such, any longer; it makes too much sense. When are we going to start practicing what we preach in the Columbia and other river valleys?

I believe all river valleys should be developed "as a whole thing" no matter where they are.

The junior Senator from Oregon, Senator NEUBERGER, had the Thomas L. Stokes column, which prompted this editorial, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 5662 of the April 16 issue.

Admitting Satellites to U. N. Is Called Immoral Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting as a part of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by David Lawrence which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on November 29, 1955, as follows:

ADMITTING SATELLITES TO U. N. IS CALLED IMMORAL PROPOSAL

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, November 29.—Rarely in world history has there been such a glaring example of concessions to immorality by a supposedly moral organization as in the proposed acceptance of a package deal by the United Nations whereby governments plainly unable to carry out the obligations of the Charter are to be admitted as members.

For it now is proposed that the governments of Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Albania, and Outer Mongolia, which are puppets under the control of the Soviet Union—itself a partner in the conspiracy of aggression against the free world—shall be accepted in defiance of the provisions of the Charter itself.

"PEACE-LOVING STATES"

These provisions state that membership is open "to all peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter, and which, in the judgment of the present organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations."

What are the "obligations"? They are set forth in many articles of the Charter. One article says that the organization is based "on the sovereign equality of all its members." Another article says:

"All members shall give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the provisions of the present Charter and shall refrain from giving assistance to any state against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action."

PROVISION FOR EXPULSION

The charter is replete with statements of the obligation of members to maintain peace and participate in efforts to achieve peace, and then says:

"A member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the principles contained in the present charter may be expelled from the Organization by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council."

The Government of the Soviet Russia has persistently violated these principles and openly boasted before the General Assembly in 1952 that it had aided North Korea with arms and munitions in the war which the United Nations itself waged against the aggressors. The Soviet Union, being a party to a dispute, could be held ineligible to vote in the Security Council and hence her own veto could not prevent expulsion.

The United Nations, moreover, in admitting the governments of the Communist-occupied countries would be compounding the crime against morality by allowing governments that have been deprived of their independence by Soviet Russia to come into the Organization on an equality with sovereign governments that are truly independent. None of the five satellite states is independent or capable of acting independently.

Expediency, which has always been the cancer that has ruined good statesmanship in both national and international affairs, is, however, being extolled nowadays by those who argue that the only way to bring into the U. N. the several non-Communist governments, such as those in Italy and Japan—13 of them in all—is to appease Moscow and make a deal whereby no objection will be made by the West to the admission of the Communist governments provided the Soviet doesn't veto the admission of the non-Communist states.

CALLED BLACKMAIL

This is nothing less than blackmail. Yet there are those who favor it, including officials of the American Government. If there ever was a time when moral principle required an objection to the admission of the additional Communist states, it is today. The cause of peace would be uplifted by rejecting the expediency which demands a deal and brushes idealism and morality aside. It would be far better to let the Soviets use the veto and keep some peace-loving nations out than to surrender on principle.

It would be far better, too, to uphold the basic provisions of the charter and consider the expulsion from the U. N. of the obstructive Communist states, including Soviet Russia. Then membership in the United Nations would be worth something. Then, also the many well intentioned American groups which laud the United Nations as an Organization representing a great advance toward achieving world peace would not have to hold their heads in shame as they teach the schoolchildren of America that the U. N. is based on international morality.

There Was No Defeat at the Alamo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL VINSON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a brilliant and most appropriate speech delivered by the Hon. Paul J. Kilday at San Antonio, Tex., on April 16, 1956, in celebration of the great victory of the Texans at the Battle of San Jacinto. It is entitled "There Was No Defeat at the Alamo." I think every Member will benefit by reading this outstanding résumé of our struggle for constitutional rights and the preservation of liberty:

THERE WAS NO DEFEAT AT THE ALAMO

(Address by PAUL J. KILDAY, Member of Congress, at the pilgrimage to the Alamo, April 16, 1956)

We stand on hallowed ground. Ground hallowed by the life blood of 187 patriots. One hundred and twenty years, 1 month, and 10 days ago the last of that valiant band died within the walls of this chapel of the Mission San Antonio.

"Texians" they were called and Texians they were, but they came from many States and originally from many nations. To place the time in perspective, remember that this occurred but 61 years, almost to the month, after the minutemen drawn up on the village green at Lexington, Mass., had heard the British command: "Disburse ye rebels" and the countermanding order of their own commander: "Stand your ground. Don't fire unless fired upon. If they mean to have war, let it start here."

And then at Old North Bridge at Concord, Mass., and:

"By the rude bridge that arched the flood,
Their flag to Aprils' breeze unfurled.
Here the embattled farmers stood
And fired the shot heard 'round the world."

Like their fellow Americans of but sixty odd years before they loved liberty. They loved liberty to the extent that they would give up their own lives to establish and maintain it for others. Those earlier Americans began their resistance as loyal British subjects to maintain the rights and liberties enjoyed by all British subjects since the barons met on the Plains of Runnymeade in 1215 and wrung from the reluctant King John the Great Charter, Magna Carta, which established for the first time that rights existed in men above and beyond those granted by the sovereign king. That was the first idea of the concept so dear to Americans—constitutional government.

In the course of events the shots fired at Lexington and at Concord resulted in that meeting of the Continental Congress at Philadelphia which declared on July 4, 1776:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure there rights, governments are in-

stituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

The issue being formed, the bitter and long drawn out American Revolution ensued. Many lives were lost, much suffering and privation were endured.

Through many defeats and the long winter at Valley Forge they persevered. Shortly before the battle of Trenton, Thomas Paine, the great pamphleteer of the Revolution, sat by the flickering camp fire and, using a drum head to write upon, wrote the inspiring words of the "American Crisis." Words so inspiring and typical of the times, that George Washington directed that his troops be paraded and the "American Crisis" read to them. It included:

"These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of their country; but he that stands it now, deserves the love and thanks of man and woman. Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph. What we obtain too cheap, we esteem too lightly: It is dearness only that gives every thing its value. Heaven knows how to put a proper price upon its goods; and it would be strange indeed if so celestial an article as freedom should not be highly rated."

Those words were true before the Battle of Trenton. Those words were true before the Battle of the Alamo. They were true before the massacre at Goliad. They were true before the Battle of San Jacinto; and they are true today.

Their efforts triumphed, victory was achieved. There followed what a great Englishman has called "the greatest document ever struck off, at a given time by the mind and purpose of man." Again from Philadelphia, this time in 1787, comes the pronouncement:

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Peace survived only until 1812, when Americans again fought to maintain the Nation so newly established. In 1814, just 22 years before the battle of the Alamo, Americans saw their Capital sacked by the British invader, their Capitol Building, the official residence of the President, and other public buildings burned. But their Nation and their Constitution endured. They endured because Americans who had been willing to fight and to die to establish them were willing to fight and to die to maintain them.

The Texans had come here relying upon the protection guaranteed them by the Constitution of the United Mexican States proclaimed on October 4, 1824. It guaranteed to each of the Mexican States, of which Texas was one, that each State be divided as to the exercise of its powers into a legislative, executive, and judicial department; and that two or more of those powers could never be vested in the same persons. Most important, that legislative power be never confided to a single individual, but be entrusted to a Congress of each particular State. It guaranteed that executive and judicial power be exercised in accordance with the constitution of the respective States.

A free legislative system has always been, and still is, the one effective deterrent to dictatorship. Hitler and Mussolini as the first step to dictatorship assaulted and subjugated the legislative bodies of Germany and Italy. Communist Russia has never tolerated a free legislative system.

As Americans these Texans had come to the Mexican State of Texas believing that Mexico's Constitution was as sacred and inviolate as that of the United States.

In 1835 there arose in Mexico a dictator named Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna. True to the pattern of all dictators before and since, Santa Anna abolished the Constitution of the United Mexican States with its restrictions on the powers of government and seized all power for himself. As the self-proclaimed "Napoleon of the West," he proceded to establish his one-man rule. In violation of the Mexican Constitution, he abolished the separate State of Texas and combined it with the State of Coahuila.

Let us here and now remember that Santa Anna's oppression was against all of the people in all of the States of Mexico, not only the former citizens of the United States now Mexican citizens settled in Texas. Long devoted to constitutional government, these Americans fought against dictatorship, proclaimed a provisional government, declared in favor of a union with Constitutionalists of all of the Mexican States, and dedicated themselves to the restoration of the Mexican Federal Constitution.

No patriots ever fought for higher purpose than these Texans—the protection of constitutional rights—as dear to us here today as it was to them. Did these men, under siege in the Alamo, know the high purpose of their resolve to remain in the Alamo and die with their leaders, Travis, Bonham, Bowie, and Crockett? There can be no doubt. In the last message from the Alamo, in which he pleaded for reenforcements and pledged never to surrender, Travis said, "Our flag still flies proudly from the walls." It was not our beloved Lone-Star Flag of Texas nor was it the Stars and Stripes of the United States. Rather, it was the red, white, and green flag of Mexico, their adopted country. However, the Mexican eagle had been removed from that proud banner, and substituted for it was the date 1824, which symbolized for these besieged all of their rights, their freedoms, their protections—1824, the sacred date of the constitution of the United Mexican States. To Santa Anna's observers at the Church of San Fernando, that date, 1824, on the Mexican flag was a galling reminder of his perfidy.

Their defense of basic rights, to the very last drop of the blood of each of the 187, has long thrilled the hearts of freedom-loving men wherever the story has been told, and the story has been told wherever men love liberty. Here is the Cradle of Texas Liberty. Not a combatant remained alive on March 6, 1836; only three noncombatants remained alive.

Today we begin a week of observance of the gallant deeds of our forebears. It is mete and proper that our first thoughts be of the Alamo and its immortal dead. We celebrate with pageantry and with pomp, not that the Alamo was conquered and its defenders slain, not that here some 3,000 annihilated 187. No; we celebrate the victory of the Battle of San Jacinto and its triumph of right over might—the vindication of constitutional government over dictatorship and oppression.

We here pay honor to the memory of the immortals who died here, but we celebrate the victory of San Jacinto some 6 weeks later. Herein lies the basic difference between our new world and the old world with its constant wars. Even today in Europe, nations observe and celebrate defeats of the 18th century. They are determined that each succeeding generation shall remember that the neighboring nation is its traditional enemy and shall remain so. Hence, the interminable wars between them.

How different in our own beloved America. Nowhere in our calendar of holidays and observances is there one dedicated to the remembrance of a defeat or a wrong. Those reverses belong to the dead past. Not forgetting those who were the victims of defeats, keeping them fresh in our memories, we celebrate our victories. The victor can be magnanimous. The vanquished can only be embittered.

In our country, unlike the old world, we have no traditional enemies. We have many traditional friends. The descendants of the British redcoats at Lexington and Concord are now the traditional friends of the descendants of the minutemen they faced. You and I, as the successors to the men of the Alamo, are the traditional friends of the descendants of the men who fought here and at San Jacinto under Santa Anna. It will ever be so.

An orator has said most eloquently: "Thermopylae had her messenger of defeat, but the Alamo had none." There may have been defeat at Thermopylae. But was there defeat at the Alamo? True every combatant was slain. Their bodies were placed on a funeral pyre interlaid with mesquite wood and the torch applied. They were reduced to ashes. But from their own ashes they rose in youthful freshness like the Phoenix. In that pristine beauty they formed the inspiration of the gallant army of Sam Houston in its decisive victory at the Battle of San Jacinto. They provided the battle cry, "Remember the Alamo." There followed the Republic of Texas, its admission to the United States as the 28th bright star of the galaxy of 48. Their devotion to constitutional rights, their defense thereof, rendered it possible for us to stand on this hallowed ground surrounded by the marvels of modern progress and stable government. The wild frontier conquered, the blessing of liberty maintained for you and for me and for generation after generation which shall follow us as did every generation which has followed them. No; there was no defeat at the Alamo.

State of Israel

SPEECH

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged today to add my sentiments to those of my distinguished colleagues in the House and Senate in congratulations to the State of Israel upon the occasion of the eighth anniversary of its establishment as a free, independent, and sovereign state.

This is a singularly happy occasion that shines out like a star of hope in a dark-clouded sky. In a world beset by confusion, aggressions, and subversions, in a world where the democratic ideal is so often under attack, it is an exhilarating satisfaction to call attention to one new nation that has from the beginning manifested its adherence to the ideas and ideals of a democratic society.

It is also gratifying to know that this new nation has exhibited a generosity of national spirit that has solved a problem of homelessness for hundreds of thousands of people to whom it opened its doors in welcome. The great humanitarian service that Israel has rendered in converting desperate people from the category of "refugees" to that of upright, free citizens will always shine as a bright page in the history of our times.

In saluting the State of Israel and extending to it our good wishes, I cannot

help but draw parallels with the early history of our own country, the United States of America. We, too, started as a new young Republic after the embroilment of war, with a devotion to independence and democracy and in need of understanding and friendship. It is heartening to know that the social and spiritual concepts that marked the birth of the United States have their parallels in the State of Israel.

I hope that the views expressed by Members of both Houses will give notice to the world at large of American friendship and support for the State of Israel. Those with aggressive designs on the security and independence of Israel might do well to read the record of the United States Congress and reconcile themselves to the bonds of friendship and mutual regard that link the people of the United States of America and the people of the State of Israel.

This occasion, however, must not be noted without regard for the threats of and actual aggression that hover like a calamitous cloud over the State of Israel. The cry of the victims reaches out to us and calls upon us to reassert vigorously our national policy to prevent aggression and to warn and, if need be, punish aggressors.

The security of the State of Israel is vital to the stability of the entire area of the Middle East and this in turn is basic to America's own defense and the defense of the free world. This calls for an administrative policy of action rather than of inaction; and of direct, friendly, and timely intervention rather than by a nod to our allies. It calls for prompt and sympathetic action as to the defense needs of the State of Israel, out of the same considerations that justify our provision for our own defense needs and for those of the Western World.

It calls for an ample and timely counterweight to the armaments furnished by the Communist and satellite governments.

Above all, it calls for a clear unambiguous assertion on the highest level that the United States is committed to the proposition that peace is indivisible and that peace and the safeguards of peace for the State of Israel are basic in our national policy.

The Income Tax—What To Do About It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, in 1950 I introduced a constitutional resolution to repeal the 16th amendment and to substitute for it a limited power to impose a Federal income tax in national emergencies and for debt reduction. This is now House Joint Resolution 16. This resolution was accompanied by a proposal for the establishment of a joint commission to consider reallocation of Government functions and tax sources as between Federal, State, and local units. At the time I had no illusion that so drastic a change in the Federal tax structure could be effected so long as the cold war emergency demanded such an enormous proportion of the national income. Nor had I any illusions about the disastrous impact of the present confiscatory income-tax law upon the traditional pattern of American life, political, economic, and social—a pattern which had been so largely responsible for the creation of a great nation upon a virgin continent.

I hoped then, and I hope more than ever now, that we may live to see a stable peace in the world and the cost of national defense reduced to the point where it may be possible to reduce drastically Federal taxes. Meanwhile no time should be lost in preparing for such day by the establishment of a Hoover-type joint commission as suggested by the Honorable Coleman Andrews, distinguished former Commissioner of Internal Revenue, to give consideration to the defects and inequities of Federal tax structure, including the income tax, and to recommend constructive changes. I intend to introduce such a resolution.

I am inserting excerpts from a provocative article by Mr. Andrews in the American Weekly of April 22, 1956, entitled "Let's Abolish the Income Tax." This graphically reveals the evils of the present income-tax laws and analyzes the harmful impact upon American life. It should be read and pondered by every citizen. It cannot fail to excite interest in effecting such changes as present exigencies permit and ultimately in the substantial limitation upon Federal taxation of income as and when world conditions permit. I congratulate Mr. Andrews and the American Weekly.

The excerpts follow:

LET'S GET RID OF THE INCOME TAX

(By T. Coleman Andrews, former Commissioner of Internal Revenue)

Recently a 14-year-old boy won $100,000 on a television quiz program. He winds up with about $25,000, after giving the Federal Government its two-thirds tax share ($67,000) and New York State its $8,000.

Did I say that the young man won? Pardon me, Mr. Tax Collector, as you say, "After me, you come first."

In order to take home a full $100,000, that young man would have had to win a grand prize of roughly $765,000. Taxes would have taken all the rest.

Striking as his case, is, it actually represents one of the lesser inequities of our present tax structure. Luck was on the boy's side; he was gambling, and after all he did win a sizable amount.

But what of people of large earning power and often erratic income—high 1 year, low the next—actors, authors, painters, and other artistic or professional people? More than luck and casual knowledge go into the winning of their jackpots. Usually their skill and talent is made to pay off only after long years of study and training. Yet the taxes they have to pay are equally brutal, equally confiscatory. Not being permitted to average their incomes over a period of years, except in special situations, they pay much higher effective rates than people with steady incomes.

The professional athlete fares even worse. Those who manage to break through to the top usually do well incomewise. But the way up is pitifully unrewarding, so much so that those who make the grade more often than not mount the throne of glory head over heels in debt. And their reign usually is short.

These are people with whom the tax collector forms a real heads-I-win-tails-you-lose partnership. For instance, let's see what the income tax does to a boxing champion:

If such a fellow winds up a year having to pay on $200,000—not a high amount for even a not-too-colorful champion—he obviously is 50 times better off incomewise than, let's say, a man paying on $4,000. But—I still gasp at just the thought of this—his tax is nearly 500 times more. And before he can get clear financially some challenger polishes him off and put him right back where he started. No averaging for him either. His are indeed the highest effective rates of all.

However, people of irregular earning power are by no means the only sufferers from our income tax laws. Almost everybody has now been gathered under the tent, and the percentage of those taxed leaves few immune to plucking who have enough feathers to notice.

IT'S LEGALIZED CONFISCATION

Up to $2,000 of taxable income the tax collector takes 20 percent. That's a mighty big bite for a person at that level of income. But from there he really moves in fast. From $4,000 to $6,000 it's 26 percent. Between $8,000 and $10,000 he takes a third. From $16,000 to $18,000 it's a half. From $32,000 to $38,000 it's two-thirds. From $50,000 to $60,000 it's three-fourths. And so on, until the top rates of 91 percent (more than nine-tenths) is reached at $200,000. This is called progression, a fancy term which, realistically defined, means legalized confiscation. But if the term used to define this brigandage is fancy, the results certainly are anything but fancy; they are murderous.

For instance, an executive, professional man or other person with an income of $40,000 pays 47 times more tax than the fellow with an income of $4,000. Ten times more income, 47 times more tax.

But even that isn't the whole of it. To the extent that income is derived from dividends, the Government already will have skimmed off more than half (52 percent) before you get yours. Every stockholder should realize by now that while he takes all the risk and responsibility he's just a junior partner when it comes to participating in the profits and must eat at the second table and take what is left.

While the top rate (91 percent) of our steeply graduated tax is not reached until taxable income amounts to $200,000, one-half of the graduation above the beginning rate of 20 percent takes place by the time the income level reaches one-tenth of $200,000, or $20,000. This is rank discrimination against the middle-income, white-collar class. Is it deliberate?

Well, I'll give you one fact and one observation that ought to answer that question: The fact is that the first order of business of every dictatorship is to destroy the middle class. The two simply cannot live together. The masses are not regarded as a problem because dictators figure that the masses can be made to believe anything. The well-to-do don't count because there never are enough of them to be a serious threat.

The observation is that I have never known an advocate of statism in any form who did not give me the impression of being either a dupe or, at heart, a dictator. In my book one is as dangerous as the other.

* * * * *

IT'S TOO COMPLICATED

One of the strongest and most serious counts in the indictment against the income tax is its complexity. It started out simple enough, but it is not an exaggeration to say that it has become as bewildering, confusing, and frustrating a fiscal problem as the people ever had to cope with.

* * * * *

WHO UNDERSTANDS IT?

Who, if anybody, does really understand this tax? How about the people who write it? The answer is not greatly different. By the time the tax committees and their staffs get through with the grist that is delivered to their mills many undecipherable changes have been wrought. The problem then presented is well illustrated by the struggle the experts in the Treasury Department have been having with the job of getting out regulations to cover the 1954 code.

There is official recognition of the fact that standing alone no revenue law is understandable. So the Treasury Department follows the enactment of each revenue law with an official interpretation of that law. The official interpretations are called regulations. Almost 20 months have elapsed since the Income Tax Code of 1954 became law—but the official interpretation of it isn't out yet.

* * * * *

IT COSTS THE GOVERNMENT TOO MUCH

Another count in the indictment against the income tax—and a very serious one—is the high cost of it. There are two categories of this cost: first, what the Government spends to administer the law; second, what the taxpayer pays to comply with it.

Notice that in identifying the first category of cost I did not speak of it as a cost that the Government pays. The Government doesn't pay any part of this cost; the taxpayers pay every cent of it—the cost of administration as well as the cost of compliance. The Government never pays anything; it spends and the taxpayers pay.

I am not suggesting that the Internal Revenue Service is wasteful or inefficient, because I know better. After 3 years of unrelenting war against redtape and unnecessary overhead, and of using the savings thus made to strengthen and expand enforcement and other operating activities, the Service is showing a degree of improvement of which its management and personnel have every right to be proud.

What I am suggesting is that the complexity of the income tax law necessitates the use of a lot more people in the Nation's revenue department than would be necessary under a simple and better understood revenue system and that, therefore, the cost of administration is a great deal more than it ought to be. We should have a revenue system under which no more than one-half the present revenue force would be required.

* * * * *

IT'S UNSTABLE

At least some of the Members of Congress must fear what many knowing outsiders firmly believe, namely, that if Congress ever allowed the Revenue Service to have enough money for all-out enforcement of the income tax the demand for repeal would become so great within a year that it would be irresistible.

As to the complaint about having to employ professional help there is no answer short of wiping the slate clean and starting fresh.

Another count in the indictment is that the income tax is unstable. Being based upon income, it's a low producer in slack times and a high producer in good times. Thus, theoretically, rates must be raised when people are least able to pay, and they must be lowered when everybody is most able to pay.

I am aware, of course that Congress' practice is to resort to the use of deficit financing in slack times in order to avoid increasing taxes. But this validates my citation of inherent instability. I also am aware of the tendency to hold expenditures at such a level that decreases are seldom effected in good times. I suggest that this only compounds that instability.

After 23 years of deficit financing everyone should be convinced by now that in addition to all the other indictments that may be laid against the income tax it just isn't up to the job that has to be done. And, to paraphrase Virginia's Senator BYRD, if the job can't be done in prosperous times like these—and, I might add, at the outrageously high rates presently in effect—when can it be done?

The manmade deficiencies of the income tax law are to a large extent the consequences of submission to the demands of pressure groups. For instance, tremendous accumulations of income-producing wealth have been removed from the jurisdiction of the income tax law by the exemptions granted to foundations and certain other nonprofit organizations.

Considering the fact that large accumulations of funds such as those segregated for the use of foundations usually compound themselves, it is clear that the effect of this removal of income from the reach of the tax collector is to cause the Government a loss of revenue that grows and grows with the passage of time.

Billions of dollars of potential income also are kept out of the reach of the tax collector by the Government's engagement in business activities that compete with private enterprise.

The Second Hoover Commission tells us that "more than 2,500 business facilities that provide goods and services are operated by the Defense Department alone," that the investment in these facilities exceeds $15 billion, and that the facilities range all the way from "shoe repair shops to clothing factories, from cement mixing plants to sawmills, from chain stores to tree and garden nurseries."

In all the foregoing ways (and in others as well—space does not permit complete citation) we have by legislative enactment deliberately kept taxable income from keeping pace with economic development and growth, thus precluding realization of the full potentialities of the income tax as a revenue producer and making it more and more unequal to its job. And, sin of all sins, we've made up the loss by taking it out of the hides of the people with the know-how that has so largely accounted for our success as a Nation.

Also, the income tax having proven to be an unstable source of revenue, Congress has availed itself of a variety of other taxes. Some, if not many, of these other taxes could be dispensed with if the primary tax were a stable one and could be permitted to produce fully and freely.

WHAT CAN WE DO ABOUT IT?

What then can be done about all this? I suggest that the time has come to take a new and sincerely critical look at our whole tax system. After all, some elements of the present system are as old as the Union itself. Even the income tax, which we have been relying upon as our primary source of income ever since shortly after it was adopted, isn't any chicken. It's 43 years old.

Now, clearly, age alone is not a sufficient reason to condemn any particular tax or any tax system. But, as I have shown, there's a lot wrong with the income tax besides its age. Moreover, it isn't just old; it is incurably infirm. If the present administration couldn't give it simplicity and effectiveness, I don't believe anybody can.

My proposal is simple. It is that Congress appoint a Hoover-Commission-type group to make a really critical analysis of the income tax in particular and of the tax system in general, and to study such reasonable proposals as may be made with regard to both. Such a study is long overdue. None has been made in 43 years.

There hasn't even been any search for something better in all that time. Incidentally, why hasn't such a search been conducted on a continuing basis? Research pays off handsomely for business as to matters far less important to it than the Government's tax system and its principal source of revenue are to it. It's time the Government got some research started in this important field.

Such a commission as I have in mind should be a nonpartisan one, and all the responsibility for it and its findings should be assumed by Congress. Moreover, it should not be put under the handicap of a deadline. It should have time to do a thorough job, and not be restricted in its inquiry.

No doubt most of my readers have asked by now, "Well, if we get rid of the income tax what would you put in its place?" That's a fair question, and I have some ideas. But that's not the immediate problem. Moreover, if I proposed any substitute tax or plan at this juncture the first step in my proposal would never be taken. The necessity for a commission to go into the whole problem of taxation thoroughly would be lost in an argument over whether my suggestions would be feasible. Those who have a vested interest in maintaining the status quo would see to that. There are many such people, and some of them have tremendous political power.

For the time being I will say only that I believe that a law or system can be contrived that would be simple enough for the average taxpayer to understand. Such a system might be relatively inexpensive for the Government to administer and the taxpayers to comply with and at the same time be a stable source of revenue. Such results have been worked out in at least two very important categories of business enterprise. I believe that the same can be worked out for business generally, and for individuals as well.

IT'S DESTROYING THE MIDDLE CLASS

There isn't any time to lose, ladies and gentlemen of Congress. Whether you believe it or not, everybody is being overtaxed and the middle class is being taxed out of existence and the Nation, thereby, is being robbed of its surest guaranty of continued sound economic development and growth and its staunchest bulwark against the ascendency of socialism. We who somehow have managed to hold on finally are beginning to see the shameful extent to which we have been made the special victims of rapacious tax enactments—and we don't like it.

* * * * *

Things are mighty serious, ladies and gentlemen. Largely because of the income tax, big business gets bigger and little business and "substantial folks" are beginning to disappear.

We are concerned about the future because we don't believe that we could stand another serious recession, what with the present "good times" founded as largely as they are on defense production, deficit financing and other generators of thin ice and phony prosperity. And with the tax collector taking the fruits of our labors in "progressive" ratio to our achievements. High rates of tax don't mean anything when there isn't anything to tax.

Time's a-wasting, and the enemies of the way of life that we cherish rejoice as we are obligingly led closer and closer to national suicide.

What are you going to do about it and when?

Also Against Sin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks I include an editorial, Also Against Sin, appearing in the Boston Post of April 19, 1956, and how true the editorial is in its expression of facts and logic.

The editorial follows:

ALSO AGAINST SIN

It would be a foolish man, indeed, who would quarrel with the eight points which President Eisenhower proposed should be embodied in the Republican platform to attract independents and irregular Democrats to the party in the 1956 presidential election.

These were in effect a hearty hurrah for the individual, for the spirit of the people, for prosperity, for a heart as well as a head in government, for courageous principles, for government that serves, to be strong and free and espouse freedom under God for all peoples. We assume that the GOP party leaders who conferred with the President will in their wisdom also write a plank against sin in the Republican platform in favor of home and mother, and call upon all to smite the iniquitous Democrats hip and thigh.

But one can scarcely miss the fact that this eight-point proposal is of a piece with all the glittering generalities, the spread-eagle clichés, the McGuffey First Reader maxims and adages which establish the President as one of the best intentioned of men. Good intentions have been demonstrated to be only one ingredient of leadership, either of a party or a nation.

Home and mother are treasures beyond price. But in these perilous times something more than sentimental attachment is required to keep a home going and provide for mother—and this is the area in which the President has a distinct poverty of ideas. There are questions of great urgency—the national security, foreign aid, the farm problem, foreign policy failures, and many another controversial matter upon which the noble-sounding clichés have nothing to say.

This is a dynamic Nation, not yet—it is earnestly hoped—suffering from the inertia that clings with fainthearted timidity to the status quo. An expanding economy doesn't have its way greased by clichés, analects, homilies, and aphorisms, but by courageous and imaginative thinking translated into certain action.

This does not mean the formula of the superliberals embracing all the half-baked propositions which emerge untested from the fertile but often frivolous minds of the love-'em-all political innovators. When the President is making a bald appeal to independent voters and to the hedge-hopping Democrats something more than treacle is expected. He is elevated so far above party as to be invisible.

The businessmen who gave him stout support want some better explanation for the tightening credit policies of the administration. The farmers want to know why loans have become so tight in a situation in which they have to go shopping around for loans to tide them over this year. People want to know why national security was given second place in the administration's plans.

It is not the statement of noble principles which are understood to be implicit in both major party platforms that interests the voters, but the implementation of these noble principles.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*.....6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*.....
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*.....120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*.....University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*.....
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*.....5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*.....
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Jenner, William E., *Ind*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*.....
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Laird, William R. III, *W. Va*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*.....Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*.....
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*.....The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*.....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*.....
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*.....
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*.....
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*.....
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*.....Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*.....
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*.....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*.....
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*.....Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*.....
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*.....
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Wofford, Thomas A., *S. C*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Johnson of Texas, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Barkley, Anderson, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Morse, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Wofford, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Laird, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Wofford, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Laird, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Scott, Wofford, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dill, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Committee on Agriculture

Messrs. Cooley (chairman), Poage, Grant, Gathings, McMillan, Abernethy, Albert, Abbitt, Polk, Thompson of Texas, Jones of Missouri, Watts, Hagen, Johnson of Wisconsin, Anfuso, Bass of Tennessee, Mrs. Knutson, Messrs. Jennings, Matthews, Hope, August H. Andresen, Hill, Hoeven, Simpson of Illinois, Dague, Harvey, Lovre, Belcher, McIntire, Williams of New York, King of Pennsylvania, Harrison of Nebraska, Laird, Dixon, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Cannon (chairman), Mahon, Sheppard, Thomas, Kirwan, Norrell, Whitten, Andrews, Rooney, Gary, Fogarty, Sikes, Fernandez, Preston, Passman, Rabaut, Yates, Marshall, Riley, Sieminski, Evins, Lanham, Deane, Shelley, Boland, Magnuson, Natcher, Flood, Denton, Murray of Illinois, Taber, Wigglesworth, Jensen, H. Carl Andersen, Horan, Canfield, Fenton, Phillips, Scrivner, Coudert, Clevenger, Wilson of Indiana, Davis of Wisconsin, James, Ford, Miller of Maryland, Vursell, Hand, Ostertag, and Bow.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Vinson (chairman), Brooks of Louisiana, Kilday, Durham, Rivers, Philbin, Hébert, Winstead, Price, Fisher, Hardy, Green of Pennsylvania, Doyle, Wickersham, Miller of California, Bennett of Florida, Holtzman, Mollohan, Lankford, Huddleston, Short, Arends, Cole, Johnson of California, Gavin, Norblad, Van Zandt, Patterson, Cunningham, Bates, Hess, Nelson, Devereux, O'Konski, Bray, Wilson of California, Osmers, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Spence (chairman), Brown of Georgia, Patman, Rains, Multer, Addonizio, Barrett, O'Hara of Illinois, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Fountain, Reuss, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Ashley, Vanik, Bell, Holland, Healey, Wolcott, Gamble, Talle, Kilburn, McDonough, Widnall, Betts, Mumma, McVey, Hiestand, Nicholson, Oliver P. Bolton, and Bass of New Hampshire.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. McMillan (chairman), Harris, Abernethy, Smith of Virginia, Klein, Teague of Texas, Davis of Georgia, Morrison, Dawson of Illinois, Williams of Mississippi, Steed, Wier, Jones of North Carolina, Rutherford, Simpson of Illinois, O'Hara of Minnesota, Talle, Miller of Nebraska, Auchincloss, Allen of California, Kearns, Patterson, Gubser, Broyhill, and Hyde.

Committee on Education and Labor

Messrs. Barden (chairman), Kelley of Pennsylvania, Powell, Bailey, Perkins, Wier, Elliott, Landrum, Metcalf, Bowler, Chudoff, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Roosevelt, Zelenko, McDowell, Thompson of New Jersey, Udall, McConnell, Gwinn, Smith of Kansas, Kearns, Velde, Hoffman of Michigan, Bosch, Holt, Rhodes of Arizona, Wainwright, Frelinghuysen, Coon, and Fjare.

Committee on Foreign Affairs

Messrs. Richards (chairman), Gordon, Morgan, Carnahan, Chatham, Zablocki, Burleson, Hays of Arkansas, Mrs. Kelly of New York, Messrs. Dodd, Hays of Ohio, Donovan, Jarman, Byrd, Selden, Pilcher, Williams of New Jersey, Chiperfield, Vorys, Mrs. Frances P. Bolton, Messrs. Smith of Wisconsin, Merrow, Judd, Fulton, Jackson, LeCompte, Radwan, Morano, Mrs. Church, Messrs. Adair, Prouty, and Bentley.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. Dawson of Illinois (chairman), Holifield, McCormack, Chudoff, Brooks of Texas, Holtzman, Mollohan, Fountain, Hardy, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Garmatz, Moss, Kilgore, Fascell, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Reuss, Hoffman of Michigan, Riehlman, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Brownson, Meader, Brown of Ohio, Lipscomb, Reece of Tennessee, Younger, Knox, Krueger, Jonas, and Minshall.

Committee on House Administration

Messrs. Burleson (chairman), Byrd, Friedel, Ashmore, Hays of Ohio, Jones of Missouri, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Smith of Mississippi, Dowdy, Long, Alexander, Thompson of New Jersey, Abbitt, LeCompte, Morano, Schenck, Carrigg, Harrison of Nebraska, Corbett, Bennett of Michigan, Hillings, Oliver P. Bolton, Lipscomb, and Halleck.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Engle (chairman), Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Rogers of Texas, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Haley, Shuford, Powell, Edmondson, Metcalf, Christopher, Sisk, Udall, Diggs, Rutherford, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Miller of Nebraska, Saylor, Wharton, Berry, Dawson of Utah, Westland, Pillion, Young, Hosmer, Rhodes of Arizona, Budge, Chenoweth, Utt, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Priest (chairman), Harris, Klein, Granahan, Carlyle, Williams of Mississippi, Mack of Illinois, Roberts, Moulder, Staggers, Dollinger, Rogers of Texas, Dies, Friedel, Flynt, Macdonald, Hayworth, Wolverton, Hinshaw, O'Hara of Minnesota, Hale, Dolliver, Heselton, Bennett of Michigan, Hoffman of Illinois, Beamer, Springer, Bush, Schenck, Carrigg, and Derounian.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Celler (chairman), Walter, Lane, Feighan, Chelf, Willis, Frazier, Rodino, Jones of North Carolina, Forrester, Rogers of Colorado, Donohue, Brooks of Texas, Tuck, Ashmore, Quigley, Boyle, Davidson, Keating, McCulloch, Miss Thompson of Michigan, Messrs. Hillings, Crumpacker, Miller of New York, Taylor, Burdick, Curtis of Massachusetts, Robsion of Kentucky, Hyde, Poff, Scott, ———.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

Messrs. Bonner (chairman), Boykin, Garmatz, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Thompson of Louisiana, Miller of California, Kluczynski, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Bell, Tumulty, Davidson, Zelenko, Clark, Ashley, Dingell, Tollefson, Allen of California, Seely-Brown, Sheehan, Van Pelt, Ray, Mailliard, Dorn of New York, Pelly, Cederberg, Baumhart, Chase, Norblad, and Bartlett.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Murray of Tennessee (chairman), Morrison, Davis of Georgia, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Dowdy, Alexander, Moss, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Fascell, Tumulty, Kilgore, Holifield, Rees of Kansas, Corbett, Mrs. St. George, Mr. Gross, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Cretella, Gubser, Broyhill, Cederberg, Henderson, and Johansen.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Buckley (chairman), Fallon, Davis of Tennessee, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Dempsey, Smith of Mississippi, Kluczynski, Steed, Thompson of Louisiana, Gentry, Burnside, Mrs. Blitch, Messrs. Wright, Hull, Gray, Clark, Rogers of Florida, Dingell, Dondero, McGregor, Auchincloss, Mack of Washington, Scudder, George, Becker, Scherer, Withrow, Cramer, Baldwin, Schwengel, Alger, Bush, and Nicholson.

Committee on Rules

Messrs. Smith of Virginia (chairman), Colmer, Madden, Delaney, Trimble, Thornberry, Bolling, O'Neill, Allen of Illinois, Brown of Ohio, Ellsworth, and Latham.

Committee on Un-American Activities

Messrs. Walter (chairman), Moulder, Doyle, Frazier, Willis, Velde, Kearney, Jackson, and Scherer.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Messrs. Teague of Texas (chairman), Dorn of South Carolina, Mrs. Kee, Messrs. Long, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Edmondson, Boykin, Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Shuford, Christopher, Diggs, Sisk, Haley, ———, Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts, Messrs. Kearney, Ayres, Adair, Fino, Weaver, Avery, Thomson of Wyoming, Siler, and Teague of California.

Committee on Ways and Means

Messrs. Cooper (chairman), Mills, Gregory, Forand, Eberharter, King of California, O'Brien of Illinois, Boggs, Keogh, Harrison of Virginia, Karsten, Herlong, McCarthy, Ikard, Machrowicz, Reed of New York, Jenkins, Simpson of Pennsylvania, Kean, Mason, Holmes, Byrnes of Wisconsin, Sadlak, Baker, and Curtis of Missouri.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

(United States Court House, 3d and Constitution Ave.)

Office telephone	*Chief Judge*	*Residence telephone*
	Henry White Edgerton, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 3-6017

Circuit Judges

E. Barrett Prettyman, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	Oliver 2-3263
Wilbur K. Miller, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	North 7-8109
David L. Bazelon, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	Emerson 2-0544
Charles Fahy, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	Emerson 3-6267
George T. Washington, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	Adams 2-6327
John A. Danaher, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	District 7-4704
Walter M. Bastian, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	
Warren E. Burger, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	Emerson 2-6253

COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

(Internal Revenue Building. Phone National 8-4696)

Chief Judge—Vacancy.
Judge—Ambrose O'Connell, of New York, Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Judge—Noble J. Johnson, of Indiana, 4318 Warren St.
Judge—Eugene Worley, of Texas, 4745 32d St. North, Arlington, Va.
Judge—William P. Cole, Jr., of Maryland, 100 West University Parkway, Baltimore, Md.
Judge—Joseph R. Jackson (retired), of New York, Westchester Apts.

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

(Pennsylvania Ave. and 17th St. Phone, District 7-0642)

Chief Judge—Marvin Jones, of Texas, University Club.
Judge—Benjamin H. Littleton, of Tennessee, 2737 Devonshire Place.
Judge—Samuel E. Whitaker, of Tennessee, 4921 Quebec St.
Judge—J. Warren Madden, of Pennsylvania, 300 East Broad St., Falls Church, Va.
Judge—Don. N. Laramore, of Indiana, 5017 Scarsdale Road, Sumner, Md.

EMERGENCY COURT OF APPEALS

Washington 1, D. C.

Chief Judge—Albert B. Maris, Philadelphia 7, Pa. (United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.)
Judge—Calvert Magruder, Boston 9, Mass. (Chief Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.)
Judge—Thomas F. McAllister, Grand Rapids, Mich. (United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.)
Judge—Walter C. Lindley, Danville, Ill. (United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.)
Judge—Bolitha J. Laws, Washington, D. C. (Chief Judge, United States District Court for the District of Columbia.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

District of Columbia

(Washington 1, D. C.)

Chief Judge Bolitha J. Laws

Judges

F. Dickinson Letts	Edward M. Curran
James W. Morris	Edward A. Tamm
David A. Pine	Charles F. McLaughlin
Matthew F. McGuire	James R. Kirkland
Henry A. Schweinhaut	Burnita S. Matthews
Alexander Holtzoff	Luther W. Youngdahl
Richmond B. Keech	Joseph C. McGarraghy

UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

(United States Court of Military Appeals Building, 5th and E Sts. NW.)

Phone, Liberty 5-6700

Chief Judge	Robert E. Quinn
Judge	George W. Latimer
Judge	Homer Ferguson
Commissioner	Richard L. Tedrow
Clerk	Alfred C. Proulx

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*—6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*—4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*
Albert, Carl, *Okla*
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*—University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*
Andrews, George W., *Ala*—3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*—4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*—113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*

Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*—2601 Woodley Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*
Bates, William H., *Mass*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*
Beamer, John V., *Ind*—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*
Belcher, Page, *Okla*
Bell, John J., *Tex*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*—1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*—5804 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*—2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*
Boggs, Hale, *La*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*—3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*—2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*—The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*—The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*
Bray, William G., *Ind*
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*
Brooks, Overton, *La*—4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*—Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*—Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*—2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*
Byrne, James A., *Pa*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*—1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.

Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*—The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*—The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*—Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*—1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo*.
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill*.—2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*—3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*—The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*—1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*—2480 16th St.
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*—The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*
Cramer, William C., *Fla*—Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind*.
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*—3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*—4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*—2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*
Dawson, William A., *Utah*
Dawson, William L., *Ill*
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*—2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*
Dies, Martin, *Tex*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*—The Congressional
Dingell, John D., *Mich*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*—3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*—The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*
Dowdy, John, *Tex*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*—3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*—The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*—3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*—3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*—5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*—3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*—200 C St. SE.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*—Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*—The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*—3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*—4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*—514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*—The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*—Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.*—3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*
Fulton, James G., *Pa*
Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*—6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*
George, Myron V., *Kans*—3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*
Granahan, William T., *Pa*
Grant, George M., *Ala*—4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*
Green, Edith, *Oreg*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*—2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*

Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*
Hale, Robert, *Maine*—2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*—4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*—The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*
Harris, Oren, *Ark*—1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*—4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*—314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*—The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*
Healey, James C., *N. Y*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*—104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*
Heselton, John W., *Mass*
Hess, William E., *Ohio*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*
Hill, William S., *Colo*—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*—100 Maryland Ave NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*—Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*
Holt, Joe, *Calif*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*—3541 Brandywine St
Horan, Walt, *Wash*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*

Ikard, Frank, *Tex*

Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*—200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*—2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*—630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*—3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*—3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*—3083 Ordway St.

Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*—2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*—Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*—1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*—The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*—The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*—3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*
King, Cecil R., *Calif*
King, Karl C., *Pa*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*—112 Schotts Court NE.

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass*
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md*
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y*
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif*
Long, George S., *La*
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak*—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.

McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa.*
McCormack, John W., *Mass*—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C*—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill*—The Coronet

Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash*
Mahon, George H., *Tex*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn*

Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
Meader, George, *Mich*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*

Miller, A. L., *Nebr*—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md*—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif*
Miller, William E., *N. Y*—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va.*
Morano, Albert P., *Conn*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa*

Morrison, James H., *La*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., Jr., *Calif*
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa*—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn*

Natcher, William H., *Ky*—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine*
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark*—2301 Conn. Ave.

O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill*—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn*—2313 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis*—4201 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J*

Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.

Passman, Otto E., *La*
Patman, Wright, *Tex*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn*
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky*
Pfost, Gracie, *Idaho*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass*
Phillips, John, *Calif*
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga*

Pillion, John R., *N. Y*
Poage, W. R., *Tex*—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va*
Polk, James G., *Ohio*
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y*
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga*
Price, Melvin, *Ill*
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn*—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*

Quigley, James M., *Pa*

Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich*
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y*
Rains, Albert, *Ala*
Ray, John H., *N. Y*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn*
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis*—1650 30th St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa*—1809 Franklin St. NE.

Rhodes, John J., *Ariz*
Richards, James P., *S. C*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala*—6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va*
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky*—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo*
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla*—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex*

Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn*
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y*
Saylor, John P., *Pa*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans*—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill*
Shelley, John F., *Calif*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif*
Short, Dewey, *Mo*
Shuford, George A., *N. C*—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa*—5205 Lawn May, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill*—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss*

Smith, Howard W., *Va*—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis*—2480 16th St.
Smith, Wint, *Kans*
Spence, Brent, *Ky*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va*
Steed, Tom, *Okla*
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo*

Taber, John, *N. Y*
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa*—4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex*—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J*
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich*

Thompson, T. A., *La*—1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash*
Trimble, James W., *Ark*
Tuck, William M., *Va*
Tumulty, T. James, *N. J*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz*
Utt, James B., *Calif*

Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Velde, Harold H., *Ill*
Vinson, Carl, *Ga*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio*—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill*—The Congressional

Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa*
Watts, John C., *Ky*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla*
Widnall, William B., *N. J*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn*
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass*—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss*—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y*—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La*
Wilson, Earl, *Ind*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis*
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich*—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J*—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex*

Yates, Sidney R., *Ill*
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev*—2705 Westminister Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif*—4545 Conn. Ave.

Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y*

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), *Alaska.*—1718 33d Pl. SE.
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
J. Chester Wilfong, 225 17th St. NE.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 1200 North Stuart St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 You Place, SE.

Appendix

The FCC and the Broadcast Industry's Growing Pains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Mr. George C. McConnaughey, addressed the 34th annual convention of the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters in Chicago, Ill., on April 17, 1956. Mr. McConnaughey has made a forthright statement on the problems facing the Commission and the broadcast industry. It is heartening to hear a public official welcoming congressional probes. Mr. McConnaughey warns the industry that there is no room for complacency. He calls for a crash research development program on UHF by industry. He points out that the Commission's task may well turn out to be that of finding a practical means to keep UHF alive until technical developments can make it as good as or better than VHF. I am confident that the Commission will find a practical means to encourage the development of UHF in the very near future, and that American industry will respond to his call to improve UHF receivers, transmitters, and antennas on a crash basis.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Chairman McConnaughey's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FCC AND THE BROADCAST INDUSTRY'S GROWING PAINS

(An address by George C. McConnaughey, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission at the 34th Annual Convention of the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, Conrad-Hilton Hotel, Chicago, Ill., April 17, 1956, luncheon)

Recently a public official in Washington was looking for a high school in Fairfax County, Va., where he was to address a parent-teacher association in connection with a drive for funds for the Community Chest. After driving in a vicious circle for several blocks, he stopped at the curb and asked a teen-ager where the particular high school was located. The young man who attended that school daily squared his shoulders, inflated his chest, and said resolutely, "That is a subject on which I am an expert."

When I addressed this group at your 33d annual convention in Washington last year, I had been appointed to the Commission for a bare 6 months and I pointed out to you that it would be presumptuous for me as a newcomer to attempt to lecture you concerning the operations of your business. I still feel that way. However, since then, it has been my good fortune to visit many European countries and to observe at first hand the status of the various systems of broadcasting by comparison to ours. Without in the least casting reflections upon other countries, I can unqualifiedly congratulate broadcasters and members of your organization for giving to the American public one of the finest radio and television broadcast services in the world. Like the young high-school boy in the story, I can speak with authority upon this subject.

Some of you may be whispering at this point, "I wish you could convince the Congress of this." It is true that the Federal Communications Commission is well on its way to obtaining the distinction of being the most investigated agency in the Government. The March 26, 1956, issue of Broadcasting-Telecasting contained the following banner headline: "Investigations of Radio-TV Begin Bustin' Out All Over."

Some of you may view such headlines with alarm. From the outset, let me state that I welcome congressional probes. Most of them are born of a sincere desire on the part of Members of Congress to keep abreast of developments in the industry and the activities of the FCC. This is as it should be. It is true some investigations may be spawned by suspicions of individual Members of Congress, suspicions based upon misinformation or half-truths furnished to them by disgruntled litigants before the Commission. Even in these cases, after the initial smoke of charges and counter charges has been cleared from the atmosphere, the net result is usually a better understanding on the part of the Congress of the real problems facing the Commission and the industry at this stage of the development of the technology. One of the prominent members of one of these committees before whom we have appeared several times recently said to me, "We now know you Commissioners truly have difficult problems."

And let us make no mistake about that, we are facing grave problems that cry out for a solution. There is no room for complacency on the Commission's part or on yours. The Commission's role at this point is largely that of a doctor. We have initially diagnosed the ailments as consisting largely of growing pains.

Let me say at the outset that my remarks today represent my own thinking and do not necessarily reflect the views of all of my colleagues.

Commercial television is only in the 15th year of its development. It is not abnormal that it should have growing pains. However, we must guard against letting these pains become symptomatic ailments with the danger of their developing into cancerous growths that will hinder the full development of a healthy, highly competitive industry with the rich rewards to the public and to private enterprise that competition in a free economy normally brings. Stop and think what other industry offers such rich rewards to the public for so little.

What are these growing pains? The questions currently raised by Members of Congress simply serve to highlight these pains which have been known to you and to the Commission for quite some time. After all, the Congress is normally a reliable sounding board of the opinion of large segments of the people or of dissatisfied segments of industry. In the pending investigations in Congress, I think it is quite obvious that dissatisfaction among certain segments of the industry, rather than among the people in general, is being reflected.

I need not review for the benefit of this audience the phenomenal growth of television since July 1952. It spells out a record of achievement which speaks volumes as a tribute to a dynamic, alert group of men and women, many of whom are here today.

While I state my conviction that current congresional inquiries center around the problems of disgruntled segments of the broadcast industry, that is not to say that the American public does not have as large a stake in the proper solution of these problems as if it had originated the complaints. We have a right to be concerned that about 10 percent of the population does not get television at all and that only a little over 100 communities have more than 1 local television station in operation. Despite the evident growth of television, the development of a nationwide competitive service has not been realized to the extent contemplated by the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and the sixth report and order of the Commission.

Broadcasters and members of your association deserve great credit for the remarkable growth of radio and television to date, but until something more can be done in television to reach every home in America and to give every family a choice of programs, we will hear complaints on Capitol Hill and we will be called before committees to explain why the objectives of the act have not been fulfilled. I am certain that the Commission can expect the full cooperation of your members in accelerating the day when these aims can be regarded as accomplished.

There is some comfort to be derived from the fact that many of the criticisms now being leveled at television—dominance by the networks, inability to survive without a network affiliation, inability of stations in smaller communities to obtain national advertising, etc.—15 or 20 years ago were being hurled at the Commission and the radio industry by Members of Congress. In less than 2 decades, radio has made its adjustments, I am pleased to note, without direction or assistance from the regulatory body or any other governmental agency. Instead, as any dynamic industry in a competitive economy, it has created new markets for itself. Radio is intensely tilling the local markets, down to towns of 5,000 population. In programing, it is catering more than ever to a broad variety of distinct interests in the community, with good music stations, sport stations, foreign language stations, educational stations, and background music stations. A large number of them have found it more remunerative to operate without network programs. Many of them prosper on local advertising. Many of them find no difficulty in obtaining national advertising. On the networking side, which has been hardest hit by television competition, the networks are currently engaged in an intensive effort to rebuild advertiser and public support by innovating new program materials. Still, just a few years ago, radio's demise was being freely

rumored. In dollar volume, radio has held, roughly, to its 1949 level. In number of outlets, it has grown from 2,100 to 2,800 stations in this period. And the demand for new stations shows a steady, upward trend. In fact, we have more requests for new radio facilities than we have for television.

It would be grand to have a "Futuravision," an instrument which would not simply reproduce programs originated in an emitting studio, but one which would reflect future events, in order to look forward 15 or 20 years and see the shape of things to come. Perhaps we would find color television in every home, with a choice of myriads of programs, such as is possible now in radio, with one or more stations in every community of 5,000 or more inhabitants. And, perhaps, we would find every set an all-channel set, with the televiewer blissfully ignorant of the difference between VHF and UHF.

Even if such does come to pass, I predict that there will still be congressional investigations. Even though radio has reached the age of maturity, we hear congressional criticisms leveled at alleged bait and switch advertising, lotteries, overloud commercials presented in a hysterical manner, as many as five spot commercials end to end, and too frequent repeating of inferior films. I wish to commend your association for its concern with these matters and the prompt action which you have taken recently to find out to what extent these accusations are justified.

The fact that censorship legislation is presently under consideration should be sufficient notice to affected broadcasters that affirmative action on their part to correct this abuse is long past due. I am confident that a word to the wise will be sufficient. You do not want your life regulated by a Government censor and the Commission does not want to be a censor. I shall repeat here what I told broadcasters in my home State last month:

"Let me suggest that instead of so much emphasis being placed upon profit, set sales, percentage of advertising and commercial progress, that you stress your public service accomplishments that have not received adequate publicity and build a record of public service that cannot be successfully challenged. You cannot only afford such a program but you cannot afford not to expedite it on a crash basis."

The most serious growing pain confronting the Commission today is the problem of the survival of UHF. Committees of Congress have expressed fear that UHF will not succeed. I know I can speak for every member of the Commission when I say that we, too, would prefer to make 82 channels available to the public rather than only 12. The high incidence of business failure among UHF licensees who went on the air and the failure of many licensees to go on the air has distressed the Commission as much as or perhaps more than it has Members of Congress. After all, it was the Commission's decision in 1952 to make these channel available to the public and we, perhaps more than anyone else except the licensees themselves, should want them to succeed. This is undoubtedly the most difficult problem confronting the Commission at this time.

There is no need for me to review here the reasons for the economic and technical problems besetting UHF. You know those perhaps better than I do. However, some of you may have gotten the impression that our recent action, in denying the petitions to defer or stay the authorization of new VHF stations in a number of communities, meant that the Commision has thrown UHF to the dogs. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The suggestions in the pending general proceeding or review of television allocations encompass a considerable variety of approaches. What impressed me from the start in this matter is that the interested opponents of any given plan are far more numerous than the proponents. Therefore, no matter what the Commission does, it will be the subject of critcism and further hearings.

As far as the Commission is concerned, it will arrive at a conclusion as promptly as possible upon whether, and if so, in what manner, the public interest may be served by revising the structure of the present allocations plan. But the Commission will not be stampeded into hasty, ill-advised action in a frantic attempt to ward off the barbs of critics with a tendency to desperation.

Some of these critics say: Why haven't you done something about this situation 2 years ago? Why didn't you just shift everything over to UHF? This remedy reminds me of the one resorted to by the young doctor who had just finished his internship in a large metropolitan hospital where he had specialized in cases of convulsions in children. He had just hung up his shingle and hurried to his first call. He found the 2-year-old patient with a high fever, the cause of which he could not diagnose. He instructed the mother to prepare a tub of hot water and a tub of cold water so that he could immerse the child in one and then the other. Panic-stricken, the mother said, "But, doctor, if you do that, you will throw the baby into a fit of convulsions." "That's just what I want to do," replied the doctor, "because I am a real expert on curing convulsions." That is not the kind of a doctor that the Commission proposes to be in this matter. The transfer of all commercial broadcasting to the UHF band would be a simple cure. The Commission has acquired a lot of experience in dealing with only one band. However, this could easily turn out to be another case where the operation was 100-percent successful but the patient died.

Another criticism frequently leveled at the Commission is the following: "It would seem to me that you could solve this problem of intermixture in a very short time. Just make up your mind what you are going to do and do it. Why don't you follow the advice given in such and such a staff report?" This reminds me of another young doctor who was advising a woman patient on how to cure a nosebleed. He suggested that she hang a cold key on a chain around her neck. The patient remarked, "That is odd. My maid advised me to hang a warm key." The doctor hastily replied, "Oh, no. My own maid insists it must be a cold key." The Commission will not follow this medical approach. While we welcome the assistance from the industry and suggestions from committees of Congress, the Commission must diagnose these growing pains itself and evaluate all the factors involved. We are not building a house of cards. We are molding the pattern for the future growth of television in the United States.

I am certain that every Commissioner wants UHF to thrive and prosper. We shall resort to any reasonable and practical means to achieve this end, but we must not deprive the rural areas or other segments of the population of existing service in order to accomplish that objective, nor shall we make second-class citizens of the population in large areas of the country in order to provide other sections with a multiplicity of program sources and outlets. Should we do that, we would really hear from the grassroots and we would justly incur the wrath of Members of Congress.

It is not enough to make people accept UHF and tell them that, at some time in the indeterminable future, it will be pretty good or, perhaps, on a par with VHF. Some of the witnesses before the Senate Commerce Committee would have us believe that UHF is as good as VHF right now. Others insist that it is a vastly inferior medium and that all UHF grantees should be given a VHF allocation. I incline to believe that the scientific facts will show that the truth lies somewhere between these two extremes. If this is so, the Commission's task may well turn out to be that of finding a practical means to keep UHF alive while the incomparable genius of American inventors and scientists can determine whether the medium is worth saving for the benefit of the American public within the foreseeable future.

It is in connection with this phase of the problem that I would like to present to you, the experts, for close scrutiny and your friendly advice, the following ideas.

If the facts adduced in our general allocations proceeding indicate that UHF has not yet reached that state of development that will allow it to supply all our needs for additional channels, it will still be true that almost no informed technician will predict that it will never be able to accomplish the desired result. Many engineers have stated that after many years of development UHF may prove to be the answer. Of course, that is no remedy for our present growing pains.

The Commission is unable to obtain a sufficient number of VHF channels. We have for the first time explored this phase. You are acquainted with the results of this examination. Therefore, I urge the members of your association to give serious consideration to the following suggestions as a long-range plan, regardless of what the Commission may do in the present allocation study.

Why would it not be a good idea to begin a crash research development program on UHF immediately? Industry could set up quickly a private nonprofit educational research development corporation which could qualify to receive tax-free education grants. All segments of the television industry, I feel sure, would want to contribute to this enterprise. There are also other foundations and educational institutions which have funds and facilities to devote to this cause. I believe they would contribute to the solution of the UHF problem in the public interest. I am sure that such a private nonprofit organization would receive the full cooperation of the Commission.

A concentrated research program in which all knowledge is pooled has never been directed to the specific subject of UHF only. A twofold approach should be made, concentrating on both the UHF receiver and the UHF transmitter. A genuine UHF receiver could perhaps be developed with an improved detector for increased sensitivity and range, and a more practical tuning device to be used with a newly designed antenna.

Once this development program has been completed, the Commission and the industry will have a sound technical basis for making a long-term decision on the merits of UHF.

America has witnessed the almost miraculous results obtained by such research projects during the war in a relatively short time. When we consider the many problems confronting the development of the atomic bomb as compared with the few problems confronting the improvement of UHF and consider that the atomic bomb was developed in less than 2 years, it is certainly reasonable to expect that UHF could be improved in a much shorter time. At least, in a reasonably short time, we would know the true potentialities of UHF. Let us make no mistake about that. We do not know today.

Industry has a very large stake in the utilization of adequate additional channels. A prolonged scarcity of TV outlets will cause renewed and increasingly grave congressional demands for regulation of the industry. You

all know how much I abhor avoidable industry regulation.

It is obvious that the future expansion of television broadcasting toward an economically stable nationwide competitive business must depend, in large degree, upon the business and technical ingenuity of free enterprise to improve the practical usefulness of the only spectrum space which can be allocated to television. The Commission is aware of many of the facets of this developmental program and is prepared to cooperate with private industry in any practical way to achieve this ultimate objective as may be consistent with the public interest and with the interest of the television industry as a whole.

The Commission realizes that the present allocation of spectrum space to television presents complex technical problems with respect to the design, manufacturing, and marketing of a compatible television receiver. I believe the Commission will make such readjustments to its policy and television channel assignment plan as may be deemed necessary to minimize the complexity of these television receiver problems.

It appears to me that the present channel assignment plan and the policies relating thereto are not altogether compatible with the basic economics of the business of a national competitive television broadcast structure. The Commission should not adopt a television channel assignment policy which is tailored to a preconceived plan of television economics or which regiments the business economics of the television broadcast industry. However, the Commission, in my judgment, should alter its present policies to permit the development and expansion of television in accord with natural economic laws insofar as this is possible within the terms of the Communications Act requiring equitable distribution of television facilities to States and communities.

The Commission has continued its diligent efforts to reduce the large backlog of mutually exclusive applications for television channels which have required numerous lengthy hearings. Only a few weeks ago it was my pleasure to be able to inform the Senate Commerce Committee that there were only 10 cases awaiting the final decision of the Commission. Eleven were ready for oral argument. Only four were awaiting the examiner's initial decision. Hearings were in progress on the 11 other cases now remaining for disposition. I am proud of that record and particularly am I proud of the really devoted hard-working staff of the Federal Communications Commission. They are doing a magnificient job.

That reminds me of one of President Eisenhower's boyhood stories. The President likes to reminisce about his boyhood days on a Kansas farm. One day he had this episode to tell:

"An old farmer had a cow that we wanted to buy. We went over to visit him and asked about the cow's pedigree. The old farmer didn't know what pedigree meant, so we asked him about the cow's butterfat production. He told us that he hadn't any idea what it was. Finally, we asked him if he knew how many pounds of milk the cow produced each year.

"The farmer shook his head and said, 'I don't know. But she's an honest hard-working old cow and she'll give you all the milk she has!' "

In the solution of the problems I have discussed, the Commission, like the farmer's cow, will give you everything we have.

As I stated earlier, dissatisfaction stems basically from certain segments of the industry—not the public. That is why I am a confirmed optimist about the future of the broadcasting business in America. With your sincere cooperation we will succeed in finding a remedy to the growing pains.

What Is Our Mission in the World Today?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

WHAT IS OUR MISSION IN THE WORLD TODAY?

(Address by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp. annual meeting, Bethlehem Chamber of Commerce, Bethlehem, Pa., April 17, 1956)

I am one of a number of Americans who has been active in politics and who believes that the United States has a world mission. She did not seek it. Frequently she has done her best to avoid picking up the hugh check implied in having a mission; but history has handed it to her. When history makes a date for a country the country must keep it with strength and honor and dignity, or find itself in serious trouble. You will remember the prophet Jonah in the Bible. The Lord told him to go to Nineveh and preach there. Jonah did not want to go and started for somewhere else, whereupon the combination of the storm and the wave took him to Nineveh anyhow, against his will.

Our country wishes to mind its own business and develop its own affairs. It was so successful in this that it found itself one of the two or three strongest nations in the world, looked to by many peoples as a mighty force which must try to bring peace and law to a torn and unhappy world. This, I think, the United States has tried to do to the best of its ability.

Now, the mission is in a dangerous phase. Three or four years ago, the Soviet Union talked boldly of seizing all Europe—but the United States was there and the Soviet Union settled for the less violent policy of coexistence. Today the young Chinese Communist revolution talks belligerently and rattles a borrowed Russian sword. The United States has no earthly interest in possessing or governing Formosa, still less in trying to run China. It has every earthly interest in not letting a new imperialism run riot over the whole Pacific Ocean and is endeavoring to make that clear. There will be other anxious moments as time goes on. My point now is that the American mission is primarily moral rather than military. We may have to defend ourselves by force, but our ultimate victory, of which I am certain, will come by conversion rather than conquest.

America, which was cradled in the principles of freedom and human dignity, cannot retire within its own orbit and do nothing. Such a position represents spiritual sterility and mental cowardice. I do not know how long it will take us to overcome the dark forces of totalitarianism but since we are obliged in the name of decency and good conscience to accept the challenge we shall not fail—just as we have never failed when called on to defend a righteous cause. I say defend because we are a people who are opposed to attacking others and interfering with the internal affairs of other nations. But we will defend, to the last man, our right to maintain our way of life in our Republic.

The answer to this lies in the history of our country and in the traditions of our people, who acknowledge freedom to differ without impairing national loyalty.

The United States, a republic dedicated to freedom, came into existence in 1776. It had no great military power and little foreign influence. Nevertheless the example of America was followed throughout most of the world so that a century later much of the earth's surface was ruled by democratic governments. Clearly, America had a mission then and performed it. The mission was to show the world that free government was workable. Our pre-Civil War forefathers were convinced that the American experiment in freedom was divinely inspired and was practical and that America was to be a beacon light of liberty, pointing the way for others to follow. Amazingly, they did follow.

To the mid-twentieth-century politician the speeches and writings of our forefathers seem a little self-centered. In the light of today they seem to lack appreciation of the fact that other peoples, too, have contributed to the art and practice of free government and made their own contribution to democratic living. In those days, America was nationalistic and talked that way. Then, of course, the United States could afford that luxury of thought. Sailing ships were slow, North America was empty, and the rest of the world was far away.

This attitude does not altogether fit a modern world in which you can have breakfast in Paris and dinner the same night in New York, or in which an attack on an Asiatic peninsula like Korea could set strategists calculating whether Alaska, Seattle, or San Francisco may not be threatened. And yet there is a good deal of nationalist sentiment still active in the United States.

It can be useful. It can help us to understand new and young nations just coming into independence and to appreciate the intense nationalist sentiments of those countries. Some of them have come into existence as a revolt against imperialism, just as we did. Thoughtful Americans will appreciate that nationalism of these new countries springs from the same cause that made us nationalists a hundred years ago.

Our duty toward the world, I think, is still to demonstrate that free government is workable and is more desirable than any other. To fulfill it, however, we must stand by certain principles.

First and foremost, we must continue to make democracy work at home. That is the cornerstone of any American sense of mission today. This means that we have to bring our practices and our ideals into line. Freedom to take part in the processes of government and economics is not an occupation for the few or for isolated groups. It is part of the life of everyone. The American system has given a larger share of power and participation in public life and in private affairs to all of its people than any great country in history. We have trusted our people, and the trust has been repaid.

This needs some explaining abroad. Some Europeans particularly quarrel with American tastes. Some even think and say we are vulgar. These are the ones who forget that tens of millions of Americans from humble backgrounds take part in American cultural, as well as American political life. Never on such a scale as here have literature and music and art and journalism and business and politics been open to a whole population. Of course, we get a result different from the results where learning and the arts and government have been kept in a relatively small circle. The power and the strength and the glory of the American way is witnessed by a single fact. No group of peoples who have ever lived in America for any length of time have ever desired to leave America and go back from whence they came. A South American politician once said: "Other people talk about freedom; you practice it; and it has proved the most assimilative system in the world."

We must maintain that freedom at home. Any attempt to limit or mistrust it endangers our primary mission. Free government is workable, and we have proved it.

What we are learning today is a corrollary proposition. We cannot and should not attempt to export our particular form of government unless it is voluntarily sought. American democracy cannot be foisted on others. Woodrow Wilson talked about the self-determination of peoples—and he meant it. This goes for us as well as for others. There are parts of the world in which American institutions and the American economic system are not wanted, and perhaps would not work. Democracy means different things to different people, depending on their traditions, their habits, their religion and their way of thinking. Our tradition calls for tolerance and respect for difference. Indeed respect for difference is one of the great forces binding us to our friends. If elsewhere peoples choose to adopt in whole or in part some of our ways they will do it because having looked at the example they want that result. Any salesman knows that you cannot force a product where it is not wanted; if it is adopted it is adopted on its own merits. The American mission thus is not the same as the mission of the Roman Empire, nor do we now talk of the "white man's burden" as they did at the end of the last century.

If the problem could be stated in those terms we could stop here or at least be smug.

However, we cannot accomplish the American mission alone. In fact we cannot live alone now, even if we wished to do so. The Wright brothers settled that 1 day when they flew a contraption through the air at Kitty Hawk, if it had not already been settled when man learned to send communications from anywhere to anywhere in a split second. Safety and well-being today depend on an international system which observes some rules of morality and of law, producing international relations established more or less on the rules of fair play. We have fought two wars on that theory. It is true that from 1919 to 1939 most of the country seemed to feel that the rule of law in international affairs could be maintained if the United States lived alone in unprepared isolation and urged pious resolutions outlawing war. World War II, I think, taught us by bitter experience that international cooperation is necessary if any rule of right and law is to be maintained. At the close of that war the atomic bomb launched from long-range aircraft blew up forever the idea that Americans are entirely masters of their own destiny. That is why I supported, as I hope you did, the formation of the United Nations, and while it has a long way to go I am free from doubt that the principle will eventually succeed. If this United Nations fails another will have to be built to take its place. As we fought to withstand aggression in Korea and to prevent new Koreas and to provide the aggressor of our time—the Communist faction—with clear-cut evidence that the lawless expansion could not be permitted, so we are bound to work with others in building a world-wide community of nations.

Now this will be a long and difficult task, as any one who travels abroad as I do knows very well. The world of nations outside our own has its realities and its hard facts. We have to work with that world as it is and not as we think it ought to be. We will have to work with peoples who do not think as we wish they did, and often govern themselves as we wish they did not. At the moment, we work with the other nations of the free world chiefly to assure military safety and to protect ourselves and them against lawless aggression. But while we are doing this we can help to extend and strengthen the moral foundation of the community of nations.

Even a politician reads occasionally and profits from it. A book written several years ago by Arnold Toynbee makes the point that whenever the culture of one nation enters another a wide contact is established which continues to unforeseeable limits. A country which first becomes familiar with American manufactures and manufacturing methods eventually may come to learn the dominant principles of American life, just as close relations with Europe have made us somewhat acquainted with their ways. The salesman and the politician, the Army officer and the journalist, the engineer and the student who work abroad are carrying out the American mission for good or evil, whether they know it or not. The policy now famous as point 4, offering technological assistance to other countries, was perhaps one of the most imaginative ways by which America could perform its mission. Other, better ways will continue to be developed as the days go on, as we realize more and more their importance.

A new duty is placed on the United States by this modern conception of America's mission. This is the duty to be strong nationally. Even Abraham Lincoln, struggling for peace, was willing to go to war to assure that the Union should be preserved—else there was danger, as he put it, that government of the people, by the people and for the people might perish from the earth.

We shall not achieve a community of nations at peace merely through strength; but it is perfectly clear that we shall never achieve it without strength. We are quite clear that our mission does not require us or even permit us to try to rule the world. But we are equally clear that our mission includes being a bulwark of the free world and joining in its defense. But this means the most careful attention to foreign policy. Someone observed that the British Empire was acquired in a fit of absentmindedness. America could have the same experience if we do not draw a careful line between democratic leadership of a free world and practices which might slowly lead to an American imperialism.

The men (there are still a very few noisy ones) who talk loosely about "going it alone" and who want to pull out of cooperative arrangements like the Inter-American Organization of States and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and who want to torpedo the United Nations, have not learned an important lesson. Fortunately, few in this country agree with them.

It is barely possible, of course, that the United States could make itself into an empire and organize an American century. But if we did we would slowly and steadily find our cherished freedom disappearing. There would no longer be freedom of speech, and freedom of assembly, and free inquiry, and fair trial and the right of every American to look all these ideas in the face. Even as we are fighting the Communist menace at home and abroad, we must be sure that we do not betray our own traditions. Under free institutions America grew. By free institutions America forged her position. Under free institutions she defended herself against totalitarian enemies and by virtue of free institutions she has become the senior free nation of the world. We do not want a police state, or thought control, or rule by hysteria of fear in our system.

The success of the United States is largely due to one fact. We have discovered the art of throwing thousands of free minds against a problem. We do this in politics, we do it in business, we do it in education, and do it in science. As a result, we have come up with the right answers more often than those who depend on a small group of party officials, politburos or police chiefs. This is often confusing to foreigners. They hear the noise of our debates and discussions and do not realize that out of these discussions come firm decisions. The result has given American the most stable Government and the most stable economy of our time. It is respected by our enemies, hence their sound and fury. The fact is that most of the countries under Communist domination would like to achieve what America has achieved and will try to do so as soon as they are free to make the attempt. Because of this, I do not think a third world war will be attempted; and it is attempted I have no doubt of the result.

For the first time in our history we are called on to maintain continuously a measure of armed might. I venture to think that the arms are as strong, and no stronger, as the free institutions which bring them into being. Armed strength so supported can be trusted by America and by the neighbors of America. Armed strength not derived from free institutions would be a danger to us and to the entire world.

As I see it then, America's mission is still to demonstrate that free government is workable, not only for the United States but for the world. Nationally, we must cherish and foster and maintain our institutions and use them to give our own citizens progress toward wider life and fit them to be the heirs of a great civilization. Internationally, we must, in strength and not in weakness, work toward a community of nations steadily developing a wider common base in morals and in law. It will be said that this is ideal rather than practical. I can only say that, as a politician accustomed to deal with an infinite number of practical matters, I know that a chief source of power can be an ideal, since the ideal alone gives consistency to the efforts of the day.

Criticism of TV and Radio Commercials Is Unjustified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received a letter from Mr. Ted Rand, general manager of radio station KDRS, Paragould, Ark., regarding recent attacks made against the radio and television industry in the House of Representatives. Mr. Rand is an outstanding business and civic leader. The principal complaint against these media was that both television and radio stations increased the sound volume when commercials were being presented. According to Representative CRAIG HOSMER, of California, "these excessively loud commercials" applied to networks as well as local programs. Mr. HOSMER asked the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission to look into the matter and advise him of the Commission's findings.

Mr. Rand's letter, giving views and observations of an owner and operator of a radio station, is good reading indeed. His letter portrays the value of radio to a community. I highly recommend that you read it. The full text of Mr. Rand's letter is as follows:

KDRS,
Paragould, Ark., March 31, 1956.

The Honorable E. C. GATHINGS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GATHINGS: The assaults upon radio by Representative CRAIG HOSMER and others, in my opinion, accent the negative. It seems to me that radio needs something of a champion among Congressmen who will accent the positive.

I feel sure that you appreciate the services which the radio industry has rendered to the Nation. Moreover, I am confident that you have intimate knowledge of the manner in which many Arkansas radio stations relate themselves to their communities.

In our community, we do not merely give lip service to the goals, dreams, problems, and purposes of our people. We roll up our sleeves and pitch in. We devote time, talent, and energy to the building of our community. We try to do our best in support of those groups which are creating happiness within our community—from a home demonstration club's bake sale to a citywide campaign to raise $100,000 for a new industry.

We have time for our churches, Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, Red Cross, cancer, nursing home, schools, civic clubs, service clubs, farm groups, and every other similar organization. We rarely receive any direct remuneration from our work on behalf of these groups, although we do feel that our community service policies are directly responsible for our overall successful business operation.

We are typically American in the business sense, and I firmly believe that our industry is suffering unnecessary abuse from some of its critics. While criticisms of specific abuses by a few stations may be completely valid, the tendency to smear them across the entire industry is unfair to many of us.

I sincerely hope that you will find an opportunity to speak up for the great majority of the Nation's radio stations and in defense of the typical small city Arkansas station which builds its entire service around its people and their needs.

If the emphasis remains upon the negative aspects, may I then recommend that someone be equally unfair in appraising other aspects of the American scene which might be loud, noisy, and obnoxious in their own way:

Used car dealers illuminate their lots in a manner which is bright, glaring, and disagreeable to me.

Service stations fly masses of distracting pennants and twirling silver devices. They display huge day-glo signs. They distort the natural beauty of my town.

Magazines cluttered with attention-getters continually force me to turn to page one-hundred-and-something for a continuation of the article I am reading.

Full pages of my newspaper contain nothing but advertising. I find this annoying.

Billboards put to shame the loudest radio commercial I have ever heard. These billboards obliterate the landscape, and they divert my attention from the somewhat important function of operating my automobile.

I pay to see commercials at my neighborhood theater.

Times Square is simply a disgrace.

Anyone who will acknowledge the futility of these observations may then wonder with me why radio and television are such prime targets.

After all, radio and television offer two great compensating factors: a dial for the selection of various stations and a switch for turning the entire receiver off.

May I urge you to caution critics of the broadcasting industry to temper their observations with an appraisal of the services performed for the Nation, and to properly relate radio and television to the age in which they live.

Frankly, I am proud to be part of an industry which is vitally important in the everyday lives of the Nation's people. Because we are, we should not be shielded from valid criticism. However, there surely must be room for the presentation of radio's positive side in the Congress of the United States.

Very truly yours,

TED RAND,
General Manager.

Many people accept fine programs of both radio and television as a matter of course and apparently do not appreciate fully that the station or network that is making such program available to them is performing a distinct and outstanding public service. Numerous viewers and listeners over their television and radio receiving sets do not stop to think that these programs are offered to them gratis; that if they do not like one particular station they have but to turn the knob. So many are prone to be unappreciative and ungrateful for the entertainment and educational value of the programs which come into our homes, and criticize the time consumed in advertising the product or firm or company that makes the program possible. Without advertising there would be no radio and TV industry; the public could not have and receive the entertaining, news, and educational programs that are a part of the daily lives of the American people.

I am of the opinion that those who criticize commercial advertising are in reality in the great minority, and that such is not the attitude of the majority of our populace.

The radio industry has consistently grown bigger and stronger from year to year. I set forth a table showing the growth of commercial radio stations:

Growth of commercial radio stations

Year:	Commercial stations
1922	30
1923	556
1924	530
1925	571
1926	528
1927	681
1928	677
1929	606
1930	618
1931	612
1932	604
1933	598
1934	593
1935	623
1936	616
1937	646
1938	689
1939	722
1940	765
1941	897
1942	925
1943	948
1944	957
1945	977
1946	1,009
1947	1,346
1948	1,835
1949	2,340
1950	2,611
1951	2,782
1952	2,915
1953	2,990
1954	3,094
1955	3,244

Source: Years 1922–1926 from Federal records; 1927 onward from Federal Communications Commission.

The broadcasting industry has become and is one of our most significant fields of endeavor. The following economic analysis of the total radio and television industry, as published by Caldwell-Clements, Inc., in Mart magazine, reflects the general importance of this industry:

Year 1955

Sale of time by broadcasters	$1,000,000,000
Talent costs	200,000,000
Electricity, batteries to operate 176,900,000 radio and TV receivers	750,000,000
12,500,000 radio receivers, retail value	485,000,000
7,500,000 television receivers, retail value	1,215,000,000
250,000,000 phonograph records	310,000,000
Radio repairs and supplies, 95,000,000 replacement tubes	237,000,000
Parts, accessories	425,000,000
Labor	850,000,000
Total	5,472,000,000

This data covers both the radio and television industry.

The following table clearly illustrates the phenomenal growth of the radio manufacturing industry.

Radio receivers—Selected data, 1922–55

Year	Sets produced	Retail value	Homes with radio sets	Total sets in use
1922	100,000	$5,000,000	260,000	400,000
1923	550,000	30,000,000	1,000,000	1,100,000
1924	1,500,000	100,000,000	2,500,000	3,000,000
1925	2,000,000	165,000,000	3,500,000	4,000,000
1926	1,750,000	200,000,000	5,000,000	5,700,000
1927	1,350,000	168,000,000	6,500,000	7,000,000
1928	3,281,000	400,000,000	7,500,000	8,500,000
1929	4,428,000	600,000,000	9,000,000	10,500,000
1930	3,827,800	300,000,000	12,048,762	13,000,000
1931	3,420,000	225,000,000	14,000,000	15,000,000
1932	3,000,000	140,000,000	16,809,562	18,000,000
1933	3,806,000	180,500,000	20,402,369	22,000,000
1934	4,084,000	214,500,000	21,456,000	26,000,000
1935	6,026,800	330,192,480	22,868,000	30,500,000
1936	8,248,000	450,000,000	24,600,000	33,000,000
1937	8,064,780	450,000,000	26,666,500	37,600,000
1938	6,000,000	210,000,000	28,000,000	40,800,000
1939	10,500,000	354,000,000	28,700,000	45,300,000
1940	11,800,000	450,000,000	29,200,000	51,000,000
1941	13,000,000	460,000,000	29,700,000	56,000,000
1942	4,400,000	154,000,000	30,800,000	59,340,000
1943			32,000,000	58,000,000
1944			33,000,000	57,000,000
1945	500,000	20,000,000	34,000,000	56,000,000
1946	14,000,000	700,000,000	35,000,000	60,000,000
1947	17,000,000	800,000,000	37,000,000	66,000,000
1948	16,000,000	700,000,000	40,000,000	74,000,000
1949	10,000,000	500,000,000	42,000,000	81,000,000
1950	14,600,000	721,000,000	45,000,000	90,000,000
1951	13,000,000	605,000,000	45,850,000	100,000,000
1952	10,000,000	500,000,000	46,000,000	114,500,000
1953	13,400,000	536,000,000	48,000,000	120,500,000
1954	11,200,000	470,000,000	50,000,000	127,000,000
1955	12,500,000	85,0400,000	52,000,000	135,000,000

Source: *Broadcasting Telecasting*—Broadcasting Yearbook, 1956.

People of India Will Preserve Individual Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, recently there has come to my attention a statement by Dr. Douglas N. Ensminger, representative in India for the

Ford Foundation, which is very enlightening to the people of the United States.

As part of my remarks I am including an excerpt from a personal letter which Dr. Ensminger and his wife have written to friends in the United States. Dr. Ensminger points out that the people of India will eventually prove to the world that individual rights can be preserved and strengthened while the social and economic revolution is brought about through peaceful means. He says that the road ahead is a long one, but the free world can expect India to support the principle of the sanctity of individual human rights. The excerpt referred to follows:

Given a chance to help improve their welfare, as provided through the community and other development programs, the people of India will succeed in proving to the world that individual rights can be preserved and strengthened, while social and economic revolution is brought about through peaceful means.

Make no mistake about it, India has a long road ahead to achieve social and economic freedom from poverty. Its people are poor, averaging in income less than $55 per person per year. Thousands of Indian village teachers receive less than $9 per month. India has at least 10 million people unemployed and another 10 million underemployed. It has 550,000 graduates of high schools and colleges who are yet to find their place in India's economic life. These hard facts stand to challenge all of us who hope and work for peace. India has the will to succeed and the leadership required to see it through. It needs only sympathetic understanding and limited financial help from the West. While we in America, through military strength and other ways, are seeking to make the world free from aggression and armed conflicts, we should know and understand that India is aggressively striving to remove the conditions of poverty, which cause unrest and provide the soft spots for growth of communism. India believes that, as it succeeds in freeing its people from the bondage of poverty and develops them to be responsive and responsible citizens, it too is contributing to conditions of peace.

As the largest parliamentary democracy in Asia, India's political achievements for the past 8 years include the following:

1. India has developed a strong, responsible and responsive Government, concerned about and capable of planning and carrying out big programs to raise the level of living of the masses and poverty ridden people.

2. The policy and actions of the Government are (a) to develop and strengthen democratic organizations and institutions; and (b) to develop the Indian people as self-respecting citizens, capable of making and willing to make intelligent, independent decisions, and contributing voluntarily to the the nation's growth and development.

3. The policy and action of the Government of India encourages and provides for criticism of the Government leaders as well as the Government policy.

Many feel today that the peace of the world for the next generation may well be determined by what happens over the next 5 or 10 years in southeast Asia. We have in Red China a firmly established Communist government committed to totalitarian methods of revolution in economic and social development. In India we have a country committed through its actions, policies, and methods, to the bringing about of a revolution in social and economic developments through democratic means.

The other countries of southeast Asia are eagerly watching Red China and India. It is the belief of many observers that whichever country succeeds in bringing about the greater improvement in living conditions of its people, will influence the political development of the other countries. Repeatedly one hears it said that as India goes, so goes southeast Asia. Peace we can have only when we have found the way to remove the millions of people of the world from the bondage of poverty.

In the Indian and American quest for peace, we need to recognize our dependency on each other. From India, we should look for dynamic leadership in pointing the way for Asia's now democratic nations to remove conditions of poverty, by democratic means in which the freedom of the individual is guaranteed. From America and the west, India should expect moral and financial encouragement and essential help, if it is to succeed in its great democratic experiment.

We must recognize that India's motives for peace are as strong and sincere as are those of the United States. Our differences in approach to peace are largely the result of our different geographic location, internal economic conditions, and the newness of India's independence. India should be looked upon as the ally of all nations committed to social and economic development by democratic means. That India wants to maintain international political neutrality is related to its all too recent and long period of domination and rule by others. That India may make mistakes we must accept, as others had to observe and accept our early efforts.

We from the United States often seem too many generations removed from our own struggle for independence to understand India's psychological, economic, and political stresses and strains during its early years as a new nation. Like the United States, when it gained its independence in 1776, India wants to and must find its own way and with its own methods.

India is engaged in the greatest experiment the world has ever witnessed, seeking to prove that a new way of life for the masses can be brought about through democratic means, and holding as its highest aim the development of effective, responsive citizens, capable of playing their part as freemen in building a new India.

Eugene Landyshev Becomes a Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news release by Martin L. A. Sternberg, director of public relations of Gallaudet College, Washington, D. C. The release is dated April 9, 1956, and relates to the naturalization of Eugene Landyshev, a deaf student at Gallaudet College.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, April 9.—A small but moving notation will be made in the annals of American democracy tomorrow (Tuesday, April 10) at 10 a. m., when 23-year-old Eugene Landyshev appears in United States District Court for the District of Columbia to join ranks with a group of newly naturalized citizens in taking the oath of allegiance to the United States.

Russian-born Eugene will look like any of the other damp-eyed newcomers to the American family. Like all the others he will be in his Sunday best, standing at the threshold of a new life, the first real security he will know. For him, as for the others, this oath-taking will be the culmination of a long period of waiting, hope, and prayer.

But, unlike the others, young Eugene will be unable to hear a word of the oath of allegiance uttered by Judge James R. Kirkland, for he is deaf. Instead, he will watch the swiftly moving fingers and lips of an interpreter from Gallaudet College, here, the world's only college for the deaf, where Eugene is a student.

Born in the tiny town of Krasny Lutch, which means "red beam of light," in the Ukraine, Eugene was the first of the two sons Mrs. A. N. Landyshev bore for her electrical engineer husband. At the age of 8 he was stricken with German measles, which left him totally deaf. That was in the spring of 1941. The Nazis were already well on the road toward their planned world conquest.

Three months later the Ukraine was overrun by the enemy. In 1943, on the retreat again, the Nazis "borrowed" Papa Landyshev for technical help in Germany. Strangely, they brought the rest of the family with him.

For the next few years Eugene lived in Germany, with his parents and brother, "I had comparative freedom," he recalls, "but I was unhappy, for I couldn't speak German, and it was difficult getting along with the German children." His education was sadly neglected during this period.

Finally, in August 1949, the Landyshevs left Hamburg for the home of relatives in San Francisco, on a regular immigration quota. It was a big day for the young deaf boy when he arrived in the "Promised Land."

In San Francisco he quickly made up for the lag in his education, learned English, and matriculated at George Washington High School. Papa Landyshev could not practice his profession until he became a citizen, in 1954. He now teaches electrical engineering at the University of California in Berkeley.

Meanwhile, Eugene had entered Gallaudet College to prepare for a scientific career. His leaving San Francisco resulted in a delay in his naturalization. Ever confident in the outcome of his citizenship application, however, the young scholar preferred a delay here, rather than jeopardize his chances for a higher education. He is a junior today and is very much absorbed in his scientific studies.

How does he feel about tomorrow? "Good, very good," he says simply. He is an unemotional young man: He has seen too much suffering and strife in his short life not to have been affected. But his eyes betray his breathlessness and excitement. "You know, I like to dance," he says, as he awkwardly changes the subject.

Anniversary of the Birth of John F. Stevens, Chief Engineer of the Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, this year marks the 50th anniversary of the decision of the Congress and the President in 1906 to approve the lake-lock plan for building the Panama Canal. Today is the 103d anniversary of the birth at

West Gardiner, Maine, of John F. Stevens, who was the chief engineer of the Panama Canal. I ask unanimous consent that a statement and a poem on Mr. Stevens may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and poem were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE

The State of Maine has produced many leaders on the national scene but few have attained the stature of John F. Stevens, who was born at West Gardiner, Maine, on April 25, 1853.

In a career packed with hard work and adventure he built a record of constructive achievement that stands as an inspiration to the youth of our land.

After graduating from the State Normal School at Farmington, Maine, and an attempt at teaching, Stevens decided upon an engineering career. In 1874, at the age of 21, and without technical engineering training, he went to Minneapolis where his uncle, Jesse Stevens, was an engineer. There he began as an assistant engineer—a rodman—for the city.

Attracted by greater opportunities that would be afforded on the railroads, then at peak construction, he went to Texas in 1876, and secured employment as a railway section hand. Rising step by step, he worked as rodman, instrument man, surveyor, and location and construction engineer—all of which served as a great school of experience.

Attracting the attention of the great railroad empire builder, James J. Hill, he was sent by the latter to locate a route for the Great Northern Railway over the Rocky Mountains. This led to his dramatic discovery on December 11, 1889, of Marias Pass in Montana, through which the railroad was constructed.

This notable achievement is commemorated by a bronze statue of the engineer-explorer near the track at Summit, Mont., showing Stevens as he appeared at the time of his discovery. Replicas at this statue are in the Maine State Library and in the national headquarters in New York of the American Society of Civil Engineering, of which society he later became national president.

In the course of his rise in the railroad work, Stevens was well prepared for a still greater assignment in taking over the building of the Panama Canal. For appointment as Chief Engineer of the Isthmian Canal Commission, the combination of his ability and extraordinary background of experience made him a "natural."

Assuming charge in the Canal Zone on July 25, 1905, at a time when chaos and hysteria incident to yellow fever was coupled with the resignation of its previous Chief Engineer, by the adoption of wise policies, Stevens promptly brought matters under control. One of the outstanding instances of his broad outlook was his sympathetic and timely support of the health and sanitation plan that had been proposed by Colonel Gorgas—adequate health and sanitation being an absolute prerequisite for constructing the Canal.

Considering the problem of constructing the Panama Canal from every significant viewpoint, functional as well as economic and engineering, Stevens strongly recommended to President Theodore Roosevelt what is known as the lake and lock type canal as offering the best solution, and vigorously opposed the so-called sea-level proposal.

When this celebrated issue as to the choice of type was before the Nation in 1906, he was the greatest single influence in bringing about the decision of the Congress and the President for the high-level lake and lock plan. This contribution, which has been justified by more than 40 years' successful operation, establishes him in history as the basic architect of the Panama Canal. He was rewarded by the President with the first appointment to the combined positions of chairman and chief engineer of the Isthmian Canal Commission (1907).

Having organized the forces for construction, acquired the necessary equipment, designed the key features of the waterway, launched the project and brought it to a point where its success was a certainty, Stevens resigned in April 1907 and returned to railroad work. The Panama Canal was completed by others under the Stevens plans.

Though separated from the project his interest never ceased. At times of crises during the remaining years of construction, he always gave his support in the best interest of the project. In later years, he wrote extensively of his Isthmian experiences. Special reference is made to his collaboration with Col. William L. Sibert, a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission in charge of Atlantic construction, in a book entitled "The Construction of the Panama Canal," published in New York by D. Appleton & Co. in 1915. This volume is probably the best engineering historical treatise produced by the construction era.

Just after the declaration of war by the United States in 1917, Mr. Stevens went to see President Wilson and requested an active assignment in the war. The President expressed his interest, as Russia was then an ally and badly in need of a competent railroad man, in connection with its war transportation problems. Appointed as Minister Plenipotentiary and head of the United States Railway Mission to Russia in 1917, he undertook the difficult tasks involved in operating its railroad system. Later, from 1919 to 1923, he was president of the Inter-Allied Technical Board supervising the Siberian railways.

In these positions he observed the start and early years of the Communist Revolution. Accurately foreseeing the vast scope of that work conspiracy, he was among the first to alert responsible leaders of the United States to its dangers.

It is thus historically fitting that in 1956, which marks the 50th anniversary of the decision in 1906 by the Congress and the President for the lake-lock plan for building the Panama Canal, that the Honorable Maurice H. Thatcher, of Kentucky, formerly Civil Governor of the Canal Zone, and the only surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, serving during peak years of canal construction, and later a Member of Congress, should write for the occasion of Mr. Stevens' birthday an inspiring poem that epitomizes the vision and work of this eminent leader for the Panama Canal.

The poem follows:

"JOHN F. STEVENS: A TRIBUTE

"Amongst all those whose labors cleft the land
To blend, as one, the seas at Panama—
There was none greater than John Stevens; and
The passing years bear witness. He foresaw—
More clearly than the others had foreseen—
The value of the plan for lock and lake,
And led Authority—in doubt between
Diverse designs—the wiser choice to make.
Possessed of genius rare, with skills supreme
And ripen'd knowledge gained from ventures vasts—
He shaped the moulds to vitalize the Dream
Which had so long persisted in the past.
His all he gave to serve the Isthmian Task:
What more could men demand, or duty ask?"

—*Maurice H. Thatcher.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 25, 1956.

Eleventh Anniversary of Meeting of American and Russian Soldiers on the Elbe River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me about the 11th anniversary of the meeting of American and Russian soldiers on the Elbe River.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR POTTER

Today is a significant day for a great many American veterans. It is a day which is well worth remembrance and thoughtful consideration of the American people. Today marks the 11th anniversary reunion of the American Veterans of the Elbe River link-up. I would like to quote now from a letter by Joseph Polowsky, the secretary of the American Veterans of the Elbe River link-up, sent to the fellow veterans of that occasion:

"Eleven years ago, at noon on Elbe day 1945, a patrol of American riflemen thrust through the no-man's land between the forward American and Russian lines and linked up with a patrol of Russian soldiers on the east bank of the Elbe River. On that blood-soaked river bank, we met the Russian soldiers with high resolve and as friends. All of us on both sides swore never to forget the scene, the day or each other, swore to do what we could to make a freer and more peaceful world for our children, and to meet again in peace. Two days later, when the link-up was more fully secured and American and Russian military units were joyously greeting each other, our patrol mission was completed, and we returned to the American lines; General Eisenhower said the American people were proud of us for our initiative and devotion to duty. The confidence and optimism, the spirit of comradeship and hospitality all of us had 11 years ago, from General Eisenhower to the privates in the field, lives on in us as American veterans. We'll make the American people proud of us once again when we shake hands again with the Soviet Elbe veterans at our reunion this month in Washington."

I should like to quote also from a letter from Mr. Polowsky addressed to the Soviet Veterans of the Elbe River link-up:

"Last spring, the Governments of the United States and the Soviet Union cooperated in bringing together the American and Soviet Elbe veterans for an inspiring and successful 10th anniversary reunion in Moscow. On May 11, 1955, at a formal meeting at which military and civilian representatives of the United States Government and the Soviet Government were present, the Elbe veterans read the following unanimously approved joint declaration: 'We Soviet and American veterans of the Elbe River link-up of the Allied armies in 1945, gathered together in Moscow on the 10th anniversary of that historic event, affirm that we have not forgotten the friendly alliance formed during the war years. The link-up of our soldiers at the Elbe will live on in history of mankind as an enduring symbol of friendship, good will and mutual respect between our peoples. Today, as 10 years ago, we declare our determination to work for friendship between the American and

Soviet peoples and the establishment of a peaceful world. We hope this first reunion will establish a tradition. We hope that on future anniversaries of the Elbe River link-up, American and Soviet war veterans will exchange friendly greetings and hold reunions as friends."

"We American Veterans of the Elbe River link-up will hold our 11th anniversary reunion in Washington, D. C., on Elbe Day—April 25, 1956. We extend to the Soviet Veterans of the Elbe River link-up a cordial invitation for a group of Soviet World War II veterans to visit us at our reunion. We are sure that the visit of the Soviet veterans to the United States this spring will contribute to the establishment of the free and friendly world we all fought for during the years of the Second World War."

And now, may I read the words of acceptance from the chairman of the Soviet committee of the participants of the meeting at the Elbe. He says:

"Permit me, on behalf of the Soviet veterans of the Elbe meeting, to sincerely thank you for the invitation extended to the Soviet participants in this unforgettable, historic meeting to visit the United States of America to participate in the meeting of the American Veterans of the Elbe River link-up, which is being held on April 25, 1956, in Washington, D. C.; and thank you also for your good wishes and your efforts toward supporting and strengthening the ties between the American and Soviet veterans of the Second World War."

"The Soviet committee of the participants of the meeting at the Elbe, with a deep feeling of gratitude, accepts your kind invitation and is ready to send to the United States a group of Soviet participants of 5 to 7 people to take part in the meeting of April 25th of this year in Washington, D. C."

"We trust that the meeting of the Soviet and American veterans of the Second World War will further mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the Soviet Union, and other freedom loving peoples who carried on so great a battle against a common enemy in the years of the Second World War."

It is interesting to note that some 11 years ago the armies of the United States and of the Soviet Union were fighting a common cause. The meeting at the Elbe demonstrated that the peoples of these two countries deeply cherish the common goals of freedom and peace. This should serve as a reminder to all of those in positions of responsibility in all countries that these are the goals of the peoples. We all sincerely hope that these meetings on a man to man basis at the various levels of our society will continue to deepen the mutual understandings and to strengthen the bonds of common interest all over the world.

Chemical Progress Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to represent the city of Niagara Falls, N. Y., and the Niagara frontier, which is one of the greatest chemical centers in the world. This being Chemical Progress Week, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call to the attention of the House of Representatives and insert in the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Monday, April 23, 1956, edition of the Niagara Falls Gazette honoring this great industry.

I would further like to take this opportunity to compliment industry, genius, and labor for the great part they have played through the research, development, and production of chemical products to help make the United States the greatest and strongest Nation in the world.

The editorial follows:

CHEMICAL PROGRESS WEEK OF SPECIAL IMPORT HERE

This is Chemical Progress Week, an unusually significant observance for Niagara Falls and the Niagara frontier.

Of all developments in the last 25 years, none has helped raise the American level of living more than the growth of a strong American chemical industry. Day in and day out, chemical progress is a vitally important thing in Niagara Falls. Our community prosperity depends, to a large extent, upon chemicals and their uses.

During the past three decades alone the chemical industry has introduced nearly 6,000 new chemical products; and last year placed new products on the market at the rate of more than one a day.

Although these products are seldom visibly a part of our daily living, like steel or oil, they are essential to virtually everything we use, eat, or wear in our daily lives.

Chemistry also makes it possible for us to enjoy longer and healthier lives. The conquest of disease through medicinal chemicals, notably the antibiotics, and gains made through vitamins, hormones, and sulfa drugs has been but one of the outstanding chapters in American chemical progress.

Today, with more than 825,000 employees at 11,000 locations, the chemical industry is the fourth largest industry in the Nation. And in great part through chemistry, 165 million Americans are living richer, healthier, and happier lives.

Niagara Falls, as one of the greatest chemical centers of the world, can be proud of its contribution to chemistry and the chemical industry. Through chemistry, our city has contributed greatly to America's peacetime prosperity and to its strength in war.

Defense Highway Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON G. ROGERS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Colorado stating its position concerning certain features of the defense highway legislation. The letter is as follows:

STATE OF COLORADO,
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION,
Denver, Colo., July 20, 1955.

Hon. BYRON ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROGERS: It is our understanding that the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives has just reported out House bill 7072. Section 7 of this bill permits reimbursing municipal and private utilities for 50 percent of the cost of relocating facilities on a Federal aid highway project.

We are fully convinced that public utilities should be reimbursed for the expense of relocation of their facilities occasioned by the construction and reconstruction of the Federal Aid System of Highways. The following reasons support our position:

1. All costs of this expanded program of Federal Aid are to promote national defense and interstate commerce and are for the benefit of the public as a whole and therefore should be borne by the general public. This includes relocation costs as well as other construction costs.

2. Users of utility service are not directly benefited by the highway program. They should not be forced to bear the burden of relocation expense merely because utility property happens to be located in the paths of new highway construction.

3. The users of utility service, as part of the general public, pay in their taxes for the cost of highway construction. They should not have to pay a second time through their rates for utility service. They should not contribute twice.

4. While the expense of utility relocation forms an insignificant part of the highway program, it could have a disastrous impact on some utilities if they were forced to bear this burden themselves.

5. The Federal Government is causing these relocation costs by the expansion of the Federal Aid Program and the Federal Government should at least recognize and reimburse the utility for the share of these relocation costs which it creates.

Section 7 of House bill 7072 is a watered-down version of section 11 of Senate bill 1048. We favor the stronger section 11 of the Senate bill but believe that the House bill should be passed in its present form in order to expedite the matter in this session of the Congress.

The above is an expression of the opinion of our entire Commission.

Respectfully,
JOSEPH W. HAWLEY, *Commissioner.*

Alaska Mental Health Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I have here two letters which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N. Y., on April 19, 1956, which were sent to me with the request that they be inserted in the RECORD. Since this is a subject which affects the liberty and rights of every person in the United States, I want to call again to the attention of the Members of both Houses the necessity of defeating H. R. 6376 in the Senate.

The letters follow:

ALASKA MENTAL HEALTH BILL WOULD CREATE SIBERIA?

Have you heard of House bill 6376 known as the Alaska Mental Health Act? It passed the House by a voice vote.

This voice vote allotted 1 million acres, or 1,560 square miles of land and $12,500,000 to build a hospital for mentally ill in Alaska. There are about 350 mentally ill in Alaska, yet the experts are allotting half again the land area of Rhode Island, which has 800,000 inhabitants. Why 1 million acres? Are the

experts expecting the number of mental patients to increase more than in proportion to population?

The proposed law to provide for the mentally ill of Alaska, and for other purposes (what other purposes?) provides that any Federal judicial officer may conduct proceedings for commitment. No longer would a member of the family need to consent for application to the Commissioner could be made by an interested party, defined in section 101 (g) as "an interested, responsible, adult friend." One section provided a penalty for unwarranted hospitalization or denial of rights set forth in other parts of the bill, but this was stricken out.

Under section 119 the governor of any State could contract with the governor of Alaska to take over all or part of that State's mental cases on a reimbursable basis.

Our one worlders, left wingers, and fellow travelers are working day and night, bit by bit, as through shrewdly worded parts of this harmless-looking bill, to provide machinery under which, when the time comes, the state (Federal Government) will have omnipotent power over all the people.

These provisions in H. R. 6376 could take care of many honest dissenters who had been warning the country about the socialistic and communistic phases of our own Government which they don't like. What better way than to railroad them to Alaska? What better scheme than an American Siberia?

Write your Senators and demand they defeat this bill. Write and ask for copy of H. R. 6376 or send 15 cents for a copy of Letter 377 to Social Economic Council, Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. Time is short. This could go through and be signed by the President by July 1.

LILAS A. STANTON.

FREDONIA, N. Y.

PROPOSAL FOR HOSPITAL IN ALASKA PROTESTED

The Alaska Mental Health Act or H. R. 6376 has been brought to our attention recently. On March 14 Representative BURDICK, of North Dakota, said, regarding this resolution: "There ought to be no person in the United States ignorant enough to believe that this procedure is constitutional, yet, the planning goes on. * * * This whole program is a brain-washing procedure borrowed from the Russians and is intended to block all opposition."

Its vicious provisions are a menace to our civil liberties, especially that of freedom from unreasonable seizures. It was railroaded through the House under very suspicious circumstances.

JANET THOMAS.
NANCY CALHOUN.

The Parris Island Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, recently I was shocked to read of the death of some fine young Americans at the Marine training base on Parris Island.

My first reaction was one of horror. It seemed completely inconcelvable that this tragedy could have happened in this country. Even more amazing, the incident occurred in the United States Marines.

Everyone knows that the Marine Corps has a reputation for toughness. It is an important part of the great spirit of a great fighting organization. Each former Marine I know takes particular pride in his service. Without exception, every young man I have met who served with the Corps wears his former service with a certain air, a knowledge that he was one of the finest outfits in world military history.

On every battlefield the United States Marines have acquitted themselves well. Every volume that tells of the growth of this great Nation has an important place for the leathernecks. It is true now as it was 170 years ago, the Marine has no superior as a fighting man. An important part of the secret of his success has always been the training he receives. In a word, it is rough; it's meant to be. Yet for all its roughness there is intelligence, planning and direction to it.

Still in the final analysis any system is only as good as the men who administer it. In the Marine Corps, as indeed everywhere else where man is involved there are instances of abuse and flagrant violation. A review of the record of any criminal court will show that man has a habit of violating his conscience and the best laid plans of God and his fellow creatures. So it is with the Marines.

In every instance the corps tries to find and correct any inequalities or injustices in the system. Their only interest is in maintaining the quality of their organization. Humiliation of the individual and stupidity are not a part of their plan. If those two undesirable qualities crop up occasionally they are committed by individuals and not by the system, nor the men who direct the Marine Corps.

This is a most difficult matter to consider rationally or objectively. The fact is that young Americans have died while taking training under the rules and regulations of a United States Armed Force.

Still, it seems to me that there has been some hysteria toward this tragedy. The papers have been filled with stories about other abuses or alleged abuses in boot camp. Everyone has an opinion and it is usually a very violent one.

However, I firmly believe that this is a matter which the Marines can handle. They have been dealing with the weakness and the strength in men for a great many years. Their discipline and training have always been tough. Their court-martial records show that there have been abuses before. In every instance they have handled their problems with the same dispatch and efficiency which characterizes every combat action in which they have participated.

Commandant Pate's reaction to the news of the tragedy was instant and commendable. He flew down to the scene to take charge, to make sure that an investigation was launched with the maximum of authority to get the job done; he called for a board of inquiry. At no point can I find reason to criticize the action of the general or any of his officers since the entire incident came to light. They know the full story of what happened and will act accordingly.

Whatever the decision rendered by the board of inquiry, I have every reason to believe that it will be a fair one—fair to the American people, just to the parties involved, and in the finest tradition of the United States Marines.

As to the future of the training programs, I think they are in the best hands right now. If modifications are called for, they will be modified. If the system is right and some individuals are wrong, the individuals will be changed.

We have trusted the United States Marine Corps in war. Now let us have confidence in them in peace. And more, let us pray to God that they might always receive His help and guidance.

"The True Heart, Spirit, and Character of TVA Should Be Preserved"—Radin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, opponents of TVA have for the past several years, by one means or another, been waging a continuing battle designed to cripple and eventually destroy this great agency of Government.

In a recent speech in Knoxville, Tenn., Mr. Alex Radin, general manager of the American Public Power Association, pointed out, step by step, the onslaught by TVA critics in this misguided crusade.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent address by Mr. Radin concerning TVA be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The remarks follow:

I turn at last to the situation in the Tennessee Valley. It was, of course, no news to you when I said earlier that the cancellation of the Dixon-Yates contract did not end the problems of TVA. Having the day-to-day responsibility of serving your customers, you know better than I that the Tennessee Valley area—like every other area of the country—needs a constantly expanding source of power to meet ever-growing loads. Consequently, the cancellation of the Dixon-Yates contract and the decision of Memphis to build its own steam plant presented no long-term solution to the need for ever more generating capacity in the Tennessee Valley.

For many years the private-power companies have been telling TVA that it should be operated like other power companies, and should get its funds for expansion from the private money markets, rather than ask for appropriations from Congress.

One might have had hopes, therefore, that the power companies would not have objected to TVA's plan for issuing revenue bonds on the open market. After all, this would force TVA to go to the money markets just like any other power system. The bonds would not be guaranteed by the United States Treasury but would be secured by power revenues alone. And interest on the bonds would not be exempt from Federal taxation.

It was with some degree of disillusionment that we found last year, in the hearings on the TVA revenue bond financing legislation, that the power companies were unalterably opposed to the TVA self-financing plan. Their blind opposition made it crystal clear that they are opposed to any plan for TVA short of the complete wrecking of the agency.

Nevertheless, in the current session of the Congress, earnest efforts have been made in the Senate Public Works Committee to

bring out a bill that would preserve the essential provisions of the TVA self-financing plan, but at the same time would take cognizance of some of the objections which have been voiced.

I betray no secrets, of course, when I report that the progress on this bill does not appear to be encouraging. Whether or not it will be acted upon during the current session of the Congress remains to be seen.

Meanwhile, the President, in his budget message to Congress earlier this year, advocated the construction of 450,000 kilowatts of generating capacity at existing projects, consisting of 1 additional units of 180,000 kilowatts to be placed in operation before the end of 1957 at the John Sevier plant, and 2 units, totaling 270,000 kilowatts, to be placed in service in 1958 at New Johnsonville. A supplemental appropriation of $3,500,000 was requested for the current fiscal year to provide funds for starting work at the John Sevier steam plant, and the President said that funds to be needed in later years for this unit, as well as the two units at New Johnsonville, are expected to be provided through congressional enactment of the revenue bond legislation.

About 2 weeks ago the House Appropriations Committee knocked out the $3,500,000 appropriation to begin work on the unit at John Sevier. The committee, citing legal opinion of TVA's general counsel, declared that TVA's power revenues "have provided it with sufficient funds for the construction of such additional units as TVA now requires." The report added that TVA "should follow normal business procedure, using its revenue to the extent necessary."

In its report, the committee noted that "a minority of the committee opposes the TVA using its own money to meet its power needs and in addition voted against the President's recommendation to appropriate money for this purpose. The only conclusion to be reached is that the minority is simply opposed to the people of the TVA region having power to meet increasing needs."

It was only by a tie vote of 21 to 21 that the opponents failed to carry a motion that would have inserted language in the report to the effect that TVA did not have the authority to use its own funds, without specific congressional approval, for adding units at existing steam plants.

In passing the supplemental appropriations bill last week, the House, in effect, sustained the position of the committee. Opponents of TVA were ready and willing to try to stop TVA from using its power revenues to add units to existing plants, but it was clear that the opponents were unable to find a means of preventing such action by TVA. The opponents had their weapons aimed directly at the intended victim—TVA—but they found themselves in the rather frustrating position of not being able to pull the trigger.

The position of the opponents was perhaps best described by Congressman DAVIS, of Wisconsin, who told the House that, "Those of us who take exception to the use of $3,500,000 of TVA revenues to initiate construction of a new steam-generating plant are in a most frustrating position. There is no language in the bill which we can seek to delete, or to which we can seek to add a limitation. The use of the $3,500,000 is authorized by the language of the majority committee report, which is not subject to amendment under the rules of the House."

So, with their pistols cocked, the opponents had to put their weapons aside—to await another day.

The question of TVA's authority to use its corporate funds to add units at existing plants was again examined on Tuesday of this week by a subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee. Joseph Swidler, general counsel of TVA, gave a detailed account of the legislative history showing that TVA did have the authority to use its corporate funds to add such units at existing plants, and his statements were reaffirmed by Senator GORE, who was a member of the House Appropriations Committee at the time when Congress adopted legislation in 1948 stating that none of TVA's power revenues were to be used for construction of new power-producing projects (except for replacement purposes) unless and until approved by act of Congress. Senator GORE said the record showed that it was clear that the word "project" referred to a new dam or new steam plant, and not the addition of units to existing plants.

However, in response to a question from Senator DWORSHAK as to whether he thought TVA has the legal right to use corporate funds for new units, General Vogel replied, "Not necessarily. I think that's the question that's before this committee today."

As the hearing ended, there seemed to be rather general agreement by the Senators present that to require congressional approval, in the pending appropriation bill, of TVA's use of power revenues for the addition of new units would be adding legislation to an appropriation bill, a procedure which is not permissible. At the same time, some of the Senators seemed to indicate that this question might be raised soon before another committee of the Congress.

This indication was reinforced that same day by the release of a letter to Congressman JOHN TABER, of New York, ranking minority member of the House Appropriations Committee, from Comptroller General Joseph Campbell. While he did not directly answer the question as to whether or not TVA had a legal right at the present time to finance new units from power revenues, the Comptroller General recommended that the law be amended "to clearly state the intent of the Congress with respect to its control over TVA's capital expenditures for power facilities." He said that such legislation is needed at the present time because "(1) the present law is not clear in this respect, (2) there has been a substantial change in the nature of TVA's capital expenditures for power facilities between 1948 and 1955, and (3) the present law, as currently applied, does not give the Congress effective control over TVA's expenditures of public funds for power facilities."

He added this significant statement: "It is our view that the Congress can most effectively control expenditures of this character through appropriations; however, if the Congress wishes TVA to use its power revenues, or funds obtained from other sources, to construct or acquire power facilities, it should require TVA to obtain specific and prior authorization from the Congress for such facilities."

In other words, the Comptroller General has stated he feels that the Congress should specifically approve TVA's use of its own revenues to finance each addition to existing plants. It is clear that such a requirement would seriously hamper the conduct of TVA in carrying out its obligations to the people of the Tennessee Valley, and would deprive TVA of necessary flexibility of operations—one of the features of the TVA act which has made it such a notable success. Certainly such a requirement would lead to anything but a business-like operation.

The supplemental appropriaton bill will not be considered by the Congress until after the Easter recess, but it is now clear that if the opponents of TVA do not succeed through this bill in blocking TVA's use of power revenues to build additions to existing plants, efforts will be made through other routes to bring about such a restriction.

Regardless of what happens as a result of the current controversy over TVA's use of corporate funds, it is evident, in any event, that the use of such funds do not provide an answer to TVA's long-range power supply situation. Everyone in the utility business realizes that, with the rapidly growing loads which all utilities are experiencing today, all utilities ultimately must borrow some funds to finance the necessary expansion of their plants. TVA is no exception to this rule.

The most satisfactory long-range solution to the TVA power supply problem is to be found in the self-financing plan embodied in the Kerr bill in the Senate and the similar Davis-Jones bill in the House. Only time will tell whether this bill will be adopted during the curent session of the Congress, but if this legislation is not enacted during the present session, then it is clear that an all-out effort must be made in its behalf during the next session of the Congress.

I do not feel that I am exaggerating the situation or over-dramatizing it to say that the next few years will be among the most critical in the history of TVA. The entire nature and character of the agency can be radically changed. And in the final analysis, it is the character of TVA that is of equal, if not greater importance than its physical features. For just as one should judge a person more by his character than by his physical appearance, so must we judge TVA, in the final analysis, by its character rather than by its dams, its powerhouses, its navigation locks, and all its other works.

When friends of TVA say that certain legislation, or the Dixon-Yates contract, would destroy TVA, obviously they do not mean that the TVA dams would be blown up, or that other TVA structures would be taken out of the valley. But what they do mean is that the basic character of TVA would be destroyed—and such a result would be as catastrophic as the wrecking of the TVA physical facilities.

And what is the character of TVA • • • what is its basic nature In my opinion, TVA represents the essence of the efforts of man to bring into a harmonious relationship the work of man and the forces of nature. In the power field, TVA is a symbol of what can be accomplished when the principal objective is greater service to mankind, rather than profits or dividends on stocks or bonds. In the power field, TVA in the past has pointed the way to dynamic technical progress; its ever-larger units, tied together with high-voltage transmission lines have shown the way to the economies that can be achieved through a regional, integrated power system. TVA, in all the facets of its character has brought a fuller and more meaningful life to millions of people throughout the Tennessee Valley, and it has kindled new hope in many distressed and worn-out sections of the ancient world.

As we face the future, literally scores of plans may be offered for the future of TVA. These plans should be measured, not against the physical structures of TVA and the disposition of these works, but against this standard: Will these plans change the true heart and spirit and objectives of TVA? That spirit and character have been worth fighting for in the past, and it will be worth fighting for in the future. I know your great organization will continue to be in the forefront of that effort in the trying days ahead.

A Case of Algers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include another interesting edi-

torial on the Hiss Princeton controversy by the Advocate, official publication of the Archdiocese of Newark and of the diocese of Paterson in the State of New Jersey. The Advocate has an unequaled reputation for reportorial accuracy and editorial excellence. The article follows:

A CASE OF ALGERS

The present uproar over the invitation extended to Alger Hiss by an undergraduate society at Princeton University demands some attention. Times have changed most certainly. Apparently Alger Hiss, a convicted perjurer, can become a campus attraction if not a campus hero. Fifty years ago it would have been another Alger, perhaps, who would have attracted Princeton's attention. Horatio Alger, with his advocacy of honesty and integrity, hard work and thrift, simple morality, and economic success, presented the ideal American. This second Alger presents the opposite side of the mirror. If standards have changed so much that ideals of Horatio Alger have been replaced by the recognition of the standards of Alger Hiss, then education has not done much for men.

Even more, apart from the case of Hiss, it is a frightening thing for a university and its authorities to admit that the students have done something wrong and then refuse to right that wrong, to remand the students who have so acted. This is supposed to be a democratic procedure but it is certainly an inversion of the philosophy of teaching. College men treated with a laissez-faire when they are injudicious and even wrong, are being trained to expect the same treatment when they are no longer undergraduates. When the principle of authority in education becomes lost in a maudlin tolerance, then the strongest asset of education is lost, and the best effect of education cannot be achieved.

United States Coal Development Program Is Justified for Vital Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include the following editorial from the Huntington (W. Va.) Advertiser, for Tuesday evening, April 24, 1956, on the subject of the United States coal development program:

UNITED STATES COAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM IS JUSTIFIED FOR VITAL INDUSTRY

Representative KEE, Democrat, West Virgina, has justice on her side in her protest against the Atomic Energy Commission's use of Federal funds for the "commercial business enterprise" of building powerplants for utilities.

"By contributing most of the construction," she said, "providing the fuels for operation of atomic plants, and possibly assuming at least some of the insurance risks involved, the AEC is in fact taking away traditional coal markets in the electric utilities field, whether or not these markets are located close to coal-producing areas."

There is no objection, of course, to pilot atomic plants operating on a purely experimental and noncommercial basis. Such plants will contribute to the scientific progress and know-how of the country.

They are part of the research and development work necessary to keep America abreast of the world in atomic science.

With all the progress experimenters can make, it will probably be many years before atomic power will replace coal as a fuel for commercial generation of electricity.

That is obviously the belief of the Nation's big utilities. Otherwise they would not spend billions of dollars constructing new coal-burning powerplants.

But while the Government is pushing its atomic research, it should also take more than a casual interest in the future possibilities of coal.

A resolution authorizing a study of a proposed coal research and development program has been presented to the House of Representatives by Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR, Republican, of Pennsylvania.

Over the years such a program could have a vastly stimulating effect on the economy of West Virginia and other coal-producing States.

The known available supply of coal is much greater and will last much longer than the present reserves of oil and natural gas. It is possible, as Representative SAYLOR suggests, that synthetic oil and gas produced from coal will eventually find its way into most of the market areas of the Nation.

Whether that ever happens or not, coal is still a potential source of great many by-products as yet unknown.

A Federal program of research in this field is no more out of place than that now underway in atomic science.

It could have tremendous influence on the progress of the chemical industry as well as upon the science of fuels and could bring about revolutionary advances much more spectacular than the development of nylon to replace silk.

Even without such a possibility, the program would be justified as a means of providing a prop to the coal industry during future periods of recession.

For a good many years coal will probably continue as the main source of power and fuel and as the mainstay of the Nation's program of defense in peace or war.

Keeping its potential available for an emergency is vital to the Nation's survival.

Further than that, it is only a matter of sound economy to provide for the future well-being of the hundreds of thousands of people dependent upon the coal industry for a livelihood.

Resolution by Mohr-Christie Post, No. 158, VFW

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I desire to record a resolution of the Mohr-Christie Post, No. 158, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, of Hoboken, N. J. The resolution contains some very interesting suggestions and is as follows:

At a regular meeting of the Mohr-Christie Post, No. 158, VFW., held on April 17, 1956, at the post headquarters, 1000 Garden Street, Hoboken, N. J., the following resolution was adopted and directed to be forwarded to the Hudson County Council, VFW., for their concurrence and further action:

"RESOLUTION

"Whereas an organization known as the American-Whig-Cliosophical Society comprised of alumni of Princeton University has invited convicted perjurer Algier Hiss to speak to them on April 26, 1956; and

"Whereas said society, its officers and members must know that the whole weight of evidence at Hiss' trial concerned treason and that the verdict carried the clear indication that Algier Hiss has been an espionage agent for the Soviet Union; and

"Whereas on Friday, April 6, 1956, a United States Senator while addressing said society was greeted, according to press reports, with discourtesy and with cries of "We want Frank Costello"; and

"Whereas convicted gangster Frank Costello might object strenuously to being classified with convicted perjurer Algier Hiss; and

"Whereas the officers and members of the American-Whig-Cliosophical Society of Princeton University have exhibited a lack of good manner, judgment, and knowledge of current events; Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the officers and members of the Mohr-Christie Post, No. 158, VFW, do recommend the following: (a) That the officers and trustees of Princeton University do all in their power to make it mandatory that the officers and members of the American-Whig-Cliosophical Society be enrolled in courses of ettiquette, logic, contemporary American history and Americanism; and be it further

"Resolved, That the authorities of university censure the actions of the officers and members of the society."

Military Reserve Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as the Nation celebrates National Military Reserve Week, I ask unanimous consent that there be reproduced in the RECORD a timely discussion of our Reserve training program by the outstanding military news correspondent Hanson W. Baldwin, which appeared in the New York Times April 24, 1956.

The article follows:

MILITARY RESERVE PLAN—A DISCUSSION OF THE TRAINING PROGRAM AND PROSPECTS OF WIDENING ITS APPEAL

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Ceremonies this week which symbolize the proclamation of Military Reserve Week.

The week marks an intensive nationwide drive to popularize and publicize the reserve components of the Armed Forces. The Pentagon, aided by a private sponsoring organization—the National Security Committee—is stressing particularly the 6-month military training program, instituted last year, in an attempt to build up the reserves.

The 6-month program—one of several optional methods of fulfilling the military obligation facing young men—has not yet attracted nearly as many volunteers as had been hoped. Many youths have preferred to take their chances on 2 years of conscription rather than volunteer for 6 months' active duty training, followed by 7½ years in the Reserve. When the 6-month program started last fall the Army had hoped to re-

cruit some 90,000 6-month volunteers between then and next June 30; the Marine Corps had planned for 5,500. The Air Force and Navy are not participating in the program.

These high hopes have not been met. Incomplete Pentagon figures made available yesterday indicated that about 22,176 young men had volunteered to date all over the Nation for the 6-month program. A major part of the objective of the program—to strengthen the Army's Ready Reserves to about 1,700,000 men by 1959—is not being accomplished.

National Reserve Week, strongly endorsed by the President and the Secretary of Defense and sponsored by the National Security Committee and its 19 national constituent organizations, is an attempt, therefore, to dramatize the advantages of the 6-month plan and to give it the benefit of national publicity.

The 6-month training plan is essentially a "civilian-soldier" program. Young men between 17 and 18½ years of age may enlist in Army or Marine Reserve units. Normally 6 months of active duty training follows soon after their enlistment, but induction for the active training program may be deferred until the age of 20, pending graduation from high school. However, the volunteer must sign up before he is 18½, or he becomes subject to the 2-year draft.

Basic training in the 6-month program is given by the Army at Fort Ord, Calif.; Fort Jackson, S. C.; Fort Knox, Ky.; Fort Leonard Wood, Mo.; Fort Bliss, Tex., and Fort Chaffee, Ark. Specialist training follows at various specialist schools. The Marines train their 6-month volunteers at Parris Island, S. C., and San Diego, Calif.

Following the 6 months of active duty training, the volunteers return to civilian clothes. For the next 7½ years they must train with specific Reserve units. Normally, the reserve training includes 2 hours of drill each week at Reserve training centers or armories near their homes, and 2 weeks of training each summer at an Army camp near their home. The men have no obligation for extended active duty except in case of emergency, and they are not subject to the draft.

From the point of view of the young man, the 6-month plan has certain advantages. His active duty training can be completed in 6 months and he can take a job, or complete his education with the assurance that his career will not be interrupted by a 2-year draft. He does his Reserve drill training near his home. And, if he wishes, he can apply for officer candidate schools. He draws drill pay as he trains, and he is considered for promotion.

This is the program which is now being publicized in Military Reserve Week. Whether or not it can produce a strong Reserve depends upon the solution to a number of problems. So far, the Nation's young men would rather take their chances with the draft than commit themselves to a total of 8 years of Active and Reserve training. They are not convinced the draft will get them, even though Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, has said that "in the long view practically every young man must expect to be called upon for some kind of service in the Armed Forces."

Many young men do not like the idea of committing themselves to spend their vacations, or part of their vacations in uniform each summer for 7½ years. Some employers, it is true, are paying employees their salaries for their 2-week summer training and are allowing some vacations in addition. However, most small businesses cannot afford this and even some big ones do not follow this procedure.

And finally, and most important, the entire value of the 6-month program will, in the long run, be no better than the organization of the Reserve and the training it gives in weekly drills and in 2 weeks of summer camps. This training has been totally inadequate and grossly unrealistic in too many cases. It is undergoing major revision; new armories and reserve facilities are being built and there is more hope now than there has ever been before for the creation of a strong Army Reserve. But this is not assured; only an effective partnership between the Nation's young men and the Nation's armed services can provide it.

The Boxcar Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in the issue of April 12, 1956, of the Green River Star, Mr. Adrian Reynolds, the editor of the paper, published a penetrating analysis of the seriousness of the shortage of railroad boxcars. The mater is of such importance that I ask not only that the analysis may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, but that a copy of the article be filed with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, and to be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

WHY NOT RAIL-TRUCK SERVICE TO MEET NATIONAL SITUATION AND IMPROVE FREIGHT SERVICE?

(By Adrian Reynolds)

Being a former railroader, and being as Green River interests are so entwined with railroad well-being, I am naturally interested in railroad problems. At the present time, much attention is being given to the freight-car shortage. The seriousness of this shortage becomes more apparent when we read of a shortage of steel that will slow production of freight cars and thus threatens to prevent solution of the problem. We have local interest in this because of our very important industry using a large number of boxcars, although I understand the most serious trouble seems to be moving grain and lumber.

From my own experience in various positions on the railroad, I have long been concerned with the loss of less-than-carload or so-called package-freight business from the railroads. At times when it was necessary to search for suitable cars for the loading of wool and other locally produced commodities, it often came to my attention that freight cars often are required for this less-than-carload service to haul but a few hundred pounds.

Of course, all such freight must be accepted and handled by the railroads—which is as it should be—to serve the public, but in many instances railroad highway vehicles often could be operated more economically and speedier, giving faster and more satisfactory service, an important matter to places away from freight terminals. But, at the same time, such usage would release large numbers of boxcars for handling of carload traffic.

There are, however, various roadblocks in the form of Interstate Commerce Commission imposed restrictions such as so-called prior-rail-haul or key-point requirements or limitations that prevent railheads from utilizing highway vehicle service when justified to avoid wasteful use of boxcars and to render service.

At present, the railroad is required to load and package cars daily from Ogden and Salt Lake City to Green River and Rock Springs, even though the amount of merchandise in each car is small. I believe a single substitute highway vehicle would handle these shipments and serve merchants and other consignees of freight, including those at Evanston and other intermediate rail points, with better and faster service.

Similarly, peddler cars, i. e., cars stopping to unload freight at various towns, are handled westbound, all adding up to wasteful use of approximately 75 cars per month or about 900 cars per year in this relatively small service area. These freight cars are tied up 2 or 3 days each to handle these often small amounts of merchandise business, but could be put to better use if loaded with soda ash, lumber, grain, or other commodities in carload service.

Such Interstate Commerce Commission restrictions might have been justified several years ago, but certainly any restrictive regulation interfering with full and efficient use of the freight car supply and interfering with fast service is outmoded and without justification. This becomes more apparent when the problem is considered in relation to the national boxcar shortage.

Many Wyoming shippers feel this freight-car pinch and farmers, small-timber operators, and other shippers throughout the West are suffering financial loss directly or indirectly because of the freight-car shortage.

Reportedly, some Members of Congress are recognizing the seriousness of the situation and are investigating it. Up to now, I have not seen any report that they have any knowledge of various contributing causes, including that I have mentioned, and which obviously could be corrected by the ICC without delay.

From my observation and inquiry, our local wasteful use of rail cars and the possibility of a more practical and modern substitute railroad vehicle service is similar to that in other areas, and allowed some railroads. If our little area shows such wasteful use of approximately 900 cars annually, it is not impossible to accept the estimate of the loss of the use of at least 100,000 boxcars annually in the Nation, needlessly used in package car- and peddler-car service, which could be made available to ease the carload shipper requirements and aid in relieving the car shortages, which affect all of us in one way or another.

In fact the matter is serious enough, despite its local effect, to warrant congressional investigation.

Clayton E. Freeman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the April 19, 1956, issue of New Jersey's Newark Evening News extolling Mr. Clayton E. Freeman, a resident of the town of Glen Ridge, N. J., and an outstanding American. Mr. Freeman, who has been known for his interest in civic and community affairs, has lent himself unsel-

fishly to the service of his fellowman. It is indeed a fitting tribute to a very deserving individual:

TO AN OLD FRIEND

On hand was a boyhood friend and fellow worker he hadn't seen in 40 years. A congratulatory telegram came from President Eisenhower. A sketch, This Is Your Life, was performed by a cast of old friends who know him best. All were joined in what must have been for Clayton E. Freeman a heartwarming tribute by his fellow townsmen of Glen Ridge.

Mr. Freeman had been lured to this hometown testimonial under palpably false pretenses. He was there, ostensibly, to introduce an old friend, United States Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, at a public meeting. Instead he found 650 friends and neighbors assembled to make him the principal of the affair. They must know by this time, though, that their pleasant deception has been forgiven.

This was the Battalion Forum's way of expressing its warmth, regard, and friendship for a man whose useful life has been devoted in such generous measure to the public good. They didn't call it Clayton Freeman Night, but it was. And for Glen Ridge, no less than "Essex County's first citizen," it was an occasion to be remembered.

The Way Things Are

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include in the RECORD syndicated column appearing nationwide titled "The Way Things Are," by Irene Corbally Kuhn. The distinguished New Jersey State newspaper, the Newark Star-Ledger, carried the column on Saturday, April 21. The article follows:

THE WAY THINGS ARE

(By Irene Corbally Kuhn)

If I were a parent with a son at Princeton, I'd sure want my tuition money refunded. Recent student behavoir there indicates that the higher education, as practiced at Old Nassau is pitched to the kindergarten level. A few years ago Princeton undergraduates distinguished themselves by swallowing live goldfish. This year they are making the embarrassed but impotent university administration and the outraged alumni swallow a live, convicted perjurer, Alger Hiss. Something called the American Whig-Cliosophic Society has invited Mr. Hiss to talk to them on April 26.

Mr. Hiss, for those who came in late, will be remembered as the slick smoothie who rose so high in Government in the Roosevelt administration that he was virtually Mr. State Department. He was a man so intellectually able and with so many powerful friends and connections that it was a terrible shock to all Americans when he was accused of being a Communist agent. Americans just don't expect men with university degrees, high-type intellectuals, to be Communists. Why, it's like being called a Communist yourself to have a fraternity brother or someone high up in your own Government accused of being a Red—especially when the then Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Acheson, stood right up for him and said, "I will not turn my back on Alger Hiss."

Nevertheless, Mr. Hiss was convicted in 1951 of perjury for denying he had passed secret Government documents to Whittaker Chambers, another intellectual, but not considered as high-type-like as Mr. Hiss. Chambers was an admitted and repentant Communist who had been a courier for a Soviet spy apparatus.

The elegant, arrogant Alger might have got away with it if he hadn't pressed his luck too far and brazenly sued Chambers. It was then that Chambers, who had a few tricks of the trade left from his Communist espionage days, produced the "pumpkin papers," rolls of compromising microfilm he had kept hidden inside a pumpkin on his farm against such a contingency. The jury believed Chambers' evidence, and the slim and elegant Alger exchanged the diplomat's striped-pants uniform for the convict's stripes in the pokey for a 5-year term, shortened for good behavior. His parole ended last year, and now he is going to tell us, courtesy of Princeton, all about "The Meaning of Geneva."

As if we didn't know.

However, instead of getting mad at the wet-eared Princeton lad with the euphonious name of Bruce D. Bringgold, the debating group president who issued the invitation to Hiss, I think I'll just reserve a few sneers for the management.

When youths, still in their teens, living on parental allowances and bounty, behave in college like irresponsible, publicity-seeking jerks, it is ridiculous for the college administration to treat them as adults, and wash their hands piously of responsibility for their actions. But that's just what Princeton's president, Dr. Harold Willis Dodds has done. "The university administration believes it unwise to take the responsibility for the decision out of the hands of the student group that issued the invitation," he said.

The view that college undergraduates should be allowed to get away with any kind of stupid, irresponsible thing they feel like doing is a basic tenet of modern egghead philosophy. It's an extension of the extreme view the ultraprogressive educators have imposed on teachers everywhere for 25 years that children should be allowed to run hog wild and never be disciplined lest their growing little egos be stunted.

It must be that Princeton has a goodly number of undisciplined men with disorderly minds, for a straw poll of the undergraduate student body, and of faculty members, indicates that both favor the scheduled address of Hiss, the convicted perjurer.

One of the hallowed buildings on the Princeton campus is Nassau Hall, built 200 years ago, in 1756. It was a barracks and a hospital, during the American Revolution. It was a meeting place of the Continental Congress from June to November 1783.

Princeton doesn't deserve either hallowed building or hallowed memories. As New Jersey Congressman T. JAMES TUMULTY said, "'Old Nassau' will henceforth be 'Old Nausea.'"

Statement of Hon. Thomas J. Lane, of Massachusetts, in Support of H. R. 10344

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a splendid statement made by our colleague and my very good friend from Massachusetts, Mr. LANE, in support of H. R. 10344, introduced by Mr. LANE—

To establish the concurrent jurisdiction of the Federal Government and the States and Territories with respect to sedition against the Government of the United States, States, Territories, and their political subdivisions.

Which statement was made April 20, 1956, before Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Judiciary Committee.

There is no Member better versed on the subject matter of H. R. 10344 than our distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. LANE. I might also say there is no Member of the House more devoted in the performance of his duties to his people than my distinguished friend, Mr. LANE, of Massachusetts.

The bill which he introduced, and the statement he made in support of it are evidence of the fine character of service which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] renders.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN THOMAS J. LANE, DEMOCRAT, MASSACHUSETTS, SUPPORTING H. R. 10344, "TO ESTABLISH THE CONCURRENT JURISDICTION OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND THE STATES AND TERRITORIES WITH RESPECT TO SEDITION AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES, STATES, TERRITORIES, AND THEIR POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS," SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1 OF THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, APRIL 20, 1956

Mr. Chairman, in recent years we have witnessed a gradual erosion of States rights.

It goes without saying, that only the Federal Government can carry out certain functions, but the growing tendency to take over more and more authority, denying to the States even the right of cooperation, will lead to a topheavy centralization of power.

Amendment 10 to the Constitution provides that "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Under the Smith Act, passed by the Congress, the Federal Government is empowered to try and punish those who are accused and are found guilty of sedition.

The law does not specifically prohibit the States from taking such action under their own laws.

The Supreme Court of the United States has recently decided, but with a strong dissenting opinion by the minority, that only the Federal courts have jurisdiction in cases involving sedition.

This has paralyzed the initiative of those States which, under their own laws, have been most active in prosecuting sedition within their own borders.

In turn, this has weakened our total efforts to protect ourselves from the Communist conspiracy, and has had the effect of giving aid and comfort to the enemy.

The Communists are expert in exploiting every legal loophole to their advantage, and will continue to do so as long as we permit them to claim a conflict between Federal and State laws of this issue. Any division plays into their hands.

Obviously, State officials are more familiar with certain aspects of the problem, as well as having the additional facilities to prosecute sedition.

Furthermore, there is a precedent for joint Federal-State action.

Under the Volstead Act, both authorities moved in on violators of the prohibition laws.

Unfortunately, the Smith Act was loosely written.

This fact is generally recognized as a result of the Supreme Court's interpretation.

To compensate for this omission, several bills are up for consideration by the subcommittee.

One of them is H. R. 3 "to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws."

I submit that is language altogether too general.

It states "that no act of Congress shall be construed as indicating an intent on the part of Congress to occupy the field in which such act operates, to the exclusion of all State laws on the same subject matter, unless such act contains an express provision to that effect."

This covers all legislation.

It could have far-reaching applications, establishing the principle of precedence and priority on the part of the Federal Government "to occupy the field" if Congress so states. Without delegation of that power to the Federal Government by the States through amendment of the Constitution.

Secondly, H. R. 3 provides that, in cases of irreconcilable conflict between acts of Congress and State laws, the Federal law shall invalidate those contradictory provisions of the State laws.

We are primarily concerned here with the problem of sedition alone, and not dealing with possible legislation in which there might be an honest difference of opinion among our people, or progressive legislation which the several States might enact without fear of being subordinated in all cases to the will of Congress.

Again there is no conflict on the issue of sedition.

We need and want the most effective employment of our courts to try and punish sedition.

Acting in concert, we shall make sure that no Communist conspirators will escape.

Speaking in support of my bill, H. R. 10344, I want to emphasize that it is specifically limited to sedition.

And that it will establish a concurrent jurisdiction as among the Federal Government, the States, the Territories, and their political subdivisions, to make certain that the laws and the courts give us full protection against those who conspire to overthrow the Government by force and violence.

To ferret out the Communist intriguers, there must be specific authority under both Federal and State laws for this purpose.

H. R. 10344, by establishing concurrent jurisdiction with respect to sedition keeps us well on the target.

It avoids the suggestion that Congress might expressly provide for the exclusion of all State laws on the same subject matter.

It clearly removes any possibility of judicial conflict of authority in dealing with the Communist danger and without establishing rules of interpretation that might be used in similar circumstances, and regarding other issues as a subterfuge for weakening our cherished institutions.

I submit that H. R. 10344 is strictly to the point.

Military Reserve Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, George Washington once said:

Every citizen who enjoys the protection of a free government owes not only a proportion of his property but even his personal services to the defense of it.

Never before in our history was there more truth in those words than today. Though we hear a great deal of talk about changing Russian policies, the plain fact of the matter appears to be that we are in the cold war for a good long time. We must, therefore, prepare ourselves for the long haul. We must be patient. And the only thing that will defeat the patient plotters of the Kremlin is our own patient readiness.

Reserve training is the anwer. It enables us to build up a large, nonveteran Reserve through military training that is ready for the worst, yet pursuing the productive ways of normal, civilian life.

If this program is to succeed, its merits and purposes must be understood by the young men and their parents who will be involved. That is one of the main aims of Military Reserve Week.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including questions and answers on the Reserve program and Facts on Drafts Odds issued by the National Security Committee. This is the kind of material which I hope will be brought to the attention of all young men of this Nation during Military Reserve Week:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE NEW 6-MONTH RESERVE TRAINING PROGRAM AND MILITARY RESERVE WEEK

Question. When is Military Reserve Week?

Answer. April 22–28, 1956.

Question. What is Military Reserve Week?

Answer. Military Reserve Week is designed to focus attention on—and spur enlistments in—the 6-month Reserve training program.

Question. What is the new 6-month Reserve training program?

Answer. This is a new and practical concept of military service that enables young men to fulfill their military obligation by being full-time civilians and part-time soldiers. It enables young men to: (1) Plan when they want to go on active duty, and (2) fulfill their military obligation in their hometowns. The 6-month training program was authorized under the Reserve Forces Act which became effective on August 9, 1955. The purpose of this act is to assure those Ready Reserve Forces essential for our Nation's survival.

Question. How does this program work?

Answer. Young men between the ages of 17 and 18½ may enlist in the United States Army Reserve for a 6-month active duty training course. The basic training usually is done at the Army camp nearest his home. After completing the training course, the young man returns to civilian life. From that point on, he has only two obligations: (1) To train 2 hours a week at his local Reserve center; (2) to put in 2 weeks of training at an Army camp each year until he has completed a 7½-year period of Reserve duty.

Question. What opportunities does this program give to plan for the future?

Answer. By taking part in this program, a young man becomes draft proof. He can make definite plans for his education, for a job, for marriage and a family, but he must volunteer before he reaches age 18½.

Question. Can a young man fulfill his military obligation through this program?

Answer. A young man can fulfill his patriotic duty and his legal obligation—by serving only 6 months in a training camp, instead of the 2 years required of draftees. He is paid for all duty performed.

Question. Can he choose his unit?

Answer. Depending on a young man's aptitudes and the unit vacancies available, it is possible for him to pick the exact job he wants to be trained for during his 6-month basic course.

Question. Does a young man taking this program improve his job prospects?

Answer. Without the draft threat hanging over his head, a young man is a better prospect for an employer. The employer knows he is not going to be pulled off the job for 2 years service just when he becomes useful—the employer can plan on facts, not chance. What's more, the technical skills a young man learns in this program can help him to advance faster on the job.

Question. How does this program help him to make his educational plans?

Answer. A young man can enlist in the 6-month training program before he is 18½ but can postpone the 6 months' training until he graduates from high school. After his 6 months' training his further education will not be interrupted.

Answer. He must join before he is 18½ years of age, even though he does not actually go to training until age 19 or even 20. The decision must be made before age 18½ or he becomes liable to be drafted for 2 years after age 18½.

Question. What is the purpose of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955 and the 6-month Reserve training program?

Answer. Its purpose is to improve the measures by which our Reserve Forces may be so organized and trained that in the event of war they can be mobilized quickly to augment the Active Forces in combat and to carry out defense and internal security missions in the United States.

Question. Where will the 6 months of active duty for training be conducted?

Answer. The following installations will be utilized for basic training for the 6-month training program: Fort Ord, Calif.; Fort Jackson, S. C.; Fort Knox, Ky.; Fort Leonard Wood, Mo.; Fort Bliss, Tex.; and Camp Chaffee, Ark. Specialist training will then be conducted at appropriate specialist schools.

Question. Where will members of the reserve components train after the 6-month Reserve training program?

Answer. Training programs will be conducted in facilities such as Reserve training centers and armories, located throughout the country consistent with the need and budget approval. Reserve facilities of the Army will be expanded and new ones constructed. Annual active duty for training programs will be conducted at installations of the Active Forces, or in other military facilities as required to provide the necessary training.

Question. What tangible benefits accrue from Ready Reserve training?

Answer. The individual who participates in Ready Reserve training is entitled to pay. In addition, he is periodically considered for promotion and he may by satisfactory participation over a period of years qualify for retirement.

Question. Will a member of the Army Reserve who is precluded by distance, geography, or occupation from a 48-drill program be subject to the compliance measure for failure to participate?

Answer. No. He may apply for 30 days' active duty for training each year. This does not apply to the National Guard, all of whose members are required to attend scheduled drills and active duty for training. In proper cases, members of the National Guard may attend drills with units other than their own, perform appropriate duty, or obtain constructive credit for attendance.

Question. Will there be an opportunity for young men enlisting in the 6-month Reserve training program to qualify to become officers?

Answer. Yes. The act establishes the basis for such persons to attend officers candidate schools.

Question. Is the 6 months' trainee entitled to any veterans' benefits?

Answer. When a young man enters the 6 months' program, his enlistment is for "active duty for training" and as such he is not

considered a member of the Active Forces. He is, however, eligible for certain benefits such as reemployment rights, hospital and medical care, serviceman's indemnity payments, disability retirement, death gratuity, Veterans' Administration compensation or pension, payment for accrued leave, and Federal employees' compensation.

Question. What will be the function of the National Security Training Commission insofar as young men entering the 6 months' active duty for training program are concerned?

Answer. The act provides that the National Security Training Commission shall advise the President and the Secretary of Defense, and shall report annually to the Congress with respect to the welfare of persons performing the 6 months' period of active duty for training. The Commission has no authority with respect to the military training of the trainees. Within 60 days of enactment of this act, the Commission is required to submit to the Secretary of Defense a program containing recommendations for the personal safety, health, welfare, and morale of members of the Ready Reserve while performing active duty for training, including regulations concerning the dispensing of alcoholic beverages on training establishments in conformity with the laws of the several States.

FACTS ON DRAFT ODDS

Contrary to a very prevalent and very erroneous popular belief, today's young American can count on wearing a uniform before he reaches his 27th birthday if he is in good health, mentally normal, and has no criminal record, no children and no critical specialty. He may find himself in uniform even if he does have a critical specialty, or children. That is the conclusion that must be reached after a careful study of recent selective-service actions and military requirements.

It is a matter of very simple arithmetic.

Last year practically as many men without prior service entered the military service as qualified men were added to the selective-service manpower pool. Here are the facts:

There were 1,108,150 men added to the list of selective-service registrants in 1955. That was the total input in what might be called the overall manpower reservoir. Past experience indicates 40.7 percent of these individuals are unacceptable for military service because of physical, mental, or moral reasons. Of this number, then, approximately 657,000 are usable for military service.

Last year 533,000 non-prior-service men enlisted or were inducted. In addition, another 100,000 men (in round figures) enlisted in the National Guard, the Army Reserve, or were senior ROTC students with a contract obligation to enter active service upon graduation.

Roughly then, the military accepted 633 for every 657 men that became available. To put it mildly, these odds should not encourage a young man to the belief that he will not be called upon to don a uniform.

We do not mean to imply that all of the men that come under selective service last year are now wearing a uniform. They are not. We haven't touched as yet upon deferments, or upon the relatively small backlog that exists in this many-compartmented manpower reservoir. But if world conditions remain as they are at present, and if these men are qualified, they can certainly count on military service of some type before they reach age 27.

Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, the Director of Selective Service and probably the Nation's greatest authority on this country's manpower situation, recently made this statement:

"In the long view practically every young man must expect to be called upon for some kind of service in the Armed Forces."

Taking an entirely different approach to the picture, we see that Selective Service, in their annual report, list 1,542,189 men registered but not examined, as of December 1, 1955. Let's presume that we have a son who turned 18 years of age last year and registered for the draft. He is one of the men in the above pool.

What are his chances for military service, providing he does not volunteer?

If he has no physical, mental, or moral defect, he will be one of some 914,000 men remaining after the first screening. If this group are like their brothers were last year, well over 300,000 of them will enlist in one of the services, and thus remove themselves from the selective service available list. This leaves somewhere in the neighborhood of 600,000 in the pool with our son.

All of these men, however, are not going to be available. If the current rate of enlistment in the National Guard and the Army Reserve is maintained, the above figure will melt to less than 450,000 men. Another group will be deferred for one of the following: Dependency (III–A); students (I–S); occupational deferment (II–A); agricultural deferment (II–C); sole surviving son (IV–A); officials (IV–B); aliens (IV–C); and ministers or divinity students (IV–D).

Our son in now left in a pool that numbers slightly over 300,000. How many of these men will be called?

There are two major factors that determine this number. One is the world situation and the required strength of the services. Here again the wheel of chance spins rather lopsidedly for our boy if he wants to avoid military service. Most readers will admit that there are few signs of a bettering world condition as far as military requirements are concerned. The other variable that is difficult to predict accurately is the reenlistment rate of prior servicemen. If this rate is maintained as it is at present, and if there is no requirement for a buildup in any of the services, slightly less than 200,000 men will be drafted in 1956.

It is possible that our son will be in that pool for 7 years, waiting, never knowing for sure when he will receive his official "greetings." And if he is deferred, he remains in the pool until age 35, a total of 17 years. Each year the odds get tougher by reason of the fact that the older men are called first. The closer our son gets to age 26, the higher his priority on the draft board's list.

Look around your own neighborhood. Take one age group, those men born in 1931. They are, or will be 25 years of age this year. A study made by the Selective Service System as far back as 1953 showed that over 56 percent of them had been, or were in the military service. Today the percentage is higher.

It is doubtful if you know a man 25 years of age who has not had military service, and who is acceptable. If you do, he has been deferred because of occupation or dependency. And he is still sweating out the draft—still liable to be called, and will be to age 35.

From all of this it is apparent that the only sure way for a lad 17 to 18½ years to be able to plan his future, is to complete his military service as early as possible. The United States Army Reserve offers just that opportunity.

The Halo Is Slipping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Halo Is Slipping," published in the Sapulpa, Okla., Herald of February 19, 1956, relating to the veto of the natural gas bill and other matters.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HALO IS SLIPPING

That jarring and inexplicable shake experienced by Oklahoma day before yesterday was not an earthquake, as so many of our residents thought.

It was the thud of the halo, the tinsel, and the gilt falling from the shoulders of the President when he vetoed the vital gas bill under as extraordinary and out-of-focus bit of logic as ever assailed the hopes of the American race.

We lost a national hero and gained another politician.

It was a poor trade for America.

The reasons advanced by the President for his veto were, undoubtedly, the lamest ever advocated by our past rulers, or, at the best interpretation possible, equally as lame as any of bygone years.

It brings into focus the thought that legislation under the GOP set of rules is not based upon intrinsic merit per se but rather will be based upon the current interpretation of what is the politically expedient thing to do.

The pattern of philosophy which for many years shelved the Republican Party now comes back into view.

It was momentarily obscured when President Ike went into office.

His voice seemed to be that of a new vein of governmental philosophy in the ranks of the GOP.

Then came Dixon-Yates, Hells Canyon, and Ezra Benson.

And now the gas bill.

Vetoed because of arrogance.

Arrogance from an obscure source (fully documented by a Senator seeking a face-saving episode to change his vote) and which was not revealed until the time came for a desperate last-second maneuver to defeat the bill.

It shapes up as an interesting year—what with elections slated.

And could be the turning point.

History might record this the "Pickett's" charge in the realm of political warfare, a la GOP.

A lot more hopes and aspirations might have been gassed by this ill-advised veto than appears on the surface.

No, sir; that thud Oklahomans felt wasn't an earthquake.

It was a falling halo.

Alumni Warns on Hiss Invitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD the following editorial from the Hudson Dispatch, a distinguished newspaper in New Jersey:

ALUMNI WARNS ON HISS INVITATION

Princeton Alumni Association of North Jersey has warned Whig-Cliosophic Society, an undergraduate Princeton University organization, to think it over before going through with the invitation to Alger Hiss to speak before the group on April 26 to appraise the accomplishments at the Geneva

summit conference last July and compare same with the results of the Yalta session, the last of the World War II international meetings of the big three attended by Franklin D. Roosevelt.

In a half-page advertisement in Daily Princetonian on Friday, placed by the executive committee of the alumni unit, the Whig Society was told that if the invitation was not recalled and Hiss was allowed to talk at the meeting, it would hurt the raising of funds for unrestricted use of the university sponsored annually by the alumni.

The university officials have refused to interfere with the engagement despite protests from various sources. This position of "neutrality" by the university was upheld by the Undergraduate Council, which represents the students. On Thursday, New Jersey Department, American Legion, urged students to cancel the Hiss invitation.

In the meantime, Congressman T. JAMES TUMULTY, of the 14th District, reiterated his censure of the university officials for failure to stop the Hiss appearance.

Replying to taunts in Daily Princetonian that he was using the Hiss incident as a "rabble-rouser," the representative said again that the university officials should prevent the appearance of Hiss. He thought that there might be a sinister move behind this action of the Whig Society. He wanted to know who was responsible for getting the Princeton club to invite Hiss.

"I am convinced," he said, "that somebody wants Hiss there for a purpose and is using Princeton as a backdrop. If the faculty refuses to take any action to bar the speech, it will be a detriment to the university."

It may be that the representative's suspicion that there is a sinster source behind the Hiss invitation is well founded. It may not just be a spontaneous action by a naive undergraduate debating society.

We reiterate that Alger Hiss, only recently out of prison after serving a term for perjury, should not be allowed to address an undergraduate group at Princeton University or on any other campus. The Hiss case has more serious implications than his being found guilty of perjury. The perjury consisted of his denying he clandestinely arranged for secret papers to be transferred from the State Department at Washington to Whitaker Chambers, an admitted courier of Communist undercover agents. The name of Hiss is the very symbol of the subversive Communist activity in America, even though he was not convicted as a saboteur or subversive.

Since the trustees of Princeton University will meet on Friday, Congressman TUMULTY has suggested that Gov. Robert B. Meyner, an ex officio member, urge that body to overrule the Whig Society's action on Hiss. Seems like a good suggestion.

Principle or Pauperization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a very interesting editorial that appeared in the National Tribune-The Stars and Stripes, April 26, 1956.

The subject matter is one that is of vital interest to each Member of Congress and deserving of thoughtful and studious attention of all Americans:

PRINCIPLE OR PAUPERIZATION

The Bradley Commission, appointed more than a year ago by President Eisenhower to study and report on nonmedical veterans' benefits, has at long last released its report, and, as frequently predicted in this column, it confirms the worst fears of informed former servicemen and compares only with the proposals made nearly 25 years ago by the infamous Economy League. The Commission's findings are to be given to the President. If, as contemplated, the Chief Executive calls upon the Congress to enact the recommendations into law, and if the legislators are constrained to do so, the veteran class, as such, would be as dead as a dodo.

It would be impossible here to analyze completely in one writing the devastating extent of the group's conclusions. We have in this issue attempted to brief the 415-page report for the information of our readers, and, as events indicate, we shall doubtless have much more to say about the whole sordid business, because the entire substance of proposed treatment of this Nation's saviors and their dependents in future is as typically un-American as is the socialistic processes indulged in by Soviet Russia. Service-connected or not, every benefit to the veterans of this country, and to the dependents of their dead, would be geared to need. Those whose disabilities are not proved to have been service-incurred would, if the findings of the Commission are approved be tied in with social security. All distinctions as between the man or woman who served the country in war, and those who for any reason did not, would be wiped out, and a new deal would be built around service in the permanent Armed Forces with rank and length of service as the guiding principle.

There are to be further findings presented in addenda to the published report that has gone to the White House where its present content is fully known. Spokesmen for organized veterans have been thoroughly briefed, as promised, but with no right to interpose objections. Senate leaders, according to General Bradley, the Commission head, seem presently to be uninterested but the House Veterans' Committee has been fully advised of the report's content. We anticipate that most Congressmen who have the interests of war veterans at heart will agree with us that in its studies the Commission demonstrated a total disregard for the sacrifices that war entails and that its conclusions constitute a gross insult to those who have saved this Nation and its cherished institutions from enemy rape but who managed to return practically unscathed to civilian pursuits. We do not have nor would we offer any protests to proper care for discharged draftees, or enlistees—they, to, have their rights—but we do have a very high regard especially for those older veterans and their dependents who fought and won their wars without enjoying any of the extended privileges that had their advent with the end of World War II fighting. These classes of veterans proved their citizenship without regard to special inducements such as seem to have had the greatest bearing upon Commission thinking, and they will very properly resent the philosophy voiced in the Bradley recommendations. These people, according to the report, will all be poured into the social security melting pot along with the highly paid munitions and shipyard worker who was exempted from carrying a rifle and with the craven individual who somehow managed to avoid war service. Civil workers have earned and paid for their security insurance but this proposal, regardless of assertions to the contrary, would favor the coward over the lonely Joe who did his wartime duty, and the widow of the general or admiral would be treated with far more generosity than the now little old lady who lived from hand to mouth while her man was away at war furnishing what little he could from his meager pay to make up a limited allotment to keep her alive. We cannot agree that this can be accepted procedure in a land of plenty.

For one thing we must commend the Bradley Commission. It did adhere strictly to the scope of investigation sought by the President when he named its members and dictated its duties. The study was most thorough along lines calculated to make Mr. Average Citizen believe that veteran costs will eventually be unbearable and that he who did not actually suffer injury or disease in uniform will wreck the national economy. And it sought to sell the false bill of goods, so often heralded these days, that the farmer serviceman lives in a land of milk and honey whereas he has no more claim upon his fellowmen than any other person who approaches the age of fear engendered by insecurity. We also see good in the report that found more realistic payments should be made to the badly disabled and that the family man requires more aid than one who enjoys single blessedness, but the failures in the recommendations tie in the false suppositions that were followed.

Significant changes have taken place in society in recent years, the probers say. True, there are more of us and we have more of the world's goods, but there have been no fundamental alterations in our way of life, there will always be the rich and the poor, the good and the bad, the industrious and the indolent; it is false idealism to attempt to place all in the same social pot and let it boil. Veterans and their families will soon be in the majority, they say. That is absolute rot. So long as we have wars, there will be more veterans, but they have always been and will always be in the minority unless a plague halts a population growth and a universal draft is necessary. Conditions of military service have bettered, it is asserted, but while they have lessened the hazards and reduced death rates, a dead soldier is still just as dead as ever and modern weapons have made the fighting of wars more horrible and their aftereffects more lasting both physically and mentally. And, certainly, new conditions as defined can have no relation to veterans of our earlier wars. It is alleged that veterans are better off economically than nonveterans; in spite of methods followed in Commission studies, we can easily and successfully challenge that finding. Changes in security requirements, it is true, do call for larger armed services, but that does not make peacetime duty as hazardous as service in wartime. Spending, as charged, has been stepped up, but the care of the veteran class is as much a part of the costs of war as are the guns that kill, and it appears we still have enough money in the till to rehabilitate the world, including those enemy countries that hatched the wars in the first place. The Nation, we agree, has been generous to its defenders and their loved ones, and, for a time, costs will mount in maintaining that generosity, but that is no argument for a change in national policy that would detract from the demonstration of patriotic zeal, and one that has worked so well since the country's birth, and to substitute for it a philosophy that so levels off all factors that draft-dodging would be considered an honorable profession.

If, indeed, it should be agreed that the entire system of dealing with war veterans must be overhauled—and we cannot for a moment see any justification for such a demand—we would still consider the proposals of the President's Commission unthinkably cruel. When General Eisenhower said a year ago that he was in full accord with the pension policy followed by the United States since the Revolutionary War, he must have uttered the words with tongue in cheek or he could not have instructed

his Commission to come in with the sort of findings it has returned; and if anybody questions that statement, let him read, as General Bradley did last week, somewhat apologetically we thought, the injunctions given to the factfinders on March 5, 1955. The seven-man group could not do other than it did while engaging in its studies with the help of $300,000 and a professional and administrative staff of 54 members. If its conclusions were faulty and its assumptions unsound, it is because its directives were restricted. But if veterans' benefits and the treatment of dependents were to be given an entirely new approach, the age factor, which was not considered, should be the most important of all elements, and a distinct starting point should be found. From Civil War dependents on down to veterans of the Korean war and their loved ones, all are to be given exactly the same treatment under the newly proposed arrangement. That is as arrogant as it is preposterous. It is equivalent to denying a person insurance, after his premiums are fully paid, and only because he purchased some other type of protection. It makes paupers out of men and women who have earned the right to every consideration their country can afford to give them. It is faithlessness personified, base ingratitude, and dishonest from every standpoint. Promises made should be kept if our countrymen would maintain their decency and the Government its honor.

As greatly as any others, younger groups of veterans are as much to blame for the threat that faces their older comrades today as are any politicians, public servants or other despoilers of their earned privileges. They were weaned on the sour pickle that was voiced so often when they entered uniform in recent years, "Citizens first, veterans second," and they came to attach to the expression something never intended. By their ready acceptance of some of this strange new philosophy, which they will cast aside in abhorrence if or when they, too, reach an hour of need, they have given credence to a false theory that one who seeks Government aid after full and unselfish service to country is diluting his citizenship. The record, of course, speaks for itself. Most of the older war veterans now living proved their love of country before Junior was born.

A short time ago President Eisenhower told the leaders of his political party that regardless of what he does and irrespective of what others might think, whatever he approves will be based upon sound principle and his belief in the right. The next move is up to him. The Bradley group has made its findings and has recommended courses to be followed. They are in most part totally unacceptable to the veteran class. The Chief Executive can disregard them in whole or in part, or he can ask that the Congress enact them into law. On that decision rests the conclusion as to whether this Nation is to be requested to believe in high endowments or whether it will hereafter be asked to resort to dollar expediency and the pauperization of its warriors.

An Address by Former President Herbert Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following address delivered by former President Herbert Hoover before the Inter-American Bar Association, Dallas, Tex., on Monday evening, April 16. In this speech Mr. Hoover has sketched briefly and concisely a penetrating picture of the "world experiences with the Karl Marx way of life."

WORLD EXPERIENCE WITH THE KARL MARX WAY OF LIFE

(Address by Herbert Hoover)

I am naturally awed before a convention so representative of the legal profession from the whole Western Hemisphere.

I am not, however, going to attempt to improve your legal minds. I give you this reassurance, lest you fear that I might try reprisals from the brainwashing that I have had continuously from your profession for nearly 60 years. But every lawyer, like every engineer, by the nature of his profession, is interested in every phase of government, of economics and of social life—or he ought to be.

OUR COMMON PROBLEMS IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

We in this hemisphere have had many problems in common. For more than a centurn and a half, we had a common struggle to shake off colonialism. We have had the problems of maintaining defense of our hemisphere from reassertion of European or Asiatic domination right down to this hour. We have had need to establish our own distinctive form of representative government. And it differs widely from that of our European forebears. We have had to develop new protections to personal freedom on a better pattern than those brought from Europe.

We have had common problems in the development of our natural resources to improve the standards of living, and the general welfare of all our people.

We have sought to make this hemisphere a refuge for the oppressed of all mankind. These problems have haunted us since we began our independence. We have learned much from each other's successes and failures.

ENTER KARL MARX

But a new problem has come across the Atlantic to plague us during the past 50 years. That was the invasion of Karl Marx Socialism. While I do not credit him with the original discovery of this philosophic virus, yet he can be credited as its chief carrier. And today its blight takes many shapes and forms over the world.

COMMUNISM

I do not need to take your time with a discussion of the theory and practice of the Communist variety of socialism. Today it is rotting the souls of two-fifths of mankind. The threat to freemen of Red colonialism, with a supply of fission bombs, needs no emphasis from me. The unity of free nations is the only certain defense.

But the Red citadel in Moscow is right now carrying on aggression against the Western Hemisphere by conspiracies among our fuzzy-minded to overthrow our governments. They compromise a cult of disloyalty. Almost daily do we need pluck out these disgusting things which have crawled into our governments.

For the last year the Kremlin has been exuding peace and good will toward all men. But I have not observed that they have called off these conspiracies and corruptions. In the last month the men in the Kremlin have turned Stalin's face violently to the wall. Their next step to righteousness would be to give us the names and addresses of all his collaborators in the Western Hemisphere.

However, without such a gracious act we can take care of this particular manifestation of Karl Marx—although it is a good deal of a nuisance.

The picture of Karl Marx still appears everywhere in Russia in the place of the old religious icons. Possibly the Russians have not read Karl Marx' writings very attentively. In letters to his friend Engels in January 1869, Marx said: "I do not trust any Russian." Also, he said: "As soon as a Russian worms his way in all hell breaks loose." Possibly in time they will discover that they invented socialism prior to Marx and turn his picture to the wall also.

THE LEGALISTIC SOCIALISTS

But it is on the other forms of socialism that I propose to speak briefly on this occasion. The advocates of these other forms proclam that their difference from the Communists is that they would attain their ends by making use of the legal processes of our free institutions.

Recently a meeting was held in Europe of representatives of legalistic Socialists from different nations. They said that they did not like the Communists. Also they kept Karl Marx's picture on the wall. After all, they maintain his philosophy—only they would tread softly. However, every convention has a right to its own Utopia.

Over recent years the words "socialism" and "Socialist" have become unpopular words in most of the Western Hemisphere. Many of our political parties under the name "Socialist" have declined or have been abandoned. They no longer have the courage to proclaim their principles as does the Socialist Labor Party in England. That party frankly declares that its purpose is "Government ownership and operation of all of the agencies of production, distribution and exchange."

OUR NEW MARXIAN CULTS

Instead of frank advocates, our Socialists have developed new and disguised cults in many of our Western Hemisphere countries. These new cults prowl around under many fronts. They are like hermit crabs. They crawl into our long-accepted phrases and proclaim their sole ownership of human progress. They claim to be "liberals" and "progressives," they vociferously advocate real "democracy" and "public welfare." They have a fondness for the threatening word "action" in the titles of their political organizations.

Our Western Hemisphere nations have stood for the true, and a far more wholesome, definition of such terms and principles, for a century before these hermit crabs were born. And this hermit crab habit is not confined to words and phrases. They crawl into some of our many associations of citizens advancing some cause. Their leadership embraces the Socialist-minded and those who would flirt with Karl Marx. But they include many persons who are genuinely seeking a better world. I do not believe that 1 in 50 of the members of their captive groups detects the disguise of Karl Marx.

However, some of these cults and fronts are less subtle in their phrases. They advocate "managed economy," "nationalization" of a particular industry, and "public electric power."

I could give them another phrase for use by their cult—that is "statism." But the Socialist-minded shy away from such a disclosure of the Karl Marx parentage.

OUR WESTERN HEMISPHERE'S ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY

I suggest to you that we in the Western Hemisphere have developed an economic and social philosophy of our own far different from our old world inheritances. It has brought fabulous blessings to this hemisphere. And for that matter, it is far different from the philosophies against which Karl Marx developed his virus.

I submit to you that our system may be defined as "private enterprise regulated to prevent monopoly and unfair competition."

Freemen can no more permit private economic power without checks and balances than governmental power without checks and balances.

And to my definition I would add that "the state must undertake business enterprises in great national emergency or because the size of the undertaking is beyond the abilities of its citizens."

And I submit to you that this philosophy of economic freedom is an indivisible of all freedoms. You cannot extend the mastery of government over the daily life of men without making it the master of the people's thoughts and souls.

THEIR DISGUISED INFILTRATION

Yet the legalistic Socialists with their disguises claim they can maintain all freedoms except economic freedom. These variegated cults promote creeping socialism through centralizing government and thus weakening the strength of local government. They strive to absorb the income of the people by unnecessary spending and exorbitant taxes.

They seek to continue and amplify the government business enterprises undertaken in crises or in wars after their emergency tasks are completed. Most of these continuing government businesses pay no taxes, seldom pay interest on the taxpayer's capital invested in them or pay any return of the capital itself. Thus by any definition they are unfair competition with taxed and regulated enterprise and tend to drive it from the field.

These cults and fronts work to expand every other form of bureaucratic empire. They divert well-meaning associations into pressure groups seeking for special privilege.

All of which dulls the initiative and enterprise of the people. And it undermines the safeguards of free men.

WORLD EXPERIENCE WITH LEGALISTIC SOCIALISM AND ITS NEW CULTS

The world in our own times has had some experience with these legalistic Socialists and where their cults and fronts can lead.

THE SOCIALIZATION OF ENGLAND

We have witnessed the great attempt legally to socialize England. There it so reduced the productivity of the British people as to contribute to years of so-called "austerity." That was simply a polite phrase to cover their constant reduction of the standard of living of all the people by compulsion from the state. Furthermore, the British Socialists touched the Communist ideal when they passed a law compelling labor to work at jobs designated by the state. Fortunately the British people have revolted from it. But they have inherited continuing injuries to their economic and social life.

THE FRENCH EXPERIMENT

We witnessed another variety of Karl Marx tainted experiment in France. Lenin advocated parliamentary coalitions of the Communists with the Socialists and the other dupes of Karl Marx's disguises. Such was the Front Populaire of the Blum regime. Under it the economic and moral life of France was so degraded as to contribute to the humiliating defeat of France in World War II. France still suffers from its aftermaths.

THE CASE OF THE EIGHT SATELLITE STATES

But there is another experience in legalistic socialism or its cults and fronts in the world of even greater tragic consequence.

The peoples of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, Hungary, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia have descended from free men into the abyss of communism. There were many steps in common among them during the years of their descent into slavery. And the impulse which the legalistic Socialists or their fronts gave to their downfall has been too little observed.

I have had occasion to deal intimately with the peoples in many of these onetime 8 nations at intervals over more than 40 years.

The first time was prior to the First World War. I practiced my profession among many of them when they were subject to the old empires of Russia, Austria, and Germany.

The second time was a few years later in 1918 and 1919. Immediately after the First World War, these states had established their independence from the old empires, with constitutional guaranties of personal liberty and representative government. My duty was to relieve a great famine and aid in their reconstruction on behalf of the Allied Governments.

The third time was 19 years later when in 1938 I visited most of them to study why many of them had gone Fascist.

The fourth time was 8 years later, in 1946, when all but 1 of these 8 states had gone Communist and that 1 was on the way. That contact with most of them was on a mission on behalf of the United States Government to relieve the great postwar famine.

THE FIRST STAGE OF THEIR DESCENT TOWARD THE ABYSS

We may first examine the forces in motion in their descent to Fascism. There was a pattern roughly common to all of these nations, except one, in their descent from freedom into the Fascist furnace of human rights. It was not always parallel in timing or in sequent steps.

All these nations made progress in every avenue of life during their early years of freedom after the First World War. But at once the Socialists and their various cults and fronts and the Communists organized fractional political parties with representation in their parliaments. The Socialists professed dislike for the Communists, but they joined them in advocating nationalization of industry and one of their joint slogans was "managed economy." Pressure groups of farmers, of labor, of business grew apace, each seeking parliamentary representation. With these fractional political parties came the next phase. That was impotent parliamentary coalition governments.

The net result of this stage was to create hesitation, uncertainty and fear in every avenue of free enterprise. It made impotent the individual judgment of men. These poisons weakened the initiative, the vitality and the productivity of their people. Unemployment became chronic. More and more statism was injected as its remedy. Coalition governments could agree only on more spending in frantic efforts to care for the unemployed. Debts, taxes and inflation grew apace.

SEVEN OF THE EIGHT NATIONS GO FASCIST

With all these confusions the people themselves, except in Czechoslovakia, welcomed a strong or mild Fascist man-on-horseback with his beatific promises. The Fascists bitterly denounced the Communists but they embraced much from Karl Marx in their programs. And private enterprise was still further eroded away by regimentation.

THE EIGHT NATIONS GO COMMUNIST

Just before the Second World War, Stalin took the three Baltic States with their mild Fascist governments into his Communist bosom by violence. In the latter stages of the war, as Stalin's armies moved westward following the defected Germans, he set up provisional governments in four more of these nations. He agreed with the Western Allies that their ministries should include representation of all the democratic "elements" in addition to the Communists. But when it all washed out, the only so-called democratic elements in these ministries were picked selections from legalistic Socialists. And even these have been expelled or executed.

The last of these nations to go under was Czechoslovakia. It had followed all the patterns except full fascism. It finally fell by a coalition of the extreme Socialists and Communists which seized the ministry and the democratic "elements" escaped or were assassinated or imprisoned.

One cannot say that the legalistic Socialists or their cults and fronts were wholly responsible for the descent of these eight nations into the Communist pit.

But one thing is certain—and that is that from the beginning of their independence, the Socialists and their cults joined with the Communists to sabotage freemen. Certainly the Socialists helped to build the boarding ladders by which the Communist pirates took over the Ship of State. And perhaps the ghost of the Atlantic Charter, by which those nations were assured freedom, now listens to the clank of their chains.

OUR WESTERN HEMISPHERE EXPERIENCE

I believe that if looked at broadly there is a proof of these conclusions within the Western Hemisphere itself. I think you will find it is a fairly general rule that those of our countries which have the highest standard of living and freedom have today shed the most statism. Each of you can name these states for yourself.

THE NET OF OUR WORLD EXPERIENCE

Thus, there are some conclusions that we might learn from these years of world experience with the Karl Marx virus-infected civilization.

Despite many setbacks and all the disguises of Karl Marx, we in this hemisphere have in the main sustained the dynamic incentives and creative energies of regulated economic life. We have thereby made it a better place for the masses of our people to live than anywhere else in the world.

Certainly the exhibits of Karl Marx elsewhere would not indicate that his philosophy has anywhere produced a Utopia.

WHAT OF RELIGIOUS FAITH?

There is far more to all this than just economics. Some people seem to forget that the primary dogma of Karl Marx was atheism and substitution of economic materialism for religious faith. It denies the existence of God. It defiles the ideals and spirit of men.

For 6,000 years, since the beginning of recorded time, every civilized race has believed in a Supreme Being. They have realized that the laws which control the orderly movement of the stars were not economic materialism.

Religious faith is deeply imbedded in our Western Hemisphere civilization. The Sermon on the Mount established the transcendent concept of compassion and good will among men. From those principles have come our moral foundations, our obligations as our brothers' keepers, and our respect for the dignity of man.

I would not have you think that I believe our civilization is perfect, or that we do not have a multitude of problems if we would improve the life and invigorate the spirit of our peoples. But these problems can be solved only by freemen. And I prefer to go forward with the philosophy of Christ to that of Karl Marx.

THE FUTURE OF OUR HEMISPHERE

And there are mighty hopes before us.

The last dozen years have seen advances in science, invention, and technology which amount almost to revolution in our life and world relations.

If we maintain free minds, free spirits, and direct our steps aright, still other new horizons and new frontiers will open to us. New scientific discoveries, new inventions, and

new applications of old knowledge will come to us daily.

These new frontiers give us other blessings. Not only have they taken great burdens from the backs of men and expanded the standards of living of all our people. They have opened new opportunities and new areas of adventure and enterprise. They open new vistas of beauty. They also unfold the wonders of the atom and the heavens. Daily they prove the reality of an allwise Supreme Giver of Law.

South Riding Back Seat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Aiken Standard Review, published in Aiken, S. C., recently ran a most interesting and thought-provoking editorial on the political problems now confronting the South as the result of its blind allegiance to the national Democratic Party through all the long expensive years of the New Deal and the Fair Deal.

Since this editorial suggests methods whereby the South can once again exercise an important and prevailing influence in our national elections, I take pleasure in calling it to the attention of the country and the Congress. I ask to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH RIDING BACK SEAT

Senator MUNDT, Republican from South Dakota, was probably trying to stir up trouble in the Democratic Party recently with his statement on the problem of the South and the party.

Regardless of his intentions, he hit the nail squarely on the head in almost every comment he said and especially when he stated "the South is weary of riding in a political automobile which it can never steer."

The South Dakotan, said the restlessness of Southern States as being "straitjacketed" in the grip of "a one-party system which rejects its policies, and resents its political leadership" hit its height in 1952 when four Southern States voted for Eisenhower.

This year, he said, "is likely to witness a similar revolt of Jeffersonian Democrats in Dixie." MUNDT said this group has "about had enough of the Rooseveltian formula of pitching the party policy to attract Northern minorities while relying on Southern docility and political prejudice to furnish over 100 electoral votes in each election."

The racial controversy, he said, is but one manifestation of the "wide-open split" between Northern and Southern Democrats.

"Actually," he added, "There is a whole pattern of programs and policies which Stevenson, Harriman, Kefauver, and the Democratic National Committee offer as 'lures' to Northern voters in big metropolitan eastern cities which are repugnant to the States rights advocates who predominate among Southern voters."

MUNDT said that the Southern resentment at their "one-party political trap" is increased by the knowledge that 8 of the 9 Justices of the Supreme Court who handed down the decision against racial segregation in public schools were appointed by Democratic Presidents.

He said that the recent manifesto of Southern Members of Congress, "if it means anything at all, is a warning shot over the prow of the ship manned by Northern Democrats that the days of docility and blind obedience to the demands of their city-machine associates are over."

While MUNDT's comment may be aimed at stirring trouble in the Democratic Party of the South he has nevertheless called a spade a spade and has gone further in outlining the problem that some of our own representatives and party spokesmen who place seniority and blind party loyalty above the will of the people of this State and section of the country.

Israel Celebrates Eighth Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, while we in the United States marked the eighth anniversary of Israel's independence recently in a state of calm and peace, those within the borders of that embattled nation were also celebrating. But in Israel the birthday was overshadowed by the threat of war and the tension which must necessarily grip a people whose very future hangs in the balance. Nevertheless, with characteristic fortitude and enthusiasm, the citizens of Israel proceeded to give thanks and celebrate the eighth anniversary of the independence which means so much to all men of good will the world over.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a short article from Israel Speaks of April 20, 1956, which describes the tension-filled anniversary in the Holy Land:

NATION CELEBRATES EIGHTH BIRTHDAY

Israel celebrated the eighth anniversary of her independence in an atmosphere of tension and expectancy much like that which reigned when the State came into being. In celebrations throughout the country the people expressed readiness to repulse any invasion. Economies marked the external aspects of the festivities, but the people made up in their spirit for whatever material displays may have been wanting.

The traditional memorial ceremony took place on the eve of Independence Day at the military cemetery on Mount Herzl, overlooking Jerusalem and its approaches—the site of battles that took the lives of many of those buried there. The speaker of the Knesset, Mr. Joseph Sprinzak, whose son was among the fallen, addressed the assembly in the presence of bereaved parents and citizens. A guard of honor was mounted by crack paratroopers; eight salvos were fired and the flag was lowered to half mast, lighted by a single searchlight glowing against a backdrop of spreading darkness.

More than 250,000 Israelis watched a parade of defense forces in Haifa on Independence Day. The crowds cheered as jet planes swooped and circled overhead and heavy guns rumbled along the streets. A number of new arms were seen, including a submachinegun, Uzi, designed by an Israeli army captain, which has become a standard weapon in the Israel army. The troops wore their new summer uniform, of olive green khaki, similar to the one already used by Israel paratroopers.

FOLK FESTIVAL

Dancing and singing in the streets, artistic performances, torchlight processions, athletic displays, fireworks, and every other form of popular merriment marked the day. Kol Yisrael transmitted special programs on wavelengths increased for the occasion. Folk dancers representing Israel's many communities performed their ethnic dances in colorful costumes.

There were no elaborate grandstands for spectators this year. Makeshift seating was provided for some 6,000 tourists and 2,000 Israelis. But many of these gave up their seats in a spontaneous movement to enable border settlers to watch the military parade in relative comfort.

The celebrations were not limited to the big cities—there was much merrymaking in the villages, kibbutzim, moshavim, and above all, in the lonely border outposts.

The shadows of war were lengthening over the land, but Israelis hailed their independence, and vowed to defend it with their blood.

Wilkes-Barre Girl Nation's Fastest Key Punch Operator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Record of Wednesday, April 18, 1956, which discloses that Mrs. Isabelle Langan, of Wilkes-Barre, has been described as the Nation's No. 1 key punch operator which has enabled the Federal Government to have over $10,000 in the past 4 years.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my congratulations to this loyal and talented public servant whose remarkable record is a goal toward which others may strive.

NATION'S FASTEST KEY PUNCH OPERATOR CITED

The Nation's fastest key punch operator, Mrs. Isabelle Langan, 25, of 177 McLean Street, has been commended by the Government for her speed which has saved the Government $10,393 in the last 4 years.

Described as a natural born puncher, in which she uses her hands to punch a machine, not pugilists, Mrs. Langan nevertheless is considered a prizefighter for Government economy.

Employed in the Wilkes-Barre section of the Report Processing Branch of the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance of the Social Security Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare located on the ninth floor of the Veterans' Administration Building, North Main Street, Mrs. Langan daily punches out cards with holes at a tremendous speed.

As a key punch operator, she sits at an IBM machine all day long striking the keyboard and producing cards with oblong holes punched in them. The cards become a record of the quarterly earnings of every wage earner in the country.

The Bureau has figured that when an employee punches 240 cards an hour, she has performed minimum requirements. If she punches 350 she is downright superior.

But Mrs. Langan, through her uncanny skill, has averaged over the last 4 years 577 cards per hour. Furthermore, she makes less than 3 errors per thousand cards as compared with 13 mistakes for the average operator.

The Bureau figures the $10,393 was saved in persons who didn't have to be hired, machines that didn't have to be purchased, and mistakes that didn't have to be corrected.

Mrs. Langan earns about $3,300 a year. As a key puncher she is way down on the totem pole of Government employees. But she is living proof that little people can sometimes do big things.

In recognition of her prowess, Mrs. Langan was honored at an award dinner along with 21 other Government employees at a Baltimore Hotel last Friday night. She will receive a cash award of $140 in recognition of her production speed and accuracy. She previously received awards totaling $600.

A graduate of Hanover Township High School in 1949, where she excelled in typing classes, Mrs. Langan has been employed by the Government for 5½ years.

She was married to William Langan, Jr., a Fleetwood Airflow employee, 4 years ago. They have one son, Daniel, 2. Her mother, Mrs. Mamie Stemplewski, lives at Korn Krest.

Mrs. Langan will celebrate her birthday anniversary today.

Continuing the Policy of the United States Concerning Certain International Injustices in the World

SPEECH
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I supported House Resolution 370, introduced by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY]. The able chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee has given a most explicit explanation of the purposes of House Resolution 370. He has pointed out that the purpose of this resolution is to make clear the policy of the United States with respect to Germany, Korea, and Vietnam, and the basic policy of our Government toward all people who are today denied human freedom and the right to national independence.

Germany, Korea, and Vietnam all stand as victime of a crude experiment in Russian surgery. Each of these nations has been divided by Russian military action and Communist aggression. Germany was divided during the twilight sleep of the West when the Russians were posing as our allies and when it was believed that a defeated enemy could only be controlled by four-power occupation. The Western powers many years back recognized that the German people had demonstrated a fine capacity for democratic self-government and that there was no further reason to maintain occupation forces in that country. But the cunning Russians who seek neither a democratic Germany nor a representative government in Germany, have continued to occupy a part of Germany and have even set up a stooge government in the part of Germany they occupy for the purpose of carrying out subversive and other illegal activities against free Germany. Thus the Russian Communists alone are responsible for an unnatural and unjust division of the German people.

In Korea we find practically the same set of circumstances applying as those which brought about the division of Germany. The Russians were granted military jurisdiction of Korea north of the 38th parallel until such time as a treaty of peace was arranged with Japan and stability established in the Far East.

Moscow used this advantage granted by the West in order to launch a war of aggression against free Korea and in particular, against its former Allies, the United States, Great Britain, and France. The Communist war of aggression in Korea brought great suffering and hardship to the Korean people. We Americans will never forget that thousands of our youth died a hero's death in the defense of freedom on the cold battlefields of Korea. It is with sadness that we recall to memory the fact that a precarious truce which was arranged in 1953 still recognizes the cruel handiwork of the Russian Communists which continues the division of the Korean nation.

In Vietnam the agents of Moscow got control of the national independence movement which opposed French colonial rule and ultimately brought about a state of war. The same Russian agents were supplied with arms, ammunition, tanks, and soldiers by the Communist Chinese, and their Russian bosses. This same unholy trio brought about a Geneva Conference in which the French Government ceded part of Vietnam to Communist occupation. In the southern part of Vietnam, which remained in French hands, there has lately arisen a great and patriotic leader of the people who is completely dedicated to democratic principles and to government of the people, by the people, and for the people. This new leader, President Diem, is dedicated to the goal of a free, independent, and united Vietnam.

The people of Germany, the people of Korea, and the people of Vietnam seek the common goals of political freedom, self-determination and independence. It is in this spirit that they seek reunification of their homelands now divided by the tyranny of Russian surgery.

I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] that the people of Germany, Korea, Vietnam, and Japan should, and of right ought to be represented in the councils of the United Nations. The Russian efforts to deny the German people, the Korean people, the Vietnamese people, and the Japanese people this right deserves the condemnation of all mankind.

This resolution reaffirms the long-standing policy of the United States Government in support of all people who seek freedom and independence from Russian and Chinese Communist bondage. The now famous McCormack resolution, which Congress passed unanimously last year, stated, in unmistakable terms, the rights of all people and nations to freedom, self-determination, and independence. House resolution 370 gives specific application to the principles of the McCormack resolution to the people of Germany, Korea, and Vietnam. These are time-honored principles in support of which the people of the United States have shed their blood here at home and on foreign battlefields, and our unwavering support of which have brought us the approbation and prayerful thanks of people everywhere in the world.

The distinguished chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], has summarized the compelling purposes of this resolution by stating that we must continue to nurture in the hearts and minds of the enslaved peoples their hopes for freedom and independence and that this can best be done through expressions of the executive branch, through expressions of Congress, and through public expressions. Our colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] points out that passage of this resolution has served notice on the world, at a time when a massive effort is being made to bury the long and cruel record of Communist crimes against humanity, that we continue to recognize that there are in this modern world grave injustices which remain uncorrected. He emphasizes that we, as a Nation and people, must avoid any action which will tend to perpetuate these wrongs and must engage in undertakings which give promise of correcting the inhumanities and grave injustices which now bar the way to a just and lasting peace.

John L. Lewis' Visit to Wilkes-Barre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Record, Wednesday, April 11, 1956, in which the newspaper comments on the recent visit to Wilkes-Barre of John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers of America:

JOHN L. LEWIS' VISIT

It is a far cry to 1906 when John L. Lewis, now long since the veteran president of United Mine Workers of America, took on his first official assignment for his union—as delegate to the UMWA convention. During the ensuing 50 years and more particularly since he became president in 1920, Mr. Lewis has made numerous visits to Wilkes-Barre, but usually they have been spaced far enough apart to give each the character of an event. Mr. Lewis paid a surprise visit to Wilkes-Barre on December 15, 1953, and made his first call to the then newly located UMWA district office, 165 South Franklin Street. Always he comes with a definite purpose on behalf of his union and its members.

So when Mr. Lewis unheralded arrived at the Hotel Sterling on Monday, immediately official importance was attached to his appearance here. On that score there were no advance announcements, but with yester-

day's meeting of the Committee of 12—the members of which are hard coal operators and UMWA officials—came confirmation of a report that the conference was related to more uniform working time throughout the industry.

Clearly this cannot be an overnight achievement. Recognized as a prerequisite for success is revision of the present allocation plan, and to use the language of the official announcement, the task of revision, entrusted to a committee, is "an effort to make it (the allocation plan) a more effective instrument."

Mr. Lewis termed the meeting constructive. Of special interest was his reply "No" when asked by a reporter if the 1952 union contract with operators had been opened or if an opening of it was discussed.

As viewed by Harry J. Connolly, chairman of the Committee of 12, the meeting yesterday was concerned with taking joint action by the UMWA and the operators "endeavoring to expand the markets existing in anthracite and improving the conditions existent in the industry." Attainment of this objective would promise direct benefits not only to the industry and its employees but also to the region.

Basically labor-management relations in the anthracite industry are the product of many years of experience. The stability was suggested yesterday by the reminder that the Committee of 12 has been functioning for upward of 26 years, a degree of permanency that is an augury of success for its newest and apparently harmonious undertaking.

We Do Not Want Vigilantes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the throwing of sulfuric acid into the face and eyes of Victor Riesel, who has exposed many a labor racketeer, was not an isolated act. It was characteristic of the methods of the vicious gangsters who so frequently, by beatings, bombings, sometimes by murder, have sought to silence those who exposed their lawlessness, their stealing of welfare funds, the misuses of union dues.

Ever since the gangsters attained nationwide power in organizations like the Chicago Capone crime syndicate, they have frequently, without punishment, made good their boast that those who exposed them would be silenced.

Many a gangster, turned informant, has been executed by the gang. The recent attempt to silence Riesel obviously came from the same source.

Nor have police officers been exempt from the decrees of the gangsters. Well do I recall that, when a legislative committee held hearings in Chicago in an attempt to ascertain from whence came the pressure back of the paroling of the 4 Capone gangsters, 2 certifying police officers were threatened with physical violence. Not long thereafter, one, Captain Drury, when on his way to furnish another committee with information about the gang, was cooly and deliberately slain.

Others, sometimes officers charged with enforcement of the law, sometimes reporters or newspaper publishers or editors, have met a similar fate.

Time and time again have legislative committees, State investigatory bodies, called to the attention of the public this lawlessness which apparently has known no limits. If we continue to permit gangsters to ignore the law, to beat and to kill not only their own associates who inform against them, but innocent individuals whose only fault is that they speak or publish the truth about crime—if men like Victor Riesel are to be murderously assaulted—how long will it be before men like Pegler, Clark Mollenhoff, and others who publish or speak the truth about these gangsters will be likewise permanently injured or removed from the scene?

If those charged with the enforcement of the law fail in their duty because of lack of public support—if that situation worsens, will not otherwise law-abiding citizens attempt to retaliate by lawless punitive acts? Will not a situation develop similar to that which existed in the West when outraged citizens acting in defense of their rights organized and without legal procedure hung or shot those who over-long wilfully disregarded all law? Drifting into such a situation is unthinkable. The cowardly assault on Victor Riesel—a courageous fearless writer—should be another warning to law enforcement officials to fully perform their sworn duty.

One remedy for the threat to our freedom is to elect to law-enforcing offices only those who, regardless of threats of physical violence or political execution, have the will, the ability, the courage, the determination to see that all laws are enforced without fear or favor.

That remedy has worked in Berrien County, in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, where two prosecutors, Joe Killian and Jack Spelman, with the assistance of Sheriff Kubath and fearless judges, have successfully demonstrated that the unlawful activities of gangsters will not be tolerated and that the civil rights of citizens will be protected.

What we need is not more civil rights legislation, but a better enforcement of what we have.

Concordia Singing Society's 77th Annual Concert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Record on Wednesday, April 18, 1956, which calls attention to the 77th annual concert to be presented in Wilkes-Barre on May 1 by the historic and talented Concordia Singing Society, which is the oldest group of its kind in Wyoming Valley, Luzerne County, Pa.:

CONCORDIA'S 77TH CONCERT

Concordia Singing Society, Wyoming Valley's oldest group and one that has achieved national note on more than one occasion, is rehearsing for its 77th annual concert to be held on Tuesday, May 1.

In that connection an appeal is being circulated for support by means of patron memberships. When we consider the value of Concordia to the community, the honors it has brought here and the society's many contributions to civic welfare, a generous response to the appeal is indicated.

Apepals made in other years have not gone unheeded. Many civic-minded individuals, appreciating the society's endeavors, have contributed to its support.

The quality of its programs has become traditional. They are worthy of a large attendance on merit. As has been true in other years, the continued existence of the society is dependent on public support.

Some 65 members of the society will appear in the chorus on May 1 under the leadership of Clyde Owens, director of the society and a member of the city school district musical staff.

During the first 10 years the society operated under four different directors. In January 1889, Adolph Hansen became the director and conducted the society continuously until the summer of 1942, the year of his passing. This was an unmatched record of continuous conductorship during which the society rose to national fame on the concert stage, as well as in competition.

Among the guest airtists of the long past were Paul Althouse, metropolitan tenor; Frederic Martin, bass; Edwin Grasse, blind violinist; John Barnes Wells, tenor; Milton Cross tenor; Ruth Rodgers, soprano; Joan Peebles, mezzo soprano.

This year's artist will be Frank Guarrera. He is a metropolitan baritone and has made more appearances in the metropolitan theater than any other baritone. He is now averaging 3 or 4 appearances a week in the metropolitan opera. The night before his apeparance in Wilkes-Barre, he will give a concert in Washington, D. C.

Japanese Imports and the American Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, if there is any doubt in your mind about the affect of Japanese imports, read the following statement by Mr. Roger Milliken. He is president of Deering, Milliken & Co., one of the Nations largest textile companies, representing 28 mills. In addition to being a great textile man, Mr. Milliken is a great American and a champion of our free enterprise system.

PUBLIC STATEMENT OF ROGER MILLIKEN, PRESIDENT, DEERING, MILLIKEN & CO., INC.

The United States Department of Commerce now has joined the Department of State in what can only be interpreted as a concerted effort to sell out the great American textile industry.

For years—most recently for Japan—the State Department has been bargaining away our mills and the jobs of our employees by reducing tariffs under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). Now we have the spectacle of a United States

trade mission, sponsored by the Department of Commerce, advising the Japanese on how they best can step up their already damaging shipments of textiles and apparel to this market. Indeed, the mission, whose expenses are paid in part by our mills and employees, is advising the Japanese which of our markets to hit so that their exports may be further increased.

Recent newspaper headlines tell a succinct story both of rising imports and Government inaction:

"Cottons Imports Sharply Higher During December."

"Textile Imports of United States During 1955 Up Substantially."

"Japan Predicts Export Rise in 1956 for all Textiles."

"United States Rejects ACMI Requests for Cottons Imports Quotas."

I repeat a warning made on March 15 to the House Ways and Means Committee in opposition to H. R. 5550, the bill to permit United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation, the alleged administrative agency for GATT. On behalf of the National Council of Textile Industries, comprised of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, National Association of Wool Manufacturers and the National Federation of Textiles, I said:

"If the present rate of increase of Japanese goods is permitted to continue, unemployment in the textile and apparel industries of the United States will grow in proportion and ghost towns will replace the thriving mill communities from Maine to Texas."

This warning and others like it bear repeating. Press reports from Japan during the last 2 weeks reveal the shocking activities of a Department of Commerce trade mission headed by Eugene Braderman, Director Far Eastern Division, Bureau of Foreign Commerce. Other members of the mission are American businessmen none of whom, it is significant to note, are textile or apparel manufacturers.

On April 2 a report from Nagoya said the mission told the Japanese there was "plenty of room to increase American imports of woolen goods" and urged them "to give further close study to American wool textile fashions."

On April 9 it was reported from Osaka that the mission "urged Japanese manufacturers to diversify exports of cotton textiles and apparel for the United States market not only on types of goods but also on price brackets as a means of simultaneously increasing export business and minimizing the impact on United States producers." The mission meant, of course, that such procedure might lessen the opposition here.

On April 10, another dispatch from Osaka found the mission defining what it had meant by the term "wool textiles." This term, it said, did not mean wool apparel fabrics. It did mean "textile products in the sense of cashmere sweaters, gloves and other specialties." Apparently, in the mission's opinion, American manufacturers of such specialties would welcome still more imports of these items from Japan.

The Department of Commerce surely must know that imports of textiles and related products from Japan, and other countries as well, have soared to record levels and will soar still higher under present conditions. These imports are damaging American manufacturers and displacing American workers. The Department must also know that American tariffs, cut again and again under GATT, fall far short of even tending to equalize the immense wage gap between American and Japanese mills.

Yet, the Department, through its trade mission, is issuing a cordial invitation which tells the Japanese in effect: "Go and get the American textile and apparel industries and their 2¼ million employees."

It is high time that the Secretary of Commerce put his Department squarely on the side of all American industry and labor by repudiating and recalling the trade mission to Japan and any similar missions which may be roaming the world.

Moreover, the actions of the mission to Japan offer further proof to Congress—if any was needed—that H. R. 5550 must be defeated. The mission to Japan is merely an example of what will happen if Congress permits United States membership in OTC-GATT. Such approval, as I warned the House Ways and Means Committee on March 15, "Would invite and practically assure the eventual destruction of the textile industries of the United States."

Boston High School Turns Out Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a deserving article Boston High School Turns Out Farmers—referring to the Jamaica Plain High School—which article was written by Paul R. Stevens and appeared in the Boston Post of April 8, 1956.

I am sure it will be of interest to the agricultural communities of our country to know that in the great city of Boston, where there are very few if any farms, that 38 years ago there was established at the Jamaica Plain High School a special course of study for its students in certain fields of agriculture. This specialized course was set up in 1918 by Thomas P. Dooley, who is assistant headmaster of Jamaica Plain High School.

The article pays a deserved tribute to an educational experiment which was started 38 years ago and which has proved very constructive:

BOSTON HIGH SCHOOL TURNS OUT FARMERS

(By Paul R. Stevens)

Some of the country's most successful farmers today grew up deep in the heart of Boston. Here's where they learned how to milk cows, plant potatoes, and make hens lay jumbo eggs.

Boston—for all its teeming industries and bustling ways—has one of the finest high school agricultural courses in the country.

Founded at Jamaica Plain High School, 38 years ago, the course has turned more city teenagers into farmers than there are straws in a haypile.

More than 2,500 of these youngsters have taken at least 1 year of agriculture, and 1,500 have majored in it. Students from all parts of the city have enrolled for the course—unique in the Boston public school system.

Graduates and students have won hundreds of ribbons, rosettes, medals, and medallions at local fairs and interscholastic contests.

The school's city-slicker "Aggies" have walked away with 15 out of 19 championships in the interschool flower judging contests at the annual spring flower show; they have taken 8 straight first prizes and a gold medal for their garden exhibit, "A Typical City Backyard Garden."

The course was set up in 1918 by Thomas P. Dooley of the "Old Southie" Dooleys. It had a starting class of 6 students. Today, the annual enrollment is about 110.

Since 1937, Dooley—still active at 68—has been sending his "boys" to work at Harvard's world-famous Arnold Arboretum in Jamaica Plain for practical training. Here's what Donald Wyman, horticulturist, once wrote of these boys:

PROVE INDUSTRIOUS

"They have proved industrious, good workers in every way. We have tried to give these boys all-around experience in the arboretum so that they will gain a working knowledge of the many phases of our work."

Other students are sent for on-the-job training to nearby estates, Franklin Park (where Dooley had charge of one of the Nation's biggest "Victory" gardens during World War I) and farms during the school year.

Students work full time for pay from early May to August 15 on farms. A representative of the school visits each boy every 15 days to check on his progress.

Dooley, a graduate of Massachusetts Agricultural College (now the University of Massachusetts), set up the course at the request of John C. Broadhead, then assistant superintendent of schools.

Broadhead conceived of the idea after boys had inquired about an agricultural course that was being taught at Walpole.

FAVORABLY LOCATED

The school was favorably located for this almost unheard of experiment in teaching city boys farming, horticulture and floriculture, because of its nearness to Franklin Park, the 360-acre Arnold Arboretum and easy transportation to nearby poultry plants, orchards, dairies, nurseries, and market gardens.

Students learn classroom theory 4 days a week; the 5th day they spend in on-the-job training. Buses carry them to nearby farms and estates.

Dooley serves as administrator and finds jobs for students. His teaching staff consists of experts in landscape and market gardening, poultry-raising, fruit growing, floriculture, forestry, dairying, and allied subjects.

DEAN OF AGRICULTURE

Farmers are always on the lookout for Jamaica Plain High's aggies, and the department boasts of 100 percent placement record.

Hundreds of the school's graduates go on for further study at the University of Massachusetts, Cornell University, the Stockbridge School of Agriculture, the University of New Hampshire and other top-ranking training centers.

A student who commuted to Jamaica Plain from South Boston to take the aggie course is an outstanding cytologist with the United States Department of Agriculture today; a Jamaica Plain graduate is dean of an agriculture college in North Carolina.

A former Brighton boy is a professor at Cornell; a Dorchester boy teaches animal husbandry at the University of Massachusetts, a West Roxbury graduate manages one of the State's largest ice cream factories.

And so it goes.

One of the school's most illustrious graduates is Oswald Tippo, formerly of Roxbury—a community about as remotely associated with farming in most peoples' minds as Admiral Byrd's Little America. He is chairman of Yale University's plant science department and one of the world's foremost specialists on woods.

Occasionally a youngster takes the course only to find that agriculture is not quite his dish. Just such a boy was John X, who Dooley believes may be the reincarnation of Tom Sawyer.

John was sent out to a retired general's estate to get in some practical training in weed removal. He was paid 20 cents an hour. When the general returned late one afternoon

to check the boy's work he found he had made almost no progress.

PAY IS BOOSTED

The next day the general boosted the boy's pay to 40 cents an hour as an incentive for faster work.

When the general returned at noon to check on the effectiveness of his double-pay plan, he found the boy lying with his shoes off in the general's orchard. Another boy was doing the weeding.

"You're paying me 40 cents, so I'm a boss now," John explained.

"I'm paying my helper half."

P. S.—John X didn't go far in agriculture. Dooley himself tended a vegetable patch in South Boston as a boy, and the thrill of making things grow has stayed with him all his life.

In recent years, however, he has been too busy teaching others how to farm to do any gardening himself. As Dooley explains it, "Cobblers' sons are always the most ill-shod."

The Faith of a Military Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last summer a young man gave his life for his country. This young man was Lt. (j. g.) Robert Clem Allison, who was killed instantly on August 11, 1955, when his Banshee jet fighter crashed near Perry, Fla.

Bob Allison was held in unusually high regard by young and old alike in his hometown of Robinson, Ill. As a former naval aviator, I admired him for his great contribution he made in the development in the jet air age. The security of America is dependent upon young men like Lieutenant Allison, who are willing to risk their lives to promote a strong air arm. The contribution these men are making is important to all of us, as citizens of this great country.

Lieutenant Allison graduated from Annapolis in the Class of 1952, after winning many honors as a student at the Academy both in scholarship and in sports. He served 18 months in the Korean action aboard the heavy cruiser, U. S. S. *Bremerton*. He made a great record in the Navy and his loss is keenly felt by all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I was so much impressed with the remarks made by Rev. William M. Hunter, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Robinson, Ill., at the funeral of Lieutenant Allison, that I asked that a copy be made available to be included in the RECORD. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following sermon:

THE FAITH OF A MILITARY MAN

(Remarks made by the Reverend William M. Hunter, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, of Robinson, Ill., at the funeral of Lt. Robert Allison, United States Navy, Tuesday, August 16, 1955)

THE SCRIPTURE LESSON

"After Jesus had entered Capernaum, a captain in the Roman Army came up to Him, entreating His help.

"'Sir,' he said, 'my manservant is lying ill at my house with a stroke of paralysis, and is suffering terribly.'

"'I will come and cure him,' answered Jesus.

"'Sir,' the captain went on, 'I am unworthy to receive You under my roof; but only speak, and my manservant will be cured. For I myself am a man under the orders of others, with soldiers under me; and, if I say to one of them, "Go," he goes, and to another "Come," he comes, and to my slave "Do this," he does it.'

"Jesus was surprised to hear this, and said to those who were following Him: 'Never, I tell you, in any Israelite have I met with such faith as this.' Yes; and many will come in from east and west, and take their places beside Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the Kingdom of Heaven; while the heirs to the Kingdom will be "banished into the darkness" outside; there will be weeping and grinding of teeth.'

"Then Jesus said to the captain: 'Go now, and it shall be according to your faith.'

"And the man was cured that very hour." (Matthew 8:5–13; 20th Century New Testament.)

THE ADDRESS

The Scripture passage I just read is one I have never read at a funeral before. I must admit I have never had an occasion of this sort where I felt it would be especially appropriate. But, as soon as I heard the first, limited details of the passing of Bob Allison, I could not get this passage out of my mind. Something seemed to tell me: "Here is a clue to the whole matter; the answer lies in this incident in the life of our Lord."

What we need at a time like this is faith. But we need not only something to believe with our mind; we need something to act upon. We need to see, to understand, to accept, to live by something which makes sense, which gives meaning not only to life, but to a death which normally seems to us so utterly unnecessary. Notice, I said seems to us. Our own minds, our own wills, are too limited in their grasp, their ability to comprehend everything which needs to be considered. On top of that, our national shock, grief, unhappiness make those already limited human minds even more limited. Truly we need a faith at a time like this—a faith which more than makes up for our all-too-present and obvious limitations.

But what does our Scripture passage tell us about such a faith—and how does it apply to this circumstance? Believe me, it isn't simply because Jesus cured the servant of the military man that I feel it speaks to us now, through I am sure that is part of it.

Military men of all branches of the service work under orders. Usually those orders are right, because not one, but many trained minds have worked on them. The Roman Captain summed it up very nicely when he said to Jesus: "For I myself am a man under the orders of others, with soldiers under me." As we said, being under orders usually leads the man to do that which is right and good for both the service and the man. These orders are intended to enable the doing of a job, the completion of a mission, with a maximum of results, and with a minimum of risk: The military man under orders very, very rarely will question those orders; he simply accepts them and does them. That is the result of his faith; he does what his belief, drilled into him, tells him is the right thing to do.

Bob Allison, I am reliably informed, died in the performance of duty, while acting under orders. It would appear to us that, in this case, the orders may have been wrong. But were they? I am confident that whatever may have caused something to go wrong at this time, and perhaps we may never know just exactly what did go wrong, that the orders were not only basically right for that situation, but had probably brought more men in safely than otherwise.

Certainly, while wise and intelligent men will strive to avoid such things in the future, possibly revising future orders, if need be, the basic system of acting under orders will not be abandoned.

Bob Allison, then, acted in good faith. He was not only a good officer and a gentleman, but he had a belief which could lead him on to a brilliant career—or to his death. But he had faith in more than merely being under orders. He had the mind of one who believes in Him Who, though Invisible, is none-the-less real. I believe that Bob's belief in God did not come from being a good officer; I believe he was a good officer because of his belief in God. Just as the Roman Captain who came up to Jesus, he believed that if God, or God's Christ, were to say "Let a thing be done," it could be done. Just as simple, just as direct, as that. And Jesus Christ admired that faith, and held it up to Eternal Credit, saying, "Never, I tell you, in any Israelite have I met with such faith as this."

But—some may say—where did Bob's faith get him? Where did his obedience to orders get him? That is a question everyone, or nearly everyone, may ask. They don't stop to realize that in asking it, they are questioning the Love and Wisdom of God. But, I am sure, God understands our limited love, our limited wisdom in asking it—and seeks more to bring to our understanding a deeper meaning than is now the case.

When we ask this question, we assume that for any of us death is stark, unutterable, terrible tragedy. But is it, for the man of faith? Does not the Bible say, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ"? Do we not believe that Jesus Christ died and rose again mainly that we would also rise again, in Him? Does He expect us to be weeping for Him at the tomb—or does He expect us to be awaiting Him among the living? Of course, much of our sadness, of our grief, is caused more by our sense of loss, our frustration. When we stop to think of the joy, the triumph, the achievement of the one who has gone on, our love for him will ultimately triumph, and we will some day say, "It is good. God loved him and was truly good to him. Now I've had a chance to think it over, I wouldn't have it any other way."

I have told people, many times, that we never learn how to live until we overcome our fear of death—that is, until our faith becomes so strong we are ready for either, as God may will. And I do believe that the man under orders, whether in time of war or of peace, obeys those orders, knowing these is risk, knowing something can go wrong. I believe it was a local veteran of Korea who said in my presence that the men who don't last long in time of battle are those who are so cocky, they don't know the risks. In other words, it is the man who, under orders, or in faith, does his job, taking every reasonable precaution and care because he knows the risks, but still goes on—that man is the one who can and does teach us much.

We live in an age where we have made a god of success. We won't accept anything (at least many of us won't) unless we are positive, before hand, how it will work out. But God calls upon us to believe, to follow Him, to be under orders to Him in true faith, even though it may lead to a cross.

Jesus Himself was under orders. Jesus Himself was a young man. Jesus Himself knew the risks, and faced them. And Jesus Himself met death. But because He did—Bob Allison and the rest of us need have no fear of death. The only fear we need is that we are too timid, too lacking in faith—because we want to share in the adventures to which He beckons us.

The Honorable George A. Dondero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I know that I join with every Member of the House in congratulating Congressman GEORGE A. DONDERO on his courteous, efficient, and capable services as a Member of this honorable body.

In my mind, he was one of the outstanding leaders, due to his kindliness and consideration of Members on both sides of our political aisle. We all regret that he has decided to complete that meritorious service in the Congress, and I know that the people of his congressional district will have difficulty in replacing our amiable colleague.

However, I sincerely hope that his decision will be for the best and that he will continue to enjoy many years of happiness and good health in his retirement.

I herewith include the following article from the April 1956 issue of the American Highways, which I am pleased and proud to have ordered printed in the RECORD:

CONGRESSMAN DONDERO TO RETIRE FROM CONGRESS

Almost simultaneous with his presentation of his portrait to the House Committee on Public Works, GEORGE A. DONDERO of Michigan announced that he was not going to again be a candidate for Congress. Climaxing some 25 years of service, Mr. DONDERO's decision will remove one of the staunchest supporters of adequate highway legislation from the House Committee on Public Works. Following the reorganization of the House committees, Mr. DONDERO was the first chairman of this committee. The following are his remarks made at the time he presented the portrait, shown on the opposite page, to the committee:

"A little more than 5 years ago an occasion similar to this was held in this chamber. At that time the portrait of my good friend, a very distinguished American, our former colleague from Mississippi, the Honorable William M. Whittington, was placed in this room.

"My own portrait as first chairman of the Committee on Public Works under the Reorganization Act of Congress was to be placed here at the same time. It is of no interest now to detail the cause of delay.

"An occasion of this kind is rare indeed, it occurs only once in a lifetime.

"In this room I have served nearly a third of a lifetime—24 years of my official life as a Member of Congress.

"It is a red letter day for me. That a likeness of myself is to adorn these walls is a distinct honor in itself. That it shall be in company with my former chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, Mr. Mansfield of Texas, and Mr. Whittington of Mississippi, makes it a lasting and double honor.

"Politics rarely enters this room. Years ago when the Honorable Joseph Mansfield was Chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, he on more than one occasion requested that I preside or act as chairman while he absented himself from the room.

"If there is any lesson or any example that might be gleaned from the portrait now being placed here, it is that of complete confidence and harmony between men of different political faith and coming from widely separated sections of the country.

"The end desired in human existence is happiness. All men and women cherish and desire the respect and esteem of their fellow man. That in itself is a great factor in making life pleasant, gratifying, and happy.

"Your very presence here this afternoon is an expression of your kindness and friendship, for which I am truly grateful, and which I deeply appreciate.

"It is, indeed, with a deep sense of gratitude that I am honored and privileged to present at this time a remembrance of my long membership on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and the Committee on Public Works—this portrait of myself."

The portrait, painted by Miss Dorothy Drew, of New York City, was accepted in behalf of the committee by Chairman Buckley. Present at the presentation were many friends of Mr. DONDERO, including Congressman MARTIN, of Massachusetts, and Secretary of the Army Brucker, former governor of Michigan.

At the time of the presentation of the portrait to the Public Works Committee, Mr. DONDERO had not yet announced his decision not to seek reelection. In his brief remarks made at the presentation ceremony, former Speaker JOSEPH MARTIN mentioned the fact that Mr. DONDERO came to the Congress for his first term in 1933, and "you'll recall that year we did not have very many freshmen Republican Congressmen." As a matter of record, only one other new Republican Congressman still in office came to Congress that year.

Mr. DONDERO has established a reputation as one of the greatest living authorities on Lincoln. He was acquainted with the surviving members of Mr. Lincoln's family, and it will be noted in the biographical data at the end of this article that his son is named Robert Lincoln. Few, if any, Members of Congress are held in higher respect and esteem by their fellow Members than is the Honorable GEORGE A. DONDERO. * * * "Congressman from Michigan; born December 16, 1883, in Greenfield Township, Wayne County, Mich.; educated in the public schools; graduate of Royal Oak High School in 1903, and of the Detroit College of Law in 1910 with an LL. B. degree; admitted to the bar the same year, since which time he has practiced law; held the following office: village clerk of Royal Oak, 1905–06; township treasurer of Royal Oak, 1911–21; assistant prosecuting attorney for Oakland County, Mich., 1918–19; first mayor, city of Royal Oak, 1921–22; member of the board of education for 18 years; member of Methodist Church, Masonic orders, and Kiwanis International; married to Adele Roegner, June 28, 1913, and they have three children—Marion E., Stanton G., and Robert Lincoln; elected to the 73d and each succeeding Congress, including the 84th (24 years)."

Soil Bank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith historical background on the idea of the soil bank, contained in an article which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. The article written by Leonard Hall, a Post-Dispatch columnist, was forwarded to me by an alert constituent, Mr. Pete Fields, of Venice, Ill.

The story follows:

As for the so-called soil bank, the idea is not without merit. Yet the conservation crops which we propose paying these fellows to plant are the ones with the good, family sized conservation farmer plants as a matter of course in order to build and protect his land. Nor is the idea a new one. Back in 550 B. C. the Attican dictator Peisistratus was offering a cash bounty to farmers and landowners who would take their marginal, sloping hill lands out of grain crops and plant these acres to trees. Attica was that part of Greece which produced the remarkable civilization centering in Athens; a city state whose power and prosperity are certain proof that it had once been a land rich in soil and forest resources.

There's a difference in the reasons for our soil bank and that of old Peisistratus. In his day Attica was beginning to know shortages because of misuse of the land. We are, despite much bad land-use, still blessed or cursed with oversupplies. But the plan for persuading landowners to plant conservation crops and take marginal land out of production seems old as time; you offer them a cash bounty. It evidently didn't work too well in ancient Greece, for the area that was then Attica supports fewer people today than in the time of Pericles. I rather doubt it will work today; my observation being that the only true conservation is practiced by people who have a deep respect for and love of the land.

Tribute to the Memory of the Honorable Vera Buchanan, Late a Representative From Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow that I rise to add my small tribute to the memory of my friend and colleague, the Honorable Vera Buchanan, late a Representative from the 30th District of Pennsylvania. I know that this feeling is shared by all of us here, for her courageous spirit, her patience and understanding were an inspiration to all who knew her.

Mrs. Buchanan was elected to the 82d Congress on July 24, 1951, to succeed her husband, the late Frank Buchanan. Like her husband, she worked hard for the people of her district, and they returned her to the 83d and 84th Congress. After having previously served on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the Committee on Public Works, she was elected to the Committee on Banking and Currency in the 84th Congress. As you know, the Banking and Currency Committee deals with housing matters. We are constantly concerned with the statistics of housing, and their effect on the Nation's economy. Being a successful homemaker herself, Mrs. Buchanan brought to the committee a special insight in housing matters, and a warm understanding of the problems and needs of homemakers and the

importance of the home in American family life.

A severe case of pneumonia overtook Mrs. Buchanan last year when she had devoted her energies to the point of exhaustion in support of housing and flood-control legislation for her constituents. Her death on November 26 deprived the people of her district of a devoted and courageous representative. The House has lost a sincere and capable Member who will be sadly missed by those of us who knew her and valued her friendship.

My deep feeling of sympathy goes out to her two daughters and other relatives in their great loss.

Acres for Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, since the Congress has become increasingly concerned with providing for the establishment of a soil bank, retiring acreage not currently needed for food production, there is an interesting timeliness in an item that first appeared in the Chicago Daily News on September 1, 1954. In this article, Dr. Raymond Miller, presently a lecturer at Harvard Business School, offered a plan for Government payment for retired acres to prevent the creation of enormous surpluses. He describes his plan as "putting land in mothballs," although he prefers the expression "acres for tomorrow." Since this article appeared I have discussed this currently popular idea with Dr. Miller, who states that credit for originating the idea must be shared with several others. However, I know that he expended a lot of energy familiarizing people with this plan and building up sentiment for it. Mr. Speaker, I believe that regardless of differences of opinion over price supports, "acres for tomorrow" should be adopted as part of our farm policy. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this Chicago Daily News article as follows:

EXPERT HITS WASTE OF UNITED STATES FARMLAND

The use of all American farmland, resulting in enormous surpluses, has been labeled "foolish and wasteful" by a farm expert.

"We don't need all the land now, but we will 100 years from now," said Raymond W. Miller, Harvard University lecturer.

"We should not keep our farmland in full production when American women haven't produced enough babies to use the surpluses up," he said.

Miller, American consultant to the U. N. Food and Agricultural Organization, offered his own plan to curb surpluses.

"Instead of paying out millions for price subsidy and food hoarding, we should take some land out of production and pay the farmers for doing so."

Miller said his plan, which he calls Mothball Acres, calls for laying fallow 5 million to 10 million acres yearly.

"This will not only cut down on surplus production but will give the land a rest to recover its fertility," he explained.

Miller, 59, who calls himself simply a California farmer, recently spent 5 months studying farm problems in India with a team of Ford Foundation experts.

He was in Chicago Tuesday to speak on India at the Institute of Management of Northwestern University's School of Business.

"But India has no problem similar to ours. In fact, I don't think any other country has, except maybe Canada," Miller said.

"In this country we've tried paying farmers to stop growing one crop.

"So they plant something else causing another surplus. We've even tried burning crops.

"My mothball plan is similar in principle to the system used in oil-producing States, where only the amount of oil needed is pumped."

Testimony of J. Spencer Love in Opposition to H. R. 5550

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I was impressed with the testimony of Mr. J. Spencer Love, of Greensboro, N. C., made recently before the Ways and Means Committee. I was so impressed with this testimony, Mr. Speaker, that I recommend it to all Members of this House and Senate:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am J. Spence Love, of Greensboro, N. C., chairman of the board of Burlington Industries, Inc. The next witness, Mr. Roger Milliken, and myself are appearing here today on behalf of the textile industry in opposition to H. R. 5550. We speak for the National Council of Textile Industries and, through it, for the member associations—the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, the National Federation of Textiles, and the National Association of Wool Manufacturers.

During 1955 the textile industry, including manufacture of apparel and other end products, employed an average of 2.3 million persons, accounting for 14 percent of total manufacturing employment in the United States. In addition, a substantial portion of the 813,000 workers in the chemical and allied products industry group are engaged in the production of man-made fibers, dyes, bleaches, and other chemical products used in textile manufacturing. Many thousands more are employed in the manufacture of textile machinery and cotton agricultural machinery. Probably textile manufacturing and directly related allied activities account for 1 out of every 6 jobs in American manufacturing industry today. In addition, of course, several million people in this country derive their livelihood from the growing of cotton and the preparation and movement of the crop from the farm to the mill door.

The textile manufacturers of this country, regardless of which particular fibers they individually process, are united in opposing United States membership in the proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation. We are opposed to it because OTC, constituting as it does an endorsement of GATT, would guarantee a continuation of GATT's trade policy. This policy has already done much damage to the textile industry and threatens to do much more. Furthermore, United States membership in OTC would freeze this situation by removing from the Congress effective control over our foreign-trade policy as specifically delegated to the Congress by the Constitution of the United States. Delegation of such vital authority, in whole or in part, to a supranational organization in which the United States would have but 1 vote in 35 would, in my judgment, add so much more uncertainty and doubt as to the future of textile operations in this country as to have serious consequences.

With your permission I want to summarize briefly the situation in which the textile industry finds itself today.

At no time in the past 5 years has the textile industry in the United States earned a rate of profit after taxes anywhere approaching the average of United States manufacturing industry as a whole. Even in 1955, with an improved business picture, the textile mill products industry profit rate was only half as large as that of United States manufacturing industry as a whole. This is the case whether profits are figured as a percent on sales or as a percent on stockholders' equity. This decline in profits has directly resulted in a 50-percent reduction in the industry's spending on new plant and equipment since 1948 and the industry continues to shrink in volume of equipment in place.

In my own company, with half again as much average volume over the 1951–55 period, due almost entirely to diversifying acquisitions with borrowed money, our average profits were less than half those of the 1947–50 period. Such results as these are generally characteristic of the industry.

Another indication of this situation is that the textile industry in the United States has not participated in the postwar expansion of the American economy to any important extent. According to the Federal Reserve Board, production of all textiles has increased only 10 percent since pre-Korean days, while total industrial production has been increasing 44 percent.

The foregoing facts can have no other meaning but that the textile industry is in close to the poorest condition of any major United States industry to absorb large new import competition. Yet the cotton segment of the industry was singled out last year for drastic tariff reductions in the GATT negotiations at Geneva.

The tariff on cotton cloth in the grey was reduced by about 27 percent. On Japanese cloth comparable to our 39 inch, 80 x 80, 4.00 yards to the pound print cloth, for example (the most important single item in united States production), this tariff cut alone is the equivalent of two times the profit per yard in 1954 of the average United States grey goods sales mill, the latest year for which such data are available. On most of the bleached, printed, dyed, and colored cloths the tariff was cut by 48 percent.

Because there are relatively few important secret processes or patents in the manufacture of textiles, because most machinery is readily adaptable to a vast range of cloth constructions, and because the industry in the United States is highly competitive, being composed of hundreds of independent companies, the price structure of the entire industry is extremely sensitive to small variations in supply and demand.

Virtually the entire output of the American textile industry, together with imports from abroad, is priced and sold in New York City. In the cloth market lead times between orders and deliveries are frequently several months long. The availability of foreign deliveries with normal lead times means that the price effect on the New York market is far greater than actual imports from abroad would seem to indicate, for the buyer

uses foreign availabilities to beat down United States prices.

The offer in New York of a relatively small amount of foreign goods at a lower price will not only result in a decline in price of the comparable American-made product, but by stimulating the shift of mill machinery to other still profitable cloth constructions, will spread the price decline and profit squeeze rapidly throughout the entire range of goods. Furthermore, this chain reaction is usually accentuated by concentration of imports in particular types of cloth and is often aggravated by substantial and apparently unlimited availabilities.

Owing to the foreign industry's great competitive advantage resulting from lower costs of both raw materials and labor, and the ability of a cartelized industry like Japan's to target its shipments against segments of the intensely competitive American industry, the only certainty is that nothing stands in the way of Japan's taking over almost any portion of the United States textile market when and as she decides to do so.

The rapid growth of import competition in cotton textiles, largely from Japan, which followed upon the 1955 tariff cuts, illustrates the extreme vulnerability of the United States textile industry to unrealistic trade policies of the sort OTC would perpetuate. The Association of Cotton Textile Merchants of New York estimates total imports of cloth in the form of piece goods, household articles, and clothing into the United States for 1955 at not less than 250 million yards. Imports of piece goods add up to half this quantity. An additional 60 million yards have come in in the form of blouses alone. Some 35 million yards represent table damask, towels, and sheets and pillowcases. Imports of shirts, handkerchiefs, and a variety of other apparel items account for the balance. Not included are sundry lines not readily converted to yardage terms. These imports represent roughly 40,000 less jobs or 40,000 American men and women for whom there is suddenly no livelihood in the textile industry.

The impact of such imports becomes clear when we consider that though the specific items Japan is shipping us may on the surface be equivalent to only about 2.5 percent of United States production stated as a general average, imports have taken about 70 percent of our velveteen market and 30 percent in ginghams. It is worth mentioning that the American velveteen people, after having in effect lost their market to Japanese manufacturers, filed for relief on January 23, 1956, under the so-called escape clause of the Trade Agreements Extension Act. June 19, 1956, has been set for the hearing before the United States Tariff Commission and it is estimated that a decision will be reached by the end of the year. We don't know what action the Tariff Commission will take, but all reasonable men certainly must agree that this surely is a slow way to escape. On the broad basis a loss of 250 million yards is a serious loss for the textile market. When we add that our exports of cloth have fallen 250 million yards from 1951 to 1955, largely from competition with Japan overseas, it is clear that real damage is being inflicted even on so large a textile industry as ours. A half billion yards a year can and often does spell the difference between a good year and a bad year for the textile industry.

Even the best Japanese wage scales are only about one-tenth of the prevailing scale of the United States textile industry. Such a differential combined with lower raw material and other supply costs makes possible prices which, while profitable to the Japanese textile industry, are completely ruinous to the American. The observation of American textile mill operating executives recently visiting Japan, is that in the larger Japanese mills labor productivity is as high as in the United States industry; and it is, of course, the larger and more modern mills of Japan which dominate the export trade to the United States. In addition, of course, Japan is now buying cotton—including United States growths—several cents a pound cheaper than United States mills must pay. In fact, the United States Government has just announced an expansion of the program of selling American cotton abroad below the price paid by the American manufacturer. World prices on synthetic yarns and fibers are generally lower also than in the United States.

The net result under GATT has been the contraction of United States textile export markets and the opening of our domestic market to a full-scale attack by overseas industries operating Western-type machinery at Oriental wage levels. Under such circumstances, there is little likelihood that the needed equity capital will be forthcoming to modernize and expand the United States textile industry in line with peacetime needs, much less essential defense requirements.

In recent years mill property after mill property has been sold at prices equal to or less than 50 cents on the replacement dollar. Textile equities, including those of the very best companies, sell characteristically in recent years at less than 50 cents on the replacement dollar on the established exchanges. And this is going on during the period of the most dynamic growth in American history. It can only be explained by the fact that the investor must believe that the textile business is going to live constantly under the cloud of unbearable competition from low-wage labor countries. Necessary new capital for the most essential requirements of modernization, expansion, research, and development is obviously not seeking employment in the textile manufacturing industry.

The American textile industry today has no reserve capacity such as it had at the outbreak of World War II, and in that war there developed acute shortages of key textile items. As Chairman of the Textile, Leather, and Clothing Bureau of the War Production Board from October 1943 to December 1944, I have vivid personal recollections of the problems we faced at that time. At the commencement of the war emergency the cotton and woolen portions of the industry were just starting to utilize their third shift capacity and this reservoir made it possible for use to squeeze out minimum needs without rationing. We have 8 percent less spindles and 8 percent less looms in the textile industry today than we had at that time and are running mostly on a three-shift basis. With substantial population increases, and the industry now having little or no shift capacity reserve, it is obvious that we would have to go to a system of rationing immediately if such an emergency should confront us again. In this connection the plight of the woolen and worsted end of the industry is particularly serious. A petition has already been filed with the Office of Defense Mobilization by the National Association of Wool Manufacturers under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955 relating to the effect of imports upon the adequacy of the United States wool textile plant today to meet United States emergency military requirements.

This country cannot afford further decline in its basic textile-manufacturing capacity or deterioration in its facilities. Many American communities (whole States, in fact) are almost wholly dependent upon textile mill payrolls. World competition is already pinching our pay envelopes and deterring our employees from enjoying the full fruits of better conditions in industry generally. Unless the threat of ever-increasing textile imports at sales prices below United States production costs is removed, equity capital needed to keep this basic industry modern and competitive with other segments of our economy will become less and less within reach and plants will continue to close. We will lack the essential minimum capacity for any emergency needs.

It would be fallacious to appraise this influx of cheaper textiles as a net gain for American consumers or as true stimulation of world trade. The American textile plant is adequate for our present peacetime requirements. Thus any increases in imports represent displacement of mill operations and employment in this country. American textile employees are the highest paid textile workers in the world and, as such, constitute far greater consumers, when employed, of this world's goods than their foreign counterparts anywhere. In essence, these cheap labor imports represent completely unfair competition wtih and displacement of American textile workers. I might add that this competition even goes to the extent of frequently copying our exact designs and patterns.

I am proud of the American textile industry. We will bow to no one in our loyal and patriotic devotion to our country. We are more than willing to accept our share of the burden of the cold war, but we must warn you that we are being pushed into a very unhealthy state; and our strength is a part of the strength of America. We are a part of America's essential system of defense. Some have said that in time of national emergency the textile industry is second only to the steel industry in importance. Since winning the war, and in the spirit of international amity, brotherhood and good will, the United States has poured money into Japan and other low-wage countries. We have been constantly exchanging technological know-how under the point 4 and other programs, and now we are helping see to it that basic raw materials for textiles will be available at substantially lower levels than our domestic prices. The textile industry has not opposed these programs; it has even participated in the point 4 work constantly in the interest of contributing to world progress. However, when the end result of such programs is permitted to lead to the gradual confiscation of our major industries, to the gradual loss of hundreds of thousands of jobs and to the ultimate desolation of entire communities, the textile industry can only rise with all the strength it can muster to protest what is not only the grossest sort of injustice but what will also lead to ultimate economic suicide.

Passage of H. R. 5550, authorizing OTC and thus perpetuating GATT, would further undermine investor confidence in the future of the American textile industry and destroy thousands of jobs. We, therefore, oppose this legislation.

Thank you.

An Excellent Idea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial that appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on April 24, 1956. The editorial supports the most meritorious proposal of my distinguished col-

league, Hon. OLIVER P. BOLTON. The editorial follows:

AN EXCELLENT IDEA

We wish Congressman OLIVER P. BOLTON, Republican of Ohio success in his attempt to have Federal buildings in Washington properly marked so that each could be easily identifiable from the sidewalk or from a passing vehicle.

After having heard the question of visitors, "What's that building over there?" a few thousand times, Congressman BOLTON decided to investigate.

"I found some Government buildings labeled only with tiny plaques near the entrance bearing the agency's name or initials in small print," BOLTON reported. "Others were marked only with a number or street address; and still others carried hard-to-find names inscribed near the top of the building."

A uniform system of marking would, indeed, end much confusion among visitors, and the cost would more than be justified. We hope the idea succeeds.

The Supreme Court's Grab for Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Richmond (Va.) News-Leader from the pen of its brilliant editor, Jack Kilpatrick.

The editorial contains the ablest review of the sweeping grab for power by the Judges of the Supreme Court into all fields of human endeavor.

The editorial follows:

THE STATES REACH ARMAGEDDON

There could have been no real surprise among observers of the United States Supreme Court at the Court's arrogant action yesterday in rejecting an appeal sought by the South Carolina Electric & Gas Co. in a bus-segregation case. The Court announced, in its own contemptuous fashion, that the petition was filed "without authority of law" and "needlessly consumed our time."

In the view of many thoughtful attorneys, the South Carolina petition was no waste of time. It challenged a breathtaking stretch of the Constitution. The case arose when Sarah Mae Flemming, a Negro woman, sued the buss company for damages because a bus driver required her to change her seat in accordance with South Carolina law. Her suit was dismissed in the Federal district court, but on appeal to the Fourth United States Circuit Court of Appeals, Judges Parker, Soper, and Dobie last summer reversed the district court and ordered the suit tried.

In their opinion of July 14, 1955, the circuit court judges called attention to the Supreme Court's opinion of May 17, 1954, in the school segregation cases. Here the Supreme Court, after terming education "perhaps the most important function of State and local governments," held that "in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place." But though the Supreme Court had carefuly confined its ruling to "the field of public education," the Fourth Circuit Court held, in the South Carolina case, that the doctrine of "separate but equal" had been repudiated not only as to schools, but in every other field also.

That was a big jump for the circuit court to take. Hundreds of other appeals, involving modifications of long-standing law far less severe, have been reviewed by the Supreme Court in other years. But this time, the South Carolina company's petition "needlessly consumed our time." With that abrupt and high-handed stroke of its pen, the Supreme Court snatched from the States a part of their inherent police power, daily exercised by the States for generations.

It was, we say again, no surprise. In triphammer succession, the Supreme Court of the United States has taken from the States their clear power to maintain racially separate public schools. It has deprived them of the power to regulate their own natural resources. It has seized their authority over nonnavigable waters wholly within their borders. It has voided the sedition laws of 42 States. It has invaded their right to fix conditions for the employment of college professors. Now it has distorted the 14th amendment to make it read that no State may regulate seating on wholly local buses; merely to separate the races is to abridge the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States.

The States have reached Armageddon. By successive assaults upon the Constitution, the Supreme Court has undertaken, in effect, to repeal the 10th amendment and to write into the 14th amendment sweeping new provisions to which the States have never consented. The Court has usurped the amendatory powers reserved to the States in article V of the Constitution. The Court has established itself as a superlegislature. It has arrogated unto itself a power, never given the Court, to twist and shape the Constitution as a thing of wax or putty.

If ever the time has come when the States should take urgent counsel among themselves, that time is now. The Federal Government they created is devouring them.

This crisis transcends any particular question of schools or buses, or gas or oil or water or sedition laws. It goes to the very heart and soul of our constitutional Union. If the Court is not checked—if the States fail to reestablish the dual structure of our Union—the Court will have achieved, by judicial legislation, what the Convention of 1787 resolutely refused to approve: It will have saddled upon us a consolidated government; it will have reduced the States to nullities and placed all meaningful power in the hands of a national authority.

The one possible check upon the Court, in our view, lies in interposition by the States. They, and they alone, by concerted action may restore a constitutional balance of powers. Five States already have interposed their sovereignty in the matter of school segregation; North Carolina and Louisiana are expected to raise the number to seven this spring. But the matter cannot be met regionally; it cannot be met on the single issue of schools or segregation. It can be met only if the States reclaim their clear powers, assemble in convention as they did in 1787, and dedicate themselves to a rewriting of our Constitution in order to repair the damage the Court has done.

Outstanding Negro Leadership in Jacksonville Acclaimed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Afro-American Life Insurance Co. this week moved into its new $1,085,000 office building in Jacksonville, Fla. This marks an important milestone in the history of this company, discussed in the following newspaper account in the Jacksonville Journal. I take this opportunity to congratulate the Negro leadership which founded and carries forward this important financial institution. Moreover, the article mentions another Negro leader in Jacksonville, who is now primarily known for his great philanthropic and social work, Eartho M. M. White. As to her I can truly say that all of Jacksonville is her debtor for her Christian spirit and her good works of all kinds through a long and fruitful life. I am proud as her Congressman to express my gratitude for her fine life. The article is as follows:

INSURANCE COMPANY 55 YEARS OLD—NEGRO FIRM NOW IN BIG TIME

(By Doug Danford)

Fifty-five years ago 7 men got together in Jacksonville and chipped in $100 apiece to form a company that today has assets of $8,400,000.

The men were Negroes and their company has grown into the Afro-American Life Insurance Co., which is now moving into its new $1,085,000 home office building at 101 East Union Street. Dedication ceremonies will be held Sunday afternoon.

It was January 15, 1901, that the seven founders met in Bethel Baptist Institutional Church at the invitation of the pastor, the Rev. J. Milton Waldron. Oldtimers say the minister was disturbed because Bethel's burial society had just been bankrupted by the death of two members. (Dues were 10 cents a week and the death benefit was supposed to be $30, which was the full price of a funeral in those days.)

Waldron sold the others on a large-scale burial society and on March 4, 1901, Gov. William S. Jennings signed a charter for the Afro-American Industrial and Benefit Association for the United States of America. Waldron became secretary and the first president was another minister the Reverend Elias J. Gregg, of Mount Zion Methodist Episcopal Church. The other founders:

J. F. Valentine, a Western Union lineman; A. W. Price, business manager of a weekly, the Florida Evangelist; Dr. Arthur W. Smith, physician; E. W. Latson, a bricklayer; and Abraham Lincoln Lewis, a 34-year-old planer who was working in Cashen's Mill.

On April 1 the new firm opened for business at 14 Ocean Street, using the front part of the Florida Evangelist's printshop. A few weeks later the Afro narrowly escaped being wiped out; the clerk came back from lunch on May 3 to find the great fire bearing down on the premises and she paid a drayman $2 to haul the entire corporation—records, furniture, and a small rug—to safety in Oakland. That clerk was Eartha Mary Magdalene White, who left the business world for full-time social work and is still going strong.

After the excitement subsided, the company office was set up in the dining room of the treasurer, A. L. Lewis, at 621 Florida Avenue. They moved in 1902 to 609 Main Street, then to 722 Main, and finally, in 1910, built a two-story brick home office at Ocean and Union that has served until now.

A bookkeeper has preserved one of the company's first policies. The document was decorated with an assortment of woodcuts: A beehive, symbol of industriousness; a reclining St. Bernard, symbolic of tenacity; a loosely draped Columbia, leaning on an anchor peering seaward, whose symbolism is unclear. For the premium of 15 cents each Monday the association promised to pay $30 upon the death of the insured. In the small print, probably as a hedge against a catastrophic epidemic, the company mentions that only one-half of the $30 will be paid within the first 6 months after death.

Today the Afro-American is writing policies up to $25,000. The company began operating in Georgia in 1926 and expanded into Alabama in 1946. Now there are 126,000 policyholders and 600 employees in the 3 States.

In 1938 the Afro-American became Florida's first million-dollar business owned by Negroes. At present it claims to be 6th among the Nation's Negro insurance companies and 27th among all United States insurance companies.

A. L. Lewis, the original treasurer who rose to the presidency and gained stock control of the company, died March 10, 1947. He was 81 years old and worth $337,764.36. Three generations of descendants are working in the company now—a son, James H. Lewis, who is president and chairman of the board; a granddaughter, Mary Lewis Betsch, who is vice president and treasurer; and a great-grandson, James Leonard Lewis, Jr., who is assistant agency director.

Southbridge DAV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the text, in part, of an address I delivered on Sunday, April 22, 1956, at the annual banquet of the Southbridge, Mass., chapter, Disabled American Veterans.

The material follows:

REMARKS, IN PART, OF CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN BEFORE THE DAV, SOUTHBRIDGE, MASS., APRIL 22, 1956

Distinguished commander, distinguished State commander, Judge Williams, my able and distinguished friends of the general court, Senator Benoit and Representative Cournoyer, distinguished town officials, Gold Star Mothers, officers, members, and friends, it is always with a great sense of privilege that I attend the installations of this outstanding veterans' organization because I am conscious of the fact, as the American people are, that this Nation owes to you and to all our gallant veterans a deep debt of gratitude that can never be repaid.

Moreover, you have not been satisfied to serve in time of war alone and to offer your all on the altar of patriotic devotion. You have also made, and are making, tremendous contributions to the Nation in time of peace.

Your service to this beautiful community in various phases of its civic, economic, and political life, your unselfish service to the State and particularly your untiring efforts for the disabled veterans and their dependents are so well known, so memorable and distinguished, so praiseworthy, that they scarcely need comment from me or anyone else.

However, I gladly embrace this opportunity once again to tell you how deeply and sincerely your fine work is appreciated, and I am sure that it will be continued with the same zeal with which it has been conducted in the past.

I propose this afternoon to discuss with you very briefly some matters relating to veterans' affairs which are presently pending in the Congress and before the country, but before I do that I would like to make some reference to the progress we are making regarding flood-control and flood-rehabilitation work because I know how close to your hearts this subject is, and you know how close it is to mine.

When the great flood disaster struck us last summer and fall, it came like most disasters of this kind without particular warning. Not even our weather services, which usually endeavors to the best of its ability to give us timely reports, was able to present an accurate forecast of the approach and course of the terrible storm which caused such great loss of life and heavy damage in our area.

Most unfortunately and most unhappily this lovely community was afflicted with a sorrowful blow almost without precedent in the history of our State, in fact, I doubt that any similar disaster has ever beset any area in our State as the result of floods and turbulent waters as that which was visited upon us last August and which was augmented during the fall season.

The damage was great and the losses and suffering that followed almost unbelievable but, as I stated in your town hall a few days after this frightful disaster, I am proud and filled with unbounded admiration for this stirring manner in which all the people of your community faced up to this great disaster and the way in which you set to work both in your public and private facilities, to bring order so speedily out of the chaos and confusion and restore vital public services and set into motion the machinery of rehabilitation. Let me emphasize that you are all entitled to great credit, all of your town officials, your able, diligent, effective representatives in the general court, your various civic and business organizations and, indeed, all the people of Southbridge, for the spirit of determination and fortitude which you exhibited in the midst of adversity.

As you know, Government at every level has been participating in the efforts to repair the damage that was wrought and to bring the community back to normal in every respect. In this work your town government has made tremendous contributions and all your town officials to a man, have given their cooperation and assistance.

The State government, which has primary responsibility for the rivers and waterways of the Commonwealth, due in large measure to the unceasing, vigorous, persistent labors of Senator Benoit and Representative Cournoyer, and State agencies, is endeavoring to play its part, and the Red Cross and Federal Government, pursuant to its mandate under the laws, to cope with emergency situations is working and cooperating to the fullest extent possible. For all these efforts we can be thankful, to the Army engineers, civilian defense, Small Business Administration, and all the rest, and we can be thankful most of all for the indomitable spirit and never-say-die attitude of the good people of Southbridge who have made sure that their community will rise up from this disaster stronger, more prosperous, and finer than ever.

I may say that in Washington we are making splendid progress to date with the efforts which I commenced right after the floods and have continued since that time as chairman of the Massachusetts Congressional Delegation Committee on Flood Prevention and Rehabilitation.

So urgently have we pressed the matter of flood protection in this area in our determination to see to it in every way we can that such a disaster will never be visited upon the people again, that almost within a month from the convening of Congress this year, we were able to secure legislation inaugurating several major flood projects in our area including the major dam at East Brimfield, which is considered by the Army engineers to be the key to adequate protection at Southbridge. That project has been authorized and planning money has been appropriated and we expect that before long construction will be underway. I am also pressing for planning money for the project at Westville which is another important part of the overall protective plan and, in time, I expect that that will also be accomplished although the engineers advise me that from an operational standpoint it would be necessary substantially to complete East Brimfield first.

The point I desire to make, my friends, is that we are moving as rapidly as humanly possible toward the desirable goal of full and adequate flood protection for this community and other areas in our State against the ravages and cruel afflictions of periodic floods. And we have been also moving with all possible dispatch with activities designed to effect stream clearance and stream improvement by the removal of rubbish, debris, and other obstructions and to provide for unimpeded flow of the river and the other streams involved.

In this work, among other features, we must understand two things, first, that it is a cooperative undertaking which involves the concurrence and participation of the local governments, and the State government as well as the Federal Government.

Secondly, we must realize that the major projects in mind are of considerable magnitude and require careful planning and construction activities over a period of time and that they cannot be completed over night.

The main thing to remember is that we are making progress, great progress. We are on the right road, moving in the right direction, and if we continue to cooperate with each other as we have been doing up to this point, I venture the prediction that it will not be very long before we will realize our objectives and the people of this community will be able to feel assured that, insofar as anything that can be done to insure them protection against terrible floods, it will have been done and accomplished by the patience, persistency, ability, and zeal of all those to whom responsibility for this work may be committed.

Then there is the question also of disaster insurance which will enable people and businessmen generally to be insured against floods and other disasters. To those of us in this area the arguments for this proposal are unanswerable. Admittedly there are practical difficulties to be worked out concerning the program, and the committees of the Congress are now considering them with vigor and careful attention, and I am hopeful that we will be able in due course to provide a system of insurance that will go a long way toward indemnifying our people against losses from these great disturbances of nature.

This great organization may feel well pleased and well satisfied with the response its membership has made in time of stress and danger. Dedicated as you are to the welfare, interest and defense of the Nation, determined as you are by reason of your own past service to protect it, I know that it is not necessary for me to urge upon you the continuance of your splendid work.

By all means, let us continue to build adequate protection against floods so vitally needed.

And by all means, let us continue to build adequate protection against the dreadful world conspiracy of communism which threatens our liberties at this hour. That is a particular job for patriotic Americans to see to it that the insidious influences of subversive elements is checked.

And let us see to it also that the cause of the veteran and their dependents of the people who have done so much to sustain this country is protected and advanced in the legislative bodies of the Nation and in every other place necessary. Let us make special efforts to assist our disabled veteran and his dear ones and, indeed, all the veterans with reference to the rights and privi-

leges which the Congress has so fittingly extended to them—the GI Bill of Rights—education, homes, hospitalization and medical care and pensions which must be assured and provided at standards commensurate with the higher price levels and the higher cost of living which obtain in the country. In short, let us keep America strong, militarily, economically, socially and, above all, spiritually, since spiritual strength, belief in our Creator and in the great liberties we enjoy is the greatest weapon we have in combating the evil enemies that would destroy us. Let us stand by our ideals, by the principles of the Constitution and the Nation, the rights of the individual, the rights of our people to advance to a more dynamic way of life and we will not only thus protect and secure our liberties but we will be making the greatest contribution possible to a better, more prosperous and happier America and the cause of lasting world peace.

A Time for Calm Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include excerpts from an address before the Mississippi State Senate by one of my distinguished constituents, the Honorable W. B. Alexander, State Senator from Bolivar County. Senator Alexander's remarks are worthy of attention as indicative of the views of a responsible leader in Mississippi during this trying period:

Mr. President and members of the senate, when the senate and the house passed the Interposition Resolution without debate in the senate and by unanimous vote in both houses, I suggested from the floor that our presiding officer and the senate itself, for some weeks, indulge us with considerable leniency, so that those members of this body who wished to do so, might at a later date discuss interposition and the problems related thereto, which were forced upon the South by the misguided Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954, and the later decision implementing that momentous and most important decision. I thank the chair for recognizing me now for that purpose and I shall make my remarks as brief as the importance of the subject will permit, so as not to abuse the distinct privilege accorded to me by the President and the membership of this distinguished body of patriotic Mississippians.

My senatorial district, the 30th district, consisting of Bolivar County only, a county of 63,000 population, should and does feel as strongly on the question of segregation as any other county in our great State, or for that matter, any other county in the South, unless it be a county like Clarendon County, S. C., in which according to the statement of that great statesman and constitutional lawyer, John W. Davis, has 17 colored people to each white person in its boundaries.

* * * * *

THE GREATNESS OF MISSISSIPPI

Mississippi is historically and truly a leader among the 48 States of this Union. In 1819 Mississippi was the first State in the Union to charter an institution for the education of young women. This was Elizabeth Academy located in the town of Washington, near Natchez. This town was for a time, as you know, the capital of Mississippi.

In 1824 Mississippi was the first State in the Union to abolish imprisonment for debt.

In 1832, Mississippi was the first State in the Union to provide for an elected judiciary. Time has shown that this system is much preferable to appointive judges.

In 1884, Mississippi was the first State in the Union to establish a college for women, supported by the State, this being the Industrial Institute and College at Columbus, now known as M. S. C. W.

* * * * *

While we have not had a member of the United States Supreme Court or a member of the Presidential Cabinet in approximately 60 years from Mississippi, and we may not have another such official from this State for decades to come or for the remainder of this century, and while we have lost power and influence in the councils of the Nation due to the ever-increasing influence of minority groups, many of them subversive, upon the political parties of this country, yet the native genius and intelligence and ability of the sons of Mississippi, the State with the highest percentage of native-born population in our Union, is such that a Mississippian is now president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, another Mississippian has just finished a term as president of the National Municipal Association, on a recent year a Mississippi boy was elected president of the National Boys' State and a Mississippi girl was elected president of National Girls' State. Many of the large colleges and large industries and large banks of this country are guided by a Mississippian as its head, and Mississippians have won Pulitzer prizes in journalism and in literature and in many fields of endeavor. Our people, after being ground down into abject poverty following the Civil War, have the most eager aspirations for education and for enlightenment according to the official records of the United States Department of Commerce, of which I have photostatic copies in my office. Mississippi stands second among the States of the Union in the percentage of its white population who are attending college, although we stand last in per capita income. Mississippi ranked first among the States of this Union in the percentage of volunteers for the Armed Forces in World War II. The citizens of this State, along with 35 million of their Southern brethren, stand ready to spring to arms if necessary to defend our liberties or in resisting the Communist hordes, domestic and foreign, which seek to overwhelm us. We Mississippians are loyal people. We believe in the principles of constitutional government. We believe in the Constitution of the United States. I feel, along with many of my fellow citizens, that if the trend towards socialism and towards a more highly centralized national government should continue to the left as much in the next 25 years as it has since 1932, that this Government will be one of advanced socialism or perhaps even a communistic government itself. The Southern States, so deeply for generations entrenched in their reverence for constitutional government are the last great bulwark of conservatism which will in time preserve this Republic and enable us to remain free men.

If such an organization as the NAACP is to continue to dominate and intimidate the officials and Supreme Court of this Nation, then we may even before another quarter century has elapsed, be no longer a Nation of free men, but be nothing but slaves to the Federal Government and as such slaves be persons whose only right will be to bare their backs to such lashes as a tyrannous master may seek to impose. We all know from such authorities as Attorney General Eugene Cook of Georgia and many other authorities, that a majority of the board of directors of the NAACP are either outright Communists or have been such, or that they belong to not 1 or 2, but many dozens of subversive organizations. To try to overthrow such organizations as this, is the bounden duty of every sworn public official in maintaining the Constitution and the freedom of this country.

INTERPOSITION

I shall refer only briefly to interposition. We are all familiar with it. The wonderful resolution so carefully prepared by a most able committee of our legislature itself adequately explains the reason for that resolution and the philosophy on which it is based. The greatest and most momentous of all national issues, that of abolishing all separate State supported educational institutions for colored citizens and integrating them into white schools, presents far more than the issue of mixed schools. We believe that the Supreme Court ruling, which reversed more than 100 years of previous decisions of that Court, is an unconstitutional violation of the 10th amendment, which specifically reserves to the States "all powers not delegated to the United States nor prohibited by it to the States." There is nothing in the Constitution which empowered the Federal Government to control the State school systems, and the Supreme Court has in its recent decisions, usurped legislative powers and has in effect begun the writing of a new Constitution. The Supreme Court of the United States has the wrong concept of the Constitution. It is an immutable instrument which can be changed by an amendment voted by the people or the legislatures of three-fourths of the States. Under the common law under which English-speaking people have lived for many centuries, the common law judges as conditions changed, would announce some new principle of law or some social revolution by judge made edict. But this cannot be done with the Constitution, for it is the fundamental, stable, and paramount law of the land, with which no judge can tamper. The doctrine of interposition was first invoked by Thomas Jefferson against the Alien and Sedition Acts, that set our new Nation on its first witch hunting crusade. This was when the Federalists exercised a dominant influence over the Supreme Court. Virginia joined Kentucky in calling on the other States to declare the act to be unconstitutional. In 1859, Wisconsin interposed against the Supreme Court's Dred Scott decision. The act has been at other times invoked by various States and interposition or nullification is an historical American constitutional remedy, invoked more frequently in the North than in the South.

This Government is a union of sovereign States. All rights not specifically granted the Federal union were reserved to the States or to the people, respectively. Where there are two contracting parties, it is never true that one party to the compact has the sole right to construe that compact. The Supreme Court of the United States, as the creature of the Federal Government, does not have the last and supreme right to construe the Constitution, because the States and the people who created that compact are after all supreme.

* * * * *

THE RACIAL QUESTION

It is obvious that we can never rectify the great wrong done us by the Supreme Court if we attack this problem solely from a racial standpoint. It is obvious that having once taken charge of the schools of this Nation, that the Supreme Court will in turn attack all matters of public health, marriage, elections and every activity of the citizen, so that instead of being a citizen of a sovereign State, he will be merely a tiny cog in the Federal scheme of things and we will be lost as free men, and that instrument referred to by James Bryce as the great-

est document ever written by man, will be trampled in the dust. I recall how Lord Macauley said, over 100 years ago, that the American experiment would fail when all of our free lands were gone, and I often wonder if the prophecy of Lord Macauley is about to become a reality through the forces of communism undermining our Government and through the misguided decisions of our own Supreme Court, and through the repeated and successful attacks upon private industry which we have witnessed for the last 25 years, and which we witness to this very day in our own legislature.

The Negro has far more to lose through the destruction of the Constitution than we do. Any minority race will suffer first if that Constitution is destroyed. We have nothing but friendship for good colored people. While of late race relations have been worsened and the efforts of men of good will toward better racial relations have been retarded and the patient progress of many decades has been destroyed, yet we cannot base our fight on anything, but good will toward the colored race. After all, we can recall that not a single suit to force colored people in our schools and colleges has been filed in Mississippi. This is largely because we, the poorest of all States, have taxed ourselves voluntarily to where we pay the highest taxes in proportion to our per capita income and per capita worth, of any State in the Union, and that a larger percentage of our tax dollar is used for education, than in any other State in the Union, and because we are making a determined and costly fight to afford our Negro brethren school facilities, which while utterly separate, will be the equal of those afforded the white man. Two months ago, eulogies were paid to the memory of that great American and southerner, Gen. Robert E. Lee. I attended college in the little town of Lexington in Rockbridge County, Va., at the Virginia Military Institute. There we repeatedly visited the graves of Stonewall Jackson and Gen. Robert E. Lee, where he is interred in the little Episcopal church on the campus of Washington and Lee University. The incident in this great man's life which impressed me more than any other, was the incident of General Lee strolling with a friend in that little town when a venerable Negro passed and respectfully raised his hat to the general, and the general in response raised his hat to the colored man, and upon his friend expressing his surprise that he should do so, the general replied, "Why, my friend, I am sure you would not want me to be exceeded in courtesy by a colored man." I also recall that that very great Virginian and southerner, Stonewall Jackson, who had been a professor of mathematics at VMI most of the time between the close of the Mexican War and the outbreak of the Civil War, devoted every idle moment organizing Negro Sunday schools. Neither man believed in slavery and neither man owned a slave. They embodied the spirit of real gentlemen of the Old South and of the New.

My people have lived in the South for 300 years. My grandfathers and all of my uncles of military age served in the Confederate army. We know the Negro, with all his virtues and limitations. We have an affection for good law-abiding Negroes. Early in life, I learned that a colored person did not like to be called nigger, and my wife has reared all of my five children to never use the word "nigger" or Negro, but to refer to them as colored people. We should not wantonly hurt the feelings of any human being, especially a human being who is less privileged than we are.

Just before the beginning of the great depression, I bought some 6,500 acres of land and subdivided it and built roads and built about 140 houses on these lands. I selected certain sections adjacent to each other for sale to white people, and certain other sections of land adjacent to each other for sale to colored people, and I sold about 75 tracts of farmland to ambitious Negroes who wanted to live as law-abiding citizens and educate their children. These lands are now paid for. I enjoy the confidence of these many Negro friends and hundreds of others in Bolivar County and in Mississippi. I shall always treat these colored citizens as good as they will treat me. I shall always protect them if I can and see that they have the same economic rights and the same evenhanded justice in the courts that any white man has. Nevertheless, like the late Senator Bilbo, I can say in my heart that "I will welcome my colored friend as a brother in Christ, but I will not have him for a son-in-law." We must maintain segregation. It is inconceivable to me that the white race in Mississippi, owning 95 percent of the wealth and 95 percent of the real estate, cannot maintain segregation as long as we have the sincere desire to do so. The Federal Constitution imposes no duty to afford public schools. We will abolish these public schools, if necessary. When the first colored child puts his foot, by court order, into any white school in Mississippi, we will abolish these schools. We will discontinue all appropriations for Negro colleges and universities, for we will then know that we will not need a single Negro teacher or instructor for any school in Mississippi, and we will discontinue the training of these people. However, we must not attack this great problem from a racial standpoint. We must attack it from a constitutional standpoint and thereby secure help from the North. It is said now that the Indiana Legislature is to seriously consider an interposition resolution. We must be conservative. We must be logical. We must be calm.

However, notwithstanding the fact that only 6 Negroes were killed by white people in Mississippi last year, while 8 white people were killed by Negroes and 186 Negroes were killed by other Negroes, we have had the most unfortunate and undeserved publicity of any State in the Union in this regard.

We must be conservative in our talk. We must at all hazards, through such great and patriotic organizations as the Citizens' Councils, prevent any lawlessness toward Negroes. We must be circumspect. We have had a flood of resolutions and bills aimed at preserving segregation introduced in this legislature, many of which were radical and unwise and did not aid in maintaining segregation. We have had many inflammatory statements made, which were unwise and undeserving among a great citizenship such as ours. We must not permit the radical NAACP to goad us into radical and fiery statements.

* * * * *

I do so well recall a few years ago when our Senators in Congress were in a filibuster against the iniquitous FEPC bill, designed to further rape the Constitution, that Senator EASTLAND told me that he was approached by a dozen northern friends in the Senate who were sympathetic to our cause, who assured him that if we would fight this matter out on a constitutional basis and not on a racial basis, that they would give us quiet help and assistance in the fight. Our southern Senators adopted this advice and never mentioned the racial question in any debate and they won the fight. We can win this fight in time, if we restrict it to constitutional grounds and not racial grounds, and if we are conservative, logical and decent throughout our fight.

* * * * *

Then there is the matter of boycotts. In Alabama they indicted 99 Negroes for violating the boycott law in connection with the bus strike at Montgomery, Ala. This strike upon the part of the colored people would have been over for good by now if the officials at Montgomery had not been unwise enough to make martyrs of them. We cannot afford boycotts. We have the problem with us of sustaining and augmenting the tremendous advances we have achieved in the postwar period. Our fondest dream is for a true balance between industry and agriculture and that dream may be realized in a not too distant future. The so-called economic boycotts being conducted against many companies is manifestly unwise. So far as these boycotts in Mississippi are concerned, I am advised that they were pushed and pedaled by an admitted ex-Communist from St. Louis. It is unfortunate that these so-called economic reprisals, commonly known as boycotts, have been injected at the very same time when we are engaged in a death struggle in maintaining a way of life and a philosophy of life we have known in the South for 300 years. We have lifted the banners of bitterness and prejudice above our feeling of commonsense and decency against some people and companies whose records for as long as a half century have been friendly and helpful not only to this State but to the South as a whole. The ramifications of these boycotts are many. Our State, with its 2 million people, contributes to the national economy less than 1 percent. Boycotts have been historically a prime weapon of the Communist Party and are un-American in nature, in that they deny and are contrary to the first principles for which we have been fighting. In the next place, these boycotts are most disturbing because they, in fact, display an unreceptive attitude, and one which everyone knows is untrue toward potential newcomer corporations in our State.

* * * * *

Let us be moderate, but unyielding and determined. Let us be conservative in every act and deed. Let us fight this thing out not on a racial basis and not on a basis of hatred and prejudice but upon a basis of commonsense and reason, upon a constitutional basis, so as to preserve that immortal document which guarantees freedom to us and to our posterity. Let us all serve in this cause and use every lawful means to preserve our way of life. Let us use no unlawful means. Let us follow the example of our Citizens' Council, a very great patriotic organization, in staying strictly within the law in the fight which lies ahead. This is our duty. The great man, General Lee, whom I referred to, said, "Duty is the sublimest word in the English language," and that is the opening sentence of that great book written by Thomas Nelson Page on the subject of Lee, the American.

At the battle of Cressy, it was said that as his army met defeat, the blind old king of Bohemia, unwilling to survive the cries of defeat and disaster, had his chargers tied on either side to the chargers of his companions and that he, though blind, dashed into the fray and was killed, and that night as the pale moon shone down upon 30,000 slain, they found the body of the blind old king of Bohemia with his brow ringed in blood and a small crest upon his head which bore the words "Ich dien," meaning "I serve" and that they took this simple crest and placed it in Westminster Abbey high above all the battered shields and shattered swords and banners of victory which had aided the fighting men of England in a thousand years of conquest in mastering the seas and conquering the earth and that this simple insignia, "I serve," is still the motto of all of England's kings and queens and all of her princes yet unborn, and we in the South in humble imitation and in obedience to the words on this simple crest, may set our face like a flint toward the foe and must never yield. We are not in the fight to protect the constitution 75 percent or 98 percent but we are in the fight 100 percent. We shall never give in. We shall never permit the amalgamation of the races and the destruction of the virtues of both

races at the behest of a power-mad minority in this country. We shall serve and we shall serve to our dying day. We will never retreat. We shall win this fight if we adopt the principles of moderation. "He whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad." We shall grit our teeth and keep our temper. We shall make no intemperate public utterance. We shall introduce no foolish and unwise legislation. We shall fight this fight on a constitutional basis. We shall thus enlist the help of the States of the North because the preservation of the Constitution is just as much to their interest as it is ours. We shall be law-abiding. We shall not let a colored man be kinder to us than we are to him. We shall in the interest of both races unyieldingly maintain segregation, even though we must abolish the public schools to do so. We shall fight a good fight; right and justice and the Constitution are on our side. We shall win the victory. We shall as citizens of this great State be urged and uplifted by the crisis which surrounds us. We shall be a bulwark against communism and radicalism. We shall restore the Constitution to its pristine force and vigor. Mississippi is a natural leader among the States. Her power and political prestige shall finally be restored. I pray that although we have gone far to the left already and our Constitution has been weakened, that we shall never forget that we still have the finest Government ever devised by man. Pray, Almighty God, that we may preserve that liberty and that Constitution for our posterity and as an example of freedom throughout the centuries for all the nations of this earth.

Soviet Squeeze Play Perils United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this point in the RECORD a timely article by that outstanding columist, Mr. Constantine Brown, who writes in the Evening Star. On Tuesday, April 24, in his column he pointed out that the Soviet propaganda efforts are placing the United States in a serious squeeze with its friends in the free world. The article follows:

SOVIET SQUEEZE PLAY PERILS UNITED STATES—RED GAINS AND AMERICAN LOSS OF FRIENDS DESPITE MONETARY AID ARE COMPARED

(By Constantine Brown)

The main effort of the Soviet leaders these days is directed at squeezing out the United States from the position of world leadership which was thrust upon us after the last war. And Messrs. Bulganin and Khrushchev and Co. are doing a good job of it.

The loss of our illusory leadership would not be a severe blow in itself if it did not jeopardize our security.

Unlike the Western Powers in past centuries, which became world powers for profit through colonialism and exploitation of the lesser nations. America has conceived its new world position as a job in which it assumed obligations without compensation. We spent the taxpayers' money chasing that will-o'-the-wisp, lasting peace, without asking anything for ourselves.

Our leaders of both parties believed in the gratitude of the countries which received our bonanza. They thought that by spending tax dollars indiscriminately they would secure such good will from the recipients that the free world would help create a strong barrier against the rising tide of Communist imperialism.

There were some White House advisers during the war who conceived the idea of a millennium through economic leveling between the haves and the have nots. This was expressed by one of the brain trusters at an informal dinner at the Polish Embassy in Washington which this reporter attended, as follows: "The world peace will have to be assured by America. We shall have to siphon our wealth across both oceans in such volume that there shall be a leveling off between our prosperity and the European and Asian lack of it. When sufficient American substance has been transferred across the oceans we will have less and they will have more. In this manner there will be an economic equality between all peoples which will insure the world free of wars and strife."

Whether this theory, expounded by one of the foremost brain trusters of President Roosevelt, was espoused by his successors is difficult to say. But we are now continuing the policy of siphoning across the oceans American dollars and goods without regard for where they go.

Yet we have not reached the millennium the brain truster expected from this leveling off of economic disparity. Far from it. We are now faced with an international situation that only inveterate wishful thinkers would describe as favorable to peace.

The French are looking to Russia to help them out of their ticklish position in North Africa. Premier Mollet and Foreign Minister Pineau start their pilgrimage to Moscow on May 14. The main purpose is to ask the Kremlin's price for friendly intervention in France's behalf with the Arabs.

The West German Republic has begun discreet negotiations with the Muscovites looking toward German unity. In the Middle East the Russian drive to substitute themselves for the United States is moving rapidly toward successful accomplishment.

This reporter, just returned from a trip to Turkey and Greece, can say that our position in Turkey is becoming precarious, while in Greece the American-supported Tito is taking advantage of the Cyprus and is driving for a Greek-British controversy over new political constellation—the Belgrade-Athens-Cairo axis. The fact that Tito's heart belongs to the daddies in Moscow (and since Stalin's death and dedeification he is closer to the Kremlin than before) does not keep us from pouring tens of millions into his treasury. The argument of our bureaucrats is: "If we do not help him, the Russians will soon have bases on the shores of the Adriatic."

We were, according to statements from the highest in the land, on the brink of war in the Middle East until the Russians told the Arabs last week: "Go easy, boys, for the time being." Only then did fears of an early outbreak subside.

Communism is gaining in the Far East. Only a handful of weak countries still stand by us. The Pakistanis still are loyal, but have become uncertain about our intentions toward them. In the meantime, the Russians are making important inroads in the country and are preparing to increase their support of the republic.

There is an uneasy armistice in Korea. Since it was signed in 1953, the Communists have strengthened their military position far beyond what it was before the truce.

The ridiculous "exchanges of views" between American Ambassador Johnson and Communist Ambassador Wang which have been going on at Geneva since last August are interpreted by the free Asiatics as marking time to pave the way for a conference between Secretary Dulles and Red Premier Chou En-lai.

Only professional optimists can maintain that we are not being squeezed out of our position of leadership in the free world. And this Communist squeeze is a definite threat to our national security.

Public Policy Aspects of Automation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago it was my pleasure to address a Conference on Automation in Pittsburgh, Pa., cosponsored by the Pittsburgh Labor Education Council and Labor Education Service, Pennsylvania State University. My remarks were directed toward the public policy aspects of automation. Mr. Bruno A. Moski, Director of Industrial Engineering, Yale & Towne Manufacturing Co. presented the management viewpoint while Mr. Nat Goldfinger, economist from the Department of Research, AFL-CIO, presented the labor viewpoint. Delegates from AFL and CIO local unions and from lodges of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen from the western Pennsylvania area attended the conference and participated in the discussion which followed the formal presentation of the various viewpoints on this important subject.

Mr. Speaker, this Conference on Automation was an inspirational example of democracy in action, citizens meeting together to discuss the various aspects of a mutual problem which is of immediate concern to the working people of our country. The conference in Pittsburgh made an outstanding contribution toward the more widespread understanding of the impact which automation will have on our social and economic systems. I congratulate the Labor Extension Service of Penn State University and the Pittsburgh Labor Education Council for their outstanding leadership in making the conference an outstanding success and hope that this type of meeting may serve as a model of similar discussions in other parts of the United States.

The text of my address follows:

Congressional concern over the impact of automation on our citizens, our living habits, and our economy has many different aspects. I would like to discuss some of the more important of them in the brief time allotted me for this initial presentation. Others may come into our discussion as the result of questions following your buzz sessions.

I would like to devote my remarks here today to these major points in regard to automation: (1) Automation in the Federal Government; (2) the broad public policy aspects of automation; (3) the role of the Federal Government in meeting the challenge of automation; and (4) positive steps which should be taken now.

I. AUTOMATION IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

In our general consideration of automation, we have tended to direct our attention to the application of automation in industrial situations. We have learned of dramatic changes in the production-line uses of automation, whereby hundreds of workers have been replaced by a handful, because of the installation of awe-inspiring machines and electronically controlled operations.

Less has been heard about the impact of automation on various agencies and departments of the Federal Government. A recent article in the Wall Street Journal reported that machines to streamline paper work in the Bureau of Public Debt of the Treasury

Department have reduced the number of employees in that office by two-thirds over the past 10 years. Records divisions of the Veterans' Administration and the Social Security Administration are drastically reducing their number of employees through the use of electronic machinery. The Weather Bureau now has a machine which automatically reproduces the weather maps appearing in our daily papers. Weather data is fed into the machine, and in 8 minutes it performs mathematical computations that would take one man 64 years to complete.

The Post Office Department will perhaps have the greatest use for electronic machinery in the years ahead. Already there are various machines in use which sort mail, and perform other similar mechanical functions. The Wall Street Journal reports that encouraging results have been obtained on tests of a new machine which can read typewritten addresses on letters and sort these letters by city of destination.

The Post Office has also installed a new stamp-vending machine for use in post offices. You drop in coins, dial the number of stamps you desire, and they are automatically dispensed. A recorded voice even says "thank you" to the stamp purchaser.

Thus, you see that all of the applications of automation are not confined to the field of industrial production, but affect workers in the Federal Government as well.

II. BROAD PUBLIC POLICY

In view of the broad social and economic ramifications of automation, what should be the role of the Federal Government? Or to phrase it another way, what are the public policy considerations in the impact of automation on our modern civilization? At the outset I feel that the advent of automation on our modern industrial scene requires us to carefully reexamine our basic philosophy of government, since the concern over the changes automation will bring to our daily lives in the years ahead intimately affects this concept of democratic government.

Our democratic system of government in America is unique because it places primary concern on the individual human being, his wants, his needs, his welfare. All power of government reposes in the hands of the individual citizens. Government is successful in terms of its ability to formulate and carry out policies which fulfill the needs and promote the welfare of the people who delegate certain powers to their government. Government which ignores the needs and welfare of all the people, in order to pursue courses of action beneficial to particular groups of its citizens, is violating our fundamental precepts of democratic government. Good government is responsive to the needs of its people and within its constitutional limitations, acts to meet problems or innovations which conceivably could affect the well-being of its citizens. Such response of government to individual situations may be called public policy. Sound public policy, like good government, must be tailormade to meet the needs of our people and must always keep foremost as its objective the promotion of human welfare and human values. Material progress at the expense of human suffering cannot be defended. This is the way of the totalitarian dictatorships and has no place in our democracy.

These are fundamental statements of fact which we must be aware of in the discussion of automation as it affects public policy. I am sure that most Americans today accept these time-honored philosophies of Government, which were written into our Constitution by the Founding Fathers and implemented by practice over the years.

In searching for a governmental policy to effectively deal with the problems raised by automation, we have certain insights gained by past experience. Automation has sometimes been referred to as the second industrial revolution. What policies were adopted by governments in the past when sudden technological changes appeared?

Most authorities agree that the first industrial revolution took place about 200 years ago, while our country was still divided into colonies of Great Britain. We all remember reading of the violent uprisings in England which accompanied the invention and application of labor-saving machinery in mills and factories. Thousands of workers were thrown out of work in the wave of social and political upheaval. As a result, human suffering under the rule of an absolute monarch caused untold misery and deprivation. Economic justification of the changes, brought about by the first industrial revolution, were expressed by the philosophy that government should not interfere in any way with the right of business and industry to carry out policies, even though they might be detrimental to the public good.

This philosophy dominated the 18th and 19th centuries and extended well into our present century. Certain reactionary elements of our business society even today still cling to this philosophy, which is evident in the lack of social responsibility in the pursuit of their policies.

In America, during the late 1800's, the introduction of mass-production methods brought about a notable acceleration of the first industrial revolution. This period marked the development and growth of giant corporate enterprises of such power as to rival our Government itself. "The public be damned," was the motto of these industrial giants. Their wealth and influence dominated the election of public officials at the State and National governmental levels. Unbridled power and wealth was a corrupting influence on the very foundations of democratic Government.

Resurging public opinion demanded regulation of these monopolistic giants. Antitrust laws, regulatory laws, and court decisions were directed against them, but only a portion of their activities were ever brought under control. Legislation such as the Public Utility Holding Act, and the Securities and Exchange Act, passed during the New Deal years, was a later step to protect the public against further exploitation.

Governmental policy during the period of the growth of monopolistic corporate enterprises was generally one of nonintervention. When the abuses and power of these enterprises grew to such a point as to threaten our form of government, public opinion demanded action. But such action against entrenched economic interests was at best only a checkrein to further abuse.

Some people argue that our material progress during the past 75 years and our present high standard of living could not have taken place otherwise. I am of a different opinion. It was not until corporate excesses began to be curbed that any real advancement of the welfare of the individual citizen took place. Labor was crushed by monopolistic corporate power until the depression and the New Deal afforded working people the legal right to organize and bargain collectively. It has been over the past 20 years that the real advances in our standard of living have taken place, and the role played by organized labor in winning a share of the fruits of corporate wealth is a matter of record.

Here is a lesson which was learned 75 years ago and which is applicable to our present discussion of automation. Government must not surrender its duty of protecting and promoting the welfare of all its citizens, especially in times of economic and technological upheavals. Economic and material progress must never again be permitted to travel a road paved with the bodies of workers, crushed in the mad scramble for wealth and power. Human dignity and the public good must not be subverted to personal greed.

Our Government has a legitimate right to become involved at the very beginning of this "Second Industrial Revolution" so that past abuses will never again be repeated. We, as citizens, should demand such public policies as are necessary to insure that the impact of automation will be intelligently directed toward the realization of benefits which will be enjoyed by all our citizens.

III. THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN MEETING THE CHALLENGE OF AUTOMATION

There can be not doubt that the problem of automation is a national issue. By the enactment of the Employment Act of 1946 the Congress of the United States gave legal recognition to the duty of the Federal Government to use its resources to create the conditions making for maximum employment, by fostering and promoting conditions which will afford job opportunities for all people desirous and capable of working.

If the results of automation were to take place suddenly and on a broad scale, millions of workers would be thrown out of work, competing against each other for fewer and fewer jobs at lower and lower pay. Our social and economic system would be in a chaos. Widespread depression and mass unemployment poses a dangerous threat to our democratic way of life. It would be disastrous both in terms of human suffering at home and in terms of the opportunity it would afford to Communist imperialism in its plan for domination of the free world. The stakes in the game are high. Either we adopt public policies to study, anticipate, and channel the course of automation toward human betterment, or like the Frankenstein monster, it may rise up to destroy us.

I am confident that intelligent and informed American citizens will not permit the potential blessings of automation to escape us or be turned against us. We will not permit our Government to stand idly by and await the full impact of automation without preparing ourselves for its effects. We cannot afford the luxury of inaction or failure to face up to the realities of automation. If the administration temporarily in control of the policies of our Government fails to take heed of the impending changes which automation will bring to every phase of our lives, I am sure that a new administration will be elected in its place which will take such action as is deemed necessary.

IV. POSITIVE STEPS NOW

What are some of the ways in which public policy can be effectively directed toward systematic preparation for the social, economic and technological changes brought about by automation?

First, there must be a recognition of automation, what it is, what it means, what we estimate its effects will be, where its impact will be first felt, and other similar fact-finding questions. Meetings such as this are of tremendous importance because these types of questions are discussed. It is also important that the word "automation" and its meanings be made known to the great numbers of our people who do not have the opportunity of attending such meetings and who may not read or hear about automation. There must be widespread recognition and understanding of the problem, not in technical terms but in the basic understanding of what automation means to individual citizens and how the future of all of us depends on the adoption of sound public policy to deal with the problems which automation creates. Government is motivated into particular courses of action by an awareness of its citizens, and their ability to make their opinions known to their appropriate elected representatives who have a role in the formation of public policy.

One way of making your views known is to call the attention of your public officials to

hearings before Joint Committee on the Economic Report. The hearings are entitled "Automation and Technological Change" and contain a wealth of information and statistical data submitted by the expert witnesses who appeared before the committee. A subsequent report on these hearings gives a concise statement of the basic facts of the problem of automation and offers policy recommendations to meet this problem.

Secondly, I feel that sound public policy required that every possible effort be made to strengthen our economy at its foundations so that temporary setbacks resulting from technological change may be compensated for elsewhere in the national economy. By this I mean the enactment of a broad legislative program to place greater purchasing power in the hands of the average citizens. This program would include an increase in personal income tax exemptions; an increase in the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour and an extension of coverage; an increase in social-security benefits, a reduction of the retirement age, and a liberalization of other provisions of the law; liberalization of our unemployment compensation system; assistance to areas of chronic unemployment in the establishment of facilities for vocational rehabilitation, education, and retraining of displaced workers, especially older workers, and the attraction of new industries; an expanded health and medical research program; Federal aid for school and hospital construction; full development of our natural resources, and other similar type programs which will have a long-range beneficial effect on our economy while also meeting the most pressing economic needs of our people.

A dynamic, expanding, full-employment economy is perhaps the best way in which we can prepare ourselves for the impact of automation, and guarantee that hardships to displaced workers and their families will be kept at a minimum. A healthy, expanding economy will be able to absorb displaced workers as well as providing job opportunities for our young people entering the labor market.

Thirdly, it is the responsibility of enlightened management to face up to the broad social aspects of automation and understand and accept their full role in the process of technological change. Industry must be prepared to use part of the wealth and abundance created by more efficient and less costly production in the retraining of displaced workers so that their skills might be utilized in other parts of our economy. Industry has the responsibility of carefully planning and scheduling its production, so that loss of employment and resulting human suffering may be minimized. The institution of new automation machinery must be carefully planned so that due consideration is given to the general state of business so that displaced workers may find new employment more readily.

Fourthly, the impact of automation places on organized labor the responsibility of meeting the challenge of technological advancement. I am proud to pay tribute to the statesmanlike position which the leaders or organized labor have taken in this regard. There will be no machine-smashing riots in the second industrial revolution in America, for the new labor-saving machines offer almost unlimited opportunities for human progress if our technical skill and ability are molded to the needs and betterment of all mankind. This does not mean that labor can afford to sit back and await the fruits of abundance created by more efficient labor-saving machinery. Labor must cooperate with enlightened management in the solution of mutual problems so that the mutual advantages which automation has in store for us may be fully realized. Labor must be prepared to offer constructive recommendations in the application of technological changes to specific situations. Labor must educate its membership to understand automation and mobilize public opinion in the community to a realization of the problems, opportunities and the challenge which we must all meet in this spirit of cooperation.

The horizon is filled with glorious opportunities. A bright new day is dawning, if only we can grasp its significance and adopt policies to meet the challenge of automation.

We look forward to shorter workweeks, more leisure time, greater cultural and recreational opportunities, travel, and an enjoyment of the good things of life with our families.

Men of good will—people in all walks of life, in labor, mangement, and in government—working together in a spirit of cooperation and brotherhood can achieve this goal of freedom, security, and abundance for which civilization has been struggling for thousands of years.

Problems of the Middle East Are Still Unsolved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the problems of the Middle East appeared as if they were on the way to a solution according to the jubilant headlines which the papers gave them early last week. Today we realized, with sober reflection, that the basic problems remain unsolved and the threat of a conflict which might blossom into the third world war remains hanging over the world. That the unrest which seethes in that part of the world is unsettled is made evident by the repeated clashes and outbursts of violence along the frontiers of Israel before that cease fire which we hailed so hopefully was a week old.

We in America have not realized that lasting peace will come to that area only when all of the people there have become reconciled to peace and the status quo. And the latter, the status quo, which means the existence of Israel and its present frontiers, is the most important of the two.

Beyond these two paramount ideological and economic conditions for peace are the important considerations of the problems of resettlement of refugees, ending of the economic misery and privation which is so prevalent in that part of the world, the solution of the problems of furnishing adequate water for domestic, agricultural, and economic use, and the furnishing of a decent standard of living to all the people of the area.

As a preludium to any such settlement, we must set about making the Arabs recognize that war is in no wise either practical or desirable.

Present conditions indicate that the Arabs only seek to use the present cease-fire as a period to continue their military buildup until they are either ready to attack themselves or to attempt to goad the Israelis into a preventive war.

I repeat that this impending war may be the preludium to the first atomic war. We in America have a duty to ourselves and the rest of the world to see to it that Israel and the Arabs do not fall into this abyss and drag the rest of the world in with them.

Israel wants peace as badly as do we in America. The Arabs are spoiling for a fight, and their leaders' declarations show they will go to war as soon as the circumstances indicate the success of such a venture.

We in America can delay or prevent the possibility of such a calamity by providing Israel with such of the sinews of modern war as would make her such a sufficiently formidable opponent that the Arabs would not dare to attack her. I have consistently urged that Israel be given the weapons she needs for her own defense, and hope that her need will be soon realized by the White House to coincide with America's own enlightened self-interest.

One of my good friends, Dr. Leon Fram, of Temple Israel, in the city of Detroit, one of our city's most respected clergymen, and leaders in church and civic affairs, recently wrote a letter to the President which expresses the feelings of many of our people here in America their concern for the future of Israel, as well as the peace of the world.

I hope that my insertion of it into the RECORD at this point will call to attention the problems faced by the sister democracies, America and Israel, and their pressing common danger in the Middle East.

APRIL 6, 1956.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As a citizen of this Republic, I am exercising my right to criticize your administration of your office.

You are responsible for our foreign policy. Let me say frankly, then, that your policy on the Middle East is timid and confused, and is, therefore, leading our country inevitably to war and disaster.

You, who have had so much experience with dictators, seem to have forgotten that the one thing dictators despise is weakness, and the one thing they respect is firmness. Instead of dealing firmly with the dictator of Egypt, you are displaying weakness and appeasing him. You are encouraging him in his openly proclaimed project of destroying the State of Israel. You are inviting him to aggression and war by denying Israel the right to purchase those defense weapons which would deter his aggression.

Your betrayal of Israel will only serve to unite the Arab countries in utter contempt of you and the free world. A solid Moslem land mass, including North Africa, will fall like ripe fruit into the palm of Communist Russia. Then both oil and bases will be lost.

The only way to safeguard the American and the free-world position in the Middle East, is by firm resistance to the obvious aggressive designs of the Egyptian dictator.

Like all other dictators, Nasser will not attack where victory is uncertain. Defense weapons for Israel, and a security pact with Israel, are the only sure way to prevent war and assure order, and thus safeguard our oil and our bases.

Sending the Secretary of the United Nations to supervise the Israel-Arab frontiers is a futile gesture. It will not prevent Nasser from attacking when he is ready to use his new Communist jet bombers.

Israel must be protected in 1 of 2 ways—either by free-world forces, or by its own defensive weapons. Since you, Mr. President,

have stated emphatically that American forces will not be available, the only way left to deter aggression is to supply Israel with defensive weapons.

As the Life magazine editorial recently suggested, once the Arab leaders are given to understand that Israel's right to live will be protected, all the other problems of the Middle East will become minor and open to ready solution. With peace will come cooperation, rehabilitation, and prosperity.

I beg you, Mr. President, to apply your knowledge of dictatorship mentality. Instead of appeasing Nasser, give Israel the chance to resist.

Israel will not fail you.

Sincerely yours,

DR. LEON FRAM.

What I Owe My Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include 2 of the prize-winning essays in the American Legion essay contest in Ohio. Miss Shellia Gallagher, of St. John's High School, Bellaire, and Mr. Elmer Tope, of Sherrodsville, Conotton Valley High School, were 2 of the 12 winners out of the more than 100,000 high-school students who entered this contest. Naturally, we of the 18th district are very proud of them and I would like to extend my personal congratulations to them. The subject of all the essays was "What I Owe My Country." The American Legion is to be congratulated for sponsoring this kind of citizen-building program. The prize-winning essays follow:

WHAT I OWE MY COUNTRY
(By Shellia Gallagher)

Dear Lady America, gazing from my Ohio home, I behold your hills, not majestic purple mountains, but glorious hills. They are not just heaps of dirt, however, for they furnish homes for your peoples, and they are a masterpiece sculptured by the Greatest of Artists for your admirers. To the farmers they are sloping gardens, and to your miners a vast source of coal, but most of all they are a small portion of your land where was planted the small seed of liberty, which through the years has grown and blossomed into the wealthiest Nation on the face of the earth.

You are a temple of freedom. Our forefathers, your architects, built you from the blueprint of a durable Constitution, supported by pillars of justice and equality. Your windows are stained with the red blood of your citizens who keep you free, with the white denoting your purity of purpose, and with the blue representing the loyalty felt by every American, as he views the misery of the down-trodden held in greedy captivity. You have allowed me to live within your portals, America, and for that I am grateful. To God I owe my existence, to others I owe my consideration (and to the loan company I owe my car). But to you, America, I owe my democratic existence, my loyal consideration, and the right to call a mortgaged car my own and not property of the State. You give me a home, food, recreation and, most important, liberty. Yet you require so little in return. You are supported by taxes for sustenance and defense. But this should not satisfy my sense of debt. I should, instead, desire to dedicate my very being to your beck and call. You have been so considerate of me that I am even ready to lay down my life for my country, should you ever call on my meager services.

My debt to you, America, cannot be counted in terms of dollars and cents. Our democracy is a priceless heritage. All the gold in the world could not purchase my inalienable rights. For no treasure would I trade my freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and freedom of the press. This heritage is the boast of every living American. Only when Uncle Sam and every citizen guards you can each individual be worthy of his democracy. My debt to you, therefore, must be paid by my attitude toward you, by paying my taxes cheerfully, by accepting the new immigrant family that moved in down the block, by voting each year for the most capable man even if he goes to a different church, by obeying your laws because I love and respect them, not because I fear the consequence of breaking them, and by answering your call instead of dodging the draft, can I fulfill my moral obligation to you, the country I love, America! This small voice calls a heartfelt cry, "Thank you, America!"

WHAT I OWE MY COUNTRY
(By Elmer Tope)

I owe my country a great debt as does every American citizen.

I owe thanks to my country for the liberty I have. I am reminded of this liberty when I think of our great Statue of Liberty, forever standing straight and proud, a symbol of freedom, for all those who enter this country.

I owe a feeling of gratitude to the forefathers of my country because they have kept this land free from oppressive rulers, and because they have made it a land of opportunity for any person who wishes to obtain a goal in life.

I owe support to our National Government and to State and local officials who are working for the good of the people. Since our Government on all levels requires financial aid in order to operate, I owe it to my country to pay taxes. Too many people today complain about taxes and deductions from their wages. People like these seldom stop to realize that the privileges that are found in this country far overbalance the amount we contribute to the National Government.

I owe sincere thanks to my country for the education I am receiving free of cost. If education weren't free, far too many people would miss the opportunity of gaining knowledge. Intelligent and educated people are necessary to keep America strong.

I must be aware of the way our Government is run and the purposes the Government seeks to serve so that my mind will not become filled with ideas of communism, which some people right here in the United States are trying to get people to believe. If communistic ideas enter the minds of our people, this country to which I owe so much will decline in greatness and in time the citizens will lose the feeling of pride for their country. I owe it to my country to help to prevent this sort of thing from happening.

I must fight for my country in time of war and insure my preparedness for war by military training.

I owe it to my country to be a good citizen. Being a good citizen does not merely mean a passive acceptance of all the privileges granted to me by the Government, but rather it means taking an active part in the furtherance of our ideals by living a clean, wholesome, and worthwhile life, by getting a good education, by working in local groups for the benefit of the community, by keeping up with current affairs, and by voting in State and national elections. By doing all these things I will be a citizen worthy of the privileges granted to me and will in some measure repay my debt to my country.

All Truth and Fact Must Have Its Day in Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, on April 16 my colleague, Congressman QUIGLEY, delivered a speech from the floor of the House of Representatives which appears on pages 5725 to 5727 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at which time the gentleman made some very scurrilous remarks about Whitney Gillilland chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. Mr. Gillilland is a former district judge of Iowa. His honesty, ability, patriotism, and fairness, is not questioned, by those who know him well.

Mr. QUIGLEY saw fit to quote just two paragraphs from a speech recently made by Mr. Gillilland, in an attempt to prove a point.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the entire speech of Mr. Gillilland, from which Mr. QUIGLEY took two paragraphs out of context, be printed in its entirety in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for all to read.

The speech is as follows:

REMARKS OF WHITNEY GILLILLAND, CHAIRMAN, FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION OF THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE JOINT MEETING OF VETERANS ORGANIZATIONS AT COUNCIL BLUFF, IOWA, ON APRIL 10, 1956

I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you. I have some things to say which very much need saying, saying out loud so that everyone will hear them. They have needed saying for a long time. They involve American GI's who were held prisoners of war by the Communists in North Korea.

Our functions, those of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, in passing on claims is judicial in nature and we have not considered it proper to make public comment while issues affecting the determinations of a claims load remain pending before us. During the pendency of the North Korean claims it has been necessary to remain silent while a great deal of misinformation has been disseminated to the public. Sometimes this propaganda has tended to reflect against our agency. Much more frequently it has been so calculated as to tend to mold public opinion against the American GI's who suffered great hardships and many of whom died as prisoners of the Communists.

That claims load has now been substantially completed, the major issues resolved, and I can now take off some of the wraps. I am going to take this as the earliest opportunity to say some things which need to be said for the good of everybody.

With regard to the first proposition, I will comment merely that if you hear anyone say that he has been deprived of any rights, constitutional or otherwise, in dealing with the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission

you can say for me to him that he is mistaken. Contentions of that kind just are not so and have not happened with us.

Now with regard to the second proposition:

Beginning in the spring of 1953 shortly after "Little Switch," and continuing until now, stories have appeared in the press and elsewhere to the effect that American GI's held prisoner of war in North Korea did not demonstrate the sturdiness that might have been hoped for in resisting Communist indoctrination. Instead of challenging the accuracy of these accounts, critics have apologized for them and belabored the Army and the American educational system, claiming that the GI's were poorly prepared for their ordeal. These stories have no doubt caused anxiety to many people.

A number of these authors or propagandists infer, or outrightly say, that Americans have lost purposefulness and direction and the capacity for success, and that the only persons in this day and age who know where they are going and what they are doing and why they are doing it, and succeed in getting it done, are the Communists. They make it appear that we are a decadent generation and no longer any match for the clever and progressive Communists.

Some of these people in effect present, or actually present, the American GI's as poor, ignorant, miserable, weak creatures, lacking in principle, faith, honor, character, loyalty, patriotism and integrity, incapable of resisting, and who did not resist, the teachings of communism to which they were skillfully subjected.

This is all dangerous talk and it would have been better for the critics to have given more attention to the accuracy of their tales. The fact was well known that at the end of the conflict only 21 Americans held prisoner by the Communists elected not to be repatriated. The fact was also well known that more than 22,000 of the enemy similarly held prisoner by us did not return to the Communist countries. That is one to a thousand. How, if the story tellers had given it thought, could they have reconciled these facts with the statements they were making? And where, if they had looked at the young men about them, would they have perceived deterioration in any of the sturdy qualities they apparently believed the older generations to have possessed?

In 1954, the Congress enacted a law providing among other things benefits to Americans held prisoner of war in North Korea (Public Law 615, 83d Congress). Administration was assigned to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. The benefits consisted of $1 per day on which a prisoner of war did not receive proper food and $1.50 for each day he was otherwise mistreated in violation of the Geneva Convention of 1929. Benefits were not to be paid to anyone "who, at any time, voluntarily, knowingly, and without duress, gave aid to or collaborated with or in any manner served such hostile force."

Now it will be noted that anyone who might have been guilty of outright disloyalty, that is, voluntarily, knowingly, and without duress, collaborating with the enemy, would in any even be excluded by either the provisions (1) concerning food and mistreatment, or (2) those precluding payment to anyone who voluntarily, knowingly, and without duress at any time and in any manner served such hostile force. Therefore, it never became necessary to pass on the issue of collaboration and no claim was rejected on that ground. Therefore, no inference is to be drawn that any particular individual denied benefits was disloyal.

On the other hand, it will have been apparent that any collaborators would be included among those claimants denied for the two mentioned grounds and that the total number of collaborators could in no event have exceeded the total number of the claims denied on those two grounds.

A great deal of care has been taken with that claims load. The very best of the staff was put at the task. No one was permitted to participate at the staff level who was not himself a veteran and who did not have security clearance. A full investigation by the appropriate agency of the Government was had on every one of them. It was a good, loyal, skilled, and conscientious staff.

Every bit of evidence available concerning the claims was carefully examined and in many instances that included the benefits of thorough and fair investigations by other departments and agencies.

For the first time on any claims program of ours, the Commission went into the field for oral hearings. This was done as extensively and the hearings conducted as closely to the homes of the claimants as the administrative funds available would permit. As many of these hearings were conducted by the commissioners themselves as it was possible to arrange for. Every single claim involving one of the above matters which had been denied in the first instance by the staff was subsequently reviewed whether review was requested by the claimants or not. The evidence concerning every claim on which review was requested was considered by the Commission itself. When it is borne in mind that we have many claims loads other than this one, and that sometimes over all determinations in the name of the Commission run into the hundreds per day, it will be obvious that the commissioners can give individual detailed attention to only a small proportion. But we did do that here with every one of the hearings of this class. We spent many hours, days, weeks, and months at the task and we came to know, I believe, a good deal about the subject.

We approached this task with much caution and determination that we were not going to talk until we knew what we were talking about. It was our view that if we found the record to be bad it was no part of our function to engage in the injuring of any reputations. Our function was solely to determine upon those persons to whom we should make the awards authorized by the Congress. We therefore made no public announcements. This has been construed as prejudicial to the claimants. I assure you that quite the contrary was intended. However, if on the other hand we found the record to be good, the time to speak was when we could speak with certainty.

The Commission was aware that even in the old days not all soldiers, at all times, conducted themselves with valor. It is frequently said that Benedict Arnold was the ablest American general of the Revolutionary War. He was the hero of the Battle of Saratoga, the turning point of the war. Benedict Arnold defected to the enemy. Soldiers of the War of 1812 ran away from the field of battle. In the Civil War, several thousand Union soldiers held prisoners by the Confederates enlisted in the Confederate Army against their former comrades. Several thousand Confederate soldiers held prisoners by the Union forces enlisted in the Union Army against their former comrades.

It seemed reasonable to expect that we would find the average conduct of our GI's in Korea about like that of their forefathers under similar circumstances. In other words, we expected to find some evidence of defection to the enemy.

What we found was, and I am happy here to tell you, that they actually appear on the whole to have conducted themselves better than their forefathers. Furthermore, while I am not going to express an opinion as to whether the Army or the American educational system might not have done a better preparatory educational job, I will say that I found no comparative basis for adverse criticisms of either one. I did find some basis for favorable criticisms.

An attack on the will to resist of our GI's was made by starvation, exposure to cold through lack of proper shelter and clothing, lack of sanitation, lack of medical care, sometimes outright brutality and even torture. In the first few months following capture, thousands of our boys died as a result of this treatment. Meanwhile, the survivors were subjected to a constant and persistent effort at Communist indoctrination. A favorite tactic in the early days of the prison camps was to stand the poorly clad, filthy, lousy, and starving GI's at attention in cold and freezing weather under threat that they would not be permitted to rest, much less eat, until they gave the party line answers to the questions of their interrogators. Just like a dog—"when you bark I'll give you this miserable food."

I will say to you that the Communists could have taken little satisfaction with the results of their indoctrination efforts.

This claims program has been nearly completed. A total of claims by reason of the imprisonment of 7,626 servicemen were filed under it. The rate of disallowance for all causes has been lower than on any other major program the Commission has administered. It appears that the final number of disallowances which could fall under the two propositions above will be less than 1 percent. If we were to assume that all of this number were disloyal, the record would even then be better than our forefathers. But no such assumption can be made.

Included among the prisoners of war as among all groups of people were to be found some who were ignorant, weak willed, easily persuaded, persons of the type who always follow the path of least resistance. Some of them could scarcely read and write. Such people we always have with us. To the extent that any of them understood the Communist teachings, most of them have long since forgotten it. They are in no event influential with other people. They are of no value to an enemy and no danger to us. I have no doubt that many of them will go through life in this country paying their debts, kind to their families, friendly to their neighbors, praying to God and regarded as good citizens.

There were a few of the "smart boy," the "I'm looking after me" type, who followed the teachings or pretended to follow them in what they considered to be their own self-interest. Their self-interest now lies in the other direction and their loyalty to communism is not likely to prove any greater than it was to the nation to which it rightly belonged.

All in all, the results must have been a sore disappointment to the Communists, for despite all of their efforts, there would have been very few, indeed, among the returning G. I.'s who they could realistically have expected to serve any propaganda purpose in this country or as a nucleus for espionage or to serve any other purpose for them. By and large, our GI's regarded the Communists and their teachings with disgust and contempt, and the Communists came to know it, and that they had not even made a substantial dent in their patriotism. That they recognized the futility of their efforts is evidenced by the fact that long before repatriation the efforts at indoctrination began to subside and general treatment of the prisoners improved.

There are lessons to be learned from these Korean experiences which it would be well for us to keep very carefully in mind. I am going to mention one of them.

It is this: Let's not sell ourselves short. Regardless of how clever, ruthless, and persistent the Communists may be, and they demonstrated in Korea a capacity for all of those things, we also demonstrated in Korea that we were fully capable of standing up to it and surmounting it and prevailing over it. Furthermore, we have the advantage of

being morally right and history has many times proven that in the long run that kind of right prevails.

There is only one kind of right to a Communist and that is what the party line says. It can be one thing one day and an entirely contrary thing the next. Inconsistency creates no perplexity to him because right itself is the party line, nothing else. That is true to the extent that Communists are perfectly capable of using arguments for freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom from self-incrimination, confrontation by witnesses against them, even freedom of assembly and of religion—the very things they despise and hate, to gain their own ends. Treasury officials seeking to collect United States taxes from the Daily Worker have just heard the anguished cries that they were interfering with the freedom of the press. Communists will even accuse others of communism in order to discredit them among their fellows and to accomplish their own immediate ends. Such things happened continuously in individual cases in Korea just as they are made to happen every day by Communists who have gained influence with, infiltrated or fostered organizations with high sounding names in this country including some which now attack the administration of this program.

The Communists made every effort to create dissention, disunity, and distrust among the prisoners of war. Members of racial groups and national ancestry groups were singled out for special indoctrination and propaganda, and preferential and preferred treatment, calculated to produce hatreds, jealousies, and suspicion. At the same time officers were forbidden to exercise authority over the men and the men told not to obey the officers. The officers were separated from the men. Groups of men acquainted with each other or who appeared to be developing loyalties to each other were broken up immediately. The men faced strangers in their quarters. They did not know who was spy and who was friend. They became very close mouthed.

A common tactic to bring about disunity would be something like this: A pitiful, feeble GI with a background of witnessing killings and hearing of more, and who had seen his buddies dying of malnutrition and disease would be taken to headquarters on a winter night and ordered to perform some act of Communist propaganda. When he refused he would be stripped of his clothing and compelled to stand at attention naked in the bitter cold until he dropped or his will to resist had been broken. He would frequently be threatened or beaten. Then he would be returned to his quarters to suffer the tortures of remorse for his weakness. When he refused a subsequent request to engage in wrongdoing he would be threatened with exposure as a Communist collaborator. Let it be said to the everlasting credit of many of these so unfortunate people that they did have the will to then resist and face the consequences.

Another method to further suspicion would be for a soldier to be required to go for a walk with one of his captors although in an apparently friendly manner. He might be compelled to remain separated from his fellows for hours, sometimes for days, during which time he would be threatened or even tortured. Regardless of the failure of the Communists in their efforts to interrogate him they would invariably, after his return, go to great length to create the appearance of great and unusual friendliness to him and intimacy with him thereby seeking to give the impression to others that he had subscribed to their doctrines.

Still another and even more insidious method to destroy the morale and the hope and volition of our GI's was in the method of handling the mail. It was made known to the GI's that unless they engaged in some cooperation they wouldn't get any mail. This threat was made good and the GI's who appeared to tend toward defection got his mail while his more sturdy buddy got none—with this cruel exception—if there was bad news from home that letter came through—if there was serious illness, if there was a death, particularly a child, if there was a financial reverse, if his wife was getting a divorce, the mail came through that told those things.

It takes a good deal of fortitude for men living in poorly or unheated, crowded, primitive quarters, with dirt floors, no bunks, no window panes, no artificial lights, few blankets, no soap and water but with plenty of cracks in the walls and bugs and vermin, living on cracked corn and a little rice, I say it takes a good deal of fortitude under such circumstances for men to maintain their equilibrium. Yet by and large our boys did it.

We are, I believe, witnessing the beginning of the breakup of the Communist system. They have repudiated their hero Stalin and now themselves point to him as a wicked man. They are claiming repudiation of the principle of dictatorship by one man. This change in direction will not work. Such successes as the Communists have achieved have been possible only through terriorist policies of one man. Groups of men cannot do that. They demand more and more and constantly expanding authority of their own. More and more men demand a share. The change in direction will either break up by a return to dictatorship and this means revolution, or it will continue to expand until it reaches something having little resemblance to present day communism. Neither eventuality bodes any good for communism as we know it now.

This change in direction will not justify any relaxation in our alertness. On the contrary, it requires even greater alertness. While the monster is dying, he is more dangerous than he ever was.

The change in direction has unquestionably been brought about in large measure by a realization on the part of the Communists that they cannot do a selling job among civilized people unless they assume a much greater appearance of respectability than they have heretofore possessed. Also unquestionably, the American GI's in the North Korea prison camps had a great deal to do with teaching them that lesson.

First Guided-Missiles Conference Being Held by NATO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, according to an Associated Press dispatch from Munich, Germany, the world's first international conference on guided-missile development is being held under the auspices of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Dr. Theodore von Karman, an expert in this field and chairman of NATO's scientific research, says, despite feverish activity in worldwide research, it is not likely—in fact, highly unlikely—an intercontinental rocket can be made accurate enough for "guaranteed" push-button warfare.

Meanwhile, certain Capitol Hill experts in partisan-guided political missiles have been firing potshots at the administration. It has been inferred that the long-range ballistic missile is the ultimate weapon and that our Defense Department has been sitting on its hands in the interest of economy. The partisan attack has been to the effect that the Defense Department is guilty of lagging behind and then, second, that an investigation is needed to find out the truth. The verdict is guilty before the trial by investigation is even held.

The technique of preelection frightening of voters with undocumented and irresponsible statements may not be new, but it calls for some rebuttal.

First, however, I should like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that I do not rebut Soviet Leader Nikita Khrushchev's prediction that the Communists would have such a missile soon equipped with the H-bomb. My only comment to this would be to quote our own military men.

Admiral Radford, Chairman of our Joint Chiefs of Staff, has said it is not a matter of matching man for man or missile for missile; rather superiority is a combination of factors and we have, he says, an industry-science-military team which is unbeatable. General Gruenther says, "they would lose the war." Chief of our Air Force Staff, Gen. Nat Twining, has said we are well ahead in all fields. Air Force Secretary Quarles says retaliatory bombing is best, that even if the Soviets had a 1,500-mile guided missile, it would not upset the balance. Sir Frederick Brundrett, head of the British research in the guided missile field, has indicated England might be behind the Soviets, but the United States is definitely not.

One partisan charge has been made that the Nation will get a big defense bill right after election, implying the Republican administration will not be actually balancing the budget. This falls a little flat with the recent announcement that the budget surplus for the year ended June 30, 1956, may be $2 billion. It is becoming fashionable on both sides of the aisle to talk tax reduction but a postponement of costs is a bit fantastic.

However, Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness, there is real danger in the partisan misrepresentations and clamor of demogoguery emanating from the hard core of this ultimate-weapon cult. Our circle of bases in the world requires supply ships and a merchant marine. To maintain supply lines requires a Navy. Unfortunately, some ultimate-weapon leaders would scuttle our Navy. This is serious. This is the same loose and illogical reasoning that some years ago caused the same type of strategists—the very same in one instance—to try and move airplane manufacturers back of the protection, so-called, of the Rocky Mountains.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, every Boeing Airplane Co. worker who lives in my district, as well as navy yard employees, and all who believe in a strong Navy will view with great alarm inferences to be drawn from the statements on defense and known views of certain political figures who lately have been appearing on nationwide TV programs.

Recently, Secretary Quarles characterized certain public-scare statements and

publicity as highly misleading and damaging. As President Eisenhower remarked on this subject, he was sometimes astonished at the amount of information that others get which he does not.

Now is the time for the American people to beware of the head and headline hunters. The scare technique is not new, but wider communication through TV programs when it comes to politics gives public wisdom and education a most intensive test. Also it requires that the people be given all the facts, not just a few partisan opinions.

We Please Nobody

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, a Republican President, Secretary of State, and assorted Republican press agents and politicians are attempting to have the people of this country believe that the foreign policy of the United States has under their leadership scored important victories in the ideological struggle with godless communism and Soviet Russia because of the recent changes in the policies of Soviet Russia.

No fact could be further from the truth. The fact of the matter is that this change is the greatest peril to the United States from Russia since 1919. True, it constitutes an admission that the expansionist policies of Russia of Stalin's time are not the best way to win over the undecided, to weaken America and separate us from our allies.

The very fact that Soviet Russia recognizes the weakness of her old policy constitutes great peril to America. Such a program based ostensibly upon sweetness and reason, will appeal to many, and induce many others to adopt positions of neutralism in this time of danger. Unaccompanied by any other proof, the defeat of governments friendly to America in Italy, Ceylon, and elsewhere should be adequate proof of the threat posed by this new Russian imperialism. The wave of neutralism sweeping the world should constitute further proof.

Let us cease congratulating ourselves, and commence vigorously forming a new and better foreign policy aimed at making our friends strong economically and militarily, and to make evident to the world that America is still the world's best hope for peace and freedom of all men. We must continue foreign aid, but wisely, not only to make our friends strong, but to help even those who are now engaged in "neutralism" to reach such a point that they realize our intentions are only that they shall be free, economically sound, and independent. All must know that America only wants their freely given friendship in a community of peaceful, prosperous, and independent nations.

Let us not forget in this new era the millions enslaved behind the Iron Curtain. Let us increase diplomatic and economic pressure to see to it that all of those people are soon given the right to free self-determination as expressed in the United Nations charter and in the Yalta agreement. Above all, let us never cease in our encouragement of these subjugated peoples to keep alive their love and hope of freedom by all means, by propaganda, by economic and other means.

We must air the problems of these conquered peoples that the world at large may know that Soviet Russia's policy is only a sham aimed at deceiving the peoples of the world into the trap of Communist enslavement. To fail to do this is for America to ultimately reach a point where we face a neutralist and Communist dominated world, alone, and friendless, when Russia utlimately decides that the time, predicted by Marx, Lenin, and Stalin has come for her to take over the world.

I insert into the RECORD an editorial of the Detroit News of April 15 pertaining to a survey of what diplomats abroad think of our present foreign policy.

WE PLEASE NOBODY

A recent New York Times survey of what diplomats abroad think of American diplomacy came up with the expected conclusion: Nearly everyone thinks we are doing badly, and each has a different reason for thinking so. There were no "Don't knows."

Foreign observers, almost without exception, believe America fails to understand the state of mind of the nations it deals with. Asians say we need to recognize the importance of the drive for national independence and ought to take an unequivocal stand against colonialism. The French feel our anticolonialism is far too unequivocal now and betrays our unfortunate habit of waving moral principles instead of appreciating political realities.

Europeans in general think we are unrealistic in refusing to recognize Red China, but Spaniards complain of our obtuseness in dealing with Franco to the exclusion of the masses of the people who may want a different kind of government.

From all sides come objections to our emphasis on military security, our preoccupation with the Communist threat, our unwillingness to adapt our trade policies to our declared diplomatic goals, our absorption with the American way and free enterprise as universal ideals, our habit of contradicting ourselves in public debate so that no one really knows where we stand.

Some of this criticism is directed specifically against policies which are certainly debatable. In large part, however, it is the reaction of a struggling community of nations to one power among them which seems to have the power to resolve their difficulties. Great Britain is frankly envious of that power and believes naturally enough that she, with her greater experience, could use it better. Most other nations have a sense that out of the ashes of 19th century imperialism a new world might be born if only the United States would midwife it into being.

So far we haven't accepted that responsibility. We are content mostly with keeping the peace and containing communism. For nations concerned, as they must be, with their own development, this use of American power seems much too negative. It is rather like having a bodyguard around the house: Finally you wish he would either go home or make himself useful.

Slaughter of Israeli Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on April 11, 1956, a group of Arabs infiltrated into Israel and murdered in cold blood several children and their teachers while they were in the midst of prayer at Habad village. The inhabitants of that village are affiliated with a religious and philanthropic movement whose spiritual head is Chief Rabbi Menachem Schneerson, a resident of my district.

I have since received many telegrams of protest from congregations and various religious organizations in my district. Consequently, I have written a letter to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles urging him to take two steps: Condemn those who are responsible for this wanton murder and request indemnification for the families of the victims.

The following is the text of the letter addressed to the Secretary of State:

APRIL 24, 1956.

The Honorable JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State, Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to you in connection with the massacre committed by Arab murderers who infiltrated into Israel on April 11, 1956, and slaughtered in cold blood a group of children and their teachers at prayer in Habad village. This is a most despicable act of atrocity committed against young and innocent children, who weren't even given a chance to defend themselves.

The children of this village in Israel are associated with the religious and philanthropic movement known as Hassidim, which is headed by Chief Rabbi Menachem Schneerson, a citizen of the United States and a resident of my district.

I have received no less than 49 telegrams from congregations and various religious organizations in my district, bearing the signatures of the rabbis and presidents of these groups, in protest against the massacre at Habad village. These religious leaders implore our Government to take the necessary measures to prevent similar outrages in the future and the needless shedding of innocent blood.

Public opinion is still one of the most effective means of stopping such atrocities in a civilized world. I, therefore, urge you, Mr. Secretary, to take the following two steps:

First, to express in the strongest possible terms our Government's condemnation of those responsible for this act of murder.

Second, to request indemnification for the bereaved families of the victims.

I feel certain that if these two steps are taken it would greatly discourage such inhuman and barbarous acts in the future.

Sincerely,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

The wording of the telegram from the religious organizations and congregations, signed by their respective rabbis or presidents, is as follows:

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *April 23, 1956.*

Congressman VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Washington, D. C.:

The children slain in cold blood while at prayer in Habad Village, Israel, last Wednes-

day, belong with numerous congregations and schools in America to the same family of Habad Lubavitch followers of purely religious and philanthropic Hassidic movement headed by Chief Rabbi Menachem Schneerson, American citizen, with headquarters in Brooklyn, N. Y. We are our brothers' keeper grieved and heartbroken at cold-blooded murder of young brothers in Holy Land. We demand our Government take energetic effective steps to prevent similar massacre and assure indemnification of bereaved families.

Congregation Bikur Cholilim, Rabbi Sholom Hecht; Congregation Tifereth Israel, Meyer Hasper, President; Congregation Kesser Torah, Rabbi Weinberg I. Rosenberg, President; Congregation Beth Aaron Beth Sholom, Rabbi E. Berman; Congregation Chevra Thilim, M. Bernstein, President; Congregation Skwer, Mr. Holtzman, President; Congregation Emunah Sheleimo, Rabbi A. Jacobson; Congregation Chevra Kadishe, Rabbi A. Katzman; Congregation Shaar Hashomayim, Rabbi Rosenbaum; New Hebrew School, Rabbi S. Spiegel, S. Beck, President; Congregation Oilem Sholeim, M. Widovsky, President; Chevra Mishnayos Anshei Wolin, I. Y. Zwieg, President; Congregation B'nei Israel, Rabbi Samuel Baskin, L. Grossman, President; Congregation Beis Aaron Anshei Sfard, D. Weissman, President; Congregation Machzikei Emes, Rabbi Auerbach; Congregation Arugas Haboshem, Grand Rabbi L. Greenwald, Mr. Rosenberg, President; Chevra Liadi, Rabbi Klein; Congregation Pride of Israel, Rabbi Malenick; Congregation Kehal Chareidim, Rabbi Moskowitz, Mr. Friedman, President; Congregation Balchwer, Ch. Meyer, President; Congregation Anshei Ujehle, Rabbi I. Meisels, J. M. Zeidenfeld, President; Chevra Bikur Cholim, Rabbi S. Novick, A. Goodman, President; Agudas Achim, Rabbi B. Z. Peffer, H. Kuznick; President; Congregation Beth Yitzchok, Rabbi Rabinowitz; Congregation B'nei Yissochor, Rabbi L. Spiro; Congregation Adas Yeshurun, Rabbi Teitz; Congregation Beth Jacob, Mr. Pilchick, President; Congregation Shearith Israel, N. Landman, President; Congregation Bnei Issochor, Rabbi E. Shapiro, M. Mermelstein, President; Congregation Knesset Israel, Rabbi E. Cohen, Mr. Finkel, President; Congregation Torah Utefila, Rabbi A. Levine, Mr. Trattner, President; Congregation Dershowitz, Rabbi M. L. Malik, Samuel Dershowitz, President; Congregation Sheveth Achim, Mr. Jagadnik, President; Congregation Kol Israel, Rabbi Shinaller, L. Yandah, President; Boyaner Kloiz, Rabbi I. Stern, M. Weitman, President; Pirchei Agudas Israel, M. Lazar, President; Congregation Bnai Jacob Anshei Sholom, Rabbi Bunim; Congregation Glory Israel, J. Gilberglat, President; Congregation Ahavas Achim Bnai Israel, L. Kott, Secretary; Young Israel of Willoughby, Rabbi Yachnes, Joe King, President; Chasidei Belza, Rabbi M. Feder, M. Weiss, President; Congregation Or Itzchok, Rabbi E. Rosenbaum, J. Kleinbrand, President; Young Israel of Brooklyn, B. Solomon, President; Beth Hamerdrash Chasidei Amshenov, Rabbi I. Kalish; Adas Yereim, H. Lipshitz, President; Congregation Kehilat Jacob, Rabbi J. Grunwald, H. Lipshutz, President; Congregation Divrei Jechezkal, Rabbi Supnick; Congregation Netzach Israel, Rabbi M. Horowitz; National Council of Young Israel, Meyer Wiener, President, Elijah Stein, Chairman of Eretz Israel Committee.

No Beautiful Blonde Spies—Just Blind Stupidity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of our colleagues to Mr. Stewart Alsop's article in the New York Herald Tribune of April 15, 1956, which is as follows:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Stewart Alsop)

NO BEAUTIFUL BLONDE SPIES

WASHINGTON.—It is strange how the highest administration officials stubbornly disbelieve what their own intelligence experts tell them. Take, for example, Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson's recent testimony before the House Appropriations Committee: "You know, we cannot get very far ahead of them (the Soviets), because we talk so much in this country, and write so many articles, and publish so many pictures and magazine articles that they are always bound to be able to do it. Most of their weapons, of course, really came out of the Western World * * *." No national myth dies harder than the notion that the Soviets are technically backward, capable only of slavishly copying what the West has already produced. But it is really very odd that Secretary Wilson, after more than 3 years in office, should still believe in this comfortable myth. For throughout those 3 years, Wilson has been literaly deluged with evidence pointing in precisely the opposite direction. There is, moreover, nothing particularly mysterious about the great bulk of this evidence—it does not come from beautiful blonde spies. Most of it comes, instead, from such items as a long, profusely illustrated book called Aviation Gas Turbine Engines, by G. S. Skubachevski. Mr. Skubachevski's formidable work was published in Moscow last year, and it is freely available in technical bookshops in the Soviet Union. When it arrived in Washington recently, it caused quite a fluttering in the intelligence dovecotes.

It contained, for one thing, numerous cutaway drawings of something called a split-compressor engine. The split-compressor system is used in the most advanced American jet engine design, and all diagrams and performance data are top secret. Yet, here was a mere textbook, distributed to mere student engineers in the Soviet Union, containing numerous detailed diagrams of the split-compressor engine.

The notion that they get it all from spies, which is a companion myth to the "backward Russians" myth, does not hold up in this case either. The text of the book contains not only a highly sophisticated discussion of the split compressor engine but a number of jet engineering techniques new to American experts. Soviet spies could not have stolen these ideas from us simply because we didn't have them.

Reliable information on Soviet weapons progress, from such overt non-cloak-and-dagger sources as Mr. Skubachevski's book, is not as impossibly difficult to come by as it is often cracked up to be. Last year, for example, the magazine Aviation Week published excellent photographs of the mass flights over Moscow of the new Soviet heavy bomber, the Bison—the same plane which Mr. Wilson had previously opined was a fake, or a mere handmade prototype.

The publication of these photographs caused horror in the Pentagon and the editor of the magazine was called on the carpet to explain where he got such top-secret material. He explained that he had called the New York representative of Sovfoto, the Soviet propaganda agency. Sovfoto had happily offered him as many excellent photographs as he could use, and motion-picture films of the overflights as well.

The notion that all information about Soviet weapons development comes from beautiful but highly untrustworthy blond spies is one reason why such officials as Wilson do not really believe their own intelligence. Another reason is that men like Wilson and Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey tend to regard the intelligence experts as impractical longhairs.

Secretary Humphrey, for example, recently became much exercised when he learned from a British steel tycoon, who had made a tour of the Soviet Union, that Soviet steel mills were as good as the best in Britain. As a member of the National Security Council, Humphrey had been repeatedly told exactly the same thing in intelligence briefings. But he only really believed it when he learned it from a fellow businessman and payroll-meeter.

A third reason is that the Central Intelligence Agency is prohibited from making comparative estimates of Soviet and American weapons development, so that the estimates lack meaning and impact. But there is also another reason why high officials tend to disbelieve or disregard their own intelligence experts. Believing them would inexorably suggest all sorts of highly expensive and highly inconvenient action.

Tribute to Charlie Halleck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, the nationally famous columnist, Bill Henry, in a recent edition of the Los Angeles Times, discussed the debate prior to the action of the House in sustaining President Eisenhower's veto of the farm bill. In his column he pays particular tribute to our distinguished friend the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HALLECK. This tribute is well-deserved. The article follows:

WASHINGTON.—On the theory that you may never have been present when one of those blood-tingling moments of decision takes place in the Congress—most sessions are a dreadful bore—let me tell you about the vote on the veto.

IKE'S VETO

The Democrats, with some aid from farm-belt Republicans, passed a farm bill which even its proponents were not proud of. Economically, it was designed to continue to subsidize the farmer to raise more food than we know what to do with. Politically, it was designed to place the President in the position where signing it would not only be contrary to his principles but would enable the Democrats to claim credit for largess to the landsmen, whereas if he refused to sign it the Democrats would be able to say they tried to do something for the poor farmer but the wicked Republican President prevented

them. Well, the President vetoed the bill, gave his reasons for it, took what steps he could to help the farmer without legislation and the question then was whether or not the Congress would try to muster the two-thirds vote necessary to override the Presidential veto. The Democrats announced they'd vote to override.

EMBATTLED

The bill had been originally passed by a vote of 237 to 181, a decisive majority but not the two-thirds edge required to override the veto. The Democrats had to make a few converts if they were to slap down the man in the White House for his temerity. Chairman HAROLD D. COOLEY, a Democrat from North Carolina, obviously recognized the magnitude of his problem as, with debate limited to a single hour, he announced that he'd give Representative CHARLEY HALLECK a grand total of 10 minutes to speak in support of the veto while the rest of the hour would be taken by the opposition. This brought the remark that "COOLEY believes in 90 percent of parity for his side in the debate as well as in the bill" which may have slightly overstated the percentage but pretty correctly represented the attitude.

ORATORY

To be brutally frank about it, congressional oratory is more "for the RECORD" than for purposes of persuasion. Congressmen like to be able to refer their constituents to a certain page in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as evidence of their stand on a given question. Chairman COOLEY led off with a defense of the bill and then turned the rostrum over to his colleague, W. R. (Who's Excited!) POAGE, of Texas, a roundhouse, arm-waving orator who shouted and roared that it was no more fair to give the farmer 80 percent of parity than it was to ask a workman to accept 80 percent of a fair wage.

THE MINORITY

More Republicans than Democrats remained on the floor for the debate but the galleries were packed to suffocation. CHARLEY HALLECK, who is a real red-hot pistol when it comes to floor debate, plunged headlong into his 10-minute argument, seeking to make the most of the tiny share of time allotted to him. He methodically answered the charges of the opposition, annoyed them heartily by quoting Democrat Governor Lausche, of Ohio, applauding the Presidential veto, reminded the Democrats that they had claimed to have supported the President better than the Republicans did—said this was their chance to prove it, and wound up by predicting that the Democrats not only would not get their two-thirds majority to override the veto but that there would be, in fact, a majority favoring Presidential action. HALLECK proved to be not only a good debater but a good seer as well. The Congressmen poured back onto the floor for the vote. It was significant to see the Representatives from my own general area, HIESTAND, HILLINGS, HINSHAW, HOLT, WILSON, and MCDONOUGH, among those voting to support the President, and when the counting was over there were 211 to uphold the veto, 202 to override it.

Highway Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the House will shortly consider H. R. 10660. I have received numerous communications both from people in my district and from public officials of my State in support of this measure. For the information of the membership of the House and to indicate the breadth of support achieved by this bill, I include three telegrams the signatures on which cannot help but be impressive:

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., APRIL 24, 1956.
Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We approve and endorse Federal highway bill, H. R. 10660. The allocation formula for the interstate system is fair and equitable and should not be changed. Passage of the bill is vital to California. We urge your favorable support.

Goodwin J. Knight, Governor of California; Randolph Collier, Chairman, Senate Transportation Committee; Lee Backstrand, Chairman, Assembly Committee on Transportation Commerce; Frank B. Durkee, Director of Public Works and Chairman California Highway Commission; George T. McCoy, State Highway Engineer; Charles P. Salzer, President, County Supervisors Association of California; O. W. Campbell, President, California League of Cities; Burton Chace, Chairman, Los Angeles Board of Supervisors; John Gibson, President, Los Angeles City Council.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *April 24, 1956.*
Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
Member, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Each Congressman, county of Los Angeles, at their meeting on April 24, 1956, the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County instructed me to inform you of their full support of H. R. 10660, and their request for your full and aggressive support of this bill, which is scheduled for committee hearings this week.

Very truly yours,
JAMES S. ALLISON,
Chief Clerk, Board of Supervisors,
County of Los Angeles.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *April 24, 1956.*
Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We respectfully urge your support of H. R. 10660, the Federal-aid highway bill, in the form recommended by the Public Works Committee. This measure should prove particularly advantageous to California as it places major emphasis upon the improvement of the interstate system and will assist materially in meeting traffic problems in metropolitan areas. It also recognizes the need for a tax rate differential between passenger cars and heavy trucks. We believe the measure will assist materially in the development of our major highways in California.

NORMAN P. THOMPSON,
Executive Vice President, Automobile Club of Southern California.

Congratulations, Mr. Kearns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all good Republicans and good Americans rejoice in the victory of our colleague, CARROLL D. KEARNS, in the Pennsylvania primaries yesterday. Pitted against him in the primary was one of the most formidable Republicans of his congressional district. He won, by unofficial reports, by more than 21,000 votes.

While I am not a native of Pennsylvania and know little about the political situation there, it does seem to me that this election's results indicate that our colleague, CARROLL KEARNS, is well on his road to a higher office in the great State of Pennsylvania. I believe that he would make an excellent governor, and an excellent Senator, should my good friend, Senator ED MARTIN, retire.

My wholehearted congratulations and best wishes go to my colleague, CARROLL KEARNS, for his future successes.

The Free Sons of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith copies of letters addressed to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of State by Mr. Milton M. Meyer, grand master of the Free Sons of Israel.

This organization is the oldest national Jewish fraternal organization in the United States, having been chartered in 1849. It numbers among its membership over 10,000 families resident throughout the United States. It has been a leader in all worthwhile causes and along with innumerable American organizations is justly concerned about the situation involving the State of Israel and the Middle East generally.

It would seem that organizations and citizens similarly minded should call to the attention of the authorities in this country their own views as well.

The letters follow:

THE FREE SONS OF ISRAEL,
New York, N. Y., April 19, 1956.
PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

SIR: For the past 106 years the Free Sons of Israel, the oldest national Jewish fraternal organization in the United States has been justly proud of our contribution to the American communal scene and has evidenced our single allegiance to our United States by the service and even death of many of our members in her defense. We feel that this background gives us the privilege of speaking.

The executive board of the Free Sons of Israel by unanimous resolution on April 16, 1956, required me to represent to you our firm and deep conviction that the defense and safety of the United States requires the prompt and immediate shipment of defense arms to the State of Israel in order that that bastion of democracy in the Middle East might be preserved against destruction from Communist armament. We also respectfully request that in addition to arms and armament for her defense, the State of Israel,

which by its national sentiment, its political outlook, and its cultural pursuits so emulates the United States, receive such other, necessary, and appropriate action and safeguards from the United States, either alone or in cooperation with others friendly to the State of Israel, that the State of Israel might be preserved.

Aggression has never been Israel's purpose, but her lifeblood will flow in her defense. Communism and its threats are repugnant to Israel's basic heritage and can, with your aid, be forever thwarted in the Middle East.

May I respectfully request, sir, that you use your good offices as Commander in Chief of the United States to carry out our most prayerful request, not by the blood of our sons, but by the sinews of our arms and the concrete resolve of our purpose.

Please accept our sincere good wishes for your continued good health.

Respectfully,

MILTON M. MEYER,
Grand Master.

THE FREE SONS OF ISRAEL,
New York, N. Y., April 19, 1956.

SECRETARY OF STATE,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: For the past 106 years the Free Sons of Israel, the oldest national Jewish fraternal organization in the United States has been justly proud of our contribution to the American communal scene and has evidenced our single allegiance to our United States by the service and even death of many of our members in her defense. We feel that this background gives us the privilege of speaking.

At a meeting of the executive board of the Free Sons of Israel held on April 16, 1956, it was our unanimous resolution that you and the Department of State be urgently requested to promptly ship to the State of Israel arms and armament for her defense and that in connection therewith you take such other, further necessary and appropriate steps as will insure the defense and continuance of the State of Israel.

We respectfully point out that events over the past 40 years weighed on the scale of justice will show preponderantly that the safety, defense, and well-being of the State of Israel weighs more heavily to the advantage of the United States than does the shipment of offensive arms and war materiel to her Arab neighbors. It seems to us that the Arab countries have shown their complete disregard for the Tripartite Pact and that it now behooves our great country in cooperation with the other signatories, England and France, to take those steps which good judgment as well as honesty and decency require and dictate.

We respectfully urge your implementation of our prayerful petition.

Respectfully,

MILTON M. MEYER, *Grand Master.*

Arab Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the attention of our colleagues the following article which describes the anti-American and anti-Jewish propaganda being disseminated by the Arab radio and press. The article appears in the March 1956 issue of the ADL Bulletin:

CAIRO'S RADIO TALKS 'RED' FOR LOCAL CONSUMPTION IN THE MIDDLE EAST, ARAB PROPAGANDA TAKES A WEST-BAITING, PRO-SOVIET LINE

(Democrats and Republicans are on an equal footing in their eagerness to put the free in chains, and the American, British, and French knights of the free world are cut from the same cloth. (Voice of the Arabs broadcast.))

(We view the parliaments of the democracies as a comical farce. (Voice of the Arabs.))

(It was Khrushchev who announced that the Soviet Union sympathizes with the Arabs, and it was Bulganin who attacked the Baghdad pact and all military alliances, describing them as imperialistic acts in new forms, with only aggressive aims. * * * It is no wonder, therefore, that these dual voices find an appreciative reaction in the hearts of the Arabs. The cause of peace is served by such support. (Cairo Radio's Home Service.))

Today, Arab propaganda speaks with two strident voices. One talks to the East, the other to the West. Were they to confront each other, their words would collide in a welter of contradictions. The Arabs are careful to keep them apart.

In the United States, Arab propaganda has been pointed toward the destruction of American sympathy and aid for Israel. "The removal of Israel from Palestine," say the Arabs, "will start * * * when Arabs succeed in convincing the West that the fruit of this tree (Israel) which it has planted in our countries is harmful to any cooperation and any possible alliance with the Arab nations." This nails down the essential aim of Arab leaders: to bring pressure against the United States Government, and with it the governments of the West.

Frustrated by their failure to destroy Israel, first by war, and then by diplomatic maneuvering, the Arab league states have begun a vast propaganda effort to exploit antisemitism in the United States for their own political purposes. World tensions have developed a propitious climate for such enterprise and they have found willing allies among the professional peddlers of antisemitism operating in this country.

"American Jews," says a book being distributed here by the Syrian consulate general, "give a necessary allegiance to the United States while reserving their first loyalty for Israel. * * * It is time that Americans realize that these teeming masses of Zionists who infest their cities and sit astride the arteries of their commerce are, in every sense of the world, aliens * * * because they render their first allegiance * * * to their own so-called State of Israel. This specter of dual loyalty is echoed constantly by the antisemitic press. "Who are the internationalists?" asks the glib and pompous Merwin K. Hart, of the bigoted National Economic Council. "They are the Marxists and the Zionists. * * * It is highly possible that in a matter of months, drafted American youth will be fighting and dying in the defense of Israel."

The Arab voice that speaks to the East is even more demagogic in its attacks on zionism. But while its lunatic fringe supporters in America persist in equating zionism with Communist imperialism, in the Middle East this has now been changed to American imperialism. And the Soviets have become the great and good friends of the Arab world.

From their propaganda base in Cairo, the Arabs are flooding the Middle East and much of North Africa with anti-American and anti-Jewish propaganda. Their themes achieve a new, high pitch of hostility and incitement against the West, and the lowest depths of antisemitic abuse. Their vilification of Jews is without parallel in the postwar era, matching the most cynical efforts of Goebbels and the most clinical creations of Julius Streicher.

The anti-West tactic represents an abrupt shift in Arab propaganda—and dates from the Egypt-Czechoslovakia arms deal. In their campaign against the free world, the Arabs' chief target is the United States, followed by England and France. And while the Arab masses are subjected almost daily to heavy doses of anti-West hatred, nothing unfriendly is said about the Soviet European bloc and Red China. The western governments have, at different times, protested to Egypt over some of the more provocative outbursts, only ot be rebuffed by Premier Gamal Abdel Nasser, Egypt's strong man, for their interference with Arab nationalism and self-determination.

The most potent outlets for domestic Arab propaganda are broadcasts through Cairo Radio's Home Service and the Voice of the Arabs, which is beamed over shortwave. Both are controlled by the Egyptian Government and their broadcasts have become a force for disruption, stirring up unrest and inciting the peoples of the Middle East and outlying areas against the West and against Jews.

This campaign has been attended by a new orientation with the Communist bloc: the Arabs now serve as a vehicle for pro-Soviet propaganda. As part of this pro-Communist shift, the Arabs no longer link Zionism with Communism—but with the West, particularly the United States—and with colonialism and "capitalistic imperialism." "It is the capitalists who rule [the United States]," said the Cairo Radio, "while the masses are busy chasing dollars and watching baseball games. Everyone knows the Soviet Union is a democratic state and that its rulers come from the masses."

"I never imagined before," wrote a commentator in the Cairo newspaper, Al-Akhbar, "that a day would come when I would defend Russia and attack Britain and America. However, it is with justice and logic that I now defend and not attack Russia and now attack and not defend Britain and America, which have shown falsehood, deceit, fallacy and ill will."

A favorite of the Arab radio is to preach the big, but useful, lie about Zionist control of the press in the United States; how the Jewish vote controls American policy; that American Jews are leading the United States down the road to war. "The poor American public," one broadcaster lamented. "No one outside America is ignorant of the Zionist domination of the press. * * * One wonders what is left for this lost people to read after the Government and the Zionists have done their job." Such quotes turn up in endless variations, in Arab broadcasts, in the Arab press, in official government handouts, in the speeches of Arab diplomats and in the anti-Semitic press of the United States.

Aside from their pro-Soviet twists, Cairo broadcasts reveal little that is new in the Arab propaganda line which has been parroted for some time now by Arab emissaries in this country, and has settled at a point where it is now common property, to be shared on a give-and-take basis by all Arab officialdom and American professional bigots. Their partnership in the exchange of propaganda has been mutually profitable.

Thus, it is no surprise that the Arab radio should comb the writings of the most disreputable American anti-Semites for its broadcast material. When it selected for broadcasting purposes an article by Eustace Mullins, it really hit bottom. Mullins, a frequent contributor to Conde McGinley's Common Sense, was cited in the December 1954, report on Neo-Fascist and Hate Groups by the House Un-American Activities Committee.

But the voice of the Arabs described him as "a great American author," and broadcast

the following extracts from his diatribe in Women's Voice, one of the less subtle among hate sheets:

"The United States is a land for Jews in which they can tell lies and loot as they like. Why then do the Jews hate the United States? The Jews hate the United States because Americans do not try to oppress them. * * *

"The Jews have never felt love for their homeland except in connection with Germany—Germany which suffered for 500 years from the crimes of the Jews. In the Jewish quarter in Warsaw, and in Frankfurt, the Jews lived happily, because they were despised, spit upon, and were treated as the scum of the earth. In our country, Jews receive complete respect from Americans.

"Imagine this Jew, who should be despised and hated, now receiving every respect and consideration in the United States. No wonder, then, that the Jew is happy in the States. * * * The nervous system of the Jew is used to torture. Jews dream of concentration camps and torture centers in Germany. America has nothing of the sort to offer them. The American citizen allows them to deceive him and betray him as they like."

Egypt's press provides Arab broadcasters with a rich harvest of anti-Semitic and anti-American material. This stuff, in turn, is gathered from highly productive anti-Semitic sources in the United States. One example is a new bimonthly, Rissalet Masr (the Egyptian Message), published in Arabic by an organization created and financed by the Egyptian Minister of Information. Circulated throughout the Arab world (estimated: 150,000 copies per issue), it is handed out free, though it has an official price of 3 piasters (8 cents).

The first issue of the Egyptian Message, which appeared in Cairo in December, carried an article by Opal Tanner, long-time professional associate of Gerald L. K. Smith. Here are some excerpts from Tanner's piece, called, Who Is the Most Powerful Jew in Washington?:

"Question. Who is the most powerful Jew in Washington?

"Answer. I can say that the most powerful Jew in Washington today is one of the men who helped conspire in organizing the Federal Reserve bank and who owns the biggest daily newspaper in the city. He is Eugene Meyer. * * *

"Question. Who is the strongest adviser close to Eisenhower?

"Answer. The man who manages the affairs of the White House is Max Rabb. He is a Jew and his original name is Rabinovitch. He is the brain who directs the actions of Ambassador Lodge. * * *

"Question. Is Supreme Court Justice Warren still ambitious?

"Answer. Enlightened observers in Washington believe that Justice Earl Warren still covets the Presidency. This is why he drafted the decision of nonsegregation in the public schools. He thought that by doing so he would gain the votes of the Negroes. Actually, the Negro vote holds the balance of power in America.

"Question. Do Congressmen fear the Jews?

"Answer. Most Congressmen fear the Jew, because of their control of the press, radio, and television."

But in its attitude toward Moscow, the Arab League speaks with all the fervor of a Soviet satellite. President Eisenhower has become the warmongering villian to Khrushchev's hero for peace. Said the Lebanese newspaper Al Jaridah:

"The United States will continue to aid countries fighting Communist infiltration. It will also endeavor to find a solution between the Arab States and Israel, for it is anxious to retain the friendship of both parties—so said President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message. * * * Eisenhower's words sound so hollow now that the Soviet Union has embarked on its 'courageous peace campaign.'"

The editor of the Cairo daily, Al Ahram, became almost lyrical in his appreciation for "the serious outlook on public life of the Soviet people," after his visit there. The Cairo radio applauded French dissidents for having "sided with the Soviet peacemakers [while] booting out the lackeys of the American warmongers." Red China's Chou En-lai is quoted approvingly. The meeting between Nasser and Yugoslavia's Tito was greeted as "a slap in the face of the imperialist hangmen." Nasser's protestations notwithstanding, the Arabs appear to be importing ideology, along with arms, from the Soviet bloc.

Can peace be achieved in the Middle East? If this is the fervent hope of the free world, the Cairo radio chooses to ignore it. "Peace between us and the Jews is impossible," it has broadcast. "As far as we are concerned the problem is a matter of life and death and not a dispute over frontiers or interests. Nor is it a difference over viewpoints which require mediation for settlement. * * * The Middle East cannot hold both of us. It is either we or they. There is no other solution. * * * It is steel and bullets which will realize these objectives."

Broadcasts of this kind—they are beamed constantly to the emotionally charged populace of the Middle East—do not square with Egypt's arguments in the councils of the United Nations that it is accepting Soviet arms as a defensive measure. Nor do its trade agreements with the Soviet bloc—agreements to purchase goods and machinery in which Egypt spurned the lower bids of Western nations to buy from the Communists.

One Hundred Thirty-fifth Anniversary of Greek Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, in commemoration of the 135th anniversary of Greek independence this year, I arranged, at the suggestion of Mr. Peter Chumbris, formerly assistant attorney general of my State of New Mexico, to have Father George P. Gallos, of the Greek Orthodox Church of the Annunciation in Baltimore, invited to offer the prayer at the opening session in the House on Monday, March 26. Father Gallos offered the following beautiful and inspiring prayer:

God of our Father, to Thee, author of liberty, to Thee we pray. On this occasion of the 135th anniversary of Greek independence, we ask Thee, Lord, to bless the Greek people. Keep alive in them the love of liberty for which they bravely fought and sacrificed. Grant that the Greek Nation ever may be on the side of justice, democracy, and freedom.

Lord God of Hosts, we pray for America, this land of ours, on which Thou hast bestowed so many rich blessings. Make us worthy of our inheritance. Let not Thy wrath descend upon us. Save us from new ordeals and tribulations, for wars and rumors of wars are shaking the equilibrium of the earth and heavy clouds are invading the tranquil heavens of peace.

O Ruler of the Universe, preserve in harmony those who govern us. Make them vigilant and keep them from falling into the spirit of sloth, faintheartedness, lust for power, and idle talk. Grant them, rather strength to do Thy will, wisdom to govern well, and make them worthy laborers of Thy kingdom, a kingdom of love, goodness, justice, mercy, and peace.

Lord of Love, who didst command the disciples to pray for their enemies and who didst pray for those who crucified Thee, grant that we, too, may forgive those who hate us and show brotherly love to those who maltreat us. Enlighten us, through the light of Thy truth., O Lord, and guide us in the paths of Thy precepts. Amen.

Mr. Speaker, the sons and daughters of Greece who, like Mr. Chumbris, are devoted to the democratic ideals steadfastly followed by the Greek Nation and our own, have contributed to the greatness of America. They, like all other Americans who believe in and adhere to those democratic ideals, are saddened today at the steadfast refusal of the British Government to grant the people of Cyprus the right to democratic self-determination, so that they may govern themselves or may join with Greece, their mother country, in a common government under a common heritage and culture.

And yet from Father Gallos' mouth we in the House heard these words sincerely offered in prayer:

Lord of Love, who didst command the disciples to pray for their enemies and who didst pray for those who crucified Thee, grant that we, too, may forgive those who hate us and show brotherly love to those who maltreat us.

In our hearts we all pray that the injustices occurring in Cyprus may be righted, and that the British Government and the people of Cyprus may reach a mutual understanding with our Lord's help, guidance and divine light, that will lead to peace and justice for all.

A Well-Deserved Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for his factual, fearless, and exceptionally meritorious work, Clark R. Mollenhoff, of the Des Moines Register and Tribune and the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, has been given the Raymond Clapper Memorial Award.

Many of us in Congress have long realized that Mollenhoff's courage, ability, discrimination, and desire to get and report the facts have over the years given the Members of Congress as well as the public the facts not only in connection with the doings of Wolf Ladejinsky, but that he has been true to what I assume to be the reporter's objective—ascertaining and giving to the public an accurate narrative of the incidents he has been called upon to report.

All too often reporters have forgotten what the public has assumed to be their function—a narration of what actually

was said or happened in connection with a specific incident. All too frequently, reading carefully a news story, one has found himself compelled to reexamine the article, determine if possible where the factual statement ended, where the expression of an opinion—an editorial or commentator's function—began.

Mollenhoff is not lacking in either the ability or the courage to express an opinion, but his writings make it easy for the reader to separate the two when they are joined in the same story.

Few reporters or writers have done more to clearly, accurately lay the facts on the record, expose the misuse of health and welfare funds, the dues and special assessments paid by union members, the violence and lawlessness in which some—fortunately a few—of their officials have engaged. The stories which he has written about these activities have been a warning to sincere union members and leaders, a notice to legislators of the need for sound, courageous action by them.

From the following press notice comes the notification of the award:

MOLLENHOFF GETS CLAPPER AWARD

The Raymond Clapper Memorial Award, given annually for exceptionally meritorious work by a newspaper correspondent in Washington, was won last night by Clark R. Mollenhoff, of the Des Moines Register and Tribune and the Minneapolis Star and Tribune.

Mr. Mollenhoff, 12th winner of the award established in memory of the late Washington correspondent, received a $500 check and scroll in a ceremony at the closing dinner of the American Society of Newspaper Editors at the Hotel Statler.

The judges, five ASNE members, awarded him first prize for his stories concerning Wolf Ladejinsky, former United States agriculture attaché in Tokyo who figured in a controversy over Federal security regulations.

Memorandum Submitted by the Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association in Response to a Request by Congressman Thomas B. Curtis Regarding Its Experience With the Committee for Reciprocity Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in my supplemental views on H. R. 5550, to authorize United States participation in the organization for trade cooperation, I pointed out the problems that confronted American industrial, labor, and agricultural interests in getting their data and arguments into the hands of the United States representatives who actually negotiated our trade treaties.

I asked during the hearings for various economic groups which had specific information in regard to this problem, and in particular their experience with the Committee for Reciprocity Information, to supply this information for the printed record. A memorandum submitted by the Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association came too late to be included in the printed hearing. However, this information should be available to the House for reference in the debate on H. R. 5550. Accordingly, I am inserting this memorandum into the Appendix of the RECORD so my colleagues can consider it:

MEMORANDUM SUBMITTED BY THE SYNTHETIC ORGANIC CHEMICAL MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION IN RESPONSE TO A REQUEST BY CONGRESSMAN THOMAS B. CURTIS REGARDING ITS EXPERIENCE WITH THE COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION

Congressman CURTIS inquired of the association's witness, Mr. Sidney C. Moody, on March 14, 1956, of its experience with the Committee for Reciprocity Information under procedures which have been established for the exercise of the trade agreement authority.

Because of the continued importance to the association's members of the tariff policy for the encouragement of domestic manufacture of synthetic organic chemicals which is contained in the chemical schedule of the Tariff Acts of 1922 and 1930, this association has appeared frequently in the public hearings which are a prelude to the conduct of trade agreement negotiations by the President's representatives.

Before discussing the defects in the trade agreements procedure, on which we intend to be quite specific, it is necessary to consider the purpose which Congress had in mind in requiring that the exercise of trade agreement authority be preceded by public notice and an opportunity to all interested parties to be heard.

It is reasonable to conclude from the committee reports concerned with the original enactment of the trade agreements law that this procedure, specified in section 4 of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, was intended to accomplish the following results:[1]

1. To insure very careful exercise of the trade agreement authority so as not to injure manufacturers or domestic producers;

2. To protect American producers or manufacturers from hasty or ill-considered action without their knowledge and without their being given a chance to present their views.

Four major defects in the operation of the procedure have become apparent which prevent the public notice and hearings specified by section 4 from achieving their intended purpose. They may be summarized as follows:

1. The public notice is inadequate to inform domestic producers that their interests are affected.

2. The procedure is inappropriate to the manner in which tariff negotiations are actually planned and carried out.

3. The public notice fails to advise of the foreign countries with which negotiations on particular products are proposed to be conducted.

4. Interested parties are not advised of nor given an opportunity to rebut the data compiled by Government agencies concerning their products for the guidance of the trade agreement negotiators.

I

Public notice which is given of intention to consider certain articles for trade agreement negotiation is so poorly adapted to the facts of commercial life that it fails to constitute actual notice to the hundreds of domestic producers scattered throughout the United States whose interests are, in fact, affected by the tariff concessions which are contemplated or which may result from the negotiations.

This defect can be illustrated by two examples:

(a) The lists of articles considered for possible concessions at the Torquay negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade comprised items included in some 480 paragraphs and subparagraphs of the Tariff Act of 1930. They embraced approximately 2,800 statistical classifications. The lists themselves were contained in 98 closely printed single-spaced pages of the public announcements released by the State Department. The phraseology used in describing the articles was that contained in the Tariff Act itself or as modified in order to narrow the scope of the dascription contained in the tariff paragraphs concerned. Many of the descriptions were stated in generic language. These provisions in themselves embraced tens and even hundreds of items competitive with commercial articles produced in the United States. Similarly,

[1] When the trade agreements bill was introduced in 1934 (H. R. 8430, 73d Cong., 2d sess.; H. R. 8687, 73d Cong., 2d sess.), it did not contain any provision for notice or hearing. Though the House of Representatives desired that the trade agreement authority be "very carefully exercised so as not to injure manufacturers or domestic producers," (H. Rept. 1000, 73d Cong., 2d sess., p. 13) it failed to correct the lack of a requirement for notice and hearing. In the Senate, however, such a provision was added (sec. 4): "In order to protect American producers and manufacturers, who may fear hasty or ill-considered action without their knowledge and without their being given a chance to present their views * * *." (S. Rept. 871, 73d Cong., 2d sess., p. 3).

Section 4 of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as amended, prior to 1951, contained this requirement for notice and hearing and read as follows:

"Before any foreign trade agreement is concluded with any foreign government or instrumentality thereof under the provisions of this act, reasonable public notice of the intention to negotiate an agreement with such government or instrumentality shall be given in order that any interested person may have an opportunity to present his views to the President, or to such agency as the President may designate, under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe; and before concluding such agreement the President shall seek information and advice with respect thereto from the United States Tariff Commission, from the Departments of State, Agriculture, and Commerce, from the National Military Establishment, and from such other sources as he may deem appropriate."

Under the authority contained in section 4 the President established the Committee for Reciprocity Information by Executive Order No. 6750 of June 27, 1934, to receive the views of interested persons concerned with proposed trade agreement negotiations. A series of Executive orders have refined this procedure. The most recent of these is Executive Order No. 10082 of October 5, 1949. Its predecessor, Executive Order No. 9832 of February 5, 1947, was issued to make "assurance doubly sure that American interests will be properly safeguarded."

The procedure which is followed in the executive department of the Government in exercising the trade agreement authority is described in the Tariff Commission's initial Report on the Operation of the Trade Agreements Program (Report No. 160, 2d series), chapter 5. It is also described in a very recent memorandum by the State Department inserted at Congressman CURTIS' request in the record of the hearings on H. R. 1 before the Ways and Means Committee, part 1, pages 80–84.

the public lists relating to the current negotiations at Geneva comprise more than 450 paragraphs and subparagraphs of the Tariff Act. Eighty pages of description are required to list these items in the public notices.

This form of public notice is least likely to convey an intelligible notion to businessmen of the manufactured articles produced by them which would be affected by imports. It is well to bear in mind that the business organizations whose interests would be affected by the increased imports which the trade agreement program is designed to encourage do not comprise a regulated industry. They therefore are not organized for close attention to Federal Government notices. By habit and inclination they do not regularly pay close attention to Government publications such as the Federal Register, Treasury Decisions, etc., which carry the infrequent notices of the Committee for Reciprocity Information concerning proposed trade agreement negotiations.

Many business organizations belong to trade associations which call such matters to their members' attention. Many others, however, do not. Indeed, many trade associations whose main interests lie in fields other than tariffs give little or no attention to trade agreement matters. The business organizations most likely to be quickly affected by tariff reductions are the many small-business firms located throughout the length and breadth of the United States who in most instances have no means of becoming apprised of the pendency of trade agreement negotiations unless fortuitously the matter is called to their attention by a business associate or an acquaintance.

Even were most of these organizations likely to have the list of articles proposed for trade agreement consideration called to their attention, they in all likelihood would find it difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain whether their products were in fact embraced within the often curiously stated language of the Tariff Act Where general terminology ("basket" clause) is used, it is extremely difficult for the average businessman or, indeed, for many lawyers who do not specialize in the tariff and trade practice, to ascertain whether or not specific manufactured articles of the United States are included.

(b) Domestic companies in the organic chemical industry are possibly better informed than most United States concerns on tariff and trade agreement matters. This association undertakes to distribute to each of its member companies the lists of items proposed for trade agreement negotiation. Yet even our member companies are unable in many cases to ascertain with the public notice before them whether or not their particular products are concerned. For example, in the most recent public notice pertaining to the trade agreement negotiations now being conducted at Geneva, nine tariff classifications of chemicals involving basket clauses were included on the public list. Through the resources of the association, an effort was made to identify the commercial chemicals produced in the United States which if imported would be included within the classifications proposed for tariff reduction. We and our members learned to our surprise that there were nearly 600 organic chemicals produced commercially in the United States which were included within the purview of these 9 paragraphs. We contacted many of our member companies to call their products so affected to their attention. We learned, as we had feared, that they were unaware of the fact that their products were concerned though they had examined the public list.

The time required for this identification and notification necessarily consumed so much of the one-month period intervening between the date of the notice and the deadline for filing a request for appearance with the Committee for Reciprocity Information that it was impracticable for our member companies to collect the accounting data and make the factual investigation within their company required in order to determine whether they would experience serious injury as a result of the reduction in the tariff. Consequently, simply as a result of the ambiguity of the public notice, our companies were powerless to decide whether they should appear and offer testimony in the public hearings.

II

The second major defect is that the procedure is not adapted to the manner in which tariff negotiations have been carried out in the postwar era.

Consider once again the fact that the public lists of articles considered for possible concessions at Torquay embraced approximately 2,800 statistical classifications. To receive the testimony of those parties who were fortunately aware that their interests were affected by the proposed negotiations, the Committee for Reciprocity Information divided itself into 5 panels which conducted hearings for a period of 2 weeks. The mass of information supplied at the hearings, together with the data submitted by the various Government departments, such as the Tariff Commission, the Department of Commerce, etc., was supposedly in some manner reviewed and considered by the Trade Agreements Committee. Since the hearings did not conclude until June and the negotiations commenced in September of 1950, it is obvious that little more than 2 months could have been devoted by the Trade Agreements Committee to a study and determination of the situation disclosed by that mass of data on the thousands of articles included in the 2,800 statistical classifications. Inasmuch as the United States was proposing to negotiate with 24 foreign countries in the Torquay session, the evaluation of data referred to was required not only to be specific as to each imported article but also with reference to the trade situation and competitive status of various of the 24 countries which were or might be pertinent with respect to these articles.

To the extent that any impressions can be gained by organizations outside the Government, it is becoming increasingly apparent that the manner in which multilateral trade agreement negotiations are undertaken in the current era preclude any but the most superficial consideration of the evidence presented on the astonishing range of articles included by the executive department within the purview of each negotiation.

III

Section 4 of the Trade Agreements Act is worded in such a way that it is evident that Congress was considering that the authority given in the act would be utilized by entering into trade agreements with a particular foreign government. The section requires that the public notice advise of the United States intention to negotiate an agreement with such government. This fairly means that it was the intention of the Congress that interested parties be advised not only of the articles proposed for consideration in the trade agreement, but also of the particular foreign government with which trade agreement negotiation on the particular articles would be conducted. In the postwar era the public notice of the proposed negotiations under the auspices of GATT has usually listed all of the foreign governments it is expected would participate in the negotiations. No information, however, is contained in the public notice of the particular foreign government with which negotiations would be conducted on particular articles contained in the list.

During the preparations for the initial negotiations under GATT at Geneva in 1947 the Tariff Commission released its digests of trade data prepared for the guidance of the trade agreement negotiators. This extensive document presented a summary of available statistical information on each classification of articles under consideration. The document also indicated the government with which it was proposed that tariff concessions be negotiated on each classification of articles. This practice, however, has not been followed since the Geneva negotiations in 1947. Indeed, in the case of the negotiations for the benefit of Japan, the public notice did not even list the foreign nations with which the United States would be negotiating in a triangular exchange of concessions for the benefit of Japan. It was impossible for interested parties concerned with articles proposed for consideration in those negotiations to know at all what foreign country the United States would be negotiating with on any of the articles listed.

It is fundamental that negotiations for tariff concessions should be conducted with the principal producing and exporting nation. If this principle were not followed, it would be impossible to limit the extent of the concession granted to an amount which would not harm a domestic industry. Only by knowing the relative advantage of the most important producing country from the point of view of wage and other cost advantages can anyone in Government or industry estimate the amount of a reduction which could be safely made. If the wrong country were selected for negotiation, its relative advantage might be sufficiently different from that of the principal foreign producing and exporting nation to lead to a concession which cuts too deeply to avoid injuring a domestic industry. For this reason the Government ought to announce the country with whom each concession is to be negotiated so that erroneous determinations of principal producing status can be corrected and cost comparisons responsive to the actual competitive situation which is pertinent to the concession under consideration may be presented by domestic industry to the CRI.

IV

The Government withholds from interested parties the data concerning the articles on the list which its various agencies prepare for use by the Trade Agreements Committee. A hearing which does not give interested parties a real opportunity to meet the issues before the triers of fact is of very dubious value. Under the procedure followed for trade-agreement negotiations, the Tariff Commission, the Department of Commerce, and other agencies prepare compilations of data bearing upon the advisability of a reduction on the articles appearing on the list. Interested members of the public come before the Committee for Reciprocity Information without any knowledge of the content of the memoranda which have been prepared for the Trade Agreements Committee by these Government agencies. How is it possible for them to know the type of evidence or information which should be adduced for the Committee for Reciprocity Information when they have no way of knowing the nature of the information which has been laid into the record, perhaps contrary to their interests, by various Government agencies?

There is no conceivable reason why these compilations of data from the Tariff Commission, the Department of Commerce, and other Government agencies should not be made available to interested parties at least to the extent that they concern the products manufactured by those parties. This would give interested parties a real opportunity to present evidence bearing upon the possibility of injury to their enterprise if the tariff is reduced on certain articles and to correct misapprehensions or misinformation placed into the record by Government

agencies, however well-intended it may be. But none of this is available to the citizens and business enterprises whose interests Congress above all desired to protect from injury and for whose benefit the hearings by the Committee for Reciprocity Information are presumably held.

These defects are highlighted by the fact that interested parties are not made aware of the decision which is made by the triers of fact, whoever they may be, or the reasoning on which it is based, as a result of the evidence presented at the hearing conducted by the Committee for Reciprocity Information. The first knowledge that these parties receive relating to the decision is the release of the trade agreement concessions themselves after they have been finally concluded. This alone apprises interested parties of their success or failure in protecting their interests within the procedures established for the exercise of trade agreement authority. Then there is no opportunity to correct any misapprehensions, overcome any erroneous information, or otherwise secure the correction of an error which would be detrimental to the interests of the domestic producers who are concerned. While domestic manufacturers have a right to protect improper classifications under section 516 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, the decisions of the customs court, particularly under the analogous circumstances of cases arising under section 336 of the Tariff Act, would seem to indicate that no review of the determinations is available on the merits. The most that could be hoped for would be a review limited to an ascertainment as to whether the statutory steps have been followed.

In view of the unsatisfactory nature of the procedure as described above, the pertinent inquiry becomes: How can this procedure be modified to accomplish its intended purpose?

The changes which this association might suggest in the trade-agreement procedure are as follows:

1. The public notice of the list of articles to be considered for trade-agreement negotiations should, wherever possible, be broken down into descriptions of contemporary commercial significance with a cross reference to the particular Tariff Act paragraph wherein such articles are deemed to be covered.

2. Hearings conducted by the Committee for Reciprocity Information should be limited to the products of a particular industry at a time; sufficient time should be granted both in the period of preparation for interested parties, and in the hearing and investigation of the Committee for Reciprocity Information to permit full consideration of the evidence presented.

3. At the same time that the notice of the list of articles under consideration is published, each Government agency which has prepared digests of data pertinent to the articles under consideration (such as the Tariff Commission, Department of Commerce, Department of Interior, etc.) should publish such data, or make it available upon request to interested parties. This can be done in a manner which will not violate the obligations of Government agencies to keep certain types of data confidential.

4. Following the hearing by the Committee for Reciprocity Information, the particular committee, whether it be the Trade agreements Committee or a country committee operating under its supervision, which makes a recommended decision on the merits with respect to an article or articles on which interested parties have appeared and presented data should notify each interested party in writing the substance of the recommended decision and the grounds upon which it is based.

5. A sufficient period of time should be provided for interested parties following receipt of the recommended decision on its products in writing to prepare and file exceptions with the Committee for Reciprocity Information and, where desirable, to be given an opportunity to present its arguments orally.

The President's Answer to the Press on the Mediterrenan Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the New Republic for April 16, 1956, contains the following graphic description of a press conference which was held by the President several weeks ago:

"I GET DISCOURAGED"

Eisenhower was as mad when he answered Sarah McClendon's question last week as we have ever seen him. He was so eager to slap her down that he took an all-out position on getting Congressional approval before sending United States troops to the Middle East. Sarah McClendon may have altered history.

It happened at the press conference. These have been telescoped into half an hour once a week (F. D. R. had two-a-week before the war; no time limit). With 219 reporters on hand it is hard to get recognition. Some vainly rise and sit and get all their week's knee-bending calisthenics done trying to catch the President's eye.

When the President gives the nod the custom is that the reporter first gives his name and paper—a new, dampening effect on reporters who know the TV cameras are grinding away and that his remarks will be recorded for publishers. These rules have two effects: they silence the timid and encourage exhibitionists.

No conference is complete without a question from a woman reporter. Last week the redoubtable May Craig did not rise. She may have sensed the President's mood. Sarah McClendon, of the El Paso Times, however, rose repeatedly. No recognition. Mounting tension. A duel of wills. Finally Sarah McClendon simply popped up and delivered her question, anyway, with a courage—or insensitivity—few men could have mustered. It was a good question in view of the deepening Mediterranean crisis, though it had been asked at various times in the past: Would Eisenhower use our marines in the Middle East without asking the approval of Congress first?

The rash reporter had won her right to be heard, had defeated the President in a game where he made all the rules, and left him angrier than we have ever seen him. "I get discouraged sometimes here," he ejaculated. He started again, flushed, paused, continued with hands clenching and unclenching. Reporters, mindful of his heart, watched with awe.

The President's eyes are a little reddened by conjunctivitis. In his wrath he is a formidable sight. His answer was, in effect, a stronger reaffirmation of his self-imposed limitation against sending troops into battle without specific congressional approval, a position inferentially critical of Truman's quick action in Korea. To some this interpretation of the Constitution seems a dubious restriction on White House authority, typical of a tendency to yield leadership. The issue is red hot, because Britain is now desperately trying to get advance United States commitment to act quickly with her in the Middle East if war starts.

OFF TO GEORGIA

Reporters sometimes get the frustrated feeling at the President's press conference that he does not keep track of what is going on. Asked last week about the Wisconsin primaries, the President prefaced his remarks with "Actually I haven't seen the final figures"; asked to comment on the latest Dulles statement on Russia, he replied, "Well, I don't know exactly what the Secretary of State said * * *"; asked about Sherman Adams' attack on the Democratic record in Congress, he began, "I don't know under what circumstances Mr. Adams made such a statement * * *"; asked about Iceland's strategic value in relation to Russia he said that he had not given "my personal attention" to "this particular question." In fairness it should be said that the President gave answers in each case, though not always precisely to the question asked. Doesn't Eisenhower want to know, and don't they tell him? It's hard to say.

There is a theory in Washington that the details of being President bore Eisenhower. He reserves his decisions for the big issues. These finally reach him at the top staff level. He does not follow them in the papers. There is also a delegation of powers by the President, a growing void of new international ideas as the reservoir left him by Roosevelt and Truman is pumped dry. For the United States things have gone badly in Iceland and Ceylon; the Mediterranean is now a powder keg; the farm bill at home has reached a crisis. And President Eisenhower leaves for a week's golfing in Georgia.

California State Board of Agriculture Resolution Against Freight Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent, heretofore granted me so to do, I present the text of a letter to me of April 19, 1956, from the assistant secretary of the California State Board of Agriculture at Sacramento, with which communication there was enclosed a copy of the resolution by said California State Board of Agriculture dealing with the subject of excessive freight rates. Said text is self-explanatory of the purposes thereof:

CALIFORNIA STATE
BOARD OF AGRICULTURE,
Sacramento, April 19, 1956.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: The California State Board of Agriculture, at its regular meeting held in Sacramento, Calif., on April 16, 1956, passed a resolution in protest against the recently granted increases in freight rates and refrigeration charges by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Your consideration of the enclosed resolution will be greatly appreciated.

Very sincerely yours,

ROMAIN YOUNG,
Assistant Secretary.

RESOLUTION RE EXCESSIVE FREIGHT RATES

Whereas freight rates since 1947 have increased by 68 percent, and are now not only becoming excessive to the point of being

detrimental to the $2 billion agricultural industry of the State of California; and

Whereas these rates are actually becoming a deterrent to agriculture of California, being geographically the greatest distance from the large consuming markets east of the Mississippi River; and

Whereas it is nationally conceded that the farmer's income is being steadily reduced, compared with income to industry and almost all other lines of endeavor, including the railroads; and

Whereas industry and other lines of business can pass on increased costs, including transportation charges, to the ultimate consumer, whereas the income from agricultural production is strictly controlled by the laws of supply and demand; and

Whereas the Nation's railroads, in applying for increased rates and charges, have apparently ignored these important factors applying to agriculture; and

Whereas, the California Public Utilities Commission, recognizing the plight not only of California agriculture, but also of California business and industry, joined California shippers by intervening in a recent rate case before the Interstate Commerce Commission, protesting and opposing further rate increases as detrimental to California; and

Whereas the Interstate Commerce Commission, disregarding all protestants, recently saw fit to grant another 6-percent increase in freight charges and 15-percent in refrigeration charges: Now, therefore, the California State Board of Agriculture, at its regular meeting, April 16, 1956, at Sacramento, Calif., does hereby unanimously

Resolve, That they petition the Congress of the United States for a full and complete investigation of the activities of the Interstate Commerce Commission to determine whether the Commission has established reasonable charges for transportation services on agricultural products, without preference or undue advantages or discrimination between localities or geographical areas, and whether increases in rates granted to railroads have been in accordance with law, and what effect such increases have had on the price of agricultural products, and further

That copies of this resolution be spread on the minutes of this meeting and copies be mailed to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the governor of California, all Senators and Congressmen, and to the Interstate Commerce Commission and California Public Utilities Commission, and to the vice presidents, traffic, of the four originating railroads of California.

Display of Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial written by Mr. Lawrence Spraker in the Stayton (Oreg.) Mail on the President's veto of the farm bill:

DISPLAY OF COURAGE

The people, we think, will accept the President's veto of the farm bill as the only logical step that he could honestly have taken.

The Democratic Congress was so intent upon hanging a political noose around the President's neck that it wrote more politics into the farm bill than economics. It is our opinion that the onus for the bill's defeat will rest more upon the Congress than on the President.

Eisenhower, in his veto, displayed courage, a trait that sets well with the American people.

That he is cognizant of the plight of the American farmer is evident from his announced purpose to increase parity rates, permissible under the flexible program, and to urge anew immediate acceptance of the soil-bank provisions of the vetoed bill.

A Scholastic Memorial to Franklin D. Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address of the Honorable Charles H. Silver, president of the Board of Education of New York City, at the dedication ceremonies of Public School 34, in Manhattan, on April 17, 1956.

REMARKS BY CHARLES H. SILVER, PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION, AT DEDICATION CEREMONY, PUBLIC SCHOOL 34, MANHATTAN, APRIL 17, 1956

The pride that all of us feel who have had any part in the construction of this school is a very personal thing to me. It is a pride in which every citizen of New York may share. It belongs to all of us—to the devoted teachers, to the parents and to the children who will attend this splendid school.

But, while I speak for your entire board of education in marking this almost sacred moment when their efforts and yours culminate in the dedication of this magnificent building, I find a very special feeling welling up in my own heart. For this, there is a very good reason.

Public School 34, within whose walls we are now gathered, stands in my own backyard. I was brought up right here. I lived and attended public school on the lower East Side within blocks of this very spot. For me, these ceremonies tonight could be called a homecoming except for the fact that I have never really left home. Many of my tenderest associations, my warmest memories and dearest friends are still closely linked with this teeming, growing, vastly improving area of our great city.

Here, in this impressive auditorium, in this bright, modern, handsomely appointed structure, we can all witness dramatic proof of the progress we are making in widening the frontiers of our educational program. And we have only just begun.

A full measure of praise for the planning and execution of this far-reaching program must very rightly go to Dr. Jansen our superintendent of schools, to David Moskowitz, our associate superintendent of Housing and to the small, untiring army of technicians, designers, and workers who have brought this triumph of inspired effort from the blueprint and the drawing board to a dream come true in stone and steel, in beauty and efficiency. I need only look around, and compare what I see with what I recall from my own boyhood days in this neighborhood, to know the vast advances we are making in our public school system.

Let me express appreciation, also, on behalf of the board of education and the grateful citizens of New York to His Honor, Mayor Robert F. Wagner, who has shown in a few short years, by his enthusiastic cooperation and sincere interest in our school-building program, that he intends to make our city's mammoth educational enterprise, not only the biggest in the world, but, beyond any challenge, the best.

The same accolade fits our borough president, Hulan Jack, who has done so much to support the development of our schools by his untiring efforts before the board of estimate. He has assured Manhattan, and especially this too-long neglected area, a large proportion of our school-building program.

More than genius, industry, and devotion have joined to promise a great destiny for this school. It bears the added blessing of a great name. No child who attends these classrooms can help but benefit from preparing for citizenship in a school named for one of our most notable citizens, an immortal spirit of freedom, a deathless symbol of courage, President of these God-loved United States of America, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

It is altogether fitting that this school be dedicated at this time in tribute to the timeless memory of a man to whom America meant so much, a man whose life and achievements meant so much to America. Out of this school must issue class after class of boys and girls who are themselves predestined to high places in public life, for they will be the custodians of a glorious heritage.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, whose soul is enshrined for all time in this edifice, as it is in the fiber of our democracy and the hope of our Nation's future, passed away eleven years ago, almost to the very day. I remember when the words came over the radio, the shock of disbelief, the sick, numbing news that stopped crowds in their tracks while through all of a world, suddenly gone silent, freedom itself seemed to hold its breath.

How firm he stood for the right. How swift he rose to meet all threats against it. His was a voice that shook the nations and woke the little, peaceful, frightened men to mass their might and overthrow the enemies of mankind.

The children who come to this school will know that he was a friend of children. Some will walk again because he was their friend and fought a grim infimity for them. They will read obout him here in their textbooks and learn about the lean days when he was called to office, days of empty hearts and pockets. They will learn that a man doesn't have to be born in a log cabin to know that ignorance and poverty are evil.

Teach them how he gripped our faltering souls when banks were falling to pieces, when democracy stood threadbare on breadlines and sold apples on streetcorners. Teach them, as he taught us, that : "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

Years later, we can look back and realize that what he called a "fireside chat" was more than that. It was the quickening roll of drums rousing us to defend the citadel of honor and decency. It's good that we sat in our living rooms around the loudspeakers. It's good that we listened or, maybe, some of us wouldn't be able to sit and watch the horrors of atrocity newsreels. We'd be in them.

I was fortunate enough to know Franklin Delano Roosevelt. I remember his words, beating like a massive bell on the brink or war: "Having taken up arms, we will not lay them down until liberty is secure forevermore." I think that would be a good motto for this school.

Eleven years have passed since Franklin Delano Roosevelt passed from life as our president into the pages of history. For many of us, the ache of his going has not

grown less. I can see him in this room because he was one with workers and doers, with teachers and children, with mothers and fathers.

He would speak to you in tones you would never forget. Chin high, a friendly wave of a friendly hand with warm eyes smiling reassurance. He would tell you in this room, within the walls of this school where it can be so rightly told, that you need never know again on earth the fear of fear. And he will live as his message will live and stand guard eternally over little children at their lessons and their play, over parents waiting to take their youngsters home, over teachers that will echo his faith in a better day for men of every birth in a world brotherhood of peace and good will. God bless this school.

Looking at Political Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting a report prepared by the Dunn Survey of Greenwich, Conn., entitled "The Political H Bomb." This report was prepared by Mr. Rogers C. Dunn and his associates and it represents his findings on election results based upon the actual vote cast for President and Congress since 1936 up to and including 1952.

Mr. Speaker, this report reveals the political quality of the American people that most individuals would like to believe but have been taught not to believe. It reveals an opportunity of such magnitude and so greatly desired that some will not dare believe it could be a reality. This report, however, is supported in every instance by political facts which cannot be successfully denied.

The report follows:

THE POLITICAL H-BOMB

PART 1

Communism can infiltrate America only as our own ideology becomes dim and appears to be unworkable. Only a few Americans have been given the opportunity to realize that communism is basically an ideology of government—reactionary government.

Socialism is the back-door entrance into communism. Few Americans have knowingly supported either one. But the liberal movement, created in about 1936, has provided a respectable side door into socialism.

The liberal program of today is the same thing as the unwanted Socialist program of yesterday. The Socialist program of today is made the liberal program of tomorrow.

Nevertheless, the national organizations of both political parties are competing to enlarge and extend liberal programs. As long as this continues, as a practical matter the opportunity to escape from an accelerating envelopment by socialism is closed.

Fantastic, but true

There is a flaw fatal to the liberal movement when recognized. Substantial and exacting facts have not established that the movement reflects a public demand, and that liberal benefits have won a gain in votes from various groups, farmers, workers, etc.

The absence of such facts provokes the question: Is the liberal movement being forged by the ballot and desire of the people, or is it a thinly veiled scaffolding sustained by leaders who have misrepresented and misled the people, wittingly or unwittingly?

This report is addressed to the answer to this question, for:

If election facts establish that liberal benefits have not won a gain in votes then:

1. The incentive to win votes, which causes leaders of both parties to compete in accepting and promoting liberal programs is destroyed.

2. The fear of liberal votes which has erroded the leadership of those who wish to oppose the liberal movement would cease; and this leadership would prevail in at least one party.

3. The revelation that the people are not ignorant or greedy groups, but are competent to be master of their Government, would relight the American ideology and make it live.

4. One of the two parties would be forced to become a party in opposition to the liberal movement.

PART 2

Facts

1. Sixteen years of liberal benefits to growing millions of people, and a growing population, did not win a gain in total vote for the Democratic Party which sponsored the programs.

Number of Democratic votes cast for President (in millions): 1936, 27.5; 1940, 27.2; 1944, 25.6; 1948, 26.4;[1] 1952, 27.3.

2. Liberal benefits did not increase the Democratic share of total vote.

Democratic percent of total vote cast for President: 1936, 62 percent; 1940, 55 percent; 1944, 54 percent; 1948, 55 percent;[1] 1952, 45 percent.

3. While the adult population (21 and over) increased substantially, the ratio of Democratic votes to the population did not increase.

Percent of Democratic vote to adult population:[2] 1936, 34 percent; 1940, 32 percent; 1944, 28 percent; 1948, 28 percent;[1] 1952, 28 percent.

These facts establish that if liberal benefits to farmers, workers, and others, won a gain in Democratic votes, the party's policies lost as many or more votes from others.

Who are these other voters? Why have the Nation's leaders chosen not to reveal a fact of such major significance?

Why have the Nation's leaders chosen to promote the view that liberal programs are necessary to gain votes?

Why has the national organization of the Republican party moved closer and closer to the liberal program of the Democratic party when that party failed to increase its vote in 16 years?

These facts and questions are sufficient to challenge those who teach, or believe, that the liberal movement is being forged by the vote and desire of the American people.

[1] Includes vote for Truman, Wallace, Thurmond.

[2] Based on figures of population 21 and over received from U. S. Census Bureau.

The facts which follow reveal why the Nation's leaders never offered substantial facts supporting their teachings that liberal benefits won a gain in Democratic votes.

Labor vote

The facts here deal with one of the largest groups of citizens who have received as great, if not greater, benefits from liberal programs than others.

1. In the labor citadels of Wayne County (Detroit), Mich., and in Allegheny County (Pittsburgh), Pa., as the population and union membership grew, and as the political power of labor leaders grew, the Democratic candidates for President received a smaller share of the vote.

	Year	Pittsburgh	Detroit
		Percent	*Percent*
Before CIO-PAC:			
Roosevelt	1932	56	60
Do	1936	68	68
After CIO:			
Roosevelt	1940	58	62
Do	1944	57	63
After Taft-Hartley:			
Truman	1948	56	59
Stevenson	1952	51	53

2. In the 98 counties which comprised the largest industrial areas throughout the country; as union membership grew, and as the political power of labor leaders grew, the Democratic candidates for President received a smaller share of the vote cast.

	Democratic vote		Union membership (United States)
	Year	Percent	
Before CIO-PAC	1932	57	3,250,000
	1936	65	4,700,000
After CIO	1940	57	8,500,000
	1944	56	13,500,000
	1948	52	15,600,000

3. The following facts are the result of segregating the vote of every labor precinct in 261 (84 percent) of the 310 counties in Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maine, Illinois, Iowa, and Wyoming. These labor precincts cast a total of 1,172,000 votes in 1952.

	1940	1948	1952
(*a*) Percent of Democratic vote for President in labor precincts	55	54	48
(*b*) Number of Democratic votes for President cast in labor precincts	628,000	519,000	559,000

4. The movement of the vote in labor precincts was generally similar to the movement in white-collar, wealthy-residential, and mixed population precincts where there were fewer or no special liberal benefits.

5. The preceding labor vote facts are consolidated here for comparison, and to show the similarity of the vote in labor centers and the nationwide vote.

[Percent]

Democratic vote	1932	1936	1940	1944	1948	1952
	Before CIO		After CIO		After Taft-Hartley	
All United States	59	62	55	54	55	45
98 industrial counties	57	65	57	56	52	
Pittsburgh (Allegheny County)	56	68	58	57	56	51
Detroit (Wayne County)	60	68	62	63	59	53
Labor precincts in 6 States	(1)	(1)	55	(1)	54	48

[1] We do not have precinct figures for 1932. For 3 States we do not have precinct figures for 1936 and 1944 so have omitted totals for these years.

NOTE.—For the sake of clarity and brevity we have omitted reference to the Republican vote. The Republican vote strengthens the weight of the evidence here.

These facts establish that liberal benefits did not win a gain in labor vote for the Democratic Party which provided the benefits.

These facts establish that the Nation's leaders, liberal and conservative, who promoted the view that liberal benefits won a gain in labor votes have, for years, misrepresented and misled the American people.

Farm vote

Billions of dollars in liberal benefits were paid to farmers by Democratic administrations, for 20 years. Political leaders vied to gain farm votes through liberal benefits. Virtually all public leaders educated the people to believe that farmers yielded their votes for liberal benefits.

The facts reveal a shocking misrepresentation.

1. The following figures show the number of Democratic votes cast for President in all farm precincts in 97 of the 99 counties in the farm State of Iowa.

Iowa—Number of Democratic votes for President in farm precincts

1936	293,000
1940	273,000
1944	207,000
1948	215,000
1952	168,000

The total number of Democratic and Republican votes in these farm precincts in 1952 was the same as in 1936. Thus, the decline in Democratic vote cannot be attributed to a decline in farm population.

2. The number of Democratic votes for President declined in the farm precincts in Illinois. The following figures cover all farm precincts in 97 of the 102 counties in Illinois. (We do not have figures for 1936 and 1944.)

Illinois—Number of Democratic votes for President in farm precincts

1940	241,000
1948	176,000
1952	167,000

3. In Wyoming, Maine, and Pennsylvania, and in the other States where tests have been made, the decline in Democratic farm vote is similar to Iowa and Illinois.

PART 3

Taft election exposed liberal movement not supported by public

Commencing in 1941, this survey has presented facts which revealed that the so-called New Deal labor vote was a hoax. In 1946 we reported, in part:

"We believe that there is little labor-union legislation needed in the public interest which could not also be sought for the welfare fo union members. We believe that labor has been exploited by its own mechanism. Therefore:

"We urge that the Republican Party rise up to fight as the champion of the welfare of the rank and file of union members, and of the public, for labor-union legislation which is fair, decisive, and of full measure.

"By this course the Republican Party would aline the rank and file of union members and the public into an irresistible political force.

"The facts lift the rank and file of union members out of the New Deal-labor-leader orbit, and place them alongside of the rest of the American people. But isolated and encircled by the New Deal, abandoned by the Republican Party, the American workingman has had no political champion."

This was the overall campaign which brought Senator Taft his great majority in Ohio in 1950. He knew that liberal programs had not gained the vote of rank-and-file workers, farmers, etc., in Ohio.

An editorial in the Cleveland Plain Dealer, October 1, 1950, revealed:

"Despite the vast favors which labor unions have received from the Democratic Party, despite the party's open alliance with the unions, and despite the feverish election activities of the CIO-PAC, the number of Democratic voters has constantly declined in the principal centers of organized labor since the 1936 heyday.

"To put it another way, fantastic as it may seem, the victorious Democratic Party has not been converting increasing numbers of men to its philosophy, but has been losing followers.

"And also in the principal farm areas of the Nation, fewer Democratic ballots were cast in 1948 than in 1940 despite the enormous subsidies lavished on them by Roosevelt and Truman administrations.

"In factory and on farm, the give-away programs have been losing—not winning—voters.

"We are indebted to the Dunn Survey, of Greenwich, Conn., for pointing out this political trend. We checked for ourselves the official election returns of Ohio, and find that the conclusions both as to farm and factory are borne out. * * *"

With such knowledge Taft could campaign fearlessly for the American ideology. His great majority made a dramatic revelation of the political character of the people of Ohio. But there was little that was new about this except that it was dramatic because Taft was a national figure.

Scores of Members of Congress made similar campaigns each year with but a rare casualty—and these were mostly in years when a "liberal" Republican presidential candidate neutralized the Taft-like campaigns of individuals and their local organizations.

Taft-like campaigns, across the country, had a total result which revealed the lack of public support for liberal programs, even more significantly than the Taft victory.

But the Republican national organization did not exploit these opportunities to reveal that liberal benefits were not gaining public support. Instead, it strengthened the liberal movement by promoting the belief that liberal benefits gained labor, farm, and other mass votes; and it sought to make ineffective facts to the contrary.

Today

Today, the program of a Republican administration is as liberal as the Democratic Fair Deal. This neutralizes the political character and effectiveness of Republicans and organizations who oppose the liberal movement. It leaves them to wither on the vine, one at a time—a movement now apparent.

Today, neither a Democrat nor Republican can vote for his party's national ticket without supporting and accelerating the liberal movement. Voters can choose only the most competent and comforting bedside nurse, while the liberal operation continues.

From the top down

The liberal movement and its programs have originated, and been kept activated, by the national organizations of the Democratic and Republican Parties and by the Federal bureaucracy—not by the public or local party organizations.

To maintain and extend the movement, leaders of these organizations must propagate the view that the public seeks the benefits, and that the vote proves the contention.

When leaders of both parties claim a liberal labor, farm, or other vote, the public naturally believes it. However, for 20 years election facts have not been offered to sustain the contention. There are no such facts.

The liberal movement is a thinly veiled scaffolding sustained by leaders who have misrepresented and misled the American people.

Taft revealed this in Ohio in 1950. The many Taft-like campaigns made by Members of Congress revealed this year after year. The absence of extensive State and local liberal programs reveals this. The actual vote cast in precincts, towns, cities, and States reveals this.

Twenty years of efforts by conservatives

For 20 years conservatives have sought to educate the public to understand and oppose the liberal-socialist movement. They failed to halt the movement. They failed to even provide the opportunity to choose between a liberal and a conservative party.

These failures appeared when, on election days, the people were confronted with no choice but to vote for 1 of 2 liberal candidates for President. They could only vote "ja," or stay home.

For 3½ of the 4 years between elections the public was taught the evils of the liberal-socialist program. But in the few months before election day the same teachers supported, and urged all good Americans to support, their liberal candidate for President.

This contradiction neutralized the 3½ years of educational efforts, as should be expected. This explains why the Republican Party has become a minority party: why a growing number of voters will not affiliate with either party, independents: why fewer than 50 percent of the eligible voters went to the polls: and why there is public confusion and discouragement.

Conservatives have failed to learn that the mind and vote of a majority of citizens has been as ready as their own to sustain the American ideology.

They have failed to learn that the factor preventing voters from registering this ideology at the polls, excepting 1952, has been the national organization of the Republican Party.

The revelation that a Republican administration is as liberal as the Democratic Fair Deal confirms what the political character of the national organization of the party has been for approximately 20 years.

This assures that in 1956 the people can only vote "ja" on the issue of the liberal program. This will give the movement the appearance of having greater public support than ever before, regardless of which party wins the election. And more men who have carried the fight for the American ideology will quit, from discouragement and personal considerations.

Partisan blindness

Some Republicans will discount or resent any reflection against a part of their party. In the interest of briging out the truth, we would suggest that any such man look in the mirror and repeat the reflections he made against the character and intelligence of conservative southern Democrats who disaprpoved of their party's liberal program but continued to support the New Deal.

The one opportunity to win

There is only one means through which the liberal movement can be stopped, and returned to its proper minority position.

Reveal to all Americans that they have been deceived into believing that their fellow citizens are yielding their common ideology and, in growing numbers, given their vote for liberal benefits. From the local level to the national level.

This truth can be revealed through the record of the vote cast by the people themselves. This is a political H-bomb.

Endorsed by many Members of Congress

Twenty-seven Members of Congress, including seven committee chairmen, have examined our methods and precinct vote findings and taken the unusual action of jointly signing a letter which reads, in part:

"We believe your methods and procedures are sound and that the resulting figures open a new field of political intelligence of great value—at the National, State, and local levels.

"When and if the study you have already made in several States is extended upon a national scale, with similar results, we believe the facts will afford the sorely needed incentive to both Republicans and Democrats alike to move away from the welfare-Socialist state, back to the fundamental principles of government outlined by our forefathers in the Constitution." And:

"We believe it is a matter of great importance to the Nation for you to extend your studies of the precinct vote on a nationwide basis, and that you make the results as widely known as possible.

"You have undertaken a great task, an important task. We wish to help and encourage you in your efforts, and to that end we recommend this work of yours as being worthy of support by all who have the future welfare of this Nation at heart."

We ask for your careful consideration of this report. Achievement of the objective stated here depends upon the support we receive. Therefore we ask for your wholehearted financial support at this time.

Comparison of farm and labor vote with other types of population

The following figures are based on the number of Democratic votes cast for President in 1936 representing 100 percent. The 1940, 1944, 1948, and 1952 figures show the number of votes cast (percentage) compared to 1936.

[Percent]

Type of precinct	1936	1940	1944	1948	1952
IOWA [1]					
Farm	100	86	70	73	58
Labor	100	102	91	94	88
White collar	100	106	100	102	99
Wealthy residential	100	100	110	102	105
Mixed population	100	94	81	89	76
PENNSYLVANIA [2]					
Farm	100	78	56	51	64
Labor	100	87	67	62	76
White collar	100	80	68	57	76
Wealthy residential	100	87	76	60	69
Mixed population	100	80	66	56	74
ILLINOIS [3]					
Farm	------	100	------	73	70
Labor	------	100	------	85	92
White collar	------	100	------	81	99
Wealthy residential	------	100	------	89	96
Mixed population	------	100	------	79	85

[1] All precincts in 97 of 99 counties.
[2] All precincts in 25 of 67 counties thus far completed.
[3] All precincts in 97 of 102 counties. We do not have 1936 and 1944 figures. 1940 vote used as 100 percent.

Those Tireless Chandlers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, the April 30 edition of Newsweek magazine carries an interesting article concerning Mr. Norman Chandler, publisher of the Los Angeles Times, and the outstanding service to the southern California area which he and his family are rendering. The article follows:

THOSE TIRELESS CHANDLERS

In the brilliantly lighted city room of the afternoon Los Angeles Mirror-News one day last week a chunky young rewriteman turned in his final copy, emptied a gray steel desk, and hurried off to catch an east coast plane. After 3 months on rewrite and features he had been assigned to accompany his boss, Norman Chandler, to the 70th annual convention of the American Newspaper Publishers Association in New York.

For Otis Chandler, 28, a convention trip promised to be about the least taxing job he will ever perform for his father's company. Since 1952 he has put in 18 months as a lobster-shift production man in the morning Times' press room and another 15 as a reporter on general assignment. One week hence, back in Los Angeles, he will move into a low-ranking job in the Times' circulation department. After that he will spend a year or so as an ad man, then work at the Publishers Paper Co. in Oregon City, Oreg., a newsprint mill largely owned by the Times and the Mirror-News. Two years from now he may be assigned to the Hollywood studios of the company's television station, KTTV, Los Angeles. It is, he says, "a long executive training program—probably 10 years."

HOURS AND TALENTS

Otis Chandler will need every minute of it. As any one of the 1,300-odd publishing executives present this week in the corridors and meeting rooms of the Waldorf-Astoria might testify, the newspaper business is far from ready to dismantle its presses. But, if pressed, all of them would also admit that the delightful craft which once was newspapering has become a tough and reasonably scientific business where survival and profits are increasingly a matter of long hours, high-priced talent, and an intimate familiarity with such details as the quality of ink, the price of newsprint, and United States tax laws.

On the surface, 1955 was the most prosperous year in history for the American press. Together, the country's 1,760 dailies sold 56.1 million copies, more than they have ever hawked before. Simultaneously they raked in $3 billion in advertising revenue, also an all-time high. But in this bright year, the increases in publishing costs more than offset the rise in income. Newsprint alone, which can represent as much as 40 percent of the production cost of an average daily, and much more for a large one, jumped almost 4 percent to the record high of $131 a ton. In some areas publishers were forced to buy on the open market at prices ranging above $200 a ton.

A few years ago it was easy for publishers to net 15 percent of their gross revenues. Today it takes considerable effort to make 5 percent, and few do that. Last year one of the biggest, best known, and apparently most prosperous newspapers in the country netted its proprietors only $400,000 after taxes. The average 50,000-circulation daily, on which Editor & Publisher has been keeping tabs since the end of the war, earned only $128,870 after taxes on a gross income of $2.7 million. Ten years ago the same paper pulled in almost $200,000 on a gross of only $1.25 million.

CLIMBER

In the face of such discouraging figures, the record of the Chandler enterprises in Los Angeles over the last 10 years is nothing less than spellbinding. Since the end of the war Norman Chandler has invested almost $29 million in his own properties. His conservative morning Times (circulation 428,300) has moved from 17th to first place in the Nation in total advertising lineage. Last year it published more than 21.5 million lines of news and features, some 2.7 million more than the second-place New York Times.

Chandler's afternoon paper, the Mirror-News, founded in 1948 as the tabloid Mirror (circulation 308,500) has in its brief existence (1) almost single-handedly run the opposition Daily News out of business and (2) saleswise, climbed to within 40,000 copies a day of the rival Hearst Herald and Express. The Times-Mirror television station, KTTV, started in 1949 in partnership with CBS, has become probably the most successful independent in the country. Last year, despite the fact that the Mirror-News was not yet landing regularly in the black (estimated loss since its founding: $5.5 million), the Times-Mirror parent company and KTTV grossed $70.6 million, $14 million more than it made in 1954, after taxes, the company netted more than 6 percent of that.

Under its veteran editor, L. D. (Hotch) Hotchkiss, the Times carries more internation and national news than any other west coast paper. But its lead story is almost always a local one. Its corporate faith in itself as an instrument of southern California's growth has not wavered since Lt. Col. Harrison Gray Otis, Norman Chandler's grandfather bought a quarter interest in the paper in 1882. When Colonel Otis, a Civil War veteran, acquired control of the paper 4 years later, his "general order No. 1" was in the southern California tradition: "Push things."

PUSH FOR LOS ANGELES

Under the colonel and his circulation manager, Harry Chandler (who later became his son-in-law), the Times pushed with a will. It was Harry Chandler who helped the development of the California Institute of Technology, who was one of the original organizers of Western Air Lines, and who, with 10 friends, put Donald Douglas in the business of manufacturing aircraft. Chandler and the Times were also the moving spirits behind the development of the San Fernando Valley, Los Angeles Harbor, the city's modern civic center, and the Hollywood Bowl. Of him and his fund-raising, it used to be said: "It cost $1,000 to have lunch with Harry Chandler."

Today, his son barely finds time for lunch. Born in Los Angeles in 1899, Norman Chandler was put to work in the Times' composing room in 1922, a few months after graduation from Stanford. From the start, he worked harder than any one of his future editorial employees and, probably, for less cash (his first Times job paid $16 a week). He served his apprenticeship in the composing room, the circulation-complaint desk, in stereotyping, as a cashier's clerk, and as his father's secretary. By 1936, he had worked his way up to vice president and general manager of the company. In 1941, he became president and in 1944, after his father's death, publisher of the Times.

There was no real need for him to extend himself in new plans for the Times. The Chandlers—Norman, Philip, and Harrison—are indisputably wealthy, and estimates of their total worth have ranged from $50 to $100 million (the lower figure is probably closer to accuracy). But Chandler threw himself wholeheartedly into the Times, and his apprenticeship paid off. In 1944, when he took over, the paper ranked 34th in ad linage among the country's dailies; 5 years later it was in seventh place. A year later it was in third.

TIMES' TAB

Chandler was not satisfied. Under the postwar influx of industrial workers, Los Angeles was both booming and changing. The heavyweight Times was not necessarily the kind of paper the new groups scattered in the burgeoning suburbs from Palmdale to Santa Ana wanted to read. "There was room," he says now, "for another newspaper. I wanted something completely different from the Times."

The tabloid Mirror he founded in 1948 was indeed different—so much so, in fact, that many old Times hands privately admitted something close to shock. Chandler hired Virgil Pinkley, then general manager of the United Press in Europe, as his editor and publisher and gave him, Pinkley recalls, only two orders: "One, not to favor communism in any way. Two, not to print anything that couldn't go into the American home."

Pinkley took Chandler at his word. For the first few months of its existence, the Mirror's tabloid page 1 was printed sideways. It campaigned against saloons, the black market in babies, and ugly female legs. It started a page of "personals," in which the lonely were allowed to advertise for prospective mates. Under its buzz-saw managing editor, Ed Murray, it sponsored beauty contests, planted "atomic missiles" in vital installations, bombarded the city with leaflets, and broke the unwritten Los Angeles law against mentioning the opposition by attacking both the Hearst papers frequently and loudly.

INDEPENDENT

Most amazingly, for a product of the quiet, stanchly Republican Times, it was politically independent. Where the Times (and Chandler himself) preferred the late Senator Robert A. Taft for the Republican nomination in 1952, the Mirror plumped editorially for Dwight Eisenhower.

At 56, a handsome gray-haired executive, the Mirror-News and the Times' boss is still putting in longer hours at the shop than most of the hired hands. He and his wife, Dorothy Buffum Chandler, a tireless and pretty woman, active in countless civic affairs (and who also acts as adviser on women's news), arrive at the Times' six-story downtown building before 8:30 every morning. Some evenings they manage to get away by 7:30 at night. When they do, Chandler's briefcase is jammed with the details and homework of publishing.

Although active with a round dozen civic and business groups, he spends nothing like the amount of time on them that the last publisher of the Times did. "My father," Norman Chandler says with a smile, "was never around the office. He spent at least 15 to 20 percent of his time on civic affairs and on his ranches. No publisher today can afford such luxuries."

The Time To Help Small Business Is Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 24, 1956, I had the pleasure of addressing the National Association of Tool & Die Manufacturers at its ninth annual dinner held at the Hotel Statler in Washington, D. C. My address follows:

REMARKS OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, OF NEW YORK, AT THE ANNUAL DINNER OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TOOL AND DIE MANUFACTURERS

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is nice to be with you again even though this is the first time you have invited me to sing for my dinner. I probably should have declined on two grounds. First, I have no union card, and, second, your very fine entertainers would no doubt refuse to appear on the same program with me properly urging that my talent fell short of their minimum criteria for entertainment.

Nevertheless, I am prepared to leave with you some of my thoughts. I know that at least some of you may disagree with me but controversy is good for the American soul; that is, the political soul—particularly in an election year.

It has been my happy privilege to serve on the House Small Business Committee for many years. It is one of the few committees of Congress which has been truly nonpartisan. I cannot recall a single recommendation coming from that committee which did not have bipartisan support.

Therefore you should bear in mind that anything I say that is critical is deliberately intended to be critical but is just as deliberately intended not to be political.

The criticisms that have come from my committee were always made constructively, never destructively, and always made without regard to the political affiliations of the appointee against whom directed.

I sincerely believe that my Republican colleagues on our committee will endorse what I say.

I will try to relate my remarks directly to your interests.

You will hear more and more as the year rolls on that small business is the backbone of our free-enterprise economy and that big business aided by big business in Government is more and more throttling small business.

While none of you are small in the colloquial sense, you are small business in accordance with our legal definition. Each of you represents a business which is independently owned and not dominant in your industry. That is the new language of the statute, which defines small business.

The Defense Department had an arbitrary legal definition that any firm with 500 or more employees was big business and any firm with less than 500 employees was small.

The reason for the change of the definition is important. The Congress found that small business must be protected against the depredations of big business and of big government and accordingly, enacted into law many aids, safeguards, and even preferences for small business.

These laws were enacted because the facts as developed in dozens of hearings, sustained by volumes of testimony and documentary evidence demanded them.

Similarly, almost a year ago we enacted a law repealing the Defense Department's arbitrary definition and making it mandatory that the Small Business Act definition, which I enunciated before, be uniformly applied in all Government agencies.

Now, I do not care whether that policy has not been implemented and enforced by the Defense Department because Charlie Wilson is big business or favors big business or because his subordinates unbeknown to him have failed to do so for fear of antagonizing the boss. You and I are not concerned with the motives, good or bad. We are concerned that the congressional committees that urged that policy upon him before enactment of the law, were told that the policy was a good one and should be the rule.

We are more concerned with the simple incontrovertible fact that a concededly good doctrine was not voluntarily effectuated and the Congress was compelled to and did mandate it. The same agency continues to ignore and flout the law.

That is typical of how small business is being mistreated by the executive department of the Government.

We get fine speeches from the top echelon about broadening the base, integrating small business into Government procurement, both military and civilian, and about requiring the big prime contractors to subcontract a fair portion of their contracts to small business. They come into our hearings and document their slogans and shibboleths with directives and regulations.

Then we go out into the field only to learn that the complaints from small business have increased both in number and in bitterness.

What do we find?

Except for isolated instances we find the procurement offices fighting small business and making it impossible for them to get into the program, withholding plans and specifications, imposing impossible conditions, putting obstacles in the way of performance, demanding changes and extras without compensation, and delaying their payments interminably.

Our latest field investigations were made during the Easter vacation only a few weeks ago.

We found that it took 6 to 9 months for directives to reach the personnel in the field and then too frequently they were promptly ignored by the people charged with enforcing them.

Our Defense Department is still spending about $40 billion per year. How much of it are you getting? Not very much. All the small business throughout the whole country is only getting 17.6 percent of the prime contracts.

I am amused and at the same time terrified by Government economists who prate about our prosperity and our stability.

Our national gross income is stable they tell us. Of course, it is when you add big business income to farmers' income to small business income. The total of the gross is about the same for 1955 as for 1954.

What they do not tell you is that the gross income of big business is up over a billion two hundred million dollars and the gross income of the rest of our economy is down by a billion dollars.

They tell you that bankruptcies for the whole country are no more than in the previous years. Of course, they are. Big business failures have practically disappeared and those of the rest of our economy have nearly doubled.

They tell you that the number of business firms has remained stable in the last 3 years, that is, it has not changed. They do not tell you that in the prior 3 years our economy grew to the extent of 50,000 new firms a year. What about the manufacturing firms with less than $250,000 in assets? We are getting closer home to you now. They are the bulk of your customers. Their prosperity or lack of it, is directly tied to yours.

In the first 6 months of 1952 they netted profits after taxes of $175 million. Last year for the same period they netted only $60 million. Did you get the difference of $115 million? I doubt it.

From 1952 to 1955 these same firms had 40 percent less funds available for reinvestment and expansion. That means 40 percent less with which to buy your tools and dies.

But neither you nor they need investment capital. Oh, no. You just call up your banker and tell him what you need—and try to get it.

A recent survey shows that 10,000 manufacturing companies, many of them your customers, will need about $100 million this year to fulfill their contracts.

Big business borrows long-term money at low rates from the insurance companies, sells bonds to the banks and investment houses or sells stock to the underwriters and the public.

What do you and your customers do?

If the bankers have not yet told you they will. They will say:

"The Secretary of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board are afraid of inflation. They are tightening up on credit. They are raising reserve requirements so we will have less to lend. They are making us buy more Government bonds for the same reason. They are raising the discount rates so we must charge you more interest, so that you cannot afford to borrow."

Congress set up a Small Business Administration which should be able to help you but don't be too optimistic about that. The Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce, both big businessmen control the Loan Policy Board of that Administration. Believe me the Congress wants the Small

Business Administration to succeed in serving you.

But the latest figures do not augur too well. They show an average of 11,000 inquiries a month. During the first 2 years of operation only 395 direct loans had been made.

In the insecure world in which we live today. America must always be alert and prepared. It is essential in order to maintain a defense potential that we stockpile the necessary machine tools needed in any war effort. Therefore, let us look at a program in which you, the National Tool & Die Manufacturers, are vitally interested. An industrial mobilization program was developed after the Korean incident. Under this program it was intended that the Government spend up to $800 million a year for the acquisition of machine tools considered essential to maintain our defense potential. If this program had been followed America's bastion of defense now would contain about $2,400,000,000 worth of long-lead-time machine tools; the large and complex machines that require for their own engineering and building a period of many months. The economy aspect of this policy is striking. It was reasoned that instead of actually producing weapons in great volume and taking the chance that these might become obsolete before they were needed, it would be more economical to mobilize capability of production equipment, build and keep up-to-date numerous machines which would be available for defense tasks when the need arose. Although the administration developed such a program, little has happened under it. Congress appropriated $250 million for that specific purpose. Only $29 million has been utilized.

Long delays, continual procrastination, and failure to plan ahead have resulted in the almost complete failure of that part of our industrial mobilization program. Purchasing was cut short by a pretended economy in the Defense Department after only a negligible volume of orders had been placed. This great failure has caused fears that in the event of war there will be a repetition of the same difficulties, the same problems, the same desperate need for complicated weapons, and the same restrictions that hampered output of vital weapons in the last two emergencies.

Is that business that was intended for you, now being channeled into big business?

I do not know.

But my committee intends to find out unless blocked by the favorite but much abused answer to congressional committees—the information is classified.

There is another aspect of our economy which is very bad and needs attention. Small businesses complain of the inability to obtain steel, steel scrap, aluminum, copper, nickel, lead, newsprint, plate glass, and almost every essential material. They point out that the historical allotment pattern used by the suppliers discriminates against the small business firms because they are unable to obtain greater allotments as their orders increase. If they are new users, they are not able to get supplies at all. As prices of basic materials rise the small businessman is squeezed by the inability to raise the price of its products or to pass the increased cost on to its customer. I do not pretend to know the answer. I can only say that I am not satisfied with the administration's answer that in a free economy there is no remedy.

Criticism without suggested remedy may in turn be criticized as ineffective. My suggested remedies are simple:

1. Tax relief to small business that will permit it to retain as much of its earnings as it needs for modernization, expansion, and working capital.

2. Appointments to high Government positions of men who understand that small business is the backbone of our economy and who will devote themselves to executing our laws in the spirit in which they were intended to operate so as to aid, not hinder, small business.

3. Finally, to the big businessmen in Government who give me a big pain, every time they tell you they, too, were small once, you should say, "big boy, move over and give me a chance, too."

Thank you for listening to me.

Address by Hon. Herbert C. Bonner, of North Carolina, Before the Hampton Roads Maritime Association, Norfolk, Va., Thursday, April 19, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, recently the distinguished chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee addressed the 36th annual banquet of the Hampton Roads Maritime Association at Norfolk. It was my privilege to present Mr. BONNER to this gathering of outstanding business people in my district.

The Hampton Roads Maritime Association represents the shipping and maritime interests in the entire Hampton Roads area. Although the majority of its members are residents of my district, its membership includes the leaders of this industry in the Newport News community, represented by my colleague, Mr. ROBESON. This association has been a moving force in harbor development and in the stimulation of the movement of overseas commerce through the great world port of Hampton Roads. It has been tremendously effective because of the outstanding leadership provided by its able officials.

Mr. BONNER'S address includes much valuable information which I believe would be of interest to the entire membership of the House, and for that reason I have asked permission to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. HERBERT C. BONNER, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, BEFORE THE 36TH ANNUAL BANQUET OF THE HAMPTON ROADS MARITIME ASSOCIATION, NORFOLK, VA., APRIL 19, 1956

President Black, members of the Hampton Roads Maritime Association, distinguished guests, nothing could please me more than to have the privilege to speak to you here in Hampton Roads today in celebration of the 36th anniversary of the Hampton Roads Maritime Association. My interest in your excellent port is twofold.

As chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee in the House of Representatives, I feel deeply concerned about the maritime commerce in and out of all the ports of the United States—and their adequacy to serve the needs of the Nation in times of peace and in times of emergency.

In addition, as a North Carolinian, I view with personal feeling the capacity, the health, and the growth of the great harbor of Hampton Roads which provides a vital link between my home State and the other Southeastern States to the markets of the world. I feel a very close affinity with all you gentlemen and your port when I think of the fact that during 1954, out of more than a quarter of a million net tons of unmanufactured tobacco exported from the combined customs districts of the Atlantic and Gulf coasts, shipments from the Virginia ports totaled over 200,000 net tons, representing better than 60 percent of the total.

I have been thinking back over the years since your association was formed, early in 1920, to organize the efforts of this combined community in the development of the port and the area, in bold effort to hold and develop the overseas commerce which suddenly grew during and immediately following World War I. Our great $3 billion wartime ship-building effort was still not quite completed. Private enterprise was beginning to wake up to the possibilities of American-flag shipping. And, remembering the costly and near tragic consequences of our prewar blindness to the importance of participating with our own ships in the development of foreign commerce—remembering the absolute necessity for maintaining an effective posture of readiness on our sea frontiers—that same year saw the enactment of our first legislative program for a merchant fleet in the Merchant Marine Act of 1920. In 1920 Hampton Roads exported nearly 7½ million tons of goods, worth over $226 million, with imports of 331,000 tons worth well over $10 million. Business was good, and the population of about 200,000 was expanding.

The intervening years have seen many ups and downs—years of recessions, depressions, and prosperity—years of hot and cold wars. They have seen the high hopes of the early postwar years fade from the great expansion with the new ships of World War I, when we carried more than 50 percent of our total exports and imports, to 1935, when, despite efforts in Congress and in the industry to carry out our maritime policy, we found our merchant fleet 2d in tonnage, 5th in speed, and 8th in age, among the fleets of the world. In 1939, when war broke out again in Europe, we were only carrying 22 percent of our foreign trade.

By a miracle of coincidence, some of the errors of World War I were avoided as the result of the timely enactment and implementation of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. This was followed by the tremendous construction program of modern merchant ships during the war, without which the struggle for democracy would have been lost to the Axis powers. After the war we tried to establish a definite and realistic policy for returning our shipping to privately operated peacetime commerce.

Over the years we have made some progress—but not enough. And the signs, again, point to the old pattern which must be avoided at all costs. During the first 6 months of 1946 the United States merchant fleet carried an average of 67.5 percent of our exports and imports. In 1949, we carried 45 percent, and today we are carrying less than 25 percent of our foreign trade.

The diligent and informed efforts of groups such as yours, which have survived the ups and downs of the dramatic—and sometimes violent—events following the First World War, are perhaps more vital right now than ever before. Today your port ranks third on the Atlantic coast, after New York and Baltimore. Exports from Hampton Roads have more than doubled, both in tonnage and value, since the foundation of your association. More impressively, your imports are 8 times the tonnage of 1920, with a value more than 13 times greater. You are the leading coal port in the United States, and commodities of all kinds move through Hampton Roads to and from all areas of

the world. You have modern facilities, excellent shipbuilding and repair yards, good labor relations, and industry of all kinds establishing or expanding plants in the area.

This great development of your port has coincided with the period when we, as a Nation, have adopted a national maritime policy—a policy which, sometimes strongly—sometimes feebly—we have sought to make effective in the interests of our economy and national security.

Yet, with business so good and with the firm bonds of friendship and alliance with the maritime nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, is there a national and economic necessity for our Government to support an American merchant marine?

This Nation had so neglected its merchant marine prior to the outbreak of the First World War in Europe that our ships were carrying only nine percent of our export-import trade. In 1914, while we were still a neutral Nation, we found ourselves without ships for even our basic needs. Our foreign trade was paralyzed, and goods and materials were piling up on the docks.

During that period, much of the foreign-flag shipping upon which we had so heavily relied was withdrawn because of the outbreak of war in Europe. Thus, even before the heavy movement of munitions, ocean shipping rates went up 700 percent. By the time this country entered, these rates skyrocketed to 2,000 percent.

Our experience in World War II was a little better. At least the beginning of a modern American-flag merchant marine had been started under the impetus of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. Despite the vastly greater demands upon shipping, at no time during that period did American shipping rates rise higher than 70 percent.

Think of where we—and probably the world—would be today if we had not come out of World War II with a strong merchant marine in operating condition, ready to serve in the rehabilitation of the war-torn and weakened countries of Europe and Asia—and thereby provide a bulwark against the insidious advances of communism.

Then we had the years of the Korean conflict, which was supposed to be a United Nations war. At that time, even though the fleets of friendly nations had been extensively restored through purchases of surplus vessels from the United States at bargain-basement prices, it was American ships that supplied better than 80 percent of all ocean transportation to Korea.

I hate to think of what would have happened to ocean shipping rates if there had not been an American fleet to hold the line.

In one sense, it seems incredible that the need for an American-flag merchant marine can still remain a subject for debate. Yet, even today, there are many Americans, including some in high quarters, who fail to realize that a reasonably powerful American merchant marine is more than an arm of our military defense. Of equal if not greater importance, the merchant marine is the protection which provides against a strong enemy on the economic front. It is our guarantee that American exports will reach their markets speedily and in competition with other producing countries of the world. And it is our insurance that we will receive the imports that are so necessary to maintain our economy.

Of 38 critical industrial metals and minerals vital to our industrial society, the United States is self-sufficient in only 9. We import by ship two-fifths of our copper, and nearly one-third of our lead and zinc—all classified as strategic minerals by the Munitions Board. We are almost entirely dependent upon foreign sources for tin, nickel, and platinum. And, of the 20 alloying elements necessary for steel production, the United States is deficient in about a dozen. These facts speak for themselves as to the vital necessity for an American merchant marine.

Less than 2 years ago, the Congress enacted Public Law 664, known as the Cargo Preference Act. I am sure you are all familiar with this legislation. It provides that at least 50 percent of all the United States cargoes given away or sold for foreign currencies must be transported overseas on privately owned United States-flag vessels, if such vessels are available at fair and reasonable rates. Prior to the enactment of the permanent 50–50 law, beginning with the Marshall plan, there was an annual fight each time a foreign-aid bill came up in Congress over the inclusion of the cargo preference clause. This happened no less than 11 times.

This policy has been the salvation of the American merchant marine during these postwar years. Foreign-aid programs have constituted the bulk of our export foreign commerce. These programs have been conducted on a government-to-government basis, and are totally lacking in the characteristics of ordinary commercial practices. Had it not been for this policy of assurance of 50 percent of these cargoes for United States-flag vessels, I am certain that much, if not all, of the freight would have been directed to the shipping of other maritime nations.

In 1955, when the Cargo Preference Act was less than a year old, charges appeared in the press to the effect that the administration's program for selling farm surpluses overseas was "running into a bottleneck because of a ship-American provision in the law." It was alleged that the Department of Agriculture was having trouble finding space on American vessels.

We, on the Merchant Marine Committee, were deeply concerned by these allegations and scheduled an immediate investigation.

After full hearings, the committee found no basis in fact for the charges. There was no evidence that shipments to foreign countries of surplus agricultural commodities were being delayed in any way by reason of the Cargo Preference Act. The plain truth is that the act could not have any such effect.

Despite the convincing and objective record of our investigation into the administration and operation of the Cargo Preference Act, an effort was made to nullify its effectiveness by an amendment to a foreign-aid bill reported to the House in May of last year. After spirited debate on the floor of the House, the amendment was defeated by an overwhelming majority, and the 50–50 principle again received a resounding vote of confidence.

But the attacks upon the law did not cease. They shifted to other flanks, but increased in intensity. Allegations were made during the latter part of last year by farm groups and others that the surplus disposal program under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, 83d Cong.) was suffering by reason of the application to it of the 50–50 cargo preference law. It was said that foreign countries refused to enter into agreements subject to the 50-50 shipping provision; that the operation of the law results in American agriculture providing an indirect subsidy to American shipping, to the detriment of the disposal program; and that the existence of the 50-50 law establishes an undesirable precedent in world trade and offers encouragement to countries which are disposed to adopt similar discriminations in favor of their own national flag.

Again, the House Merchant Marine Committee felt obliged to examine the operation of the law in relation to the farm surplus disposal program.

In hearings held over a period of 3 weeks, during which some 38 witnesses appeared before the committee, we heard expressions of every possible point of view. We spent 2 full days receiving testimony from the administrator of Foreign Agricultural Services and other top officials of the Department of Agriculture, in order that we might overlook no fact bearing upon the opposition which the Department had expressed to the application of cargo preference to the surplus commodity program. The State Department likewise expressed objections to the law. This was, of course, no surprise and nothing new for the State Department. Since I have been in Congress they have opposed almost every bill designed to strengthen the American merchant marine. Opposition was also expressed by the International Cooperation Administration. In addition, we invited the testimony of agricultural groups who were known to have expressed objections to the 50-50 principle. We went still further. We took the unusual step of inviting one of the leading shipping men of Northern Europe. He came all the way from Norway and gave us his views. The American shipping industry was called upon to account for its stewardship in carrying out the 50-50 law and of assuring the success of the agricultural surplus disposal programs.

These two exhaustive and objective studies of the operation of the Cargo Preference Act have proved conclusively that it has not, does not, and cannot work any serious detriment to American agriculture. Now, let me say a few words of what it means to American shipping. The implications of it are devastatingly simple.

The Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board brought out some interesting but, in some respects, disturbing figures. During the years 1953–54, American-flag vessels carried only 23 percent of the dry cargo exports from the United States. In other words, this low percentage obtained even with the assistance provided by the 50–50 provision; the loss of those aid cargoes by the removal of 50–50 would reduce our carryings from 23 percent to 19.5 percent.

In the past 2 years the 9½ million tons of aid cargoes produced estimated freight revenues of $142½ million. The Board Chairman concluded that the financial return to the United States from the application of 50–50 far exceeded the small differential of $3 million charged to Department of Agriculture appropriations. Much of this freight revenue was returned to the Government in taxes. Another substantial part was deposited to statutory reserve funds to be used for the construction of new vessels to replace those which are now becoming obsolete. And, of course, bearing in mind the portion of those cargoes carried by American-flag tramps, that segment of our merchant marine was virtually kept in existence by earnings from foreign aid freights. Living in our greatest coal port, you here in Hampton Roads can appreciate the dangerous significance of the loss of those 70-odd Liberty ships that make up our tramp fleet.

I like to think our efforts to bring out the truth about 50–50 have not been in vain. It was reassuring and gratifying when the Senate voted overwhelmingly to strike a provision from the farm bill which would have seriously crippled the 50–50.

I realize I have devoted considerable time to the Cargo Preference Act and its meaning to the American economy and security. I have done so because I believe it is one phase of the problem where we, in the Congress, have been most effective.

If there were such a thing as a free international trade, I, for one, would favor the full, open and fair competition. Unhappily, we do not have today anything approaching free international trade. On the

contrary, we have our vast Government-sponsored foreign aid and rehabilitation programs, a program for the disposal of agricultural surpluses, at reduced prices with payment in foreign currency, and programs for the importation of strategic materials—all conducted outside the normal channels of trade. We are confronted with currency exchange problems in many countries. We are confronted with numerous instances of Government monopolies in foreign countries where nationalistic policy directs transportation on vessels of their own flag. In the face of these overwhelming obstacles, the survival of our merchant marine is heavily dependent upon continuing interest and support of our Government.

We, in Congress, are trying to do our share to develop and maintain the merchant marine which we need. But we cannot do it all.

In my many years with the Merchant Marine Committee, I have been concerned with the expense involved in the Government's support of our maritime policy, and yet each year we seem to be falling behind in progress toward the goals set forth in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

Today, more people with higher incomes are creating an expanding market for homes, durable goods, and for many items which were once considered luxuries or nonessentials. Along with all this demand for new goods has come new demands for travel, brought on by paid vacations and a reduction in the workweek. At present the population of the United States is increasing at the rate of almost 3 million persons per year. I have heard estimates that by 1965 it will be one-fifth larger than it was in 1953—while production will be one-half again greater—disposable income per person will be one-third larger—and the hours of work one-tenth less.

These trends are not something which developed this year, or this administration, or the previous one—they have been clearly present for years. Yet, today, this Nation, which prides itself on its greatness—its technical and inventive genius—and its productivity, is able to provide only a small fraction of the means for transporting its foreign commerce, upon which it depends more than any other nation in the world.

At present levels, our export foreign trade is almost three times the monthly average of 1.9 million tons exported in 1938. Our 1955 imports are double the 1.7 million tons imported monthly in 1938.

While overseas passenger traffic is expanding at an unprecedented rate, we have much less than one-third the passenger capacity that we had in 1939. In 1954, American-flag steamship lines, operating their passenger vessels at near capacity, carried only 18 percent of the tremendous passenger movement between the east coast of the United States and the tourist mecca of northern Europe. Today the percentage is undoubtedly even less, in view of new foreign ships which have entered the services.

I am keenly aware that nearby we have one of the greatest shipyards in the United States. So it is particularly appropriate that I refer briefly to a hope—yes, an intense desire—that the members of my committee have entertained for some time. You all know that the flagship and pride of the American merchant marine is the great superliner, *United States*. To watch that ship glide majestically up the North River in New York is a wonderful sight. It is as much a part of America as the Star Spangled Banner.

The trouble is we need another, a sistership, in order to provide a well-balanced passenger service to northern Europe under the American flag. With 1 ship it is like walking on 1 leg. So, it is our hope that before many months go by we will hear the familiar and heart-warming sound of those giant cranes and see the hustle and bustle of activity in the building of another great merchant ship—a new steamship *America*—with all the speed, comfort, and safety of the steamship *United States*. At this time I wish to pledge the full and wholehearted support of the Merchant Marine Committee to the fulfillment of that purpose. If legislation is, or becomes, necessary, I am sure I speak for my colleagues on the committee when I give public assurance of speedy, careful consideration to a feasible proposal.

In the extensive inquiries which the Merchant Marine Committee has made into all phases of our merchant marine, I have seen deficiencies which should be corrected. For example, there are problems in the labor-management field. But I do see hope for improvement in those relationships. There are serious problems in other areas too, that we are struggling to remedy.

I do not mean to imply that all is bad or hopeless. Nevertheless, shortcomings stand out like a sore thumb in every phase of our merchant marine. Part of the reason for this lies in the fact that so much Government money is involved. By the same token, we must all be vigilant and strenuous in our efforts to preserve the merchant marine of this country against attack from both within and without. This means, first of all, cleaning out all the dirty corners, and then, keeping the house in good order at all times.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*, 6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*.....
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*...120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*...
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*...The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.
Eastland, James O., *Miss*...5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*...
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*...
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*...
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*, University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*, 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*...Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*...
Jenner, William E., *Ind*....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*...
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*...
Laird, William R. III, *W. Va*..
Langer, William, *N. Dak*...2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*...Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*...
McClellan, John L., *Ark*....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*, The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*...
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*...The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*...
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*, Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*..
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*...
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*..2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*...Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*...
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Wofford, Thomas A., *S. C*....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*...Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Johnson of Texas, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Barkley, Anderson, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Morse, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Wofford, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Laird, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Wofford, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Laird, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Scott, Wofford, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Appendix

Protection of Jewish Americans in Foreign Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on the floor of the Senate on February 17, 1956, and in the public hearings accorded to Secretary of State Dulles and Under Secretary of State Hoover before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on February 24, 1956, I protested against the apparent acquiescence of the State Department in the discriminatory treatment by certain countries, especially Saudi Arabia, of American citizens who happen to be of Jewish descent or faith. It has come to my attention that this country faced a similar issue in 1911 in connection with the abrogation of a commercial treaty with Czarist Russia because of its discriminatory treatment of American citizens who were also Jews.

In 1911 it also took a public outcry to correct the passive attitude of the State Department of that day. The most eloquent protest then was delivered by a future President, Woodrow Wilson, in an address at Carnegie Hall in New York on December 6, 1911. President William H. Taft and former President Theodore Roosevelt agreed with him.

Woodrow Wilson's protest is as pertinent now as it was the day it was delivered. I ask unanimous consent that his address be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS AT CARNEGIE HALL, NEW YORK, DECEMBER 6, 1911

(From the public papers of Woodrow Wilson, vol. I, College and State—Educational, literary, and political papers (1875–1913), by Woodrow Wilson)

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the object of this meeting is not agitation, it is the statement of a plain case in such terms as may serve to arrest the attention of the Nation with regard to a matter which is of no mere local importance, which does not merely affect the rights and essential privileges of our Jewish fellow citizens as freemen and Americans, but which touches the dignity of our Government and the maintenance of those rights of manhood which that Government was set up to vindicate.

The facts are these: For some 80 years a treaty has existed between this country and Russia in which it is explicitly covenanted and agreed that the inhabitants of the two nations shall have the liberty of entering any part of the territory of either that is open to foreign commerce; that they shall be at liberty to sojourn and reside in all parts whatsoever of the territory thus opened to commerce in order to attend to their affairs; and that they shall enjoy the same security and protection as inhabitants of the country in which they are sojourning, on condition, of course, that they submit to the laws and ordinances there prevailing, and particularly to the regulations there in force concerning commerce. For some 40 years the obligations of this treaty have been disregarded by Russia in respect to our Jewish fellow citizens. Our Government has protested, but has never gone beyond protest. After 40 years of more correspondence the Russian Government naturally does not expect the matter to be carried beyond protest to action, and so continues to act as it pleases in this matter, in the confidence that our Government does not seriously mean to include our Jewish fellow citizens among those upon whose rights it will insist.

It is not necessary to conjecture the reasons. The treaty thus disregarded by Russia is a treaty of commerce and navigation. Its main object is trade, the sort of economic intercourse between the two nations that will promote the material interests of both. Important commercial and industrial relations have been established under it. Large American undertakings, we are informed, would be put in serious peril were those relations broken off. We must concede something, even at the expense of a certain number of our fellow citizens, in order not to risk a loss greater than the object which would seem to justify.

I for one do not fear any loss. The economic relations of two great nations are not based upon sentiment; they are based upon interest. It is safe to say that in this instance they are not based upon mutual respect, for Russia cannot respect us when she sees us for 40 years together preferring our interests to our rights. Whatever our feeling may be with regard to Russia, whatever our respect for her statesmen or our sympathy with the great future in store for her people, she would certainly be justified in acting upon the expectation that we would follow our calculations of expediency rather than our convictions of right and justice. Only once or twice, it would seem, has she ever thought our Government in earnest. Should she ever deem it in earnest, respect would take the place of covert indifference and the treaty would be lived up to. If it was ever advantageous to her, it is doubly and trebly advantageous now, and her advantage would be her guide, as has been ours, in the maintenance of a treaty of trade and navigation.

If the Russian Government has felt through all these years that it could ignore the protest of American Ministers and Secretaries of State, it has been because the American Government spoke for special interests or from some special point of view and not for the American people. It is the fact that the attention of the American people has now been drawn to this matter that is altering the whole aspect of it.

We are a practical people. Like the rest of the world we establish our trade relations upon grounds of interest, not sentiment. The feeling of the American people toward the people of Russia has always been one of deep sympathy, and I believe of ready comprehension, and we have dealt with their Government in frankness and honor, wherever it appears that the interests of both nations could be served. We have not held off from cordial intercourse or withheld our respect because her political policy was so sharply contrasted with ours. Our desire is to be her friend and to make our relations with her closer and closer.

But there lies a principle back of our life. America is not a mere body of traders; it is a body of free men. Our greatness is built upon our freedom—is moral, not material. We have a great ardor for gain; but we have a deep passion for the rights of men. Principles lie back of our action. America would be inconceivable without them. These principles are not incompatible with great material prosperity. On the contrary, unless we are deeply mistaken, they are indispensable to it. We are not willing to have prosperity, however, if our fellow-citizens must suffer contempt for it, or lose the rights that belong to every American in order that we may enjoy it. The price is too great.

Here is a great body of our Jewish fellow-citizens, from whom have sprung men of genius in every walk of our varied life, men who have become part of the very stuff of America, who have conceived its ideals with singular clearness and led its enterprise with spirit and sagacity. They are playing a particularly conspicuous part in building up the very prosperity of which our Government has so great a stake in its dealings with the Russian Government with regard to the rights of men. They are not Jews in America; they are American citizens. In this great matter with which we deal tonight, we speak for them as for representatives and champions of principles which underlie the very structure of our Government. They have suddenly become representatives of us all. By our action for them shall be tested our sincerity, our genuineness, the reality of principle among us.

I am glad this question has been thus brought into the open. There is here a greater stake than any other upon which we could set our hearts. Here is the final test of our ability to square our politics with our principles. We may now enjoy the exhilaration of matching our professions with handsome performance. We are not here to express our sympathy with our Jewish fellow-citizens, but to make evident our sense of identity with them. This is not their cause; it is America's. It is the cause of all who love justice and do right.

The means by which the wrongs we complain of may be set right are plain. There is no hostility in what we do toward the Russian Government. No man who takes counsel of principle will have in his thought anything but purposes of peace. There need be for us in this great matter no touch of anger. But the conquests of peace are based upon mutual respect. The plain fact of the matter is that for some 40 years we have observed the obligations of our treaty with Russia and she has not. That can go on no longer. So soon as Russia fully understands that it can go on no longer, that we must, with whatever regret, break off the intercourse between our people and our merchants, unless the agreeemnts upon which it is based can be observed in letter and in spirit, the air will clear. There is every reason why our intercourse should be main-

tained and extended, but it cannot be upon such terms as at present. If the explicit provisions of our present agreement cannot be maintained, we must reconsider the matter in the light of the altered circumstances and see upon what terms, if any, of mutual honor our intercourse may be reestablished. We have advantages to offer her merchants, her mine owners, her manufacturers, which her government will not despise. We are not suppliants. We come with gifts in our hands. Her statesmen see as clearly as ours. An intolerable situation will be remedied just as soon as Russia is convinced that for us it is indeed intolerable.

Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, Fiscal Year 1957

SPEECH
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10721) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, in this connection I would like to endorse the low-priced books program of the United States Information Agency. This is one activity where the Information Agency will actually compete with the Soviets. What has been a complete vacuum in the availability of American books at prices people can afford overseas will be filled under the present program. The Agency requested funds for mass editions of some 500 separate titles, which will put into commercial circulation 22 million books, worldwide. Certainly with the threat that confronts us on all sides, this number would hardly begin to scratch the surface. I am assuming this is only a beginning and that an expanded program will be developed. I urge that we make certain that this beginning be pushed to the extent that capabilities will allow and that the Agency be encouraged to expand this low-priced books program to its full potentialities.

According to testimony by United States Information Agency officials before the House Appropriations Subcommittee, Soviet Russia alone turns out more than 50,000 titles a year and more than a billion books in all. This means that 200 million books are available from the Soviet Union alone for free or low-cost distribution worldwide. To meet this, we are asked to support a program, which will yield 22 million books. The figures speak for themselves. Even with this low-priced books program, the Soviet Union will still be distributing almost 10 times as many books as we do.

In my opinion, this threat must be met, and, further, we must reach the point quickly where the Soviet saturation of worldwide markets is neutralized and overcome by our program of making our best books available at 10 cents per copy to foreign readers.

It is interesting to note the warm endorsement of this activity by the Washington Post and Times Herald. I include excerpts from the editorial in this morning's edition:

STRENGTHENING USIA

The House of Representatives is scheduled to take up today the budget request for the United States Information Agency. The Appropriations Committee was neither ungenerous nor undiscriminating in its treatment of the Agency.

* * * * *

We hope that the House will give USIA enough money to insure an expansion of its tremendously valuable program of distributing inexpensive editions of significant books. The House needs to think of the whole USIA program as an important element in the contest going on today for men's minds.

Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, Fiscal Year 1957

SPEECH
OF
HON. KENNETH J. GRAY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10721) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, was going to offer this very important amendment, but out of respect for my senior colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK] I decided to support his amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment just offered would allow the Department of Justice an appropriation of $9½ million to build a much-needed maximum security penitentiary somewhere in the United States.

Under the 5-minute rule, I, of course, will not have time to give all of the many reasons why this amendment should be adopted today; however, the need is imperative. The request comes from President Eisenhower, the Department of Justice, and the Bureau of Prisons, and has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget in their request to the Appropriations Committee. A maximum security penitentiary is needed to relieve the dangerous overcrowding of penitentiaries that house prisoners convicted of serious offenses. Maximum security penitentiaries are now located at Alcatraz, Calif., Atlanta, Ga., Leavenworth, Kans., and the main institution at McNeil Island, in Washington State. The total capacity of these institutions is 5,175. As of April 12 of this year, they were housing 6,304 prisoners, an overcrowding of 1,129 prisoners convicted of serious offenses and who cannot safety be housed in other than maximum security institutions because of their bad records. This proposed maximum security institution would help relieve this situation. In addition to the present need, the Federal courts are imposing longer sentences and increasing numbers of offenders are being committed for more serious crimes. This excess population of over 1,000 prisoners in the maximum security penitentiaries cannot be taken care of at the medium security penitentiaries.

It has been admitted by the Bureau of Prisons that some of their medium security penitentiaries throughout the United States are not at capacity. However, these institutions are definitely not suitable for housing the hardened criminal and, above all, subject him to living with some person who has been convicted of a less serious crime. The hardened criminal definitely must be separated. I am sure no one would propose that we subject some young American boy who has been convicted of stealing an automobile to living in a cell with some cold-blooded murderer such as the one who shot and killed the innocent service-station attendant last week here in Washington.

Overcrowding institutions housing the more serious type of prisoners is one of the major factors for riots and other disturbances. It is folly to wait until the need for this type institution is brought home to us by some major disturbance such as has happened in a number of institutions.

If this amendment is adopted and the money is allowed, it will take 3 years to build this proposed prison. With the already overcrowded facilities and the increase in the number of hardened criminals, we are late in building this institution as the matter now stands.

Mr. Chairman, there has not been a maximum Federal penitentiary built since 1902. Think of that—54 years with the same crowded and outmoded facilities.

The Bureau of Prisons had requested the Appropriations Committee for $17 million which would have allowed the maximum security penitentiary, plus $7½ million for a close custody reformatory for youthful offenders. This institution is also very badly needed; however, as a compromise we have only offered an amendment for the maximum security penitentiary because I believe of the two it is the more important.

I want to be perfectly frank and honest with the committee in saying that if this appropriation is allowed, I propose to try to have the penitentiary built somewhere in my congressional district of southern Illinois, which is near the center of population. However, I want further to be frank with the committee and say that a committee will be appointed to select the best location that can be found. I only feel that we should be in the running when a selection is ready to be made.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. I yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. Let me say that I am in support of the amendment. I think the gentleman would have a logical reason to suggest its being built in southern

Illinois because I understand that one of the requirements is that it will be on Government-owned land.

Mr. GRAY. That is exactly right.

Mr. PRICE. And there is an ample quantity of Government-owned land available in southern Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. That is a good point and I appreciate the gentleman's contribution. We have 180,000 acres of Government-owned land in my district. In addition, we have scores of cities that are willing to put up funds to buy a site and donate it free of charge to the Government, on which to build this proposed institution.

I want to say this very, very sincerely, in closing. In the interest of security and to insure adequate facilities to house the hardened criminals and in order to prevent the mixing of these hardened criminals with those who are convicted of less serious offenses and in an effort to assist the good, deserving people of southern Illinois or some other locality, I beg of you to support the Department of Justice and vote in the affirmative on this amendment.

Let me say further in closing that we have in southern Illinois 51,000 people receiving Government surplus food. We are spending a million dollars a month for public-aid assistance. This is only a $9½ million institution. It would employ approximately 500 persons and we could pay for the institution by a saving of expenditures now being paid to relief recipients. I beg of you to support the amendment. Thank you.

Address Delivered by Hon. John Marshall Butler, of Maryland, at Goucher College

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, this is the season of mock political conventions in many of our schools, colleges, and universities, and such enthusiasm on the part of our young people is most refreshing, and portends good for the future.

Last Saturday, April 21, 1956, it was my great pleasure to participate in a mock convention at Goucher College, in Towson, Md. Goucher College is one of our State's leading institutions of learning, and we of Maryland are proud of its many graduates who have distinguished themselves in the arts and sciences. The students of Goucher College are indeed alert to the problems of today and tomorrow.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech which I delivered at this convention.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, members of the convention, ladies and gentlemen, 1956 will be recorded in history as another year of reawakening and resurgence—a year of purpose and action. This climate is not accidental; it is the product of vision, leadership, and determination. It typifies the present strength, unity, and vitality of the American people in support of President Eisenhower and the Republican administration. It offers the opportunity of even greater accomplishments.

Yes, my friends, we can face the future with optimism—with even greater determination—and with even greater dedication to those principles of integrity and of economy and efficiency in government on which our Nation was founded.

The lessons of the past have been fruitful. Unity of purpose and action has developed a cohesive spirit of Republicanism which has been successfully demonstrated in the administration of the Federal, State, and local governments.

I have already stated that this favorable climate did not occur by chance. On the contrary, it has been precisely calculated. It marks a crescendo of energy and wisdom, whose dictating force has been the halting and reversal of dangerous socialistic tendencies at all levels of government. The full volume of this crescendo is unlimited and the promise of the future for our Nation is bright. The national posture of the opposition party has been confounded by a babble of political counsels, resulting in many cleavages. With our critics thus operating in a vacuum of confusion and discord, the solidarity of purpose within the Republican Party assumes greater significance.

You might ask—and the people of America might rightfully demand—"What are the accomplishments of the national administration, under President Eisenhower's leadership, which justify a continuation of Republican management in government?" The record of the past 4 years is truly filled with undeniable successes of lasting impact, and a few of these historic milestones are deserving of special emphasis.

The Eisenhower administration is to be commended for its constructive achievements. It has dispatched the public business with efficiency. It has restored the people's confidence in the integrity of their Government. No longer are we compelled to tolerate the miserable displays of arrogance, scandalous behavior, waste, and inefficiency which characterized 20 years of the New Deal and the Fair Deal.

The sacrifice of American lives in Korea has been ended. Russian imperialism and Communist aggression have been confronted with our firm determination to safeguard freedom and attain genuine peace. The devious Communist conspiracy, as inspired and carried out by the Kremlin, has been exposed in its true, ugly light. Without any weak-kneed surrender of basic principles, the Eihenhower administration has met this threat to freedom and liberty with a determination of lasting vigor. We shall not, and must not, lose sight of our cherished heritage and our pledge to freedom-loving people everywhere.

Today, able men and women are striving to undo the damage created by the incompetency of the unrealistic foreign policy of the New Deal and the Fair Deal.

Our national-defense program has been reorganized and strengthened by policies capable of providing long-range security at substantial savings and without disruption of the national economy.

Unification of the armed services has been effectively advanced through efficient management and careful coordination.

We have taken decisive action to safeguard the Nation from enemies within its borders and to remove Communist infiltration and subversion from all phases of our society. This serious threat has been illuminated to the extent that there is now wide public awareness of the potential menace to our traditional American way of life.

The trend toward destructive socialistic tendencies in Government has been arrested by the encouragement of private competitive enterprise, thrift, and the self-reliance of our people. Labor and private enterprise have been urged to solve their own problems without Government interference.

The States have been encouraged to meet their proper responsibilities. Their inherent rights to develop submerged lands and other resources within their boundaries have been restored, and we have rededicated ourselves to the concept of States rights.

The fundamental belief that Government should do only those things which the people cannot best do for themselves has been restored to its rightful ascendency in our way of life.

The difficult transition from war to peace has been successfully bridged without disrupting the Nation's economy. National controls of prices, wages, and rents have been ended, freeing American enterprise from undue Government interference. The nation's economy has been stabilized and the value of the dollar strengthened, ending the cheating of our people by inflation and avoiding the distress of deflation, while employment, production, wages, and earnings have remained high. The solvency of America is one of our greatest weapons in combating those forces which are bent on destroying our free way of life.

Under this prudent administration, taxes have been cut, thereby reducing income-tax payments, excise taxes on goods consumers buy, and providing substantial benefits in other deductions and allowances for individuals and enterprises.

All Americans look to the day when their individual and collective tax burdens will be reduced. For the first time in many years, the Eisenhower administration made possible a tax cut of some seven billion dollars.

For the first time in almost 80 years, our internal-revenue laws have been broadly revised. The continued economic growth of our country has thus been stimulated.

By way of contrast, let us look at the record of the Democratic Party. Since 1913 there have been 15 income-tax increases. All but one of these were voted by a Democratic Congress.

On the budgetary side, in the 1932–52 period, our Government lived within its income on only three occasions. Two of these three times, the budget was balanced only as a result of action by the Republican 80th Congress.

The Republican administration has acted courageously to end the shameful waste of farm surpluses, to reduce the high cost of subsidies, and to provide farmers with a long-range program for an independent, self-reliant agriculture, with Government providing a shield against destructive forces beyond farmer control.

Political courage, the likes of which have seldom been witnessed in our history, best describes President Eisenhower's action of last week in vetoing a hodge-podge, unworkable farm bill.

It has continued and enlarged the program to meet human needs, to strengthen civil rights, to aid our veterans to become established in civilian life and to provide adequate care for the disabled, to expand social security, and to assist the aged, the blind, and dependent widows and children.

In these and all other respects, the Eisenhower administration has fostered the forward progress of a free nation under a government without favoritism, without corruption, without waste or extravagance, but

efficient, economical, trustworthy, and fair to all.

The essential task of removing New Dealers, Fair Dealers, and their ilk, from policymaking and confidential governmental positions, has progressed steadily. I prefer to describe this group as "Cryptosocialists."

They seek to subvert the American system of limited government, free enterprise and democracy and to replace it with a system hostile and alien to our traditions as a nation. In striking at this cancer, which is gnawing at the very vitals of our government, we must, and shall, continue to rid the Federal payroll of those "crypto-socialists" and other political hacks. In spite of efforts by the previous administration to preserve these purveyors of destruction and scandal, their replacement by competent men and women has accelerated and continues rapidly.

The evidence of accomplishment by the Eisenhower administration cannot be disputed. The record is clear and positive. Even our severest critics must concede this. The Nation and the world can give grateful thanks to President Eisenhower for his forceful leadership. If the accomplishments of the Republican Party are to continue in the service of the American people, President Eisenhower needs a stronger Congress through the election of Republicans this fall.

Why a Republican Congress?—you might ask. In the political sense, the legislative and executive branches of our Government must respond to the voice of the people. I have already recited some of the main accomplishments of the executive branch under the leadership of President Eisenhower and the stewardship of the Republican Party. But, these attainments have not been realized without a considerable amount of legislative frustration activated by the party in opposition. It has long been true that for effective and continued progress, the legislative and executive branches of our Government must function like two gears in a finely balanced, expensive timepiece. Much can be said on this point.

It has been my very great privilege to represent the people of Maryland in the United States Senate for nearly 6 years. Thus I have been a part of 3 Congresses—the 82d, the 83d, and now the 84th. The 82d Democratic-controlled Congress had such a wretched record that the voters, in their indignation, cast the Democrats out.

Much different indeed were the legislative achievements of the 83d GOP Congress, the record of which will long be regarded as one of the finest in history. Unfortunately, and to our sharp regret, a good job in acquainting the people with those achievements was not done. Candidly, we lost by default.

Strange as it may seem, many of these Democratic Senators and Representatives campaigned for office on a promise to support President Eisenhower. Luminaries in the party of Andrew Jackson mesmerized the people into believing that they would give the President more cooperation than he received from the Republicans.

The results of that duplicity are self-evident in all quarters. The 84th Congress has truly become the Congress of obstruction. The Eisenhower legislative program has been roadblocked. It is a legislative program designed to build upon the successes already forged with vision, leadership, and determination since 1952. Yet, in the United States Senate, at this session, only four major bills have been completed. They are the Upper Colorado River project, the natural gas bill, extension of corporation and excise taxes, and the farm bill. Two have become law. Two were vetoed. The record of the House of Representatives is equally unimpressive. A deliberate political conspiracy seems to exist to deny the American people the benefits of President Eisenhower's great leadership. And quite obviously his farsighted and constructive program for the good of the Nation will not be achieved until the legislative branch is again controlled by the Republicans.

I predict that the American people will remove this roadblock to national progress by overwhelmingly reelecting the President in November, and further by giving him a Republican Senate and House of Representatives. The American people will no longer tolerate a Congress that wastes its time and the taxpayers' money on partisan political speeches. They want deeds not words. They want action not excuses. But above all, they want a Congress whose Members will subordinate personal political ambitions to the common good of all of the people of the United States of America.

Now, I am not going to tell you that we have reached that long-sought utopian state—or that all of the ills of our Nation and the world have been solved. Indeed not. Peace, prosperity, and progress are well on the way. But there is still much to be done. It is going to be a long, difficult, and trying journey. But as an ancient sage once remarked, "The longest journey begins with a single step." It is my firm conviction that we have taken the first step.

With your help, and God's blessing, we can face the future with continued optimism—with even greater determination in providing honest government, better government, and more economical government to the people of our Nation.

Thank you very much.

Bill of Rights for National Fitness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. DUFF

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an address delivered by Dr. Joseph B. Wolffe, president, American College of Sports Medicine, at the closing session, third annual meeting of the college, Sunday, March 25, 1956. Dr. Wolffe's program calls for a bill of rights for national fitness.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY DR. JOSEPH B. WOLFFE, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN COLLEGE OF SPORTS MEDICINE, AT THE CLOSING SESSION, THIRD ANNUAL MEETING OF THE COLLEGE, MARCH 25, 1956

The wide gap which exists between our progress in medicine and the status of fitness in our country calls for some bold, new planning, especially with reference to the 37 million Americans of tomorrow who fill our schools. What we need is a "bill of rights for national fitness," backed by Government resources and by a pooling of America's creative brainpower in medicine, education, and related sciences. And since true fitness is total fitness, our approach to the problem must be holistic, not superspecialized.

Total fitness is the ability to do one's chosen work in life effectively, happily, without undue strain or fatigue, and to be capable of meeting normal, everyday stresses, even unexpected stresses, without losing mental, emotional, or physical balance. National fitness means building a nation whose citizens are as physically sound as they are brainy, as socially useful as they are technologically advanced, as happy as they are strong.

A bill of rights for national fitness should assure the following 12 objectives:

1. Every child's schoolday during the vital skill-learning and habit-forming years of 5 to 17 should include at least 1 full hour of supervised physical education. Today, the average time for this educational activity is between 80 and 90 minutes out of a whole school week. Less than 50 percent of high school students take such courses even in schools where they are given. School curriculums should be reevaluated to provide better balance between intellectual and physical activity.

2. We need more emphasis on play, and less on display. Fewer than 5 percent of our elementary schools have indoor gymnasiums, most of which are large enough for basketball only. Many stand idle, with sports equipment unused for hours, except when school teams are using them. Members of the cheering section need education for fitness even more than members of the varsities, and competitive sports are desirable only if youngsters are taught the joy of competing to improve and not merely to prove.

3. The quality of the physical education profession is high, but this group has been too long the stepchild of the educational sciences. There are too few male physical education teachers in the elementary schools; the shortage of female instructors in high schools is even more marked. Many more could be attracted to the profession if teacher training institutions were upgraded; salary schedules were raised, and more training opportunities were provided (as is being done for science teachers).

4. Out-of-school activity is vital, for physical, social and emotional fitness. Yet, out of 17,000 communities in the United States, only 1,200 have full-time recreation leadership. In 1955, there were 3,000 jobs to be filled—and only 600 recreation graduates. More training opportunities are imperative.

5. We can and must reclaim the physically under-privileged child for as full and as productive a life as his peers. For youngsters who are subpar or who have physical defects, or who stay out of activity for psychological reasons, the scientific and educational professions must cooperate in developing adapted physical education programs, guiding and reeducating them into normal activity patterns.

6. On the medical level, every child should receive, either from his family physician or from a clinic, a complete checkup annually, before entering or returning to school. We are compelled by law in many States to obtain inspection and approval for the fitness of our automobiles. Is the fitness of our children less important?

The statistics of preventable health defects among our school-age population are a national disgrace. It is estimated that 9 million children have defective and uncorrected vision; about one-third of a million children have hearing defects; more than a million are estimated to have orthopedic defects; rheumatic and other forms of heart disease affect more than one-half million; 75 percent of American children need dental care. Our school medical services, cooperating with family physicians, need to be made adequate to meet a large part of the challenge of these statistics.

7. More than 40 States have statutes on the books calling for minimum physical education programs in schools. In most instances, these regulations are not enforced, mainly because of shortages in facilities, equipment, and personnel. State aid by Federal welfare sources is mandatory or our concern for fitness is mere lip service.

8. Total fitness of the adult population is an integral part of the picture. Community centers, school gyms and playgrounds after hours, backyard activities involving whole families, along with neighbors, should be made available, under trained recreation leadership, to encourage the social and emotional, as well as the physical benefits of

fitness-building activity. This also is the best prevention medicine known against the diseases which strike in middle life.

9. Cooperative research is vitally needed, with scientists in the various branches of fitness pooling brains and experience to provide authoritative answers to many unanswered questions. We need to know what kind, and how much activity a given individual may indulge in, according to his capacity. We need multiphasic tests, not merely isolated tests of specific parts of the body, to determine overall fitness. We must know enough, authoritatively, to be able to allay fears, and to encourage fitness reeducation at all age levels for normal and so-called abnormal individuals. And much study is needed to determine the immediate and long-range effects of strenuous physical activity on the growing as well as the mature human.

10. A reasonable portion of the funds recently authorized for Government health, and particularly heart research, should be earmarked for programs to enhance the fitness of our people before disease strikes. A fraction of what we give to strengthen backward countries overseas (a highly commendable program) would fill the gap in our own fitness needs, in and out of our schools.

11. We need an effective fusion of creative brainpower to devise means of making the Nation truly preventive-medicine minded. We need, in short, to launch a program of mass education, using all media at our command, to make fitness fashionable.

12. President Eisenhower is respectfully urged to appoint a Special National Commission on Fitness, composed of leading medical, physical education and other scientific and welfare authorities on Federal and State levels, to put the facts of the Nation's fitness together, to hammer out a practical program to correct the correctable, and to prevent the preventable, and to ask Congress to authorize the funds to do the job. In the long run, this investment will save the country untold treasure in human, as well as material resources.

All Aboard for the Atomic Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "All Aboard for the Atomic Age," which I wrote for the April 1956 issue of Steelways magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALL ABOARD FOR THE ATOMIC AGE?—A PROPOSED ATOMIC LOCOMOTIVE MAY FORESHADOW A NEW ERA IN RAILROADING

(By JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, United States Senator from Maryland, participant in last year's Atoms-for-Peace Conference and sponsor of proposed legislation to build an atomic locomotive. Senator BUTLER is especially qualified to write this article, an exclusive for Steelways)

The age of the atom has only begun and no one knows what exciting developments may yet unfold from the atomic research now in progress or already completed. But from the vantage point of the United States Senate, and as a member of the delegation to last year's Atoms-for-Peace Conference in Geneva, one fundamental hypothesis has been reaffirmed in my mind: that the understanding of the atom brings great promise of good. That, having faith in the future of man and of America, its potential for good far outweighs its potency for destruction

Nuclear reactors are already in operation here and abroad generating electricity for peaceful uses, and the powerplant aboard the submarine *Nautilus*, while placed in a warship, points the way toward the use of atomic power in our national transportation system.

To aid further in speeding the development of "atoms for peace" a bill of my sponsorship has been introduced in the Congress this year calling for immediate construction of an atomic powered locomotive. Of this proposal, Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, has said: "A railway locomotive, where weight is not such a problem, seems to offer more and more promise as our reactor technology advances."

Such a locomotive can serve two purposes. First, it could furnish the motive force to pull an "atoms for peace" train to every corner of America. Such a train would carry varied exhibits showing peacetime applications of atomic energy and would vividly emphasize the benefits which atomic energy is bringing, and will continue to bring to all Americans.

Second, there is a coldly practical purpose in building such a locomotive. It would indeed be a pioneering step. The knowledge and experience so gained would spur the economic development of commercial atomic energy by private capital and assure its growth and utilization in keeping with the traditional American free enterprise system.

Since the construction of the atomic locomotive has been proposed, two questions are often asked: Is it possible and practical to build such a locomotive now * * * and can it be designed so it will not expel dangerous radiation or disintegrate like an atomic bomb?

The answer to both is an unqualified "Yes."

The explosion in an atomic bomb is an uncontrolled reaction: the reaction which produces nondestructive atomic energy, as in an atomic locomotive, is a controlled one. More than 50 safety devices can be employed to maintain this control, and special rods activated by the force of gravity would automatically neutralize the locomotive's reactor in event of sudden acceleration or deceleration. Furthermore, it is envisioned that the reactor will be sheathed in a sealed housing of four-foot-thick laminated steel to absorb radioactive rays.

As for its feasibility, engineering studies have already been completed which show us how to go about building an atomic locomotive today. Work is already progressing on the actual manufacture of many of the component parts which would be needed. Engineers and other experts from locomotive manufacturing companies, steel companies and operating railroads are working together on specific design problems. The artist's drawing of an atomic locomotive on these pages is taken directly from practical engineering diagrams: it is not a futuristic dream.

Even now, we know enough about the problem to say that an atomic locomotive would be no heavier or longer than the present-day giant diesels, and therefore suitable for use on any major railroad. And, by its very nature, it would possess certain advantages. Like the highly efficient electric locomotive, the atomic counterpart would be capable of tremendous overloads of energy for short periods. And this means a real economic reward on roads where quick starts and stops with heavy loads spell the difference between profit and loss.

At the same time, an atomic locomotive should prove itself equally efficient operating at high speed over long distances since refueling will be necessary only every few months. Such refueling would be accomplished by skilled technicians at a central point and thus atomic rail power may ultimately eliminate today's complex of fueling stations, just as the diesel locomotive made obsolete the extensive watering stations required in the days of steam power.

If such a locomotive is practical today, what, then, is the future of atomic power on our Nation's railroads? Certainly none of us expects to see atomic energy revolutionizing rail operations overnight. More accurately it will be the continued evolution of man's ingenuity.

The price of atomic fuel is still high and the cost of the initial unit, not even including developmental costs, will exceed $1 million. Yet experts predict that the railroads can have their first atomic locomotives in operation by 1960, and by 1970 they should be justifying their existence, economically, in long-haul, high-speed service. Not long thereafter they should be able to compete with conventional locomotives under all heavy-duty operating conditions.

The atomic locomotive is only a glimpse into one facet of the future being shaped by the atomic age; one glimmer of the effects it will have on our economy. Certainly the ever-increasing peaceful uses of this energy source will attract tremendous private capital investment, thus expanding the entire economy. In industry, in agriculture, in medicine, in countless ways, the energy of the atom will serve mankind.

The application of atomic energy to rail transportation may, in a sense, be symbolic, for this new age can usher in an era of solidly expanding prosperity which will rival or surpass the great period of expansion which the railroads brought to America in the last century.

Relations With the Soviet Union and the Communist World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a stimulating article by Chalmers M. Roberts, entitled "We Can't Seem To Square Up to New Red Stance," appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on April 15, 1956. I ask unanimous consent to have this article inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE CAN'T SEEM TO SQUARE UP TO NEW RED STANCE

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

The Eisenhower administration is in the throes of a major internal argument over what the United States posture should be for the years ahead in its relations with the Soviet Union and the Communist world.

Today there is no all-embracing posture nor are there even any firm guidelines for such a posture. American policy is ambivalent. There is confusion in Congress and in the Nation. America's allies and its friends in the so-called neutralist nations abroad complain that there is no American leadership of the free world in the changed con-

text of the continuing struggle between freedom and tyranny.

The contrast becomes sharper every day because the Soviet Union's collective leadership has taken a new Communist stance and is acting upon it with determination in every corner of the globe.

In Washington, however, there is no clear policy on East-West trade, and the administration and Congress have tangled violently on that subject. There is no policy on exchange visitors with the Russians, and Justice and State are often at odds. There is no policy on foreign economic aid, and much of Congress is hostile to its continuance.

There are, of course, policies for all of these problems, but they are hangovers from the cold war years, inescapably modified by the necessity of facing the new Soviet stance. The basic fact is that there is no new American posture—again to use a word which the President himself so often employs.

Today, National Security Council policy papers are often so generalized as to be meaningless because the President's subordinates cannot agree and generally have not put the issue squarely to him. One competent administration critic sees the United States today as a great sleeping volcano which usually sits quiet, important because of its sheer bulk, but which now and then rumbles and looses an eruption which affects the world around it.

At this moment, Mr. Eisenhower is in Augusta, Ga., going over the drafts of a speech he will make here next Saturday. A check of some key spots in the administration indicates that, as of now, at least, the speech will not state a new posture or new guidelines. But it may give some clues to the current process of policy evolution.

Just what is the problem? About the best definition is one offered by a State Department official who has been struggling with some phases of it:

"What do you do when Khrushchev sticks out his stubby right hand, puts on that big smile and says, 'Let's co-exist and let's compete now that we've agreed fighting is out'—but you know that in Khrushchev's other hand, held behind his back, are the strings to an evergrowing and plenty tough Soviet military machine?"

Two things may be said at once about what to do with the Khrushchev proffer:

A democracy such as the United States cannot, and should not, attempt to put down indefinite terms an all-embracing, detailed policy. Mr. Eisenhower has said that many problems have to be played by ear. Gen Walter Bedell Smith, former Under Secretary of State, once set 4 years (from the beginning of a new administration) as the practical limit on long-term foreign policy planning.

There can be no free world feeling of American leadership in the East-West context until at least new American guidelines, well accepted by Congress and the Nation, have been clearly established and every responsible administration official is forced to act within them. Such guidelines will not be generally accepted until they have been offered by the President himself and the country has had opportunity to debate and judge them.

Policymaking in any administration naturally depends on the views of its most powerful figures, albeit nudged and supplied with ideas by working-level officials. Testimony from various sources about Mr. Eisenhower's mode of operation tends to stress two points: He has strong visceral reactions, as one person puts it; but he hates to have to resolve major conflicts of views among his most trusted subordinates.

A story will illustrate the first. During a discussion of the foreign-aid problem at the National Security Council table, Treasury Secretary George M. Humphrey, the conservative bulwark of the administration and in many ways its second most powerful figure, expressed the view that the United States should do nothing to encourage socialism (i. e., Government ownership) in its aid to such nations as Indonesia.

Mr. Eisenhower's reaction was to say that if he were running that country, he would build up government-owned enterprises just as the Indonesians are doing. The President said there was no other way to do it because Indonesia lacks capital to develop private enterprise as Humphrey would have it do.

But the President did not upset a compromise reached between Humphrey and his allies, such as Under Secretary of State Herbert Hoover, Jr., and those who wanted a much larger foreign economic program. The result was a boost of only $200 million for fiscal 1957 over the current expenditure, including $100 million for long-range projects.

The President has yet to say to Congress and the Nation what so many, both within and without the administration, believe to be a fact: that the United States must continue for the indefinite future to spend large sums of money abroad to aid the economic development of many free nations regardless of whether or not they are allied to America.

Partly as a result of his not having taken such a posture, and explaining the reasons for it, the foreign-aid program is on the defensive in Congress and something less than even the limited amount being asked is likely to be voted in the end.

Confusion over a sense of direction for American policy may also be seen outside the Government. President George Meany, of the AFL–CIO, terms India's Jawaharlal Nehru an ally of communism. But Vice President Walter Reuther says that it is in America's interest to give India massive aid so she can develop within a democratic framework regardless of Nehru's nonalinement policy. Yet both men would agree that, as Meany puts it, "we have nothing to fear from peaceful competition" with the Soviet Union.

The ambivalence of American policy today is this: On the one hand, the United States, from the President on down, takes the position that the Communists have not changed their basic aims and hence America must above all keep ahead in every possible phase of the arms race. Our military budget is being increased for the coming fiscal year.

On the other hand, the President, Dulles and some other—but by no means all—administration leaders accept at least to some degree the idea that Russia is changing internally; over the years it may be possible to help turn Russia's course away from the fanaticism of international communism.

Dulles has spelled out this thesis at some length. The President approaches it gingerly. Others resist it strongly and, as some of their opponents put it, sabotage efforts which might further such a trend. The internal battle over exchanges of groups and individuals between the two nations is one field of such controversy.

The President himself led the way to setting the stage for the current situation. In October 1954, he declared that there is "no alternative to peace." And at the Summit Conference last July he said that he had talked with every member of the Soviet delegation and added "I believe they are earnestly desirous of finding peace, as we are." The spirit of Geneva meant, in essence, a tacit Russo-American agreement that nuclear war was too risky for either side.

Against this new backdrop on the world stage, fully concurred in by Mr. Eisenhower, the Soviets rushed ahead with a change of face for their troupe and a new act to boot. The American have accepted the new stage setting but haven't gotten out of the dressing rooms.

The Pentagon comes forth with a document called Militant Liberty, designed to help the Armed Forces and other Americans evaluate and assess freedom—in other words, to know what America is all about. Its oversimplification and naivete repel the diplomats.

The United States Information Agency backs the Advertising Council's "People's Capitalism" exhibit to show the world how the American version works. Foreign correspondents are critical of it. And Mr. Eisenhower says a little wistfully that he "would like to have seen some kind of adjective put between 'people's' and 'capitalism' "; if not "democratic," then " 'competitive,' or something of that kind."

Yet how do you compete with a fellow you figure has the power to clobber you, even though you can clobber back a fellow who says his aim is communism all over the globe?

"Competition" is a word, if there is any word, which expresses the American mystique, whatever the exceptions in American life. Yet there has been no spelling out of competition with Russia, in part because the Soviets have drummed the phrase "peaceful competitive coexistence" so hard as to create suspicion of a boobytrap in the very idea.

On April 16, 1953, in the first memorable speech of his administration, the President told the same group he will address next Saturday the American Society of Newspaper Editors; that the United States was ready "to dedicate our strength to serving the needs, rather than the fears, of the world." In a series of questions, Mr. Eisenhower asked: "What is the Soviet Union ready to do?"

Moscow has given its answer in its own way. It has not been an affirmative answer on those political issues the President mentioned. But, to much of the free world, it is a partially or fully convincing answer.

The time is rapidly approaching for the President and the United States to answer the question: What is the United States ready to do? And, the fears of world war having abated, what posture does America propose to take toward the free world now so intent on having its needs served?

Report of the Women's Congress on Housing—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the Women's Congress on Housing have just left Washington and it is my pleasure to place their report at this point in the RECORD.

Housing and Home Finance Administrator Albert Cole had the original idea of bringing these women, the homemakers of our country, to the Nation's Capital, to consult with them and issue a report on their recommendations and findings.

Mr. Speaker, it is to be hoped that this is but the first of many reports to be so issued, for better homes and better housing by the true experts in this matter—the women of America:

The Women's Congress on Housing, called in Washington this week by Housing and Home Finance Administrator Albert M. Cole, today closed its 3 days of meetings with a pencil-sharpening report that took the things they would like to have in a modern home and cut them down to pocketbook size.

The reports were made by 10 leaders of geographically related discussion groups, in which 103 American housewives for 2 days at the Washington Hotel had compared and discussed their desires, their preferences, and their practical judgments on the modern home for modern family living needs.

Expressing their thanks to the Government and the HHFA Administrator for the opportunity of developing their views on the home, the American homemakers from all parts of the country came up with a number of basic agreements on the home of today, along with a wide variation of preferences and tastes as to arrangement and detail, varying according to climate, background, and individual ideas.

The mass of detailed information and judgments assembled during the 2 days of discussion will be analyzed and correlated for a more complete report on the conference to be issued later. The main lines of the housewives' thinking, however, were given in summary reports at the final session by the leaders of the 10 discussion groups.

After the earlier discussions had brought out a wide range of desires and preferences, the delegates later settled down to trim these preferences to a feasible cost figure for most middle-income families.

All the leaders asserted that the women did not want a uniform style or plan of house to serve all people but, on the contrary, wanted individuality and flexibility within the scope of essential family functions. They called for more individuality in lot placement, exterior style, and internal arrangement for modern homes.

The home on which the groups finally based their proposals ranged, among the groups, from a $10,000 to $15,000 house, with a living-space area of 1,200 to 1,500 square feet.

In what one of them described as the painful process of bringing the cost of their theoretical home down to practical levels, the items that most of them decided to sacrifice to keep down the cost were garages, separate dining rooms, dens, and utility rooms, and one group which preferred no basements, accepted them to gain space at lower cost. Proposed lot sizes ranged from 7,500 to 11,000 square feet.

All of the groups, however, considered 3 bedrooms, 1½ baths, ample closet and storage space, and a family room closely related to the kitchen area as minimums for modern family life.

They left generally to personal or local preference the question of 1-story and 2-story houses and the style of architecture, but the preference for traditional styles of architecture was strong in New England States, while that for contemporary and 1-story homes was more pronounced in the Midwest and Southwest. Most of them, however, did not want extremes in architectural design.

Most wanted garages, but in facing cost factors, the garages were often eliminated in the original house, although one group wanted a driveway included for a planned garage later at the rear.

Some of the things that the groups largely agreed on were:

Outdoor play and living space in the backyard, which was given greater emphasis in the South and less in the North.

Backdoor entrances with "mud-room" and half baths for the children and family to use.

Curvilinear streets and sidewalks with a planted space between the walk and the curb.

They wanted only essential appliances included with the house, and preferred to get their own as they were able, preferring "more space in the home and fewer gadgets."

All agreed strongly on the need for much more storage space in the modern home, and called generally for at least 5 feet of hanging closet space per person. The groups presented various proposals for increasing storage space on a planned basis.

All wanted the home plan basically divided into a family or noisy area and a living room that furnished a quiet and adult area, and all wanted to eliminate cross traffic between different areas of the house.

While most would like a separate dining room, they were willing, for economy purposes, to accept a dining space provided it was in the "L" of an L-shaped living room, and all wanted at least a small space for eating in the kitchen or family area.

Nearly all wanted the kitchen to the rear of the house with a window facing the backyard, although one group preferred to have the house turned around, facing to the rear, and another group was willing to have both interior kitchens and bathrooms.

Many of the groups preferred traditional windows, but wanted them removable and easy to clean, and all felt that picture windows should be used only when they had a desirable view.

They differed on placement of closets, specific arrangement of family room, kitchen, eating area, and recreation space, on location of laundry facilities, and on bedroom size, one group wanting larger bedrooms, others willing to accept small ones with built-in storge walls and furniture.

All wanted to do their own landscaping, except for sodding which they want the builder to provide, and all wanted builders to save trees wherever possible instead of clearing the lot before construction.

The father's needs got varied attention in the form of a den, or workshop, or quiet area. One leader, however, reported that her group discovered they had pushed father completely out of the house, and in order to let him back in, they agreed to let him share the utility room with his workbench, tools, and other equipment.

Report of Women's Congress on Housing—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include part II of the report of the Women's Congress on Housing:

DISCUSSION TABLE NO. 1

Mrs. Robert C. Baldridge, Cedarhurst, Long Island, N. Y., discussion leader for Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, upper New York, Rhode Island, and Vermont, reported:

The group felt that the bathroom is at once the most important and archaic part of today's home. Her group expressed a desire for complete streamlining of bathrooms, with rounded corners for easier maintenance and cleaning, sinks at more convenient heights, a bathtub separate from the shower, and a free-standing water closet.

The New England delegates, Mrs. Baldridge reported, had devoted their time to planning a house with 1,350 square feet of space. There was no unanimous agreement on the favored architectural design of the house, but the group was agreed on the need for better arrangement of living space which would provide for two distinct areas of activity—the noisy and the quiet. They were also in agreement on their preference for a full basement; medium-pitched roof; a kitchen with eating space and with a south or southeast exposure overlooking the children's outdoor play area; three bedrooms; a utility room for laundry, sewing, and cleanup purposes; a separate dining area; and a separate living room for decorous living.

To get the price of the house down to a more practical middle-income level, the group decided that it could forego for the time being a garage, separate dining room, and den, although they agreed that these were desirable.

The New England housewives preferred traditional windows which would permit adequate ventilation, and picture windows only if they looked out on a view. Expressed lot requirements included a minimum of 7,500 square feet, a lawn provided by the builder, curved streets but sidewalks were not felt to be essential, underground powerlines because of the danger of hurricanes in their region, and walking distance from schools, shopping, and churches. Except for the lawn, the delegates preferred to do their own landscaping, their object being planning for utmost outdoor privacy.

DISCUSSION TABLE NO. 2

Miss Janet Shair, New York City, discussion leader for New Jersey and lower New York State.

The leader reported that the delegates from these States were not too much concerned with the physical characteristics of a house. They did not plan an ideal house, but declared in favor of a house that would free the homemaker from drudgery and give her more freedom, leisure, and greater opportunity for harmonious family living.

Her group was not against mechanical gadgets and laborsaving devices as such, but felt that these should be installed in the house when needed and when the money was available. They all agreed on the need for an abundance of storage space all over the house.

This group felt that the house should conform to existing community patterns. The landscaping should blend with the natural surroundings.

She asserted that the women of her group felt that when they returned to their communities they would continue to work in the interests of good homes that would reflect the desires of individual families, would be an expression of modern living, with close attention to family budgets for the home and the budgeting of family time to serve both the community and the home.

DISCUSSION TABLE NO. 3

Mrs. Edmund Bacon, Philadelphia, Pa., discussion leader for Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia, reported as follows:

Her group planned a $10,000 house. They came up with a minimum house and saved the ideal house for some later time.

This house contains a kitchen-family room large enough to accommodate the family "in a pleasant full eating situation." The dining area would be separate from the kitchen equipment. The family area would include the TV set, cupboards for games, and family work-play equipment. The dining room table might serve also as a ping-pong table, a sewing table, and for other uses. There would be a pleasant entrance to this area (not the old back door). It would be close to the utility room in which would be located laundry tubs and places to put the children's coats, boots, and baseball equipment. This should be adjacent to a half bath.

The living room would be the quiet room—a place for "gracious living." This would be the room for books, music, and special belongings. It must not be in the traffic ways of daily living and house care.

The bedrooms would be accessible to the family room without going through the living room.

The group emphasized it did not want a standard house; that it wanted compatibility without uniformity.

The group did not want fences around its house, saying that fences did not promote neighborly feelings and did not keep children in.

It did not want a large glass area looking out on the street. It wanted a picture window "only if there was something to look at."

The house should be at least 25 feet from the street. The group wanted as large a front footage as possible and was willing to sacrifice depth of lot for greater street frontage.

The group stressed the importance of zoning.

The group was opposed to increasing the size of the house at the expense of adequate outdoor yard space, feeling that the underlying land constitutes the basic value of the home and that the care given the exterior of the house is indicative of the interior quality and care in the neighborhood.

DISCUSSION TABLE NO. 4

Mrs. William Clancy, of Jackson, Miss., reporting for Mrs. Clara Louise Meyers, Columbia, Mo., discussion leader for Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Kentucky:

Mrs. Clancy noted that, owing to climatic and other differences between these States, there were divergencies of opinion on home design. Nevertheless, the delegates agreed on a basic house within the $10,000-$15,000 range. It included an L-shaped living room with a dining area separated by folding partitions, a family room, three bedrooms, and one and one-half bathrooms.

A picture window was wanted only if there was a picture but the main emphasis was on as much space as possible—space was preferred to gadgets. There was also emphasis on garden space, especially at the rear of the house. Minimum lot size was put at 75 feet by 140 feet. Sidewalks were a must.

On behalf of the delegates the spokesman called the congress an unforgetable experience.

Report of Women's Congress on Housing—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include part III of the Report of the Women's Congress on Housing:

DISCUSSION TABLE NO. 5

Mrs. Mary Thinger, Topeka, Kans., discussion leader for Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, reported as follows:

"A house that is cozy but not cold," was the expressed preference of these delegates. To get their planned home within moderate income limits they had eliminated the garage, separate dining room, and utility room, although these were considered very desirable.

This group agreed on the need for planned placement of rooms so that there would be no unwanted cross-traffic, and a kitchen in the rear of the home. They felt that the design of the rooms and the house in general should be best left to the individual taste, although the general preference seemed to be for a house that would combine both contemporary and traditional features.

They also agreed on a pitched roof, a minimum lot size of 60 feet by 120 feet, 20 feet between houses, a set-back of 30 feet from the front lot line, and more privacy for the individual home, perhaps through alternate placement on the block.

The delegation urged builders and architects to save existing trees on lots, but if this were not possible, they preferred to plant their own. Some favored fenced-in yards, but all agreed that utility lines should be placed underground or at the rear of the lot, sidewalks should be provided, streets should be curved, and that schools, shopping facilities, and churches should be within easy walking distance. They felt that primary schools should be no more than six blocks from any home, high schools no more than a mile away.

DISCUSSION TABLE NO. 6

Mrs. Stanley Anderson, Lake Forest, Ill., was discussion leader for the group from Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and West Virginia.

This group felt they were in the highest-cost areas of the country. The majority wanted a traditional house within the means of the family, but a substantial minority favored a contemporary house. The house should be convenient to schools, shopping centers, and community facilities. They favored facilities for teen-agers, but sponsored and financed by the community.

Their house would be on a lot 75' x 150', with 15 feet on either side. It would contain at least 1,200 square feet, with garage or carport only if family can afford either. The house should have a basement because of the necessary depth of footings and to get more space at lower cost. Trees should be retained whenever possible. They were not too much concerned with outdoor living space, but wanted a backyard.

This house would be 2 stories, with 3 bedrooms. The master bedroom should be larger and the other two of adequate size. They stressed the need for at least 5 feet of clothing-hanging space per person. The bathroom should contain 2 feet more than present minimum. Stairs should also be a little wider than current minimums.

They want conventional windows throughout the house, so that children may look out with ease.

They want extra wiring installed at time of construction to permit future installation of appliances, etc.

The group favored adequate space off the kitchen for laundry equipment, storage, etc. There should be a guest closet and one-half bathroom near the kitchen.

The kitchen should be in the rear of the house, and should be a working room only, with sufficient space for light meals. The kitchen should overlook and be separated from the L-shaped family room by a 4-foot divider. In the kitchen the group wanted rounded corners on fixtures, as well as a built-in chopping block and bread board.

The family room which would be entered from a small vestibule would include bookcases and a fireplace if budget permits.

DISCUSSION TABLE NO. 7

Mrs. Everett Sugarbaker, Jefferson City, Mo., discussion leader for Arizona, Arkansas, southern California, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas, gave a brief report, explaining that many of the points her group favored had been covered by previous discussion leaders.

She said that the women in her group felt strongly against "row on row housing" and thought builders ought to let the prospective home owners do some of their own planning in order to achieve individuality.

They also thought builders should be discouraged from taking out all trees when they clear the land for a new development.

Her group emphasized the importance of developing community life as much as possible in order to keep children off the street and interest them in the home. They would like a small community center in a new development, even in older developments if not too late to provide for them. They don't want schools "miles away" and favor the present trend of more and smaller schools—not large secondary schools with 2,500 pupils.

Her group said that sidewalks on both sides of the street were a must. They also want curved streets with cul-de-sacs.

Mrs. Sugarbaker urged the delegates to let the zoning and planning commissions know what they want by making themselves heard. She added that one of the important results from this congress will be that when the delegates return to their cities they will become a "center of activity" in disseminating information received and conclusions reached at the meeting.

DISCUSSION TABLE NO. 8

Mrs. Helen Gant, of Kansas City, Kans., discussion leader for Iowa, Kansas, and Missouri, said that the group had agreed on a "modified contemporary" basic plan for a house in the $15,000 range. It would have a low-pitched roof, plenty of storage space, 3 bedrooms, a family room, separate quiet living room, 1½ bathrooms. Mrs. Gant got a loud laugh from the audience when she said that the original plans of her group had "pushed father right out of the house." They brought him back, she added, and put him in a utility room where he could putter around, but she got another laugh when she added this would also be a mud-room or rough-room.

Again there was emphasis on space rather than gadgets. The acceptable lot size was put at 150 feet by 70 feet.

DISCUSSION TABLE NO. 9

Mrs. Grant Hess, Boise, Idaho, discussion leader for the western States of Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming, Nebraska, and the eastern part of Washington.

These delegates were agreed that (a) the emphasis in design for the modern home should be on family living and family living areas, both indoors and outdoors, and (b) both interiors and exteriors of homes should have the utmost in individuality.

Mrs. Hess said that her group felt that both homes and lots can have adequate individuality at moderate cost. They believed that curved streets, more space between houses, and varied lot sizes could help achieve the desired individuality.

This delegation was agreed that today's minimum standards for homes are too low, particularly with regard to room sizes, storage space, wiring, bathrooms, and kitchen cupboards. They felt that adequate storage could be provided at no additional cost to the homeowner if it were properly planned.

The group considered a 1,200-square-foot home. These housewives didn't mind if bathrooms or kitchen had no outside exposure, provided the rooms were properly ventilated. They were unanimous in condemning curbstone sidewalks because of the danger to children, but favored sidewalks set back from the curb.

DISCUSSION TABLE NO. 10

Mrs. Rosalie Ehart, Miami, Fla., discussion leader for a special mixed geographic table, including northern California, Florida, Oregon, Texas, Missouri, Long Island (New York), and western Washington.

This group favored a house flexible in cost and not of extreme design, with 65-by-100-foot lot size. They felt that the cost of a larger lot would reduce the amount of housing that could be built.

This house would have 3 bedrooms, a 10-by-14 kitchen with dining area, and no laundry facilities in kitchen. These facili-

ties would go in a combination laundry-utility room. There would be a half bath near the kitchen. They want a side entrance to the house.

They wanted 8-foot-high flat ceilings and no exposed beams to catch dust. The children's bedrooms should be for sleeping only.

If funds are limited, they preferred a tub instead of a shower stall.

They did not want an attic or basement. They favored an oversized garage with overhead storage platforms for baby carriages, bassinets, etc.

They want outside electrical outlets for Christmas-tree lighting, etc.

The Changing Scene and Higher Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very important address entitled "The Changing Scene and Higher Education," delivered by the Honorable Virgil M. Hancher, president of the State University of Iowa, on March 21, 1956, before the Southwest Iowa Bar Association.

The cost of printing the address has been estimated by the Public Printer as $260.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHANGING SCENE AND HIGHER EDUCATION

I

If one were to describe the dominant characteristic of the present age, one would be forced to say that it is an age of irresistible and accelerating change. It is a characteristic which is worldwide, and one which affects the most ancient and immutable of institutions and ideas.

The nature of our economic and social life has been completely altered in the last 150 years. It has been said that the life of George Washington at Mount Vernon more closely resembled the life of a Roman Senator in the days of the late Roman Republic than it resembled the life of a leading citizen of this Republic in the year 1956.

At its beginning the United States was predominately an agricultural nation. Once its people were 90 percent rural and 10 percent urban. Today the figures are reversed. About 13 percent of our people live on farms and 8 percent in cities or towns. In the course of this change farming has become a new and different occupation. Once it was the calling of the unskilled and the untrained. Today it is closely linked to botany, to genetics, and to the research departments of our great land-grant colleges. Once farming was the calling of the poor and the impecunious. Today the farmer is, and must be, a capitalist. The equipment reasonably required for the up-to-date operation of an Iowa farm is estimated to cost $20,000. The average actual cost is approximately $16,000 on a farm averaging 173 acres and having an average value per acre of $197. Thus the average investment for machinery, land, and buildings on the average Iowa farm is $50,000.

At the same time, the number of farms is decreasing, and their average size is increasing. There are about 700,000 fewer farms in the United States than there were 5 years ago, a decline of about 10 percent. In the 10 years from 1940–50, the number of farms in Iowa decreased by 10,000, or approximately 5 percent. As you might expect, the decrease in the number of Iowa farms means that the average size is increasing at the rate of approximately 1 acre per year. During the same 10-year period, from 1940 to 1950, the number of Iowa farms decreased in every category up to 180 acres, and increased in every category beyond that figure. Specifically, the group from 180 to 159 increased from 40,000 to 42,000; the group from 160 to 499 increased from 2,400 to 2,800; the group over 1,000 acres increased from 201 to 254. It has been reported that in 1 Iowa county, 138 houses, formerly farm homes, stand vacant because of the consolidation of farm holdings. The long-range implications of this trend are clear.

So much for agriculture. The changes in transportation and communication have been no less dramatic. From stagecoach to railroad to supersonic air transportation are the developments of three generations. The telegraph, the telephone, the radio, and television are the developments of two generations. Telephoto, facsimile, and other electronic devices are in use and await further development. Intercontinental ballistic missiles are on the drawing boards. Trips to the moon or to Mars are discussed seriously. An earth satellite is projected for early launching. In fact, the head of the department of physics at my own university, the State University of Iowa, is the chairman of the committee on instrumentation of the proposed earth satellite.

Everyone is aware of the tremendous growth of industrial, manufacturing and processing activities, and of the substitution everywhere, even in agriculture, of machines for men and natural energy for human energy. Now automation promises to augment that change by enabling machines, in certain selected situations, to be used for the management and control of other machines and mechanical processes.

These developments, in conjunction with increased agricultural production, have enabled us to sustain a vastly increased population. It is well that this is so, because the facts of population growth are in themselves surprising, if not terrifying. When the Constitutional Convention was held in 1787, the population of the United States was less than 4 million. Monday, March 19, 1956, it was reported that our population has passed 167 million. It is predicted that in 1975, 20 years from now, it will reach 220 million, and that in the year 2000 it will reach 300 million. The year 2000 is only 44 years away. That is not of direct concern to you and me, but most of the students now in our colleges and universities, and substantially all of those in the elementary and secondary schools, will live to see the year 2000. They will be expected to know how to live amicably and efficiently with 300 million compatriots where you and I find it difficult enough to get along with a little more than half that number. Here are facts, or reasonable predictions, which to me, at least, are quite as shocking and quite as devastating as the development of the A bomb or the H bomb. With 300 million people driving automobiles or riding in airplanes, the congestion we now complain about may resemble the wide open spaces of the last century. With a population of 300 million, the people of the United States may find it necessary to substitute cremation for burial, as the people of India have done. Or, perhaps, the eagle, our national symbol, which is in danger of becoming extinct, may find itself supplanted by the rabbit, which is in no such danger.

The advent of great new populations, as well as the pressure of old ones, is forcing us to seek new sources of energy and of food. The peaceful utilization of atomic power is at hand—and, although industry is reluctant to assume the full risks involved, full utilization of this source is bound to be accomplished in the public interest. Recent announcements indicate that we are coming closed to the capture of solar energy, an apparently inexhaustible source of energy whose primary costs will be for conversion and storage. The development of atomic energy and solar energy is being watched with great concern by newly created states, such as Pakistan, whose industrial hopes and ambitions far exceed their natural resources. We are told, also, that there are great new reserves of energy in ocean water. Because civilizations have flourished on new sources of energy, the possibilities and vistas opened to us by these new discoveries far exceed the imaginings of only two decades ago.

Vast portions of the earth, which were once rich and fertile, have become deserts, and water is in short supply in many regions which once enjoyed an abundance. Experiments have been carried on now for approximately a decade on the extraction of salt from sea water in order to make it available for drinking purposes and for irrigation. These processes, at last reports, had not yet become commercially practicable, but progress has been made and here, as in invention, necessity may well be the mother of progress. At the same time experiments have been conducted in the production of protein through a process involving sunlight, ocean water and deep sea algae. Here, again, the process need further refinement, but they are reported to be in limited use in Japan where the pressure of population is great and protein is in very short supply. This suggests that the centers of population in the future may be in the coastal regions adjacent to the oceans, or in any event adjacent to large inland lakes or seas.

Another event of the first magnitude in this changing scene is the emergence of Asia. As late as the end of World War I, the great nations of Asia were still quiescent. They had scarcely aroused from their long sleep. They exercised little influence in world affairs then, and it was not clear when, if ever, they would exercise a powerful influence. That situation has altered completely. China with her 400 million people; India with more than 350 millions, southeast Asia and Indonesia with more than 100 millions, and the whole Arab world extending from the Gates of Hercules on the west to East Bengal on the east, are on the march. The goal of these nations is equality, and perhaps dominance, in world affairs. We are face to face with a wholly new factor in world affairs, a factor to which we must adjust and to which we will find it difficult to adjust. This adjustment may be as difficult for us as it has been difficult in recent decades for the British to adjust to the idea of a strong and powerful United States.

Here, in brief, are some of the factors which make our age an age of irresistible and accelerating change. These factors, or others like them, as far as we can judge, will dominate our age for a long time to come, and will continue to make irresistible and accelerating change its outstanding characteristic. It is against this background, it is with these factors in mind, that education must prepare young men and women for competence and responsibility in their daily lives.

II

By any set of standards, I suppose that the late Alfred North Whitehead would be judged one of the great men of our age. Jointly with Bertrand Russell he was the author of Principia Mathematica. At the age of 63, he left his native England, came to the United States, and embarked upon a career of philosophy where again he achieved exceptional distinction. Often, as I pause to reflect upon his wise insights and sayings, I am reminded of the American Indian, a

descendant of tribes, who for generations had sent messages by smoke signals across the valleys and deserts of the great American Southwest, on the day when the first atomic bomb was set off, the Indian was standing on a high ledge at the edge of a valley. The impact of the bomb knocked him to the ground. It almost knocked him into the valley. He was much shaken up and considerably frightened. Slowly he got up and turned around just in time to see the giant atomic cloud rising like a mushroom toward the heavens. He surveyed this enormous smoke signal for a moment in undisguised astonishment, and then said, "I certainly wish I could have said that."

Whitehead has said many things that those of us who read him wish that we might have said. He was aware of the impact of accelerating change and in one of his writings he pointed out that up to about a hundred years ago, education was primarily concerned with the preparation of youth to spend their lives in a society not unlike that in which their parents and grandparents had lived. On the basis of prior experience, there was little reason to believe that the next generation would be required to adjust to radically new or altered conditions as a predictable certainty. But, beginning about a century ago and moving forward at an accelerating pace, education has been increasingly aware of the need to prepare youth for the inevitability of change and to endow them with the resilience and toughness of spirit which would enable them to adjust to inevitable change. This is a wholly new and difficult assignment.

The late Prof. John Dewey was a figure around whom much controversy centered. He was and is condemned by many people who never read his works, and for the excesses of his disciples rather than his own. He was, in fact, educated in the classics. I do not propose to present a brief for him on this occasion. On the other hand, his was one of the first American voices, and by all odds the most persuasive and powerful one, to point out that the best way to prepare young people to live in the real world was to simulate, as far as possible, the conditions of real life in the schools. He and Whitehead, who differed at so many points, were agreed that inert ideas are the most useless things that can be stuffed into a child's mind. Each believed that the only education of value is that which induces the student to take hold of something and make it his own. Vital education does not consist in the acquisition of facts or inert knowledge, but in the development of the ability to solve problems, in the development of the mental powers and discipline of students so that they are enabled to master the knowledge which they acquire and to put it to use constructively in solving the problems which they will encounter in an age of irresistible and accelerating change.

III

The task of education would be burdensome enough if it were merely called upon to meet the expanding needs for the professional and social services adequate for a population of 300 millions in the year 2000. Unless current population trends are radically altered, those are the needs which our educational system must meet.

The rising tide of students is already visible. This is nothing for which the schoolmen can be blamed, although they are face to face with the consequences. Nearly 40 million young people are in schools, colleges, and universities this year. This is the 11th consecutive year of increased enrollments, and enrollments will continue to rise sharply for another 10. Last autumn the elementary schools had 1,300,000 more pupils than in 1954; the high schools had 258,000 more, and colleges and universities were up 10 percent. There were 2,840,000 college and university students in 1954–55. It is predicted that there will be 3,950,000 in 1964–65, an increase of 1,100,000. In Iowa the increase in 1970 is predicted to be 157 percent over 1953. The latter youngsters are born and growing up. There is no crystal-gazing in this part of the problem. The only question is whether the children now in being will ever get to college. This projected increase does not mean universal higher education. The projections assume only a slightly higher ratio than now exists. Will there be teachers, buildings, and budgets adequate to provide them with higher education? Will the United States be a land of opportunity for them, as it has been for us? Will you be happy to see your children or grandchildren excluded from the opportunity which you enjoyed?

This problem goes hand in hand with another one. We know that a very high percentage—perhaps one-third to one-half—of our ablest high school graduates never go to college. The causes are complex and obscure. Often they are more social than economic. But the fact remains that here is an enormous wastage of human talent. Can we afford this wastage? Put at the lowest level, can we afford it in view of Russia's determined and evidently successful effort to recruit and develop talent at every level in society?

There are those, of course, who say that we are providing higher education for too many young people, that higher education should be given only to the intellectually elite. Being a graduate of Oxford University, I believe that I understand fully that point of view. But I do not agree with it. The most penetrating and convincing exposition of the merits of our broader system of higher education, of which I have any knowledge, was made by President Cornelius de Kiewiet of the University of Rochester at the annual meeting of the American Council of Education last autumn.

Dr. de Kiewiet was born in Amsterdam, Holland, and received his baccalaureate degree at the University of Witwatersrand in the Union of South Africa. His Ph. D. degree was taken at the University of London, and was followed by study in Paris and Berlin. For 12 years he taught at the State University of Iowa, where he first came to know an American State university. Later he served as teacher, dean, provost, and acting president at Cornell University which, as you know, is a combination of a private, endowed university and publicly supported land-grant college. More recently Dr. de Kiewiet has been president of the University of Rochester, the great private university endowed by the late Mr. Eastman. Few men have equalled Dr. de Kiewiet's experience as student, teacher and administrator in public, private, and mixed public and private universities on three continents. Out of that experience he pays tribute to the American dual system of higher education not only because it educates an elite, but also because it educates a very large number of extremely competent people who would not be educated if we had followed the European concept of restricting education to an intellectual elite. Because British university education has never been extended to this second level of competence, he believes that Britain has suffered industrially and financially. Because France has never extended university education to this second level of competence, he believes that France has suffered politically and socially. Because the United States has provided university education for this second level of competence, as well as for an elite, he believes that we have created a vast reservoir of competent men and women who, in politics, economic life, education and in many hundreds of specific pursuits and callings, have helped to create the unique political, social, and economic system which is indigenous to the United States. In my judgment this is a sound analysis of the facts. We need captains and majors and colonels, as well as generals, in the intellectual and professional life of this country. As I see it, both our present status and future condition are dependent upon our dedication to the American dream of equality of opportunity, and upon our insistence that neither in politics nor business nor education shall the doors be open only to a privileged few. This American dream of equality of opportunity, however, is under attack from many quarters, and it will be no easy task to preserve it for those who follow us.

It is a task so great that the combined resources of privately controlled and publicly supported colleges and universities will be required to meet it. This is no time for rivalry or for feuds. One encouraging fact is that in many States, public and private institutions are jointly surveying the needs and resources of their States and areas. This work was begun in Iowa by the Association of Iowa College Presidents, and will be continued by a committee representing the private colleges, the junior colleges, and the State institutions. The cooperation which is developing is a new and heartening phenomenon in American education.

Neither private nor public colleges and universities will be able to perform their tasks unless they can recruit and hold faculty members of high ability. Teachers are notoriously underpaid. A part of this arises from the belief that "those who can do, those who can't teach." I have heard that old wheeze come from the lips of men who could have told all they knew in one class-hour, and would have been mentally bankrupt had they been forced to face a second. Again, there is a curious dichotomy in our thinking. I have seen a parent willing to pay any fee to the best neurosurgeon obtainable to prevent or repair injuries to the brain of a son hurt in an automobile accident, and I have seen the same parent quite indifferent to the salary or quality of the teacher charged with the educational task of developing the mental skill and ability of that son. Teachers often teach from a high sense of dedication, but they can't pay their rent or grocery bills with it. And the tragic fact is that college and university teachers have lost ground in the economic changes of the last 15 years.

In a recent report prepared by Beardsley Ruml for the Fund for the Advancement of Education, entitled "Teaching Salaries Then and Now, a 50-Year Comparison With Other Occupations," he points out that serious relative changes in economic status have occurred in the compensation of university teachers of the highest professorial rank, and of educational executives at all levels. In 1908 top professorial salaries of $5,000 were not uncommon. Today's equivalent, merely to restore the 1908 status, would require $19,200. The study shows that the average salary received by professors in a select group of large State universities in 1953 was $7,000 per year, and that this salary deflated back to 1904 levels of real purchasing power would be the equivalent of $1,956. Wages and salaries rose in all parts of the American economy during the 50-year period 1904–53. Relatively, salaries in the field of education rose less than salaries in other occupations and callings with the result that the economic position of people in education has deteriorated over the years, after allowing for income and social-security taxes and changes in the cost of living. The study shows that, taken as a whole, the professors in the group studied actually lost 2 percent in real purchasing power in the 50-year period, while associate professors and assistant professors gained only 6 percent and 3 percent, respectively. Contrast this with the increased percentages of the 50-year change in real purchasing power for workers in automobile manufacturing, 140 percent;

workers in bituminous coal mining, 163 percent; workers in electrical manufacturing, 131 percent; workers in furniture manufacturing, 137 percent; and railroad firemen, 137 percent.

The deterioration at the top is so great that it affects the attractiveness of the academic career as compared with other professions and occupations. The ablest young men and women eligible for graduate work and professional study will not be attracted to education as they once were and as the Nation's needs require. The implications of all this are summed up by Mr. Ruml in the following statement:

"The American society is deteriorating in the sector most critical for future progress and well-being. The quality of education depends on its top leadership. The best talent of the younger generation finds that education is not as highly valued by its seniors as law, medicine, advertising, or many technical skills. The response of the talented members of the younger generation is rational and what might be expected. The talented members of the younger generation choose to enter law, medicine, advertising, the mechanical vocations, or the arts.

"Our society is in a period of rapid change. We face increasing complexities and hazards, both technical and moral. It is imperative that we bring into education a sufficient share of the highest talent of each generation so that each succeeding generation will be the better prepared to deal with the old and new challenges of its own time. Quality in teaching breeds quality in students."[1]

What you as citizens and taxpayers and donors to private supported institutions are willing to do about the facts obtained in the Ruml report is the measure of your regard for the educational future of this country. In the last analysis, the people and the people alone will determine whether or not we are to restore the relative economic status of top-flight educational leadership which was given to it as a matter of course in the early years of the present century.

Earlier in these remarks I mentioned the emergence of Asia. If we had no higher level of concern for education than the safety of our own skins, we might well be concerned with the reports coming out of Russia. Two of our unique contributions to western civilization have been our widespread opportunity for education and our technological developments. Recent studies—one a study of Soviet professional manpower sponsored by the National Science Foundation and performed by the Office of Scientific Personnel of the National Academy of Sciences; another by former Senator William Benton, based on his 1955 visit to the Soviet Union and its satellites, and the more informal report of Dr. Homer Dodge and his son; all agree upon the tremendous Soviet advances in education and technology. Benton reports that:

"The massive educational program, still expanding in Russia, under which today nearly twice as many students are enrolled above the high-school level as in this country, is one reason for the extraordinary confidence expressed by Soviet leaders at the recent 20th Congress of the Communist Party. The Soviet educational system is geared to win the cold war. The Soviets are now challenging us frontally at what have historically been two of our strongest points, technology and mass education.

"In some fields, notably technological, the Soviet Union is producing graduates who compare favorably both in number and quality with those in the United States. Indeed Allen Dulles, head of the United States Central Intelligence Agency, and Admiral Lewis Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Committee, say the Soviet output of engineers and technical specialists may exceed that of the United States by as much as 50 percent. This figure becomes the more startling when one recalls that the Russian economy is probably no more than one-third the size of that of the United States and thus, presumptively, the demand for engineers internally should be far less than in the United States."[2]

Benton says that the surplus of engineers and technicians will be assigned to carry our technical assistance in every uncommitted country of the world. Moreover, while getting their scientific training, they are thoroughly indoctrinated in the Marxist-Lenin line and are taught English, French, or German to give them a fluent working knowledge of the language they are likely to need when they are sent abroad to do a technical and a propaganda job. It is this combination of indoctrinated zeal with technical proficiency that is so ominous for the West.

One grave question for the men in the Kremlin is this: Can they provide the Russian people with the highest and best in technological education and still keep them indoctrinated with the Marxist-Lenin line? One grave question for us is this: Can we stand up to the tremendous threat of Communistic power and still retain our faith in the right to pursue and to teach the truth?

When, amidst Prussia's tribulations under Napoleon, the basic pattern of the University of Berlin was being fashioned, Wilhelm von Humboldt made it a prime requisite that teachers in that university should be free to pursue and teach the truth. It is this freedom which has contributed so greatly to the accelerating changes of the modern world. Yet 125 years after Humboldt's decree Hitler and his Nazis destroyed that freedom and with it the University of Berlin.

Could the same thing happen here? Are public universities free from the danger of laws and regulations which would curb their efficient operation or impede their intellectual freedom? Are private universities free from the danger of laws and regulations which will reduce or destroy their tax exemptions or pressures from alumni or Government which will impede their intellectual freedom?

We dislike the Nazis and the Communists, but it is not clear how much freedom our fellow citizens believe in. Is free speech designed to protect only the kind of speech that I like to hear? Does it also protect the speech with which I disagree? Will the lessons of Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia be lost upon us? The cult of freedom is a difficult one. Its price is eternal vigilance, and no small annoyance and inconvenience. Its relation to educational institutions has been well put by Ralph Barton Perry:

"I am not unaware of the difficulty which the creed of freedom creates for educational authorities who have to worry about financial support—whether from a legislature or from alumni. There is, however, only one solution of this difficulty—the only ultimate solution, and the only American solution: namely, to educate those who provide the support, so that they can better understand what it is that they support. At present, the privately endowed institutions enjoy, in this respect, an advantage over the State-supported institutions. Whereas the latter are governed by regents, legislatures, and the electorate at large, privately endowed institutions are governed by trustees and alumni, who can be assumed to feel a closer sympathy with the purposes and principles of higher education.

"But this is an ephemeral and at best a relative advantage. The State electorate is composed more and more of alumni of State colleges and universities; the alumni of privately endowed colleges and universities are dispersed and absorbed in the electorate and tend to be of the same mind. In self-defense, as well as to fulfill their obligation of public service, all institutions of higher education must, therefore, educate not only their own students, but the people at large, to value such institutions for that unique service which they alone are qualified to render."[3]

IV

What are the unique services that institutions of higher learning are qualified to render? For the universities, at least, the matter has never been put more clearly or powerfully than it was put by Sir Richard Livingstone when he said:

"If you wished to destroy modern civilization, the most effective way to do it would be to abolish universities. They stand at its center. They create knowledge and train minds. The education which they give molds the outlook of all educated men, and thus affects politics, administration, the professions, industry and commerce. Their discoveries and their thought penetrate almost every activity of life. The technique of the doctor and the miner, the pronouncements of the pulpit, and even of the press, the measures of governments are dictated or at least modified by these distant nerve-centers of intelligence, and on their health and vigor and well-being of the whole modern world depends. They add nothing to the amount of natural intelligence existing, but they refine and perfect what exists and fit it to serve purposes and take stresses which in its raw form it could not meet. Their influence is increasing and will increase unless there is a collapse of modern civilization."[4]

Universities are vital to our civilization. Upon you, and those like you, rests the responsibility for interpreting them to those around you who do not know or understand them. Upon your support and leadership depend the solution of the problems, the almost insolvable problems, which they face. And, I urge you to give that support and leadership so that, in the words of the prayer book, "knowledge may be increased among us, and all good learning flourish and abound."

[1] Beardsley Ruml, Teaching Salaries Then and Now, Bull. No. 1, The Fund for the Advancement of Education, p. 23.

[2] William Benton, The Voice of the Kremlin, 1956 Book of the Year, Encyclopedia Britannica.

[3] Ralph Barton Perry, The Citizen Decides, Indiana University Press, 1954, pp. 109–110.

[4] Sir Richard Livingstone, Some Thoughts on University Education, pp 7–8.

Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, Fiscal Year 1957

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10721) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is the wrong way to amend legislation. I think every one of us will agree to that. The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], a distinguished lawyer, has said that he did not like this way of approaching the

matter, and I do not believe any lawyer or any Member of the House for that matter would believe that this back-door method is the right approach.

But I am not going to talk any more about that. I want to go to the merits of the question which is basically involved here. It is charged that there are a lot of small farmers who are being criminally prosecuted and fined because they grew more than 15 acres of wheat.

That is not the fact. These are civil cases to collect penalties from farmers who have exceeded their marketing quotas. The law, as a matter of fact, is very generous. It provides that any farmer who has never grown a bushel of wheat on his land before may grow 15 acres of wheat without paying any penalty whatever. Members know that with the use of fertilizer this means from 400 to 500 bushels of wheat that may be grown even with moderate yields. This provision was placed in the law to protect the noncommercial wheat growers. It does protect him adequately. Do not tell me that a man who grows more than four or five hundred bushels of wheat is a small farmer who is not engaged in commercial operations.

In addition to that, he may grow all the corn, and all the rye, and all the barley, and all the oats that he wants for food and livestock feed, because there are no marketing quotas on any of these crops. So no one is suffering; no one is being persecuted. No criminal offense is being charged, nor can there be. These are simply civil suits and you would be surprised, perhaps, if I told you, in view of all the furor that we have had here today, that there were only 1,219 of these cases in 1954 and only 680 cases in 1955 out of over a million and half wheat growers in the United States. By this I mean that, according to figures furnished the Committee on Agriculture by the Department, there were only this number of cases in each of these years in which marketing quota penalties were incurred where all the wheat produced on the farms was used solely for food, seed, and feed. In most of these cases the penalties have been or will be collected by administrative action. As of March 1, 1956, only 143 suits had been filed. In all probability most of these cases will be settled without trial since the law is clear.

Now, in order to prevent the United States district attorneys from doing their duty under the law, this amendment is suggested to save a few farmers from paying a civil penalty because they grow more than the 15 acres of wheat which the law permits them to grow without any penalty when marketing quotas are in effect. Why adopt this method which everybody agrees is the wrong way of approaching this matter in order to save a few farmers from paying the penalty which they have incurred. Is this fair to the more than a million and a half farmers who grew wheat and stayed within the provisions of the law. In my opinion, if you adopt this amendment, it will mean an entire breakdown of the wheat program.

Let me call attention to the fact that we do not have such a provision in the case of any other commodity under marketing quotas. Producers of cotton, tobacco, rice, and peanuts cannot exceed their allotments in the slightest degree without paying a penalty, but a farmer may grow 15 acres of wheat where he has no allotment at all.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Under this proposal, what would keep a grower of 10,000 acres of wheat from qualifying?

Mr. HOPE. Nothing in the world. It would break down the program.

Mr. ALBERT. This is not a little-farmer's amendment. It is a big-farmer's amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. These 3 million farmers to whom the gentleman has referred, and those referred to by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] would be subject to this amendment if they fed all of that wheat on their own farm. This amendment is limited to those who use all of that feed on their own farm, and that, in general, would be only the relatively small farmer.

Mr. HOPE. It would have the effect of breaking down the entire wheat program and I think you might be surprised at how many large growers might take advantage of it.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Is it not a fact that anybody who is going to feed four or five hundred bushels of wheat in his farm as feed must be in the commercial feeding business? He has probably a flock of 40,000 chickens. He is not feeding simply the old lady's hens with 500 bushels of wheat. And he is not grinding up 500 bushels of wheat to feed the kids flour, either; because there are not any such mills in this country. People buy their flour from commercial mills. You will not find flour being ground in this country to make biscuits and light bread any more. It is a commercial proposition if a man is selling more than the product of 15 acres of wheat.

Mr. HOPE. This in the main is a proposal to bail out a few large poultry growers. That is where most of the support for this proposal comes from. This amendment should be voted down, not only because it is the wrong approach to the matter but because the basic proposition itself has no intrinsic merit.

Seasonable Consistency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, an editorial published today in the Wall Street Journal is further recognition of the Democrats' desperate search for issues. Their present plight is somewhat akin to the cat chasing his own tail, and proves, with the analogy of Mr. Reynolds, that the Democrats really are not interested in solving any issues, but only in creating them.

I ask that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEASONABLE CONSISTENCY

This being the season when political campaigns are budding all over, you can expect to hear a lot from the outs about how the ins are ruining us with policies full of inconsistencies and contradictions.

Mr. Adlai Stevenson, for instance, has been demanding that the administration stop letting us just drift and present us with some policies to deal with the cold war that will be clear and consistent.

On Saturday last he accused the administration of being niggardly with our defense program, thus letting the Russians outstrip us in military power. He also said the United States needed a more consistent peace program to impress the world and counteract Communist propaganda.

So he proposed that we outwit the Russians propagandawise by halting all our atom bomb tests to show our peaceful intent. Just what this would do to our defense program, he didn't explain.

However, he took care of that on Tuesday after Mr. Khrushchev claimed that the Soviets are developing intercontinental atom bomb guided missiles. Mr. Stevenson demanded that the administration step up its guided missile program to counteract this Russian threat. It wasn't quite clear, though, what kind of warheads we would put in those missiles since, presumably, we are to stop atom bomb experiments.

Then on the domestic front the Democrats in Congress have been giving the administration what-for about the farm program. The Democratic Senate leader made a speech telling the farmers that when the President vetoed the farm bill he was taking millions of dollars out of the farmers' pockets this year.

So now the Democrats are in favor of quick passage of the soil-bank bill which would pay farmers for not growing things. But at the same time they are fighting very hard against a provision in the bill which would permit farmers to draw part of their soil-bank payments in advance. They don't want the farmers to get this $500 million in their pockets this year—before the election.

Oh, well, we have long since ceased to marvel at these little flowers of political consistency, these biennials that bloom in the spring. We glimpsed our first one, years ago, when Robert R. Reynolds was trying to unseat Senator Morrison down in North Carolina.

Mr. Reynolds went about the State making a pitch that Senator Morrison was a penny-pinching old fogey who wouldn't spend a nickel for the good of the poor folks. After quite a bit of this, Senator Morrison got his dander up and pointed with pride to the many occasions in the Senate when he had voted for larger appropriations than Mr. Hoover's Republicans had proposed.

Whereupon the undaunted Bob Reynolds let fire with a broadside at Cam Morrison for sitting up there in Washington spending the people's hard-earned money like a profligate.

Which may help explain why the political outs today aren't going to be hobbled by any hobgoblins of consistency. After all, Bob Reynolds won.

Politics Should Be Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to keep the record straight.

I do not refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD but to the record of my distinguished colleague, the Honorable HARLEY STAGGERS, of the Second West Virginia District.

Mr. Speaker, in the heat and stress of interparty political primary battles for party preference, some individuals often distort the facts. Some even resort to half truths and still others are not averse to using untruths in their desire to win political advantage.

I do not subscribe to the old axiom, "Everything is fair in love and politics." It is not a question of whether you win or lose but a question of how you played the game. In this instance, it is a question of keeping the record straight.

Practically every newspaper in my State of West Virginia, both daily and weekly, find their way to my desk. These include the papers from the counties and cities in the Second West Virginia District represented by my colleague, Mr. STAGGERS.

Political news from this area points to systematic and well-planned campaigning by his political opponent to discredit and belittle the record of Mr. STAGGERS on farm and conservation issues. A large part of Mr. STAGGERS' district is the Monongahela National Forest area which is the pride of all West Virginians.

The charge is being made that Mr. STAGGERS has neglected to properly safeguard the interests of this and other forest areas in his district. This I want to disapprove.

I, too, am interested in conservation. Every year since Mr. STAGGERS became a Member of the Congress he has personally accompanied me in appearances before the appropriate House committees interested in conservation and pleaded for increased amounts for improved facilities for both the Monongahela National Forest and the George Washington National Forest within his district.

Some years ago we appeared before the House Appropriations Committee and secured an item of $36,000 for improvements on Camp Horseshoe at Parsons, within the national-forest area. In recent months Mr. STAGGERS accompanied me to a hearing and joined in a plea that the item for replacement of physical facilities and campsites on our national-forest lands be increased by approximately $9 million. This increased amount was approved and is a part of the current budget which will be made available for fiscal 1957.

In 1955 the gentleman from the Second West Virginia District accompanied me before the House committee to secure $1,800,000 increase for fire protection on State and privately owned property surrounding the national forests so as to better remove a hazard in the national-forest holdings.

The charge has been made that the Monongahela National Forest "is being permitted to run to rack and ruin," and that "money for upkeep has been cut drasically and money for improvements has been cut off entirely." Let us look at the official record of the Forest Service. This shows that during Mr. STAGGERS' tenure in Congress—1949 to 1956—the funds appropriated and made available for expenditure on this national forest were increased from $294,000 to $482,000, an increase of from 60 to 70 percent, or an average of almost 10 percent each year.

The charge has been made that "forest roads and tourist facilities are so run down that they are of little, if any, practical use." As a matter of record, the road and trail construction and maintenance funds for the Monongahela National Forest have increased from $110,000 in his first year in Washington to $236,500 during this year, an increase of 114 percent within 8 years.

The charge has been made that the national forests of New England and the Western States have received an unfair share of the national forest recreational funds at the expense of our Monongahela Forest. Forest Service officials in Washington have assured me that the recreational use funds appropriated to the Forest Service are distributed among their national forests based on a careful and impartial analysis of actual use and the number of recreational areas and facilities.

One of the untruths I refer to above is that while the Forest Supervisor at Elkins and his crew on the Monangahela National Forest are doing a good job, one cannot trust the Forest Service officials in Washington in their distribution of funds. All year-long Forest Service officials in Washington—from Chief McArdle on down—are career, technically trained men devoted to their job. I know many of them personally and hope that this will clarify the unfair statements and inferences made which reflect on the fairness and ability of our Forest Service officials whether at Elkins or at Washington.

HARLEY STAGGERS has honestly and efficiently served his district for 8 years. His untiring efforts in behalf of his constituents must not be sacrificed by unfair and unethical political tactics.

One-Party Press?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Where Is the One-Party Press?" published in the Scottsbluff (Nebr.) Daily Star-Herald of April 22, 1956. The editorial gives a correct and objective evaluation of the clamor about the so-called one-party press which clamor is sounded in election years. I commend the writer of this editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are becoming increasingly irked over the Democratic National Committee's wholly unsupported and unwarranted charges of a one-party press.

Implied is a situation that only news of the Republican Party finds its way into the news columns of the Nation's newspapers, and that there exists some unspecified prohibition against routine Democratic Party news or reports of Democratic viewpoints on national matters.

This situation simply is not true, either in this newspaper or in the vast majority of newspapers of the Nation.

We do not attempt to control news, nor to create it.

News events happen, and newspapers print their accounts of such events as nearly without bias or coloring as is humanly possible.

The wire services, chief among them the Associated Press and the United Press, maintain high standards of journalism. They cannot be bought by either party, Republican or Democrat, and they scrupulously report, and local editors use, the news of political and State matters, regardless of political origin.

The number of newspapers, daily and weekly, which vow allegiance to the Republican Party are in the majority, it is true. The editors of such newspapers reflect the Republican viewpoint in their editorial columns, as is their right, but not in their news columns, if they are worth their salt.

They permit the expression of political viewpoints of all shades in their "Letters to the Editor" departments. Within limitations of space, the newspaper can become a forum of political opinion.

As to other major media of communication, we know little except for the fact that radio and television industries engage in practically no editorial activities. They sell their time, first come first served, but attempt to make their facilities equally available to both parties.

Perhaps, it might be proper to call the South an area which a one-party press exists, because Democratic editors predominate. We think the charge would be unfounded, although Demo bigwigs might be more satisfied with the editorial tone there.

We think that editorial climate is all right, because it reflects honest and sincere opinion.

The Democrats should hunt for some other whipping boy.

Victory for Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper editorial:

VICTORY FOR CONGRESS

The ruling by the full bench of the United States court of appeals in the case of John T. Watkins, a former organizer for the United Automobile Workers, reflects a salutary respect for the right of Congress to func-

tion within its proper sphere without judicial interference.

Last January a divided three-judge panel of the court had reversed the conviction of Watkins for contempt of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The majority on that panel, Chief Judge Edgerton and Judge Bazelon, held that the committee had no authority to ask a series of questions which Watkins had refused to answer. This brought a vigorous dissent from Judge Bastian. He said this: "I suggest that this decision puts us in the position of a court of appeals over the Congress and its committees, allowing us to pass upon questions relating to legislation and limiting the scope of such inquiries to what this court thinks that scope should be." The five other appellate judges (newly appointed Judge Burger did not participate) now have agreed with Judge Bastian's view on the legal question involved. The earlier decision is set aside and the right of the committee to ask the questions is affirmed.

The issue turned on a rather narrow point. Watkins, a forthright witness before the committee, did not seek to invoke the fifth amendment. He readily answered questions pertaining to his own Communist associations, and said he would answer questions about any others whom he still believed to be Communists. But he refused to answer when asked whether, in past years, he had known some 30 individuals as Communists. His basis for this refusal was that he did not think the questions were relevant to the committee's investigation, but were designed, instead, to expose these individuals This view was accepted by Judges Edgerton and Bazelon

But the full court was in emphatic disagreement. "The purpose of the committee's hearing," it said, "was to aid it in its study of a proposed amendment to the Internal Security Act of 1950. That amendment was in fact enacted into law 4 months after appellant's refusal to testify. * * * This is a proper example of the exercise of a legitimate legislative purpose. * * * Congress has the power of exposure if the exposure is incidental to the exercise of a legislative function."

This is an important ruling. For, if it stands up on appeal to the Supreme Court, it will tend to lift from the congressional power of investigation a severe and, in our judgment, an unwarranted restraint imposed by the earlier ruling.

Freedom for Slovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and at the request of many of my constituents of Slovak descent, I wish to urge the Congress to approve House Concurrent Resolution 231, resolving that it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the Slovak Nation, is entitled to and should no longer be denied the right of national self-determination. I introduced this resolution in the House on April 12, 1956.

The Slovak Nation lost all possibility for its freedom and independence when the Soviet troops marched into Slovakia early in 1945 and when the so-called people's democracy was introduced in that unfortunate country, before the coup of February 1948, totalitarian communism became the ruler.

Since that time Slovakia suffered as much as any other enslaved nation or even more, behind the iron curtain. But there is no country in the Soviet orbit which has a better underground movement than heroic Slovakia, resisting communism through its two underground organizations; the Liberty Legion and the White Legion.

The stirring cry for the freedom of the Slovak Nation has the sympathy and friendship of the American people who have always been ready to assist the downtrodden and the oppressed. Since the Slovaks stand on self-determination and since they demand free elections or a plebiscite under United Nations supervision, as clearly stated on many occasions by the leading Slovak exiles and as confirmed by the leading Americans of Slavok derivation, in order to choose their own form of government and to reestablish their own state or its association, if any, with other nations.

We place the Slovak nation in every respect on the same basis of equality enjoyed by any nation of Central or Eastern Europe whether they are Poles, Rumanians, Hungarians, Lithuanians, or Bohemians. Each of them has the basic right for self-determination and the right to set up its own government.

We urge the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the President of the United States and the Secretary of State to give favorable consideration to this resolution in order to formulate a practical program of assistance to the oppressed Slovak Nation, and to direct the United States Representatives at the United Nations to demand that free elections or plebiscite be held in Slovakia under police supervision of the United Nations so that the Slovaks may freely decide their national future without any outside pressure.

We shall not fail the Slovak Nation in its struggle for the same freedom and independence we enjoy. From every viewpoint the Slovak Nation is entitled to the enjoyment of full freedom and independence. World peace is unattainable without granting the Slovak Nation freedom and independence, the basic and elemental right of every Nation.

Federal Aid For School Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Local Control Maintained," published in the Scottsbluff (Nebr.) Daily Star-Herald of April 19, 1956. The editorial affords the views of Nebraskans—and I am sure the views of many other Americans—on the issue of Federal aid for school construction. I offer my sincere compliments to the author of this editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Apparently the disagreement among Banner County residents over the proper program of school operation has been resolved in Tuesday's special election.

Unofficial returns show that over 60 percent, more than the 55 percent required minimum, favored issuance of $500,000 in bonds to finance construction of a central school plant operated by a single county-wide district.

Actually, the chief point at issue was whether or not the county should reestablish the old district boundaries and operate several schools, as opposed to the idea of a single district with a modern school.

But, to a disinterested outside observer, another and more important issue could have been at stake, too.

That issue hinged on the principle of local self-determination of school problems.

Banner County people, like people everywhere in the United States, could have voted down the bond proposal and, because of a failure to solve their own local and peculiar problems, could have awaited the entrance of the Federal Government, or the State, or some other foreign authority, to tell them what to do and to supply the cash for improvements determined by some outside agency to be necessary for the maintenance of adequate school facilities.

Such a procedure is proposed, to a degree, by the advocates of Federal aid to education.

What's happening, in contrast, is that Banner County people have met their own problem head-on and are going to handle it themselves.

As a matter of principle, they are going to finance and administer their local schools. The majority have recognized a need and, by the exercise of democratic processes, have determined the method of meeting it, free from outside influence.

Furthermore, it is our guess that they can afford and can pay for the improvements they propose to make. They will have a school plant and auxiliary facilities that answer community needs and in which they can take pride.

The situation, in some ways, is repeated all over the country. The pressures for additional school facilities is unremitting.

Whatever we must do to meet it we should do on a local basis. That is the important point. Unless we want Federal control of schools, financed by an uneconomic and more costly system, we will follow Banner County's example, and decide our own local problems on a local basis.

United States Information Service Features Suffolk County News in Report From America Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct the attention of the Members of the House to a very interesting and significant article which ap-

peared in the New York Times on April 2, 1956.

It is particularly significant to me because the smalltown newspaper selected by the United States Information Service for this program Report from America is the Suffolk County News, located in Sayville, Long Island, N. Y., which is in my congressional district.

It is my firm opinion that this is the sort of public relations that really shows the way in which American people live—unadorned by the screen sets of Hollywood and the razzle-dazzle of the film world.

The United States Information Service should be commended for the excellent job it is doing. If this is the approach adopted by our Government in the field of public relations, then I believe we are on the right track.

The editor of this smalltown newspaper, Joe Jahn, should be congratulated for his untiring efforts and cooperation:

BRITISH TV SHOWS EVERYDAY UNITED STATES LIFE—CRITICS CALL DOWN-TO-EARTH SERIES POWERFUL ANTIDOTE TO HOLLYWOOD FILMS—NOTE SIMILAR PROBLEMS—AUDIENCE SAID TO BE GIVEN FIRST REALISTIC PICTURE OF ORDINARY AMERICANS

(By Thomas P. Ronan)

LONDON, April 2.—The existence in the United States of ordinary people with basic human problems is being brought home to Britons through a new television series called Report from America.

It is not that the British think the United States is inhabited by ghosts or supermen. But the picture many of them have is colored by the distortions of Hollywood and by the emphasis given by some newspapers here to the more sensational side of life in the 48 States.

Motion pictures like Blackboard Jungle and Rebel Without a Cause have convinced many Britons that most United States children are maladjusted and often brutal delinquents. Other Hollywood efforts have left the impression United States adults are gangsters or millionaires.

Report from America, presented by the British Broadcasting Corp. in cooperation with the United States Information Agency, is showing that there are other types, much like people in Britain.

The emphasis is on everyday life, with typical Americans portrayed in typical situations. Few, if any, actors are used and the accents are pure American.

TRAFFIC PROBLEM DEPICTED

Dealing with traffic problems in large and small communities, the first report depicted motorists driving round and round in an endless quest for parking space, a salesman trying to make a sale against a parking meter deadline, truck drivers sipping coffee and chatting about their problems at a roadside restaurant.

The topic of the second report was a smalltown newspaper—the Suffolk County News at Sayville, Long Island. Through the eyes of this newspaper, with a circulation of about 4,250, Sayville was portrayed as a town where people chipped in to build a new Lutheran church when the old one burned down and to supply an ambulance service manned by volunteers; where a community forum is provided for the discussion of local problems and where civic leaders fought to save the famed Blue Point oyster when pollution from duck farms threatened its extinction.

"This program did a little to kill the Hollywood-created myth of the American way of life by showing that people in small towns lead lives and have interests similar to our own," the Yorkshire Post said.

The Glasgow Evening News concluded that life in Sayville was not so different after all from life "in our own little burgh." The Eastern Evening News of Norwich found this film a refreshing insight into the less spectacular side of that "way of life" so well publicized by the cinema.

SIMILARITIES NOTED

Of the Suffolk County News, the Sheffield Star said: "How little it differed, in both function and production, from many weekly newspapers in this country. In fact, how little the people of Sayville and their problems varied from thousands of small town dwellers here."

Maurice Wiggin, television critic for the Sunday Times, found the reports "a valuable corrective to the picture of America which a viewer might pick up from other sources of entertainment."

"What is finest about these fascinating reports is the integrity that is written all over them," he said. "America speaks for herself, through undoctored pictures of her streets and the untrained voices of the men in them."

After having viewed the traffic film, the critic for the Bristol Evening News remarked that it was astonishing "what a great disservice the majority of American films do to their native country; how inaccurately they portray the American way of life."

HOLLYWOOD VERSION CITED

The Liverpool Evening Express said Hollywood had told of only two kinds of United States weekly newspapers. The first was printed by hand in a one-horse town in Kansas. The editor carried a .45, took his orders from the local bad man and devoted his columns to libeling the hero. The second was put out in a small Southern town by a right-thinking editor who refused to be bribed by the local gangster and whose fast-talking, hard-fighting reporters ranged the underworld blowing the top off vice and corruption.

The critic continued: "Really, the American weekly newspaper is very much like ours in Britain. It fights the little fights of the small-town people it serves. It tells them about their neighbors."

The program was conceived by Leonard Miall, former BBC correspondent in Washington and currently head of its Talks Department, as a television counterpart to the radio report from America broadcast weekly by Alistair Cooke, a Manchester Guardian correspondent in the United States.

With the enthusiastic endorsement of W. Bradley Connors, head of the United States Information Service here, the project was approved in Washington. Mr. Connors and his aides worked with the BBC in selecting topics.

The films, made by the National Broadcasting Co., with Don Cash as director and producer, have been praised highly for technical brilliance. Joseph C. Harsch of the Christian Science Monitor has won critical plaudits as the relaxed, unobtrusive narrator.

That the United States Information Agency and its hard-working staff here have a tremendous job before them is evident in the review of Rebel Without a Cause, by C. A. Lejeune, film critic for the Observer. This picture dealt with juvenile delinquency in a California community.

"When I was a child my books taught me to love America," she wrote. "I don't remember ever thinking of American stories as 'foreign' stories. Today I still read and relish American books. I like their fast hold against the deadly bloat of 'comic' strips, their nice appreciation of the gravity of words.

"I admire American writing very much indeed; and often wish that I could emulate it. But I no longer want to visit America. I think I should be unhappy there. The films from Hollywood have taught me to expect a dangerous country full of violent, maladjusted people; unhappy in their home lives and politically inflammable.

"Commonsense tells me that this picture is untrue; but the picture has been too often drawn; the harm is done."

The third report in the series on the United States will show how Pittsburgh beat the smog problem. Now, if Mr. Cash can only find 4 or 5 American children without police records.

SAYVILLE GETS REACTION

SAYVILLE, LONG ISLAND, April 7.—America's most widely publicized smalltown newspaper these days is the Suffolk County News of Sayville.

The reaction of British TV viewers to the community service projects of this typical weekly on Long Island's south shore is reflected in the many letters the paper has received from the British Isles.

Typical is the comment of Mrs. Gwyneth Rowland, of Monmouthshire, who said she and her husband were "enchanted with the whole portrayal and thought your shops quite wonderful." Terence Harlow of North Harrow, Middlesex, asserted: "It appeared to me that North Harrow and Sayville have a lot in common as people and problems go."

The News was selected by the United States Information Agency because of its many community service projects in recent years, several of which are highlighted in the film report. Since the film was shot on location here in Sayville, the News has been nominated for a Pulitzer prize in public service, a rare honor for a smalltown weekly.

Tour of the Middle East by Walter Reuther

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, there has just returned to this country after what can only be described as a triumphal tour of the Middle East, and especially of India, Mr. Walter Reuther, president of the United Automobile Workers of America, and former president of the CIO. Mr. Reuther is now an international vice president of the AFL-CIO and director of the industrial department of that great organization.

I have read several newspaper accounts of Mr. Reuther's tour and of the reception he received. None has impressed me more than an article in the Christian Science Monitor issue of Saturday, April 21. The account is written by a reporter whose name suggests that he might be an Indian. If the impressions reported by this correspondent are accurate, and I have no reason to believe that they are anything other than accurate, we all owe Mr. Reuther a deep debt of gratitude, a debt which it is unnecessary to pay, because Mr. Reuther, whom I am proud to call my friend, has always served his country without thought of reward.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this very interesting article, entitled "India Hails Diplomacy by Reuther," which appeared on page 1 of the Christian Science Monitor of April 21, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIA HAILS DIPLOMACY BY REUTHER

(By Sharokh Sabavala)

BOMBAY.—In a year of Soviet propaganda successes in south Asia, the visit of Walter Reuther to India is a notable victory for western democracy.

The progress through this country of the vice president of the AFL–CIO American labor organization is shaping up into a minor triumph.

Mr. Reuther is spending a fortnight in this country at the invitation of the Indian National Trade Union Congress—the workers wing of Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru's ruling Congress Party. But interest in the visit no longer is confined to trade-union circles, as the guest tells his widening audience the story of the American worker, his joys and sorrows, his successes and failures.

Hitherto this story has remained untold. For the average Indian the United States is a faraway, fabulous land peopled by owners of shiny automobiles and mysterious television devices, where poverty is almost forgotten and wealth—not its lack—is the main problem.

So overwhelming are these impressions that very few people in this country take time off to wonder and think about the hard work and effort that has gone into making the United States the world's most prosperous nation.

Mr. Reuther, perhaps, is the first American to make Indians think along these lines. And the net result, to date, appears to be a drawing together of two peoples who are sympathetically made aware of each other's problems.

In New Delhi and Calcutta, his audiences undoubtedly were impressed by the fact that the vice president represents 15 million workers. In a country where the trade-union movement is in its infancy, this demonstration of massed and organized strength holds out a promise of what can be achieved here also.

AUDIENCE ASTONISHED

To be given proof that the United States is essentially a nation of workers is surprising enough. But to hear that these workers still have to fight for their rights against a few remaining reactionary bosses causes astonishment.

At a meeting of members of the Mill Mazdoor Sabha, a textile workers union, Mr. Reuther stated that competitive coexistence should mean competing for better living standards and fighting against poverty, hunger, and social injustice.

As this was translated into simple Hindi, word for word, a member turned to another saying, "This sahib (gentleman) makes sense. He says what we are thinking."

In New Delhi, a similar reaction was noticed when he addressed a more sophisticated audience, the members of the Indian Council of World Affairs. Many of them thought they had assembled to listen to a foreign demagog's peroration.

Instead, what they heard sounded so strikingly familiar that many went away wondering why there was so much talk of Indo-American differences.

At yet another get-together, Mr. Reuther was heard to say that freedom's struggle in Asia would be won on the ricefields and not on the battlefields. "He's got it right first time," murmured a listener, "the ricefield is the battlefield."

PRAISED IN PRESS

Summing up the first crowded week of the visit, the Hindustan Times, which is edited by the son of Mohandas Gandhi, said, "He has helped renew our faith in American democracy. Considering his background, we would like to think of him as a true voice of America."

From Calcutta, a leading Bengali newspaper writes, "From the land of Abraham Lincoln to the land of Mahatma Gandhi comes a man to tell us that neither peace nor freedom can be secured in an age of nuclear giants and moral pigmies. We agree."

Unlike other visitors, who have spoken to Indians against the backdrop of their high moral heritage, Mr. Reuther wades in to bluntly emphasize the fact that Indians are no better or worse than other people.

For 8 years, since the beginning of Indian independence, it has been the tradition to praise and pity this nation as something which is unique, both as to its achievements and its problems.

Now along comes a foreigner to explode this myth, to point out that his nation also is susceptible to the same strains and stresses and capable of equally great, if not greater, achievements.

And his Indian audiences are applauding him vigorously, while embassies in New Delhi hastily revise the rules governing what not to say in this country.

The visit's apparent keynote is a policy of enlightened self-interest. Tell Indians that millions of dollars are being poured in each year to save them from communism and they are inclined to shrug their shoulders.

But tell them, as Mr. Reuther has been doing, that the American achievement cannot be made secure as long as there is want, poverty, and social injustice in any part of the world, and United States aid falls into more comfortable perspective making the receiver less beholden to the giver.

A part of the Reuther success here also is due to his own approach to the problem of colonialism. When United States Secretary of State John Foster Dulles recently tried a similar approach, he seemed to fail to carry conviction.

But when Mr. Reuther, openly disagreeing with some of Mr. Dulles' pronouncements—on Goa in particular—says the overwhelming weight of United States opinion is on the side of freedom from domination of all subject peoples, Indians are more inclined to listen.

Dollar Foolish and Time Foolish: Must Our Air Force Be Second Best?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the investigation of Air Force strength began this week behind closed doors. When it is over, we hope to be given an answer to this major question: "Are the present and planned strengths of the United States Air Force adequate to preserve the peace through the deterrence of aggression?"

In this week's issue of Look magazine—May 1, 1956—Mr. Trevor Gardner, until recently Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Research and Development, begins a series of articles on what may justly be called the guided missile mess. During the last 2 years, we have had to face the problem of learning to fly and fight at four times the speeds of World War II and at altitudes so high there is literally no air left. During these same years, we have been confronted with indisputable evidence that the Soviets have made great scientific advances in air weapons and are possibly already ahead of us in the development of guided missiles. Whether the Soviet progress is due to invention or theft, it is equally astounding. But we continue to squander time as though we had invented a way of replacing it. Mr. Gardner says that we are being "dollar wise and time foolish." We are being both dollar foolish and time foolish when we fail to realize that with every tick of the clock the Soviet Union is moving closer to the capability of knocking us out; and yet we continue to do nothing about it.

We go on with a business-as-usual attitude, not realizing that the only resource we cannot afford to waste is time. Because we have a business administration with highly successful businessmen in control, the Air Force budget has been whittled down below the figure Air Force leaders consider adequate. General Twining has testified before the Congress that "137 is just a number" and that "this increase in combat readiness is a goal we are aiming at, not a reality." And General Twining and Secretary Quarles have both admitted that the cuts made in the 1957 budget are one-time cuts which cannot be made again if we are to achieve even the 137-wing goal on schedule.

Mr. Trevor Gardner recently resigned as civilian manager of the Air Force Research and Development program in an honest and basic difference of opinion with the Secretary of Defense as to whether budget balancing or airpower was the more important. With some cynicism, Mr. Gardner calls the budget now being considered by this Congress as "the supreme accomplishment of men who believe in saving dollars even if you have to waste time." Unless we give America the air might America needs to deter Soviet aggression and to build an Air Force adequate for national defense, we can be sure of only one thing: that is, that if the Russians should take this country after defeating us in a cruel atomic war, they will find the budget balanced when they arrive.

Mr. Speaker, our Strategic Air Command needs missiles and planes. The rapid development of both types of weapons by the U. S. S. R. intensifies the need. But in the face of adequate and convincing evidence of this need, the administration continues to juggle defense funds for research and development in an effort to beguile the public with a budget balanced on paper, balanced in appearance, but not balanced against national defense in the scales of history's judgment.

Mr. Speaker, with the consent of my colleagues, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the first of Mr. Trevor Gardner's articles which he has promised to follow with a plan of action to overcome the dangers that face this Nation. Mr. Gardner's article from the May 1 issue of Look is as follows:

MUST OUR AIR FORCE BE SECOND BEST?

(By Trevor Gardner)

With every tick of the clock, the Soviet Union is moving closer to the capability of knocking this country out. Intercontinental airpower and missiles are the new double-edged sword of destruction, hanging by a hair over us all.

The danger America faces has not been apparent to the general public because it has not been revealed. The disturbing facts about the major delays in our continental air defense, the story behind the 137-wing Air Force fantasy, and the accurate account of how Russia is outpacing our country in ballistic missiles have been withheld.

These facts should no longer remain the exclusive, private property of a few Government executives whose main mission in life is to balance the budget. All of us share these dangers. The facts must be known and understood by all.

There is no time for business as usual. We face a crisis as grave as any we have ever confronted in our peacetime history. Its gravity requires President Eisenhower to take the people of this country into his full confidence. He should disclose openly and realistically what threatens our homes and our very lives.

We cannot avert our peril unless we insist upon, and are prepared to pay for, the finest Air Force in the world without further waste of time. This is attainable. The unrealistic obstacles of dollar cost and budget balancing must be brushed aside by decisive leaders capable of understanding that while money is an important commodity, time is priceless. In fact, time is the only resource we cannot afford to waste.

The tragedy in Washington today is that we are being dollarwise and time-foolish. If we abandon our present business-as-usual, time-consuming, committee-ridden approach, we will make a few of the budget types unhappy; but this is a very small price to pay for the kind of national security we need.

Whether we like it or not, our plans for tomorrow's Air Force are being determined just as much—if not more—by the Kremlin as by the Pentagon. We cannot overlook this fact. This is true because in Russia, as well as in other parts of the world, scientific advances are being made with the speed of light while in Washington bureaucracy continues to move like a turtle. Because we refuse to face the facts, Russian realism is prevailing, and Soviet efforts to fully destroy the thin airpower advantage we have threaten to succeed.

This need not happen. But it will, unless we do two things. First, we must provide adequate funds. Second, we must junk the creaking, decentralized reviewing and rereviewing machinery we now so foolishly look to for decisions. In place of this bureaucratic Noah's Ark, we urgently need a streamlined mechanism capable of responding to new dangers as quickly as they become known.

Our Air Force must lead the world both in the quality and in the quantity of its weapons.

In the status of the race for superior quality is a particular disturbing one. It started in the World War I era. In 1917, the United States ranked only 14th in world airpower. Soviet aeronautical science ranked even lower and was—in comparison—still in its swaddling clothes. But the infant Soviet science possessed remarkable vitality. By 1940, it established its own vigorous, independent maturity. This growth was accelerated during World War II and has continued at tremendous speed. During the past few years, the rate of Soviet technological progress has challenged the comprehension of even our most advanced thinkers.

One of the most underplayed facts about the growth of Soviet science is that Russian leaders have established an extraordinarily consistent record of announcing their technical advances.

On November 6, 1947, Foreign Minister Vyacheslav Molotov stated that the secret of the atomic bomb had ceased to exist. Very few people took this seriously. Two years later, on September 23, 1949, President Truman announced that an atomic explosion had just occurred in the U. S. S. R. For a time, this fact stunned many of our leaders, since nearly everyone believed it would still take Russia many years to develop this weapon. However, we soon returned to a comfortable state of national complacency. This again was temporarily shattered on August 20, 1953, when the Russians announced, and the Atomic Energy Commission confirmed, that the Russians had tested an H-bomb.

During the past 6 months, there have been new Russian statements portending ominous things for our national security. On July 30, 1955, 1 day after a White House announcement that the United States had begun development of a space satellite, the U. S. S. R. announced that the Soviet Interplanetary Commission had been formed 3 months earlier, and that rapid progress was being made on space vehicles. This commission includes one of Russia's greatest physical scientists, Dr. Peter Kapitsa. In August, Prof. G. I. Pokrovsky announced that, "not far off" in the future, Russia would be launching space ships on regular schedules. Four days after Christmas, 1955, Prime Minister Nikolai Bulganin greeted the New Year with the statement that rocket missiles had already been under development for several years and were now becoming intercontinental weapons. On February 18, 1956, Marshal Georgi Zhukov stated that if attacked, Russia would hurl atomic bombs at American cities with large airplanes and "mighty missiles."

Based on past performance, these announcements cannot be regarded as mere hollow boasts. Many of Russia's earlier claims were frighteningly validated at the 1955 atoms-for-peace convention in Geneva. There, the representatives of the Western World were startled by the quality of the technical papers presented by the Soviet scientists, and by the understanding of electronics and nucleonics implicit in the Russian exhibits.

This sweeping, fundamental scientific advance has been reflected in the quality of Soviet air weapons. Within a single year, the Russians have shown us six new types of advanced aircraft. All compare well with the most advanced types now in operation here. These new aircraft are powered by six new types of engine, two of them of extremely advanced design. Their intercontinental turboprop bomber, known as the Bear, discloses Russian advances in at least one technical area which we have only belatedly explored. For a backward nation that became acquainted with modern technology less than 40 years ago, this progress in the quality of Russian aeronautical science is astounding. It is equally astounding, one might add, whether Soviet progress is due to invention or theft.

Perhaps even more disturbing is the Russian ability to produce large quantities of air weapons. This brings us to the race for quantity. No one can walk away from the fact that the Russians have demonstrated an impressive mass-production capacity. They actually display substantial quantities of new aircraft in what has come to be known as their annual "May Day flyby"—the military demonstration they make on their equivalent of the Fourth of July.

OUR FLIERS SAVED US IN KOREA

They have done something even more impressive. They have exported, by gift or sale, large numbers of IL-28's, MIG-15's and MIG-17's.

These exports are full of bad news for us. The MIG-15, for example, gave the best American planes we then had (like the Sabrejet) quite a surprise in Korea. It was the quality of our fliers that saved the day. We know that the MIG-17 is an even better airplane than its predecessor. It is a radar-equipped fighter with better engines and capable of higher altitudes than even the MIG-15. And these are the planes the Russians are giving away.

This speaks most eloquently for both the quality and the quantity of their planes. It also telegraph the distasteful fact that their supporting factories are running in such high gear that they can treat a lot of complicated, hard-to-make items as surplus. This includes the armament, electronic, navigation and gunnery systems associated with the planes they now export. Any nation that can afford to treat these associated systems as "spares" has licked some of the most sophisticated mass-production problems of our day.

The best testimony on the quantity race is by Gen. Nathan F. Twining, chief of staff of the United States Air Force. He says the United States now has many thousand fewer jet aircraft than the Russians. The brutal fact is that we now clearly outnumber the Russians in only one class of airplane, the B-47 medium jet bomber. In all other categories, they either do or can outnumber us.

Today's Air Force was bought 3 years ago. It is behind the Russians in quantity. Its quality lead is also slipping dangerously. Obviously, since the Russians have already begun to outpace us, we must find a way to pick up and maintain enough additional speed in the race, not only to close the gap, but to forge ahead of them.

No one questions the patriotism of the civilians who think the way to pick up this kind of speed is to slow down on men, money, research and planes. But there is every patriotic reason to challenge their judgment.

Although our airpower is lagging, the American people have actually been lulled into believing that by July 1957, we will have achieved the goal of 137 wings of combat aircraft. This is a tragic illusion. Nothing could be less realistic. It is well known by responsible Air Force leaders that the 1956 and 1957 budgets can only adequately support a 120-wing Air Force.

Any serious effort to support 137 wings under these budgets would compel the Air Force to postpone modernization of the striking force. The training of personnel would have to be reduced. Additional units would have to be squeezed onto existing airbases, thereby increasing their vulnerability to attack. Finally, expenditures for maintenance and supplies would have to be slashed, thereby jeopardizing the safety of American airmen. To support a 137-wing Air Force, without downgrading already austere Air Force standards, the air budget would have to be increased at least $4 billion over its present $16½ billion level. Without this increase, it is impossible to achieve 137 combat wings of modern aircraft.

When General Twining recently testified before the Congress that "* * * 137 is just a number * * *" and that "* * * this increase in combat readiness is a goal we are aiming at—not a reality," the cat was out of the bag.

Unhappily, this fact is much better known to the Russians than it is to the American people.

The Soviet Union has arrived at its threatening qualitative and quantative posture in the air by pursuing, with unswerving determination, the goal of technical supremacy over the West.

Traditionally, our American attitude toward support of research and development has been anything but consistent. Prior to World War II, research and development for airpower were the business of private concerns.

As World War II approached, defense budgets for research and development did increase. This, together with industrially sponsored work, allowed us to wage that war with modern equipment. Even so, the astonishing technical developments by the Germans of the turbojet, rocket propulsion, ballistic, and other guided missiles left us no

room for complacency. This was soon forgotten, however, and the peak Air Force research and development budget of 1946 was cut in half in 1947.

It was not until 1951, during the Korean war, that the Air Force research and develcpment budget again reached its 1946 level. During this 1947–51 period, priceless opportunities were lost and not a few of the seeds of our present peril sown.

MISSILE RESEARCH DANGEROUSLY DELAYED

The guided-missile programs which were initiated in 1946 could not be vigorously prosecuted. Our scientists were mostly confined to studying what we might build if money should become available. During some of these years, no money was available at all for intercontinental ballistic-missile development, or even for research in this field. The B–52 was carried, during this period, on a similar basis. Study was confined to a number of hypothetical possibilities before money became available in 1951.

The Korean war scare caused a temporary increase in research and development funds, which was promptly reduced again in 1953. Since that year, Air Force research and development funds have been maintained essentially constant at a figure 20 percent lower than the 1953 cut. We appear to have entered an era quite like that of 1946–51, the consequences of which will only be fully realized 5 or 10 years from now.

During the past 2 years we have had to face the problem of learning to fly and fight at four times the speeds of World War II, and at altitudes so high there is literally no air left. This involves new problems in aerodynamics, electronics, and powerplants, problems not just 4 times as complicated as those of World War II, but more like 40 times as complicated.

America's scientists clearly understand the challenges confronting them. They are acutely aware of the deadly implications of Russian progress. They cannot comprehend, therefore, why we have been prevented from seriously examining a number of fascinating and promising new scientific discoveries. These are called technological breakthroughs. The real reason is simple enough. The answer is the financial limitations which have held us down.

These same shortsighted limitations have also hamstrung the financial support we may allot to vital basic research, the discovery of fundamental, new scientific facts. This is one of the greatest mistakes of our time.

Had the same business-as-usual attitude prevailed in 1941, no money would have been available for the fantastically costly basic research project sponsored by Albert Einstein. No Manhattan project would have come into being to unravel one of the great cosmic mysteries. The logic of budget balancing would have supported the continuing development of bigger and better TNT blockbusters.

How differently the race for world power would have turned out if the Russians had discovered the secret of atomic energy first. Today we are faced with exactly the same kind of decision. But now the budget balancers are in control, and basic research is being sacrificed in favor of the improvement of old ideas. This will look good on today's budget books. Tomorrow's history books may well say that, at this point, the United States gambled irrevocably with its future and passed the dreaded point of no return.

The lack of funds in the 1957 budget also prevents us from capitalizing on many proved developments. An example is our recent experience with the F–84D fighter airplane. We successfully proved our ability to zero-length-launch this aircraft. This means that, with slight modifications, we can shoot this airplane and possibly others into the air like a rocket, with no runway or airfield required. This manned airplane is capable of delivering nuclear weapons at high speed within enemy territory. A few hundred of these aircraft, stationed around the Russian periphery in the countries of our NATO allies, fully equipped with fuel and bombs and with their crews on a 24-hour alert, would constitute a formidable additional deterrent to the Russians. Our NATO allies would then be really equipped to help carry out a realistic policy of massive retaliation. Unfortunately, because of the lack of funds, our military planners are precluded from even considering such a simple improvement.

Take the relatively elementary question of providing our Air Force with enough bases to operate effectively, and to protect itself from devastating attack. Our Strategic Air Command is now crowded onto 33 bases throughout the continental United States. It is also deployed on many overseas bases which might be denied to us in the event or threat of war. Therefore, we now depend very largely on elements of the Strategic Air Command situated on bases within the continental United States.

The Air Force planners within the Strategic Air Command and the Pentagon have repeatedly requested more bases, not only because the Russians have been expanding their base system in Eastern Europe, in the Far East and in the Arctic, but because crowded bases are booby traps. They needlessly endanger both men and planes and jeopardize our ability to retaliate against surprise attack.

The Air Force has also repeatedly asked for funds to train more men, modernize its planes and increase the force of combat-ready aircraft. It has petitioned again and again for more B–52 bombers, one of the few planes that will give us a quality advantage in air power. Our Air Force generals have requested more of these planes because they know the Russians not only have a counterpart in their Bison, but also because they know the Russians have more Bisons than we have B–52's.

Although the State Department for the last 18 months has proclaimed a policy of massive retaliation, the Bureau of the Budget has ignored the pleas of the Air Force for the means to execute it. The ability of the Air Force to retaliate massively is dependent upon:

1. The ability to detect a surprise attack.
2. The capacity to absorb whatever destructive portion of the attack we cannot destroy.
3. The possession of enough remaining strength after we have been hurt to mount a decisive retaliation in the air.
4. Above all, the ability to maintain an overwhelming lead in airplanes and missiles, and the base structure to support them.

Within the Defense Department, the response to these needs has been to maintain a business-as-usual attitude, reduce the budget and limit our expenditures. Meanwhile, the budgeteers have insisted that the research-and-development effort, the force responsible for the strength we have, is wasteful and duplicative.

Both the procedure for establishing the level of expenditure, and the arbitrary manner in which cuts are applied, reflect the same complacency on the part of the civilian leaders in the Pentagon today that provoked Gen. Billy Mitchell's revolt against the defense planners of his time.

Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson has vitalized this wing-collar complacency into a procurement policy known as "fly-before-you-buy." It is the supreme accomplishment of men who believe in saving dollars even if you have to waste time.

TEST MODELS NEVER WON AN AIR WAR

The fly-before-you-buy policy means that each new airplane must be procured in small quantities initially, and be thoroughly tested over a protracted period of time before large-quantity commitments are made. From a budget point of view, this is an excellent precaution. It not only reduces the chances of error but also defers heavy expenses to later years. In the development of automobiles and telephones, this is a necessary and sound business practice. Unfortunately, no battles will be won by hurling one test model of the world's best airplane into the air when the enemy attacks. Such a policy is dangerous to the point of being suicidal. It only assures the Russians that should they take this country over, they will find the budget balanced when they arrive.

During the past 2 years, we have known enough about many advanced aircraft to abandon our supercautious attitude with a negligible degree of technical risk. We must recognize the threat confronting us and adopt the policy of buy—then fly them.

The point is illustrated by the development of one of our most advanced fighter aircraft, the Lockheed F–104. This air weapon was conceived by one of this country's most brilliant aeronautical engineers, Clarence E. (Kelly) Johnson. In 1952, Johnson decided that it was time to develop an extremely high-performance day fighter which could clearly outperform any imaginable Russian air weapon.

He sold his idea to the Air Force and was awarded funds for research. With this money, he proved his theory, and by early in 1954 had a prototype of this magnificent new air weapon in the air. Under the fly-before-you-buy policy, his company, Lockheed Aircraft Corp., obtained a pitifully small order for seventeen 104's. Had a production order been given in 1954, we could have had these airplanes today in operational quantities.

Instead, we recently placed a cautious order for a small production quantity which calls upon less than one-fourth of Lockheed's capacity. These planes will not be operational until the end of 1957. Should we become involved in a little or a big war before then, our airmen will have to be content with something less than the best—a dangerous business in this H-bomb age.

As a nation, we have been extremely lucky that so many of our jet-aircraft experiments have worked. We have a large selection of advanced aircraft to choose from. But, unfortunately, the tragic story of the F–104 has been repeated through a wide range of aircraft weapons. We continue to squander time as though we had invented a way of replacing it.

The F–101, a high-performance fighter, the F–102 and the F–105 all must have their production rates dramatically increased to modernize our fighter Air Force at the winning rate. For in this business of airpower, winning is our only aim.

In the field of bombers, where the production rate of the Russian Bison is clearly ahead of the B–52, we must begin to win by procuring approximately 500 additional aircraft, and by doubling or even tripling the present production rate during the next 15 months. Similarly, we must increase the production quantity and rate for the B–52 companion piece, the KC–135 jet tanker.

These are all large, expensive but necessary steps if we are to meet the growing threat of Russia's air force.

Beginning early last June, the annual dismal, bureaucratic procedure of budget preparation was begun in the Pentagon. Air Force officers charged with the preparation of this budget were concerned about the effectiveness of our existing Air Force. They feared that we might lose the airpower race with the Soviets.

The Air Force reflected its concern in early September with a budget which called for $20 billion of new money for 1957. This budget request was met with an order which said in effect: "You can have no more than $18.8 billion. We don't care what you eliminate to meet this figure—but that is all you're going to get." This was bad, but the worst was yet to come. Between October 10 and December 21, the Air Force was ordered to make 11 separate revisions in its budget.

This abnormal series of revisions and cuts finally hacked the 11th version of the budget to a flat $16 billion for airpower.

Dismayed, several senior members of the Air Force management team finally prevailed upon the Secretary of Defense to increase the 11th version by one-half billion dollars. The 12th and final version of the Air Force budget, calling for $16½ billion, was submitted to the Congress. However, a great price was exacted in return for even this inadequate increase. The civilian leaders who accepted it were committed to "hold still," to forbear from pleading their case to the public or the Congress.

In the face of this, a concerned chief of staff, torn between his earlier endorsement of a much higher budget and his dedication to the principle of civilian control, characterized the budget before Congress as "austere" and capable only of meeting "our most essential needs on a minimum basis." Lest there be any doubt remaining about the real meaning behind his statement, General Twining significantly added, "To keep this minimum program going and to reach and support 137 wings will require an increased budget in 1958."

Prior to writing this article, I resigned as civilian manager of the Air Force research-and-development program over an honest and basic difference of opinion with the Secretary of Defense as to whether budget balancing or airpower was the more important. I believe that with all the facts available the people of this country should not be subjected to the dire consequences of possessing the world's second-best Air Force.

Modern Seapower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been invited to a speech delivered by Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, more than a month ago in Baltimore. As a veteran of the Navy during World War II, I found the remarks of Admiral Burke to be extremely interesting as well as reassuring. I am certain they should prove equally interesting to other Members. Admiral Burke's remarks follow:

ADDRESS BY ADM. ARLEIGH A. BURKE, UNITED STATES NAVY, CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, BEFORE THE BALTIMORE EXECUTIVES CLUB, BALTIMORE, MD., MARCH 19, 1956

It is good to be back in Baltimore again. Baltimore is home to a lot of Navy men past and present. Baltimore will be home to many Navy men in the future. Many of us remember Baltimore as the big city through which we passed on the last leg of our journey to enter the Naval Academy. In fact, Baltimore is considered by many as the home port of the United States Naval Academy, and some of the Naval Academy's major home athletic events are staged here.

Baltimore is home to the Navy for another reason. Its history is steeped in naval lore. Many famous naval commanders came from Baltimore. Adm. Raymond A. Spruance, one of our greatest combat commanders of World War II, was born here. Joshua Barney, another son of Baltimore, participated in the gallant defense of his homeland against the British in 1814.

It was here in Baltimore under the supervision of Thomas Truxton that *Constellation*, one of the great ships of our history, was built at the cost of $314,000. *Constellation* was one of the first men-of-war authorized by Congress. Her exploits gave courage to our struggling Republic at a low point in our history. The famous Baltimore clippers were fitted out here by the merchants of Baltimore. Those were the ships which exacted such a heavy toll of merchant shipping right under the guns of the powerful British Navy.

The city of Baltimore has suffered from the sea; she has also profited from the sea. Baltimore is one of our great seaports today. She is the third leading port in the United States in import-export commerce. From the point of view of a sailor, there is no limit to the future of Baltimore as a great seaport. Baltimore today is one of our country's gateways to the world. Anyone who observes the flags of many nations flown by the ships moving in and out of this great seaport must realize that Baltimore is a nextdoor neighbor to every seaport in the world by way of the sea.

The influence of the sea on the growth, the prosperity, and the security of Baltimore has been great in the past. Its influence will be even greater in the future.

The importance of the seas to prosperity and security of the entire United States will continue to increase. One need only glance at a globe to see why. This earth of ours is covered by a world-encircling ocean. The principal land areas, that is, the continents, are actually large islands in this great world ocean. The oceans provide deep waterways into the very heart of the continents—waterways like the Mediterranean Sea, Chesapeake Bay, the Gulf of Mexico, and many others. These waterways provide access to the important economic and population centers of the world.

Traffic on the oceans and seas of the world is very heavy. Ocean traffic has been increasing year after year. Today, for example, from 2,000 to 2,500 ocean-going ships are at sea in the Atlantic Ocean areas plying the trade routes transporting the immense traffic of civilization—traffic which increases in volume year by year. This ocean traffic is the lifeblood of civilization. It is the lifeblood of many nations. Cut off this traffic and nations die. Protect this traffic, keep it moving, and nations live and continue to grow and prosper. This is the reason that in time of war, the great oceans become a giant, interconnected battlefield. The victor on this giant oceanic battlefield gains access to the majority of the populations and the resources of the world. He who has command of the seas can, in his own time, assemble and motivate these vast human and material resources against the land of his enemy. The loser on this oceanic battlefield stands isolated, cut off from the resources and help of others. He must prepare himself as best he can for an isolated, last-ditch defense in and over his own homeland. Once control of the seas is lost, he can do little more than postpone the inevitable defeat which he faces.

As the years go by, the violence of warfare increases. This is true on and over the land; it is also true on, over, and under the seas. A hundred and forty years ago, Baltimore's Fort McHenry was bombarded from the sea. In those days, the citizens of Baltimore looked out over the water and saw the danger that confronted their city. The range of the naval weapons of those days was 2 or 3 miles. The destruction power of those early weapons was relatively small. The range of naval weapons of today and tomorrow are many, many times greater. The power of modern naval weapons is increasing by leaps and bounds. Navies are moving ahead into the age of nuclear power, nuclear weapons, and supersonic aircraft. In this nuclear age, it becomes of vital importance to every man, woman, and child in the United States that the United States Navy be able to control what goes on out at sea. Where our forebears were concerned only with what was happening within a radius of 2 or 3 miles of their homes, as was the case in the bombardment of Fort McHenry, we must now conecrn ourselves with what is happening 100 miles at sea, 500 miles, 1,000 miles, 1,500 miles, and beyond. The immense power and range of modern naval weapons has presented new problems to the Navy, new problems to the people of the United States—problems which must be faced and solved if we are to survive and prosper.

The importance of navies is increasing as we move ahead into the nuclear-missile age. The importance of control of the seas is increasing. Most of our friends and allies are located across the seas. The free world is actually an oceanic confederation. The free world depends for its existence upon the sea communications which bind it together. Cut off our sea communications, and many countries of the free world will find themselves isolated, without help, without reinforcements, and at the mercy of some totalitarian aggressor.

Our Government recognizes the importance of sea communications to our security. We know this because one of the cornerstones of our foreign policy is collective security. We have mutual defense treaties with 42 nations, and other commitments with 20 more nations—all overseas. These treaties would not be worth the paper they are written on if the United States Navy should lose control of the seas, even temporarily.

We know, of course, that our Government has no intention of giving up control of the seas under any circumstances. To prove it, we have backed up our vast overseas commitments by keeping large detachments of our Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps deployed on three continents across both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. We have developed over the years a huge overseas investment in foreign aid programs, in a worldwide system of air bases, in stockpiles, in the thousands of men we have deployed overseas. Unless the United States remains supreme on the seas, our overseas forces and bases, our overseas interests, our allies, will face capture or destruction. If we should be cut off from our overseas forces and our allies, we in the United States will be isolated and will face eventual military defeat.

Today, the Navy has tremendous responsibilities. These responsibilities are increasing as our overseas interests increase and as the threat to our control of the sea increases.

The Navy has tremendous responsibilities in the cold war as well as in limited war and all-out nuclear war.

Let us consider these responsibilities only briefly. Take all-out nuclear war first. In case of an all-out atomic surprise attack, naval forces ready for action at sea will be among the first to retaliate. Perhaps after both sides have made their initial strikes, the United States' ability to take further action will depend on the mobile striking power we have dispersed at sea.

The Navy's responsibilities in case of limited war are also very important. It would have been impossible, for example, to stem the Communist attack on the Republic of Korea in 1950 if the United States Navy had not been ready, nearby, and on the job. It would not have been possible to destroy the Communist offensive poyer by the Inchon landing if the United States Navy and the United States Marine Corps had not been on the job ready for action on relatively short notice.

Let us now consider the Navy's cold war responsibilities. The United States Navy is carrying the load today in the cold war. Our powerful 6th and 7th Fleets are guarding the interests of the United States in the principal trouble spots of the world. Today, those trouble spots just happen to be in the western Pacific and the eastern Mediterranean. Tomorrow, the trouble areas may shift elsewhere. But wherever trouble is brewing, the United States Navy will be first at the scene, ready for action. Our ships will stand guard in troubled waters in a quiet, unprovoking manner, as long as it is in the interests of the United States to do so.

Here is something else that is important. Those who serve overseas in our 6th and 7th Fleets promote a feeling of confidence, good will, and friendliness toward the United States among the countries they visit. This sort of good will cannot be measured in terms of dollars or military hardware.

Now, just a brief word about our competition. If the aggressor can destroy the unity of the free world, he will have gone a long way toward achieving his goal of world domination. The Communists are working hard today—very hard—to destroy free world unity. They are using every political trick, every economic maneuver, that they can possibly think of to destroy free world unity. Their political and economic strategy is isolate and destroy, divide and conquer. Once unity is destroyed, they will be able to gobble up the free world in bite-size chunks. This same strategy of divide and conquer carries over into the military field. In case of war, the aggressor will attempt to isolate the areas which he desires to absorb and then destroy or capture, isolate and destroy, divide and conquer. This is the basic strategy of political, economic and military aggression. This is the strategy with which we are faced today; a strategy being pursued by a strong, determined, persistent Communist police state. This strategy will fail if the free world stands together. The free world can stand together if the United States Navy can do its job.

There is no question but that the Communists recognize the importance of sea communications to the free world. They have been engaged in an unprecedented naval building program since World War II. They have allocated critical materials to this program—critical steel, electronic equipment, fire-control equipment, and manpower—which they could ill afford unless they considered this project extremely important. They have allocated resources far beyond their purely naval defensive needs. They have a powerful submarine fleet, it is still growing. They are building new cruisers, new destroyers, at a very rapid rate. They are expanding their naval aviation, they are expanding their overall air capability to attack and destroy vital shipping. This is the isolate part of their basic military strategy of isolate and destroy, divide and conquer.

The Communists have made and are still making, rapid progress in nuclear weapons, guided missiles and electronics. Many of their new developments have surprised us in the past. We could be surprised again.

The threat to the United States' control of the seas is growing, but the United States Navy is not standing idle. We have a tough problem, but we are determined to meet the threat; we are determined to meet our world-wide responsibilities for control of the seas, come what may. We are determined to meet our day-to-day cold war commitments as well.

The United States Navy is ready today. It must be ready to fight and win today or tomorrow if we are called upon. We must be ready to fight with today's ships, with today's aircraft, with today's weapons. We must be ready to defeat today's aggressor today, if necessary. However, while we maintain our readiness today on our far-flung oceanic frontiers, the United States Navy is also moving rapidly and confidently into the nuclear-missile age.

We are shifting to nuclear power as fast as we can. The performance of the submarine *Nautilus*, for example, has been far beyond our expectations. We are moving ahead with a comprehensive program for nuclear-powered attack submarines and guided-missiles submarines. We are preparing to build a nuclear-powered missile cruiser, and are designing a nuclear power-plant for an aircraft carrier.

Nuclear power in our ships will give us tremendous advantages, many of which are only now becoming apparent. Nuclear power will greatly increase the endurance of our ships, the mobility of our ships. It will cut down a major logistic problem—the problem of frequent refueling. In the nuclear-powered ship, top speed also becomes the sustained cruising speed. This is particularly important in smaller ships which now must be refueled so often. Nuclear-powered ships will not need boiler uptakes or smokestacks. This will give them more room for the new aircraft and the powerful new weapons we have coming along. We will be able to design our nuclear-powered ships primarily around their powerplant and the weapons they carry rather than around their fuel-carrying capacity as is the case with present ships. We will be able to design ships with much greater resistance to atomic blast, heat, and radiation. Even today's ships have greater resistance to atomic weapon damage than almost any other type of structure or military hardware. Our new ships will be even tougher.

Naval aviation is moving rapidly into the supersonic age. We will soon be operating supersonic planes from our new attack carriers of the *Forrestal* class. We are developing faster, better attack aircraft. We are developing high-performance fighter aircraft.

The new jet seaplane which is being constructed here at the Martin plant in Baltimore has tremendous possibilities. It looks like a natural. It is fast. It has long range. It carries a heavy load. It will be able to operate from sea areas all over the world using submarines or surface ships for bases. Nuclear power for aircraft will be here some day. When that day comes our seaplanes will have nuclear power.

We are shifting from conventional power to nuclear power; we are shifting from guns to guided missiles; we are shifting from subsonic to supersonic aircraft. We are increasing our capability to detect and knock down attacking aircraft from very high altitudes and at very long range. We are increasing our ability to sink submarines at long ranges. We are developing long-range, surface-to-surface missiles that will greatly increase our Navy's long-range offensive power. We are developing amphibious techniques that will enable our Marines to land from the sea against all types of enemy coasts and all types of enemy opposition. All these things we are developing simultaneously.

So you can see that the science of naval warfare is advancing at a very rapid rate. It is therefore more important than ever that the citizens of our country be kept up to date on the increasing power of new naval weapons and upon the increasing importance of the Navy. The United States needs the most powerful, modern Navy that science can devise if we are to maintain our naval supremacy in the nuclear-missile age.

Keeping our Navy supreme on the seas is everybody's job. Everyone in the United States Navy, from boot seaman to admiral, is working hard at the task of making a better, more effective Navy. We also need the help of every citizen in the United States. What we need, more than anything else, from our citizens is their understanding of the tremendous problems we face. The Navy needs your enthusiastic support in our efforts to stay on top of these problems.

We know that our job is difficult. But we know that we are improving; we know that we are moving ahead; we know that we have the best Navy in the world today. We know that it will be better in the future. With the understanding and support of the people of our country, we know that we will be ready to do anything that our country requires of us.

Supreme Court Chisels Away at States Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a very important article by Mr. William Henry Chamberlin which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on Monday, April 23. The editorial is entitled "Eroding Rights," and in it Mr. Chamberlin points out that in three recent cases the Supreme Court has embarked upon an increased and undesirable trend to diminish the authority and responsibility of State and local agencies of Government, especially in the field of legislation dealing with the Communist conspiracy.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important analysis of the Supreme Court's action, and it is high time that Congress moves to prevent this usurpation of legislative authority.

The article by Mr. Chamberlin follows:

ERODING RIGHTS—THE ASSAULT ON STATE AND LOCAL AUTHORITY CONTINUES, AS SOME RECENT INSTANCES MAKE ABUNDANTLY CLEAR

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

There have been three recent instances of an increasing and undesirable trend to diminish the authority and responsibility of State and local agencies of Government—notably their power to deal with Communists.

One was the Supreme Court's annulment of State laws against sedition on the ground that the Federal Government has preempted this field. This makes the uncovering of the hidden roots of Communist conspiracy more difficult, and some State legislative committees and law enforcement agencies have performed useful services in that regard.

The ruling also diminishes the general authority of the States, which has been steadily declining in proportion as the Federal bureaucracy has been expanding in power and numbers. Many expected the present Administration to reverse this trend, but its achievements so far have been disappointing.

A second hint of the erosion of local rights is Attorney General Brownell's suggestion, not yet enacted into law, for eliminating the existing requirement that all State administrative and judicial remedies be exhausted before access can be had to the Federal courts. The affront to State sovereignty in this proposal is obvious.

OVERRIDING A RIGHT

Finally, there is the Supreme Court decision which overrides the right of New York

City to dismiss employees who invoke the self-incrimination provision of the fifth amendment to avoid answering questions about their official conduct put to them by a properly constituted authority. The case at issue was that of Professor Harry Slochower, who refused under the fifth amendment to answer the question of a Senate investigating committee about alleged past Communist affiliations. Under a New York City regulation he was automatically dismissed.

This Supreme Court decision was given by a 5-to-4 majority. In other words, considerations of law and equity were pretty evenly balanced. What was good law to 5 justices was bad law to 4.

And indeed the ruling that Slochower was unjustly treated and entitled to reinstatement seems questionable on 2 grounds. State and municipal authorities possess the right to take measures against Communist infiltration in schools. And they have a right to exercise reasonable discretion in establishing terms of employment.

The dissent framed by Justice Reed with the concurrence of Justices Minton and Burton (Justice Harlan entered a separate dissent on a slightly different basis) contains an incisive statement on the implications and limitations of the fifth amendment:

"Cities, like other employers may reasonably conclude that a refusal to furnish appropriate information is enough to justify discharge. Legally authorized bodies have a right to demand that citizens furnish facts pertinent to official inquiries. The duty to respond may be refused for personal protection against prosecution only, but such avoidance of public duty to furnish information can properly be considered to stamp the employee as a person unfit to hold certain official positions."

Justice Harlan, in his separate dissent, backs up this line of reasoning with the following observation: "I think that a State may justifiably consider that teachers who refuse to answer questions concerning their official conduct are no longer qualified for public schoolteaching, on the ground that their refusal to answer jeopardizes the confidence that the public should have in its school system."

REFUTED VIEW

These considered opinions, delivered by high legal authorities, are calculated to refute the view that no inference may properly be drawn from the resort to the fifth amendment in cases involving communism and corruption. The fifth amendment, it is true, specifies that no individual may be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself. But it does not specify that this individual shall enjoy the same esteem and confidence in the eyes of his neighbors, of the general public, of his employer, whether public or private, after he has invoked the amendment.

A university so well-known for its broad and tolerant conception of academic freedom as Harvard has pronounced members of its faculty who invoked the fifth amendment before congressional investigating committees as guilty of misconduct, although not so grave, unless aggravated by other circumstances, as to warrant dismissal. Other universities and colleges have treated the resort to the fifth amendment as cause for dismissal.

The overwhelming majority of the American people are opposed to Communists in Government offices and also to Communist teachers in schools. And this is not, as doctrinaire libertarians would have us believe, because of prejudice against a small group with unpopular views.

It is because Communists and Communist sympathizers in Government employment have habitually betrayed their trust and used their positions for purposes of espionage and for influencing policy decisions in favor of the interests of a hostile foreign power. It is because Communist teachers are bound by party discipline to abuse their positions for purposes of indoctrination.

ANOTHER BLOW

In view of these considerations, it does not seem that the New York City regulation, upset by the Supreme Court ruling, was unreasonable or out of line with public sentiment. What does seem clear is that this ruling, like that on sedition, is another blow to local rights and responsibilities.

In a Nation so large as the United States and so varied in social and economic traditions and conditions, complete centralization of power in the Federal Government is undesirable and probably unworkable. It would be well to consider carefully the implications not only of the fifth but also of the tenth amendment: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people."

You're Wonderful—In a Changing World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I was fortunate to be a guest at the closing luncheon meeting of the First Women's Congress on Housing here in our Nation's Capital and I was impressed by all I saw and heard.

Here were 100 women from all parts of our country, a large proportion of them mothers of big families, giving their Government their views on housing. The delegates at my table were most enthusiastic. One said she wished the sessions could be continued for a longer period; another added she had become so impressed by the approach of our housing people in Washington she felt better about paying taxes.

There was one speaker of the day and she was Mrs. Joan Wade Rindlaub, a New York advertising expert, and her theme was You're Wonderful—in a Changing World. She complimented the delegates on their obviously sincere efforts to be a part of the solution, not a part of the problem.

Her address follows:

YOU'RE WONDERFUL—IN A CHANGING WORLD

Hello, all you nice people. I know why you're here and it seems to me a fine thing. High time somebody got around to asking women what they want in their world—what have we been waiting around for all this time anyway?

You see I write advertising. In my business we have to know all about women. So we go out and ask questions. Golly, we've learned a lot about you by asking questions. The nicest things. And the darndest things. We find out that you're kind of afraid to make cake—cakes don't come out so good for you—so someone goes out and comes up with a cake mix so woman-proof that anyone can make it and we can guarantee it will come out perfect every time. And it does—and you love us for it—things like that. Or we find out that you aren't afraid of cakes but frostings are your problem, couldn't you just sort of throw on a sauce—so we think up a lot of sauces for you to throw on—things like that. Goes on all the time. You'd think everybody knows when people eat—breakfast, lunch and dinder, that's when. Or is it? Nope. More food is downed in this country at a fourth meal that's kind of snuck up between 9 o'clock and midnight than between 6 and 9 in the morning. Or so you tell us when we ask questions. You'd think everyone knows where people eat. In the diningroom, that's where. Yes—if you're not eating in the kitchen or out on the terrace or down in the game room or on the living-room floor. What do people eat? Now it gets really complicated. I could take a long time to tell you all about you on that one—there's only one thing that really matters though. You're eating a lot better, all of you, than you did even as short a time as 10 years ago. So you see why we have to keep asking questions to keep up with your changing world.

I've been thinking about this midcentury of ours. Think of the life of a boy born in 1900. Could his mother have foreseen the changes ahead for that bit of humanity—from the horse and buggy to the car and plane and jet—from slow-mail to wireless and telegraph and telephone and the Atlantic cable and radio and television. From 10-day boats to the Queen Mary—(just this year, for the first time, more passengers flew the Atlantic than crossed by ship.) From gas lamps to indirect lighting. From red flannels to nylon briefs. From sulfur and molasses to sulfathiazole. From the music box to hi-fi. From palm-leaf fans to air conditioning. From coal stoves to electric ranges built in the wall. From cold cellars to home freezers. From lantern slides to cinerama. From radios with earphones to portables for your purse. From outside Chic Sales to bathrooms with twin tubs. From the ear trumpet to the transitor. Whee! That was a half century! The boy of 1900 lived in a house that had never known an electric washing machine, dishwasher, vacuum cleaner, toast, iron, range. It had never seen a soap flake or detergent or a bug bomb—nor frozen foods or canned milk or baby foods—nor cake mixes or brown-and-serves or ice cream packed in dry ice. Not one of all that gay array of things in boxes and bottles and cans. The department store his rocking horse came from had never sold a radio or a TV or a sunlamp or a zipper or a wrist watch. The dressmaker who came to the house to outfit the family knew nothing of rayon or nylon or orlon or dacron. A man could buy a suit of sorts, but a woman would find it hard to buy a ready-made dress or a permanent wave. Mother got along, who can tell how well, with no more cosmetics than a little rag she called "My shammy." The old man manned the office minus bookkeeping machines and electric typewriters and ballpoint pens.

Don't let me bore you. This is your world. You've lived through it—through the tranquil years of the early 1900's the war years, the mad twenties, the sad thirties, the turbulent forties, and the constantly demanding, challenging, stand-your-world-on-end years since the Second World War.

In a Fanny Farmer cookbook at the turn of the century there was a prophetic statement. "There's a new-fangled kind of yeast that comes in a little compressed cake and some women have found that it is perfectly safe to use it." There have been new-fangled yeasts afermenting in a thousand and one fields through the half-century just past and some women and some men, too, have found them more than perfectly safe—they have been richly profitable. New-fangled yeasts. They've fermented in your life, too, I'm suspecting. I know they have in mine.

Do you have a little more money to spend than your mother at your age? Do you spend it a little more freely? You're right at home in the changing world. Have you traveled more? Everybody's doing it.

Do you have a little more education? Will your children have a little more than you? Changing world. Today's customer has been around more. She's moving more. Five million moves a year—4 moves to a family in the last 10 years. No wonder men want to know what you want in your houses.

There are more women with jobs in today's world—1 in every 2 women in the labor force is married. More than 1 in 4 mothers manages an outside job. More children in school. More people over 65. These facts color our wants and our needs.

And other forces stretch and widen our imagination and our taste. For today's customer has read more—more books, more magazines, more serious reading. She's heard more and better music. She's enjoyed more art. She's seen more of the world on TV. She's been more involved—in clubs and churches and community activities. And so the people who go out to ask you questions and the people who sit at home and study the answers agree on a great many things—today's customer, they report, not only has more money and more leisure and more children and more work and more play but—you will like this one—she has more sense. This, I think, is a fine thing. Fine thing for men to find out. Of course, we've known it all the time. But the new awareness of women's basic intelligence and good sense has had a wholesome influence on today's advertising and selling programs. It is one big reason for things like this conference. There's a new maturity in a lot of the programs and products intended for you these days—because men know that, because you have more sense, your picture of the good life has changed a little.

This year in my business we are all beginners, finding out afresh all about our customers and their good life. For you make your buying choices, says the 20th Century Fund's study, America's Economic Resources, you choose the kind of a life you wish to lead, according to your own picture of the good life.

This is important—to Government and to business. And it's easy to show you why. Suppose for a minute you picture the good life as a free, untrammeled, outdoor life, a casual life. You can see for yourself that a cosmetic manufacturer would need to know that—he has to look for ways to give you loose, easy curls, not tight, city-looking hairdos. And a food manufacturer would want to come up with quick and easy convenience foods, not slow and complex recipes. And a clothing manufacturer would want to dream up slacks and separates and play clothes and pay less attention to formal gowns. And an automobile manufacturer might build new station wagons and bring out his cars in gay country colors. And an electrical manufacturer might come up with ways for you to take electrical conveniences along outdoors—outdoor cooking equipment, picnic equipment—or might develop new ways to cut your time in the house so you can have more of the good life as you want it.

So you see it all begins with you. You dream up your good life and we work to make your dreams come true.

What is it like, this good life, as American customers picture it—and live it—today? It's a spending life, the books tell us. It's a spending life, this good life. The 20th Century Fund says, rather grandly, today's customer has "a propensity to spend." Men used to call it money burning holes in her pocket. You are ready to pay for the good life as you see it. You've been buying more durables—things that last, like houses, refrigerators, new stoves, new cars. You've been spending more, deliberately more, for food. You've been spending less for movies, more for television. You've been buying less clothes. Clothes don't seem to be the symbol of the good life that they used to be any more.

The good life is a family life. You've been marrying younger, having first babies younger, second babies younger—confounding the experts by having more children than they expected.

The good life is a country life. You got off of the farm and into the city and learned a few things, and now you're heading back for the country, or at least for the new suburbia, as fast as you can say "split level ranch house with a first and second mortgage."

The good life is a homesome thing—a stay-at-home life. It's a do-things-together life. The Overstreets call it "togetherness"—and they take a pleasant view of it. "The new Adam," they say, "is not embarrassed to be seen drying the dishes or attending a PTA meeting. He is the right sort of companion for the new Eve, the many-sided, resourceful, yet feminine woman of today." What are Adam and Eve up to in their new togetherness? You know. You're cooking together. You're down in the workshop together. You're praying together in the greatest revival of religion this country has ever known. You're playing together—active sports, parlor games, community activities. You're taking trips together—going on picnics together—bringing up the children together. Who's putting on wallpaper these days? Paperhangers? Nope. Sixty percent of all wallpaper going up in America is put on by Adam and Eve. Eve soaks the strips of paper, Adam puts them up. Who's laying linoleum? Adam and Eve. Who's doing the dishes? Adam and Eve—or sometimes poor, lone Adam.

I was riding on a bus on New Jersey's route 4 recently. The bus stopped at the New Jersey side of the George Washington Bridge and a young couple came aboard. The little wife sat down near me. Her tall, blonde husband paid the driver and came on through the bus. "Come on back, honey," he told his wife quietly. "There's a better seat back there together." They weren't going far. Just across the bridge. Five minutes. But 5 minutes or 5 years—they had found a deep secret of the good life—the secret of togetherness.

I've been telling you some of the reasons why we know good things about you. Explaining, I hope, a little bit of why American government and American business are both working harder today to understand you and your present and your future.

To keep this booming civilization of ours on an even keel, it is not enough for government or business merely to meet your wants and needs. We have constantly upon us the obligation to be out in front of you—to help broaden your picture of the good life—that you may profit by the new abundance.

That you may profit by the new abundance. That, I think, is the keynote of much of the thinking in government and business today. And a lot of people are working at it. The electrical industry is working at it.

At the beginning of this century less than 2 percent of the homes in the United States were wired for electricity. Today we've reversed that—98 percent are wired.

Today electricity can heat our homes, warm our blankets (and baby's bottle), supply us with limitless hot water, cook our meals, and wash and dry the dishes afterward. Electricity can cool our homes, freeze our food, cool and dry and circulate our air, make ice cream, and give us a limitless supply of ice cubes. Electricity can wash, dry, and iron our clothes, clean house, entertain us, and light our homes so they'll glow with charm and cheer.

Sounds like a wonderful world to live in, doesn't it? But is it? Nope. And you know why: Half of all the homes in the United States were built before 1925. In those days homes were wired for lights and the 15 appliances then available. The annual electrical consumption of the average home was 400 kilowatt-hours. Today there are 54 electrical wonders on the homeowner's list of things to buy—the average consumption figure has jumped to more than 2,700 kilowatt-hours. But what about the wiring? Fuses are popping like champagne corks all over the land.

It isn't only older homes that suffer. New homes—millions of them—being built today are being equipped with minimum electrical power. (Oh, the poor benighted unimaginative minimum.) The cost difference between the minimum and the ideal is small, but when new homes are built on a let's-save-every-penny-possible basis the wiring suffers and many homes are sold today with wiring that's obsolete even before the first owner moves in.

A lot is being done about this. A lot is being done to educate the millions of perspiring, pillow-punching, sleep-hungry people who plank down hard-earned money for an air conditioner—only to find that their home doesn't have the "housepower" to make the thing perform. A lot is being done about the millions who save and save and finally buy mother that shiny efficient rotisserie—only to find that when it's on, and the refrigerator starts up, the fuse blows and the whole house is plunged into darkness. A lot is being done to tell appliance buyers that in order to live better—electrically—they need three things, enough power (service entrance) from the electric utility company; enough circuits and outlets at convenient places all around the home; and the wonderful electrical products and appliances that roll off our factory assembly lines in mouth-watering decorator colors.

A lot is being done by the makers of building materials to give you things that you want—more space, or the effect of more space, in your houses, more color, more texture and textured materials, more soundproofing, more informality in design and colors, more practical interior surfaces—easy-to-clean-floors, washable walls, more freedom from housework, more time for your family. A lot is being done by the makers of modern living fibers to give you rugs and curtains and slip covers and draperies that are easy to wash and quick to dry and practical and beautiful, too. A lot is being done to understand you better—your need to love and to be loved, to be understood and respected and liked. You are hungry, and you want to be fed with a minimum of trouble and a maximum of satisfaction. You are weary, and you want to be housed with a minimum of work and a maximum of comfort. You are busy and you want to be clothed with a minimum of trouble and a maximum of good appearance. You are lonely islands, you want understanding and things that will help you to be understood. You get up in the morning and work hard all day and you come home tired and there's always something to worry about, somebody is mad or somebody is sad or somebody is broke or somebody is blue. You have big worries and little worries and the days go by and the years go by and things don't work out the way you hoped. We who ask questions, we who plan programs, we who write editorials and advertising, we know these things about you. More and more we are trying to be helpful, to be understanding, to give you new ideas to make your lives gayer or brighter or simpler or in some definite fashion more livable. We are trying to satisfy your deep-down needs.

For just as the world has grown in the last 50 years, so I think that every individual must grow bigger, stronger, deeper, grow in understanding, grow in awareness, grow in stature, to meet the mixed-up world's demands.

I ran across a question the other day—Are you part of the problem or part of the solution? The Government is trying, and manufacturers are trying, to be part of the solution to your problems—not to make more

problems for you. But I think you will want to try, too. Try to be part of the solution of the safety problem—this is something only you can do. You can make a safety tour of your house, as a mother, as a father, as your home's safety engineer. You can get the whole family into the act, march around the house and have every member of the family think up ways to make the place safer to live in—bigger ashtrays, less trash, no oil-soaked waste. A safety tour of the upstairs and the downstairs and the backyard and the frontyard and the cellar and the attic, with everybody working on how to beware of the flying rug and the glassy tub and the too-hot coffee and the too-cold family, because the accident-prone are the lorn and the lone. These are your problems—you can help in their solution. Try a comfort tour of your house, too—are the lights where you need them and the ashtrays where you want them and the pillows plump and the chairs inviting? Is your house a comfortable place to be, are you a comfortable woman to be with? Are you problem, or solution?

Are you making your house a home where your children can put down roots? Are you filling it with the good things that will give them wings—the books, the paintings, the music, the laughter, the love, above all, the love. I heard a story the other day about a 5-year-old who sent a message to her grandmother. "Give Granny all my love," she told her mother. And then, overcome by the enormity of the gift, she stopped short and thought it over. Then her face cleared. "It's all right," she said. "I can make more by morning." The home where love is in endless supply, where you can always make some more by morning—that is a good home to live in, whether or not it measures up to all these dreams you've been giving your Government. And I suspect that all of you are such deep down wonderful people that you will go home and warm it with your own glow so that your house, on your street, in your town, in your State, in your Nation, may forever, under God, be part of the solution, not the problem. May God bless you, as the prayer book puts it, in your innocent endeavors—and may you have a safe trip home.

Now Pass It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago American of Tuesday, April 24, 1956:

NOW PASS IT

The American people are on the verge of having their highway congestion problems settled. The House Committee on Public Works has produced an excellent highway bill and the House soon will pass judgment on it.

The Hearst newspapers urgently recommend the passage of this legislation.

Its fundamental provisions—the allotment of Federal aid to the several road systems of the 48 States and the tax schedule which will finance that aid—have been intelligently prepared and are almost unanimously approved by everyone who understands the highway problem and its solution.

Other provisions, the fringe provisions, are more controversial because of the special interests concerned, but in no case do they warrant a vote against the bill.

In the opinion of the Hearst newspapers, which have carefully followed and enthusiastically supported this legislation from its inception, the passage of this bill is in the national interest.

Any reasons that still exist to oppose it are based on such petty, narrow, self-serving reasons that those Representatives who vote against it become subject to appraisal as petty, narrow, self-serving individuals.

We believe they will be so appraised by the public they are elected to serve.

Out of our knowledge of this subject may we say this:

A vote against this bill is a vote for chaos in the highway field.

A vote for it is a vote in the national interest of the people of the United States.

Forest and Woodlands Recreation and Wildlife Use Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, along with a number of my colleagues, legislation which has as its broad objective assuring greater public multiple resource use of more than 160 million acres of public domain lands in the United States and Alaska classified as commercial forest areas and woodland areas, and administered by the Department of the Interior.

These vast areas of public domain—whether known or unknown in all respects, and whether developed or undeveloped—contain valuable public resources: land and water resources, mineral and material resources, timber and grazing resources, fish and wildlife resources, recreational, scenic, and wilderness resources.

PRESENT RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

The public land laws provide for entry on these areas for resource utilization. The Secretary of the Interior has authority to permit harvesting of timber; the lands embraced within the proposed legislation contain an estimated 411 billion board feet of timber, nearly half of it—199 billion board-feet—located on lands classified as commercial forest land. The bulk of the lands covered in the bill—125 million acres—are located in Alaska, but 22 States contain a total of 4.1 million acres of commercial forest lands and 13 States contain nearly 30 million acres of woodlands.

Grazing is presently permitted on substantial acreages of the lands covered by the bill through operation of the Taylor Grazing Act; water resources development is authorized under the general reclamation law; the Flood Control Acts assure necessary activity in the field of navigation and flood control; and watershed management and development is assured through joint activities of the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture. The lands are, in the main, subject to entry under the general mining law, Mineral Leasing Act, and the Materials Disposals Act.

NEED FOR THE BILL

Notwithstanding the foregoing, I feel, as do many of my colleagues, that there is not presently clear-cut and sufficient enough authority in the Secretary of the Interior to assure full utilization of certain other resource values on these lands, nor are sufficient funds made available.

Congress, through enactment of public land laws now on the statute books, has provided for substantial multiple resource use of Interior-managed woodlands and forest lands, but has not to date authorized expenditure of funds for maximum public recreational uses, for improvement and maintenance of wildlife habitat values, and for providing adequate safety, sanitation, and health measures and facilities.

The legislation introduced today, would, in my view, remedy the present situation, and at the same time would permit continuation of present multiple resource utilization under the general public land laws. As introduced, the bill would authorize the appropriation of not to exceed $3.5 million annually, from the share of the United States' receipts from these lands, to carry out the program envisaged.

WHAT THE BILL WOULD NOT DO

Before turning to an analysis of what the bill will do, I should like to make some brief observations of what I intend the bill to not do.

It is not intended that the bill operate to disturb or diminish the share of receipts from the lands involved which are presently credited to the States and counties; the basic funds to be expended would come from the share of the United States.

It is not intended that the recreational program or wildlife habitat development program authorized shall interfere in any respect with presently authorized development and utilization of these areas under existing public land laws. In short, the newly authorized programs would have to go forward compatible with presently authorized activities; mining, mineral leasing, and materials development; timber harvesting; grazing; water resource utilization; and related activities.

It is not intended that the legislation interfere with, or modify, operation of present laws providing for the selection of lands by States under the school land selection, lieu selection, and related laws.

It is not intended that the legislation, as proposed, be construed as authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to levy charges and fees not presently authorized by law.

Finally, it is not intended that the legislation proposed be construed as authorizing further land acquisition by

the United States; on the contrary, the bill explicitly prohibits land acquisition.

WHAT THE BILL WOULD DO

There follows an analysis of the provisions of the forest and woodlands use legislation introduced today; there is also included information indicating the statistical scope, by States, of the legislation:

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS

1. Section 1 constitutes a congressional policy declaration that—

(a) All of the resources of the public domain shall be so managed, conserved, utilized and developed as to assure maximum public use thereof.

(b) Public use for purposes of recreation is a beneficial use of public domain forest lands and woodlands.

(c) Development and maintenance of such areas for maximum safety, sanitation, and wildlife habitat values, and the concurrent maintenance of timber, wood, and forest values, including sources of water, is a proper function of the Federal Government.

2. Section 2 would authorize an annual appropriation of not to exceed $3.5 million in any year, such sum to be made available to the Department of the Interior—which administers the forest lands and woodlands areas covered by the bill—until expended as provided in section 3.

The moneys authorized would be appropriated from the United States share of the receipts from these lands; the intent of the language is to assure that the share of such receipts presently earmarked for States and counties will not be diminished or affected by this legislation.

3. Section 3 directs the Secretary of the Interior to prescribe such regulations governing the expenditure of the funds authorized as will assure—in accordance with current and prospective public mutiple use—

(a) development, maintenance, and operation of public domain forest lands and woodlands for recreational use;

(b) improvement and maintenance of wildlife habitat thereon; and

(c) provision for adequate safety, sanitation, and health measures and facilities.

A proviso in this section would prohibit expenditure of funds appropriated by the legislation for land acquisition.

4. Section 4 relates to use fees and charges collected by the United States for improved forest lands or woodlands recreational areas, and provides that amounts so collected shall be set aside as a special fund to carry out the purposes of the legislation, and in turn set off against any amount in excess of the $3.5 million annual appropriation authorized.

ESTIMATED AREA OF PUBLIC DOMAIN FOREST LANDS AND WOODLANDS ADMINISTERED BY THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR [1]

Twenty-two States contain a total of 4,136,190 acres of commercial forest lands administered by Interior, and covered by the proposed legislation; 13 States contain a total of 29,985,000 acres of woodlands, covered by the proposed legislation.

Alaska alone has 40 million acres of commercial forest lands and 85 million acres of woodlands, administered by Interior, and within the scope of the proposed legislation.

Total United States and Alaska, forest lands, 44,136,190.

Total United States and Alaska, woodlands, 114,985,000.

[1] Source: Table 10, p. 14, Report of the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, Statistical Appendix, 1955.

Acreage breakdown, by State, of areas affected by proposed legislation

State	Forest lands	Woodlands
Alabama	23,000	
Arizona	3,000	1,329,000
Arkansas	124,000	
California	275,890	1,500,000
Colorado	605,000	2,709,000
Florida	19,000	
Idaho	381,000	1,070,000
Louisiana	7,000	
Michigan	10,000	
Minnesota	93,000	
Mississippi	15,000	
Missouri	(1)	
Montana	604,000	210,000
Nevada	100,000	10,000,000
New Mexico	91,000	1,974,000
Oklahoma	300	3,000
Oregon	533,000	1,722,000
South Dakota	6,000	10,000
Utah	633,000	8,755,000
Washington	182,000	46,000
Wisconsin	5,000	
Wyoming	426,000	657,000
Alaska	40,000,000	85,000,000

[1] Less than 1,000 acres.

Federal Assistance to Depressed Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following extracts of a statement by Mr. Solomon Barkin, director of research, Textile Workers Union of America, before the House Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. Barkin's remarks are succinct and to the point and need no elaboration by me:

STATEMENT OF SOLOMON BARKIN, DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH, TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA, AFL–CIO, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY ON ASSISTANCE TO DEPRESSED AREAS, APRIL 23, 1956

We are much encouraged by the present interest in providing Federal assistance to depressed areas. This concern for the well-being of the people in the chronically distressed communities has been slow in coming. But we are heartened by the fact that the representative of both parties have finally determined that Federal action is timely and imperative. The local efforts are insufficient. The principle of Federal responsibility in the field of local economic recovery is now clearly recognized even though there are major differences in approach and in the amount of Federal assistance, guidance and monies which the proponents of the respective plans are willing to grant for this project.

We are troubled by the conviction that the philosophy underlying and the provisions of H. R. 8555 will frustrate efforts in this field rather than provide the help that is truly needed. Hope will be awakened among the distressed communities that real assistance will be offered and that the Federal Government is starting an all out drive to help them in their economic rehabilitation. But the provisions of the bill are not sufficient to back up this promise.

We are anxious to see such changes in this bill and that of the Douglas bill (S. 2663) which will guarantee an effective workable program of assistance and leadership to the distressed areas. We have previously been assured of Federal assistance but the Government failed to implement these promises. Candidate Dwight D. Eisenhower assured the citizens of New England and particularly Lawrence, Mass., in 1952 that the communities would be helped. The Federal administrations since 1950 have issued several administrative and executive orders designed to give preferential considerations to the needs of these communities. But few practical results followed.

Gestures in the direction of assistance are not enough. We must end the wastage of human and national resources. We can ill afford to continue this traffic in human hopes. An effective program must be substituted for vague promises and generous speeches. The program must be an effective one which will help in the practical economic rehabilitation of these areas. H. R. 8555 is insufficient to accomplish this purpose. It must be modified so that its philosophy and provisions more nearly reflect those incorporated in S. 2663.

We need effective legislation to offset the disillusionment which has set in from the failure of administrative action to help in the rehabilitation of these areas. Congress can redeem this Nation's record through positive action. We believe that the program of economic reconstruction for depressed areas must occupy as significant a place on the calendar of congressional action as the programs of aid to foreign countries. The latter are designed to rebuild the economies of our allies and neutral nations so that they can better fend off external and internal communist and totalitarian aggression. Programs for domestic reconstruction of depressed areas will help create the economic resources from which the funds for such assistance can be derived.

Both H. R. 8555 and S. 2663 recognize the true nature of the problem presented by the depressed area. The former declares that these areas are characterized by "substantial and persistent unemployment * * * (which) causes hardship to many individuals and their families and detracts from the national welfare by wasting vital human resources." In S. 2663 there is recognition of the "present existence of excessive unemployment in certain areas of the Nation is jeopardizing the health standard of living and general welfare of the Nation." Our goal for our domestic economic program must be at least as high as that for our foreign assistance program. The President of the United States declared in his message on the mutual security program that we seek to develop "a society marked by human welfare, individual liberty, and a rising standard of living." Only an effective program of assistance to the distressed areas can help realize this objective.

FEDERAL LEADERSHIP VITAL

Two basic deficiencies are evident in H. R. 8555. First is the refusal to provide Federal leadership and adequate financial aid in these programs. The second is the determination to make this a subordinate program by rejecting the principle of an independent administrative agency and placing this activity in an established agency devoted to very different functions. The existing departments have shown little determination or inclination to promote an all-out program of economic rehabilitation, nor have they any sympathy for Federal leadership in this area. We have great fears that the assignment of this responsibility to present agencies will severely limit the activities, and enthusiasm, and imaginative initiative required for effective work in this field.

Federal leadership is vital in promoting the economic rehabilitation of the distressed areas. Unfortunately the H. R. 8555 does not recognize this principle. As a matter of fact,

it is constructed on a very different principle. In the words of President Eisenhower it seeks to assist "communities to help themselves." The "major responsibility in planning and financing the economic redevelopment of their communities must remain with local citizens."

The dependence on local initiative, we contend, is insufficient and even unsound. We have relied upon such efforts in most communities now considered distressed and they are inadequate. Such local efforts have been so limited that the challenge of economic rehabilitation of distressed areas has become a national problem. Would it have become a national issue if local efforts were sufficient?

The continued emphasis on local efforts reflects an inadequate grasp of the difficulties and the size of the problem. H. R. 8555 represents blind rejection of the lessons we have learned during the last 10 years on the need of Federal leadership. It suggests that the authors were more intent on providing a cynical gesture of interest rather than a real program of assistance. The need is to supplement or substitute for inadequate local efforts or the absence of local efforts because the greater national interest dictates that the continued distress is destructive of the national well-being and at variance with the commitment under the Employment Act of 1946 that "it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government * * * to coordinate and utilize all of its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining * * * maximum employment."

We do not have maximum employment while we have chronic unemployment in these distressed areas. The Federal Government cannot escape responsibility by merely passing the onus to the inactivity of the local group. It has an obligation to provide leadership and assistance to assure their economic rehabilitation through direct intervention and leadership when the local communities fail. The broader national interest dictates that such positive steps be taken.

We cannot endanger our entire economy through the deficiencies and inadequacies of sectors thereof. We are recognizing this challenge in the field of agriculture.

Setbacks in this area are endangering our stability and progress. We similarly must face up to the seepages in our economic structure occurring in the distressed areas and demand immediate Federal action to avoid the economic reversals of broader magnitude.

We are suspicious of the motives of H. R. 8555 because its spokesmen have defined the problem as well as the proponents of broader action. But they have not constructed a program which is equal to the needs. Mr. Arthur Larson, Under Secretary of Labor, declared that the "Federal Government should concentrate on aiding localities where the situation is of long duration." The program is then to be directed to meet not minor recessions or difficulties but basic structural ones in areas suffering from persistent unemployment and economic inactivity. Palliatives and temporary relief are insufficient but broad programs of assistance are needed. The shortcomings of H. R. 8555 will become even more evident if we spell out the characteristics of an area beset by these long-run problems.

CHARACTERISTICS OF DISTRESSED AREAS

First it is an area which has lost historic locational advantages. The losses in employment were far-reaching so that large pools of unemployment have persisted for long periods of time. The reasons for these reversals tend to be most fundamental. Vast economic, social or competitive factors have disturbed the stability of the prevailing industrial and employment structure. Plants have been closed; and older employments have virtually disappeared. The newer industries and employers have not recognized advantages which would encourage them to move into or be established in the area.

The disappearance of locational assets may have been due to many factors well beyond the control of the community itself or the very employers who were forced to contract or close their operations. In the majority of cases, the plant closing has not been accompanied by migration. They represented a contraction of operations. The closings and shrinkage may well have been due to the exhaustion of mineral or natural resources, changes in consumer habits which have diverted demand from this to other products; shift in market locations; newer technologies and materials which may have made existing sources uneconomic and processes obsolete; tariff policies which originate in Washington or Geneva which may make it impossible for the local plant to compete with imports; or subsidies or differential inducements offered by other communities which would include tax exemptions, aids in financing construction or machinery, attractive terms for expansion or vigorous anti-union policies.

We may incidentally note that the new technologies are likely to increase the rate of plant closings, since the benefits to be obtained from new plants designed to incorporate the latest technological developments are so huge and the economies of new plant construction methods and materials are so impressive that management may find it more economic to abandon older plants and substitute newer structures for them in different areas. The problem of distressed communities resulting from such abandonments is likely to be intensified and become an integral part of the normal experience of industrial areas.

The problems of a distressed community are structural rather than superficial. A solution must look to the redevelopment of the area and the careful promotion of new locational advantages which can become the neuclei of economic growth. A new economic structure has to be built to encourage new enterprise. The construction of a new plant site or the rehabilitation of an industrial property is not enough. Real economic redevelopment requires prolonged exploration and planning for long-term growth. Such a project the local communities have seldom undertaken and are not prepared to launch. Only a Federal agency with these specific objectives in mind can provide the initiative, technical help, and financial assistance which will encourage this type of growth.

We have enough experience to know that private enterprise can do this job if it is so minded and can see specific advantages for itself in a specific area. Our problem is not with the communities and areas where private enterprise is doing or can do the job. Our task is to stimulate and assure the consummation of programs for rehabilitation in areas where private enterprise and local endeavors have been insufficient. These exist in the chronically distressed areas for which the present legislation is designed.

Second, it is an area where local enterprise and initiative have usually been smothered and repressed by the existence of persistent and chronic unemployment, or may not even have been encouraged. Areas suffering from prolonged unemployment are like individuals who have been physically ill or unemployed. They lose heart and courage. They become resigned and discouraged. Their spirit has been knocked out of them. Their physical energies have been drained. The failure of the previous efforts tends to discourage newer efforts. They cannot be relied upon to act for themselves. They are like unemployed persons who need the outside help of a professional agency dedicated to correcting this attitude and providing them with specific guidance and courage and assistance. Outside assistance can only come from the Federal Government.

Many depressed communities have been without experience in successful independent local enterprise. The communities, like those in the textile and coal industries, have usually been single-industry towns and areas where a single group of employers, usually absentee in character, have dominated the area. The communities have been governed, dominated, and directed by the managements and representatives of these absentee owners. They have not encouraged independent action. They are not likely to have many civic organizations, or professional or middle classes with the initiative and daring, or trade unions with the experience to undertake so vast an effort at economic rehabilitation. These small communities have been so accustomed to having the lives of their people and their economic destiny directed by these representatives of outside interests, and they have been left without the resources for self-assertion in a crisis. The lessons of the present distressed areas should not be missed by the prospering communities in our country which are characterized by similar conditions at the present time. It is important to change these characteristics and to eliminate this industrial domination while there is a chance and while the crisis is not upon them.

We can offer many illustrations of textile communities where the people have been unprepared for the distasters which have befallen them because they have had no past experience with stimulating local enterprise or economic opportunities. The fault does not lie with these people. The large outside enterprises repressed them and prevented opportunities from arising. Low wages had long kept the people submerged. The best proof that the human material is rich, and that it is the climate created by these enterprises which prevented initiative, is that many more venturesome individuals have left these communities and established impressive successful businesses in other parts of the country.

Any program, therefore, which assumes that all communities can initiate and undertake the responsibilities for local economic rehabilitation is starting from a wrong premise. Moreover, it is punitive in its conception, since it would penalize the more submerged communities which need the greatest amount of outside help.

Third, it is an area which has low financial resources and is, therefore, least capable of raising the capital required for these long-term, bold programs for rehabilitation. The very fact that unemployment has persisted and become chronic has meant that the community's tax rolls have suffered and its financial resources have been drained. It is not as capable of financing its own programs as are the more prosperous communities. The philosophy underlying the present program seeks, therefore, to withhold help from the needy and reward with assistance the less critical areas.

H. R. 8555 has not faced up to the economic realities of the distressed areas. The authors have begrudingly accepted the principle of assistance, but have not recognized that the economic reverses have left these communities least financially capable of acting. They need investments in public services and facilities, investigation, model projects and the planting of nuclei industries. These cannot be provided, or even adequately conceived, by the distressed community which has been left stranded by economic reverses.

Fourth, an economically distressed area is seldom a single community. It extends beyond a political subdivision and includes a geographical region. It is usually coexist-

ent with a full labor market. If economic assistance is to be provided, it must be conceived on a larger pattern than a specific municipality. The program must be planned for an entire area. The distress affects the entire area since people are recruited from different parts of the labor market area. It cannot be localized to a limited area, as is proposed in H. R. 8555, section III (A and B).

S. 2663 has a broader definition in that it sets no such restriction and the area which can be selected for the organization of local committees may more truly correspond to the economic bounds of the full region. In continuing the present practice of relying on restricted, existing political subdivisions, the failings in the present programs will be perpetuated. The purpose of the legislation will be largely negated.

Three deficiencies of present programs require special mention. First, many of them are modest because they are conceived in terms of a small, local development for local residents, whereas the actual employees formerly engaged in other employment may reside in other political subdivisions. Second, the plans invite competition among political subdivisions, which often encourages an emphasis on subsidies rather than constructive programs. Third, they prevent full exploitation of the economic resources of the area and the opportunities for constructive redesign of the locational characteristics, since such broader programs often involve sites outside the immediate political subdivisions eager to solve their problems. Only by dealing with the area as a whole can adequate programs be developed to meet the challenge.

DEFICIENCIES OF STATE GOVERNMENTS

One of the basic deficiencies of H. R. 8555 is contained in section 106 (8) which requires programs to be approved by the State or any agency, instrumentality, or local political subdivision thereof, which would have to make a positive finding that the project for which financial assistance is sought is consistent with such program.

All of us who have followed the procedures adopted by State governments know that this proviso is fatal to the entire program. Many State governments have no interest in industrial development. In fact, we can run up a list of States which have resisted such programs or have shown little interest in them. The agricultural complexion of many State governments has biased their executive and administrative personnel against such undertakings. Development commissions have become advertising bureaus for their lakes and vacation resources rather than planning bureaus for industrial development. It would be fatal to this entire undertaking to enable them to veto efforts in this field.

The Journal of Commerce in an editorial on April 5, 1956, declared that the administration is not entirely consistent in requiring State approval of projects under the area aid bill, for it proposes to bring the Federal housing law into the plan, including provision for sewage, water facilities, and the like and these do not require State clearance. Dealings are directly with appropriate local entities as in the case for urban renewal programs, except in situations where State-matched funds are involved. Two State governors, the newspaper further adds, declarled tnat the States ought not to be permitted to veto it or to exclude the otherwise eligible labor-surplus areas in their borders from benefiting, once the plan is adopted by Congress. Governor Leader, of Pennsylvania, suggested that the Federal Government should work through States which were themselves working effectively in the field, but where they were not, the Government should reserve the privilege to work with appropriate local entities.

The basic fact is that there are States as well as local communities which will discourage or will refuse to take action or receive assistance. The dominant leaders of the areas may refuse to act. They are often able to take this position by diverting local attention from the true issues and using smokescreens to hide their motives for refusing such action. Our national economic interest and the well-being of the thousands of innocent victims demands that neither the backward State nor the community should stand in the way of needed economic recovery.

H. R. 8555 will allow State and local groups to veto the intent of the economic rehabilitation of distressed areas. While these provisions remain basic to the program, we can only declare that we suspect the motives of the supporters, for they must know that they cannot effectively rehabilitate communities if they face this hurdle.

LOCAL RESISTANCE TO ADEQUATE PROGRAMS DEMANDS FEDERAL LEADERSHIP

Your own committee has had sufficient evidence that many local development groups are led by men determined to hide their community's problems from the public's gaze. They are concerned with sick economies but refuse to acknowledge them. They are laboring under the impression that if they seek new businesses quietly and entice companies to move from existing sites that they will solve their problems.

This "conspiracy of silence" has been fostered by shortsighted realtors who seem to dominate these local development boards. They are accustomed to dealing with small-business problems rather than the challenging tasks presented by a depressed area. They are seeking minor additions to employment as relief rather than programs for long-term growth. They are so blinded by their dogmatism in economic philosophy that they are sacrificing the economic well-being of the communities which they pretend to represent. Instead of pressing for economic growth, they are obsequiously seeking businesses to locate in their midst. Therefore, they fall prey to intimidations by strong outside powers.

The business community in many of these depressed communities have as a result carried on a campaign against Federal assistance. The best example is that of New England, where the New England Council decided to oppose these bills. It took the position that the responsibility for the development of employment opportunities should remain primarily at the local level. The irony of this position is that New England is one region in which many communities have remained on the distressed list for years, and many of them are still on it. Local committees and assistance have proved inadequate because the conceptions and personnel have been insufficient. Yet the New England Council, presumably speaking for the business interests, is refusing to endorse programs which would bring new light and assistance to relieve the desperation of the tens of thousands of unemployed people whose despair continues to deepen with the passing of the months.

While the New England Council speaks of local initiative, plants continue to close, employments disappear, and thousands of new persons continue to be added to the labor force; older persons are being forced out of the market because of the insufficiency of jobs. Its offices being located in Boston, it is dominated by the financial interests, real-estate promoters, and public-utility spokesmen. They sit by smugly while human wants cry out loudly for satisfaction. Since their own economic interests are not being adversely affected, they have no sense of urgency. The New England Council, composed of the region's business interests, again is adding to the evidence of its incapacity to lead the region and is dampening the efforts of those who wish to bring assistance to it.

These attitudes of the business and realtor interests have produced this conspiracy of silence when broad-scale action is required. They have coerced public officials into making statements explaining their refusal to obtain Federal assistance while their communities remain chronically depressed. No greater evidence of subservience to dogmatism and indifference to public interest and human needs can be paraded before any congressional committee.

UNITED STATES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OPPOSITION CLOAKS ITS DESIRE FOR INACTION AND BUSINESS DOMINATION OF OUR POLITICAL AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE

One has but to read the pamphlet entitled "Getting and Holding Good Employers," published by the committee on economic policy of the United States Chamber of Commerce, to understand the long-term purpose of this opposition to Federal programs. The emphasis on local action is not born out of a conviction that the local communities are adequate to handle the problems and the challenges of a depressed area. It is rather intended to capitalize on the distress to create what the committee calls a better climate for business and jobs everywhere. This thought is further emphasized in the conclusion that "though the plight of the depressed areas is most dramatic and pressing, it should not blind us to the need for a better climate throughout the country."

At a time when the present administration boastfully declares that it rescued the economy and claims credit for the good time we enjoy today with its unprecedented prosperity, the United States Chamber of Commerce is carrying on its fight for basic economic changes in tax laws, government operations, and regulations of unions, because it wants to improve the climate for American business. One wonders how much profit business wants; how much of the tax burden does it wish to shift to the consumer; how much wantonness is desired in the operation of our business economy.

The policy statement is more of an attack on labor legislation, taxes, and the refusal of communities to heed the United States Chamber of Commerce policies than a prescription for the growth of local communities.

In the chronically distressed areas we are concerned with unemployment and the disappearance of jobs because of the fundamental changes in our economy and the loss of historic locational advantages. Cringing local attitudes may bring in low-wage employers seeking to exploit a cowed work population. But they provide no real answer.

We have seen that happen in New England. The realtors who have taken over empty mills have secured new tenants. Many fled from other communities to get lower rents, tax concessions, or in some cases, to avoid unions. Many may be counted among the lowest wage payers and have held their rates well below those previously prevailing in the community.

More than a business climate is required in these communities or areas which have to be economically rebuilt. They must get new strong businesses within them. This result is not accomplished primarily by climate; success demands careful planning and the development of new locational advantages. This challenge the chamber of commerce does not meet nor treat in its pamphlet.

FEDERAL LEADERSHIP IS VITAL

Opponents of effective Federal leadership and assistance to distressed areas have begrudgingly acknowledged that we are faced with a serious problem of economic distress. But, in formulating a program, they have been hampered by their dogmas and preju-

dices and have not faced up to the primary problems of finding methods for reconstructing the economies of entire areas. These same men know how much thought, imagination, study, and investment are required to start new industries or to revive old ones. Cannot they realize that equally large efforts and funds are required to accomplish the same for distressed regions? The present administration has affirmed that such programs are needed in undeveloped countries. Are we not entitled to similar efforts and appreciation for our distressed communities in our own country?

Private enterprise is the backbone of our entire economy. But we realize what public investment and efforts must often precede and lay the foundation for later private endeavors. The very basis of the urban renewal movement is Federal Government nationalization of real-estate losses to allow for profitable local private redevelopment. The New England Council and the administration favor these programs. Why cannot they conceive of using this technique on a broader, area basis to assure redevelopment of an entire distressed area? Why shrink from the use of the very instruments which the administration itself proposed for limited use for local projects?

What is at stake is the economic well-being of millions of people. We cannot afford to be halfhearted in our efforts.

AN INDEPENDENT AGENCY IS VITAL

The present Federal agencies providing assistance to local communities are, we are all agreed, inadequate and too modest. They are primarily located in the United States Department of Commerce. Mere expansion and increased personnel are not enough. A new spirit must suffuse the people engaged in this work. It is a dedicated task to help plan and develop programs on a broad scale, equal to the needs. It requires a conviction among the administrators that the Federal Government properly can utilize the general welfare clause in the Constitution to aid communities and that it is in the interests of the Nation that it be done.

Unfortunately, the continuance of the program in the Department of Commerce, as is contemplated by the bill, would perpetuate the unfriendly, tight-fisted and casual attitudes which have hitherto pervaded their activities. The present agency has published a few pamphlets, sent its employees to deliver some speeches, and led realtors to distressed communities to extend messages of sympathy, but to provide no real assistance.

The responsibility for the stimulation of the economic recovery of depressed areas is so vital to our national economic existence that it should stand on its own and be directly accountable both to the President and the Congress of the United States. It should not be subordinated to the administrative functions of existing executive departments. The problems are so specialized and pressing that they require the attention of an independent agency devoted solely to the promotion of the economic recovery in these areas.

Still Time To Stop a Steal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is expected that we will complete consideration and vote on the highway construction bill tomorrow. The vote on one of the amendments which will be offered tomorrow will determine who will pay for relocating utility facilities. It is my hope that every Member of Congress will, before voting on the amendment, read carefully the editorial which appeared in the Cleveland Press yesterday, entitled "Still Time To Stop a Steal."

The editorial follows:

STILL TIME TO STOP A STEAL

However you measure it, $1,500,000,000 is a huge gob of money, especially when it comes from our pockets as taxpayers.

But that's an estimate of how much the highway bill, about to come to a vote in Congress, would hand over to public utilities who get free use of highway rights-of-way.

This is the bill which lays out a $51 billion 13-year road program—principally over the 40,000-mile interstate system.

The people will pay for these roads, and the rights-of-way to go with them. They will pay, for years and years, in higher taxes on gasoline and tires, in special taxes on buses and trucks.

But the House Public Works Committee has turned out a bill which would compel the people also to pay for relocating utility facilities—pipelines, wires, poles, etc.—which use these rights-of-way, rent free.

This violates all historic State practice. The States for years have resisted utility efforts to unload these costs on motorists. The rule is nationally established. The bill now before the House would wreck that rule.

Nine of the 34 members of the Public Works Committee were so outraged by this giveway they filed a blistering separate report with the House.

They said utility interests lobbied this gimmick into the bill, that it is opposed by every State highway official in the country, that it violates State laws and contracts, that it would throw the whole cost estimate of the road program out of whack.

In a few days, this bill will come to a vote in the House, with amendments permissible. This is the time for another lobby to go to work—the taxpayer lobby. With an amendment to rip out the utility windfall.

This is supposed to be a highway program, not a free rights-of-way program for utilities.

Philadelphia's Concern Over Archbishop Makarios and the Cause of Freedom in Cyprus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, recently 2 events occurred in Philadelphia in protest over the brutal treatment of Archbishop Makarios of Cyprus. One was an official protest by the city of Philadelphia, by resolution of the city council. The other was a resolution adopted at a justice for Cyprus rally attended by 2,000 citizens of our city.

In both instances—through official channels and through the right under the Constitution for our citizens peaceably to assemble and to give expression to their views—the people of Philadelphia have made it clear that we are on the side of freedom and of decency and are opposed to high-handed and oppressive actions in Cyprus.

The resolution adopted by city council, Resolution No. 39, protesting the exiling of the archbishop and expressing the indignation of our citizens at the actions of the British Government, is as follows:

Resolution expressing sympathy and indignation on the occasion of the exiling of Archbishop Makarios, of Cyprus, by the British Government

Whereas the people of Philadelphia cherish the democratic form of government under which we live and particularly the guaranties of individual freedom from arbitrary police action and the guaranties to a fair and just trial under both the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; and

Whereas we acknowledge that to exile a man from his country is cruel and harsh treatment in the extreme; particularly a prelate whose life has been dedicated to the service of God, and who by exile is separated not only from his home, family, and friends, but from his spiritual children and his work in the service of his Maker; and

Whereas we are thankful to Almighty God for the guaranties in our form of government against such acts in wanton disregard of the most basic constitutional rights; and

Whereas on or about March 9, 1956, on the isle of Cyprus, his eminence, Bishop Makarios, archbishop of the Greek Orthodox Church of Cyprus, was seized by the British Government and, without the substantiation of any charge against him and without the opportunity to refute or even to hear his accusers, was exiled from his home, his country, and his archibishopric of over 400,000 souls: Therefore

Resolved by the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That we hereby express our vigorous indignation at the high-handedness of the action taken by the British Government, as aforesaid.

Resolved, That we hereby express our sincere feelings to the members of the Greek Orthodox faith in terms of our deepest sympathy for the grievous wrong which they and their spiritual leader, Archbishop Makarios, have suffered by reason of the aforesaid acts.

Resolved, That we hereby reaffirm the sentiments of the city of Philadelphia in behalf of freedom and liberty-loving Greece and the embattled and valiant people of Cyprus, who are fighting for the freedoms for which we fought in 1776.

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Royal Greek Embassy, the United States Senators from Pennsylvania, and the members of the House of Representatives from Philadelphia.

And following, Mr. Speaker, is the resolution adopted by the Justice for Cyprus rally, sponsored by the Justice for Cyprus Committee of which Gregory G. Lagakos is chairman:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY JUSTICE FOR CYPRUS RALLY AT TOWN HALL, MARCH 28, 1956

Whereas we, citizens of the United States, assembled in the main auditorium of Town Hall in Philadelphia, Pa., on Wednesday evening, March 28, 1956, have in overflowing numbers of over 2,000 met in a huge rally to voice the unanimity of our heartfelt belief and conviction that the arrest and deportation of His Beatitude Archbishop Makarios of Cyprus is a violation of the basic concepts of the dignity of man and respect for religion, and is an uncivilized act which freedom-loving people of this city strongly protest; and

Whereas we have gratefully witnessed the vigorous and active concurrence of feeling by our fellow Americans so eloquently expressed tonight by the Honorable Richardson Dilworth, mayor of the city of Philadelphia; Hon. Roy E. Furman, Lieutenant Governor of Pennsylvania; Bishop Germanos Constantinou of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America; Rev. William Dunphy, rector of Christ Church, Ridley Park, Pa.; Hon. John G. Thevos, deputy attorney general of the State of New Jersey; as well as many other distinguished Americans who have so greatly honored and inspired us tonight with their presence and participation at this rally; and we being further inspired by the resolution enacted unanimously by the City Council of Philadelphia on March 22, 1956, proclaiming the vigorous indignation of the Council of the City of Philadelphia at the highhandedness of the action taken by the British Government in the kidnaping of Archbishop Makarios; and

Whereas the people of Cyprus have contributed so magnificently to the cause of world freedom and so eminently deserve the blessings of self-determination: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, in rally assembled, respectfully petition the State Department to request the immediate return of Archbishop Makarios to his home, country, and people of Cyprus, and that the British Government should be urged by our Government to permit the people of Cyprus to determine their own political destiny and freedom; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be filed forthwith with Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; Hon. John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State of the United States; Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, United States Delegate to the United Nations; Hon. H. A. Hammarskjold, Secretary General of the United Nations; Hon. Edward A. Martin, United States Senator from Pennsylvania; Hon. James H. Duff, United States Senator from Pennsylvania; and all Members of the House of Representatives of the United States from Philadelphia.

The Coal Industry and H. R. 5550

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

THE COAL INDUSTRY AND H. R. 5550

H. R. 5550, authorizing United States participation in the Organization for Trade Cooperation, has been favorably reported out of the Ways and Means Committee by a vote of 17 to 7, and will shortly come before the House of Representatives. This memorandum sets down some facts about the American coal industry and why it has everything to benefit from United States membership in OTC, and nothing to lose from the passage of H. R. 5550.

Although representatives of the coal industry were opposed last year to the enactment of H. R. 1, the 3-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, no spokesmen either from the management or labor side of the coal industry came before the Ways and Means Committee to oppose enactment of this bill. This shows that even though the representatives of the coal industry were opposed to further reduction of tariffs, that they recognize that H. R. 5550 will not lower tariffs by one iota, but would, on the contrary, help to get the greatest benefits for American export trade from foreign countries.

This is so because OTC would be an organization to administer the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. GATT is the multilateral trade agreement negotiated in 1947 by which 33 other free world countries have committed themselves to reciprocal tariff reduction in exchange for the tariff reductions that we have made under the reciprocal trade agreements program. OTC would help get effective reciprocity for us from the GATT trade agreement.

The American coal industry has already experienced great benefits from export trade and will experience even greater benefits if it can have assurance of stability in the treatment that American coal receives in foreign markets. In 1955 we saw a great improvement in coal production in the United States. Bituminous coal production reached a level of about 470 million tons in 1955. This was an increase of 73 million tons above the level of production in 1954. Increased exports accounted for over one-quarter of that increase in production. In 1955 exports of bituminous coal amounted to 51 million tons, an increase of 20 million tons above 1954 exports. In dollar terms, the value of bituminous coal exports in 1955 was $436 million as compared with $253 million in 1954. Thus, the bituminous coal industry depended on exports for the sale of 11 percent of its total production in 1955 as compared with 8 percent in 1954.

GATT has helped achieve this good export record, and OTC, by making GATT more effective, will be even more helpful. For example, in the last 2 years there has been remarkable progress made by Western European countries in eliminating import quotas which discriminated against the sale of American goods in Europe. Whereas in 1953 only 2 of the 13 Western European governments had liberalized their restrictions on imports from the United States to any extent, today 8 of these governments have completely removed quota restrictions on more than 50 percent of their imports of goods from the United States. As a result, American exports to Western Europe in the last couple of years have been booming, and the coal industry has participated in that expansion.

In addition, by using the machinery of GATT, we were successful last year in getting Belgium and Germany to reduce their restrictions against United States coal. In the case of Belgium the situation was that late in 1953 Belgium began to reduce the tonnages of American coal permitted to come into that country. Belgium had been a very important market for United States coal. In 1952, for example, Belgium imported 711,000 tons of American coal, valued at about $7 million. The United States, therefore, tried to get these restrictions that were imposed in 1953 eliminated by Belgium, but Belgium refused. The United States then placed its complaint against Belgium on the agenda of the ninth session of GATT in October 1954. We pointed out that Belgium was not living up to the terms of the GATT trade agreement. By negotiating with Belgium we were able to get her to agree to permit larger imports of American coal. At the present time, American coal is moving into Belgium virtually without any control whatsoever. As a result of that, coal exports to Belgium amounted to over a million tons in 1955 compared to about a quarter of a million tons in 1954.

In the case of Germany, the United States, in the ninth session of GATT, drew attention to certain German regulations which had the effect of reducing imports of coal from the United States. It was the view of the United States that these restrictions were inconsistent with the obligations of West Germany to the United States under the GATT. Consultations between the two governments followed. West Germany began to relax its restrictions and permit the entry of more United States coal. As a result, in 1955, coal imports of the United States into West Germany amounted to 7.7 million tons as compared to 1.4 million tons in 1954.

Thus, taking these two cases of Belgium and Germany together, it can be said that through the GATT the United States succeeded in having these countries remove restrictions on imports of United States coal that resulted in an increase in our coal exports to these countries by over 6 million tons in 1955.

The thing that has troubled the American coal industry so far as its foreign markets are concerned has been the instability that has existed in these markets. There has been a feast or famine situation in exports, but what we can accomplish through GATT, and what can be accomplished even better through OTC is to remove that instability by getting foreign countries to agree to treat American coal fairly and in a stable way. The accomplishments of GATT to date will be multiplied in the future if OTC comes into being.

The coal industry has much to gain from this. For example, the Wall Street Journal for April 19, 1956, carried an article on a statement by George H. Love, president of the Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co., made at its annual meeting. The Wall Street Journal says, "Mr. Love predicted soft coal production in 1956 will reach or slightly exceed 500 million tons, compared with 470 million tons in 1955. * * * Mr. Love predicted coal's usage in the energy market could well double in the next 10 years."

For the long run, therefore, the coal industry has a great stake in expanding exports. OTC will help to see to it that American coal will have a fair chance to be sold in the markets of the world without discriminatory restrictions being imposed against it.

Since H. R. 5550 would not involve any tariff reductions, would not require any change in United States laws, would not in any way affect the ability of the Congress to legislate on matters of trade and tariffs, would not in any way affect the safeguards of our domestic legislation, such as the escape clause and the peril point, it can be concluded that the coal industry has nothing to lose and everything to gain from its passage.

The Nickel Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter I wrote to Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, regarding the nickel situation.

Mr. Speaker, a number of reputable businessmen complained to me that they were caught in a squeeze whereby they were forced to pay 300 percent of the market price of nickel—64.5 cents—in the black or gray markets or go out of business.

With the assistance of some of these individuals, I wrote to Dr. Flemming, Director of ODM, on January 11, 1956, and asked him 11 questions—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 15, 1956. It was necessary for him to get informa-

tion on some of the questions from other agencies, chiefly, I presume, the Departments of Commerce and Defense.

Yesterday, I received a classified document from Dr. Flemming's office which I understand contains the answers to my questions. Since one bit of classified material in a document renders the whole classified, I have returned it, unopened, to Dr. Flemming with the request that it be declassified as much as possible as I want to place it in the RECORD for the benefit of all of those concerned. My letter of April 26, 1956, to Dr. Flemming, follows:

APRIL 26, 1956.

Dr. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. FLEMMING: On January 11, 1956, I wrote to you concerning the current nickel situation in the United States. The letter propounded 11 questions several of which had been suggested to me by responsible business concerns who are directly affected by the situation which has developed in obtaining nickel for industrial purposes. On March 15, 1956 I placed my letter with the questions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because of the widespread interest in the subject. Yesterday, April 25, 1956 I received a classified document from you which I understand contained the answers to my questions. I have, however, returned the envelope to you unopened since I consider that this subject generally is a public matter and would be restricted from making available any portion of your answers so long as the material is classified. Furthermore, I much prefer not to have classified material in my office files.

Inasmuch as there are a large number of business concerns and others in the United States who are interested in the answers to the questions I propounded I planned to put your answers in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of all concerned. Will you be so kind as to send me a letter which is declassified as much as you consider proper in order that I may place it in the RECORD?

I do not wish you to consider my return of the classified material as being critical of your action but I firmly believe that the current nickel situation needs a healthy, effective public scrutiny and comment to the greatest extent possible. I believe that the confusion and suspicion caused by unnecessary classification leads to an unhealthy situation.

The Big Business Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, permit me to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following incident which points up the manner in which a big business administration operates. The incident is reported in the April 9, 1956, issue of New Republic:

WHERE POWER LIES

Early in the life of the Eisenhower administration Clarence Davis, then Solicitor and now Under Secretary of the Interior Department, was visited by a friend, a registered power lobbyist named Herman C. Kruse from the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. The company had appeals before the Department. According to Davis' own testimony he asked Kruse to get him a detailed proposal for changes in Federal power right-of-way regulations—a crucial matter over which Pacific Gas & Electric Co. then had appeals pending. Nobody else was at this Davis-Kruse meeting; neither then nor subsequently were the farm cooperatives and municipally owned utilities consulted although they were deeply involved.

The private power corporations got together and drew up a 13-point list of changes. These were put down on an anonymous paper. The utilities gave the document to Kruse; he gave it to Davis, who gave it to a Department Solicitor of his own appointment named James Geissinger (now regional Solicitor at Denver) for study. Geissinger testified under oath before the House Public Works and Resources Subcommittee (whose report has now just been published, March 28), that Davis had told him he "didn't know" where the document came from. On August 11, 1954, the Interior Department put all these lobby recommendations but one into effect; 10 of the 13 were adopted as the power trust wrote them, another had a minor word added, another was paraphrased with the meaning unchanged, and one was rejected.

The incident occurred and is documented. Most of it Davis admits. The changes made were important and were written without consultation with the other parties affected. Federal regulations seem to have been disregarded which forbid private consultations between Government employees and parties-at-interest. Well, this is how a big business administration operates.

The efforts of an oil lobbyist in trying to slip $2,500 to a Senator in the fight over the natural gas bill created a national sensation; but here is a case where a lobbyist was brought in by the administration and told to write his own ticket, and did. You can't steal things where they're given away.

Politics in Farm Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the cost of Wisconsin feed prices under vetoed H. R. 12 has been given much publicity in our State.

Following is an article from the April 23 issue of the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times on this subject. It was written by Miles McMillin of the paper's staff.

POLITICS IN THE FARM BILL VETO
(By Miles McMillin)

A card from Stevens Point charges that Walter H. Ebling, statistician for the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, is the man behind the arguments used to back up the President's veto of the farm bill. It suggests that he is a civil servant who is supposed to be nonpartisan and that, by golly, something ought to be done about it.

The card seems to have been inspired by the hoopla raised by Governor Kohler and six Republican Congressmen from Wisconsin in behalf of the veto. The arguments used were presumably based on information provided by the State department of agriculture. I don't know whether Ebling had anything to do with it and I have no notion what his politics are.

There is some authority for the statement that the six GOP Congressmen—DAVIS, BYRNES, WITHROW, LAIRD, VAN PELT, and SMITH—took some liberties with whatever statistics were provided them by the Department. They wired the President that the vetoed farm bill would provide only $14 million in dairy supports but would increase feed costs to dairy farmers by $26 million.

They told the President that they had checked the figures with the Department. Somebody else made a check, too, at the Department and found out some interesting things regarding the kind of a political game being played with farm legislation.

Le Roy Gore dropped in to ask about the figures. The people in the Department disclaimed any responsibility for the figures used. They told Gore that there was no way to accurately determine what the farm bill would have meant financially to Wisconsin dairy farmers. According to Gore, "One official said the Congressmen had apparently grabbed a handful of figures out of the air and aimed them at the moon."

The incident illustrates the political schizophrenia which has beset some of the Republicans in the State. On the one hand, there is the inviting comfort of Eisenhower's coattails and on the other is the result of presidential primary which showed that Ike is not the popular man he used to be among Wisconsin dairy farmers.

A situation like that can make a man pretty frantic, particularly when there is a job at stake in which the job holder has just voted himself a 50 percent increase in salary, as the Congressmen did in 1955, jumping themselves from $15,000 to $22,500. It was not surprising, therefore, to hear them charge that the bill the President vetoed was a stab in the back to Wisconsin dairy farmers. Governor Kohler called it a disgraceful bill.

These charges do not only hit the Democrats who voted for it. They hit the two Senators, WILEY and MCCARTHY, and Representative ALVIN O'KONSKI, Republicans, who came to the conclusion that the farmers of the State could do more for them in an election showdown than Ike can do.

Tribute to Adm. Richard E. Byrd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. DUFF
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, United States Navy, Chief of Naval Operations, in honor of Rear Adm. Richard E. Byrd, United States Navy, retired, delivered in New York on Tuesday, April 3, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY ADM. ARLEIGH A. BURKE, UNITED STATES NAVY, CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, IN HONOR OF REAR ADM. RICHARD E. BYRD, UNITED STATES NAVY, RETIRED, NEW YORK, N. Y., APRIL 3, 1956

Mr. Duke, Admiral Byrd, Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of the International Rescue Committee, ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor and a privilege to participate with you in this testimonial for Admiral Byrd.

Admiral Byrd is an outstanding public figure. In fact, he is the world's foremost living explorer. His reputation as a geographer, a philosopher and aerial navigator is

outstanding. He is also one of the Navy's most famous flag officers.

Many of us are fortunate enough to know Admiral Byrd personally. Others have read of his many accomplishments since the turn of this century. My own admiration for this pioneering naval officer goes back many years. It is a particular pleasure on this occasion to recall with you some of the highlights of the career of the fellow mariner, whom we honor here tonight.

Admiral Byrd graduated from the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis with the class of 1912. His class was one of those which supplied our country with a large number of outstanding officers.

As a midshipman, Admiral Byrd suffered a severe leg injury as a result of his enthusiastic participation in athletics. During his first 4 years of active commission this injury was aggravated. As a result he was transferred to the retired list. Prior to his retirement he had served admirably on six ships and was twice cited for bravery. Fortunately, his retirement was only a temporary loss to the Navy—because he came back to active duty immediately to train recruits in preparation for our entry into World War I. Here he demonstrated exceptional ability in organizing an effective training program.

In 1918, after completing a course of instruction at the Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla., Admiral Byrd was designated a naval aviator. Meanwhile, he began to develop plans for a trans-Atlantic flight of the Navy's famous Curtiss flying boats, which were then being made ready. With this in mind, he began intensive study of the many new problems connected with aerial navigation. He developed the drift indicator and the bubble sextant. Improved versions of these instruments are still standard navigation equipment for oceanic flights. Admiral Byrd is recognized today as one of the greatest of the Navy's aviation pioneers.

The years immediately following World War I were lean ones for naval aviation. The times were so critical that Admiral Byrd had to forego the trans-Atlantic flight because his talents were badly needed in the Navy Department. His efforts and influence in this new assignment were largely responsible for the creation of a separate bureau for naval aviation, which we now call the Bureau of Aeronautics.

Admiral Byrd organized and commanded the naval flying unit which in 1925 accompanied the polar expedition of another famous American arctic explorer—Mr. Donald B. MacMillan. This achievement won him a commendation by the Secretary of the Navy for meritorious service.

In 1926, Admiral Byrd made the first flight over the North Pole. He was assisted in this great undertaking by Floyd Bennett, chief machinist mate, United States Navy. As a result of this history-making flight, Admiral Byrd was awarded the Medal of Honor and the Distinguished Service Medal.

Not satisfied with his pioneering achievements of 1926, Admiral Byrd prepared to conquer new frontiers. Only a few weeks after Lindbergh's historic crossing, Admiral Byrd made the first successful nonstop crossing of the Atlantic by a multiengined aircraft. For this notable and historic achievement, Admiral Byrd was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross.

In 1928 he organized and commanded another polar expedition—this time to the Antarctic. It was here that he established the now-famous Little America base. On November 29, 1929, he made the first successful flight over the South Pole. For this extraordinary and hazardous achievement he was awarded the Navy Cross and the Byrd Antarctic Expedition Medal.

These successive achievements, each equal to or greater than the one preceding, fired the imagination of the entire world. In response to public acclaim, and on behalf of a grateful nation, Congress promoted Richard E. Byrd to the rank of rear admiral on the Navy retired list. This was done in spite of the personal objections of Admiral Byrd who in all modesty believed that such a great honor was not warranted.

From 1933 to 1935, Admiral Byrd organized and headed the second Antarctic expedition. Most of you are familiar with some of his extremely hazardous experiences which he has recounted so skillfully in his numerous articles and books. For his achievements during this expedition, the second Byrd Antarctic Expedition Medal was authorized by Congress and awarded to Admiral Byrd.

In 1939 he returned to active duty and assumed command of the United States Antarctic Service. While serving in this capacity, he established two Antarctic bases 1,500 miles apart. For this great service he received a letter of commendation from President Franklin D. Roosevelt and was awarded a Gold Star in lieu of a second Distinguished Service Medal. He was also awarded the Antarctic Expedition Medal for the operations from 1939 to 1941.

From this duty, he reported to the Office of the Secretary of War as a consultant for the development of all types of cold-climate, military clothing. In 1942, he again returned to the Bureau of Aeronautics and energetically analyzed the effectiveness of overseas base planning in all World War II theaters of operation. His tireless energy, unusual foresight, and superb leadership contributed immeasurably to the success of many phases of World War II planning. He was awarded a letter of commendation, with ribbon, by the Secretary of the Navy. In addition, he was awarded the Legion of Merit and a Gold Star in lieu of the second Legion of Merit.

Admiral Byrd commanded the 1946–47 Navy Antarctic expedition which was under the tactical command of Rear Adm. Richard H. Cruzen. This expedition was the largest ever to go into the Antarctic. The purpose of this operation was to train naval personnel and test standard Navy ships and equipment under extreme conditions of cold weather. Valuable scientific information was obtained on this expedition for use in the Navy's development programs.

One of Admiral Byrd's important accomplishments was in the advancement of the science of weather observations. He was among the first to recognize that basic weather originates in the polar regions. His pioneering research in this field has been invaluable to the Navy and to the entire world.

Today Admiral Byrd is in command of the naval forces engaged in Operation Deep Freeze. Rear Adm. George J. Dufek is his tactical commander. Operation Deep Freeze is a 4-year project in which the Navy will support the many United States agencies taking part in the international geophysical events from 1957 to 1958. The scope of this operation is greater than all of the previous expeditions combined. Under Admiral Byrd's experienced leadership, we can be sure that the Navy's missions in Operation Deep Freeze will be accomplished in an outstanding manner. The United States, and the United States Navy in particular, are extremely fortunate to have the services of Admiral Byrd for this gigantic, international scientific endeavor. We expect to obtain additional scientific material of vast importance, and we expect to explore the few remaining frontiers of the Antarctic, which constitutes an area almost the size of the United States and Europe combined.

Of necessity, only a few of Admiral Byrd's many citations have been mentioned. There are many, many more, both military and civilian—national and international. He has received all of the highest awards that a grateful nation can bestow.

Admiral Byrd has already made his niche in naval history. His wholehearted devotion to duty, his rare combination of imagination, planning foresight, and his organizational ability make him one of the truly great officers in the history of our Navy. No officer has contributed more to the United States Navy than Adm. Richard E. Byrd. No officer has contributed more to his country. When the history of this era is written, there is no doubt that Admiral Byrd will take his place alongside the traditional heroes of the Navy—the Deweys, the Farraguts, and the John Paul Joneses—to inspire the man generations of naval leaders yet to come.

Admiral Byrd's career is like the mighty oak tree; it has many branches. Its shadow passes over a large area. He is now serving as honorary chairman of the International Rescue Committee. This great organization has rescued many thousands of liberty-loving people from totalitarian oppression since 1933. You have aided more than 100,000 Iron Curtain refugees alone. Your appreciation of Admiral Byrd's further contribution to humanity through your great organization is evidenced by this testimonial dinner which you have sponsored.

Admiral Byrd has already completed over 30 years of active naval duty. It is, therefore, too late for him to change a habit of a lifetime. Hence, it is quite possible that as he sits here among us tonight, he is thinking of new frontiers to conquer. I shall not be surprised to see him commanding the first naval expedition to the moon. If he does command the expedition, we can rest assured that he will get there successfully, and accomplish what he sets out to do.

Isthmian Canal Policy of the United States: An Evaluation—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, among the important issues that for some years have confronted the Congress and the Nation is the question of the formulation of future Isthmian Canal policy.

The initial step in this direction was the enactment of Public Law 841, 81st Congress, approved September 26, 1950, which resulted from the recommendations growing out of an inquiry into the financial operation of the Panama Canal enterprise under House Resolution 44, 81st Congress. This law brought about the first reorganization of the Panama Canal agency since 1914. It was aimed at placing the enterprise on a self-sustaining basis.

Since that time, however, the management of the canal project has been under close scrutiny by responsible agencies of the Government, and further changes in its administration have been deemed necessary. Measures designed to effect these changes were introduced in the first session of this Congress. In the Senate there was S. 2167, introduced by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]; and in the House H. R. 7239, H. R. 7305, H. R. 7393, and H. R. 7564, introduced, respectively, by Representatives CECIL R. KING, JOHN J. ALLEN, JR., WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, and GEORGE P. MILLER, all of California.

The next great step in the evolution of isthmian canal policy is the determination of the form and character of increased facilities for the future Panama Canal, which with question the calculation of transit tolls is definitely related. A third step involves consideration of canals at other isthmian locations. For these last two tasks, which carry serious diplomatic, economic, engineering and marine implications, adequate means do not now exist.

To provide such facilities, Hon. CLARK W. THOMPSON of Texas, an impartial and thorough student of interoceanic canal problems, and I introduced identical measures, H. R. 3335 and S. 766, respectively, early in the present Congress to create an independent and broadly constituted Interoceanic Canals Commission. Its function would be to investigate and review all aspects of the subject and to submit to the Congress and the President recommendations for a logically developed isthmian canal policy.

As a practical aid in the congressional and public consideration of this question, Representative THOMPSON prepared an extensive bibliography, which was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 23, 1955, volume 101, No. 52, page A2049, entitled, "Isthmian Canal Policy of the United States—Documentation."

The most recent addition of significance to current literature on interoceanic canals is an article by Capt. Miles P. DuVal, United States Navy, retired, published in the March 1955 issue of the United States Naval Institute Proceedings, volume 81, pages 263–275. Also in the same issue, as a historical supplement to the indicated paper, there was an instructive pictorial section prepared by Prof. Gerald E. Wheeler, United States Naval Academy.

Accompanying the article was the following biographical sketch of its author, Captain DuVal:

Graduating from the United States Naval Academy in 1918 (class of 1919), Captain DuVal has had extensive naval service, including duty from 1941 to 1944 as captain of the port, Balboa, C. Z., in charge of marine operations in the Pacific sector of the Panama Canal. From 1946 to 1949 he was Navy Department liaison officer and coordinator of the Isthmian Canal studies, under the Chief of Naval Operations. He is the author of two books on the canal, And the Mountains Will Move and Cadiz to Cathay, published by Stanford University Press, and is now completing a third volume in his trilogy.

At this point, it may be pertinent to comment, in connection with the biographical sketch, that the article of Captain DuVal included in these remarks, like his other extensive writings on interoceanic canal history and problems, is objective, and reflects the comprehensiveness of a broad background of experience, and exhaustive study.

The Naval Institute Proceedings is the leading forum of naval thought in the United States. As such, it is dedicated to the advancement of professional, literary and scientific knowledge in the Navy, and has wide circulation in governmental and professional circles.

To make the subject statement convenient for ready reference by the Congress, the Executive, and the people at large, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the full text of parts I and II. I am informed by the Public Printer that the article is estimated to make 3½ pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $280.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISTHMIAN CANAL POLICY: AN EVALUATION—PART I

(By Capt. Miles P. DuVal, U. S. Navy (retired))

ISTHMIAN CANAL POLICY ROOTED IN HISTORY

The Panama Canal, opened to traffic on August 15, 1914, is an interoceanic public utility for the transit of vessels of commerce and war of all nations on terms of equality as provided by treaty. The history of this undertaking is epic.

The idea of its construction traces back more than four centuries. The development of it includes extensive explorations, grave crises, and weighty decisions. Out of these the Isthmian Canal policy of the United States gradually evolved. Yet, despite the vast literature on the canal question, nowhere are the principles of this policy comprehensively stated in one place, and they are not adequately understood. For these reasons a knowledge of key episodes of this important historical subject is essential.

The advantageous geographical position of the American isthmus was recognized by the early Spanish who, within an incredibly short time after their arrival in 1502, explored its regions and reduced their fields of investigation to four main areas: Tehuantepec, Nicaragua, Panama, and Darien-Atrato.

Because of the lower continental divides at Panama and Nicaragua and penetration of the jungles there by river valleys, these two avenues quickly became the great rivals for transisthmian commerce. They are still potential rivals.

At Panama, mountainous terrain and torrential rivers, notably the Chagres, at first represented insuperable barriers to the construction of a canal. At Nicaragua, the existence of a large lake, with the then navigable San Juan River flowing from it into the Atlantic, reduced the magnitude of that undertaking simply to cutting across the narrow strip separating the lake from the Pacific. These facts undoubtedly supply the basis for the initial predilection of the United States in the 19th century for a Nicaraguan canal.

Eventually, the control of the Nicaragua route became a focal point of international conflict, with Great Britain and the United States in a diplomatic deadlock. This difficulty was not removed until 1901, when the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty superseded the earlier Clayton-Bulwer Treaty of 1850, which had deprived the United States of exclusive control of any Isthmian canal.

Pattern of Isthman canal issues evolves

Meanwhile, French interests under the dynamic leadership of Ferdinand de Lesseps had decided to construct a canal across the Isthmus. An International Congress for Consideration of an Interoceanic Canal met in Paris in 1879. There, this Congress wrestled with the difficult questions of selecting the best site and deciding on the best type. De Lesseps, the hero of Suez (a simple sea-level canal), lent the full force of his prestige and his genius toward securing appovral of a sea-level undertaking at Panama—a wholly different problem.

One engineer, the only one in that Congress who had adequately studied the geography of Isthmian regions and grasped their significance, when he saw the trend toward decision for the sea-level type, rose in strong protest.

He understood the topography at Nicaragua and how its elevoted lake, 105.5' high, would contribute toward the construction and operation of a canal there. He knew the surface features at Panama—the continental divide about 10 miles from the Pacific, the torrential Rio Obispo-Chagres flowing into the Atlantic, and the smaller Rio Grande into the Pacific, both through contiguous valleys suitable for the formation of lakes. Interpreting these elements in the light of maritime as well as engineering needs, he recognized the lake idea as offering the solution of the canal problem.

Then, with the vision and simplicity of true genius, he proposed a practical plan for the Panama Canal, here summarized: "Build a dam at Gatun and another at Miraflores, or as close to the seas as the configuration of the land permits. Let the waters rise to form two lakes about 80 feet high, join the lakes thus formed with a channel cut through the continental divide, and connect the lakes with the oceans by locks. This is not only the best plan for engineering but also best for navigation." Essentially, that was the plan for the Panama Canal eventually adopted in 1906. The man who conceived and presented the plan was Adolphe Godin de Lépinay.

The applicability of this plan—the only one which at that time could have had any chance for success—was not understood. De Lépinay's great idea was ignored. His conception of this plan, however, and its dramatic presentation before the Paris Congress of 1879 establish him as an architectural and engineering genius—the originator of the plan from which the Panama Canal was eventually built.

The French, despite De Lépinay's timely warning, launched upon their ill-fated undertaking. Ten years later, in 1889, their effort collapsed and the Isthmus returned to the jungle. Yet, before the failure, the French, to save time and money, were forced to change their plans from sea-level to a modified high-level lake and lock type.

Thus, as the 19th century closed, the pattern of interoceanic canal's focal political and engineering issues had evolved: First, a struggle among competing interests in the choice of route; and, second, debate as to the type of canal, with final decision for the high-level-lake and lock type at Panama.

Panama wins the battle of the routes

In 1899, after more than half a century of exploration, including a number of naval expeditions, the United States started serious investigations by means of an Isthmian Canal Commission for exploration, 1899–1902, of which Rear Adm. John G. Walker, a distinguished line officer of the United States Navy, was president.

After an extraordinary political struggle, known as the "battle of the routes," the Congress authorized the acquisition for the United States of a canal zone in what was then a part of the Republic of Colombia, the purchase of the French holdings, and construction of a canal at Panama, with provision for the Nicaragua canal as an alternate project, if suitable arrangements could not be made for one at Panama.

To this end, the Chargé d'Affaires of Colombia, Dr. Tomás Herrán, a graduate of Georgetown University and well acquainted with American governmental leaders, succeeded, after many months of arduous labor, in negotiating what was considered a most favorable canal treaty for his country—the Hay-Herrán Treaty of January 22, 1903, which was ratified by the United States Senate on March 17, 1903.

Unfortunately, this treaty became involved politically in Bogota. The Colombian Sen-

ate, called into special session on June 20, 1903, for its ratification, rejected the treaty on August 12, 1903, against urgent pleadings of Dr. Herrán in Washington and United States Minister Arthur M. Beaupré in Bogotá.

Panamanian leaders, fearing that after all Panama still might lose the canal to Nicaragua, set out to prevent that possibility. Under the leadership of Dr. Manuel Amador, the state of Panama seceded from Colombia on November 3, 1903, and declared its independence. This was quickly recognized, first, by the United States, and appropriately, second, by France, the country that started the waterway. Then followed the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of November 18, 1903, which was ratified first by Panama and then by the United States.

In this treaty the Republic of Panama granted to the United States "in perpetuity" the "use, occupation, and control of a zone of land and land under water for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection" of the Panama Canal—and as if the United States were the "sovereign" of that territory. The ratification of this treaty sealed the choice of the Panama route.

The technical justification for this fundamental action was supplied by the Isthmian Canal Commission, 1899–1902, which, under the direction of Rear Admiral John G. Walker, explored all canal routes. He also headed the first Isthmian Canal Commission for the construction of the Panama Canal (1904–05) under which the Canal Zone was acquired, the Canal Zone Government organized, and preliminary work started. These achievements place him in history as a principal architect of Isthmian Canal Policy.

Battle of the levels and the great decision

Work under the United States control started haltingly, with increasing uncertainty as to the type of canal that should be constructed—the high-level-lake and lock type of a canal at sea level. Each proposal had strong advocates.

Fortunately, when the time for decision approached, President Theodore Roosevelt selected the great railroad builder, explorer, and business executive, the late John F. Stevens, as Chief Engineer of the Isthmian Canal Commission.

Mr. Stevens' qualifications were unique. He had read everything available on the proposed Panama Canal since the time of Philip II, built railroads in the Rocky Mountains, and supervised open mining operations in Minnesota. Thus, in his experience he had witnessed what occurs when the balances of nature are altered, and understood the hazards involved in excavating a navigation channel through mountains.

Arriving on the Isthmus on July 25, 1905, at the height of a crisis, he had matters under control within 24 hours. Experienced as he was in large undertakings, he promptly provided housing for employes, organized commissaries, encouraged sanitation, ordered equipment, planned the transportation system, and formed the basic enginering organization for building the Panama Canal. Indeed, so rapid was his progress that he found himself hampered by having to wait for a decision as to the type of canal, then being considered by an international Board of consulting engineers.

In its report of January 10, 1906, this board split—8 members, including 5 Europeans, voting for "sea level"; and the 5 remaining Americans voting for high-level-lake and lock. The naval member on the Isthmian Canal Commission at that time was the chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, who, in a minority report, favored the "sea-level" plan as "affording greater immunity from hostile injury."[1]

Footnotes at end of speech.

Meanwhile at Panama, Stevens had walked through the entire length of the canal route and studied the topography. Interpreting it in the light of navigational requirements as well as construction, he decided upon the high-level-lake and lock plan, with the Atlantic terminal dam and locks at Gatun. For the Pacific end, he favored placing its locks in one group south of Miraflores at Aguadulce, just as he planned to do at Gatun.

Testifying in Washington before Congressional committees in January 1906, with a conviction for the high-level plan that no one could shake, he voiced his determined opposition to the "sea-level" idea.

But one appearance was not enough. In June, he was again in Washington, still leading in this memorable struggle, later described by Col. George W. Goethals as the "battle of the levels." On this occasion, Stevens even more forcefully and fearlessly urged the high-level-lake plan as the logical solution.

In the end, with the support of President Theodore Roosevelt, Secretary of War William H. Taft, and the Isthmian Canal Commission, the recommendations of Chief Engineer Stevens prevailed. Congress, by the Act approved June 29, 1906, adopted the high-level-lake and lock plan as proposed by the minority of the international board of consulting engineers. That was the great decision in building the Panama Canal, for the second time completing the pattern of interoceanic canal political and engineering debate.

Here it should be noted that when making his recommendation to the Congress for this action, President Roosevelt did so after evaluating all available evidence of relative vulnerability and operational effectiveness of the two types. Although he understood that the sea-level type would be slightly less exposed to damage in event of war,[2] he recommended the high-level plan because of its economic and operational superiority.

The transit from 1914 through August 31, 1954, in both peace and war, of more than 230,517 vessels of various types has completely established the wisdom of that decision. Moreover, it secured Chief Engineer Stevens, who was primarily responsible for bringing it about, his great fame as the basic architect of the Panama Canal.

Civilian control replaced by military

Though the high-level plan, as approved by the minority of the International Board of Consulting Engineers, provided for placing all Atlantic locks at Gatun, it also specified separation of the Pacific locks into two groups. Chief Engineer Stevens, who had had railroad operating experience, recognized the operational inconvenience of this arrangement and never favored dividing the Pacific locks.

Eventually, on August 3, 1906, Stevens tentatively approved a plan developed by William Gerig. The proposal placed all Pacific locks in 3 lifts south of Miraflores with the terminal dam and locks between 2 hills, Cerro Aguadulce on the west side of the sea-level section of the canal and Cerro de Puente on the east side, on a natural perimeter that would have supplied the same arrangement as at Gatun. This plan, had it been followed, would have enabled lake-level navigation from the Atlantic locks to the Pacific with a summit-level anchorage at the Pacific end of the canal to match that at the Atlantic end.

Regrettably, Stevens was under great pressure to start construction. Advocates of the sea-level proposal, stung to the quick by their defeat in Congress, were poised ready to take advantage of a major change in the approved program as evidence of weakness in the high-level plan. Opponents of any canal at all were also seeking some means to delay the enterprise. These two forces together

Footnotes at end of speech.

represented a political and economic strength that could not be disregarded.

Stevens' foundation explorations, necessarily made in great haste, proved unsatisfactory, and he did not dare to jeopardize the project by further delay. Twenty days later, on August 23, 1906, still confident that this important question would rise again, he voided his plan marking it, "not to be destroyed but kept in this office," and proceeded with the approved plan for separating the Pacific locks.

In 1907, after having brought construction to a point where the success of the project was a certainty, Stevens resigned his positions as chief engineer and chairman of the Isthmian Canal Commission, to which combined offices he had been appointed by President Roosevelt in recognition of his contributions. He was succeeded by Col. George W. Goethals under whose able direction the work was carried forward.

Panama Canal opened for traffic

Notwithstanding this shift in administrative control of the canal enterprise from civilian to military in 1907, the Stevens proposal to combine the Pacific locks did not die. Col. William L. Sibert seriously studied it and, on January 31, 1908, formally submitted a definite plan that reflected his appreciation of marine needs as the basis for navigational planning.[3] But, unfortunately, the Sibert proposal likewise was not approved for reasons then deemed adequate.

In this connection, it is pertinent to comment that after the resignation of Rear Admiral Walker in 1905 there was no experienced navigator on the Isthmian Canal Commission. Thus, one can only ponder what might have been the result had such a person been readily available for consultation with Stevens and Sibert on marine planning. In the light of later operational and engineering knowledge, developed in 1941–44, when there was such consultation between experienced engineers and marine operating officials, it is indeed regrettable that the Stevens-Sibert proposals were not adopted.

Colonel Goethals headed the project to the end, making a number of important but nonbasic changes, which included a widening of Culebra (Gaillard) Cut and the locks. He developed the first permanent operating organization under the Panama Canal Act of 1912 and, as the first Governor of the Panama Canal, opened the canal to traffic on August 15, 1914, and overcame the early slide crises. He and his associates won great fame as builders of the Panama Canal.

In this connection, it should be explained that the original concept of the functioning of the canal enterprise as a civil agency under the Panama Canal Act was dual: in peace, as an interoceanic public utility under a governor; in war, under the supreme control of the Commanding General of the United States Army on the isthmus. In either status, the operational mission of the waterway remained as the transit of vessels under the obvious assumption that the Panama Canal, like other transportation facilities in the United States, would serve in war as well as in peace.

ISTHMIAN CANAL POLICY: AN EVALUATION—PART II

(By Capt. Miles P. DuVal, U. S. Navy (retired))

DEFENSE CONCEPTS BECOME ASCENDANT

After the opening of the canal to traffic, the great builders left the Isthmus; operation and maintenance became matters of routine, and the project was uncritically accepted. The rapid development of the airplane and other modern weapons following World War I, dramatized by periodic fleet exercises off Panama, made considerations of defense

Footnotes at end of speech.

matters of increasing concern; those of marine operations became secondary.

In the excitement preceding World War II, the Congress authorized construction of a third set of larger locks, primarily as a defense measure,[4] known as the third locks project, at an authorized cost of $277 million. The proposed layout placed a new set of larger locks (140 by 1,200 feet) near each of the existing locks but at some distance away to afford greater protection through dispersal and increased lock capacity for large naval vessels. The new locks were to be joined with the existing channels by means of bypass channels.[5]

Significantly, the plan included a number of construction features for future changing of the canal to "sealevel." Thus, discerning students recognized the third locks project as renewing the old "battle of the levels" in a new form—that of "conversion."

The third locks project layout at the Atlantic end of the canal, which duplicates an operationally sound arrangement at Gatun, is likewise sound. At the Pacific end, however, the proposed new channel layout contained three sharp bends—29°, 47°, 37°—in succession from north to south. The latter, if it had been completed, would have created operational problems and navigational hazards of the gravest character.

Construction started in 1940 and was pushed vigorously until suspended in May 1942 because of shortage of ships and materials more urgently needed elsewhere for war purposes. No excavation was accomplished at Pedro Miguel; that at Gatun and Miraflores was substantially completed. Some $75 million was expended.[6]

War experience inspires plan for canal improvement

The suspension of the third locks project, however, afforded an opportunity, while there was still time left to make such a study, for its re-examination in the light of operational needs demonstrated by marine experience. This was at a period when the Panama Canal was the scene of many military and naval expeditions on their way to and from combat zones in the Pacific. This, it should be also noted, was before the advent of the atomic bomb.

These studies conclusively established that the principal marine operational problems of the existing Panama Canal are:

1. Dangerous traffic bottleneck at Pedro Miguel and lack of a Pacific summit anchorage.

2. Double handling of vessels at separated Pacific locks.

3. Effect of fog in Culebra (Gaillard) Cut on capacity and operations.

4. Lockage surges in Cut caused by operating Pedro Miguel locks (3 feet maximum amplitude).

5. Limited operating range of Gatun Lake water level (87–82 feet).

6. Navigational hazards in the restricted Cut (300 feet minimum bottom width).

7. Inadequate dimensions of present locks for largest vessels (110'×1,000').[7]

From the nature of these inadequacies, it is obvious that locating the Pedro Miguel locks at the south end of Culebra (Gaillard) Cut, where it created a traffic bottleneck and other problems, was the fundamental error in operational design of the Panama Canal.

Under the basic assumption that the prime function of the Panama Canal is the safe and convenient transport of vessels, it is self-evident that the wide channels of Gatun Lake afford safer and more convenient navigation than can any necessarily restricted channel at sea level. Moreover, the advantages of unrestricted lake navigation outweigh the minor hazards and time lost by passage through locks. Thus, the best operational solution is not provided by lowering the Gatun Lake water level to sea level, or to some intermediate level, but by raising it to its highest feasible elevation.

The obvious economic operational solution thus is a major improvement of the existing canal according to what is known as the Terminal Lake-Third locks plan, which includes the following program:

1. Removal of the bottleneck Pedro Miguel locks.

2. Construction of all Pacific locks in continuous steps near Miraflores.

3 and 4. Elevation of the intermediate Miraflores Lake water level (54 feet) to that of Gatun Lake to serve as an anchorage during fog periods and to dampen surges.

5. Raising the summit water level to its optimum height (approximately 92 feet).

6. Widening Culebra (Gaillard) Cut.

7. Construction of a set of larger locks.

These modifications will remove the traffic choke at Pedro Miguel, correct present operational dissymmetry, and simplify canal control, increase channel depths, and improve navigation, mitigate the effect of fog, reduce marine accidents, decrease transit time slighlty, conserve water, and increase capacity. Thus, the plan supplies the best operational canal practicable of economic achievement.

This plan was publicly revealed by its author on May 20, 1943, in an address before the Panama section of the American Society of Civil Engineers, under the title, "The Marine Operating Problems, Panama Canal, and the Solution."[8] Attended by high Army, Navy, and Canal Zone officials, the presentation aroused the interests of the commandant of the 15th Naval District, Rear Adm. C. E. Van Hook, who was present. He later submitted the plan to the Navy Department. On September 7, 1943, the Secretary of the Navy forwarded it to the President. Subsequently, this proposal was approved in principle by the Governor of the Panama Canal for the major modification of the existing canal. According to the report of a 1949 congressional investigation, it can be accomplished at "comparatively low cost."[9] Moreover, no doubt exists as to its soundness because a similar arrangement at Gatun has been tested since 1914 and found eminently satisfactory.

Atomic bomb resurrects sea-level plan

The spectacular advent of the atomic bomb in 1945 injected a new element into the canal picture. Under the force of its impact, canal officials sought authority to conduct an "overall review" of the entire interoceanic canals question in the light of the then newest developments in the military and physical sciences.[10] This was before the hydrogen bomb.

Accordingly, the Congress in 1945 enacted legislation[11] authorizing the Governor of the Panama Canal to make a comprehensive investigation of the means for increasing its capacity and security to meet the future needs of interoceanic commerce and national defense. The law also provided for a restudy of the third locks project, a study of canals at other locations, and for consideration of any new means for transporting ships across land. Thus was launched the second major canal crisis in the 20th century. It served to resurrect the corpses of the 1902 "battle of the routes," and the 1906 "battle of the levels," with a rehashing of all the main arguments of the earlier struggles on the basis of the newer term, "security," rather than the older one, "vulnerability."

Under a far more extreme interpretation of the "security" factor of the statute than was intended by the Congress that enacted it, the investigation was directed toward obtaining authorization for a sea-level project at Panama, with the security and national defense factors as paramount, and money costs not a governing consideration.[12] In line with the 1905–06 precedent, the naval representative on the Board of Consulting Engineers for the greater part of this engineering investigation was the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks.

In the ensuing public hysteria centered on the dangers of the atomic bomb and other modern weapons, the long-range and fundamental mission of the Panama Canal to provide efficient and economic transit of vessels was generally overlooked.

The report of the 1946–47 Isthmian Canal Studies[13] recommended only the sea-level project for major canal construction at Panama, initially estimated to cost $2,483,000,000. With the exception of the two terminals, this project provides for constructing a virtually new Panama Canal of 60-foot minimum depth in navigation lanes and of 600-foot width between sloping sides at a depth of 40 feet on a new alinement somewhat removed from the present channel, which it crosses several times. The project includes a tidal lock (200 feet by 1,500 feet) and a navigable pass at the Pacific end, many miles of dams for flood-control reservoirs on both sides of the projected canal, diversion channels and other structural features. This program would result in abandonment of the greater part of the existing waterway and the investment that it represents.

Although the 1947 report contained studies of plans for a terminal lake-third lock project, which it did not recommend, it offered a relatively minor program for improvement of the present canal installations "to meet the needs of commerce" as a preferred alternative to the major improvement of the existing waterway as recommended to the President in 1943 by the Secretary of the Navy.

Transmitted by the President to the Congress on December 1, 1947, and without Presidential approval, comment or recommendation, the report promptly encountered sharp opposition. The Congress took no action on this report. Instead, in 1949, it authorized an investigation of the organizational and financial aspects of the canal enterprise,[14] for which study Representative CLARK W. THOMPSON, of Texas, a retired Marine Corps Reserve officer, served as chairman. This investigation resulted in the first basic change[15] in the permanent canal operating organization that was established in 1914.

The new act requires that transit tolls be established at rates that will place the operation of the canal enterprise on a self-sustaining basis—a new principle in Isthmian Canal policy with far-reaching implications affecting the future economic management of the Panama Canal and interoceanic commerce. This subject is now under further congressional study.[16]

Clarifications restore operations as basis for planning

Meanwhile, in the Congress, the security and national defense premises, on which the recommendation for the sea-level project was primarily based, were vigorously challenged.

As to the atomic bomb, Representative Willis W. Bradley, a retired naval officer, summarized his views: "As far as I can ascertain, the greatest authorities on modern weapons of war who have given this subject serious attention hold uniformly that any canal would be critically vulnerable to the atomic bomb, regardless of type; that a sea-level canal would be in the same security class as a lake canal; that a sea-level canal could be closed for prolonged periods of time beyond any hope of speedy restoration; and that a sea-level canal cannot be considered secure in an atomic war. These same authorities also agree that the atomic bomb is irrelevant as a controlling factor

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

in the planning of operational improvements for the Panama Canal.[17]

Representative, now a Senator THOMAS E. MARTIN, of Iowa, a retired Army officer, developed the national defense clarification, repeatedly stressing that protection of any type of canal, wherever located, is an overall governmental responsibility and that its defense, like that of the seaports, airports, railroads, highways, and productive centers of the United States depends upon the combined industrial, military, naval, and air power of this Nation as obtained in both world wars, and not upon passive defense measures, such as may be embodied in inherent characteristic of canal design.[18]

Here it should be stated that leading atomic warfare authorities, who studied the problem of Canal Zone defense in 1947, considered that arguments as to relative vulnerability of types of construction are entirely without point and that the sea-level project would, in effect, constitute a Maginot Line. This view has been greatly strengthened by the later development of the hydrogen bomb, which is measured in mega-tons of TNT equivalent as compared to kilo-tons for the atomic bombs.

In the course of extensive discussions of the sea-level project recommendations,[19] congressional and administrative leaders often stressed the point that this project, if justified primarily for national defense, would divert both funds and resources from projects and programs in the United States that are far more essential to national security. The combined effects of the defense clarifications have been toward eliminating the concept of inherent resistance to attack as the governing consideration in planning at Panama. Thus, it appears that the only justifiable security design feature is adequate protection against sabotage, which is chiefly an administrative function.

Eventually, a group of engineers and others associated in building the Panama Canal submitted their views in a memorandum to the Congress. This memorial challenged the official cost estimates in the 1947 report, charging that the sea-level project would cost several times its initial estimate—$2,483,000,000—and that the third locks project adapted to the principles of the terminal lake proposal (widening Culebra Cut excepted) can be accomplished at relatively low cost as compared to that of the sea-level project—estimated as under $600 million.

The statement also criticized the 1953 program for repair and alteration of present lock structures as makeshift in character and without sufficient merit, pointing out that it will delay the fundamental and long-overdue solution of the problems involved. It stated that the Governor's recommendation of none but the sea-level project for major increase of canal facilities served to exclude what may be the best solution when evaluated from all angles.

Included in an address to the House by Representative EUGENE J. KEOGH, of New York,[20] this memorandum was promptly recognized by the engineering profession.[21]

Strong appeals for the creation of a wholly American, independent, broadly based, predominantly civilian, strictly nonpartisan and objective Interoceanic Canals Commission, composed of able men who may not be dominated or unduly influenced by Federal executive agencies, have been made by responsible congressional leaders as the best means for developing a wisely reasoned isthmian canal policy.[22]

The consequences of prolonged arguments, in and out of the Congress, have been toward restoration of economic thinking and an increased appreciation of fundamental planning concepts so well expressed during the 1905–06 "battle of the levels" by Gen. Henry L. Abbot, the great student of the Chagres, member of the Comité Technique of the French Panama Canal Co. and the International Board of Consulting Engineers, and an advocate of the high-level type. His words were: "The true criterion is ease and safety of transit, and * * * this test leaves no doubt as to which type of canal should be preferred at Panama."[23] This standard, both obvious and simple, is as true today as it was when written in 1905. Moreover, it is applicable in evaluating not only canal proposals at Panama but also those at other locations.

Diplomatic implications

The juridical basis for the Canal Zone rests with the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty, which authorized a zone 10 miles wide extending 5 miles on each side of the center line of the canal. After extended diplomatic discussions, the boundaries of the Canal Zone were later fixed in the Price-Lefevre Boundary Convention of September 2, 1914.

An examination of the general plan of the proposed Sea-Level project discloses a number of features not covered by current international agreements. Among these are: a new main channel alinement substantially removed from the existing channel from which Canal Zone boundaries are measured; flooding of additional territory in the Republic of Panama in the Chagres River Valley downstream from Madden Dam (Alhajuela); diverting the Chagres River from its present path west of Limon Bay to a new path east of the bay that crosses a Panamanian highway; and draining the central portion of Gatun Lake. The last features would disrupt present navigation channels to Panamanian settlements on the lake and uncover large and forbidding swamp areas with resulting health and sanitation consequences.

These aspects of the sea-level undertaking would undoubtedly bring a demand from the Republic of Panama for a new treaty covering the specific conditions for its construction. What concessions such a treaty would cost cannot be predicted. But, based upon previous experience in such diplomatic negotiations, these costs would be far greater than earlier ones, inevitably adding to the total estimate and increasing tolls.

Furthermore, such negotiations would be fraught with considerable uncertainty in the relations of the United States with Panama and other nations of Latin America, not to mention threats to the security of the enterprise through the process of its internationalization, for which there have been persistent demands.

In contrast, the terminal lake-third locks plan, being merely an enlargement of the existing facilities[24] that does not call for additional land or waters or authority, will not require a new canal treaty. This, it must be obvious, is a truly paramount consideration.

The construction of a canal at another location would introduce an entirely new diplomatic situation, which would be just as complicated as that at Panama.

The salient elements of this situation, however, are: that the 1947 report does not present these significant diplomatic involvements; that the need for negotiating a new treaty with Panama to cover the sea-level project was not submited to the Congress; and that the Congress has not authorized such negotiation as was done in the Spooner Act of 1902 for the original construction of the Panama Canal.

Isthmian Canal policy must be redetermined

The evolution of Isthmian Canal policy has been slow. Its principal objectives have long been the best type of canal at the best site for the transit of vessels of commerce and war of all nations on terms of equality as provided by treaty—and at low cost of construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection.

Often beset by bewildering confusions of ideas, the progress of fundamental concepts has, at times, deviated from their logical courses. Yet events have thus far conspired to avert irretrievable error. Now, with the main arguments clarified, the interoceanic canal problem in its national relationships is coming to be better understood and attention is focusing on the true objectives of securing requisite capacity and operational efficiency. Nevertheless, the evolving situation is of such grave concern that it must be protected by ceaseless vigilance and fully matured objective judgment.

The Panama Canal is now entering its fifth decade of operations. Its navigational inadequacies have been established. The canal as completed contains fundamental errors in operational design centered on the location of the Pedro Miguel locks. These can be corrected only by the major reconstruction of the Pacific end of the canal as contemplated in the Terminal Lake-Third locks proposal.

Commercial traffic through the canal has reached the highest volume in history. The Navy has vessels that cannot transit. Issues raised by questions of security and national defense have been formally submitted but never accepted. The principle of economic operation of the canal has ben embodied in law.[25] Yet, in a physical sense, the shipway is still esentially what it was in 1914. Thus, the time has come to provide, without further delay, the additional interoceanic transit capacity and operational improvements to meet present and future needs.

The solution of this problem is not the simple proposition that it may appear. Instead, it is a highly complicated one of the greatest national importance, rising above purely personal and group considerations. It involves questions of fundamental operational and engineering planning, the decisions on which will affect the welfare of the United States and other maritime nations through the indefinite future.

These facts call for a further reassessment of the entire interoceanic canals problem[26] based on realities, with a comprehensive restatement of isthmian canal policy as derived from a reasoned line of action. This is the task that sooner or later the Congress and the Nation must meet.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] Report of Board of Consulting Engineers for the Panama Canal (Washington, 1906), p. xix.

[2] Ibid., p. lv.

[3] William L. Sibert and John F. Stevens, The Construction of the Panama Canal (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1915), pp. 139–46 contains a summary of the Sibert proposal and its disposition.

[4] Public Law 391, 76th Congress, approved August 11, 1939 (535 Stat. 1409).

[5] H. Doc. 210, 76th Cong., 1st sess. (1939).

[6] House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Executive Hearings on H. R. 4480, 79th Cong., 1st sess., November 15, 1945, p. 4.

[7] Hon. Willis W. Bradley, What of the Panama Canal? CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 94, pt. 10 (April 21, 1948), p. A2449, and The Whys of the Panama Canal, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 12 (March 4, 1949), p. A1303 contain extended discussions of marine problems.

[8] ASCE Transactions, vol. 114 (1949), p. 558.

[9] H. Rept. 1304, 81st Cong., 1st sess. (1949), p. 2.

[10] Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, op. cit., p. 5.

[11] Public Law 280, 79th Cong., approved December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 663).

[12] See statement of Board of Consulting Engineers, quoted in Panama American, Aug. 5, 1946, p. 3, cols. 4–6.

[13] Summarized with discussions in A. S. C. E. Transactions, vol. 114 (1949), pp. 607–906.

[14] H. Res. 44, 81st Cong., quoted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 2 (Feb. 28, 1949), p. 1617.

[15] H. Doc. 460, 81st Cong., 2d sess. (1950) and Public Law 841, 81st Cong., approved Sept. 26, 1950 (64 Stat. 1038).

[16] Hon. JOHN J. ALLEN, Panama Canal—Interim Report, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 100, No. 149 (Aug. 4, 1954), p. A5766.

[17] Bradley, What of the Panama Canal?, op. cit., p. A2451.

[18] Hon. THOMAS E. MARTIN, An Interoceanic Canals Commission, the Best Solution of Panama Canal Problem, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 97, pt. 14 (July 18, 1951), p. A4481.

[19] Hon. CLARK W. THOMPSON, Isthmian Canal Policy of the United States—Bibliographical List, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 16 (Aug. 25, 1949), p. A5580 and subsequent statements of distinguished Members of Congress.

[20] Panama Canal Construction Engineers Favor Interoceanic Canals Commission, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 100, No. 79 (Apr. 29, 1954), p. 5491.

[21] Panama Canal Problem, Civil Engineering, vol. 24 (July 1954), p. 460.

[22] H. R. 8457 and H. R. 8458, 82d Cong., H. R. 1048, 83d Cong., and S. 766 and H. R. 3335, 84th Cong.

[23] Henry L. Abbot, Problems of the Panama Canal (New York: Macmillan Co., 1905), p. 224.

[24] Hull-Alfaro Treaty of Mar. 2, 1936. Art. II.

[25] Public Law 841, 81st Cong., approved Sept. 26, 1950 (64 Stat. 1038).

[26] THOMPSON, Interoceanic Canals Problem, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 98, pt. 8 (Jan. 15, 1952), p. A163.

Atomic Energy and the Power Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to insert in the RECORD the following article titled "Atomic Energy and the Power Industry" which appeared in the April 26, 1956, issue of the Public Utilities Fortnightly and which was written by Franklin H. Cook, professor of economics, College of Business Administration, the Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa.

Professor Cook, who is a constituent of mine, discusses the economics of three types of electric power generation, namely, hydro, steam, and atomic reactor.

His article follows:

ATOMIC ENERGY AND THE POWER INDUSTRY

(By Franklin H. Cook)

In the latter part of January 1956, the citizens' panel on the Impact of the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy told the Congress of the United States that by 1980 atomic energy should be able to produce more electricity than is now generated by conventional means.[1] Specifically, the panel looks for an increase in annual capacity from our present 115 million kilowatts to 600 million kilowatts. Of this latter figure, 135 million kilowatts would be produced by atomic energy. Steam generation would be up 60 percent from today.

The panel's report seems to be predicated upon the assumption that atomic fuel will ultimately replace fossil fuels as a primary source of power. This affirmation is not based upon fear that coal, oil, and gas reserves will be depleted, but that atomic energy will be a cheaper form of energy than competing fuels.

Also, the panel narrowed the field of possible applications of nuclear power. Employment of the atom in reciprocating engines was dismissed as impractical at the present technological stage of development. The use of atomic energy in airplanes was similarly repudiated because of hazard to persons on the ground in the event of a crackup. Generation of electric power appeared to be the most feasible area in which nuclear energy could be utilized, replacing conventional fuels for steam generation.

This hot capsule, peaceful use of the atom, has now been offered to the electric power industry by the Government. Political authorities had three possible approaches to industrial use of the atom. First, under guidance of a public power-minded administration, the State might have reserved the development of nuclear power as a government monopoly. Secondly, it could have turned the entire project over to private industry. Present world political and military conditions negate this possibility. Lastly, it might effect a compromise between the two positions by licensing the fuel to private industry, and encouraging risk capital to carry on the economic growth of the energy singlehanded or with Government aid. The latter position has been chosen.

The selection of the electric power companies as the representative of private industry in the evolution of atomic power has benefited common stocks of engineering and manufacturing firms connected with nuclear energy or the manufacture of electric generating equipment. The electric power companies and the coal producers have not been so elated. Without the capital reserves of a nonregulated industry, the electric utilities hesitate to burden their stockholders with the risk of being the first to venture into this new frontier. Nevertheless, international politics, Government sanction, and public expectations prod them onward.

Inroads of nuclear energy upon the electric power field will be gradual, for the peaceful uses of atomic fuel are tied in with the steam turbine. Today, approximately 1 out of 4 kilowatts generated comes from a hydro plant. Further, a large number of consumers in the United States do not buy directly from a company that generates electric power, but from a purchasing company that buys either hydro or fuel-generated electricity from a wholesaler. Investors in the hydro and purchasing company may never have to worry about a change to atomic power.

The influence of nuclear energy can be assessed by studying the effect of atomic generation upon the three types of companies: purchasing, steam, and hydro. A company fits into a classification if it secures over 50 percent of its power from one of those sources. Each type of company has a different plant investment and expense pattern. For example, the purchasing company has a large percentage of plant invested in its distribution system, and low total plant investment in relation to operating revenue, whereas the hydro company shows a large plant investment in terms of operating revenue with practically no fuel costs. The steam company lies somewhere between the purchasing and hydro companies.

In 1953 before deduction for depreciation reserves, the median purchasing company had $2.70 invested in total utility plant for every dollar of operating revenue; the steam company, $4.20; and the hydro, $5.30. Chart I, illustrating the percentage of plant devoted to production, transmission, and distribution by the three types of companies, demonstrates that the purchasing company has the highest number of dollars invested in distribution facilities; the hydro, in production plant; and the steam company has almost an equal investment in production and distribution equipment, the latter being slightly more than the distribution plant of the hydro company.

(Chart omitted.)

Transmission lines owned by the purchasing company are negligible, although representing a greater percentage of total plant than generating assets. Because of the location factor the hydro company might be presumed to have a heavy investment in transmission lines, but the investment is only slightly greater than for the steam company.

Only by the relocation of existing generating facilities would nuclear energy affect any company's investment in distribution and transmission equipment. The stockholder in the purchasing company has practically no generating plant represented by his investment. In fact, the present trend for these companies is away from the ownership of such assets. Therefore, atomic energy will enter his deliberations only when the management of the company considers the addition of generating properties to the plant. On the other hand, the investors in the stream and hydro companies are going to face the problem of nuclear investment more quickly. Whether it is adopted, and when, depends upon two factors: the future demand for electricity from a particular company and the competitive cost with other fuels as a source of energy.

A presently generating plant, steam or hydro, will add atomic energy units either as replacement of existing facilities or as supplemental units. Where a company is already generating by steam it would be very easy to replace present mineral fuel boilers with atomic units, for only about half of the production plant is represented by boiler apparatus. Because its existing generating resources are not readily adaptable to production by atomic energy, a hydro company would not be likely to supplant its present dams with nuclear boilers.

However, if a steam or hydro company is located within an expanding market and high plant and load factors make additional units imperative, undoubtedly, atomic units would be given consideration if the cost of production per kilowatt-hour was competitive with existing steam plants. An additional atomic unit could be easily tied into a steam-generating system, making use of much installed equipment; and, if it is a large steam-generating company, the construction of additional plant is a recurring problem.

Management of a hydro company requiring supplemental units because of demand would have three possible solutions: make greater use of hydraulic power; purchase power; add a steam-generating unit. It would be unlikely to choose the first, expand hydro facilities, for available waterpower sources are decreasing rapidly in the United States. Within the last decade hydro production increased about 50 percent; fuel, over two times; and gas and oil generation quadrupled.[2] Because expansion by steam generation would be a

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

new type of production for the personnel and management of the hydro company, the addition of a new generating unit either fuel fired or atomically heated would not be a first choice. First choice would be an attempt to purchase additional power needs. Thus, for the hydro company, steam generation by coal, gas, oil or atom would be a last choice. A company experienced in steam will more readily adopt atomic fuel than a purchasing company or hydro company that does not possess the adaptable equipment nor personnel acquainted with steam generation.

Whether a purchasing, steam, or hydro company contemplates the use of atomic energy, a paramount factor in reaching that decision is the cost of production of such power. This cost is made up of two items: fixed and variable costs. The main element in the first group is the depreciation on the plant. Labor and fuel are the chief variable items. Today, it seems the effect of atomic fuel will be to increase the percentage of fixed costs through greater plant investment. In 1953 the median purchasing company had $51.50 invested in production plant for every kilowatt of capacity; the steam, $132; and the hydro, $178. Contemplated atomic energy plants are expected to cost between $230 and $290 per kilowatt.[3] This makes the outlay greater than for the hydro plant, and if coupled with an accelerated depreciation rate, the result is a greater annual depreciation charge than for the hydro plant—at least 10 percent of operating revenues. However, in terms of production cost, added depreciation on generating plant is an infinitesimal part of total cost of power at the generator. The variable items represent a more significant component of production cost.

In 1953 production cost, exclusive of depreciation, was 1.23 cents per kilowatt-hour for the purchasing company, mainly for purchased power; for the steam company, 4½ mills; and for the hydro company, slightly over 2 mills. According to Mr. Morehouse[4] the generating cost of nuclear energy per kilowatt-hour is estimated to be between 6.7 and 9 mills. If that figure includes depreciation on production equipment, it would compare with 1.3 cents for the purchasing company, slightly over 5 mills for the steam, and about 3 mills for the hydro. If depreciation on production plant is added to the production expense per kilowatt-hour it amounts to about 1 mill per kilowatt-hour for all 3 types of companies and would approximate that figure for the atomic energy plant. The operating statement characteristics of a nuclear fuel plant would lie somewhere between that of a steam plant and a hydro plant.

Table I below shows a vertical analysis for the income and earned surplus statement of the purchasing, steam, and hydro companies. For the atomic plant to compete, depreciation would approximate that of the steam plant, and production expenses would lie somewhere between the 24 percent of the steam company and the 16 percent of the hydro.

TABLE I.—*Comparative common-size expenses for purchasing, steam, and hydro companies*

	Purchasing	Steam	Hydro
Average selling price per kilowatt-hour ..... cents	2.7	1.9	1.3
Depreciation ..... percent	5.6	9.8	9.2
Taxes ..... do	12.5	22.3	25.5
Production expense ..... do	45.9	24.3	16.1
Transmission expense ..... do	.3	1.3	1.7
Distribution expense ..... do	8.9	7.9	7.3
Customer and accounting expense ..... do	3.9	3.2	2.9
Sales promotion expense ..... do	1.4	1.9	.8
Administrative and general expense ..... do	6.9	7.3	8.8

Medians based on companies having all operating revenue from sale of electricity, "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, 1953," Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C.

The only conclusion that can be drawn from the analysis of the electric-power industry in terms of the application of nuclear fuel is that at the present time the atom is not in a competitive position with existing fuels in terms of production cost per kilowatt-hour.

A look at the trend line of production costs for the three types of companies since 1948 may be helpful in determining when and where nuclear energy may first be found economically profitable in the electric-power industry. From 1948 to 1953 production expenses for the purchasing company have gone up from 43 to 46 percent of operating revenue. Nevertheless, the companies have been able to keep their average selling price per kilowatt-hour in line by dropping it from 2.8 cents to 2.7 cents for the same period. Among the purchasing companies there is pressure from the increasing production expenses.

However, both the steam and the hydro companies have had a decrease in production expenses for this period, the steam moving from 34 to 24 percent—a decline of 10 percent in the period from 1948 to 1953, inclusive. Undoubtedly, this was effected by the introduction of more efficient equipment, requiring less fuel and labor per kilowatt-hour. Hydro companies dropped about the same amount from 25.6 percent in 1948 to 16 percent in 1953. The average selling price per kilowatt-hour of the steam companies held steady during this period at 1.9 cents, whereas the hydro companies dropped from 1.4 cents to 1.3 cents between 1952 and 1953.

An examination of average cost per kilowatt-hour[5] for all three types of companies shows resistance against increased expenses. The purchasing company had costs of 2.5 cents per kilowatt-hour in 1948 and the same in 1953; steam, 1.5 cents and 1.4 cents; hydro, 1.2 cents and 1.1 cents. Over the 5-year period steam and hydro companies have managed to reduce their operating revenue deductions per kilowatt-hour by 1 mill. The trend-cost picture of these three types of companies does not seem to be significant in ascertaining which type of company will be the first great user of atomic energy.

The introduction of nuclear energy to the electric power industry will not make present plant investments obsolete. As the use of atomic power spreads through the electric-power field, management in replacing existing facilities or adding new units will be governed by cost factors in integrating the atom to their system. Chief stumbling blocks to the purchasing and hydro companies will be the addition of new and different generating units, which objection would be present if the new additions were fossil fired. If the cost trend per kilowatt-hour for nuclear fuel is downward and for other fuel upward, then prior to 1980 some plants will have found it advantageous to change to atomic power. They will be purchasing, steam, and hydro companies for whom the transportation of coal, gas, or oil makes such fuel consumption so costly that nuclear heat may be used advantageously.

Since 1925 the progressive rate of decline in the consumption of coal per kilowatt-hour has not been rapid. From 1920 to 1925 the rate dropped from 3 pounds of coal to 2 pounds of coal per kilowatt-hour. From 1925 to 1954, 29 years, the rate declined to 1 pound.[6]

Technologically, atomic power is in its infancy; as it matures it should have a greater increase in efficiency than coal has shown in the last decades, particularly if the hydrogen or fusion process is released to private industry.

In the main, because of adaptability of equipment, personnel, and management, atomic energy will slowly enter the electric-power field as unit additions to steam plants. The transition will be gradual. Nuclear force is not powerful enough to shatter in one moment ancient hindrances to change; obstructions that now and in the past keep purchasing companies from changing to hydro or steam generation, hydro companies from adding steam units, and steam companies from installing more efficient steam plants.

[3] The New York Times, Wednesday, Feb. 1, 1956, pp. 1, 19.

[4] Federal Power Commission, Consumption of Fuel for Production of Electric Energy, 1954, FPC S-119, table V, p. 9.

[5] How Will Atomic Energy Affect the Electric Power Industry? by E. W. Morehouse and Theodore Baumeister, Land Economics, May 1955, 31: 2, pp. 93–107.

[6] Op. cit., pp. 99, 105.

[5] The term "average cost" as used here means total operating revenue deductions divided by kilowatt-hours sold.

[6] Federal Power Commission, Consumption of Fuel for Production of Electric Energy, 1954, FPC S-119, p. 5

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

A Critique of Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, like every other Member of this House, I receive a steady flow of mail from people who are concerned for one reason or another about social security. Often their concern stems from misunderstanding of what the system is, what it is intended to do, what it is capable of doing, and how it is financed. From time to time I have brought to the attention of this House certain of these letters which highlight these misunderstandings and some of the inequities of the system.

There is now published by Henry Regnery Co., of Chicago, a book entitled "Social Security—Fact and Fancy," in which the author, Mr. Dillard Stokes, presents a series of instances of hardship and unequal treatment of persons affected by the social-security system. He also suggests an alternative. Whether one agrees or disagrees with Mr. Stokes' analysis and proposals, one

must concede that he has performed a useful public service in highlighting some of the inconsistencies and shortcomings of the present system. Any system of such magnitude as social security should be under constant public scrutiny and evaluation, in my judgment. To say that it is by all odds the largest and most generous system in the world is not to say that it is perfect, or that it cannot and should not be subjected to analysis and review.

Two of our great New York newspapers, the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal, have published criticisms of Mr. Stokes' book, the former by the distinguished Under Secretary of Labor, Dean Arthur Larson, and the latter by the noted literary critic and political commentator, John Chamberlain.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD these two reviews:

[From the New York Times of April 3, 1956]

PAYMENTS AND PENSIONS

(By Arthur Larson)

Veryl Ribble was a foreman in a tool and die shop, making $4,800 a year. With his wife Agnes and four small children, he just managed to make out. Everything Veryl could save he put into life insurance. Then one day, when Veryl was on a trip, a friend offered him a ride home in a small private plane. Veryl was so anxious to get home to his little family that he accepted. The plane crashed and Veryl was killed. When the insurance man came round, Agnes naturally thought that he was going to pay them the $40,000 in insurance that Veryl had scraped and saved to buy. But she was wrong. She didn't get a penny. It appeared that a clause in the contract make it inapplicable to death resulting from flights in a private plane. "But who gets the money we paid in?" cried Agnes. "We do," sneered the agent. And the insurance company kept all the premiums.

If someone were to write a book about private insurance introduced by 36 vignettes of fine-print tragedy along the lines of this hypothetical example, the reader might well form a pretty low opinion of the insurance business. Dillard Stokes has used this technique at the expense of social security, in support of the thesis that the entire system is a fraud. He has methodically dug out almost every conceivable combination of circumstances that could produce an apparently inequitable result under social security, and then has found, or more often invented, a touching human story, told as if it had actually happened. Wherever a line is drawn in the Social Security Act, he constructs his set of facts just on the wrong side of the line, so that his characters just fail to qualify.

All of his shocking examples can be classed under two simple heading: policy limitations and transitional inequities.

By policy limitations is meant the simple fact that in any such system, public or private, there is always a stated set of limitations, such as Mr. Ribble's private-airplane clause, governing payment of benefits. The more limitations, the cheaper the policy. A $50-deductible collision policy is much cheaper than a policy with no deductibility. A social-security system which pays nothing to people who each over $2,160 after retirement costs much less in contributions than one which pays pensions to everyone over 65 regardless of earnings. Certainly social security could be amended to pay benefits without any of the limitations that produced the author's poignant examples. But this would mean either that people now entitled to benefits would get less, or that the cost of the system in contributions would be sharply increased. As of the present, the American people through their representatives have decided that they want the policy they have got.

The second class of examples arises out of the transitional period social security is going through. To get the system started, some people were given much more for their contribution dollar than most people will get when the system is mature and when the members have contributed throuhgout their working lives. There is nothing startling about this. The same thing will be found in many private employer pension plans, under which a man aged 60 at the time the plan takes effect will sometimes be given a substantial pension at age 65, far out of proportion to any contribution.

The alternative, which the author, a lawyer and former newspaperman, suggests, is to have everyone get exact dollar-for-dollar benefits, which means that almost no one would get a full pension comparable to Social Security until about 1990. The $200-a-month man and wife, after 10 years, would draw a monthly pension of $14.80 to $22.20, instead of the present $117.80. For good measure, the author proposes to destroy survivors life-insurance benefits. Meanwhile the rate of contribution, to finance these geratly reduced pensions and nonexistent survivor benefits, is to be immediately doubled, to 8 percent. And $30 billion is to be spent to bring about the changeover. It is unlikely that the proposal will catch on.

[From the Wall Street Journal of April 3, 1956]

THE BOOKSHELF: EXAMINING THE SACRED COW OF UNITED STATES SOCIAL SECURITY

(By John Chamberlain)

The idea of compulsory social security has become such a sacred cow that few politicians care to question it, certainly not on fundamental principle. In these touch-me-not circumstances Dillard Stokes may have difficulty getting a hearing for his "Social Security: Fact and Fancy," which is pitched at the politicians as well as at the general reader.

Mr. Stokes is, however, so very far from being an enemy of the compulsory-old-age-insurance idea that it is only in our present Alice-in-Wonderland atmosphere that he would ever deserve a citation for bravery in criticizing the workings of present legislation.

The current law, says Mr. Stokes, is a radical departure from the original Social Security Act of 1935. To Mr. Stokes' way of thinking, the first act was on an absolutely sound basis: People paid for what they got and got what they paid for. And nobody was required to support anybody else.

Mr. Stokes' objection to the present law is that it mixes old-age relief with the old-age-insurance principle. It serves in some measure to redistribute the wealth. It is precisely as if the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. were to offer a policy which would take money out of John Brown's premiums in order to pay for those of John Smith.

Moreover, the survivors of John Brown and John Smith may never see a penny of the paid-in insurance if death comes before the money has been collected by the original purchaser. Families no longer get social-security insurance as a matter of right, but only under certain conditions that vary haphazardly under a confusing system that can only be deciphered by lawyers with trained eyes for the finest of print.

Just how arbitrary the whole affair has become is the substance of most of Mr. Stokes' book. To bring his meaning home to those who dislike coping with statistical abstractions, Mr. Stokes has assembled a revealing number of short biographies of people who thought they were adequately insured under the law which had been taking money every year out of their paychecks.

For example, there was Luigi Bellini, who thought his enforced savings were providing a measure of protection for his little son Tony. Tony would have got the insurance if he had been adopted by a stepparent or by a close blood relative. But he happened to be adopted by a cousin, so the payments stopped. The curious thing is that if Tony had lived on to the age of 18 in the cousin's house on an unadopted basis the money would have continued to come in.

Millie White, who lost her right arm in the gas explosion that killed her husband, would have received benefits for her little son Charlie. But Charlie, who had been hurt by falling timbers in the same explosion that killed his father and maimed his mother, died after weeks of valiant struggle. Hence Millie will get none of Mr. White's enforced savings until she reaches the age of 65—which is 25 years from now. If she dies before then the money will be kept by the Government.

So it goes in Mr. Stoke's biographies, some of them real, some of them hypothetical constructions based on legal interpretations that have determined real instances in the past. The Belin and White cases are only two of a multitude too numerous for mention here.

Perhaps the strangest injustice is the one which allows a person with income from investments to get social security benefits without question while another person who continues working after age 65 gets little or nothing, depending on the amount of his wages. Mr. Stokes tells of people who voluntarily step down from high-wage jobs to low-wage jobs at 65 to qualify for benefits. In that way they maximize their total take from Government and industry.

In the legislative attitude which encourages this weird practice, no thought is given to the consequent loss of skill to industry. And the man who steps down a notch or two in order to qualify for social security benefits may be displacing a low-wage worker who really needs the job. If that low-wage worker is himself under 65 and ineligible for social security, he may be forced to go on relief.

Theoretically, there is a social security reserve fund which is supposed to build up to a level sufficient to meet payments to millions in the future. But Mr. Stokes quotes two widely conflicting "scientific" projections put out by Social Security Administration actuaries. One projection is that the fund will go broke in 40 or more years. The other is that it will pile up a $151 billion surplus. The reason for such discrepancies is that no one knows what the level of business will be in 1975, or how many people will be born in 1961, or what inflation may do to the cost of living and hence to Congressmen's ideas of what annuities ought to be.

In any event, the reserve fund is not a real fund. What the Social Security Administration has to show for its collections is mainly Government paper in the form of bonds. To pay annuities in the future, new taxes or new debt will be needed to convert the bonds to money. So the children of the future may be paying by taxes or debt for security supposedly earned in the present.

In spite of everything he has to say against the present law Mr. Stokes remains a convinced believer in the idea of compulsory insurance. Although he insists that not one in a hundred people can afford to buy enough insurance privately to provide for a family for 15, 10 or 5 years, he thinks the job can be accomplished at least to some degree by Government intervention. He has his own prescription for doing the job which he offers free of charge to Congress. Let the Government, he says, give annuity bonds to

people every year as they pay their social security taxes. The bonds would be redeemable as monthly life income on presentation at age 65. Survivors would get the paid-up value of anything left over.

By this system, which has the charm of automaticity, Mr. Stokes would eradicate a huge and cumbersome social security bureaucracy. The savings on operating costs, he says, would amount to $6 billion or $8 billion in 45 years.

As he describes it, under his system "there are no 110 million accounts. No recording of names, ages, addresses, employment, of everybody in the country. No Federal finger on every citizen from crib to coffin. No questionnaires. No investigations. No conditions. No exceptions. No field agents. No case workers. No triple alternative formulas. No interpretation. No claims manual. No retirement test. No earnings limit. No benefits suspended. None forfeited. No cutrate benefits. No overpriced benefits. * * * No unimaginable surplus. No fantastic deficit. * * * No theories. No social experiment. No redistribution of income."

Sounds like paradise. But when, in recent years, has Congress ever gone in for anything that simple?

United States Jaycees Conduct Nationwide Program To Create Greater Public Interest in Hoover Commission Recommendations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ORVIN B. FJARE
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. FJARE. Mr. Speaker, the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, through its 3,000 community locals in all 48 States, Hawaii, and Alaska, is now completing a most successful nationwide program to encourage public interest in the efficiency and economy recommendations of the second Hoover Report. I think that they are to be highly commended for their work in this field.

Tomorrow morning the Honorable Herbert Hoover will address a congressional banquet-breakfast, which will climax a 3-day visit to our Nation's Capital by 56 Jaycee members, selected from the chapter in each State deemed to have conducted the best Hoover Report program. These men have received an opportunity to see the Federal Government in operation and to meet some of the men who make it function. Undoubtedly when they return to their respective States and communities, they will draw upon their Washington experience to increase public interest in governmental affairs.

One of the highlights of their visit in Washington, D. C., is today's opportunity for them to watch the House of Representatives in session. Congressional leaders were honored this morning in a series of presentations made on the Capitol steps on behalf of all Jaycees.

The following is a list of the Jaycee participants who have been honored by their State organizations, and who are participating in the present Meet Your Government program.

George M. Yeager, 113 Ina Street, Fairbanks, Alaska.

Robert Fleming, 3550 Princeton Drive, Montgomery, Ala.

Frank W. Fletcher, 309 Cooper, West Memphis, Ark.

John W. Hamilton, 1638 Walnut Creek Parkway, West Covina, Calif.

Louis P. Martinez, 305 Maplewood Drive, Colorado Springs, Colo.

Gordon C. Smith, 1025 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colo.

Vincent Simko, 57 Dover Street, Bridgeport, Conn.

Lucian H. Vandoren, Jr., Washington, D. C.

Webb H. Vermilya, 1956 Richwood Drive NE., Atlanta, Ga.

Dr. G. W. Atwood, 944 Fair Street, Buhl, Idaho.

Gordon S. Peters, 302 Bigelow, Peoria, Ill.

John B. Hilkin, 9120 Major Avenue, Morton Grove, Ill.

William F. Radcliff, 18 Kimberly Lane, Muncie, Ind.

Gordon J. Forsyth, 1214 North Sixth Street, Estherville, Iowa.

George A. Lowe, 522 East Cedar, Olathe, Kans.

John Coleman Scott, 203 Pinewood Drive, Frankfort, Ky.

F. J. Lungaro, 606 Clarence Street, Lake Charles, La.

Robert Easton, Pleasant Street, Norway, Maine.

Albert D. Darby, Jr., 212 South Allegany Street, Cumberland, Md.

Frank H. Wooton, Holyoke, Mass.

John L. Deal, 1019 Pinehurst Boulevard, Kalamazoo, Mich.

William D. Hurley, 91 Crocus Place, St. Paul, Minn.

Thomas K. (Pete) Griffis, 404 22d Avenue, Meridian, Miss.

Donald C. Woodside, 417 North Washington, Butte, Mont.

Arthur D. Bradley, Jr., 7416 North 28th Avenue, Omaha, Nebr.

David P. Boyer, 1342 Douglas Drive, Las Vegas, Nev.

A. Arthur McKew, Jr., High Street, Troy, N. H.

R. Donald Quackenbush, 372 Owen Avenue, FairLawn, N. J.

John A. Voller, 1600 Gonzales Road, Albuquerque, N. Mex.

Walter P. Quinn, Melrose Road, Auburn, N. Y.

Merril Berg, 1526 First Avenue Southeast, Minot, N. Dak.

P. J. Cole, Logan, Ohio.

William G. Boykin, 2624 Southwest 46 Terrace, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Gerald L. Denton, 853 Washington, McMinnville, Oreg.

Don M. McCutcheon, 1301 West Sherman, Hood River, Oreg.

David L. Emrey, 2246 Fairview Avenue, Easton, Pa.

A. Arthur Rosenblum, 83 A Peachtree Street, Charleston, S. C.

Henry G. Harris, 14 South Main Street, Abbeville, S. C.

Paul Hammerquist, 135 Meade Street, Rapid City, S. Dak.

Gordon A. Walhood, 605 Circle Drive, Tullahoma, Tenn.

Don Greaves, 10940 Snow White Drive, Dallas, Tex.

Jack Childress, 755 West 255 North, Orem, Utah.

Walter E. Dunham II, 109 Spring Street, Bennington, Vt.

Samuel Mason Cole, Jr., Conduit Road, Colonial Heights, Va.

Joseph W. Brinkley, Semple Quarters, Williamsburg, Va.

James A. Marks, 1733 Capital Avenue, Madison, Wis.

Robert L. Lawless, 310 East Third Avenue, Cheyenne, Wyo.

Dinosaur National Park Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, with our growing population and the added freedom of movement of our Nation's people, and with the National Park System finding itself hard pressed to meet these growing demands, I wonder at the position taken by Senator WATKINS, of Utah, in creating a stumbling block to a proposal for a new national par. Last week, Congressman WAYNE ASPINALL and myself introduced a bill to make the Dinosaur National Monument a fully accredited national park concluding that this was the natural and honest thing to do for this area that Congress and the President have decided is no longer a part of the upper Colorado River storage project. The many thousands of conservationists who fought the battle to resist invasion of the area are convinced that it is of national park caliber and needs to be given the protection as well as the advantages of national park status.

Senator WATKINS, of Utah, has found it necessary to express himself about the Dinosaur National Park bill, according to the Salt Lake Tribune, of April 19, by making a statement that the conservationists in supporting this bill acted in a "disturbing breech of faith." Senator WATKINS reportedly said that the conservationists had agreed to a review by the Interior Department of possible alternative sites—"yet before this program had a chance to get off the ground the conservationist-sponsored bill was offered to remove the necessity for any review."

The good Senator from Utah went on to say that Echo Park Dam had been shelved for the indefinite future, and he hopes the conservationists would show their good faith and withdraw their support of any such legislation prior to the completion and review of the Secretary's study of alternatives.

There is obviously no basis of truth to this silly accusation and it is perfectly obvious that the conservationists would never have agreed to a temporary withdrawal of Echo Park Dam which is what Senator WATKINS' proposal amounts to. The conservationists emphatically deny that they have ever considered awaiting the study of alternative sites. They are interested only in Dinosaur and only as

a site for a national park. Senator WATKINS is apparently determined to take whatever steps are necessary to prevent Dinosaur from getting national park protection because it appears that he is still determined to thwart the will of the people and the express desire of Congress by flooding out the most impressive part of Dinosaur National Monument.

In this connection I would like to present for the RECORD a telegram from David R. Brower, executive secretary of the Sierra Club, in answer to the article in the Salt Lake Tribune of April 19.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *April 24, 1956.*

Telegram to Senator WATKINS and the Salt Lake Tribune:

The proposal to establish the Dinosaur National Park is completely consonant with the agreement between conservationists and proponents of the Colorado River storage project. Your comments on the agreement, as reported in the Salt Lake Tribune April 19, are not correct. Here are the facts:

1. Last July the Colorado project bill was doomed, according to whip pools, to inevitable defeat in the House of Representatives because Echo Park Dam was not clearly eliminated. The so-called time-bomb amendment, calling for a study of Echo Park and alternatives, was not acceptable to conservationists and was rejected by the House Interior Committee.

2. In a full page ad in the Denver Post, which appeared the day before you and other project proponents held your Denver strategy meeting, the council of conservationists called for elimination of Echo Park Dam or "any secret hopes" for it.

3. On November 1 the project proponents announced after the Denver conference ended that Echo Park Dam was eliminated. Senator ANDERSON added, "in any form."

4. On November 29 Secretary McKay acquiesced in the Denver action. In answer to my question he said that the project was feasible without Echo Park Dam. In his public statement he added that the Department would "be prepared to recommend alternate action."

5. To underline the sincerity of the action in dropping Echo Park, you and the other proponents in Congress agreed to put in the Colorado Project Act the provision that "it is the intention of Congress that no dam or reservoir constructed under the authorization of this act shall be within any national park or monument."

6. Thereupon the conservation organizations withdrew their opposition to the Colorado project bill. It passed the House March 1 by a 120-vote margin. You will recall hearing in the final debate on the floor of the House, when you came in to observe, the repeated assurance that Echo Park was really out. This assurance, we feel, brought you victory. The Senate House conferees stood firm, and S. 500, with Echo Park eliminated without qualification, became law.

Considering these facts, I believe you can understand the concern caused by the statement you are reported to have made that you would strongly oppose the creation of the Dinosaur National Park and that you question the good faith of conservationists supporting the proposal. We ask what restriction would be imposed by a Dinosaur Park that you did not accept when you joined your colleagues in agreeing that Echo Park Dam was out, and that neither that dam nor any other Colorado project dam would be in any national park or monument.

Conservationists have held all along that Dinosaur deserves national park status. The Salt Lake Tribune has editorialized that the "time is ripe for developing Dinosaur Park." It can be one of the finest parks in the entire national park system.

At no time did I pledge, as executive director of the Sierra Club or as chairman of the Natural Resources Council of America or in any other capacity that the park status move would await a study of alternatives by the Secretary, as you are reported to have said. To my knowledge, no other conservationists have urged or indicated this. Nor can I understand why you should raise such a question in view of your having joined the agreement to drop Echo Park Dam and to add to the act the conservation proviso mentioned above. We hope you will not jeopardize the appropriations necessary to get your historic project underway by allowing Congress and the Nation's citizens to infer that Echo Park Dam is still so much alive in your mind that you would oppose creation of a great Dinosaur National Park. I hope that you will instead give this park your full support, as a primeval scenic asset to be appropriately developed for Utah and the Nation.

DAVID R. BROWER,
Executive Director, Sierra Club.

I would also like to insert for the RECORD a telegram to the editor of the Salt Lake Tribune signed by the three conservation groups who led the upper Colorado fight to protect Dinosaur:

APRIL 24, 1956.

SALT LAKE TRIBUNE,
Salt Lake City, Utah.

Letter to the Editor:

We see by statements attributed to Senator WATKINS in the April 19 edition of the Salt Lake Tribune, that he has attacked the conservation organizations that stopped the invasion of Dinosaur National Monument and accused them of acting in bad faith on their recent support of Congressman ASPINALL's bill to give Dinosaur national park status. The undersigned groups who represented the united conservationists' effort would like to keep the record straight by outlining three simple facts:

1. The drive to get park status for Dinosaur is the joint effort of all conservation organizations who supported the previous fight. None of the original organizations has any intention of withdrawing from this position.

2. Any statement that the conservationists have agreed to await the study of alternative sites (as Senator WATKINS was reported to have said) is a complete fabrication—throughout this controversy, conservationists have had no direct concern with any dam or reservoir site which did not involve protected land and have never compromised their determination to remove Echo Park Dam from the project once and for all.

3. Any determined effort on the part of Senator WATKINS to prevent national park status for Dinosaur can have only one motivation—that is to make it easier to restore Echo Park Dam in spite of the public will and the express desire of Congress that no dam or reservoir shall be constructed within any national park or monument in connection with the upper Colorado project. We confidently believe that the Watkins subterfuge will not work now or at any subsequent time and we further believe that it is in the best interest of everyone that this remarkable area be properly developed.

IRA GABRIELSON,
Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, Washington, D. C.
FRED SMITH,
Council of Conservationists, New York City.
ANSEL ADAMS,
Trustees for Conservation, San Francisco, Calif.

I would also like to include in my remarks the resolution of the Izaak Walton League of America passed during their 34th annual convention in Sioux City, Iowa, April 19 to 21, 1956, just 3 days after the introduction of the Dinosaur National Park bill. I am sure that the members will also be interested in the statement of J. W. Penfold, the league's national conservation director, indicating the unanimous endorsement of this resolution by the delegates to the convention.

ENDORSEMENT OF IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA

RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE 34TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA, SIOUX CITY, IOWA, APRIL 19-21, 1956

The Izaak Walton League of America, Inc., in annual convention assembled in Sioux City, Iowa, April 21, 1956, heartily commends the congressional delegations of Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, and Wyoming for their successful leadership in securing enactment of an upper Colorado River storage project which excludes Echo Park Dam and firmly protects national parks and monuments from dams and reservoirs constructed under the project authorization.

The Izaak Walton League further heartily commends the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL, of Colorado, and the Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, for having introduced legislation in the House of Representatives (H. R. 10614 and H. R. 10635) which will create of Dinosaur National Monument a great new national park and thereby assure the permanent protection and preservation of the unique and irreplaceable natural values of this magnificient river, canyon, and benchland area and provides for the orderly development of this new national park for the full use and enjoyment of the American people.

The Izaak Walton League of America therefore calls upon all conservationists throughout the land to support this legislation and assure its speedy enactment.

STATEMENT OF J. W. PENFOLD, NATIONAL CONSERVATION DIRECTOR OF IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA

DENVER, COLO.—The Izaak Walton League of America heartily endorses and supports the Aspinall-Saylor bill which would create a great new national park in the Green and Yampa canyon area of Colorado and Utah now included in Dinosaur National Monument. The statement was issued by J. W. Penfold, Denver, the league's national conservation director, upon his return from the league's 34th annual convention held last week in Sioux City, Iowa.

"Over 600 delegates from every State in the Nation, and Alaska voted unanimously for this resolution," Penfold said, "and they are prepared to urge their representatives in Congress to take favorable action on the bill as speedily as possible.

"The Izaak Walton League," Penfold continued, "has urged this action for several years, although we realized that specific bills would be premature until after Congress had disposed of the Echo Park Dam controversy. It is most encouraging, and a source of pride to Pennsylvanians, that Congressman JOHN SAYLOR has taken the lead to secure authorization for Dinosaur National Park. As a national park this magnificent area will be assured of adequate funds for its development for full use and enjoyment by the public.

"Congressman SAYLOR has made an enviable record among conservationists the nation over for his able, effective battling to preserve the national park system and to perpetuate the natural resources upon which healthful outdoor recreation depends. His vigorous defense of Dinosaur National Monument, in which the Bureau of Reclamation sought to construct Echo Park Dam, in no small measure was responsible for deletion of this objectionable feature of the upper Colorado River project. The solid

ranks of conservationists in opposition to Echo Park Dam convinced project proponents that a project containing Echo Park Dam could not pass Congress. Echo Park Dam, consequently was deleted.

"The resolution adopted by the nationwide conservation group," Penfold concluded, "commends Mr. SAYLOR and Mr. ASPINALL for their introducing this national park legislation and calls on all conservationists to support it."

The final insertion that I would like to have permission to present for the RECORD is a statement from an advertisement appearing in today's issue of the Washington Post signed by the Council of Conservationists:

NOW IS THE TIME TO MAKE DINOSAUR A NATIONAL PARK

Last week, Representative WAYNE ASPINALL, of Colorado, took the floor in the House of Representatives to introduce a bill:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, in order to preserve in a natural condition as a national park for the benefit and inspiration of present and future generations, the nationally important scenic grandeur, geologic phenomena, and scientific features of those portions of the canyons of the Yampa and Green Rivers that are now contained in the Dinosaur National Monument, Colorado and Utah, there is hereby established * * * the Dinosaur National Park."

At the same time an identical bill was introduced by Representative JOHN SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania.

Thus was voiced the cherished desire of millions of Americans whose determination made it utterly impossible to bring the mammoth upper Colorado River Basin project into being until it was stripped of Echo Park Dam and Reservoir, which threatened to ruin Dinosaur National Monument—the priceless area which, it is now proposed, should "be preserved, protected, and administered by the Secretary of the Interior for the benefit of present and future generations in accordance with the basic policies established by the Congress for the preservation of the national parks."

FURTHER PROTECTION IS ESSENTIAL

Never before has a national park been established by nationwide popular demand; but there is more than popular sentiment behind the determination to secure permanent national park protection for this incomparably beautiful, historically important, area; in Congress itself there is a determination to protect it permanently from invasion by private interests, and from the threat which is hard to kill; the still persisting effort, in some parts of the West, to get Dinosaur dammed and flooded. A local Utah politician is reported to have promised that the bitterly fought Echo Park Dam is "surer now than ever before." Only this week, there is reported the beginning of a drive planned to stop Dinosaur National Park in its tracks. Senator WATKINS, of Utah, arch foe of conservationists and national park friends in the Echo Park battle, is now quoted in Salt Lake City papers as accusing conservatfonists of bad faith in promoting national park status for Dinosaur. He says that conservationists agreed to do nothing until alternative sites for his dam could be studied. This is a false, trumped-up charge, which has no basis whatever in fact.

With Dinosaur a bona fide national park, all potential invaders would have to face a most powerful weapon: the congressional protection afforded a national park. The battle would finally be won.

THE LEGISLATORS KEPT THEIR WORD

Victory (for the time being) came in the Echo Park struggle because men of stanch integrity in the House and Senate (even though many of them favored Echo Park Dam), listened to the persistent pleas of conservationists, women's club leaders, national park lovers, outdoor club leaders, and thousands upon thousands of independent, unaffiliated people, who begged and pleaded, in letters, in telegrams, on the telephone, and in person, "Don't dam Dinosaur." These legislators, led by New Mexico's Senator ANDERSON, and California's Representative CLAIR ENGLE, and ably assisted by such directly interested western leaders as Montana's Senator MURRAY, Congressmen ASPINALL, of Colorado, DAWSON, of Utah, and METCALF, of Montana, and nonwesterners like JOHN P. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, agreed that Echo Dam was not essential to the plan, and therefore it was unnecessary to invade Dinosaur Monument. As a result of public reaction, these men assured conservationist leaders that Echo Park Dam would be dropped from the project, and it was. The American people owe a debt of gratitude to Senator ANDERSON and his Senate colleagues, and to Representatives ASPINALL and ENGLE and their House colleagues, for carrying out their word in spite of heavy political pressures from several sides. It was not easy to do.

HELP US PRESERVE THIS REMARKABLE AREA

The Nation needs more national parks—more natural areas that provide retreat and escape from the strains and trials of city life. Our national parks are a vital resource—and one we are rapidly outgrowing. There are too few natural recreational areas left—and too many people who need them.

The present Dinosaur National Monument, which under the new bills would become a park, is not only an area of scenic splendor. True, it is one of the world's most wondrous sites—hills, terraces, massive and colorful rock formations that tower high as a skyscraper, raging rivers, and all the rest. But Dinosaur is far more; it is the whole story of millions of years of the earth's life. The story is all there for anyone to see, more complete and more graphic, perhaps, than in any other place on earth.

The remains of long-extinct, 50-ton dinosaurs are the start of the story, the record of what life was like a million centuries ago. The erosions of the wild, foaming river, the mountain that it gnawed in two, the hogback ridges that nature left, the sharp vertical cliffs and the flat mesas—all these are chapters in a long, uninterrupted tale of the earth and its inhabitants adapting to changing conditions. The pictographs of prehistoric Pueblo basket-makers, scratched 3,000 years ago on the sides of canyons, unfold a story of a too-contented life that drifted into nothingness in a dim, distant era—a story that even a school child can read, in a general way, just by walking past a wall. The full record of animal life in Dinosaur's canyons has yet to be established—even by the experts; but when the park is improved, many of the almost-extinct creatures which we know once lived there will be back, protected by the National Park Service. Dinosaur was explored only a few years ago, and perhaps it never was explored completely; but the far reaches of this surprising area already have turned up random chapters of the old West, such as the placard that reads: "To all who this may consarn that I Pat Lynch do lay claim on this botom for my home and support. Wrote the 8th month of 1886 by P. Lynch."

Who can describe even sketchily the incredible world of man and nature that lies within Dinosaur's remarkable acres? What can one really say about it—except that it straddles the Utah-Colorado border, a little south of where that border meets Wyoming, and there it should stay, unharmed, for our children, coming in jet planes and gas-turbined speedsters, to wonder at. Wallace Stegner, in This Is Dinosaur (a brilliantly illustrated book well worth enjoying) has this to say:

"To this moment, at least, the Green and Yampa Canyons (in Dinosaur) have been saved intact, a wilderness that is the property of all Americans, a 325-square-mile preserve that is part schoolroom and part playground and part—the best part—sanctuary from a world paved with concrete, jet-propelled, smog-blanketed, sterilized, overinsured, aseptic, a world mass-produced with interchangeable parts, and with every natural beautiful thing endangered by the raw engineering power of the 20th century."

If only because everywhere we turn progress is taking so great a toll, it is essential that we cling desperately to the little natural wilderness beauty we have left. Dinosaur's beauty is unmatched, its charm incredible.

Will you join us in urging Congress to enact the Dinosaur National Park bill in this session—before it is too late? Your Senators and Congressmen will be glad to hear from you about this.

Council of Conservationists, 588 Fifth Avenue, New York 36, N. Y., Executive Committee: Fred Smith, Director, New York, N. Y.; Horace M. Albright, New York, N. Y.; David R. Brower, San Francisco, Calif.; Ira N. Gabrielson, Washington, D. C.; Joseph Penfold, Denver, Colo.; Howard Zahniser, Hyattsville, Md.

These statements prove conclusively that the conservationists will go all out to give Dinosaur park status and assure that a dam will never be built within its boundaries.

An editorial challenge in the Denver Post of April 22 in support of the proposal to make Dinosaur a park states:

With all the Congressmen who opposed Echo Park Dam line up with alacrity to support the Aspinall-Saylor bill? Will garden clubs and bird clubs and hiking clubs and other groups pass resolutions, write their Congressmen, and testify on behalf of the bill? Will outdoor writers deluge magazines and newspapers with articles about the importance of developing Dinosaur, now that it has been saved?

They will unless most of the opposition to Echo Park Dam was phony. We will just have to wait and see.

I can assure the Denver Post that the same conservationists are committed to finish the job they started.

When Congressman ASPINALL and myself introduced the Dinosaur park bill we thought, as did conservationists, that it was a natural culmination—but we suddenly found ourselves confronted with Senator WATKINS who, if his statements are correctly reported in the Salt Lake Tribune, has no intention of allowing the area to become a park because he still believes, contrary to the will of the people and the Congress of the United States, that Echo Park Dam will be built. This seems to be a private project of Senator WATKINS and only when viewed in the light of a private project could one realize his intentions. He knows that the bill authorizing the upper Colorado River storage project was passed because conservationists withdrew their opposition when he, along with other upper basin legislators, agreed that Echo Park Dam would not be built. Why then does Senator WATKINS seemingly continue to fabricate opposition for the park bill?

A Citizen Describes Broken Campaign Promises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Mr. Lee Wallek which appears in the May 1956 issue of the Democratic Digest. Mr. Wallek describes some broken Republican campaign promises.

YOU CAN'T BLAME IKE—HE DIDN'T WRITE THOSE CAMPAIGN SPEECHES

(By Lee Wallek)

My brother wrote me a letter. Every 2 or 3 years he does that.

In the same mail with my brother's letter, I got a booklet on Infant Care from the Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. I sent for it, for a quarter, because we'll soon need it in our thatched hut.

It's a good booklet it looks like. Tenth revision since 1914, with nobody knows how many printings altogether, I guess. Has over 100 pages crammed with information for people in our fix. And all for a quarter.

With the booklet was a note from the Superintendent of Documents, C. W. Buckley, thanking me for my order. There's courtesy for you. Said my order had been received on Thursday, mailed the same Thursday. There's efficiency. Also, said it had been a pleasure to help and hoped I'd let them be of service again. Said I could receive a free copy of a selected list of United States Government publications every two weeks if I wanted. Enclosed a sample copy of the list and a return postcard. There's thoughtfulness.

That's why I come to praise a broken promise. If a 1952 campaign promise had been kept, we wouldn't still be able to get booklets from the Government. Ike said it was ridiculous for the United States Government to be providing such services.

I remember how during the campaign I was whooping and hollering myself. It was great fun in those days. The speechwriters had one clever TV short they had Ike do where he really cut loose against this one booklet in particular. Home-canning methods I think it was. I'd watch that and roll on the floor. Ho, ho. I'd laugh: Imagine those Democrats spending tax money to print a book on home canning. But then when we got in, all that ridicule went to waste. That particular booklet featured on TV was so popular they had to order a reprinting right away. Same deal for most of the other booklets. They were in such demand that the promise had to be welshed on.

And personally, now at least I consider it a good thing. But my brother wouldn't. He's fairly rich, he hates for the Government to spend money. He's right-wing too. He's so right-wing, I'm not even sure he's for Eisenhower.

I remember one other TV spot announcement Ike made in 1952: "They say you can't cut taxes. What kind of stuff is that? Of course you can and will. That is what the people want now. They want lower taxes now."

My brother'd explode if he ever got hold of that. Especially since Ike didn't recommend any tax cuts this year. And is spending more for nondefense items in his proposed budget, for things like the Government Printing Office, than even the Democrats did in their last 2 years in office. But you can't blame Ike; he didn't write those campaign speeches.

He'll have the same sharp-shooting bunch of Madison Avenue ad men writing his speeches and TV spots as he did in 1952. And they have that winning 1952 campaign under their belt. They probably look on winning an election as simple as infant care by now. They're not called consent engineers for nothing. They know what the people want promised. How can us Republicans lose with a team like that fronting for us? Or what?

A Goldwater-Reuther Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD an article which appeared in the column entitled "George Todt's Opinion" of the San Fernando Valley Times, San Fernando, Calif., on April 9, 1956.

A GOLDWATER-REUTHER DEBATE

Last Wednesday I hied myself to the embassy room of the Ambassador Hotel in Los Angeles to the Merchants and Manufacturers Association's 60th anniversary dinner to hear a speech by a great Republican Senator, BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona. He spoke on the right to work.

This man is simply tremendous—and if you ever have a chance to hear him, don't miss it. He is a rare combination of courage, character, and commonsense. I think you will hear of him increasingly in the future.

BARRY GOLDWATER is of pioneer western American stock; he is just about as honest and forthright as California's BILL KNOWLAND knows how to be on subjects touching on rugged Americanism. In fact, these two men have much in common in their outlook. Anyone who likes one of them should have little difficulty in liking the other one, too.

I have never heard anyone in politics do a better job of explaining what the right-to-work law means than Senator GOLDWATER did.

He is not only intelligent, but extremely articulate. And his competent and effective oratory is based on reason. Now, what did he say?

In the first place, he pointed out that the right-to-work laws had not decreased union membership or the number of jobs in any of the 18 States where such legislation has been placed into effect by the will of the people concerned. Such laws are not aimed at destroying unions, but simply to give workers the privilege of choosing for themselves whether they wish to join a union, or not.

If a worker wants to join a union in a State where right-to-work laws have been placed into effect—he may do so. He is encouraged to do so. But on the other hand, if he does not wish to join the union involved where he is concerned—then he cannot be compelled to do so. There can be no compulsion from either management or the union in such a case. Now this is nothing less than a realistic protection of civil rights. And Senator GOLDWATER indicated that the greatest wonder of it all was that the civil liberties crowd had so remarkably ignored this issue in all the years of the New Deal.

After listening to many phonies prate of civil liberties in the past—I found it a truly refreshing experience for me to hear from a real champion of human liberty, such as the junior Senator from Arizona turned out to be. He believes that the American people have become the greatest Nation in the world because of the liberty and freedom allowed them under Almighty God—and he decries socialism at every turn.

Senator GOLDWATER is about as afraid of Walter Reuther as I am of my second piece of fried chicken. The manner in which he threw down the gantlet to the man who has sometimes been called Socialist No. 1 in the United States—and not without reason—bodes ill for Mr. Reuther. For in GOLDWATER the AFL–CIO political action boss is going to find he has come up against something he has seldom met in the past—a man with the courage of his convictions who doesn't scare easily.

In the forthcoming duel between these titans on the labor front, I predict that GOLDWATER will win. And for reasons which are not quickly apparent on the surface. Both men have intestinal fortitude in abundance—and Reuther has a treasure chest of fantastic proportions from union dues collected from the workers, nearly half of them Republicans. But GOLDWATER has the edge over Reuther in the power of his ideas—and he will crack Walter wide open on the ideological front in America just as soon as he gets his story over to the American people. Which may not be too long in coming.

Senator GOLDWATER told the leaders of industry that the time for sniveling action is past—and their duty is to stand up to protect the American way of life based on traditional capitalistic free enterprise. This means, simply stated, that the time has arrived—though really long overdue—to insist that the communications media of the United States give equal facilities and time to exponents of the kind of Americanism which BARRY GOLDWATER stands for as against Mr. Reuther's brand.

Anything less than this amounts to censorship of sorts against the entire American people—who are already stirring restively against the socialistic doctrine on all fronts today. A great reaction to Marxism is about to take place, and the pendulum is going to swing back again. When it does, the embarrassed communications industry may find itself to be far out on a limb of its own choosing. It will be blamed on all sides.

Why not stage a Goldwater-Reuther series of debates on television across the Nation on The Right To Work? I think it would be good while it lasted—if Mr. Reuther could be persuaded to speak under conditions which were not rigged for him at the outset.

Our Great Presidents Were Judged Strictly by the Enemies They Made

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "What Has Happened to Ike?" which appeared in the April 23, 1956, issue of the Philadelphia Daily News. The editorial follows:

WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO IKE?

Is this the new Ike Eisenhower?

For the first, time Ike went to the people last week on a controversial issue—busted right through the Filter Curtain and rassled

with the farm depression on millions of 21-inch screens. Not many people could understand his speech. But everybody could understand that Ike was finally taking sides in an argument.

IT WAS REFRESHING BUT CONFUSING

In his old role as the strong but silent father of us all, Ike escaped blame for the blunders of Dulles, the tactlessness of Wilson, the messes of Oveta Hobby. People ranted at his Secretaries. But they felt sorry for Ike—seemed to forget they were his brats; and if he couldn't control 'em, who could?

So it was refreshing to find Ike out in the open supporting Ezra Benson. But it was confusing. You couldn't be quite sure whether Ike had appointed Ezra Assistant President or whether Ike had suddenly become Assistant Secreatry of Agriculture.

THE VOICE WAS IKE'S; THE WORDS WERE EZRA'S

In speaking Ezra's mind Monday night, Ike said, in effect, that perhaps maybe the farmers will get around $550 million in Government cash this year. But he omitted the fact that farmers' income in 1955 had dropped $10,600,000.000 and is still falling. You had to get out your own pencil to figure that Ike's and Ezra's farm promises tote up to about 5 percent of the farmers' losses in 1 year.

STILL, THE AIR IS A LOT CLEARER

Until last week farmers had been booing Ezra and cheering Ike. Didn't seem to understand that Ezra's bumbling was also Ike's fumbling.

Now they know: Ike told them he is 100 percent for Ezra. Ezra is for 82 percent of farm parity.

Whatever happens to the farmer this year, there can be no mistake about it: The blame or the credit goes to the new Ike Eisenhower.

CAN THIS BE THE TURNING POINT?

Richard Rovere writes in his best-seller book, The Eisenhower Years:

"In no administration within memory have so few decisions been made by the President himself. Eisenhower parcels everything out to committees, commissions, secretariats, advisory groups, and task forces. * * * The administration lacks the stamp of the President's personality and bears that of no one else—except possibly the collective one of the public relations and advertising men."

Has Ezra Benson finally brought about a change? Has Ike made a decision at last? That stamp you heard last week sounded like Ike and Ezra slamming a door on the have-nots.

ONLY HISTORY CAN GIVE THE ANSWER

The new Ike may again fade back of the filter curtain that has shielded him so effectively. But that's a hard trick in an election year.

It's possible the voters in 1956 will make up their minds on the basis of Ike's record as a President. Not on the picture of a genial smile. Or on his military record.

Only history can give the answer as to Ike's place in the Hall of Presidents.

PRESIDENTS ARE JUDGED BY THEIR ENEMIES

Our great Presidents were judged historically by the enemies they made. Jefferson had his Aaron Burr, Lincoln his Jeff Davis, and Roosevelt his "economic royalists."

They made enemies because they had positive opinions, because they acted boldly, because they don't parcel out problems to secretariats and task forces.

WHO ARE IKE'S ENEMIES?

They've been mighty hard to find. Ike had done nothing to make enemies. The Dulleses, Wilsons, Hobbys, and Bensons had the errors chalked up against them. Ike, the Likable, had been strangely immune even from the mildest censure.

Last Tuesday Ike got into his first public brawl. Almost anything can happen and probably will.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Excerpts From Address by Hugh Gordon Miller at Ceremonies in Connection With the Issuance of the Robert E. Lee Series Postage Stamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, last September the American Philatelic Society held its convention in my district. It was a very successful convention, due in substantial part to the tireless efforts of its general chairman, Rear Adm. Jesse G. Johnson, United States Navy, retired.

One of the highlights of the convention was the issuance at Norfolk of the new Robert E. Lee postage stamp, and the significance of this was accentuated by the delightful address of an outstanding native Virginian, Dr. Hugh Gordon Miller. Because I am sure many of my colleagues will enjoy reading Dr. Miller's address, excerpts from it are printed below:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS OF HUGH GORDON MILLER, HISTORIAN OF NEW YORK SOUTHERN SOCIETY, ON BOARD UNITED STATES FLAGSHIP "TICONDEROGA," AT THE OPENING CEREMONIES OF CELEBRATION OF THE ISSUANCE OF SPECIAL ROBERT E. LEE LIBERTY SERIES POSTAGE STAMP AT HAMPTON ROADS AND NORFOLK, VA., SEPTEMBER 21, 23, 24, 1955

Mr. Chairman, here today, once again, the Navy pays honor to the Army. Once again we realize that the Navy and its admirals, one of the most distinguished of whom now in civil life here at Norfolk, Va., is your general chairman, Rear Adm. Jesse Johnson (retired), along with the Marines, always reaches its objects first, ahead of anybody else. They do not always get there, in the language of General Forrest, one of the South's great cavalry leaders, "fustest with the mostest men," but regardless of numbers, the situation is always quickly under control after they do get there, regardless of weather or anything else.

As the great carrier *Ticonderoga* sailed back here this morning from its brush with the hurricane, loaded with brave admirals and admirals-to-be, to take the leading part in doing this signal honor to one of America's greatest generals, and I saw this magnificent warship on this beautiful day, I changed my inspiration to suggest that its name be changed from *Ticonderoga*, which is a fort on land, to "The Robert E. Lee," the name of the famous Mississippi ship made more famous by Mark Twain, a southerner, and John Hay, secretary and biographer of Abraham Lincoln.

* * * * *

Permit me to say that stamp collectors such as comprise the organization represented here, in collaboration with the Postmaster General and his staff of selectors of the really great men of our history, who should be honored with these special postage stamps, fill an important part in recording world events, just as important a part, in a way, as historians do in writing their books or teaching their classes.

Today and here, historians as well as all citizens and scholars who have become interested in this event, have actually to stand aside as the American Philatelic Society holds its 69th national convention and exhibition of celebrated stamps here at Norfolk; and as the 30-cent Robert E. Lee postage stamp of the 1954–56 liberty series is issued and put on sale. All true Americans, and especially all Virginians, thank this great national society for selecting this date and place for their annual convention, which opens today under truly inspiring circumstances. It is gratifying that this is a national and not a southern event. And those of us who are able to be here from far and near are indeed happy to be with you to honor the great name of Robert E. Lee. He has long since been accepted by historians and military men as one of the great military figures of the Anglo-Saxon world.

There have been many splendid monuments built and many great celebrations held, especially in the South before this, honoring the name of its greatest military hero. General Lee has been honored with such stamps twice before, but never by such a celebration as is opening here today. No hero of war or peace of any type is more loved or respected in this old Commonwealth, and indeed throughout the whole Southland, except, of course, one other—George Washington, the greatest of all Virginians and of all Americans, who, in the language of General Lee's great Virginian kinsman, Richard Henry Lee, was described in Congress as "first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen."

At the Yorktown celebration of 1931, a special postage stamp was issued carrying the faces of two great Frenchmen—Admiral Count De Grasse and General Rochambeau, great aides of Washington in the American Revolution, especially at the decisive Yorktown victory—on either side of the Father of Our Country. But they represented a foreign element and had not the same significance to us as the placing of another American by the side of Washington. By chance or fate, only Robert E. Lee has ever been so honored.

In 1937 the special issue carried both of these great Americans—Washington and Lee—in oval inserts opposite each other, with the main building of the great College of Washington and Lee University then holding a commemorative celebration, in the center. No one raised a voice in dissent or criticism of Lee and Washington together, on a special postage stamp.

Today a 30-cent stamp is put on sale with General Lee appearing alone, and of vital importance, in civilian dress, typifying that final period of his life which was devoted to duty as he saw it. Lee, as you know, accepted the result of that great struggle between those sovereign States with heroic fortitude, even through those dreadful years of reconstruction, teaching the youth of the land there at Washington College in Virginia, how to meet the severest adversity; in that case, by shouldering the obligations of American citizenship thereafter, to the very fullest, in what was destined, in spite of any and all setbacks, to be the greatest Nation, the freest Nation, that ever existed under the sun, in a truly reunited country.

It almost seems that the hand of Providence might have entered into the recording of names and events in American history by United States special postage stamps such as these, to place the name of Robert E. Lee and George Washington together, as symbols, so to speak, of the finest that the United States and the great State of Virginia, or indeed the civilized world, could produce; because in the last analysis, they both attained their finest hour after retirement to private life, and after returning to civilian clothes, as today's stamp so fittingly presents General Lee. It was thus, of course, that Washington appeared in his last days at Mount Vernon, after he had retired from all military or other Government service, and after refusing a crown at the hands of his victorious army.

And so Robert E. Lee appears here on this stamp in civilian dress as in those final days of his life at Washington College, and in his journeys from time to time in our Southland after that war, stopping at Norfolk on his last such journey in the interest of rehabilitation, peace, and a reunited country.

I now have the great honor to be delegated by the New York Southern Society * * * and other sponsors of this celebration representing every section in the country * * * to thank first the great general of the United States Army, born in the southern State of Texas, and familiar with southern as well as northern history, who is President of the United States and without whose approval this great honor could not have been paid the name of General Lee, and who believes as did General Lee, in the reserved constitutional rights of the States; and the Postmaster General of the United States, and his staff, and all others who have had part in the selection of this special postage stamp and who have taken part in this celebration, in further honor of the great name of Gen. Robert E. Lee.

Many of us hope that some day we, or at least our descendants, will see a special United States postage stamp issued, with George Washington, the Father of Our Country, in the center, and with Abraham Lincoln, the savior of the Union, and one of the best friends and certainly the most powerful one the South ever had, had Southerners known and understood him at the time, on the right of Washington. (If you doubt this statement as to Lincoln, you have only to read the Lincoln-Douglas debates * * * or the true story of the conference here at Hampton Roads in February 1865.) He summed up his position prior to that conflict by stating at Peoria, Ill., that if he were living in the South he would approach the questions involved just as the Southerners were doing, or words to that effect. And on that stamp to the left of Washington should appear the face of Gen. Robert E. Lee as the symbol forever in this Nation of the reserved rights of these sovereign States, under a Constitution which William E. Gladstone, a great pioneer liberal in the Anglo-Saxon world, Great Britain's most famous Prime Minister prior to Winston Churchill, declared to be "the greatest instrument of government ever put together in a given time by the mind or purpose of man." * * *

I shall not detain you now to attempt to paint the lily, so to speak, or attempt to

carry the "coals (of history) to Newcastle." Certainly not here at Norfolk, which was the subject of Lee's last trip away from Washington College as was recently so brilliantly described by Mr. Alf. J. Mapp, Jr., a journalist of this city. I beg leave to quote two short paragraphs from that fascinating article which appeared in the Virginian-Pilot of your city, on September 21, last, in which he declared:

"For the sake of national unity, Lee had concealed from the public the fact that he was denied the restitution of his American citizenship, after applying for it and taking the oath of loyalty.

"That denial was not a blot upon the record of that noble man, but upon our own national history. The blot will be erased in handsome and generous fashion Wednesday when the Post Office Department of the United States issues a stamp commemorating Robert E. Lee, a great American. Such a national celebration as this will go far to remove that blot."

That blot is a sad thing to contemplate, but we are recording history here today, and as that articles states, in behalf of all America we are doing our best to make amends for that great blunder of our Government. Gen. Robert E. Lee is today enshrined, like the brave knights and cavaliers of old, from which race he sprang, forever enshrined, in a beautiful window in the Great cathedral at Washington, the Capital of our County, on a hill which overlooks both the North and the South. Only a Christian American gentleman, regardless of controversy, could have found a place in such a shrine.

The rights of the sovereign States of the Union, under the Constitution, many claim today, are being whittled gradually away by Congress and sometimes even by interpretations of the Federal courts, including the Supreme Court of the United States. I will not discuss that issue which might be claimed to be controversial, but the States' rights theory was grounded in General Lee when he was a student at the Military Academy at West Point, and was the key to his action in the War Between the States. When he resigned his commission in the United States Army, when invasion threatened Virginia, he declared that he would "never again draw (his) sword except in defense of his native State."

Gen. Robert E. Lee was not a rebel. I say this on the authority, among others, of President John Quincy Adams, of Massachusetts. Surely he had no bias in favor of the South, and surely it must be conceded that he was honest, able and independent. Surely Adams had a right to speak the verdict of the North on the constitutional right of such a matter. Adams is recorded to have said, "Whenever the time comes for seceding, it were better for the people of these Dis-United States to part in friendship from each other than to be held together by restraint."

From 1861 to 1865 a war was waged by two parties whose official titles were the United States of America and the Confederate States of America. It was the War Between the States, because 22 nonseceding States made war upon the 11 seceding States to force them back into the Union of States.

It was a war between two organized governments; the Southern States fighting to repel invasion; to protect their rights as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States of America—the rights that were assured to each State that ratified the Constitution. Had these rights not been guaranteed, there would have been no United States of America. It was not a Civil War, as it was not fought between two parties in the same government. * * *

If a substantial part of the reserved rights of the States of the American Union, are retained as provided in one of the fundamental provisions of our Constitution, the cause of Gen. Robert E. Lee and his followers as they understood that cause, will not have been entirely lost.

Whenever we contemplate the unique position of Robert E. Lee in American history, we are constrained to doubt that the British Commonwealth nevertheless will ever place the face of Oliver Cromwell, or even John Hampden, on a postage stamp by the side of the weakest and puniest of their kings. But there stands Robert E. Lee by the side of the Father of His Country, without a protest from any American, but by universal consent, and his enemies and critics, if there are such, can in the language of Patrick Henry, of Virginia, with reference to George the Third, "Make the most of it."

Bear with me for a moment, if you please, while I illustrate how universally General Lee's name is today honored and respected all over this great country. The February following the last reunion of Confederate Veterans which was held here 5 years ago, in which I had the great honor to modestly participate, I was invited to deliver an address on Abraham Lincoln on his birthday at a celebration being held by a group of young men at New York University. I accepted the invitation and prepared to speak on Abraham Lincoln, of whom I am also, as all the country knows, an admirer.

I went to the meeting prepared to speak on Abraham Lincoln, as a typical American of the finest caliber, though not to apologize for anything that Lee or his followers did in the War Between the States, a thing which I have never done and will never do. I went prepared to speak on Abraham Lincoln, but when I arrived at the place of meeting those young northern men voted unanimously for me to speak, not on Abraham Lincoln, but on Robert E. Lee. I did so. I think I was the only southerner there. When I finished my eulogy on Robert E. Lee, those northern young men unanimously thanked me and rose to their feet and cheered the name of Robert E. Lee for 5 minutes, in a hall decorated, incidentally, by the photographs of the Union generals and other officers; a hall decorated by them with both the Stars and Stripes and the stars and bars.

I shall not detain you by attempting to eulogize generally in a place, as I have said, where he needs no eulogy. But I cannot refrain from quoting Lord Wolsley, the leading British soldier of that era, and a contemporary of Lee, who was an observer back and forth on both sides of that war, and who, when asked to name the five greatest generals of the English-speaking world, named "Marlborough, Washington, Wellington, Robert E. Lee, and Stonewall Jackson." And remind you, that that great journal, the London Standard, on the passing of General Lee, declared editorially that "A country which has given birth to men like him, and those who followed him, may look to chivalry of Europe in the fact without shame, for the fatherlands of Sidney and Bayard never produced a nobler soldier, gentleman, and Christian than Gen. Robert E. Lee." That was the true verdict of history, the history you place your stamp upon today with the approval of the Government, and the people of the United States now put their seal of approval once again.

We southerners and descendants of southerners, gathered here, are proud indeed when those who are authorized to speak for the United States Government and a country fully united, thus acknowledge by implication at least, justification for the southern position in that great conflict, and thus testify that in the light of history, Robert E. Lee and his followers were not mere rebels. We appreciate the fact that in launching the sale of this special stamp our Government is honoring the leader of the Confederacy, just as it honored the heroic veterans of the Grand Army of the Republic at their last reunion at Indianapolis 8 years ago, and just as it has on similar occasions, honored the great name of Gen. Ulysses S. Grant, the great magnanimous victor in that conflict.

The stamp honoring the Confederate veterans in their last reunion was exactly in the form of the one authorized and distributed by our Government at the last reunion of the veterans of the gallant Union Army. And I say now, as I said then, that they were gallant men in that Union Army, and their sons and grandsons were gallant comrades of the boys from the South in the Spanish-American War, and the two great World Wars, and that terrible Korean war when the sons and the grandsons of those who once wore the blue, and the ones who wore the gray, fought side by side for great ideals and for a great, glorious reunited country. These special stamps proclaim to the world that this country, represented by the sons and followers of Grant and Lee, are indeed reunited forever, and none of us, north, south, east, or west would have it otherwise.

Gen. Robert E. Lee was never drawn into any controversy over slavery or the race issue, in any form.

As I said at the last reunion of Confederate soldiers here at Norfolk 5 years ago—

"As a matter of fact, most of the leaders of the South, from the days of Washington to the days of Lee and Jackson, had been freeing their slaves as fast as they could reasonably do so, in justice to the slaves themselves. General Lee owned no slaves. My father and his brothers, who were Confederate soldiers, and their ancestors, on religious grounds, and most of your fathers and uncles had no slaves.

"In 1862 General Lee paused in the midst of one of the greatest battles of the war to liberate the many slaves of his father-in-law, Mr. Custis, who died in 1857, making Lee his executor. His will provided for the liberation of his slaves 5 years after his death. General Lee did not wait a minute for anything, in liberating those slaves. Stonewall Jackson established a Sunday school for Negroes at Lexington and taught there; and on the night following the stress of the great victorious Battle of Manassas he paused to write a leter to his pastor and enclosed a check to support that Negro Sunday school. The North was talking a great deal about the Negro problem, but they were not doing much to help the problem."

One more word on this before I close. Some great man once observed that if he could write the national songs of a country, anyone else could write its history. There is a monument in this country erected by Virginians to an old colored man named Bland. He was a poet and a songwriter, and in fact the actual—and I am not so sure that he is not already the official poet laureate of Virginia. Certainly one of his great songs is the State official song of old Virginia, and since I see that you have made that song the official greeting of this great celebration, I am sure that in responding to it I cannot be charged with raising any controversial question. He it was who, after all the horrors of the war itself, and the worse horrors of reconstruction, and of all his contacts with the white people of the South during the many intervening years, wrote that grand old song which has thrilled not only Virginians and southerners everywhere, but Americans all over the world; he wrote: Carry Me Back to Old Virginia.

That great and inspired colored poet did not, as his masterpiece, write Carry Me Back to Old Massachusetts; he did not write—with all due respect to Massachusetts and New England—he did not write "Carry me back to Massachusetts, build me a monument on Boston Common, and make me the poet laureate of that grand old State"; he did not write and sing to thrill a listening world, "Carry me back to Chicago and old Illinois,

where our Great Liberator lived and practiced law, went to the State assembly, went to Congress, and went to the Presidency"; he did not write, "Carry me back to Detroit and old Michigan, where all is said to be, for us, peace and plenty, and sweetness and light for the colored man"; he did not write and sing, "Carry me across the continent to that great State of California, where they think they know my troubles better than I do, and can right them overnight with the scratch of a pen." He did not write and sing, believe it or not, "Carry me back to old New York and to Harlem, where I was born." No, he wrote from the bottom of that great heart of his, and as only a great poet could write, under the inspiration of a great conclusion as to where his real friends actually were—he wrote those words which will make him as remembered as any Virginian, white or black—he wrote, "Carry Me Back to Old Virginia where they know and understand me best."

If southerners had been as mean and unhelpful to him and his race as some would have you believe, he would never have written such a song as that.

As Americans all, we are especially proud and happy today because this is not primarily a southern, but a great national celebration to the memory of General Lee, a great American fully understood and appreciated by historians and others, at last; and that this celebration was conceived and carried out in this way at this historic place, by a distinguished American who knows American history, and knows especially his stamps, Rear Adm. Jesse Johnson, who has come to live among you, and to understand you, though born in New Jersey, and so far as I know, without southern prejudices or affiliations; but who was able to so quickly to rally these leading history makers of the whole Nation to properly honor the great name of one of our greatest Americans, Gen. Robert E. Lee.

Free Enterprise and Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the passing of the income tax filing deadline date, April 15, annually brings merely a feeling of temporary relief to the American taxpayer.

The inequities of our present tax system and its resulting injurious effects upon many of our Nation's citizens is portrayed in an article by a former Commissioner of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, T. Coleman Andrews. This article appeared nationally in the April 22 edition of the American Weekly. This timely statement by our former Commissioner prompted many editorials to be written in newspapers and other publications throughout the United States.

One that has attracted national attention was written by Mr. T. A. McInerny, editor of the Independent Editorial Services, Ltd., of Washington, D. C.

Whether you agree or disagree with the thinking expressed by these gentlemen, all agree that the time is long overdue for a thorough examination of our entire tax structure. It behooves us as Members of Congress to encourage and support such a study.

FREE ENTERPRISE AND TAXES

Former Internal Revenue Commissioner T. Coleman Andrews has done a public service in his forthright attack upon the income tax. The Hearst press did a public service by printing it. The former official places the blame for our ruinous tax policy squarely upon Congress.

The Congress over the years has erected a jerry-built tax structure which has defied analysis. The faults and the inequities are myriad, and unless corrected will destroy our form of government. It is axiomatic that the power to tax is the power to destroy. Mr. Andrews says that the middle class will be eliminated eventually by it.

He could have added that two other elements are closing in on the middle class. They are big business and organized labor. Both are moving toward each other. Eventually, it could happen that a man won't be able to earn a living by himself any more. He will either have to belong to a union or work white-collar for a huge manufacturing or merchandising corporation.

The Saturday Evening Post recently carried a story about the tax troubles of Joe Louis, former heavyweight champion. Joe is completely in the hands of Internal Revenue, now and forever. No matter what he does from here to the grave, he can never own, for practical purposes, one solitary dollar. Every mouthful he ever eats is only upon sufferance of Uncle Sam. He is literally given an allowance to live, while his earning power goes down. And at the rate that interest piles up on what he owes, he will owe more at life's end than he ever actually earned.

In several of the States, laws have been passed against this sort of thing, among installment sellers. It has been shown that usurious interest charges could make people pay for something forever. Joe Louis will pay forever for being one of the great champions of our time. Any democracy which lets this sort of thing go past without diligent and constant scrutiny is courting a new form of government.

Congress, ever since it made income taxes constitutional in the face of a Supreme Court decision, never has been in a mood to review our present laws. No administration ever has had courage enough to fight for fair taxation.

What is fair? Mr. Andrews does not dwell on this subject, and regrettably. Perhaps he will save his suggestions for future articles. Perhaps he doesn't know. Men of good minds have asked how this country can bear its national and international burdens without the income tax. A sales or transaction tax, which field has been preempted by the States and cities, never could fill the coffers for our big and expensive war efforts. Yet the income tax excesses, both in productivity and enforcement, have never produced an adequate amount for current bills and a sum to reduce materially the national debt.

If we can't trust this method of raising money in boom times, what are we going to do in bust times, which are surely coming? Free enterprise, that very overquoted slogan, has suffered beyond hope by the use of the income tax. Every time you hear a man thanking his lucky stars that he is living and breathing in the good old U. S. A. under free enterprise, you can bring up the income tax question and point out that the United States is actually No. 8 in the scale of nations where a man can make a dollar and keep it.

Britain, Canada, Germany, Belgium, Switzerland, France, and Mexico all have income tax laws which are far more favorable than ours.

Will Farming Become a Monopoly?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, as we watch a few colossal corporate empires taking dominion over more and more of the industrial and commercial resources of the Nation, we sometimes assume that farming—in the United States at least—is exempt from any such threat of giantism. Despite the historical record of most countries of the old world, and not a few of those in the new world, a picture of all the farm lands in this country being held by a small clique of land barons, and several million farm families being dispossessed, is we like to think an unlikely picture. And such a picture is also entirely unsuited to our basic conceptions.

Actually, we already have some giant farms; and the giant farms are getting bigger, while the small farms are getting smaller.

Between 1920 and 1950 1 million farms disappeared. The land in these farms did not disappear, and this land was not taken out of farming. On the contrary, most of this land was consolidated with the bigger farms.

What are the reasons for big farms getting bigger and small farms getting smaller? Is it because of the new farm machinery and the new cultivation methods? Prof. Mason Gaffney, a distinguished economist and member of the faculty of North Carolina State College says that changes in the technology of farming is not the answer. I would like to call the Members' attention to a brief article by Professor Gaffney which sums up the recent transformations in farm holdings and points out the portentous impact of these transformations. Professor Gaffney's article, which appeared in The Nation last December, is as follows:

THE DRIFT FROM MEDIUM-SIZED FARMS IN AMERICA—MORE ACRES, FEWER MEN

(By M. M. Gaffney)

A little heeded but radical and portentous change has been quietly transforming the American farm landscape. Many a field has changed hands these last decades, many an old fence line given way to new. Although each transaction has had its own motivations the aggregate displays an unmistakable trend. The medium-sized American farm—the traditional 160-acre homestead—is clearly on the wane.

From 1920 to 1950 the number of farms containing from 10 to 260 acres dwindled from 5,500,000 to 4,100,000. The number of American farms of all sizes fell in that 30-year interval by 1 million from 6,400,000 to 5,400,000. The land yielded up by these disappearing enterprises has been, in the main, consolidated by the larger farms. The acreage held by farms 1,000 acres and over increased swiftly—from 221,000,000 in 1920 to 495,000,000—or 43 percent of the farm acreage—by 1950.

These giants comprise only 2.3 percent of all farms, and as they increased their acreage they also increased the average quality of

their lands. Values per acre of the land in farms 1,000 acres and over have been rising noticeably relative to values in smaller farms. In several Eastern States values per acre in the larger farms are now actually higher than values in smaller farms, although this is not true in all regions.

What is the background of this striking trend? Prof. C. V. Dominguez, Argentine student of land policies, once observed that, in the wake of land reforms, giant farm holdings reconstitute themselves inexorably. This does indeed seem to be the history of the many instances when governments have undertaken to distribute land more equally among those who operated it. In America we had our land reform in the 19th century. We entered the 20th with a preponderance of medium-sized farms, the heritage of equalitarian policies of land distribution which, while often honored in the breach, still set us apart from, say, Latins. And, where Federal policies failed, our State and local governments often, by accident or design, broke up large neofeudal or speculative holdings through the property tax, on which they relied heavily for financing public functions and improvements.

But today the public domain is gone, and while the income-yielding capacity of farmland has increased enormously, property taxes have receded to a miner place in the national tax structure. In these new circumstances farmland has become an attractive investment for the well-to-do with surplus funds seeking an outlet. Their spirited bidding has driven land prices up beyond the reach of many small farmers, and farmland, like most attractive investments, has tended to become concentrated in a few strong hands. Thus the middle-class farmer is losing numbers, while the giant holdings reconstitute themselves inexorably.

Some have interpreted this trend as a move toward greater efficiency, pointing to the higher outputs per man and machine that are possible when they have more good land to range over—for most analysts agree that the larger farms generally use much less labor and equipment per dollar of land value. This narrow concept of efficiency has satisfied, on one end of the ideological spectrum, the largest landholders, and on the other the Marxists—since both hold great faith in agricultural gigantism. Its obvious weakness lies in its total disregard for good land that may be underused in achieving high outputs per man and per machine.

Smaller farmers, lacking enough land to employ themselves or their equipment fully, could take additional land and put it to more productive use than those already oversupplied. In 1940 farms of 1,000 acres and more planted only 45 percent of the land available to them for crops. An efficient use of all resources would seem to call for shifting some land from those who have more than they can contrive to work intensively to those whose enterprise is cramped for lack of an adequate land base. This follows the basic economic principle of transferring resources from where they are abundant to where they are scarce, in this instance from the land-glutted to the land-starved.

But the trend in America has been the opposite. Those who have been laying field to field are, on the whole, exactly those with enough and more than enough land to complement their labor and capital. The trend has been to separate most of the farm proprietors and improvements from most of the farmland. Various studies by farm economists have shown 10 and 20 times more men per dollar of land value on small farms in such areas as the Ozarks, Appalachians, and marginal zones in Utah and New Mexico than on, for example, the vast and fertile farms of Iowa.

The larger farms, it is true, have more capital equipment, but it is often overlooked that they have less capital equipment per dollar of land value. The 1940 census, last to give this information, reported that there were 16 times more dollars of building value per dollar of land value on farms 3 acres and under than on farms 1,000 acres and over (and between these extremes the proportion of building to land value became steadily less as the farms became larger).

A great deal has been said about farms expanding to accommodate new forms of large-scale machinery. There are many small farms which could doubtless have benefited a great deal by expanding, but these are not on the whole the ones that have expanded. They have tended to grow smaller, or to be replaced with even smaller farms. The expanding farms have in general been those already large enough to achieve savings from large-scale mechanization.

The census reports the number of farms falling within various size brackets, as well as the total acreage held by the farms in each bracket. From these figures one can compute the average size of the farms in each bracket. Comparing 1920 with 1950 again, in each of the upper brackets the average has risen toward the top limit of the bracket, while in each of the lowest it has descended. On top of the heap the average size of farms 1,000 acres and over increased from about 3,300 up almost to 4,100 acres. At the bottom the average farm under 3 acres fell from 1.7 to 1.4 acres.

This pattern of change is hard to reconcile with the idea of a mechanical revolution as the prime mover. If a technological imperative determined farm sizes it would make them cluster, one would think, about some central optimum prescribed by operating economies. But, in fact, they are racing away from each other toward the two extremes, the large getting larger and the small smaller.

Today, as population has increased, as new demands, improved techniques, and farm-price supports have enhanced the income-producing capacity of farmland, as interest rates have declined absolutely and land taxes relatively, farmland titles have become a much more attractive investment than once they were.

Prices of these titles, while they have their downs as well as their ups, have stood in this century on the whole much higher than in the last. This means that those who buy land with surplus funds—as an investment, an income, a hedge against inflation, a provision for grandchildren, a good speculation, or what you will—have a new advantage over the impecunious young farmer trying to secure an operating unit of sufficient size to produce an adequate return for his labors. In the competition for land titles today, good husbandry counts for less, financial power for more. And in the arena of finance, more than an other, him that has gets. A large debt-free landholding provides a surplus of funds for additional investments, collateral security for loans, and social position to facilitate advantageous alliances. As additional factors, one might mention the superior ability of larger landholders to secure political favors such as low tax assessments, forgiveness of delinquent taxes, access to cheap, foreign labor, and Government price supports for their products. And so the race for land titles goes more and more to those who already have.

Many sincere citizens have regretfully accepted for agriculture the economic philosophy of scarcity that they condemn in other industries. For them, the present trend has its compensations. To lock up much of our good underused land in large holdings, while much labor and capital hibernate in confined quarters, is a most effective way to hold down production. It also tends to choke off investment opportunities, flood the labor market, and raise the price of necessities. Those who agree with R. H. Tawney that "a society is rich when material goods are cheap and * * * human beings dear" do not find the trend so welcome.

The Government and Fine Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to insert the attached letter from Mrs. Peggy K. Walker, of Santa Ana, Calif., to the editor of the Register, Santa Ana, because I think it is a letter which merits the attention of every taxpayer:

SANTA ANA, CALIF., *April 23, 1956.*

DEAR SIR: Miss Lillian Gish's plea for the Federal Government's recognition and support of the fine arts in the creation of a Cabinet office for the arts, when stripped of its spendorous and respectable guise, leaves the now very familiar impression of more and more centralized Federal control, more and more spending and less and less liberty, to the detriment of all of us and to the delight of those few who would knowingly or unknowingly continue to foist upon us shackling, backward Old World theories of a collectivist state.

The very fact that practically every other country's government in the world, including the Soviet Union, has undertaken the responsibility of its fine arts should be a timely reminder that it must not happen here. In America it is the people who are sovereign, not the Government. In all countries it is the people who pay through compulsory taxation for the whims of their government masters and those who support its collectivist philosophy.

Miss Gish's comparison of dogs and Ernest Hemingway is misleading. Dogs, in America, both kennel-fed and hunting, are awarded blue ribbons, to be sure, but the bestowal comes not from government but from voluntary, privately financed groups of dog fanciers. Mr. Hemingway has been widely recognized by the people of America, not through government but by the people themselves. What greater glory could there be. The Nobel prize which Ernest Hemingway received came not from the Swedish Government as such, but as a result of a fund for such prizes established by the will of the Swedish chemist, Alfred Nobel.

A reward for artistic achievement, if it is to mean anything at all by our standards, must come from just such private, voluntary action, certainly not through compulsorily taxed and compulsorily directed governmental action.

Frederic Bastiat sounded a warning over 100 years ago and clearly set forth the steps which would inevitably lead to an all-powerful totalitarian state. Among these steps was the state's encouragement and subsidization of the arts.

Igor Gorin, in the January Reader's Digest, is quoted: "In the Old World music is sponsored by the state. Here (America) the people sponsor their own culture—and pay for it."

Why must we here in America, since 1947, inject politics into our culture? Such a suggestion only recently was made, and the cry has been taken up by all the collectivists that our Government sponsor an increasing number of international cultural junkets, particularly to the Soviet-dominated countries. There is no rational basis whatsoever for the justification of such a subsidy at the taxpayers' expense. European governments for years have sponsored such entertainment within their own countries, and it has accomplished nothing but to further impoverish these countries and sink them further into the morass of mediocrity. Cultural

leveling should certainly neither be a part of the American ideal nor its practice, and to indulge in such is only to hasten the final tragedy which once befell that once proud and great Roman civilization. To repeat its mistake is folly. Government-sponsored bread and circuses pleased the people with their own money, but it lost them their liberty, their pride, and their civilization.

On April 14 Lillian Gish appeared before a Senate subcommittee holding a hearing on a bill to create a 24-member Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts, and urged that the Government become "a patron of the arts." She has been touring the United States, has been interviewed by the press, and has appeared on a television program urging the creation of a Cabinet office for the arts. Her main selling point is that "Sweden has a Nobel prize. We have a blue ribbon for a dog. We pin a bronze cross on a man who killed his brothers, but we have nothing for one who has excelled in the arts."

An Associated Press dispatch on April 21 states that "President Eisenhower is considering setting up a Commission to plan a Government award for important civilian achievements in art, science, and other activities." He is taking up the idea with the president of Princeton University, Dr. Harold W. Dodds, and the secretady of the Smithsonian Institute, Mr. Leonard Carmichael. Others who will attend the meeting at the White House "will be Budget Director Percival Brundage and Presidential Assistants Sherman Adams and Howard Pyle."

It is imperative that all those who wish to keep the Government out of the arts contact their Senators and Representatives immediately and make their protests known.

Sincerely,

PEGGY K. WALKER.

Honesty and Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, amongst many editorial comments, which are overwhelmingly favorable to the President's veto of the quite remarkable farm bill recently before the Congress, there was one recently appearing in the Wildwood (N. J.) Leader, which I beg to call to the attention of the House. The editorial is as follows:

AN EXEMPLARY DISPLAY OF HONESTY AND COURAGE

For days the eyes and ears of most thoughtful Americans were turned toward Washington, anxiously awaiting news of the President's action on the controversial farm bill, known as the "Agricultural Act of 1956."

The bill was of such a nature as to put the President "on the spot." There is every reason to believe that it was purposely so designed.

It contained some features which the President believed were highly necessary to the alleviation of some agricultural troubles.

But in its Congress had also placed some features which the President believed to be highly injurious not only to the welfare of farmers but to the whole national economy.

The President was placed in the position of having to accept the bad parts of the bill in order to get the good, or of vetoing the bill and losing the good part in order to avoid the bad.

Many farmers had been persuaded by politicians that the bill was the answer to agricultural troubles, and that if the President did not approve the bill it was because he was not sincerely interested in the farmers' problems.

Most of that had all the earmarks of the kind of political stuff that Americans have come to expect from politicians in a national election year.

If the President were to be honest and courageous enough to follow the dictates of his conscience and veto the bill, that would give his opponents campaign material with which to garner in the votes of many farmers willing to accept immediate temporary relief at the cost of greater future distress.

Some of the prominent members of the President's own political party, recognizing the possible danger to the party's election interests, asked the President to sign the bill.

But the President's chief interest was in the welfare of the farmers (even though some may not realize it) and in the Nation as a whole, rather than in the political party and the election.

Here is an example of the kind of honesty and courage that all of us could wish were found in more of our elected officials, from national way down the line.

In effect the President repeated the well-known words, "I'd rather be right than President." And because he said that, it is all the more reason why we should reelect him this fall, so that he may be not only right but President also.

The same idea holds good for all seekers of public office. The man that shows he would rather be right than be a successful candidate for public office is the man that should be elected. He would make the best official.

Statement by Cecil Harden on Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL M. HARDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, my personal viewpoint on the farm bill sponsored by the majority party and vetoed by President Eisenhower is contained in the following statement published April 11 on the front page of the Attica (Ind.) Ledger-Tribune. The preliminary remarks were written by that newspaper's publisher, Mr. Don Montgomery. The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY CECIL HARDEN ON FARM BILL

The following telegram was received from Congresswoman CECIL M. HARDEN who not only expresses her own opinion of the pending farm bill but the opinion of many other who have followed this bill closely. The statement follows closely the opinion of Governor Pyle, of Arizona, who addressed the Hoosier State Press Association, last Saturday noon in Indianapolis. The telegram follows:

"LEDGER TRIBUNE,
Attica, Ind.:

"The House just passed the catch-all farm bill approved by House-Senate conferees. I voted against it after first voting to recommit it to committee with instructions to delete most harmful sections.

"I am convinced this bill is a bad bill, that it would hurt Indiana farmers and that the President will veto it if it passes the Senate in the form approved by the House.

"The bill is undoubtedly attractive to the commercial wheat interests in the West, to corporation-size farms and to the big cotton growers in the South. It would be of no help to the family farmer in the 6th Indiana District.

"The Democrats, who control this Congress, deliberately held up action on farm legislation for 15 months. Because of this delay, the good features of the bill, particularly the soil bank, could not now be placed in operation in time for this year's crop season in the Midwest.

"Today's action proves that the interest of the Democrat leaders of this Congress lies not in solving the farm problem but in keeping the farm issue alive for use on election day. They are depending on a presidential veto. I doubt that Indiana farmers will be misled by these tactics.

CECIL M. HARDEN.

Secretary of the Air Force Quarles on the ICBM

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH L. CARRIGG
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. CARRIGG. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to hear—or read—a speech by the Honorable Donald A. Quarles, Secretary of the Air Force. Everything that Secretary Quarles has to say is well organized, forcibly presented and easily understood. His speech on Wednesday, March 21, before the Aviation Writers Association, Washington, D. C., was a model of the clarity we expect of him.

This speech at a meeting held in observance of the 10th anniversary of the 3 basic combat commands of the Air Force—SAC, TAC, and ADC—contains some very interesting things about Air Force missile development. In fact, Secretary Quarles lifted a bit of the secrecy that properly surrounds the Pentagon's missile programs and outlined the Air Force organization in this field and officially identified the various projects underway.

He made it plain, however, that the Air Force is many things and that in considering airpower we must talk about the Air Force as a whole rather than about any of its parts, no matter how important they may be. "As a matter of fact," he said, "we should really talk about the Armed Forces as a whole because each service complements the other." The anniversary of SAC, TAC, and ADC is also a kind of anniversary for global airpower. Modern airpower is an entity—flexible and powerful; and in the last 10 years the Air Force, to carry out its missions, has developed global airpower to a degree never before reached. To maintain this airpower, an airpower adequate to meet the threat posed against us, we must continually improve our concepts and our weapons.

In discussing the new weapons programs, Secretary Quarles made it plain that missiles will not replace conventional aircraft. Air Force strategic de-

livery, he said, "still puts primary reliance on the manned bomber."

Intercontinental ballistic missiles which Secretary Quarles named are the Atlas and the Titan. The Thor is a missile of intermediate range, but these three are all strategic ballistic missiles which are being developed under the guidance of the Air Research and Development Command. Secretary Quarles stated that "While it is our estimate that we are ahead of the Soviets in the guided-missile field as a whole, we know that they have emphasized the ballistic line and we would not be surprised to find close competition in this field."

Without entering the argument going on as a result of certain charges made by Members of this Congress, I would like to point out that the Air Force, under the able direction of Donald A. Quarles, is well aware of what Russia is doing in building a strong air force and developing missiles. It is well aware of the competition taking place and of the superiority that we must maintain. But in the sensible view of our clear-sighted Secretary, ballistic missiles are not an end in themselves, but only an important addition to our arsenal. Even as such, we are developing them solely to maintain a solid deterrent position that is, in the words of Secretary Quarles, "a position of retaliatory strength that could respond to any Communist aggression, even a surprise massive attack, with such devastation to the aggressors that by no stretch of the imagination could they expect to improve their position by launching an attack."

In the midst of an often acrimonious dispute about our strength and about what is being done in the Air Force, it is gratifying to read the sensible remarks of Mr. Quarles in conclusion. His final words were, "As we analyze the situation in the foreseeable future, I see no circumstances under which we would fail to have such a deterrent position even if we should not be the first to achieve each of the potent new weapons we have been talking about, assuming, of course, that we continue to press ahead with our programs."

Mr. Speaker, with the consent of my colleagues, I wish to insert this fine statement on missile development by the Secretary of the Air Force in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. DONALD A. QUARLES, SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, BEFORE THE AVIATION WRITER'S ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON CHAPTER, NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 21, 1956

It seems only a short time to me, and I am sure to you, since my previous meeting here with the Aviation Writer's Association. I am very pleased and highly honored that you have given me this return engagement. I realize that there is a special occasion for it and am, of course, very happy to join with you today in observing this 10th anniversary of the three basic combat commands of the United States Air Force. The Strategic Air Command, Tactical Air Command, and Air Defense Command were first established as combat elements of the Army Air Forces on March 21, 1946. Statutory authority for these commands was provided by the Air Force Organization Act of 1951, section 308 of which states that "there shall be within the Air Force the following major air commands: (1) An Air Defense Command, (2) a Strategic Air Command, (3) a Tactical Air Command, and such other commands, forces, and organizations as may from time to time be established by the Secretary of the Air Force * * *." The Strategic Air Command, under General LeMay, the Tactical Air Command, under General Weyland, and the Air Defense Command, under General Partridge, typify the basic combat elements of our Air Force. They are represented here today by Maj. Gen. James Seltzer (SAC), Maj. Gen. Earl W. Barnes (TAC), and Maj. Gen. Norris B. Harbold (ADC).

Each of these commands has made an enviable record in the past 10 years in building up powerful, well trained, well equipped and instantly ready organizations. With their leadership, their esprit de corps, their dedication to their missions, I am sure their promise for the future is even brighter than their great record of the past. At the same time, General LeMay, General Weyland, and General Patridge would be the first to emphasize the fact that their commands are integral parts of the Air Force as a whole and that it is with the whole rather than its parts that we should be concerned. Altogether we have some 18 Air Force commands, all interrelated and interdependent, all, for example, dependent on the Air Research and Development Command and the Air Materiel Command for materiel, and on the Military Air Transport Service for air logistic support. The United States Air Forces in Europe, the Far East Air Forces, and other theater commands, are supported by rotation of personnel largely from the Tactical Air Command. And so it goes.

Without in any way belittling these three basic combat commands, I would therefore like to talk about the Air Force as a whole, rather than with these illustrious parts. As a matter of fact, we should really talk about the Armed Forces as a whole because each service complements the others. The defense mission is the mission of all. The principle of economy of force requires that each have its assigned roles and missions, and of course as the situation evolves, these must be reviewed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and from time to time revised under the authority of the Secretary of Defense. While I believe it is fair to say that all the services are proud and watchful of their assigned responsibilities, it has always seemed to me that the public tended to exaggerate the inter-service differences, perhaps because nothing makes the news like a good scrap. In any case, in talking about the Air Force I want to make it clear that I am not implying any lack of respect for our older sister services.

Thus as we commemorate this tenth anniversary of SAC, TAC, and ADC as the basic combat arms of the Air Force, we must also remember the global nature of the Air Force and the complementary aspect of all Air Force commands and components. Modern airpower is an entity, flexible and powerful. For 10 years now, such peace as we have enjoyed has resulted from the air/atomic strength existing primarily in SAC but also in varying degrees in other Air Force and Navy commands. This strength has largely succeeded in restraining the enormously greater numerical forces of the Communist bloc while the free world built up its defenses.

To carry out its missions, the Air Force has developed global airpower to a degree never before reached. We have the men with the knowledge to employ airpower as an instrument of our national policy. We have the aircraft and weapons to make that airpower effective, and we have the base complex from which to launch it. But no form of human endeavor is static, and airpower, above all other military forms, is a dynamic thing. To maintain airpower relative to the threat posed against us, we must continually improve our concepts, and our weapons.

I would like to discuss a few of our recent weapons programs. Guided missiles seem to make news these days, so I believe you will be interested in a report on some of the newer weapons now being developed by the Air Force in this area. Again, I should point out that all three services have guided missile development programs, directed toward their respective missions or toward cross-support of other services.

The ability of guided missiles to increase Air Force effectiveness makes them a vital part of our program. We recognize their great potentialities and will develop them in many forms and integrate them as rapidly as possible to increase our operational capabilities. As I say, the other services, very properly, have similar plans.

While the guided missile field is very broad, much interest recently has been centered on the long-range surface-to-surface missiles in the strategic category. I would like to tell you what I can about the Air Force program in this field.

To get it all in perspective we should note that the Air Force strategic delivery program still puts primary reliance on the manned bomber. The B–52 now building up in production is the fourth major development in this area since the World War II B–29. Moreover, we have a continuing strong program of research and development in this field since we believe that manned bombers will be important in our program for many years to come.

Supplementing this line of manned bombers, we have two categories of strategic missiles, the ballistic or rocketlike missiles, and the air-breathing types, the Northrop Snark and the North American Navaho, which will have range, accuracy, and load carrying capabilities at least as good as the ballistic missile, although the latter will be even more difficult to intercept than the air-breathing types.

Each of these programs has its cycle of development and use—its part and place on the program. As of any given time, our capability is the summation of all parts then operationally available.

Within the Department of Defense, overall responsibility for the development of an intercontinental ballistic missile has been assigned to the Air Force. For some time now, in fact ever since our scientists became convinced that such long-range ballistic missiles had the possibility of being developed into a practicable system, the Air Force has been giving top priority to this development.

Our first project in this field—the Atlas intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM)—has been under development by the Convair Division of the General Dynamics Corp. in San Diego, Calif., for a number of years.

A second ICBM—Titan—is being developed by the Denver division of the Martin Co. of Baltimore, Md. The Titan will use many of the components being developed for the Atlas. This plan enables us to conduct simultaneous development of 2 operational missiles, representing different technical approaches, at an estimated increase of only 10 percent over the cost of developing a single configuration. The decision to pursue two different approaches was prompted by the desire to assure earliest possible success in our ICBM effort.

As in the case of the ICBM program, alternate lines are also being followed in the intermediate range or IRBM missile development. In the IRBM case, however, the Army and Navy jointly are pursuing one line, the Air Force the other. Again in the IRBM field some of the ICBM components are applicable and are being made available to the IRBM contractors.

For the Air Force IRBM or Thor program, the Douglas Aircraft Co., of Santa Monica, Calif., has been assigned a development responsibility similiar to that of Convair and Martin in the ICBM program.

The Air Force strategic ballistic missile program, including Atlas, Titan, and Thor,

is managed by our Air Research and Development Command, headed by Lt. Gen. Thomas S. Power. Immediate control and supervision over this program are exercised by Maj. Gen. B. A. Schriever, commander of the Western Development Division of ARDC, with headquarters in Los Angeles, Calif.

Backed by the vast resources of ARDC and its 10 research, development, and test centers, WDD currently supervises the activities of the thousands of military and industrial specialists who are already actively engaged in these three ballistic-missile projects.

To gain the services of top technical and scientific experts and to direct and expedite the innumerable and vitally important elements of the whole program, the Air Force has established a unique military-civilian management structure. Within the Western Development Division, three organizational elements guide the operations—the staff of the Western Development Division, the Special Aircraft Project Office of the Air Materiel Command which provides expedited procurement and similar materiel functions, and the Ramo-Wooldridge Corp. of Los Angeles which, under contract, provides WDD with a closely integrated technical staff, with specific responsibility to furnish systems engineering and technical direction to more than a dozen major contractors.

In addition, a group of the Nation's outstanding scientists, under the chairmanship of Dr. John Von Neumann, contributes to this vital program as advisers.

The organizational structure of the Western Development Division is designed primarily to expedite the Air Force ballistic-missile development program. It has the added advantage of providing for rapid transition from hardware development to operational weapons. This is made possible by concurrent operational development in which other major Air Force commands, principally the Strategic Air Command, actively participate.

While it is our estimate that we are ahead of the Soviets in the guided-missile field as a whole, we know that they have emphasized the ballistic line and we would not be surprised to find close competition in this field. Even here we must realize that the objective is effective delivery of explosive power on target and this is a very much broader problem than just sending rockets long distances.

In fact, as we view the whole strategic delivery field and consider manned bombers and air-breathing missiles as well as ballistic missiles, we are not inclined to view the ballistic missiles as more than an important addition to the arsenal. As potent as it will be when and if it is perfected, I see no reason to regard it as an ultimate weapon. I do see a reason to give its development the highest priority, and we are doing so.

Let me try, then, to get this matter of strategic delivery in perspective. First, we must remember that our primary purpose is to preserve at all times a solid deterrent position; that is, a position of retaliatory strength that could respond to any Communist aggression, even a surprise massive attack, with such devastation to the aggressors that by no stretch of the imagination could they expect to improve their position by launching the attack. This deterrent is a complex of many factors—men, weapons, delivery systems, bases, and many others. There is no question in my mind that we have such a solid deterrent position today. As we analyze the situation in the foreseeable future, I see no circumstances under which we would fail to have such a deterrent position even if we should not be the first to achieve each of the potent new weapons we have been talking about, assuming, of course, that we continue to press ahead with our programs.

The Case for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in presenting here a column written by Morley Cassidy for the Philadelphia Bulletin which comments on the speech made at the Alaska Constitutional Convention by the distinguished former Governor of Alaska, Ernest Gruening:

THE CASE FOR ALASKA

After waiting for 88 years, Alaska is about to get a constitution. The delegates to a constitutional convention signed on Monday a document on which they had been working for more than 3 months, and their draft now goes to the Alaskan people for their approval at a special election on April 24.

It will be approved, without doubt, for by all accounts it is a very fine constitution, impeccably democratic and with ironclad guaranties of the liberties that Americans cherish.

There is only one flaw, which unfortunately is big enough to be seen from Philadelphia with the naked eye. The document won't be worth the paper it is written on, and the rights it guarantees will continue to be denied until Congress sees fit to confer statehood on its stepchild of the snows.

This may take quite a while. It will certainly allow time enough to study a little pamphlet which has just been sent to this department by our old friend, Ernest Gruening, and to reflect at length on the ability of the American people to turn their moral indignation on and off at will.

The American people, bless 'em, are well known for their outsize hearts which can be counted on to bleed copiously at the very whisper of an injustice almost anywhere.

The key word in that sentence, though, is "almost," for injustice in American eyes seems to be largely a matter of latitude, like morals.

An injustice committed in the tropics, by the wicked French or British, is almost automatically an outrage which will start up an American committee for justice to Bantustan. The same injustice, however, is likely to start up nothing more than a yawn when it happens in latitude 72 degrees north, to Americans who are not illiterate, not colored, not Communists, and not even especially hungry or disease ridden.

Suppose, for instance, that the people of Bantustan were to haul Great Britain before the United Nations, and complain:

"We have been promised all the rights of British citizens for 88 years, but they are still denied us. We are taxed without our consent, and our money taken to England to build roads in Sussex while we go on wading through swamps. We are denied a voice in parliament, yet our young men are drafted and sent all over the world to die at the command of our British rulers."

Who can doubt that Americans would leap on their British ally with claw and fang, to demand justice for the Bantus?

Yet these things, former Governor Gruening points out, are happening this very day in Alaska, the United States colony; and how much indignation have you heard?

Governor Gruening's pamphlet contains the keynote address which he made to the constitutional convention when it met last November 9, and it deserves a thoughtful reading from all Americans.

It is couched in terms borrowed from the Declaration of Independence, as a dramatic way of stating Alaska's claims to statehood. The American conscience can hardly escape being stung by the thoroughly documented evidence that many of the grievances charged against George III are being duplicated today in this Nation's treatment of Alaska.

It is a long bill of complaints, and its main items can only be suggested here:

1. Alaskan citizens are subject to military conscription, yet are denied the vote, and thereby any voice in making the policies which lead to war or peace.

2. Alaskans pay all Federal taxes, including the gas tax, yet Alaska finds itself excluded from the proposed highway building program, and has received only minimal road-building aid.

3. Alaskans are denied the right to regulate such local industries as fisheries and aviation. As a result the fishing industry has declined by more than 60 percent in 20 years; and nonscheduled commercial flying, on which the Territory is largely dependent for transportation, has been banned for the benefit of scheduled airlines with stateside ownership, which do not meet the Territory's needs.

4. Alaska, as a Territory, is specifically excluded from the benefits of shipping laws applying to the United States. It is compelled thereby to use ports and shipping lines which greatly increase transportation costs and retard development of the area.

There are many more specific grievances beyond the greatest of all—that the Americans of Alaska are not self-governing citizens.

Their status, Governor Gruening points out, requires the United States to make annual reports to the United Nations on the progress it is making toward fulfilling the political aspirations of Alaskans under article 73 of the charter dealing with non-self-governing territories.

It is not flattering to Alaskans apparently to find themselves thus lumped in with the natives of Togoland or the Cameroons.

But a reading of Governor Gruening's pamphlet makes one wonder. Maybe Alaskans may some day be driven to enlisting the support of a Togoland Committee for Justice to Alaska. And maybe that is their best hope for getting action.

Need for More VA Hospital Facilities in Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Kenneth E. Doncaster, assistant State service officer of the State of Florida's Department of Veterans' Affairs, has just completed a survey of Florida's veterans needs and their economic situation.

I note with interest that they too are firmly of the opinion that for Florida veterans the major crying need today is for adequate hospital facilities.

Florida, percentagewise, is first in population growth as compared to all other States equal to or greater in population.

Florida's continued growth is a foregone conclusion. Along with this growth

annually comes increased requests for VA hospitalization.

The need for improved and expanded facilities should be recognized and immediate steps taken to correct this inequitable and inadequate situation.

Mr. Doncaster's comments together with the results of the survey follow:

STATE OF FLORIDA,
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
St. Petersburg, Fla., April 24, 1956.

Hon. DANTE FASCELL,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FASCELL: There is enclosed a copy of a survey I have recently completed dealing with the current economic situation of 60 veterans of World War I, scattered all over the State of Florida. I had been working on this survey for some months and had hoped to have many more than 60 reports, but feel that this is a representative sampling of the present-day status of our older war veterans.

Quite frankly, we were trying to determine the need for (1) more hospital facilities in the VA in Florida and (2) for liberalized pensions for World War I group. The results were not predetermined by us in any way, and they do speak for themselves.

The results, which I am sure would be confirmed again and again, in any survey of a broader scope, shows two important things in by opinion. The first is that the major crying need today is for adequate hospital facilities. Being a student of gerontology (St. Petersburg Junior College), I am well aware that this is a finding that is true of citizens generally who are in their sixties. This survey confirms the acute need in the veterans group who are in that same age group. I feel that we must continue to expand the VA hospital facilities in Florida, particularly Bay Pines, to accommodate these older veterans—many thousands of whom are daily moving down here from all over the North. The hospital problem in the North slowly improves by reason of emigration, and in the South is ingravescent by reason of immigration. The second major point established by this report is that for the people in their sixties now, the social-security program is less than adequate. If the veterans didn't have the VA pension to rely upon, they would obviously be on the welfare rolls of the several counties of Florida. Even so, the minimum benefit of $66.15 is not enough to keep a man and wife—even in Florida—or perhaps I should say, especially in Florida.

Therefore the VA pension program must be liberalized particularly for the World War I group. This finding is not motivated by the adverse finding of the Bradley Commission which came out this morning, but by hard and cold facts independently arrived at by a study of individual cases.

I am sending copies of this survey and similar letter to all members of our congressional delegation, being assured you will all work for the welfare of our older veterans, when you find the opportunity presented.

Very sincerely yours,
KENNETH E. DONCASTER,
Assistant State Service Officer.

The following report is a survey of 60 veterans of World War I, completed on April 16, 1956, by Kenneth E. Doncaster, assistant State service officer, Florida Department of Veterans' Affairs, and department service officer, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. This survey concerned itself with the need by these men for hospitalization; their income status, and employment situation.

On the question of age, 20 out of the 60 were 65 years of age or older, 18 of the 60 were 60 years of age or younger, the remainder being between 60 and 65. The youngest man in the group was 57 years of age and the eldest was 79.

On the question of dependents, 36 of the 60 were married. A total of 45 out of 60 had 1 or more dependents. Only 9 of them were unmarried, without dependents, and the remaining 6 declined to give this information.

To the question, "Do you anticipate needing VA hospital care within 5 years?" an unequivocal "Yes" was noted from 51 out of the 60; 5 men answered with a positive "No." On the question of needing VA hospital care within 1 year, 24 answered affirmatively and 30 were indefinite or vague as to when they might need it; the remainder declined to answer.

On the question of employment, 49 out of 60 reported that they were not employed at anything whatever; 11 men stated they were employed and gave their wages, which ranged from $25 per month to $327.60 per month, with 2 men who couldn't compute their wage because they were self-employed. Five of the 11 had earned income of $100 per month or more (5 out of 60 is equally valid here). The average monthly wage of these 11 was $117.96.

On the question of social security, 17 out of 60 are now in receipt of social-security benefits, ranging from $30 to $80 per month. Six men reported they would receive social-security upon reaching age 65; 25 men stated they would never draw social security. The remaining 12 men simply didn't know whether they had coverage under social security sufficient to permit payment of the benefit.

On the question of VA pension (nonservice connected), 36 men out of 60 were in receipt of the VA pension; 12 of them drew $66.15 per month, 12 drew $78.75, and 2 drew $135.45.

On the question of other income, 20 out of 60 reported income from other sources (other than VA pension or social security). The average of other income was $92.90 per month and ranged from a low of $17 per month for service-connected disability compensation to $216 per month railroad retirement. The remaining 40 of the 60 had to rely entirely upon social security or VA pension for non-service-connected permanent and total disability.

On the question of assets, 21 out of 60 reported no assets whatever—no real property, automobile, cash in bank, etc.; 31 out of 60 did have assets ranging from $100 to $10,000, with an average of $3,585.

The Public Always Pays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on April 25, 1956:

THE PUBLIC ALWAYS PAYS

Who should pay the cost of relocating utilities in the proposed $51½-billion Federal road network? Should Federal funds be used to meet 90 percent of the cost, as the bill provided when it went to the House, or should the utilities be required to pay the cost themselves?

This issue promises to evoke heated debate in the House, with one faction contending it would be a horrible giveaway if Federal funds were used to finance the utilities' relocation.

We are not greatly concerned over this issue, however, because, regardless of the outcome, the public will pay the bill, as it always does.

The cost of relocating utilities has been estimated at $1½ billion. If this money came out of Federal funds, the cost would be paid by Federal taxpayers. If the utilities were required to foot the bill, the cost would become part of their operations and would be reflected in their rate structures, in which case the utility users eventually would pay the relocation cost.

Nowadays there is no difference between utility users and Federal taxpayers. They're all members of the public. But there are demagogs who like to pretend that they are doing the public a service if they can "soak" utilities for something for which the public is going to pay anyhow. So let them have their fun.

The Republican Candidates and Union Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 21, I had the privilege of delivering the principal address at the luncheon meeting of the Young Republican Organization of Illinois, which had assembled at the La Salle Hotel in Chicago, for its annual convention. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of my address, which was as follows:

In spite of the fact that there are still many problems which the Republican administration has to resolve, no one can gainsay the fact that during the 4 years of Republican administration the country has reached its greatest heights of prosperity, peace has been attained, and we have not been involved in a shooting war. In every direction, we have been making great progress—economically, socially, and in welding our own people together.

Even with prosperity, peace and progress, and with the great popularity of President Eisenhower, there is grave question in many minds that the cumulative effect of all these factors might not be enough to capture control of the next Congress. From a review of the actions of the present 84th Congress, none of us can labor under the delusion that the Democrats will support President Eisenhower's policies. The Democrats only support Mr. Eisenhower's policies when it suits their political advantage, otherwise they are diametrically opposed to him and his program, even though they pay lip service to the principle that they want to support the President.

Knowing this audience is composed of people who are ready, willing, and able to carry a message to the people, I feel it is necessary to talk to you about a phase of the coming election which most politicians and citizens would like to forget about. It is a problem which confronts the Republican Party and all Republican officeholders, and is the opposition to the Republican Party and Republican principles voiced and carried out by union labor spokesmen. Naturally, I am speaking from the standpoint of a resident of Illinois and of the industrial North. I am speaking of the very real problem con-

fronting us whereby labor union leaders distort the truth by means of hoodwinking the labor union workers about the Taft-Hartley Act. And here I want to strongly emphasize that I am speaking only of labor union leaders. By no means are my remarks here today aimed at the rank and file of union membership, because over the years it has been proven that when the working people go to the polls they vote as Americans, supporting the best qualified candidates and keeping in mind the general welfare of the country.

The majority of union labor leaders knowingly try to sell the proverbial "bill of goods" by promoting the false idea that only the Democrats are friends of the working people. When I note the firm grip that labor union leaders like Walter Reuther and James Carey have on the Democrat political leaders, I have grave misgivings regarding the motives of these few men, as it seems to me that they are personally more interested in achieving political power and in taking over control of the Democratic Party than they are in the welfare of labor.

However, in all fairness, it must be noted that some union labor leaders do not follow the herd. Dave Beck, president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, in February said he thought organized labor should not get into politics any more than is absolutely necessary on issues confronting it in the economic fields. Maurice Hutchinson, of the International Brotherhood of Carpenters, said that neither political party has "the labor vote sewed up." He stated (February 17, 1956) that "labor will not latch onto the shirttails of any political party in 1956," and further said, "the Democrats have more people in favor of antilabor legislation than the Republicans."

If the majority of union labor leaders were interested in disseminating the truth, they would not continue to hoodwink the rank and file of union workers about the Taft-Hartley Act. They would not continue telling their members and the voters to defeat Republican candidates for the legislature and to elect Democratic candidates on the promise that the Democrats will repeal the Taft-Hartley Act.

Let us look at the record. The Democratic Party, since the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act back in 1947, has continually promised to have it repealed. You do not have to be reminded that in the Democratic Party platform and in the Democratic campaign speeches of 1948 and 1952, they promised to "tear the Taft-Hartley Act out of the books." I do not have to remind you that in the congressional and senatorial elections of 1950 and 1954, you heard practically every one of the Northern industrial Democratic legislative candidates promising to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act.

Since the passage of the act, the late Senator Taft, various labor unions, and also the general public have recognized that some changes in it were necessary and called for, and on two separate occasions the Republican leadership has considered enacting some of these proposed amendments to the law. On both occasions the solid block of Democratic votes has stopped enactment of those needed revisions. Such action by the Democrats makes it clear that they are willing to sacrifice the best interests of labor in the mistaken belief that the Taft-Hartley Act will provide them with a continuing campaign issue.

On the first occasion, in the 81st Congress, when amendments to the act were presented on the floor of the House in the Wood bill, 193 Democrats voted against the proposed improvements to the law, while nearly every Republican voted to pass them. In 1954, when amendments were considered in the Senate, every Democrat voted for recommittal. The recommittal motion carried, thus killing any chances of improveing the law in that session of Congress. Here again, I should like to point out that almost every single Republican Senator voted in favor of those proposed amendments. During that session, extensive hearings on amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act were conducted by the House Education and Labor Committee, but after noting the action in the Senate, the committee realized that there was no chance for clarification or refinement of the act in that Congress and took no further action. The Democrats have again—as you will recall they did before the November 1954 elections—told the people that they would repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. So far while they have controlled Congress during this past 2 years now, there have been no hearings in the House of Representatives to attempt to either clarify or repeal the law as a whole.

The Democrats have controlled the 81st, 82d, and 84th Congresses since the Taft-Hartley Act was passed. In 6 out of the 8 years since the enactment of that law, the Democrats had full control of both Houses of Congress and all committees. The very least they could have done, if they had wanted to be honest with union members, was to bring out of committee and onto the floor a bill for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. They had the necessary control and the opportunity to act—they failed to do so. It is a 100-to-1 bet they will again campaign on this false issue and, I regret to say, they will again hoodwink some of the union people.

In labor legislation, as in civil rights, it seems to me that the Democrats are very long on promises and short on performance. The voters will have to judge this themselves in the coming election, and disregard Democrat promises which do not result in Democrat performance. In my opinion, the Democratic Party is divided on labor issues and will not, in the foreseeable future, repeal the Taft-Hartley Act.

In the 1956 campaign, we will again be faced with the same hoodwinking and the same rash promises by labor-union spokesmen in cooperation with the Democrat politicians.

On Wednesday, April 3, the Cook County Branch of Labor's League for Political Education asked permission to use membership lists of the Chicago Federation of Labor in order to get out the vote on labor's side in the coming national election. The chairman of the league appealed for aid from the federation unions in electing a Congress that would repeal or amend the Taft-Hartley Act. How far can union labor leaders demagog? How can they continue to hoodwink their own membership, especially when you look at the record as it has been recited here today. It seems to me that if the union-labor leaders are really interested in the welfare of their organizations and in the welfare of the workingman, they would face the facts and tell the membership exactly what has happened to the laboring man during the past 4 years of Republican administration. Among a great many things they would—if they were honest—have to bring out:

(1) An alltime high in people employed: At the present time we have the greatest peacetime employment in the history of our country. The 1955 Republican peacetime average of 63.2 million is 3.8 million above the highest Democrat peacetime high of 59.4 million in 1948, and 1.9 million more than the highest Democrat wartime high of 61.3 million in 1952.

(2) Cost of living stability: Since 1933, the cost of living has continuously gone up and in practically every year since that time under a Democrat administration the increase in the cost of living has offset the gains in wages that the workingman received. The stability of the cost of living in terms of real wages, as indicated by the Consumer Price Index for 1955 and up to the present time, has meant that when the workers won wage increases in this period the extra money made it possible for them to buy more consumer items instead of merely being able to buy the same number of consumer items as previously but at a higher price. In the year 1955, there was a 10-cent total increase in wages, which resulted in an actual real increase of 9 cents. This is a record of which the Republicans can be very proud because it clearly demonstrates that the cost of living has been stabilized. The Democrats and the labor-union leaders certainly cannot point to any such record in any comparably recent year of Democratic administration.

(3) Average pay at an alltime high: From the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor, the figures show that under the Republican administration and Republican leadership the average weekly earnings of factory workers have reached an alltime high, being at $78.59 in March.

(4) Facts about the Taft-Hartley Act: In all fairness, should not the labor union leaders reveal to the union man the fact that the Democrats have never lived up to their promises to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, even though they controlled Congress 6 out of 8 years since the law was enacted. In the earlier part of my speech, I detailed the lack of action on the part of the Democrats. Why do not the union leaders give their membership these details? In spite of the fact that union leaders and the Democrats have seen fit to call the Taft-Hartley Act the "slave labor law," why doesn't common honesty force the union labor leaders to reveal to the rank-and-file union workers that union membership rolls have increased year by year and are at a record high; that the loss of time due to strikes is at a minimum; that the union treasuries are more prosperous than they have ever been; that the various unions are building palatial million-dollar structures, as evidenced by the fact that during the past 1 to 2 years seven now million-dollar union buildings have gone up in the Washington area. If the Taft-Hartley Act is destroying labor unions, how come this growth and how come this prosperity of the unions? Why do not the labor leaders reveal these facts to their members?

When President Eisenhower and the Republican administration have given the working people of the United States full employment, a stabilized cost of living, an alltime high in their earnings, and have developed a climate wherein the unions have made their greatest progress, how—in the name of common decency and justice—can so many of the labor union leaders continue to misrepresent the facts? We can all be thankful that the rank and file of union members have such good sense and are still able to see and know the truth.

I have, as you realize, spent a lot of time on this single issue because I feel it is a very vital one, and unless good citizens like yourself have the facts you will not be able to intelligently counteract the false propaganda which the labor union leaders, in conjunction with many Democrat politicians, will spread between now and the November election. Those men realize that it will be an impossibility to defeat President Eisenhower and consequently are concentrating on capturing control of both Houses of Congress. You are a vital factor in helping to counteract this false propaganda, and if you will but remember some of these facts you will be of inestimable help to President Eisenhower, the Republican Party and the general welfare of the country in the coming months.

H. R. 10

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, during recent weeks the Members of this House have evidenced increasing awareness of the pension plight of the self-employed. Many of them, from both sides of the aisle, have expressed to me their support of H. R. 10, the Individual Retirement Act, which would permit self-employed persons to obtain tax deferment on reasonable amounts set aside for their retired years. This measure is now a part of the omnibus tax bill upon which the Ways and Means Committee has not taken final action. The following comments by Sylvia Porter in her syndicated column indicate another aspect of this problem of discrimination against the self-employed. It sets forth clearly some of the major fringe benefits upon which taxes are now deferred or diminished:

[From the Chicago Daily News of April 21, 1956]

SALARIES MODEST, BUT EXECUTIVES LIVE HIGH ON FRINGE BENEFITS

My friend, R. A., is a policymaking vice president of a nationally known corporation which has made a lot of money in the last few years. If you saw his monthly paycheck, though, you would be surprised; you would expect the check to be much bigger, considering the name of the company, the industry, and his key job.

But R. A.'s paycheck would give you a badly distorted view of his actual financial setup. For, in addition to a cash salary, R. A.'s company has just, in the last 5 years, given him:

A handsome expense account which covers virtually all his expensive entertaining, travel costs, etc. It also provides him with a new car every year and a beautiful vacation haven.

A retirement program under which he's already guaranteed $21,000 a year for life, and his retirement benefits are steadily increasing.

A special contract retaining him as a consultant at $14,000 a year for 10 years beginning when he's 65.

A privilege to buy a big chunk of the company's stock at a specified price at any time between now and 1965. The stock is now quoted at $40 above the price at which R. A. can buy (or has bought) the stock, and his paper profits on the stock top a quarter-million dollars.

So, if you added to R. A.'s cash salary all his fringe benefits you would find that he is doing very nicely indeed in this era of stiff taxes on incomes. R. A. is not only building a major estate for his family; he also is in a position to move easily and comfortably in the so-called million-dollar circles of our land.

Am I making this report on R. A. because he is so exceptional? Oh, no. The point of this story is that R. A. is becoming less and less the exception, more and more typical of executives in industry.

In corporation after corporation, key officers are getting contracts and pay deals that rival or surpass the one R. A. has. As an illustration, the magazine Sales Management made a survey of 50 leading corporations a short time ago, found only one in which the chief sales executive is compensated by salary alone.

In corporation after corporation, top management men are being tied to their jobs for life by a golden cord of fringe benefits.

The deals make the executives all but immune to offers from the companies' competitors because the men would have to give up their impressively attractive benefits if they quit.

What are some of the ways corporations are compensating key men—outside of cash? These:

1. A stock option deal. Under this plan, a key employee gets the option to buy a specified total of the company's stock at a specified price during a specified period of years.

If the stock soars during the period, he still can exercise his option at the fixed price; when and as he sells his shares, his gain will be taxed only at the capital gains rate, meaning at a top of 25 percent.

The profits of some men who have stock option deals run into millions of dollars.

2. A deferred bonus arrangement. Under this, the company votes the officer a bonus payable in installments over a number of years, thereby cutting his year-to-year tax liability. In some cases, the executive prefers (and will get) payment of his bonus after he retires.

3. Handsome retirement programs. Some contracts I've seen give executives really eye-popping incomes for life. In addition, many have contracts to remain as consultants at impressive salaries after 65.

4. Rich insurance policies which also may pledge a lifetime income to the wife.

5. And fat expense accounts, special health programs, profit-sharing arrangements, many other variations of benefits.

The publicized statistics on the rate of rise in executives' salaries are meaningless unless the fringe benefits also are included.

The cash paycheck of an American executive is less and less the yardstick of his financial well-being, and it'll continue to be less and less so as his fringe benefits multiply.

Pure Milk Products Cooperative in Wisconsin Hails Prop Hikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the recent increase in price supports for the dairy farmer. I am including as part of my remarks, a news article which points out that the Pure Milk Products Cooperative, of Fond du Lac, Wis., was greatly pleased with this increase. Mr. William C. Eckles, of that cooperative, says that "this will mean an increase of $1 million a month" in the income of Wisconsin dairy farmers. Who said this would not help them? The article follows:

PURE MILK CO-OP HAILS PROP HIKES

FOND DU LAC.—William C. Eckles, of the Pure Milk Products Cooperative, said Thursday night, higher price supports for surplus cheddar cheese and butter "will mean an increase of $1 million a month" in the income of Wisconsin dairy farmers.

Eckles, general manager of the co-op, made the statement in a telephone conversation from Washington where he had been meeting with Agricultural Department officials and attending an executive committee meeting of the National Milk Producers Federation.

He referred to the announcement by the Agricultural Department Wednesday in which it said it will pay 2 cents and 1 cent per pound more for surplus butter and cheddar cheese respectively.

"This action," Eckles said, "is actually a much better emergency measure than what was contained in the farm bill." President Eisenhower vetoed the farm bill Monday and the same night announced the emergency measure.

National Association of Home Builders Endorses Extension of GI Home Loan Guaranty Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I thought the Members of the House would be interested in reading a newspaper report dealing with the comments of the president of the National Association of Home Builders on the subject of the GI home loan program which is due to expire in July of next year unless we take up very soon and enact legislation to offset the ill effects of the scheduled cut-off date of the home loan guaranty program for our veterans, the benefits which they have enjoyed as well as the good this program has been to our national economy, will have been greatly diminished as this article from the April 22 issue of the Miami Daily News, Miami, Fla., so accurately points out. There is legislation before the Veterans' Affairs Committee right now to avoid this contingency, and I am hopeful the Members will take the time to review the provisions of H. R. 10469 and that they will see fit to make their endorsement known to the committee.

BLOW THREATENS BUILDING INDUSTRY—TIME IS RUNNING OUT FAST ON GI HOME LOAN PROGRAM

WASHINGTON, April 21.—Joseph B. Haverstick, president of the National Association of Home Builders, today warned World War II veterans that time is rapidly running out this year on their rights to buy a home under the GI home loan guaranty program.

"The unpleasant fact must be faced that there is a strong indication that the Congress may not extend this patriotic program beyond its expiration date of July 25, 1957," Haverstick said. "If the 3-year extension recommended by NAHB and the major veterans groups is denied, the program for all practical purposes will terminate sometime this fall."

He pointed out that builders will have to quit starting GI houses well in advance of the actual termination date because of the long period of time involved in planning, financing, building, and actually giving possession of a house to its new owner.

PRICE TAG LOWER

Under the terms of the GI home loan program, administered by the Veterans' Administration, the Federal Government guarantees up to $7,500 of the purchase price of a house. Equally important, the veteran pays only 4½ percent interest. This compares with 4½ percent plus a one-half of 1 percent insurance charge under the FHA program and the conventional interest rate

which seldom, if ever, is under 5 percent and more often than not is more.

Haverstick also noted that despite a continuing upward trend in the cost of new housing—due to progressive increases in land, labor and materials costs—the typical GI house has still been priced somewhat under the conventionally financed home. He cited figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics showing that in 1955 the typical GI house sold for $12,476, as compared with an average $13,700 price tag on all houses.

ADVERSE EFFECT SEEN

"The consequences of any failure on the part of the Congress to extend the GI program will adversely affect an estimated 5 million World War II veterans, many of whom for very valid reasons, have not been able to take advantage of their rights," Haverstick said. "They are going to be left stranded. Ironically, the figures show that this program is about to be allowed to die at the very height of its usefulness to the men who fought in World War II."

Haverstick said that entirely apart from the hardship imposed on individual veterans, the termination of the GI program at this time will have an unusually severe impact on the home building industry and upon the overall economy.

"The extent of the blow may be readily seen in the housing figures for 1955," Haverstick continued. "New GI housing accounted for at least 400,000 units, or more than 30 percent of all 1955 starts, for more than $4 billion of our national product, and provided more than 400,000 man-years of employment onsite, and at least an equivalent amount of offsite employment. This is a staggering amount of goods and services to let go down the drain."

Advisers or Yes-Men?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include a penetrating evaluating editorial, "Advisers or Yes-Men?" appearing in the Boston Post of April 23, 1956. The editorial, consistent with the direct editorial policy of the Boston Post, is an objective one, and one that every reader clearly understands. It is an editorial that merits deep consideration:

President Eisenhower's proposal of a nonpartisan civilian brain trust to advise on global strategy in the fight against communism is one of those meritorious plans which look and sound good, but which inevitably drift and disappear into a fog of semantics.

A rotating board of private citizens to advise the Government on anti-Communist policy sounds fine until it comes down to a question of who will be on the board and whether their advice would be taken. If those chosen are to be friends, supporters and admirers of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, for example, or of the President, the advice will either be strongly flavored with the views of the Chief Executive and his major foreign policy adviser, or will be relegated to the circular file.

When the President says that the interests of the United States and the free world do not conflict with the legitimate interests of the Soviet Union he again ventures into the area where definition of the meaning of legitimate interest is necessary. If the President means that the legitimate interest of the Soviet Union does not reach beyond the pre-World War II boundaries of the Soviet Union the Russians would not deal with the West, but if he means the present spheres of Soviet influence it is abject surrender and appeasement of the worst kind.

His first major foreign-policy speech of the 1956 campaign—shorn of its generalities—is not reassuring, for it is measurable against the foreign policy-speech of 3 years ago before the same audience of newspaper editors.

The cold-war victories he cited as the proof of the merit of his foreign policy are no cause for dancing in the streets. The Communists did not overrun all of Korea; they were given only part but not all of Vietnam; the Iranian situation improved; Anglo-Egyptian settlement on the Suez was reached; and Trieste was partitioned as a result of Communist consent. These are not victories, but appeasement and compromise.

Something more than the President's assurance that we are winning the cold war is required to reverse the tide of affairs which has set against the United States. There has got to be a reappraisal of our foreign policy and an evaluation of foreign aid. To argue that the new nations, whose leaders have been actively anti-American and anti-West, deserve assistance because America, too, refused entangling foreign alliances when it was a new nation is childish. The conditions are altogether different. America of that day was making a challenge at sea and was addressing itself to the task of taming a continent.

The President seems to be more concerned with answering the arguments of Adlai Stevenson (which are also open to criticism) rather than formulating a foreign policy to retrieve lost American prestige and to put the world on notice that all the Nation's resources will be employed to achieve peace, order, and justice. This isn't done by dressing up the clear and decisive expansions of Soviet influence to masquerade as western victories. No one is very much deceived—as the 2-to-1 vote of the editors that America is losing the cold war bears out.

Soviet policy has not changed. It has been successful. It is American policy that changed—and not for the better.

Federal Assistance Is Needed To Deal With the Pockets of Unemployment That Here and There Mar the Nation's General Industrial Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, one of the major problems still pending before this Congress is that of providing Federal assistance to depressed areas which represent pockets of unemployment despite the fact that our Nation is enjoying a period of unparalleled prosperity.

As the representative of the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania where pockets of unemployment exist, I appeared before the House Banking and Currency Committee, April 26, 1956, in support of my bill, H. R. 8223, designed to provide Federal assistance to depressed areas.

My statement follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, APRIL 26, 1956, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY REGARDING THE NEED FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO DEPRESSED AREAS

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to have the opportunity of appearing before this committee in support of legislation to provide Federal assistance to depressed areas.

As you probably know, over a period of several years I have sponsored legislation on this subject. However, today I am appearing in support of my bill, H. R. 8223, which I introduced on January 9 of this year. In my opinion, H. R. 8223 is an improvement over the bills I introduced previously in the 83d Congress and during the first session of this Congress.

H. R. 8223 is a bill to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and for other purposes. In a few words, the bill provides a $50 million revolving fund for making loans in areas of substantial and persistent unemployment for industrial development projects worked out on a local level and approved by the State.

The loans would be used for (a) preparing land for industrial use; (b) constructing new factories; (c) and modernizing old factories. In addition, a fund of $1½ million would be authorized to provide technical assistance, including studies evaluating the needs of and developing potentialities for economic growth in such areas.

My interest in legislation of this type stems from the fact that I represent a congressional district in Pennsylvania whose economy is dependent upon the coal and railroad industries. Years ago substitute fuels and modernization of railroads gave indications that unemployment would result in these two basic industries. World War II and the Korean war simply postponed the day of reckoning. However, following World War II and until the Korean conflict, unemployment became a vexing problem with the Korean war absorbing the unemployed until a truce was declared.

Since the end of the Korean war, the stark specter of unemployment again began to rear its ugly head and for a period of over several years 18 percent of our employables were unemployed with the result that the United States Department of Labor classified my congressional district in group 4–B because of having a very substantial labor surplus. This condition brought hardship and suffering to thousands of good Americans.

During the period when my congressional district was classified in group 4–B, thousands of my constituents were forced to exist on unemployment insurance and when their eligibility for such benefits expired, they were compelled to rely on public assistance. To supplement the small benefits received through the public assistance program, thousands of them received surplus commodities and it may be of interest to you to know that at one time nearly 30 percent of the residents of my congressional district were eligible to receive surplus food. Words are inadequate to explain the hardship and suffering caused by this unemployment.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to report that we have experienced a marked recovery in my congressional district to the extent that unemployment varies between 6 percent and 8 percent of our employables. This unemployment can mostly be found in one of my counties whose basic industry is coal. It truly represents a pocket of unemployment that is distressing in its effects.

At the present time, over 36,000 of the residents of this particular county or about 40 percent of the total population are eligible and are receiving surplus commodities. This is truly a blighted area that is in need of the

assistance that would be provided under my bill, H. R. 8223.

While there are smaller areas in my congressional district that represent pockets of unemployment, yet I want you to know that every single community in my congressional district faced with unemployment organized, some years ago with my assistance, an industrial development committee.

These committees were financed by the local citizens who, in addition to cash contributions, gave freely of their time and effort to bring new industries to their communities as a means of providing employment.

These industrial development committees have been instrumental not only in attracting new industries to my congressional district but by their activities and their faith in the future have created an atmosphere of hope and confidence with the result that in the last 2 years existing and new industries have increased the industrial capital investment in that area by over $100 million. These industrial development committees are to be commended for the leadership they have provided in trying to solve the unemployment problem.

Mr. Chairman, our experience in the central Pennsylvania area has convinced us that we cannot do this job alone. If we are going to lick these little depressions that stem from pockets of unemployment, we need State and Federal assistance in coordinating our efforts.

Already the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has enacted a $5 million industrial-development program to aid communities in their efforts to attract industry. All that is left to be done is for Congress to implement the State action by enacting my bill H. R. 8223, which will provide Federal assistance to distressed areas.

Mr. Chairman, the people whom I represent are good Americans, thousands of whom have suffered as the result of distress in the coal and railroad industries. Modern-day progress in these two industries brought about this distress. By the facts that I have given you, my constituents without Federal or State financial aid have given of their own money as well as their own time and effort to lick this economic problem. As I have stated, some progress has been made down the long, hard road but they need a helping hand to attain their objective.

Mr. Chairman, in concluding this statement and speaking for the people of my congressional district, if this Congress will enact a program similar to the program contained in my bill, H. R. 8223, I am confident that economic stability will be restored to the blighted areas of my congressional district and these little depressions resulting from pockets of unemployment will be a thing of the past.

While not all of the communities have been successful, we can point with pride to the fact that hundreds of new jobs have been created in the central Pennsylvania area through community effort.

Outstanding in the effort is the city of Altoona, Pa., where through the Altoona Enterprises, Inc., a subsidiary of the Altoona Chamber of Commerce, to date 10 new industries have been secured representing employment for 3,500 persons with an increased annual payroll for the area of approximately $15 million.

The $750,000 contributed by Altoona residents to finance this effort represents contributions on the part of a cross section of Altoona's population. In addition, it was necessary to borrow funds from the local banks. At this moment, the Altoona group has exhausted its borrowing capacity and this is a specific instance where my bill, H. R. 8223, will be of assistance.

Besides praising Altoona, Pa., I should like also to commend Curwensville, Coalport, Clearfield, DuBois, Tyrone, Philipsburg, Martinsburg, and Houtzdale, because these communities are also pulling themselves up by their own bootstraps.

Even though the unemployment situation has improved, we still have pockets of unemployment that cannot be ignored; hence, we have a long, hard road ahead of us to build a stable and diversified economy capable of meeting the menace of unemployment.

Bradley Commission Endorses Principal of H. R. 10469 Extending GI Home Loan Guaranty Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, I introduced a bill which would extend the GI home-loan guaranty program for a maximum of 3 years. This bill, H. R. 10469, is before the Veterans' Affairs Committee and the chairman has already requested reports on the measure from the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget.

With reference to this legislation, I would like to call to the attention of the Members a report which is available as House committee print No. 236, titled "Veterans' Benefits in the United States," and which was submitted to the President by Gen. Omar N. Bradley, who served as Chairman of the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions. This group was appointed last year to conduct a comprehensive study of the laws and policies pertaining to veterans' pensions, compensation, and related nonmedical benefits. The purpose of this study was to bring up to date and correlate these benefits and services so that appropriate legislative action could be taken to insure that our veterans and their survivors will receive equitable treatment in the years to come, "consistent with the orderly development of public policy in this important area."

General Bradley's recommendation No. 45 calls for an extension of our GI home-loan guaranty program "to avoid a last-minute rush and allow an orderly termination of the program," pages 312–313.

These home-loan guaranty benefits for our veterans are due to expire on July 25 next year. The opinion of the Bradley Commission is that this home-loan guaranty program has enabled our veterans to readjust to civilian life by providing them with the opportunity to purchase their own homes and at the same time helped to overcome the national housing deficit we faced at the end of the war. I respectfully submit that H. R. 10469 is in step with the Bradley Commission recommendation toward insuring an orderly termination of this program; offsetting the serious impact which the July 1957 cut-off date will have upon our economy; and allowing our veterans the time they need to take full advantage of these benefits. I am hopeful the Members of the House will share my enthusiasm for this legislation and that the Veterans' Affairs Committee will give speedy and favorable consideration to the bill.

I am not opposed to an overall housing program. Such a program has been suggested by some of my colleagues, recommended in the Bradley report and by others.

But it is extremely doubtful that the extensive study necessary to predicate such legislation can be completed this year in sufficient time to be acted on by the Congress.

It is obvious that a July 1957 abrupt termination will cause a serious setback in our entire economy. Manufacturers, wholesalers and retailers, of furniture, electrical appliances, builder supplies, and all other household items whose business it is to supply the homeowners are undoubtedly already considering cutback of their production. This cutback must begin no later than January of next year if legislation to extend the GI home-loan guaranty program is not enacted before the close of this session of Congress.

H. R. 10469, therefore, eliminates the abrupt ending and provides for a gradual termination over a conservative period of time; thereby allowing ample opportunity for us who want to consider an overall housing program, to prepare adequate and effective legislation for this all important measure.

A Bill To Amend Section 404 of the Housing Amendments of 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to amend section 404 of the housing amendments of 1955. This section is to facilitate the acquisition by the military departments of housing covered by mortgages insured under the military housing insurance program, commonly known as the Wherry housing program.

As the new title VIII military housing program rolls into high gear, it will inevitably increase the competitive pressure upon existing Wherry projects with attendant hardship upon the sponsors. We must find some means to prevent this hardship which at the same time will protect the interests of the Government as well.

Existing law governing the purchase of Wherry housing has proved unworkable. Several bills on this subject have been introduced but in my judgment, based upon careful study of the staff of our subcommittee on housing, none of them answers the principle objections being made to these pending bills by the various interested parties.

I must agree with what others have said about the high cost of Wherry hous-

ing under the long-term lease arrangement. I also agree with statements made to the effect that tremendous future savings will be made possible if this housing can be acquired by the military departments on an equitable basis.

My bill would clearly establish the intent of Congress in this field for it would make quite clear to the military departments that they should acquire these projects. It also provides authority for the military departments to alter or improve such projects, if necessary, so that the units may be made adequate under appropriate and reasonable standards for use as public quarters. No one can dispute the fact that some of these Wherry projects do not provide the living area that our military personnel are entitled to nor is it comparable with other types of housing operated by the military department.

I feel rather strongly that all housing being used by our military departments on base should be operated as public quarters, and insofar as practical, all such housing should be comparable whether it has been built with appropriated funds, or under any other program. The provisions of my bill would permit the necessary alteration of such housing if and when acquired. In order to give the military departments some latitude in this respect, I have included a provision in the bill which though authorizing the assignment of this housing as public quarters would permit its assignment on a rental basis, without loss of quarters allowance to military personnel if the Secretary of the military departments concerned determined such housing to be inadequate for assignment as public quarters. However, these units could be rented to military personnel for only such time that was required to alter or improve them so that they could be determined acceptable for assignment as public quarters.

Perhaps the knottiest problem is the question of how to arrive at a fair purchase price. I agree with many of the charges made by the sponsors of Wherry projects that the present law does not contain an acceptable formula for determining the value of the sponsor's interest. It is important that any formula for determining the price to be paid for the sponsor's interest in this type of housing must be fair to him. But equally important the interest of the Federal Government must also be protected.

In developing the formula contained in my bill, our studies show that in some instances the fair-market-value formula contained in the present law, although equitable for some projects, would be completely unfair to most of the Wherry projects, particularly those with a high vacancy ratio. On the other hand, a formula using only adjusted cost would not produce the desired results either since we have been reliably informed that a large proportion of Wherry housing was constructed prior to the inauguration of the cost certification requirement, and, in these instances, cost records have long since been destroyed. I believe the formula contained in my bill, developed after consultation with informed persons in this field, will produce a fair price for these properties—fair to the present owners and fair to the military departments.

A number of you have spoken to me regarding the problem of Wherry housing, problems facing both the military and the sponsors under present law. I urge you to examine this proposal carefully and any suggestions you may have to improve this proposed legislation will receive my careful consideration.

I feel that my bill will provide a workable solution to the problem and hope that it will receive early and favorable attention by the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I am attaching a brief summary of this bill which follows:

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 404 OF THE HOUSING AMENDMENTS OF 1955

This proposal would amend section 404 of the housing amendments of 1955 by—

1. Establishing the intent of Congress with respect to the acquisition of "Wherry housing projects" by the military departments and authorizing the military departments to acquire them through purchase, donation, or through condemnation.

2. Establishing a formula to determine the price to be paid for the sponsors' interest in such housing. Such formula would make use of the technique of fair market value as determined by an independent appraisal; actual cost of such housing as determined by the Commissioner of the FHA, and adjusted to current costs; or the Commissioner's estimate of replacement cost of such housing at the date of final endorsement for mortgage insurance adjusted to current cost level. Both adjusted actual cost and adjusted replacement cost would be reduced by the value of improvements installed or constructed with appropriated funds and by an appropriate allowance for physical depreciation.

3. Authorizing the Secretary of the military department concerned to rent the housing acquired under this section (where it is not assigned as public quarters) to military or civilian personnel without loss to military personnel of quarter allowances.

4. Authorizing an appropriation up to $50 million for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this section.

Mortgage Bankers Association Endorses Extension of GI Home Loan Guaranty Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lindell Peterson, president of the Mortgage Bankers Association of America, this week made available to all the Members a policy statement on housing and housing finance legislation. In connection with H. R. 10469 which I recently introduced to extend the GI home-loan program for 3 years, I would like to call to the attention of the Members that portion of this statement which deals with the need for extension of the GI home-loan guaranty program. The statement is as follows:

THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

(1) Extension of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended:

Benefits under this act for veterans of World War II will expire on June 30, 1957 (July 25, 1957). Of the eligible veterans it is estimated that about 10 or 11 million still have not utilized their rights under this program. While the association considers that an effort should be made over a long term to consolidate the VA loan-guaranty program with the insuring operations of FHA, it is our belief that any such proposal can probably not be effectuated prior to the June 30, 1957 (July 25, 1957), cut-off date, particularly since the rights of veterans of the Korean war do not expire until January 31, 1965.

We, therefore, recommend a 3-year extension of the benefits available to World War II veterans; and, in order to avoid the complications we foresee if the extension is not enacted until 1957, we recommend that Congress enact the extension now.

Mr. Speaker, my bill to accomplish this, H. R. 10469, is before the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and I am hopeful the chairman will see fit to schedule this measure for action as soon as possible.

Israel Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me on the eighth anniversary of the birth of the State of Israel:

ISRAEL INDEPENDENCE DAY, APRIL 27, 1956

It was in 1948 that the new State of Israel was established. Today, on the eighth anniversary of its birth, we pause to commemorate its record of progress and advancement. Examining the course of events which helped mold this record, we are amazed at how much Israel has realized against a backdrop of discord and international tension. We feel a great humility in confronting these great achievements chiseled out of the hard rock of adversity and salute the nation that accomplished them.

We also salute our Government's enlightened decision in 1948 to recognize the new State of Israel promptly. In part this House itself may claim credit for this. In 1945, you will recall, it passed a resolution favoring the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people. This resolution, in part, reads as follows:

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the interest shown by the President in the solution of this problem is hereby commended and that the United States shall use its good offices with the mandatory power to the end that Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization and development, so that they may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine as the Jewish national home and, in association with all elements of the population, establish Palestine as a democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights."

As you will all understand, I am proud to have been the author of this resolution.

The resolution, if I may repeat, looked forward to the establishment of Israel as a democratic commonwealth. Our policy of promoting this democratic commonwealth, however, is being rapidly frustrated. Disruptive problems within Israel and outside pressures and conflict have deflected our good intentions and Israeli national aspirations. The State of Israel has never been in greater peril of national annihilation, and it is primarily the responsibility of the United States to prevent such an act. I explaind in 1945 that my resolution reflected a long series of "authoritative expressions of American policy and the views of the American people on the subject of Palestine." Today those same American people are faced with the responsibility of advocating yet another authoritative policy regarding Israel. This time, however, our decisions must be based on more than humanitarian desires; we must base them on the imperatives of international politics. The realities of world politics demand strong and immediate action to halt the drift toward war in the Middle East, with all its risks of spiraling into an even bigger war, engulfing, perhaps, the whole world.

The first question we ask is: What are the realities of the international crisis revolving around Israel? Superficially the events leading up to the present crisis consolidate into three major phases: (1) The rise of Israel; (2) the Arab-Israeli war; and (3) the truce.

Accurate as these phases may be, however, they are local and restrictive, whereas the broader political implications involve major world powers whose foreign policies need to be keyed to preserving the balance of power in the Middle East. Our own Government, therefore, must adopt a statesmanlike, constructive policy, providing not only security and peace for Israel but also for the world. In 1945 on the floor of this House I stressed the evolutionary and humanitarian elements underlying our promotion of the creation of the State of Israel. I repeat the words I then used: "As in so many fields of international policy, so here also the issue is not between nations but between emerging world democracy and the forces of reaction, hate, and decay." Numerous historical incidents have buttressed my contention, and I insist, as before, we have had and still do have the mandate of human conscience to promote Israeli national interests. This same mandate compels us today to use every available means to bring peace to the Middle East. Only with peace may Israel develop, advancing further along the road of modernization and democracy.

Eleven years ago the United States Government's primary reason for supporting the creation of the new Israeli state was to seek the establishment of a democratic commonwealth evolved through the trials of time and circumstance. It was never our intention, as I pointed out then, to "create overnight a political entity." Yet from the beginning the United States Government intended that this new nation, once founded, should remain a permanent one within the community of nations. We sensed the potentialities that Israel possessed for serving as an outpost for western civilization; we felt her existence was a positive affirmation of our own democratic values and concepts. We were aware that a new nation would likely suffer with growing pains, struggling to get on its infant feet. We also were aware that nationalist feelings would probably erupt, causing stresses within the Middle Eastern political framework. After all, the Arab States of the Middle East are also new stars in the firmament of world powers; the head-on collision of Israel and the Arab States was a calculated international risk. Fully aware of the possibilities for international tension another new nationalistic group would doubtless unleash, we, nevertheless, welcomed the rise of Israel as a victory for advancing Western idealism and triumphant democratic idealogy. We espoused the establishment of a new democracy, not as a narrow triumph for a religious or cultural group but as a broad triumph for our own faith in international morality and justice. On Christmas Eve in 1945 I remarked to this House: "The cause of freedom for a race and for a people is at all times a cause to be sponsored and proposed and fought for by Christians." At the present time I repeat that the right for the Israeli nation to exist is a cause we must continue to fight for.

Today the matter of primary concern to the world, however, is not one between nations—nor between religions—but one between ideological doctrines. Before World War I the Middle Eastern area was primarily of strategic or military concern to interested world powers. Since that time the complex ideological forces of nationalism and comunism have been added to complicate the picture. Soviet Russia's new and dynamic entrance into Middle Eastern politics is far more dangerous to the underlying democratic objectives of the Western World than many realize. To lose the battle of men's minds in another area of the world could spell final defeat for basic beliefs of Western civilization. Other areas of the world, for example, in which nationalist groups are becoming more articulate and aware may throw in their lot with the Communists if the West, especially the United States, fails to give its support toward stabilizing the fluid power structure of the Middle East. Especially Israel deserves the backing of the United States Government whose firm, decisive foreign policy could act as the realistic guaranty of the triumph of democracy. Our continuing expressions of sympathy for the material and social successes of Israel are no substitute for the diplomatic support our original policy implied when advocating its creation. The United States must exert her influence immediately for the forces of democracy before Soviet Russia makes still another vital area of the world an ideological captive.

"America," I declared in 1949, "will always be a friend at the crossroads of the world—turbulent and seething birthplace of man in the Middle East." I still do not think that our work is done as Christians or as individuals who believe in the victory of the human spirit and the ideals of brotherhood until we face up to our international obligation in this area, effectively implementing our basic democratic goals with a forthright policy. In this way alone can the State of Israel, along with the other Middle Eastern countries, feel the strength of freedom and democracy at the moment when those strengths need most to be felt. It has been truly said that we can strike no more effective blow in defense of our way of life than to do everything possible to make Israel a strong bastion of freedom in the Middle East and through it to reach the Arab world in the true spirit of our freedom. I insist, therefore, that we reaffirm at this time our own faith in democracy by championing it in Israel.

Supreme Court Enacts Another Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. FORRESTER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of great satisfaction to constitutional lawyers over our Nation that the laity is becoming increasingly conscious of the usurpation of powers by the United States Supreme Court.

I am delighted to call the attention of this body to an editorial written by Hon. James R. Blair, editor and publisher of the Americus Times-Recorder, a daily newspaper published in the city of Americus, Sumter County, Ga., reading as follows:

SUPREME COURT ENACTS ANOTHER LAW

The United States Supreme Court enacted another law Monday, this one banning segregation of races on privately owned transportation conveyances operating solely within a State. States rights means nothing to these nine little men in Washington. Is the Congress going to sit idly by and permit the Court to usurp its powers?

If the Court can tell privately owned transportation companies how they must operate their facilities, then is there any privately owned business that the Court can't dictate to in its operations? The United States Constitution means nothing to these glorified politicians.

There is one bright ray of hope gleaming through all these antics of a power-crazed Court—it may go so far that people in all sections of the country will become so thoroughly aroused by the usurpation of their rights and freedoms that proper and effective steps will be taken to curb the Court's powers. In the meantime, a serious situation appears destined to grow much worse.

This editorial is short but very concise. Mr. Blair asks the important question confronting this country, to wit: Is the Congress going to sit idly by and permit the Court to usurp its powers? Our Constitution still says that the powers granted to that Court are subject to such exceptions and regulations as Congress might make. In the 83d Congress, S. 44, which passed the Senate, had sandwiched in its other provisions a provision that would have deprived Congress of that power. I humbly point out that I was privileged to discover the language in S. 44 that would have deprived Congress of that power, and led the fight in the House Committee on the Judiciary which resulted in killing that bill. Thank God Congress still has that power.

As servants sworn to support the Constitution of the United States, I also ask: When is Congress going to exercise the power which it has to preserve constitutional government?

Veterans of Foreign Wars Honor Hon. Victor Wickersham, of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I am pleased to inform the House that Mr. Rutherford Day, chairman, Loyalty Day Committee, Department of the District of Columbia, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United

States, Washington, D. C., announced today that my colleague Congressman VICTOR WICKERSHAM, Democrat, of Oklahoma, has been unanimously selected from a group of all outstanding leaders, including Senators and Congressmen, to receive the annual Loyalty Day award given by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Day stated that this award is made annually to a figure of national prominence who works in the District of Columbia and that this is the first time that the award has been made to a Member of Congress, either on the Senate or House side. The award consists of a plaque, with the following inscription:

TO VICTOR WICKERSHAM for exhibiting those qualities in private and public life which make for a greater America.

In advising Congressman WICKERSHAM of his selection to receive the annual Loyalty Day award on May 1, Mr. Day stated:

It is the unanimous opinion of the committee, which opinion is concurred in by the Department of the District of Columbia, that no finer a man could be found to whom the award might be made. By Congressman WICKERSHAM'S sincere application to duty and to the interests of his congressional district, as well as to those of the Nation, and with a solid record of achievement in committee and other work, he has proven to be the type of man who is the basic strength of our great United States of America.

Congressman Teague of Texas: His Job Affects You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. T. RUTHERFORD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, there is a popular misconception in this Nation to the effect that if a Member of Congress is chairman of, or associated with, a given congressional committee, then he has no other interests save that committee and subjects allied to it.

Many of us, often without cause, are tagged as the champion of one particular industry, or one particular group, because of our committee assignments and attendant activity in that specified field.

But what the general public does not realize, in many instances, is the fact that every committee on Capitol Hill is directly concerned with the Nation's economic health. Each committee must operate with a two-fold purpose in mind: to give our people the service to which they are entitled, and at the same time to practice sound, sensible, economic operations.

This is especially true of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, where the members must attempt to do justice to the men who have fought our wars; where they must attempt to provide for the widows and orphans of our comrades who have fallen in battle; or where they are charged with the responsibility of seeing that no man, disabled by the horrors of war, will come upon economic poverty in this land of opportunity.

And yet the members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee must adhere to sound business practices; must work toward accomplishments for the needy without becoming spendthrifts with our tax dollars. They must separate the wheat from the chaff, so to speak.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker—and I know, in the opinions of many of my colleagues—the Veterans' Affairs Committee is in good, capable hands. The chairman of this committee is, as we know, the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE, of the Sixth Congressional District of Texas.

"TIGER" TEAGUE, as we know him here, has indeed a thankless task. I am certain that some disgruntled and misguided veterans must besiege him with requests which simply cannot be granted. I know, too, that many businessmen—both veterans and nonveterans—must at times berate him for expenditures which they do not consider essential.

But Congressman TEAGUE has proved to those of us who know him best, those of us familiar with his sincerity, ideals and integrity, that he is a very able committee chairman.

He has never willingly turned his back on deserving veterans and their families or survivors. As a former combat infantryman he is acquainted with their problems and their cause. At the same time, he has met with courage the sharp thrusts of pressure groups attempting to secure passage of legislation unneeded and economically unsound.

He has been a watchdog over the Veterans' Administration program. He has ferreted out those comparatively few persons who would abuse the veterans program, he has kept a good weather eye on attempts to defraud the Government, and he has saved our taxpayers many, many dollars by his constant and tireless efforts.

Many of our people do not realize it, but they owe OLIN E. TEAGUE a debt of gratitude. Needy veterans and their families are indebted to him because of his acts of compassion, his sense of fair play and humane responsibility. The taxpayer is indebted to him for his courage in refusing to be stampeded into expenditures designed to benefit but few at the expense of many. We are all indebted to him for his hard-working service to us as chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Nation's Business, a reputable publication of the business world, featured an article in the April 1956 issue about Congressman OLIN E. TEAGUE, of Texas, and his work in Congress. Believing people from all walks of life should have the opportunity to read it, I, under the unanimous consent of my colleagues, include the article titled "A Combat Vet Weighs Pension Pleas," written by veteran Washington correspondent, Frank Eleazer, in the RECORD:

Most of the pressures generated by the desire to liberalize veterans' benefits will focus on one man, a badly-wounded, much-decorated, 45-year-old infantry veteran of World War II. He is Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE, a blunt, hard-working Texan, a Democrat and Chairman of the House Veterans' Committee.

Mr. TEAGUE'S committee at recent count was a repository for 390 piees of proposed legislation on veterans' benefits, introduced by 146 House Members. By the end of the year the pile will approach about 500 bills, with maybe half of the House represented. Virtually all these bills call for bigger payments, looser restrictions, broader coverage, extension of time for application. Few members ever propose to reduce a veterans' benefit.

It is Mr. TEAGUE'S lot to study these proposals, to ponder over the $4,700,000,000 which the Veterans' Administration will spend this year, the $4,900,000,000 it will need next year, and the prospect that, even under present laws, this figure will rise steadily for decades as America's 22,088,000 veterans, who, with their dependents, make up almost half the population, get older, sicker, less able to take care of themselves.

Mr. TEAGUE is a man of few but plain words. He is bluntly honest about his conclusions and he is a continuing target for fire from opposing directions.

There is always the Member whose bill Mr. TEAGUE must bury. There is the local post that proposed it. There is the unending pressure for a whole array of such proposals from the vocal and persuasive national veterans' lobby. There is his own natural, inevitable, warm-hearted desire to take the best possible care of disabled veterans and their needy widows and orphans.

On the other side stands the economy bloc. Its spokesmen rarely propose directly to repeal benefits for veterans. But they continually seek out waste in veterans' programs, relating to abuse of benefits.

One group expressing outright opposition to some existing benefits for veterans is the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, 85 percent of whose members once were in service. At their 1955 convention in Atlanta the Jaycees deplored pension payments for disability not incurred in service; they opposed any pension plan based solely on having once worn the uniform.

The Amvets and the Disabled American Veterans strongly opposed broad benefit plans.

The Hoover Commission on Government Reorganization also has thrown its weight into the economy drive. Its task force on Government medicine said 19 veterans' hospitals should be closed, and that new strings should be tied to free medical care.

Congressional leaders rest easier nights because it is Representative TEAGUE who will make the compromises these pressures will require.

Speaker SAM RAYBURN, who helped steer his fellow Texan to the key post he has held since the start of the 84th Congress, is inclined to take Representative TEAGUE at his word. Bills his Veterans' Committee reports favorably usually get cleared to the floor without trouble, and are passed.

It was not always this way. There was a time when leaders and some other Members of Congress viewed the Veterans' Committee, rightly or wrongly, as a sort of annex to the veterans' lobby. There were complaints that its members let their hearts rule their heads.

In those days, bills approved by the Veterans' Committee often fared badly in the House.

It was in just such a case that "Tiger" TEAGUE first came to public attention as a junior Member of Congress. The year was 1949.

Veterans' Committee Chairman John E. Rankin, an open-handed Mississippi Democrat, who was one of Representative TEAGUE'S predecessors in the top committee post, had

pushed through the committee a pension bill under which any veteran whether or not disabled or in need, could have drawn $90 a month at age 65.

Pensions, it should be noted here, are not to be confused—though they frequently are—with compensation. The latter is a Government payment (up to $511 per month) to an exserviceman injured or disabled in service. Pensions are payments (from $66.15 to $135.45) for disability not due to military service. Compensation is paid as a matter of right and without regard to need. Pensions are paid only in case of need and established disability, the required degree of the later declining with age.

Mr. Rankin's bill would have eliminated the need and disability tests. Age would have been the sole qualification. His bill carried other liberlizations, including larger monthly checks. Initially, the cost would not have been prohibitive. Estimates of evential costs, as veterans by the millions reached 65, ran as high as $125 billion.

In committee Mr. TEAGUE had argued in vain that other needs were more urgent. He said care of the service disabled and their widows and orphans came first. Defeated in committee, he took his political life in his hands and set out to beat the bill on the House floor.

During most of the raging debate Mr. TEAGUE sat glumly silent. But he had organized well. Other courageous young members, virtually staring down the throats of the organized veterans who sat in the gallery, argued that the bill was unneeded, unwarranted, and a threat to all other veterans' programs.

Representative Rankin pointed out that the same benefit already had been provided for one group, veterans of the Spanish-American War, and argued that this merely put all veterans on the same basis. His argument had wide support, especially among the aging veterans of World War I.

On the third day Representative TEAGUE took the floor.

"Mr. Speaker," he said quietly, "I move that the bill be sent back to committee for further study."

Mr. Rankin roared his protest. The roll-call began. The voting was close. The Chamber grew tense. Speaker RAYBURN announced the results: 208 "aye" to 209 "no." It appeared that Representative Rankin had won.

Speaker RAYBURN, however, was not satisfied. A number of votes had been switched midway in the call. The count was so close that a single error could have altered the outcome. He ordered a recapitulation. As he had suspected, this recount turned up an error that reversed the decision. The vote actually was 208 to 207. The bill went back to committee, where it was buried.

For this, Representative TEAGUE was sternly scolded by the big veterans' groups. The Veterans of Foreign Wars, in a letter to its posts, gave him prominent billing in its anti-veteran listing. The American Legion made noises about going into his district. But Members of the House—and, privately, many veterans' leaders—sized up Representative TEAGUE as a tough, honest young man with no front and only one good leg but plenty of guts, and likely to go places in Congress.

Intestinal fortitude was a quality Mr. TEAGUE never had lacked. He was born on a wheat farm near Woodward, Okla., in 1910, and moved early to Mena, Ark., where his father ran lumber camps in the Ozarks. Young TEAGUE, already nicknamed "Tiger" though he claims he can't recall why, spent summer vacations from high school loading log wagons, driving the four-mule teams that hauled them, and firing the boilers that powered the saws. He also joined the National Guard.

After his first year at Texas A. and M. his father suffered a heart attack.

"From then on," the Congressman recalls, "I was on my own."

He already knew about work. What he had to do now was find more of it. At 25 cents an hour he fed the college's show calves. For the same price he shoveled manure from their stalls. A new stadium was built and TIGER TEAGUE was among the laborers. He got a job at the local post office as janitor, subclerk, and finally mail-master. The post office job took only 8 hours a day (4 to 8 a. m. and 7 to 11 p. m.) so young TEAGUE sold tickets part time for the Missouri Pacific Railroad.

He had little time in college for fun. Apparently he also had little inclination. Already he had developed into the serious, solid type that he remains today. His main recreation always has been athletics, then as a participant, now mostly as a spectator but still one of the hottest paddleball players—despite his crippled left leg—in Congress.

OLIN TEAGUE was graduated from A. and M. in 1932, in the lower half of his class but as a bachelor of science and a Reserve second lieutenant in the infantry. Somehow there were no jobs around in his chosen agricultural field, so he stuck it out at his old job in the post office. On December 20, 1933, earning $2,100 a year, he was married. His first of 3 children—2 sons and a daughter—came in 1935.

He also worked hard in the Reserves during those years, and in 1940 he went voluntarily into active service as a first lieutenant. To his dismay they put him into the military police. Not until February 1943, did he succeed in getting back to the infantry. According to his own account, it wasn't that he was a natural-born hero, or even that he was eager to get into the shooting. He was just trying to get ahead in the world, and couldn't see any future as a provost marshal.

For a time it loked like such future as he had in the infantry was soon to be all behind him.

Lieutenant Colonel TEAGUE led his First Battalion, 314th Infantry Regiment, 79th Division, onto Utah Beach on D–Day plus 6, and was in combat for 120 straight days before his comand got its first rest. Eventually one-third of his battalion was killed, another third injured.

Colonel TEAGUE himself was wounded six times. It was on December 18, 1944, that they finally knocked him out of the war. Shrapnel tore his left ankle as he reconnoitered along near the Siegfried Line, some 200 yards from help. He pulled the lace from his right shoe, fashioned it as a tourniquet around his shattered left leg. Then, with his foot hanging from a tendon, he crawled toward his lines.

Another shell exploded and shrapnel smashed into his lower back.

Somehow he made it anyway.

In the operating room 10 days later doctors changed their minds about removing his foot, and instead pulled the foot and leg bones together, shortening the limb about 3 inches.

After 20 operations and 2 years in the hospital, Representative TEAGUE still was on crutches. He also was in Congress, having succeeded at a special election his own representative, Luther Johnson, who had quit to become a judge.

"Nobody asked me to run," Representative TEAGUE recalled recently. "I didn't know anything much about Congress, and didn't know a single Member personally or even how many there were. But some of us in the hospital had done a lot of talking about the war and the Government, and I just thought I would try it."

Mr. TEAGUE arrived at the Capitol in September 1946, with no single pledge, principle, or burning ambition that he can recall, other than a general aim to take care of returning servicemen and the families of those who didn't come back. He did take along a few fundamental concepts. One was that money does not grow on trees, and that you don't spend what you don't have.

"I can't get away from the thought that the national debt is one of the biggest dangers in the country today." Representative TEAGUE said recently, "It's just the same as in your own home or business. If you keep on spending more than you make you are going to get into trouble. Sometimes I think the danger from within is greater than that from without. Too many have come to think that what they get from Washington doesn't cost anything."

In his view, debt reduction should come ahead of tax cuts. He once introduced a bill to bar Government spending beyond income, and to require, besides, that 10 percent of all receipts be channeled into reducing the debt. He admits today this would be a mighty hard goal to attain. But he says:

"We have got to live within our means. If that means cutting down somewhere, let's do it."

Representative TEAGUE is not adamant on where to start cutting. One thing is sure: He won't hold still for any big raids against spending for veterans. He has battled continuously, and usually with success, attempts to trim veterans' big medical bill. Three years ago he played a key part in a drive that added $56 million to veterans' hospital funds. Later he helped get $16 million to start work he believed long overdue putting rundown old hospitals back into shape.

Mr. TEAGUE will resist—and can make it stick—any unlikely effort to pare benefits for the service-disabled or the widows, orphans or dependent parents of men dead as a result of service. Almost certainly, as time goes on, he will insist on increasing some of these benefits.

On the other hand, he is not likely to buy broad new benefits for the men who came back whole. He is cool to the idea of any large-scale readjustment program—like the GI bill of rights for veterans of World War II and Korea—for men now being drafted for 2 years of non-combat duty. He does not believe in the general service pension, partly on principle and partly because of the vast probable cost.

That means there may be a big fight ahead.

Officially, the American Legion and VFW have forgiven Representative TEAGUE for what he did to the Rankin pension bill in 1949. They still are not happy about it, though, and relations weren't exactly improved when Representative TEAGUE, early in January, refused even to introduce "by request" the Legion's new pension bill.

Mr. TEAGUE contends the present pension law is sound and broad enough to care for those who really need help. It provides payments of $65.15 a month, subject to income limitations of $1,400 for single men and $2,700 for those with dependents. After 10 years on the rolls, or at age 65, the rate goes up to $78.75. Those so helpless as to need an attendant can draw $135.45.

In support of his position, Mr. TEAGUE cites the record: Of 3,112,000 living veterans of World War I—the group most immediately affected—502,000 already are pensioned. This is in addition to 231,000 who draw compensation.

The veterans' committee for some time has been deluged with mail about 1 or another of the 76 pension bills on which it recently held a week's public hearings without taking immediate action. Before the Legion and VFW got their letter-writing campaigns underway, the heaviest correspondence was about an even more liberal pension proposal sponsored by a group called Veterans of World War I.

Representative TEAGUE got so many letters demanding action on this proposal, and so

many phone calls from House and Senate Members asking about its status, that he sat down and wrote a long, definitive answer, which he mimeographed and now mails out to all who inquire. It sums up his philosophy pretty well. In part, it says:

"It seems to me that our first obligation is to the veterans who were disabled, to the widows and orphans, and then to those unfortunate veterans who have not been able to provide for themselves. * * *

"It is my opinion that to enact legislation such as proposed would jeopardize our entire veteran program. For that reason I am unalterably opposed to this legislation."

In short, no.

That kind of letter, as any Member of Congress will tell you, takes courage.

His friends report that Representative TEAGUE bleeds easily for a hard luck story from almost any disabled veteran. However, he has a sharp eye for the faker, the phony or the chiseler. As chairman of a special committee on abuse of the GI bill during the 81st and 82d Congresses he was the scourge of racketeers who flocked into veteran training.

He dealt unmercifully with builders who put up shoddy homes for veterans under Government-backed mortgages.

Recently Mr. TEAGUE got word that chiselers were moving into veterans' charities. Sharp operators in some cases were reported cashing in with no more than a claim that veterans—in some unspecified way—were to benefit from the proceeds. In other cases local posts had been taken in by fund-raising schemes in which virtually all the take left town in the pockets of the promoters.

Representative TEAGUE asked the House for special authority to investigate such rackets. He can be expected to show their perpetrators no mercy.

FRANK ELEAZER.

In Memory of the Passing of Isaac Evans, Industrialist, Farmer, Good Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am asking to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today an article from the Cleveland Press of April 19 which tells of the passing of one of Cleveland's most constructive citizens, Mr. Isaac Evans, industrialist, farmer, and "one-man United Nations."

This is a splendid article, but how can words do justice to the inspiring life of a sensitive, intelligent man who was deeply devoted to the needs of humanity throughout the world? How can one describe the feelings of people abroad who received some $1 million worth of his prize livestock? How can we record the rejoicing of Americans who were given work on his farm when the banks failed back in the "depression"?

Those of us who knew about the forests he planted in Israel, those of us who have been to Israel and know what those trees mean to the future of that brave little country, cannot let just a newspaper article record his passing.

I want to pay my personal respects to Isaac Evans, respects that are filled with an affection and understanding of the kind of man that had been my neighbor, whom I knew in such friendly fashion and whose correspondence meant much to me.

The kindness and friendliness of Isaac Evans to me personally is something I shall never forget. It is good to have known him. America is better because he has lived.

Under leave granted to me by unanimous consent, I am inserting herewith the article from the Cleveland Press of April 19, 1956:

ISAAC EVANS IS DEAD, GOODWILL AMBASSADOR

Isaac Evans, 72, Cleveland industrialist, farmer, and "one-man United Nations," died today at his home, 16251 Aldersyde Drive, Shaker Heights.

Mr. Evans, president of Master Mechanics Co., chemical manufacturers, earned international goodwill for donating livestock to countries whose herds were depleted because of World War II.

The animal shipments were valued at more than a million dollars. Mr. Evans owned farms in Geauga, Lake, Ashtabula, and Lorain Counties.

He came to this country from Russia as a boy of 6. He attended Brownell School, then quit high school to go to work.

BORROWED FOR BUSINESS

He started his own business with a borrowed $750 in an abandoned blacksmith shop.

Mr. Evans was a charter member of the Cleveland Farmers Club, a founder of the Cleveland Zionist Society, and vice president of Leo Levi Memorial Hospital, Hot Springs, Ark.

He paid for the planting of five forests in Israel, each named for one of the United Nations, to commemorate World War II victory.

His benevolence made him a Press "Alias Santa Claus" in 1945. His employees enjoyed unusual security and bonus arrangements.

KEPT EMPLOYEES WORKING

During the depression when part of the factory was shut down by the bank holiday, employees without work were sent to one of his farms to work at their usual wages.

Surviving Mr. Evans are his wife, Lillian; five sons, William, Robert, Charles, Martin, and Donald; and 16 grandchildren.

Services will be Friday, at a time to be announced, at J. D. Deutsch Funeral Home, 1490 Crawford Road.

The family said it will set up a charitable foundation in Mr. Evans' name and friends may contribute to it.

National Wildlife Federation Supports Bills To Curb Military Land Grabs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, the National Wildlife Federation, and other conservation groups, are giving active support to legislation which I have introduced to restore to Congress its constitutional powers and responsibilities with reference to the disposition of the public domain lands of the United States. A practice has grown up over the years whereby executive departments with little more than a simple application can withdraw these lands from general use. Congress has thus by default abdicated its responsibilities and the practice which has grown up is being viciously abused by some executive agencies, especially some agencies in the Defense Department.

I attach a copy of a statement issued recently by the National Wildlife Federation to all of its members, and through its publications, regarding the legislation to correct this situation:

BILLS INTRODUCED TO CURB MILITARY LAND GRABS

Chairman CLAIR ENGLE, California, and other members of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have introduced a bill to curb the appetite of the huge Department of Defense and its three rapacious children—Army, Navy, and Air Force—for more and more of the public domain.

Mr. ENGLE'S H. R. 10371 states that except in time of war or national emergency, no area of public land or water exceeding 5,000 acres can be withdrawn or reserved for defense purposes except by act of Congress.

The bill would require a military department, in making application for withdrawal or reservation of more than 5,000 acres, to declare who is going to use the area, for how long, and whether or not the result will be permanent or temporary contamination. The application also would have to specify the location and gross area, describe the boundaries, and set down how and to what extent the natural resources and multiple use of the area would be affected, including consideration of mining and mineral development, timber resources, grazing, fish and game management, water, and scenic, wilderness and recreational values. State water laws would have to be taken into account.

A third major provision would require observance of State conservation laws if any hunting or fishing is done on the reservation.

A fourth amends the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide that if withdrawn portions of the public domain are declared surplus, they shall revert to the public domain and not be sold into private ownership by the General Services Administration as is now the case.

The legislation has been proposed to plug what Mr. ENGLE has termed "a strange hole in the law." It was disclosed during prolonged hearings conducted by the Interior Committee that simply by a stroke of the pen, a military department can take over large areas of the public lands in the Western States and in Alaska. No other agency has the power to check on the need for such withdrawal, and the Department of the Interior is powerless to resist. The reservations become, in effect, permanent possessions.

The defense agencies, it was discovered, already have withdrawn lands exceeding in total area the States of Massachusetts, Maryland, New Hampshire, and Delaware, and presently are proposing to take other millions of acres in Alaska, Nevada, California, Arizona, Montana, and other Western States.

In Nevada where the Air Force has some 3½ million acres only sparsely and occasionally used in the Nellis (Las Vegas-Tonopah) Bombing Range, the Navy wants to take another 2½ million acres for aerial gunnery practice. The Air Force is eying covetously another million acres of the Desert Game Range in the same State.

The Engle bill will be opposed by the military departments with all their tremendous lobbying organizations. It will become law only if the people speak in a louder and more insistent voice.

Bills identical to Mr. ENGLE's H. R. 10371 were introduced as follows: H. R. 10362, Mr. WAYNE ASPINALL, Colorado; H. R. 10365, Delegate E. L. BARTLETT, Alaska; H. R. 10367, Mr. HAMER H. BUDGE, Idaho; H. R. 10372, Mr. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, New Mexico; H. R. 10377, Mr. LEE METCALF, Montana; H. R. 10380, Mrs. GRACIE PFOST, Idaho; H. R. 10384, Mr. WALTER ROGERS, Texas; H. R. 10394, Mr. JOHN P. SAYLOR, Pennsylvania; H. R. 10396, Mr. STEWART UDALL, Arizona—all referred April 10 to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Address by Grover C. Hall, Jr., Editor in Chief, the Montgomery Advertiser, to the 57th Annual Banquet of the Huckleberry Indians at the New York Athletic Club, April 21, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of Congress to a speech made by Grover Hall, Jr., editor in chief of the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser, to the 57th annual banquet of the Huckleberry Indians at the New York Athletic Club on April 21. Mr. Hall is one of the South's outstanding editorialists. His newspaper, known to Alabamians for generations as Old Grandma, has done a remarkable job in its coverage of the race situation in the South and under his guidance has taken the lead among southern publications which have with such just cause recently called on the northern press to give adequate coverage to similar problems in their own backyards.

I submit Editor Hall's address with the hope that it will receive the attention which is due an intelligent and shrewd analysis of one of today's most prominent national issues:

THE SOUTHERN WAY OF LIFE UP NORTH

I simply cannot express how pleased I am by this opportunity to travel down North from up South to speak on this Indian reservation. To me at least, this seems the most gracious of Yankee gestures since General Grant allowed General Lee's men at Appomattox to keep their horses for the spring plowing.

I will offer a few observations on a condition whose mention some regard as exotic, indelicate, and even gauche—that condition being the southern way of life up North. I mean, of course, segregation and discrimination against the Negro in the North.

I hope to say something worth your consideration on four points:

1. The history of nullification, of defying the United States Supreme Court and Federal authority, is not southern. It is all-American.

2. There is an exasperating failure by the American press to present a faithful, unsparing picture of American race disharmony from New York to Los Angeles.

3. It is a sorrowful but evident fact—not yet adequately grasped or reported by the press—that wherever the Negro migrates in significant numbers, he encounters rejection, overtly and legally in the South, covertly and illegally in the North.

Adlai Stevenson—who, take it from this Eisenhower partisan, ought to be, but apparently isn't, the pride of the Democratic Party—has stated this painful fact more honestly than his huckster rivals. Stevenson puts it this way:

"The race problem is an American, not a Southern, dilemma * * *. Before we cast a stone at Alabama, it might be well for those of us who live in some of the great Northern States to ask ourselves in candor how the Negro is faring in our own communities * * *. Racial discrimination in some degree is still a fact of life for the great majority of our Negro citizens who live outside the South."

4. The glamorous dispensation of the Supreme Court 2 years ago will not achieve a sudden, tidy Hollywood ending. Nevertheless, we southerners rejoice in the expectation that the hard lot of the Negro will continue to ease. This easement will depend, not upon the exertions of his tearful sponsors nor upon the rasping paranoid agitations of the NAACP, but upon diligence with which he works his passage to personal respectability. We Alabamians assuredly are not spending $33 million this year on Negro education with the expectation that he will remain in his present condition. But in States like Alabama, there will be no general race mixing as far as the eye can see.

I

But how is race mixing to be evaded in view of the Supreme Court's ruling? Well, to anybody with a schoolboy's knowledge of American history, the means of resistance is traditional American and obvious.

You've been reading a great deal about the resolutions of nullification, or interposition, through which some southern legislatures have been declaring the Court's school segregation "null, void, and of no effect." Like the power of the Supreme Court to nullify an act of Congress, the procedure and warrant for nullification are nowhere written down, except in the annals of American practice. Annulment of Federal dispensations since the 18th century have taken many different forms, varying from formal legislative resolutions, to the marshalling of State militia to repulse Federal troops, to a general sitdown against Federal law as in the case of the prohibition.

You've lately been splashing underneath a cataract of solemn-ass editorials in the northern press fuming that nullification is a perverse, un-American rebellion in which the South has exhumed the bleached bones of a skeleton laid away by the Civil War.

But the truth is, nullification, in one form or the other, has been undertaken by every single section of this country whenever a sectional grievance became profound.

The preeminent architects of nullification were none other than James Madison, "Father of the Constitution", and Thomas Jefferson. And there are many people—perhaps some of them right here in this hall—who consider that James Madison and Thomas Jefferson knew as much about the Constitution as Chief Justice Warren, or even that erudite Texas Blackstone, Tom Clark. After all, Madison was the only man who took notes at the convention that wrote the Constitution, and Jefferson had something or other to do with the Bill of Rights.

This country was not 7 years old when the first act of nullification occurred: the State of Georgia defied the Federal Government head-on by refusing to be sued in Federal court by a citizen of another State. This act of nullification stuck, the fruit being the 11th amendment to the Constitution. When 30 years ago Georgia again defied the Court in another matter, President Andrew Jackson egged Georgia on, saying—"John Marshall has made his decision, now let him enforce it."

In 1832, my own State of Alabama collided with Washington over control of our Indian lands. Alabama put an army into the field, and I express posthumous gratitude to you New Yorkers for the fact that a band of young New York bucks volunteered to form a company in the army of Alabama. As it turned out, President Jackson allowed Federal authority to be nullified by Alabama, and dispatched a peace emissary—who, incidentally, was a rather well-remembered music composer, Francis Scott Key.

Abraham Lincoln tweaked the nose of the Court. But the classic nullification, the one that most fascinates us southerners today, was the red-eyed defiance of the Court by the North in the case of the fugitive slave law. Runaway slaves, the law said, must be returned. Yet in the face of that law and a ruling by the Court of Chief Justice Taney, some 14 rebel States in the North enacted the so-called personal liberty laws, forbidding their citizens and constables to obey the Federal law. Poujade of France is not a more obstreperous and incorrigible scofflaw than were these 14 abolitionist States.

Many of the most strident and rash neo-abolitionists are Roosevelt idolaters. These dudish preceptors enjoin the South that it is chauvinistic—a swig of "rum, Romanism, and rebellion"—not to submit to the nine sociologists of the Supreme Court. I trust it will not seem indelicate to ask these civil rights holyrollers if they did not try to pack the Supreme Court.

And if court packing is not one of the most licentious forms of nullification? Again, it's not amiss to ask these officious, prissy scolds if it is not a fact that, had the Court ruled against Roosevelt in the gold-clause case, the country would have gotten a statement from Roosevelt that he would systematically defy the decision.

I have superficially rehearsed these episodes of nullification, not to justify what is happening in the South, but to demonstrate the plain fact that there are obvious limits beyond which the law cannot be enforced short of artillery.

It is sometimes suggested that nullification in its various forms was itself nullified by the Civil War, secession being the final resort in nullification. Stuff and nonsense. Consider, for example, the South's cunning nullification of the civil-rights statutes enacted after the Civil War. Consider how the prohibition law was suffocated. As Senator ROBERTSON recently reminded your Senator LEHMAN, there were 32,000 speakeasies in New York alone in the final nullification convulsion. How are 32,000 speakeasies different from a segregated school in Montgomery, Ala.?

II

The analogy between the present constitutional crisis and that in 1860 is striking, but imprecise. The rash, envenomed ecstatic agitations of the northern abolitionist destroyed the position of those in the South who advocated a gradual liquidation of slavery, and the rest is tragic history.

However, after that the parallel falters, for when the Confederate Army stacked its arms, slavery was at an absolute end, whereas the abolition of segregation has not, cannot, and will not come at a stroke.

There is another pregnant difference between the abolition of slavery and the abolition of segregation, for slavery was an exclusive southern institution, whereas segregation is not a Southern institution—it is an all-American practice. In 1860, the Negro was concentrated in the South, whereas today a third of our Negro population is in the North.

The hegira of the Negro to the North is a swelling torrent, at a rate that has already

reached a million in 10 years. It is estimated that the Negro is migrating to Chicago at the rate of 2,500 a month, nor does his traveling diminish his rate of reproduction.

What happens when the hopeful colored man departs the South's legal and customary order of segregation? As you yourself know, the Negro who has fled the open-faced Jim Crow meets in the North a furtive, darting Jim Crow wearing a mask and carrying concealed weapons.

But in citing this difference in the candid South and the devious North, I assure you that I am not imputing any superior morality to the South. It is simply that at one time the South had almost all of the Negroes and was impelled to create a legal structure to contain the problem, whereas you carefreely enacted your nondiscrimination laws when you had only a handful of colored citizens. Now that you have about a third of the Negro population and with more to come, you recoil and your nondiscrimination laws and flouted. Just the other day in Milwaukee, for example, an able mayor was jeopardized in an election because the opposition sprayed it around that he had encouraged Negroes to migrate to Milwaukee.

Why, then, you properly ask, if discrimination is a national fact of life do you not read more about it? Does race strife have to occur under a magnolia blossom to be news that is fit to print? The answer is, "Yes," more or less.

I am not going to burden you with a mass of examples demonstrating this newspaper distortion, for in recent weeks my newspaper has done this day after day, citing chapter and verse.

I know that the American press will land on its feet in this case, but meanwhile there are not 1 but 2 stereotype departments in northern newspaper plants. In one they cast stereotype plates from which the white paper on the press takes the printed word. In the other, editors and reporters cast stereotype plates whereon we see that segregation is newsworthy when it occurs in de land o' cotton; that the South and segregation go together like spaghetti and meat balls.

These writing stereotypers of the abolitionist press are not less honest than their southern colleagues, they simply are sluggards in catching up with the verity that wherever the Negro migrates in significant numbers, he encounters rejection. Like the Bourbons of France, these writing stereos are always prepared to fight the war just ended; and again, they have learned nothing and forgotten nothing.

But they will come around. However, their dereliction in nationalizing the discrimination story could be redeemed with swiftness if defensive southern editors and publishers would rise from their hams, give some positive stimulation to the stereos of the Associated Press, and send their own staff writers to the North to write the virgin story.

Now in the course of the Montgomery bus boycott, scores of reporters, representing papers from here to Paris and Nagasaki, descended on my office to write a story of great significance. These northerners were so diligent in describing the bus boycott that I saw in the Times this week where the bus boycott in Montgomery had spread to the buses in Captetown, South Africa.

I was pleased to help my visiting colleagues, but sometimes I could not forbear to ask them who was left back home to cover northern race disharmony with all of them taking the waters in Montgomery. They all conceded their back-home troubles, but their editors craved race strife under the Dixie magnolia. And that is what got my paper started in examining the situation in the North.

Take the New York Times, the world's greatest newspaper, which recently printed a special 8-page section on the race problem in the South. Now New York has a million Negro citizens, but how many times have you seen in the Times' society section the photographs of a Negro bride? One time only. In 125 years, the Times, whose credendum is All the News That's Fit To Print, has printed the picture in its society section of but one Negro bride. That auspicious event occurred on September 10, 1954, and at the Times office they give you that date out of hand like an Englishman giving the date of Hitler's blitz.

But I do not wish to exalt this audacious stroke of desegregation beyond the true measure of its worth, because, after all, the Times' society editor told us that—quoting—this Negro bride "was extremely light and no one ever noticed it."

One more example. In St. Louis, wherein is published the South-baiting Post-Dispatch, the Negro bride is also left at the altar. The Post-Dispatch society editor told my newspaper that when Negro brides submit their pictures, they are tactfully reminded that there are Negro publications for Negro brides. In the case of the uncertainty of a telephone approach, the Post-Dispatch asks the caller to submit the picture, which takes care of the screening in all save the most mulatto cases.

Out across the continent at the Los Angeles Times, Jim Crow is society editor, but he wears a different hat—the Los Angeles Times refuses to run Chinese brides. And since there is a great deal of race friction in Los Angeles, I assume that a Negro bride's picture hasn't got a Chinaman's chance.

By contrast, Alabama newspapers are very liberal about Chinese brides—because Alabama hasn't any Chinese to speak of. Simple, isn't it?

It is only when dealing with an Artherine Lucy—by now a more famous co-ed than Betty Co-ed herself—that the northern press finds its voice, drowning the stage with tears and cleaving the general ear with horrid speech.

Have you ever read anything about the ctiy of Dearborn, Mich.? Its population is 130,000 and it presses against Detroit with its half million Negroes, but not a single Negro citizen is permitted to live in the city of Dearborn. The mayor of Dearborn says: "Negroes can't get in Dearborn. We watch it. Everytime we hear of a Negro moving in—for instance, we had one last year—we respond quicker than you do to a fire. Our Italians and Poles are so anticolored—much more than you in Alabama."

Close by are the satellite cities of Royal Oak, Wyandotte, and others. Not a single Negro resident is permitted.

In Chicago is a code agreement among the newspapers and radio stations to muffle and play down race strife stories lest they incite more riots. There is, for example, Trumbull Park, where every day 93 policemen are required to guard the lives of 30 Negro families. In all Alabama, there is not a single Negro family in need of police protection.

This month in Detroit, a suburban mob of 500 cast stones through the front windows of a house. More than 50 policemen were ordered into action. The mob thought the new family was Negro, though the head of the family claimed to be a Cherokee Indian. But the mob thought he was a Negro and before the sun went down over Detroit that day, the mob made him sell the house and willingly gave him a $2,000 profit to be rid of him.

Now the Detroit stereotypers had made the photograph of Artherine Lucy more familiar to their readers than the photographs of Eleanor Roosevelt or even Her Royal Highness Grace Kelly, but how did they play this race riot?

I found, on examination of the 3 Detroit papers, that what is a mob in Alabama is delicately referred to as a crowd in 2 of the papers.

That only one of the papers used the word "Negro," without which you couldn't explain what happened.

That none of the 3 papers played the story on page 1, and 1 played it on page 60. In the Detroit Times the story was but three vague paragraphs. But a few weeks later, when a group of white ruffians assailed Nat King Cole in Birmingham, one Detroit paper made it an 8-column streamer on page 1.

III

I might go on relating these incidents of derelict newspaper practice until the last New York bar closes tonight, but that would be an abuse of your hospitality, even if you don't want a nightcap. So I'll pass on to the question of what is the reason why the Negro encounters rejection wherever he migrates in significant numbers.

I think the basis at least of the answer is to be found in a book written by a great Frenchman 100 years ago, that indispensable classic which is an education by itself, Democracy in America, by Alexis de Tocqueville.

A hundred years ago, Tocqueville foresaw the tortured destiny of the American Negro amid the white majority. The essence of his prediction was based on two things, the Negro's slave history and his conspicuous difference of color. Here are the remarkably discerning words of Tocqueville:

"The Negro makes a thousand fruitless efforts to insinuate himself among men who repulse him; he conforms to the tastes of his oppressors, adopts their opinions, and hopes by imitating them to form a part of their community. Having been told from infancy that his race is naturally inferior to that of the whites, he assents to the proposition and is ashamed of his own nature. In each of his features he discovers a trace of slavery, and if it were in his power, he would willingly rid himself of everything that makes him what he is.

"The Negro who earnestly desires to mingle his race with that of the whites cannot do so; while the Indian, who might succeed to a certain extent, disdains to make the attempt."

Now here are the words of Tocqueville differentiating between, say, an antique Greek slave amid Roman captors and the Negro slave:

"The immediate evils produced by slavery were very nearly the same in antiquity as they are among the moderns, but the consequences of these evils were different. The slave among the ancient belonged to the same race as his master, and was often the superior of the two in education and intelligence. Freedom was the only distinction between them, and when freedom was conferred, they were easily confounded together.

"The ancients, then, had a very simple means of ridding themselves of slavery and its consequences: that of enfranchisement; and they succeeded as soon as they adopted this measure generally. * * * Among the ancients * * * (the) consequences of slavery had a natural limit; for the freedman bore so entire a resemblance to those born free that it soon became impossible to distinguish him from them."

And here Tocqueville gets at the quintessence of his remarkable insight:

"The greatest difficulty in antiquity was that of altering the law: among the (Americans) it is that of altering customs, and as far as we are concerned, the real obstacles begin where those of the ancients left off. This arises from the circumstances that among the moderns the abstract and trancient fact of slavery is fatally united with the physical and permanent fact of color. Although the law may abolish slavery, God alone can obliterate the traces of its existence."

So said Tocqueville, and I think in his observations you have the basis for understanding the durability of the American

prejudice against the colored man. It is a depressing thing and one that no person of goodwill can contemplate without unshakable distress.

IV

So much for the past, which they say is prologue to the future. What of the future? I ought to say, first of all, that the future of the Negro in America utterly baffles me in some respects.

I can point this out. Between the North and the South there is no fortification. Any citizen, black or white, is as free as the birds to cross into the North. No passports or visas are required.

By this I mean to point out that every Negro citizen in the South is free to remove to the North any day he chooses. Many have done so and do not choose to return, even though they soon find that they are not accepted in the North. If the country's 16 million Negroes could be evenly resettled in the country, there would be only a negligible race problem.

But while the migration will continue, it seems that for the foreseeable future the South will retain the mass of Negroes. They are free to move to utopia, but the majority evidently have no intention of going.

In the South the Negro is making good and it's typical of the southerner to speak with pride of the strides the Negro has made. That the Negro has it in him to double and treble his degree of uplift is accepted by southerners. It must be admitted in all honesty that a colored man has to do more to win respect than a white man, but it is equally true that he can win respect.

He is handicapped and afflicted in a merciless way by his slave history and conspicuous color, but he has already demonstrated his capacity to work his way. In this, for whatever reasons you wish to assign, the white man has helped and will continue to do so. As I have said, Alabama is not spending a third of its education money—$33 million—this year to retain the Negro in colonial bondage and degradation. We expect the Negro to go working his way.

But the South will not blend the races in its schools and elsewhere for a long time to come, and it can't be flatly predicted then. The patterns of segregation will alter with the Negro's advance—for example, there is not a segregated elevator left in Montgomery—but basically, there will be separation. And unless the Negro is presently more inferior than the Supreme Court has said, I expect that he will make his way in high style. We southerners wish him well.

The Class I Milk Price

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, members of the Ohio delegation are gratified by the prompt action of the Department of Agriculture in accepting our suggestion for an immediate increase in the farmer's class I milk price. The decision announced yesterday may mean as much as $5 million additional income to Ohio dairy farmers in the months of May, June, and July. This is a badly needed adjustment at a time when the normal seasonal decline in prices has added to the difficulties dairy farmers are experiencing.

Immediately following our return from the Easter recess, those of us who represent rural districts met in the office of J. HARRY MCGREGOR to discuss the growing distress we had encountered in our dairy areas. Present in addition to Mr. MCGREGOR and myself were PAUL F. SCHENCK, WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, CLIFF CLEVENGER, CLARENCE J. BROWN, JACKSON E. BETTS, OLIVER P. BOLTON, A. D. BAUMHART, Jr., WILLIAM H. AYRES, JOHN E. HENDERSON, and the dean of our delegation, THOMAS A. JENKINS, who presided. This was the morning of April 10.

We called in representatives of the Secretary of Agriculture and presented the dairy problem to them, asking for immediate emergency action to suspend the seasonal decline in the Federal milk marketing orders in Ohio. Though precise amounts vary between areas, this request meant a 45-cent increase in the class I price of milk in the Cleveland-Akron-Stark County area served by farmers in my district, and corresponding amounts in the other areas. We presented at this time a telegram from the Ohio Milk Producers Federation in which the same request was made.

On April 13 the Department announced it would hold a public hearing in Columbus April 20 to consider the appeal.

Meanwhile we learned that the situation in Toledo, being near the Detroit area, was critical and that farmers there could not wait for the hearing procedure. When this special problem was presented to the Department, the Department responded with an immediate 65-cent increase for the Toledo area, effective April 16, to bring this area into a better relationship with nearby markets.

I have had extremely complimentary remarks concerning the conduct of the milk hearing in Columbus last Friday. The hearing officer permitted all interested parties to file additional briefs with the Department before midnight April 24. These were received, considered, and action taken on April 25.

To me this demonstrates that the Federal milk-marketing order system can function properly and effectively under emergency conditions. In an orderly fashion, complying with the law, the Ohio dairy farmers and the Republican Members of Ohio's congressional delegation were able to accomplish their objective in just 2 weeks.

On behalf of the delegation, I want to compliment the directors of the Dairy Division at the Department of Agriculture and Roy W. Lennartson, Deputy Administrator for Marketing Services, who must have spent many hours overtime in the past few weeks to take care of the many dairy problems, including those of Ohio.

It may be that additional adjustments will be needed in the various areas as this year's situation develops, and we intend to keep in close touch with our dairy farmers, the producers' associations, and the Department of Agriculture to take care of any new problems that may arise. Meanwhile we trust that the adjustments made will assure a continued orderly and ample supply of milk to all Ohio consumers and a measure of relief to the producers who have done so splendid a job in the past.

The Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. MCVEY. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower's veto of the farm bill appears to have raised instead of lowered his stature as a statesman. Fear was voiced by many that he had dealt a stinging blow to the prospects of his party. Events that have transpired appear to have repudiated that theory. From all over the country have come messages of commendation and congratulation for the excellent courage he has shown.

There follow a few of the newspaper reactions to his veto:

It took genuine statesmanship and a high degree of political courage to veto a farm bill. * * * (President Eisenhower) deserves acclaim for disposing of a farm measure which was so full of contradictions and inconsistencies that it would have defeated all its own best purposes.—Seattle Times, April 17.

In placing what clearly are deep-felt convictions ahead of political expediency (President Eisenhower) may hold the allegiance of more voters than will now desert him.—Minneapolis Tribune, April 17.

It took unusual courage for the President to veto the farm-aid bill which he knew to be bad. But his reasons, as given in his veto message and his address to the country, are so persuasive that the Democrats will find it difficult to make capital out of his action.—Denver Post, April 18.

If Congress fails again to rise to the needs of the hour, the farmers, and the Nation at large, will know where the blame rests. They will know that the President has striven earnestly and conscientiously for a sound farm program; that the obstacles were raised by those, in Congress and out, who insisted on delaying action, on piling up contradictory clauses in a legislative monstrosity that would have been an administrative nightmare.—New York Herald Tribune, April 18.

President Eisenhower's veto of the farm bill was one of the most courageous acts performed by a Chief Executive in recent years. He showed rare independence and devotion to the Nation's well-being.—Richmond Times-Dispatch, April 17.

No one should have been surprised that the President vetoed the hodge-podge bill laid before him. * * * He took the only course that was honest and straightforward.—Memphis Commercial Appeal, April 17.

President Eisenhower's veto of the Democratic farm bill was good politics because it was honest politics. Progress toward a rational farm policy is delayed for a year. The cost must be assessed, in all fairness, against the Democrats. They delayed the enactment of a good farm bill until it was too late to execute its provisions, and produced instead the vote-buying monstrosity that deserved the veto it has received.—Chicago Tribune, April 17.

The veto was an act of statesmanship which raised Mr. Eisenhower higher in the estimation of thoughtful Americans than anything he has done since he became President.—Cleveland Plain Dealer, April 17.

Upon calm consideration we believe most of the Nation, including understandably restless and antagonistic farm elements, will conclude President Eisenhower was right.—St. Louis Globe-Democrat, April 17.

In his veto of the farm bill he remains the broad-gaged honest and courageous leader the American people thought he was. If he had taken any other course he would have repudiated all that he stands for in American public life.—Omaha World Herald, April 17.

This Eisenhower veto of the farm bill was 100 percent an act of courage and conscience.—New York Daily News, April 17.

Mr. Eisenhower's verdict was based on sound economic principles, and if Congress will now get busy on an honest effort to pass a workable farm bill, it can be had within a week.—Chicago Daily News, April 18.

The Dutch Hustle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this article from Harper's magazine of April 1956. This article brings out the extreme importance of the family type farm and how the Dutch go about preserving it in their own country:

THE DUTCH HUSTLE

(By Wolfgang Langewiesche)

Dutchmen don't get excited over nothing. I was in an airliner over Holland, when the Dutch aboard started crowding each other at the windows: below us, green and shining, was a farm landscape that has only just recently come out of the sea. It is the first piece of a whole new province (a new state, we would say) that Holland is adding to itself: "Flevoland."

I went back later, by car, by boat, by Piper Cub, and looked into this landmaking operation. It's the pride of the Dutch. It's what makes their eyes shine.

The main method is this: you build an earthen dam from shore out into the shallow sea and back to shore, so as to fence in part of the sea. Then you pump the water out. You wait a few years for the rains to wash the salt out of the soil. Then you start farming. Such a piece of land—saucer-shaped, lying below sea level, is called a "polder." It's a necessary word, and not translatable. Nobody has polders but the Dutch. They have been making them for 500 years—small ones—and now, with big money and big machines, they make them big.

I drove out on a dike that is fencing off one future piece of Flevoland. You drive on the top of the dike and you do 60. We went out of sight of land, and still the road kept going. I thought: "This is big." You hold it against the American scale of things—Hoover Dam, TVA, Empire State Building—and it still is big. You hold it against the size of Holland—six Hollands wouldn't fill the State of Kansas—and it becomes colossal. It's as if we wanted to push the Gulf of Mexico back and build a second Texas.

We finally got to the capital of Flevoland, Lelystadt. Right now, it's just a wide place in the dike. There are a few dozen houses, a hospital, a school. Some of the dyke-builders live there. On both sides, all the way to the horizon, there's nothing but water. But never mind: the land is there. It merely happens to be covered with water. It will come out.

I went to the part where the land is out, and saw the opposite sight: a real island, one that is natural and has always been there. It has a lighthouse and small harbor—and all of it is now sitting in a sea of farmland—all newly made.

The whole thing is part of a great tradition. The Dutch have been pushing the sea back for a thousand years—and the sea the Dutch. Except for dikes, much of Holland would not exist. Some of it lies below sea level by as much as 15 feet. This much would instantly be drowned; some of it, at sea level, would be tidal flats. Some of it would be swamped by river floods once a year, other parts by an extra high North Sea tide 2, 3 times a century. Left to nature, half of Holland would be for the fish.

And this is what makes Holland Holland. Windmills, for instance; land below sea level doesn't drain. You have to keep pumping the rain out. The windmills do that—still do it, though most of the pumping now is electric, or diesel. And those wooden shoes? (You still see them quite a bit.) Why? Much of the soil is always wet, and wooden shoes are watertight and warm. You can't run in them—but then, a Dutchman is well organized; he starts early and has no need to run. Little boys who feel like running have a special Dutch boys' gesture: you take your shoes off and carry them both in your left hand, and run.

And canals—wherever you are in Holland, there's always a canal in sight; down the main street of town, or along the highway, or right through the farm. Naturally. To get the water off the land, you need ditches criss-crossing every field, about a hundred feet apart. These ditches drain into deeper ditches; those drain into canals, which run into bigger canals, and finally you come to the pumping station—windmill, diesel, or electric; there, the water goes up into the sea. This ditch and canal system has much to do with the looks of Holland. From the air it seems to be composed of innumerable tiny parcels—like a brick pavement. From the ground, you don't see all the canals, but you see one result: cows can't cross them, and so you see pastures full of cattle, and no fences. This leads to the tourist reaction: My, what well-behaved cows. Dutchmen are so used to having a canal around that a landscape without canals bothers them—doesn't look civilized. Wherever they have gone—the East Indies, South America—they have always found some excuse to build a canal. It's the Dutch touch in landscape architecture.

And the "dam" in Rotterdam, Amsterdam, and other place names: it means a dam with a sluice gate. When the tide is high, the gate is closed to keep the water from coming in. When the tide is low, the gate is open, so the country can drain. This was one way the early Dutch made sea-level land habitable, even before "polders."

HANDPICKED FARMERS

Flevoland, the future province, is simply the Zuider Zee dried up. It's man's country anyway. The North Sea broke in there over and over again. Now they are pushing it out once more. The Dutch are in no nervous hurry about it. They do the job polder by polder, each polder of about 120,000 acres, containing 2,000 farms, 10 villages, a town. Note the time scale: the Zuider Zee works were started in 1918. The first polder came dry in 1938. The second one—the one we saw from the airliner—came dry in 1942, is now being settled. The third one will come dry next year. The fourth and last one is scheduled to be ready before 1980, and even after that, there'll be 20 years of fine-point improvement. The dike-building outfits have jobs lined up from now to the end of the century. Behind them, the soil-conditioning crews, the road and bridge people, the house and barn contractors, all can keep moving on from job to job.

The new country, they call those polders. Never before in history have people had a chance to take possession of a country quite so new. The land comes out of the sea a dismal gray—barren, flat. But it comes with the main canals already dug; its soils already tested; all plans made. The officials know exactly where they are going to put the town, the villages, the orchards, the woods. Woods? Of course; children should have woods, and the Dutch think of everything.

But first the soil has to be brought to life. A few years' rain washes the salt out—but you have to see to it that the soil can drain. This is too big a job for the individual farmer. Government contractors move in with special machines. They dig those ditches, and they bury miles and miles of drainpipe underneath the fields.

And then they let the people come and take up homesteads, American style? No. The Dutch handpick their settlers, farmer by farmer. The new land must go to the most competent farmers; and they should be men who also will be useful citizens, who can run a cattle breeders' association, get the church going, generally take hold of the new country's civic affairs. An interviewer visits each applicant on his farm; looks the wife over, too. Confidential informants within the farm organization report on his record, his reputation, his personality. And when the Dutch have picked their man, they plant him as carefully as they would plant a tulip bulb.

They lay out the new country to look as much as possible like the old country. In planning the town, they see to it that the two main streets cross each other not squarely, but with a little jog. And they don't draw the streets quite straight; they give each a little dog leg. This avoids that American look—straight streets and avenues, crossing each other at right angles—that Europeans find so soul chilling. The countryside, too, is carefully antiqued—a curve in the road here, a little woods used as an accent there.

Having made the plans, the government builds the town—every house in it—the schools, the churches, the stores; the barns (prefab, but Old World looking) and the farm houses. And when the little trees are planted around the house, and the key is in the door ready to turn—then they let the farmer come. But he can't buy. He only gets a 12-year lease, renewable if he has been good.

The townsman, too, is hand-picked and hand-planted. They find a good hotel man, and lease him the hotel already built, with its name already written on the sign. The sociologists figure it takes one townsman for each 3 farmers, to teach and preach, doctor and vet, service the farm machines, run the stores. They know just how many photographers, shoe-store owners, television servicemen will be able to make a living, and just so many are planted. Nobody else can horn in because he couldn't get a place to live or work.

To the American, such all-powerful government control seems strange and rather horrible. It's a long way from Oklahoma. But then, it is now 67 years since Oklahoma had its land rush. Holland tried the American frontier style of settlement once—a hundred years ago. They had pumped dry a big lake—pumping by steam had just come in and made the project possible. They turned the land over to the settlers raw—no roads, no schools, no prepared civilization.

It did not work. People lived in sod houses. There were squatters and outlaws. There was cholera, children didn't learn to read. All this in orderly, well-kept Holland. "It took 3 generations to heal that sore." Perhaps this is not so odd. On the Amer-

ican frontier, it usually took several waves of comers to change a region from outright wilderness to full civilization; the original pioneers seldom saw the thing through; they moved on to pioneer elsewhere. Here, in tight little Europe, there was no place for them to move to.

For all the tight control, there's something American about the "new country"—because it is new. It attracts the people with get-up-and-go. It gives them a thousand chances to make a new start: new school, new church, new farmers' association, new garage, new hotel. This is one of the ingredients of the American atmosphere, and the tourist recognizes a familiar scent.

"The old country was more comfortable than here," said one man wistfully. "Here, everybody is always on the go; everybody is making money. * * *" He himself was, too. And an official said: "Wait till these people's children start marrying each other. It's going to be a high-powered new race.

COWS WITH COATS ON

"But why do all this?" I asked. "Does it pay?" As a straight business proposition, no. The land costs $1,500 an acre delivered raw, plus soil conditioning, ditches, roads. If a company tried to make land and then farm it, it would go broke. "But we draw a distinction," said a high-up Dutchman, "between private economy and public economy." The Government rents the land to the farmers at a loss. The country gains because the farmers' money goes round and round. Each guilder's worth of new farm production builds up, they figure, into seven guilders of new income all around the nation.

And what production Dutch farmers can get off a piece of land. They get four times the yield of wheat per acre that Americans get. They also use, per acre, perhaps four times as many workers. The Dutch go in for high-value products—seed potatoes, breeding cattle, tulip bulbs, cut flowers, out-of-season vegetables, and, of course, cheese, which they eat for breakfast. They work with great care. In fall and spring, Dutch cows out on the pastures wear coats, like Park Avenue poodles. I flew over a section of Holland where the farms were glassed over. You might be stodgy and call it greenhouses, but here they were so big, so many of them so close together that, from the air, seeing things as they really are, you have to call it a glassed-over countryside. So, you take a newly made acre, multiply it by 4 for big production, and then by 7 for the round-and-round effect, and landmaking does pay.

But, quite apart from all money angles, the Dutch want to keep the country part of their national life big and healthy. To many Europeans country life is something special, almost holy. They think that the best people are raised on farms; farm boys make the best soldiers. The country is morally good, the city dubious at best. The city is where a nation dies out; the country, where it is reborn. And so on. True or not, these ideas are strong, especially where German thought is influential. Germany has for a hundred years protected her farm life against the competition of American wheat and Argentine beef for just those reasons. Great Britain now sometimes wishes she had done the same. There's also the idea that a nation should be able to eat off its own land, come war, depression, trade restrictions, or what not. Holland decided on the Zuider Zee works in 1918—after 4 years of watching Germany and Great Britain trying to starve each other by submarine and blockade.

That is the background. Against this, the Dutch see cities, highways, industries gobble up land. Also, many Dutch farms have been subdivided too many times among too many sons, and have become too small to support a family decently. Farmers are looking for land and can't find it. Holland has been subsidizing the emigration of its own people—to any country where they can get in. That's a sad thing for a country to have to do. The farmer, the Dutch think, ought to have a chance in his own country, just as the engineer or the businessman has. Hence landmaking.

SLEEPERS AND DREAMERS

But the Dutch people need no such arguments. To them, landmaking is just simply good works. For the glory of God, for the dignity of man, for the future of your children—if you are Dutch, you build dikes.

And dikes are sacred. In the old days, if a man harmed a dike, they buried him right in the dike—and didn't wait to kill him first. Today, there are no keep-off signs on the dikes, no guards; they are not needed. When a new dike is built, further toward the sea, nobody thinks of tearing down the old one. The outer, active dike is called the "watchman"; the next one in, the "sleeper"; the oldest one, farthest from the sea, the "dreamer." Sleepers and dreamers still are important. They put a limit to the worst that can happen. They divide the country up into many small polders, so that Holland is like a ship with watertight compartments. The water has to fill one basin before it can attack the next dike. This takes time; and the very high floods don't last so long.

The thought of flood is always there. Almost anywhere in Holland, if you look around for a few minutes, you find some marks drawn on a house somewhere: this is how high the water came in such and such a year. The marks are always over your head: if it happened again right now, you would be swimming.

Floods come to Holland more from wind-push than from the tide. A northwest wind drives water into the North Sea through the hole between Scotland and Norway. The water can't get out except through the English Channel—very narrow. There is no room for a deep-down undertow by which the water could return northward: the North Sea is too shallow. So the water piles up against the Dutch coast—sometimes 15 feet above normal. Then comes the tide. And, if the wind shifts happen to hit the timing just right and the two water mountains, the wind-driven one and tidal one, really get moving—look out.

When a dike goes, it doesn't simply break; nor is it simply overtopped. The spray from the waves blows over the top; water runs down the landward slope and makes gullies; slowly, from the landward side, they eat into the dike. Once a low place is made and solid water begins to pour, there is no stopping it; it comes as a gigantic rapids, and that particular polder will now fill up. The waters rush slows down as it spreads, away from the break. To those who lived deep in the polder, away from the dikes, the great flood of February 1, 1953, came quietly. A child woke up and said:

"Mommy, there is water in the kitchen."

By that time, it was too late to flee to the dikes. For them the only high place was the roof. Then the roofs floated off with people on them. One family, that February night, floated across miles of open water. When their roof fetched up against an island, the wife and children were dead from exposure. An hour later, their dog landed, in a wooden box, blown by the same wind to the same spot. Now the man and the dog are back on the farm.

Eighteen hundred people were drowned that night. And the land, which Dutchmen love more than they love themselves, was terribly damaged. The salt got in the soil and killed everything, including trees that had been growing for 100 years. The sections that were hit are now absolute prairie. The salt got into the houses—all brick in Holland. Once bricks have soaked up salt water, they will be clammy ever after: You might as well tear the house down. The sea scoured up masses of sand and buried the soil under it.

But you know the Dutch: stubborn. I saw them work with power shovels, and draglines. They dig around in the sand until they find the soil. Then they pick the soil up and spread it on top of the sand. Square yard by square yard, acre by acre, farm by farm. The Government does it—and recovers part of the cost by a 30-year special assessment against the farm—a sort of mortgage.

"These farms are going to be better than they were."

Bad as it was, Holland has seen worse. In one night in November 1421, about 3½ percent of Holland's whole population was drowned. It was then that the Dutch really declared war on the sea. Since then, they have become virtuosos at working with water and mud and sand and sea currents.

They have developed special machinery: A barge that capsizes itself and dumps its load of clay, then rights itself—same idea as a dump truck. A mattress woven of willow branches—it's the world's biggest piece of basketry, being about half an acre. You float it to the job as a raft. Then you sink it, by weighing it down with rocks. It protects the bottom against the scouring action of tide currents. The suction dredge is a ship that sends a sort of elephant's trunk down to the sea bottom, and sniffles up sand, mixed with water—same idea as a vacuum cleaner. Then, through a long pipe, it dumps this sandy water in some selected place. The water runs off, but the sand remains: this is how they now build their giant dikes in the Zuider Zee: they pour them. It looks wonderfully effortless: just a few ships on the vast water surface, and, of course, no dust—everything floats and flows, and the dike comes into being.

Only the big bulk of a dike is sand, or any other earthfill that is handy. The sides are of a fancy watertight clay, which you find here and there on the sea bottom, if you know your way around. The sides of a dike are also armored with those willow mattresses. A layer of straw is often sandwiched in. Then the seaward side is paved with stones. Down the canal that's always there in Holland, there always comes a barge loaded with stones for some dike somewhere. Holland has no stones; they have to be imported, and a Dutchman can tell: this load came from Germany, this one from Norway, this one is Swiss.

In dike building or repairing, the great moment comes when its all completed but for a small gap. Through this gap the tides flow in and out as raging currents, sweeping away any earthfill you might shovel there or pour there. But four times a day, for a few minutes each time the water levels on both sides of the dike are even, and the current is slack. At that moment, they bring up a barge, loaded with rocks; they tow it into the gap and sink it: job completed.

THE MONSTER

For Holland the sea is a double-headed monster. It comes as flood, and it also comes as salt. "The devil, and the poison," say the Dutch. Salt in the soil kills plants two ways: Directly, and by making the soil pasty and airtight, instead of nice and crumbly. And salt keeps getting into Holland's soil. It comes up the rivers, much farther inland than people used to know. Salt water is heavier than fresh. It pushes inland as an undertow, underneath fresh water that is flowing into the sea. Then a ship comes and mixes the two. The poisoned water then sneaks into the canals, into the fields.

Locks don't keep it out. The world's biggest locks lead from the sea into the canal to Amsterdam Harbor. Every time a steamship passes through, a load of salt comes in

with it and spreads through Holland's inland waters. So the whole country's canal system must be continuously sweetened up with fresh water from the Rhine. And now even the Rhine is getting slightly salty. It's not enough to taste, but enough to worry the Dutch. Reason—deep coal mines in Germany strike salt water. They have to pump it out; it finds it way into the Rhine—"Europe's big sewer," as a Dutchman bitterly describes it. The Dutch are now getting ready to do a big persuasion job on Germany. It's quite a brainteaser, though. Just exactly how do you get rid of floods of salt water that spring up in the middle of a country?

But for Holland the biggest salt invasion is by seepage through the soil. It stands to reason: you've got land below sea level; the sea water will flow in if it can. Sometimes it seeps inland through layers deep underground, and from there upward into the soil. Then the yields get poor. The precious cows give less milk. On a century basis, the polder idea turns out to be not so good.

(We in the United States are inviting the same trouble on both coasts, where we pump up ground water for irrigation, and thus cause sea water to flow inland underground. But we still have time.)

The Dutch have done much thinking about this. And they have come up with a typical Dutch answer: they need a canal.

Here is the reasoning: you have to see to it that the water outside the polder, the water that's pressing to get in, is fresh and not salt. This means each polder ought to be surrounded by a fresh-water canal, in which the water level is kept high. This is the main new trick—apart from sheer size of their operations—that the Dutch have added to their art in this century. And the Zuider Zee works are a gigantic example of it. The first step of that project was a superdike that seals off the whole Zuider Zee from the open sea. The Dutch closed that one off in 1933. Then they waited 5 years, letting water flow out through the sluice gates, but never in. Slowly the Zuider Zee, fed by the River Issel, a branch of the Rhine, turned into a fresh-water lake. As it changed its water, it changed its name. Today, Dutchmen appreciate it if you call it the Issel Lake.

It's out of this fresh-water lake that they're now building their polders and getting their new land. When all the polders are in, the fresh-water lake will still survive as a system of broad waterways between the polders. And now they have their eye on two more spots where they think the same trick system will work—build a dam, develop a fresh-water lake, and then build polders into it. They think they can pump themselves up a couple of very nice little provinces. The first spot is the delta of the Rhine—the island country that was so hard hit in 1953. The second spot is a string of islands off the coast. These projects take us well past the middle of the 21st century.

You see again how big the time-scale is on which the Dutch do their geographical engineering. This may be why the whole thing has got so little attention. Everybody knows something of the sort is going on; but at any one time, everything you see looks like old news, slightly stale:

"Why," says the tourist, "I heard about all this when I was a child."

Yet the thing as a whole is terrific news, centurywise. It proves once more what may be the biggest new thing man has learned in this country: There's always more of everything! We don't need new continents to take over: there's more of everything right where we are; more food, more oil, more wood, more water, more jobs. Each time it seems incredible, but each time somebody comes and proves it's true. And now the Dutch come, right in the middle of tight, crowded small old Europe, and prove it is true even of land!

And don't think the Dutch have it easy, and that their country sort of invites land-making. Not so. All this time, Holland is sinking! The geologic evidence is conclusive: Holland is sinking under the sea at the rate of 6 inches per century. This does not discourage the Dutch.

Our Unsound, Dishonest, Inequitable Social-Security Setup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I was one of the three members of the Ways and Means Committee that voted against H. R. 6000, the social-security bill, when it was approved by our committee in 1950. I was also 1 of the 14 Members of the House who voted "No" when the bill was finally passed. I opposed the social-security setup because I was convinced that the program was both unsound and dishonest, a Ponzi-type shell game sold to the American taxpayer as a plan to provide security in his old age.

The Brookings Institution characterized our social-security setup as a plan whereby "the present generation do the promising; future generations do the paying."

Mr. Speaker, the following analysis of the social-security setup by Melchior Palyi, a noted Midwest economist, based upon the book Fact and Fancy, by Dillard Stokes, is so true and so pertinent that I include it as a part of my remarks.

SOCIAL SECURITY: FACT AND FANCY

(By Dillard Stokes, reviewed by Melchior Palyi)

How many people are aware of the fact that our social security is neither insurance nor charity, though Federal agencies call it both, as it suits their purpose? That you and I are forced to pay taxes but are entitled to nothing? Yet, the law is quite clear on this point.

Whether or not social security is to be considered a fraud, it certainly is neither "social" nor does it offer "security." The millionaire president of a large corporation can get the full benefits of some $160-odd dollars a month for his wife and himself if he retires at 65—on a $50,000 income from dividends. A pauper who paid for many years may get nothing. By 1953, not less than 6,400,000 people died without receiving a cent for themselves or their estates, though they had paid their dues. A married couple of oldsters may draw less than the same couple would if they lived together unmarried. Your widow gets nothing until she is 65, unless you leave children under 18 behind; she must not receive benefits in her own right. Adopted children must be close blood-relatives. Your penniless sister or aunt cannot inherit a single penny. The book is replete with details of this sort, handsomely documented. It makes exciting reading, thanks to the "personal touch". It deals with individual types of victims as well as with the victimization of most of us.

What kind of a system is this? What are its guiding principles? Arbitrariness is its No. 1 rule, the total absence of a rational relationship between benefits and contributions, between "need" and benefits, or between fiscal spending and revenue raising. A second, well-camouflaged principle is the evident urge to create extra revenues for the Federal Treasury. A third one is: To provide maximum benefits—to the politicians, by built-in share-the-wealth features, ostensibly favorable to some lowest-paid categories and to those entering the system in their 50's. A so-called reserve fund, a financial legerdemain as Senator BYRD has stamped it, completes the picture.

This book is a masterpiece of condensation. A fantastic maze of facts, figures, and legal technicalities is so cleverly organized that they almost seem to act out their roles, this without detriment to logic and comprehensiveness. The author makes one mistake: He proposes a clean and brushed-up compulsory system of his own construction. A fraud is a fraud is a fraud, as Gertrude Stein might have said; it is hopeless to try and reform it. Besides, maybe people do not mind being fooled when appearances make them feel that they may get something for nothing. Why, a tax is a tax, and it is fun to hope that some day one may get something back, which is most unusual. That the thing is leading the Nation into the gravest of troubles—at a remote date—worries very few among us.

Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, April 28, 1956, marks the fourth anniversary of the signing of the peace treaties between the United States and Japan. In observance of the event I wish to extend my sincere felicitations to the people of Japan, Emperor Hirohito, and His Excellency Masayuki Tani, Ambassador of Japan.

There is a new atmosphere in Japan today and it is an atmosphere in keeping with liberal democracy elsewhere in the free world. In the years since the termination of the Second World War, Japan has adopted a new approach in the realm of government, and accordingly has enacted a new democratic constitution based upon the principle of human rights. It seems quite clear that the new constitution has functioned well and that the new postwar democracy has been an educative and enlightening force. Japan is in no danger of reverting to the "good old days." Although the ancient trappings of feudalism are not entirely eliminated, they are mostly on the way out. Political democracy has brought about many valuable changes.

Over 10 years have passed since the end of World War II, and we may now take stock of Japan's amazing recovery from the havoc wrought by that unhappy conflict. Few scars are left today to tell the story of that great catastrophe. Cities and towns have been rebuilt, new factories have sprung up, and the wheels of industry and commerce set in motion. Japanese ships again plough the seas. Japan's recent accession to second place

among the shipbuilding nations of the world again puts the country's shipyards in the position of leadership they enjoyed before the war.

Prime Minister Hatoyama outlined the social goals of his government in a speech on January 30, 1956, to the Diet in which he said: "stabilization of national life is indispensable to the attainment of real independence." In addition to the modernization of industry, bringing labor and management closer together, and promotion of international trade, the Prime Minister pledged social-security improvements, tax reduction, housing, and election revision.

Economically, Japan has set her feet soundly in the paths of progress and it is reasonable to expect that her economic advance will be accelerated. It is true that there are still some towering difficulties to be surmounted but when we recall the utter ruin of a decade ago we have good reason to believe that the next 10 years will witness equally great rewards for Japan's efforts.

In the international field, Japan has been received back into the comity of nations. Although Japan has not yet become a member of the United Nations, she is a contributing member of many of the special agencies sponsored by the international organization. There are more than 100 UNESCO associations working in Japan. The Japanese National Commission has cooperated with UNESCO Headquarters in translating representative literary works, carrying out oceanographic research, and conducting studies in social tensions and other matters.

Foreign Minister Shigemitsu in his address to the Diet on January 30, 1956, expressed his conviction that the world's quest for peace will ultimately succeed. In outlining the foreign policy aims of Japan he placed cooperation with this quest at the head of the list:

> We cannot accomplish the task of building up a new Japan as a free and democratic country without cooperating closely with the free and democratic nations of the world. This is why our Government, in conducting the independent diplomacy of its own, considers cooperation with the United States as the basis of national policy.
>
> With the United States we are maintaining cooperation along all lines, including national defense. This cooperative relationship is essential to the consummation of our independence and to the advantage of our international position, and the necessary measures must be carried out under thorough mutual understanding and intimate contact.

His Excellency Masayuki Tani, Ambassador to the United States in discussing what he had learned at the Bandung Conference has laid particular stress on help to the underdeveloped nations to block Communist opportunity for propaganda and intrigue. Further, Ambassador Tani declares:

> In order to stem the fast-rising tide of communism in these regions military preparedness on the part of free nations is, of course, necessary. But the Communist peace offensive has to be countered with a peaceful campaign of education and with programs for economic development. It is here that Japan can play an important role * * * Japan has joined the Colombo plan. She has plans of her own for contributing to the economic development of southeast Asia, but she cannot carry them out without cooperation from the United States.

Looking ahead, one feels satisfied that the prospects for an increasingly better life for the Japanese people are good insofar as they are within Japan's own control. The conduct of her neighbors, of course, must needs influence any picture one attempts to draw. Japan's role must be one of peace and we must hope that the signs of lessening of international tension now perceivable on world horizons are not false but will grow greater until they usher in a new era of assured prosperity.

The Democratic Party's Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I submit under unanimous-consent order, a very illuminating editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of April 27, 1956. I think it serves to very accurately and fairly explode the myth that the Presidential aspirant is casting about through the country. I think this editorial definitely indicates the position of the Democratic Party on a very important issue which President Eisenhower has squarely faced and undertaken to resolve.

The editorial follows:

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY'S DILEMMA

Mr. Adlai Stevenson's address in New York on Wednesday did more to emphasize than to resolve the fundamental dilemma of the Democratic Party. No one doubts Mr. Stevenson's deep personal concern for "the old principle that the American heritage of liberty and opportunity is not to be confined to men, women, and children of a single race, a single religion or a single color." No one can question, either, the truth of his assertion that the Supreme Court decisions against segregation involve "social change in some areas of our country, and all social change creates massive problems of adjustment." What the Nation may rightly challenge is Mr. Stevenson's twin contentions that moral leadership is lacking in Washington today and that it can emerge, especially on this issue, from the Democratic Party.

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, who has recently been urging a more active fight against segregation by the administration and his own Democratic Party, said that Mr. Eisenhower in his first 2 years in office, "did as much as any other President of the United States had done in a comparable period to bring about equality and dignity for all American citizens." The progress made in the District of Columbia, in the Armed Forces and their bases, in the persuasion exerted by the President's Committee on Government Contracts upon the firms doing business with the Government, was in line with the finest traditions of the Republican Party, as well as with an enlightened concept of Presidential authority.

Meanwhile, the House Judiciary Committee has just approved an administration civil-rights program, which would set up a Federal commission on the subject, as well as a division in the Justice Department, provide authority for the Attorney General to bring suit in the courts for those deprived of civil rights, offer a more direct course than the present requirement that State remedies be exhausted before the Federal Government can act, and give statutory protection against infringements on the right to vote.

All of this constitutes progressive action, recognizing at once the clear need to move forward on civil rights, and the necessity for moderation in a situation which has inflamed opinion, North and South. It is a policy that has overwhelming Republican support.

On the Democratic side is the plain fact that the party contains the extremes of segregationist and desegregationist sentiment, running the gamut from Senator EASTLAND to Representative POWELL. As a party, it cannot be said to have a policy on the issue and it is certain that any President who tried to pacify both Democratic wings would wind up in complete futility, even though, in Mr. Stevenson's words, he might "work ceaselessly and with a sense of great urgency." His hardest task would be to reconcile the divergent Democrats.

While the Democrats are poised on the horns of this dilemma, for Mr. Stevenson to raise the civil-rights issue against the Republicans is, to put it mildly, imprudent. It was, after all, 19 Democratic Senators and 77 Democratic Representatives who signed the manifesto accusing the Supreme Court of "creating chaos and confusion, charging that the Justices "undertook to exercise their naked judicial power," and pledged themselves to use all lawful means to bring about a reversal of the school desegregation decision. There are far too many such skeletons rattling in the Democratic background for Mr. Stevenson's charge to be taken seriously.

A New Twist to NATO—What Next?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a very interesting article by that outstanding newswriter, Mr. Constantine Brown, which appeared in the Evening Star for last evening.

Mr. Brown points out that Mr. Dulles now proposed to change the character of the NATO organization. Are we headed for another Marshall plan in Europe? In view of the debacle in France, better more slowly, Mr. Dulles.

The article follows:

SHIFTING TO AN ECONOMIC NATO

(By Constantine Brown)

DULLES' DECISION BELIEVED PROMPTED BY MILITARY COALITION'S WEAK POINTS

NATO is by way of changing its military character to become another branch of foreign economic assistance.

This column reported from Paris some 2 weeks ago that Prime Minister Guy Mollet, in an effort to bolster up his shaky political position due to difficulties in Algeria, had suggested a revamping of the Western defense coalition. He urged America in particular to shift to accent on NATO from a defensive military organization into a kind of welfare group with the primary purpose of helping out the peoples in the undeveloped countries. He mentioned specifically Algeria, where France is fighting against the Arab

nationalists such a severe campaign that it had to remove nearly all the troops it maintained in Germany.

The proposition of M. Mollet was not taken seriously in responsible American quarters in Paris. And for good reasons. A few weeks earlier, while on an official visit to Washington, Italy's President Giovanni Gronchi had suggested in a speech in Washington that the economic rather than the military side of the alliance should henceforth be stressed.

This suggestion was quickly brushed aside by no less than Secretary of State Dulles, who stated at a press conference: "The membership of the NATO was picked primarily, I would say, for strategic and military considerations. I think that the economic problems can be dealt with through other organizations."

And indeed we have the ICA (International Cooperation Administration), the successor of the Marshall and other economic assistance plans, as the agency which distributes tax dollars to our allies.

It was therefore somewhat surprising when our Secretary of State announced on Tuesday, without being specific as to details, that he would take to the next week's meeting of the foreign ministers of the NATO countries in Paris a plan for transforming that coalition into a broader association, shifting its objectives to a permanent instrument of western cooperation, rather than a military deterrent to Communist aggression.

By a strange coincidence, Mr. Dulles mentioned at his Tuesday press conference economic assistance to Algeria (which is one of the most prosperous parts of France and where the present troubles arise from political and not economic difficulties).

He also mentioned economic assistance to Middle Eastern countries, upon which Europe depends for oil. It happens that Saudi Arabia, one of the principal oil countries, is extremely well heeled. So is Iraq, another of the chief oil purveyors of the world. In both those countries the problems are again political and not economic. Iran is less prosperous because it still feels the ill effects of the attempted nationalization of its oilfields and refineries under the Communist-inspired former Prime Minister Mossadegh.

There is little or no economic trouble in Syria and Jordan. Turkey's present acute troubles are due to that country's inability to meet its short-term obligations to Britain, France, Germany, Belgium, and Switzerland. The Turks have asked us for a $300 million, interest-bearing loan. But this has been denied to them.

The proposed shift on the part of the Secretary of State, insofar as the concept of NATO is concerned, was caused apparently by his realization that the military organization established in 1949 for the sole purpose of presenting a solid defensive wall to the Soviet's aggressive plans is now working only on three cylinders.

Its Western European members, particularly France and Germany, which were intended to be the backbone of the organizations, are extremely prosperous. The high degree of prosperity has rendered the German people reluctant to support the organization of a treaty force of 500,000 men which, together with the 6 American and 4 British divisions supplemented by an adequate air and naval force, would have enhanced the strength of the defense wall. The German Government and Parliament have been going through the motions of creating the treaty force, but so far it still is only a blueprint.

The French were compelled to remove their NATO ground forces to trouble-ridden Algeria. The struggle there may last for some time, and the French Government is in no mood to draft new forces to replace those sent across the Mediterranean. On top of all these considerations is the overriding reason why the military NATO has been faltering recently: The conviction of most Western European governments that Russia no longer intends to use military weapons to achieve her purposes in Western Europe. This has produced in some countries a wave of neutralism, in others a lackadaisical attitude toward military preparedness, despite the assistance afforded them by the United States.

Our friends in continental Europe have now devised a plan to transform NATO into a benevolent association (with the United States as the chief purveyor of benevolence). In order to avoid a flop with serious political repercussions at home Secretary Dulles, who only a few weeks ago rejected the idea of the coalitions's becoming merely an economic alliance, has reversed himself and decided to accept the suggestions of Italy's President Gronchi and France's Prime Minister Mollet.

Lynwood, Calif., School Demonstrates Practical Achievements in Realistic Disaster Drill Including Bomb Casualties and All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent granted me so to do, I am pleased to herewith present a letter to me dated April 23, 1956, from Mr. "Trig" Svendsen, director area E, civil defense, city of Lynwood, Calif., in the great 23d Congressional District which I represent this my 10th year in this great legislative body. The letter and the text of the newspaper writeup about it are self-explanatory.

I know you, Mr. Speaker, and all of my colleagues in this great legislative body, will join with me in congratulating this civil-defense program there as revealed in this letter to me and in the newspaper writeup:

CITY OF LYNWOOD, CALIF.,
April 23, 1956.

The Honorable CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: Enclosed you will find a clipping from the local newspaper, with pictures, of the bombing staged at Hosler Junior, April 19, by the students who have completed training in civil defense under the supervision of the teachers of the school.

Mr. Caples, principal, and Mr. Landis, teacher, with the help of 116 pupils who make up the medical unit, first aid, transportation, wardens, fire crew, canteen, engineers, radio, rescue, with chiefs for each division, proved that the foundation work by the Lynwood Civil Defense Office with the aid of films and talks by representatives of civil defense from our region office in Los Angeles, has been very gratifying.

Thought you might like to have this clipping in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Yours very truly,
"TRIG" SVENDSEN,
Director, Area E.

HOSLER SCHOOL STAGES REALISTIC DISASTER DRILL, BOMB, CASUALTIES, AND ALL

The shrill continuing ringing of the alarm bell at Hosler School at 2:31 Monday afternoon followed by an aerial bomb explosion set into motion the first fully realistic disaster drill to be conducted under the civil-defense organization in this area.

A minute before the alarm was sounded, the passing bell had rung, and the entire student body was in the halls and about the grounds preparing to go to the next class. As the alarm sounded, there was a rapid but orderly scurrying to the assigned rooms, and within seconds not a student was to be seen. Put into execution was the disaster plan which has been part of the study course for all students at the junior high.

Under the desks and tables a hank of hair or a patch of clothing was all that could be seen. Windows were rapidly opened to prevent shattering glass from being blown inward in case of explosion. That was the job of the teachers and one student previously assigned in each room. Teachers were the last to disappear from sight.

Soon an aerial bomb was exploded over the school. Not a sign of movement or a person could be seen except the observers at the drill. The youngsters remained in their cramped positions until after the all clear was sounded; then life began to unfold as the youngsters crawled from under their shelters and took their places at their desks.

The room wardens emerged, wearing arm bands designating their official capacity. A check was made at each room for casualties. Cots were broken out and emergency hospitalization was set up in the protected halls.

Stretcher bearers brought in the casualties. Those able to walk were escorted by those who had taken the junior Red Cross first-aid training program. Each casualty was tagged with the simulated conditions found.

Order prevailed throughout the entire drill. Although a drill, the staging came as a surprise to all except the few teachers and to those serving in the capacity of junior civilian defense officials.

Finally, after all casualties were checked in, rolls taken at each room to ascertain all were accounted for, the release bell sounded and school resumed normal activity.

As a climax to the drill, the 126 members of the junior civilian defense group were sworn in with mass ceremonies and each of the wardens was issued his official civilian defense identification card by Trig Svendsen, civil-defense director. All junior wardens are from the upper class, the seventh grade.

At Hosler Junior High, all students get first-aid training and physiology study as well as civil-defense study and as part of the student-activity program there is a large chapter of junior Red Cross.

High tribute to Hosler School for their response in the drill was paid by Svendsen and other civilian defense officials witnessing the drill. Special commendation was given to William Landis, science-math teacher who has charge of the junior civil defense at Hosler.

Observers were Harvey Mydland, assistant regional civil defense coordinator of Los Angeles County; Leland Weaver, area E coordinator; Fire Chief Earl Gallaher, assistant local director of civil defense; Ralph Darton, chief of police and member of civil defense council; Fire Captain Robert Rutter; David MacArthur, assistant city engineer; Lewis M. Letson, assistant chief of the medical division of Lynwood's civil defense; Bob Compton, newly elected city councilman, and Allen T. Witter, of the Lynwood Press.

In the pictures in the newspaper article headed "Realism Was Injected Into the Bomb Raid Drill," it showed the students lying on the tennis court and "bombed" students being carried off the tennis courts and schoolyard on realistic stretchers. It showed the first-aid group at work. Under these pictures appeared the following text:

Realism was injected into the bomb-raid drill at Hosler School staged Monday as a

surprise move by civilian defense officials. After the bomb exploded, three casualties are sprawled out in the open awaiting first-aid treatment. Center shows the emergency hospital set up in the protected school halls, lower left the junior wardens are bringing out first-aid equipment and preparing to set up cots. Lower right a casualty is being brought from one of the rooms to the emergency station.

Herblock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am certain our colleagues will agree that no member of the fourth estate contributes more to lightening our moments than Herblock. I am pleased to direct to the attention of our colleagues the following remarks by Mr. Robert C. Osborn and Mr. Elmer Davis, which appear in the March 12, 1956, issue of the New Republic. Mr. Osborn comments on Herblock's 10th anniversary as cartoonist for the Washington Post and Times Herald.

HOMAGE TO HERBLOCK

(Since there is only one Herblock, and he is unmatched, his 10th anniversary as cartoonist for the Washington Post and Times Herald is an event requiring some note. Since 1946, his drawings on the editorial page of the only morning daily in Washington, D. C., have been as important to the residents of the Nation's Capital (there are only residents, no citizens, since Washingtonians don't have the right to vote) as their morning cup of coffee, and considerably more stimulating. Syndicated in 150 newspapers, Herblock has, over the past decade, been honored by 2 Pulitzer Prizes and top awards of the American Newspaper Guild, the National Headliner Club, and the American Veterans Committee.)

(By Robert C. Osborn)

I think what distinguishes Herblock is that in a culture which is sugar-coating everything and which is scared to even mutter the unvarnished truth—Herblock comes out every day with the unvarnished truth. This is a great relief to a lot of people. We are so hag-ridden by the singing hucksters, so surfeited with counterfeit presentations—from car design to the fake eroticism of whispered weather reports—that Herblock affects all of us about the way a sound buoy affects the fog-bound sailor. We shout for joy.

And how does he lend us this encouragement and this point of reference? Primarily by his ideas. His force is the idea. Each day he distills an exceedingly intelligent and trenchant idea. One is filled with admiration for the way in which Herblock's intelligence and feeling are transposed and then welded into that day's idea. It is always perspective and immaculate, in fact they are so well conceived that they can become classics overnight. Witness the White Feather "Have a care, sir" cartoon. And because he is a man of enormous personal integrity, all of his ideas hold together and reinforce one another. Perhaps this accounts for the cumulative effect they have had on American political thinking.

It is interesting that in presenting the idea Herblock rarely uses the enormous resources of history, literature, religion, mythology, etc., at his disposal. Instead he prefers the immediate characters and types of the immediate scene. He has evolved a group of standardized caricatures of contemporary figures (for instance, a sort of Happy-Hooligan-faced person labeled "Eisenhower"), a collection of generalized types such as the congressman, the public, the politician, the big-business man, plus such things as the donkey and the elephant and his masterly creation of the bomb.

This cast of characters which he employs day after day sets him free at once to hew out the idea and get it set down in clear, highly legible terms. And he never hesitates to use printed, literary labels in his drawings if it will speed up the comprehension of the cartoon—or if he feels that someone might miss the fact that a particular person is NIXON rather than MCCARTHY. Everything can be labeled if necessary for quick, staccato appraisal.

The actual printed drawing is rarely, if ever, beautiful in the way a Daumier or the Kukriniksi or Goya or Rowlandson political cartoons can be beautiful. Those men, employing the most sensitive lines synthesize and simplify the subject until the picture becomes plastically and rhythmically related—integrated and alive the way an Egyptian bronze cat is integrated and alive. Not many cartoonists achieve this quality. Low, the English Herblock, produces clear, highly intelligent but monotonous drawings. Fitzpatrick, on the other hand, does pursue the esthetic possibilities of each cartoon. When he is dealing with a communications problem, he evolves a single, large sinister wiry-legged black spider astride an enormous black landscape. The visual impression is of a single whole. Herblock, on the other hand, never hesitates to use, almost like an expert juggler, a very complex set of images and situations in order to present the overriding idea.

Finally it occurs to me as I look at Herblock's face that he is closely related to the great clowns. He looks like a great clown—and is more related to the light touch of a Grock, a Fratellini, a Will Rogers, a Keaton, than he is to the more ponderous Daumiers and Goyas. For, like the great clowns, he pursues the main ideas with infinite variations of wit, humor, irony, and pity—using the pen as a saber or as a needle, stabbing with deadly precision at sham, cheating bombast, greed, complacency and any organized folly.

No wonder we like him. No wonder we are grateful for his presence.

WORDS AS WEAPONS

(By Elmer Davis)

Herblock, who writes as well as he draws, is not a middle-of-the-roader. That position, he says in his book, Here and Now, has the same attraction for a lot of people that a coffee cup has for cigarette ashes—the ideal place to dump any kind of decision. When an administration, he says, seems motivated by a willingness to sacrifice principles to avoid trouble, it is the job of editorial people to show that they can get into more trouble by doing what is wrong than by doing what is right.

But it is useless to introduce a book merely by quoting it. This is the work of a man who is tired of hearing people talk down to the public; he thinks there ought to be more talking up, and even talking back. He wishes that the President of the United States—a former, even if somewhat accidental, president of Columbia University—might have done something to turn the tide of know-nothingism by speaking up for intellectualism instead of against it.

But Herblock doesn't seem to think much of this administration. We have a President who is not a father-image but an uncle-image—"a favorite uncle who has won fame and fortune abroad." But Herblock wishes he would do a little more at home; "from the way people talk about 'the men around the President' you'd think he was being hustled off by a riot squad. After all, there's nobody around him that he doesn't want there." Nobody ever excused Roosevelt (or Truman) on the ground that he didn't know what was going on in his administration; whereas almost every news conference turns up something that has been on every front page, but the President hasn't heard of it.

For the people who have heard of those things, in the administration, Herblock has not much use—though he is seldom as candid as he is about Mr. Brownell ("Guilt by association is not good enough, guilt by numerology is not good enough, and an Attorney General who uses those methods is not good enough either"). But his thorough and incisive discussion of the numbers game does not divert him from other characters; including conspicuously Mr. Dulles.

So you have a picture of an administration in which "whatever the state of our defenses against possible foreign aggressors, the American Government has probably never been so firmly on guard against Americans." This is the result of the Great Crusade, which, like some other crusades, turns out to have done most damage to people who had not been mentioned when it began.

To those who reverence the uncle-image all this will be blasphemy, but it is worth thinking over what has happened in the past 4 years before we decide that we want 4 years more of the same.

Salute to Capital Airlines and Its Loyal Employees on the Capital Team

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, on April 26, 1956, one of America's foremost airlines celebrated its 29th anniversary. Hearty congratulations on this happy occasion, and best wishes for the continued success of this fine organization.

Capital Airlines began its first scheduled operation April 26, 1927, over a 127-mile route from Pittsburgh to Cleveland. Its home base was at Bettis Field, Pittsburgh, an airport that then was little more than cleared pasture land. The fleet of airplanes that this airline operated consisted of three single-engined open-cockpit Waco biplanes.

In those early days passenger business was not solicited. Airmail was the chief source of revenue to all the fledgling airlines. But as aircraft became larger and faster, with comfortable cabin accommodations, travelers began to take advantage of this new type of travel.

Capital Airlines' routes expanded slowly at first. During the 1930's, when air travel began to increase in popularity, Capital spread its system map east and west and south until today close to 6,000 miles of airlanes make up this great company.

Although Capital is noted for many innovations throughout its long history, two events are outstanding contributions

to the development of commercial aviation. The first was the introduction of the low-fare aircoach to domestic scheduled travel in 1948.

The second major event was the lead Capital took in bringing the jet age of commercial air travel to United States air transportation. Today Capital Airlines is the only United States airline to fly jet-prop transport airplanes.

The fleet of jet-prop Viscounts serving Capital's routes has brought a new concept in flight to America. This is one of the chief reasons why Capital's 29th anniversary carries such significance. The Viscounts have launched a new era of air transportation promising air travelers more comfort, more speed, and greater dependability than ever before.

Capital Airlines is particularly fortunate in its top-flight management team: Mr. George Hann, chairman of the board, a prominent forward-looking attorney of Pittsburgh, Pa.; President James H. "Slim" Carmichael, under whose administration Capital Airlines has made such excellent progress; and General Counsel Jennings Randolph, former Congressman from West Virginia. Congratulations to these men on their fine leadership of the Capital team, and congratulations to the employees on their courteous, efficient, and safe air service.

Progress in Formosa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, three members of the Legislative Yuan of the Government of the Republic of China, temporarily in Taiwan, Formosa, are studying our political institutions in the United States for 3 months on "leader grants" arranged by the State Department.

They are Hon. Tsun-Ying Wong, Hon. Shu-chin Tsui, and Hon. Yi-ping Kiang. Miss Wong studied at the University of Michigan 20 years ago and in private life is Mrs. Ting. Dr. Tsui is a distinguished educator and student of international law. Mr. Kiang was for many years an eminent lawyer in Shanghai.

All are members of the committee on foreign affairs of the Legislative Yuan, which is a unicameral legislature of 770 members, elected on the mainland in 1948, 532 of them left their homes in mainland China to keep the Government of the Republic intact on Taiwan.

At a luncheon here in the Capitol today for these distinguished visitors and members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Miss Wong, who has served as chairman of their committee on foreign affairs, gave a report on progress in Taiwan, which under leave to extend my remarks I am happy to include herewith:

ADDRESS BY HON. WANG TSUN-YING

It is both a pleasure and a privilege for me to speak to this gathering of distinguished American Congressmen. It is also an honor for us to have been invited by your Department of State to visit your country. I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to convey to you our appreciation for the sympathetic understanding and support which you have been giving to our cause. As great and true friends to China, you may be interested in knowing the progress of Taiwan through your aid.

Political democracy has been organized and practiced. People can, through their representatives, participate in legislative work in various levels of lawmaking bodies. They also elect their own magistrates or city mayors.

All the elections in Taiwan have been carried out in accordance with President Chiang Kai-shek's counsel which stressed that "observance of law, limitation of expenses, and selection of the best and ablest" should be the guiding principles of these elections. The voters of the province have enthusiastically gone to the polls in all the elections. The number of voters who actually cast their votes sometimes exceeded 90 percent of the total eligible voters.

At present, all administrative programs, budgets, statutes, and regulations affecting the people's rights and obligations have to be discussed and passed by the Taiwan Provincial Assembly of the county and municipal councils, as the case may be, before they can be enforced. In the meantime, if the post of a county magistrate or municipal mayor should become vacant, the governmental authorities of a higher level have no right to appoint a successor. The vacancy must be filled by one duly elected by the people.

Economically, agricultural and industrial production on the island has registered considerable increase each year. Reconstructions are in rapid progress. There are more than 4,000 Government and privately owned industrial and mining establishments with over 300,000 employees. This number of working population does not include the fishermen, salt workers, and aborigines. In the past, the working people had a hard life. After the retrocession of Taiwan from Japan to China in 1945, the Government introduced various measures for the protection of the people's livelihood. The land reforms have greatly benefited the farmers. The living standard of the people has been raised. They all enjoy a peaceful and stable life. We have no beggars on the streets.

Educationally, during the Japanese occupation, opportunity for the Taiwanese to receive education was limited. Besides primary education, the local people were allowed to be trained only in farming, and in the engineering and medical professions. Admission to institutions of higher learning was restricted. The local people were not allowed to take law or political science courses. Before the retrocession of Taiwan to the Republic of China, there were in the Imperial Taiwan University only 85 Taiwanese students, of whom 80 were studying for medicine, 2 for literature, 1 for science and 2 for engineering.

Since the retrocession of Taiwan, the local people have been free to enter any kind of school and to choose any subject for study. Great progress has been made in the field of education, both in the quality of it and in the number of students.

During the Japanese occupation there were only 1,097 primary schools, 72 middle and vocational schools, 5 institutions of higher learning and a few public libraries and museums. Since the retrocession of Taiwan, there are 1,350 primary schools, 137 middle schools, 77 vocational schools and 14 institutions of higher learning.

Social education, during the Japanese occupation, was limited to a few public libraries and museums. There were few facilities to give education to illiterate adults. There are now 22 public libraries, 2 museums, 17 public playgrounds, 30 public reading rooms, and 4 social-education institutes. They stress the popularization of national language, audio-visual education, and the like.

In the 10 years following retrocession, the Government efforts at rehabilitation and at undertaking new construction, have resulted in marked improvement in communications and water conservation.

Thanks to the military and economic aid from the United States, Taiwan is now the strongest fortress as well as the loveliest place in southeast Asia. We are in the front line doing our utmost to guard against Communist invasion but we still need your sympathy and encouragement, so that when the time arrives we, free people, may stand together to deliver those who are suffering Communist tyranny.

How the West Helps Collectivization Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, much is being said these days regarding trade with Communist countries. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an excerpt from the March issue of the International Peasant Union Bulletin, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues. It emphasizes the importance of food to the Communists, and it should serve to stiffen us in our determination to stand firm against any form of trade with the Soviets and their satellites. Some people say that we should only withhold strategic materials. I maintain, as I have before, that everything is strategic to the Russians and to the Chinese Reds, and I would give them nothing, not even bubble gum. Who can deny the fact that food is strategic in the war for men's minds and hearts. Let us give no succor or comfort to the Reds. The article follows:

HOW THE WEST HELPS COLLECTIVIZATION BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

The admirable resistance of peasants in East-Central European Soviet colonies made it impossible for the Communist puppet governments to proceed with their plans for collectivization of agriculture. Forced collectivization has made the food situation in East-Central European countries so alarming that the Communists were obliged to abandon it, as they faced a major political upheaval among the population.

The latest Soviet 5-year plan includes a new drive against the Russian peasant, and the Communist stooges in the captive countries are coordinating their local attack on the peasants with Soviet plans. Before they start to wage their battle against the peasantry, the Communists need to stock enough grain to be independent of food production in their respective countries.

In the New York Times of March 11, Mr. J. H. Carmical in his article Reds Liven Trade in Farm Product reports that last week, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland contracted large orders of grain from Canada. One order alone, placed last week, included: 11,200,000 bushels of wheat bought by Czechoslovakia and 7,500,000 bushels each by

Hungary and Poland. In addition, Czechoslovakia purchased 1,600,000 bushels of barley.

In selling grain to the captive countries, Canada is not helping to feed hungry people. The east-central European nations were, before the war, the breadbasket of Europe.

Grain from Canada, on the contrary, helps the Communist governments to put down peasant resistance in captive countries. Where is the logic of such actions? The free-world press applauds the peasant resistance to Communist planning, while at the same time the West supplies the Communist governments with grain to help them crush the independence of the peasantry.

Such Western tactics are one of the main reasons why communism is marching victoriously forward.

It is not very expensive to distribute food in the free world. The West helps the undernourished peoples economically in action which are, in substance, giveaway schemes. There are so many millions of undernourished people in the free world. Only to adequately feed India, for instance, would take all the free world's available surpluses. B. S.

America Salutes Israel Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 29, a mammoth America salutes Israel celebration is being staged at Yankee Stadium. With Judge Samuel S. Leibowitz as general chairman, the following national organizations are sponsoring this event: Farband Labor Zionist Order, B'nai Zion Order, American Trade Union Council for Labor Israel, and United States Committee for Sports in Israel.

A program of speeches, plus musical and sports events is planned. A highlight of the afternoon will be a soccer match between the Israeli Oympic team and the American League All-Stars.

Mr. Speaker, this commendable occasion will serve as an eloquent testimonial to the determination of the United States to maintain Israel's place in the free world as a sovereign and democratic state.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a message I have prepared for the occasion:

It is with a great deal of deep personal satisfaction that I join in the America Salutes Israel celebration. An anniversary is always a great occasion, but the eighth anniversary of Israel's independence is an especially significant milestone.

It is a milestone which attests to the determination, the will to survive, the courage of the people of this bastion of democracy. It is a milestone which has particular significance to all Americans. For democracy in Israel is, like democracy in the United States, a divine incentive—the inescapable logic of her whole destiny.

This stake—the survival of a fellow democracy—forms the indissoluble bond, the moral bridge which is far more durable than that which might unite us with any other people.

America's ties with Israel are also spiritual, personal, human, and humanitarian. And as long as our western civilization endures, the priceless heritage of the religion which was cradled in Jerusalem will bind us to her destiny.

The new nation of Israel numbers among its citizens immigrants from every modern community of the free world. Its roots are as nearly universal as those of any existing community of freemen. A little of America and all the rest of the countries of the world are there and each segment merged into the whole there endures a mutual bond of understanding and affection.

Most Americans are pioneers at heart. Compared with the rest of the world, our national history is comparatively short, and most of our heritage glorifies the bold contest with nature and adversity we have been witnessing in Israel these last 8 years. Living Americans have in their memories the satisfaction of seeing wilderness change to benevolent living space, of watching homes and buildings and cities grow where nothing stood before, and of seeing deserts flower and hardy new generations rise up to populate an empty land.

These things are close to us and dear to us. We understand the problems and disappointments of Israel as other nations, much further removed from the atmosphere of the frontier, will never understand.

We applaud on this day Israel's miraculous achievements during 8 years of troubled existence. Everywhere there is progress. Everywhere the functions of government are performed with efficiency and skill. Law and order rule supreme within the borders. The humanitarian impulse and a willingness to build together a state based on justice, equality, and peace are the order of the day. This is Israel, 1956. That these conditions exist bodes well for a successful future.

We pray to God on this significant occasion for the continued progress of Israel's spiritual adventure to secure the permanent freedom of her ancient home. We pray to God that she will be able to continue to live a life consecrated to the universal vision of fraternity and peace. If Israel will continue to serve this ideal, the new era of her freedom will be worthy of the inheritance of those who have gone before.

Our hearts go out today to those many miles away who strive so sturdily and courageously for the survival of the Holy Land. We thank God for successes so far and pray for continued prosperity.

We Believe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the American Farm Bureau Federation has decided upon the fundamental principles in which its members believe and which were set forth in the Illinois Farm Bureau magazine of May 1956. This interesting statement follows:

WE BELIEVE

To know what one believes gives quality to his thinking and purpose to his acts. Farm Bureau delegates, therefore, have decided on the fundamental principles in which they believed before writing the detailed resolutions which govern the Farm Bureau position.

I particularly like the foreword of the American Farm Bureau Federation resolutions. Believing these fundamentals will serve as a source of strength for all of us in the future, as they have for me in the past, I set them forth as this month's message to you:

"We believe—

"In the American competitive enterprise system.

"That man's search for progress should be encouraged by maintenance of opportunity, not hindered by illusions of security.

"That a person should be rewarded in accordance with his productive contribution to society.

"That every man is entitled to own property, earn money honestly, save, invest, and spend as he chooses.

"That property rights cannot be taken away without infringing on rights guaranteed by the Constitution.

"That the Constitution is the basic law of the land, and that its interpretation should be in accordance with the intent of its authors.

"That Government regulatory functions should be based on law.

"That Government should provide only minimum controls and aids.

"That Government should stimulate, not discourage, individual initiative.

"That propagandizing by Government is dangerous to the maintenance of self-government.

"That monopoly—whether by Government, industry, labor, or agriculture—is dangerous.

"That voluntary cooperation is part of the American system.

"That candidates for public office should state their beliefs with respect to communism, socialism, and capitalism."

OTTO STEFFEY,
President, Illinois Agricultural Association.

General Twining on Air Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, in the city of Shreveport during the springtime each year local people join together for a festive occasion called the Holiday in Dixie. On the first day of this occasion—April 25, 1956—came Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force, and addressed a joint meeting of Shreveport civic clubs. The subject was, of course, air power, but on this particular occasion General Twining, America's No. 1 airman, so carefully and ably mixed his remarks concerning the Air Force with local history and local conditions as to strike his audience with surprise and admiration.

This address is a most learned analysis of the importance of air power and it is entitled to especial attention from all of us who want our land to remain strong and invincible. I am pleased to present herewith this address:

ADDRESS BY GEN. NATHAN F. TWINING, CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, AT THE SHREVEPORT JOINT CIVIC CLUBS HOLIDAY IN DIXIE, SHREVEPORT, LA., APRIL 25, 1956

First, I want to thank you for asking me down here to be present during your Holiday in Dixie celebration. I am always glad

to get away from the frenzied pace and pressure of Washington, and this is an especially nice time of year down here. To be able to attend your great show makes this trip a triple bonus for me. I wish I could stay with you through the entire celebration, but unfortunately, I cannot.

You are all aware that Shreveport is closely allied to the Armed Forces today by reason of its close relationship with Barksdale Air Force Base. I have been struck by this fact of your town's background: Shreveport owes its very existence to Armed Forces.

To repeat some of your interesting local history, this locality, in 1815, was known as Bennett and Cain's Bluff. Aside from a trading post on the Red River, its only other attraction was the Catfish Hotel. I understand that this hotel was named in honor of its main dish, taken fresh from the river and served to fur traders, rivermen, and cattlemen.

Bennett and Cain's Bluff could not grow, for it was locked in by the Great Raft, a hundred-year-old jam of driftwood in the Red River. This jam blocked off the bluff 80 miles in each direction.

A little later, the United States Army began to haul freight through this territory along a route known as Military Road. This long, expensive trip could be shortened by using the river, so in 1833, the Army commissioned a man named Henry Shreve to clear the jam. He built two floating battering rams, and within a year had cleared the jam. Immediately, this locality began to prosper from steamboat trade.

In gratitude, the townspeople here, named their newly incorporated city, Shreveport.

This story is interesting to me because it illustrates the direct result of a military requirement which harnessed money and brains for the common good. Many people associate the military only with wars, but some of the greatest advances of civilization have been spurred by military necessity.

For example, the need for quick transportation of Roman soldiers resulted in the Appian Way, part of which still exists.

Or, take the airplane. The extensive experimentation and developments by the Military Establishment over the last 50 years have resulted in many blessings. Not only is our Nation protected by the greatest air force in the world, it also enjoys the finest and safest commercial air-transportation system in the world.

Or medicine, Maj. Walter Reed discovered that the mosquito transmits yellow fever. His discovery has led to almost complete elimination of this disease.

And Maj. Carl Darnell, 45 years ago, perfected a way to purify water with chlorine. His ideas are still in use throughout the world.

I could go on and on.

Perhaps the greatest result of military effort will be atomic energy. While learning to make the most effective weapons of defense the world has ever seen, we have opened the door to undreamed sources of power, health, and wealth.

Of course we would eventually have atomic energy, with or without military effort. However, there is no telling how many decades it would have taken to pass through the various stages of experimentation and testing, had it not been for the Manhattan project and successive military projects.

All through our history, military projects have contributed to our growing standard of living.

Here in Shreveport you understand this very well. Barksdale Air Force Base is a real part of your community. Indeed, the 20,000 acres of Barksdale was donated by this city in 1930. The base now furnishes employment for many local townspeople. The officers and airmen stationed here take part in local activities. Barksdale's monthly $3½ million payroll contributes to community prosperity in a real way. Certainly our peacetime military activities have a beneficial effect here.

And the benefits are mutual. I am very happy to see your fine new bridge over the Red River which connects Barksdale to Shreveport by a direct route. I realize that the decision to build this bridge was made out of loyalty and your friendly desire to provide for mutual improvement. I think this is a wonderful thing—an exceptional example of the common benefits of a peacetime, military-civic relationship.

We are allowed to enjoy these benefits fully only during peacetime. It is here that our military forces make their greatest contribution. Instead of getting us into war, we have found that strong military forces can get us into peace—and keep us there.

This year we are observing what we call a decade of security through airpower.

This decade began when we actually had a very small amount of military forces of any kind. After World War II, we reacted just as we did after the First World War. We were so sick of war, and so relieved when war was ended that we were blind to the future. In haste we disbanded—actually ripped apart—the finest and largest defense organization in history. Our Army, Navy, and Air Force were all stripped. The residue were shoestring forces in every sense of the word.

At the same time we were destroying our weapons, the Communists were rebuilding their forces. Their traditional goal of world domination had not been changed by World War II. Instead of dulling their competitive instincts, World War II had whetted their appetite for new conquests.

In short order, the Communists launched their aggression in Greece; they took Hungary and Czechoslovakia; they solidified their hold over Poland, East Germany, and China.

On all fronts the Communists demonstrated complete willingness to use armed aggression whenever and wherever they thought it would pay.

We were slow to react. Many Americans were stunned by this apparent reversal in behavior by people who, earlier, had been trusted allies. Russian soldiers had fought valiantly on our side, and we had given the Soviet Union millions of dollars worth of weapons and equipment. How could we be anything but friends?

Too slowly we realized that our wartime friendship had been one-sided in every way. It is clear that the Soviets were using one adversary to help conquer another. We know now that their objective was not to be on the right side, but to be on the winning side.

During the late 1940's when we were largely unprepared to meet armed aggression, either here or against our allies, the Communists held back from an all-out effort. In retrospect it is easy to see what stopped them.

During this period, the Communists were not held back by morals, ethics, or fear of public opinion. They have repeatedly demonstrated that these criteria have absolutely no effect on their policies or actions.

Neither were they held back by our conventional armed strength. They were well on their way toward a powerful Red Army of almost 200 divisions. The land armies of all free nations were insignificant by comparison.

Certainly no naval force presented a threat to the Reds, rulers of the world's greatest land mass. In fact, faced by the hostile Communist nation of great land area, most of the other naval powers channeled their military strengths into more effective areas. Indeed, almost purely by default, the Soviet Navy rose to its present No. 2 position. They needed no intensive shipbuilding program to achieve this standing.

No, it was neither morals nor men, ethics nor battleships, that held the Communists back. It was our ability to send airplanes over their homeland; airplanes, which could deliver a knockout punch.

Yes, even the small Air Force we had at that time, could mount a retaliatory attack with nuclear weapons. And during that time, the Soviets could not. For the moment, at least, they were forced to postpone major aggression as a course of action.

They they decided to test our mettle in another way. The Berlin Blockade is a familiar story to us all. Here again, American airpower effectively blocked a Communist move, made the Reds look ridiculous, and did more than any other one act to give our allies faith in us.

Shortly after this came an event which emphasized the importance of airpower. The first nuclear explosion in Russia was a punctuation mark—signalling the end of an era of American safety by isolation. In World War II, we played the game of blackouts and air-raid drills, but there was never danger of a significant attack.

Now, the Soviets had in their hands the growing power to attack us here at home. Still, we were safe. We retained the abiltiy to hit back harder than we were hit.

The Communist planners were intelligent, cool men, with much patience. They were not strong enough yet, so they held back and turned their attention to lesser goals.

Like Korea. Here they believed they would find little resistance, and so the Communists moved south into the free part of Korea, which they coveted.

Again, American airpower helped to save the day. It is generally admitted that our bombers and fighters played a big role in preventing allied troops from being pushed into the sea.

Instead of being pushed into the sea, our forces were able to achieve the United Nations objective, which was denial of South Korea to the aggressor. That this could be accomplished in the face of overwhelming numbers of Communist ground forces is a tribute to our air units in Korea.

Even more important: that the Korean war was kept localized is a tribute to long-range American airpower, like the airpower now based at Barksdale. The B–47's here, and the B–36's at Fort Worth were part of the force that kept Communist aggression localized.

Perhaps one might say that the Communists may have done us a big favor when they attacked South Korea. They jogged us into reversing the trend of weak defenses. We finally realized that weakness invites attack and strength deters aggression.

I want to emphasize that throughout this entire 10-year period, our security has been guaranteed by one fact. The Reds have realized that we could hit back harder than we could be hit.

They have been working hard to swing this balance the other way by building a powerful modern air force, armed with both fission and fusion weapons. They have achieved a formidable success in building up their airpower. Yet they have not succeeded in swinging the balance to their favor. They are ahead of us in many categories of airplanes, the most serious of which is in the heavy jet bomber category. Nevertheless, we feel that we have maintained a lead in comparative overall effectiveness.

This lead is what it will take to guarantee continuing security. If in 1966 we are to be able to observe a second decade of security through airpower, we must work harder than ever to insure our airpower lead.

Here are some of the things we are doing in this line.

We are extending the range of our airplanes. For example, the B–47 is a medium-range bomber. To give it intercontinental

range we use overseas bases and aerial refueling. As you know, Barksdale participated in a major milestone in military aviation. In February 1954, the entire 301st Medium Bomb Wing of 45 B–47's refueled in the air and flew almost 5,000 miles from here to North Africa.

But the performance of the B–47 is penalized by having to descend from efficient altitudes to hook up with the old, low, and slow-flying KC–97's. During the next 10 years we will convert our refueling force to jet tankers whose altitude and speed approach that of the B–47.

Then too, during the next few years, our heavy bomber force will be modernized.

The B–36 is now beginning its retirement, to be replaced by the B–52 heavy jet bomber. In view of the increased threat posed by the Communist air force, we have accelerated our B–52 program. Even now, we are weighing the advisability of increasing the planned B–52 force.

Missiles, of course, will become increasingly important during the next 10 years. The Air Force has recently released the information that we are giving top priority to three missile projects. These are ballistic missiles. Two of them are long-range or intercontinental missiles, and one is our intermediate range ballistic missile. As an alternate to the Air Force IRBM project, the Army and Navy have been assigned responsibility to develop the Redstone missile for possible use as another IRBM.

I wish to emphasize that both in our Air Force and in the Red Air Force, missiles are merely another potential weapon. Powerful to be sure, but not magic. No missile can do a job that cannot now be done with combat airplanes. The missiles only advantage is a potentially greater efficiency—cost wise—than aircraft. By that I mean that missiles are built to destroy targets. We now have airplanes that can destroy targets. It may cost us several airplanes to destroy a target. It may take more than one try. Ultimately, one missile will be able to destroy a target in one try. Thus their only advantage is efficiency.

It is perfectly true to state that there is no known defense against a ballistic missile. Standing alone, this statement has alarmed many people. What we must remember is that it is equally true that there is no known ballistic missile in the inventory of any armed force.

Offense and defense capabilities always leapfrog each other. I am confident that when the time comes that one or both sides have effective, dependable, accurate ballistic missiles, the period in which there will be no defense will be either very short or nonexistent. In fact, the processes we go through in learning to build a ballistic missile will guide us in building a defense.

I am certain that an anti-ICBM will be built.

Furthermore, if, conceivably, a hostile power were to perfect a reliable ICBM before we do, the deterrent effect of our atomic airpower would still be effective.

Adding to our present effectiveness during the ICBM time period, could be the atomic-powered bomber. Theoretically, it would be possible for us to maintain a fleet of nuclear-powered bombers airborne and invulnerable to ballistic missile attack. The unlimited endurance and range of such bombers would make it possible for us to keep them positioned all around a potential aggressor—ready to retaliate the instant a missile were launched in our direction.

There is one other point on missiles we should understand. Potentially hostile aircraft can spoof us; that is, they can head our way and turn back just short of our borders. Since we wish to prevent war, we would be unlikely to send a retaliatory attack until we were sure that the approaching aircraft really were going to attack. In other words, there is always an element of doubt as to the intention of approaching aircraft.

However, once a missile is launched on a certain trajectory there is no doubt. There is no period of indecision. Thus in this way the airplane is, and will be, a much more effective instrument of influence, control, and perhaps psychological warfare than any missile.

I mention these points mainly to reduce the ICBM to its proper perspective in the spectrum of future weapons. It will be a tremendously important weapon, but it will be a long time until it is reliable enough to replace other weapons systems, and much longer until it can match all the capabilities of the airplane.

Looking to the years ahead in a general way, all of the weapons, planes, tools, bases, and highly trained men that we will need to keep on top will cost increasing amounts of money. Yet I think if the 10 percent proportion of the gross national product now devoted to defense is continued at about that level, we will be able to provide continuing security.

There is a danger that we fall into the trap of complacency. Just as a city cannot afford to disband its fire department after a month of no fires, our Nation cannot reduce its defense because we have no wars. We must never forget that it is our powerful defense structure which can do the most to prevent wars.

Thus our military forces can free our Nation to use other means of dealing with world problems.

I will close, emphasizing this point by borrowing another story from your local history.

At one time during the Civil War, it was thought that Shreveport might be in danger of attack by boats advancing up the Red River. To defend the city, forts were built along the river. Cannon were scarce, so fake artillery were carved from the tree trunks and placed in menacing positions along the river banks.

Shreveport never was invaded. Possibly the humbug guns helped, but more likely, the Union Army was turned back at Mansfield and Pleasant Hill by some very real artillery.

The moral is—psychological warfare can only be successful provided it is backed up by military strength. Humbug weapons won't deter the Reds from aggression but a ready-to-go- retaliatory force will.

There is nothing fake about the military strength at Shreveport now.

If all the communities of the Nation were as interested in supporting and helping the Air Force as you are here in Shreveport, we could all feel much safer.

Again I want to thank you for asking me down for your Holiday in Dixie. I have really enjoyed my visit.

Against Stalin or Khrushchev?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under previous leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article from the March issue of International Peasant Union. The article, by S. Mikolajczeyk, is entitled "Against Stalin or Khrushchev?" I commend it to the attention of my colleagues. The article follows:

AGAINST STALIN OR KHRUSHCHEV?
(By S. Mikolajczyk)

Intense feeling and speculation have been engendered following reports of the press concerning the secret session of the Communist Party leaders in Moscow. This session, as well as the new party line condemning Stalin for preparation of murders and blunders, surprised the world. The question is, then: What is the meaning of the new line; why is Stalin condemned, and what purpose could this condemnation serve?

The new tactics used by the Communist leaders are intended not so much to villify Stalin, as to prevent Khrushchev's becoming another one-man dictator over Soviet Russia. What these tactics import, is less denunciation of Stalin than an attempt to prevent Khrushchev from stepping, finally, into Stalin's boots.

There was never any doubt that Khrushchev is a man who had sufficient shrewdness and ability, not to mention opportunity, to become Stalin's successor. But swiftly as he moved, with the killing of Beria, Malenkov's removal, and purges in the various Soviet Republics, his leap to power was still somewhat short of the mark before the party congress. He became, with the confirmation of the party congress, the first among others, but did not attain the one-man power possessed by Stalin. It is not so important to know what was actually said during the secret session. Much more important is the fact that the internal struggle over one-man dictatorship in Soviet Russia is in full swing again.

Opponents of Khrushchev used every opportunity to point to the example of Stalin. There was certainly unity among them on at least one point: how to use Stalin's example to prevent Khrushchev from taking over Stalin's power. At the same time, they all tried to find the best way to approach the people while preventing splits or other damage to the party.

It can safely be predicted that in the long run collective leadership for a Communist system is impossible. If decisions will be made by vote, then the very fundamentals of Communist dictatorship will be undermined. Once decision by vote is applied, it will inevitably lead to the growth of democratic procedures in government. Collective leadership cannot be forever restricted to the top echelons. The very existence of collective leadership at the top invites the democratization of the entire system down to the lower echelons, and must, finally, lead to democratic procedures in consulting the people at large. The Communist leaders are very well aware of the fact that once they have begun to move in this direction, they are undermining their dictatorial system, and that this may be the beginning of the end. What must prevail in the end is their old system of dictatorship by one man.

But the tactic of vilifying Stalin in order to keep Khrushchev from becoming sole dictator will backfire on the Communist system.

Stalin, like all dictators, made use of the well-known method of spreading rumors among the people that the responsibility for terror, economic hardships, etc., lies with the lesser functionaries of the Communist apparatus. From time to time, he purged these officials to demonstrate that every time news of wrongdoing by the local bureaucrats reached the good father, "Batiushka Stalin," he came to the support of the people and punished the guilty.

As a result, the Soviet people's growing hatred for the Communist system was directed more against others, and was not exclusively centered upon Stalin. Hated as he was, he was not the most hated among Soviet leaders.

Stalin also made clever use of strong national feelings, and even long-dormant imperialistic tendencies among the Russian

people. Nor did the people's great love for their fatherland and their deep-rooted faith escape being utilized by Stalin during the worst moments of Hitler's invasion into Soviet Russia during World War II.

The victory over Hitler, interpreted solely as a Soviet victory organized by Stalin, as well as the expansion of the Soviet orbit in Europe and Asia, were presented to the Russian people not only as Communist successes, but as great national achievements, surpassing anything ever attained by czarist imperialism. At the secret meeting in Moscow, therefore, the Communist leaders, while quarreling among themselves and planning the new party line, had to consider very carefully how to proceed in removing Stalin's name from the roster of party saints without making inevitable certain consequences of the new tactic, which they knew must backfire on them sooner or later.

The shocking facts revealed by the Soviet leaders about Stalin's past, most recently published in the western press, were certainly very useful, even when they have been generally well-known before to western public opinion. Their publication came in time for Malenkov's visit to England, prior to the Khrushchev-Bulganin arrival there. These reports began their work, and when they reached the Soviet orbit, backfired in the Communists' faces and disrupted the procedure so carefully planned at the secret session. In the whole orbit of Communist domination, the Communist leaders will not be able to prevent the inevitable consequences, no matter what they do now.

In the West, guessing and speculation is widespread concerning possible future developments. Western predictions and guesses, however, are very often based on a knowledge of what happens in similar situations in South America when military juntas take over power.

Unfortunately, such reasoning does not apply to Soviet Russia. Molotov has already disposed of any grounds for such wishful thinking by emphasizing that Communist Party membership among Red army personnel has reached 70 percent, while amongst the Soviet people it has not exceeded 4 percent. The Red army is controlled by the most devoted and skilled members of the party among the army's lower echelons and younger officers, while from the top it is controlled by such party figures as Bulganin and others. Konev, Zhukov and other outstanding military leaders will not sacrifice their lives for friendship with the military leaders of the West. Controlled as they are both from top and bottom, they are happy over their survival after the Second World War, and having returned to their former military posts, why should they now risk being liquidated?

Inside Soviet Russia, the security of the Communist system is based on military units of the security police. They have garrisons, weapons of all sorts as well as ammunition, and are the stronghold and guardian of the Communist Party. This is the reason for Khrushchev's elimination of Beria, and the change in the security system. The military units of the Soviet security police came under Khrushchev's control, as the secretary-general of the party, and he has now subordinated them to the Ministry of the Interior. Under the former system, the Soviet security police were engaged in many widespread activities involving Soviet security, spying and diversive action against the West, counter-intelligence activity, and control over atomic power. All these were now subordinated to the newly created security committee, again under the control of the secretary-general of the party, Khrushchev. The same changes in the organization of the security system were soon after instituted in all the satellite countries.

Perhaps now, in this period of internal struggle for power, Khrushchev will have to rely more and more on some of the Soviet generals, not only because they were also among those who denounced Stalin (in order to keep Khrushchev from seizing Stalin's power), but also because it may turn out that in this internecine war Khrushchev will need even the army to help control the country, should the military units of the security police prove to be inadequate. Inadequate, that is, to squash the consequences of the new line, wherever supposedly pro- or anti-Stalin followers will begin to fight each other all over the country.

While the fight for power amongst party leaders in Moscow continues in full strength, the U. S. S. R. continues to suffer from another weak point whose significance, far from diminishing, keeps steadily expanding—the Soviet failure in agriculture. Recent orders to deprive the Soviet peasants of privately worked small plots of land, and to leave them much smaller plots to be used only for flowers and a handful of vegetables, will not endear the Communist system to the peasants. The output of the small private plots had helped the Soviet peasant produce meat and fats to fill out his meager diet, and even more—it had helped to save the country from starvation during World War II.

The Soviet peasants know that the new orders aim to deprive them of the only possessions they have left—the tiny, privately owned plot of land, and the 1 or 2 cows, pigs, and poultry which were their only means to survive. They are certain that when they have to surrender these plots, which symbolize their last and only hope, the end will have come for them. The peasants will oppose these orders with any means left to them under the Communist system.

The latest developments in the U. S. S. R., stemming from the fight for power among the leaders and from the newest restrictive decrees against the peasants, already have backfired in Soviet Russia as well as in Asia, where the consequences of these developments are clearly visible. They have resulted in renewed hope, and in the growth of anti-Communist feelings among the oppressed people behind the Iron and the Bamboo Curtains.

This situation is very promising for all: those who are free, and those who long for freedom and independence from the oppression of communism. But this promise is a condition which can produce either a speed-up or a delay of further developments in the struggle between the free world and communism.

If the West relaxes immediately, misled by the false conviction that the Communist system will deteriorate by itself, and if the Western World begins to treat Khrushchev and others as poor children who were so badly treated by Batiushka Stalin, and therefore need sympathy and a helping hand, the process of deterioration in the Communist system will be delayed.

The present Soviet leaders not only share responsibility for all of Stalin's practices, but for all the Communist terror and subjugation imposed by them not only upon individual Communists, but upon entire nations, and upon all opponents of communism in the Soviet orbit, whom they constantly humiliate, imprison, or murder. The time has now come for the West to sharpen both its sense of alertness and its measures of self-defense, and to unite for increased pressure against the Moscow dictators, who now protest screamingly against the maltreatment suffered under Batiushka Stalin. For the Communist leaders, in their desperate efforts to save their own skins, may jump to any number of conclusions.

Khrushchev, as Secretary-General of the Ukrainian Communist Party, was the man personally responsible for the murder of many thousands and the deportation to Siberia of millions of Ukrainians, and after the Molotov-Ribbentrop Agreement in 1939, it was he who ruthlessly introduced the Communist system to the prewar territories of Poland annexed by Soviet Russia. He deported more than one and a half million Poles to various forced labor camps in Soviet Russia—working hand in hand with Mr. Ponomarenko, present Ambassador to Moscow, at that time acting as Secretary-General in the territories which Soviet Russia annexed to the White Russian Republic after the secret agreement with Hitler.

Mr. Bulganin, as Stalin's Ambassador to the Bierut Lubin Committee, helped subjugate Poland with the assistance of the Soviet Army and swarms of Soviet Security Police units, which he brought with him to Poland.

If the so-called maltreated children of Batiushka Stalin continue Stalin's practices (which they always utilized) in the captive countries, we may ask them: Are they ready to stop the persecution of all these nations as well as of all anti-Communists in the Soviet-occupied countries? Are they ready to restore freedom to nations occupied after World War II, and to those inside Russia? Are they ready to recognize freedom, democracy, and religious freedom for all the people; to withdraw the Soviet Army and Soviet functionaries from occupied countries? And will they agree that all these people should have freedom to decide their own fate, and to choose their own governmental and political system freely, in truly democratic elections under the supervision of the United Nations?

Col. Edward J. Connelly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, it is highly gratifying when deserved recognition is given to an individual whose whole life has been directed toward giving service to his Government and to his fellowman. Such an event has just taken place in my congressional district where a testimonial dinner was given in honor of Col. Edward J. Connelly, a native son of Wakefield, Mass. I was very pleased that I could be present at the testimonial dinner to pay tribute to this able and outstanding American citizen. Colonel Connelly is more than deserving of this great honor that has been bestowed upon him. He earned this tribute not only because of his distinguished military service, but also for the outstanding and meritorious service he has rendered his Government both on a Federal and local level. He is an example of our citizens who put the welfare of their country above all other considerations. Colonel Connelly is a man of honor and integrity, a Christian gentleman, and a true American.

We, in Massachusetts and particularly our citizens of Wakefield, are very proud of Colonel Connelly and we extend to him our very best wishes for many happy and fruitful years.

The editorial follows:

IN THE RECORD

A testimonial to a man who has written a record of service like that of Col. Edward J.

Connelly can do little. It can only express in very insufficient terms the feeling of respect and gratitude and warmth a community feels toward one of its key citizens.

Saturday night's testimonial did that in Colonel Connelly's case, but, as one of the speakers said, the true measure of service by the town's first soldier can best be taken by a look at the record.

That record has been printed in the Daily Item and it is as impressive as it is long. It includes service in the military field, the field of government, and the field of aid to veterans and townspeople. In all these fields Colonel Connelly's service has been notable and the record is one to which few men indeed can lay claim.

Referring to his service in World War I, Colonel Connelly told the group Saturday night that he was grateful to be remembered after 40 years. He is remembered, and his gallantry as a leader of men under fire will continue to be a vital part of Wakefield's history.

His service hardly ended there, however. It has continued to the present when Colonel Connelly still is a very important moving spirit behind many activities of veterans' organizations.

As the speaker said, it is all in the record, a record still being lived and written, one which in a small way Wakefield's citizens honored Saturday by their recognition of a gallant soldier and an outstanding native son.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*.....
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*.....120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Jenner, William E., *Ind*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Laird, William R. III, *W. Va*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*.....Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*.....
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*.....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*.....
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*.....
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*.....
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*.....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*.....Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*.....
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Wofford, Thomas A., *S. C*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Johnson of Texas, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Barkley, Anderson, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Morse, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Wofford, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Laird, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Wofford, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Laird, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Scott, Wofford, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dill, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton. Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*—6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*—4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*
Albert, Carl, *Okla*
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*—University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*
Andrews, George W., *Ala*—3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*—4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*—113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*

Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*—2601 Woodley Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*
Bates, William H., *Mass*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*
Beamer, John V., *Ind*—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*
Belcher, Page, *Okla*
Bell, John J., *Tex*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*—1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*—5804 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*—2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*
Boggs, Hale, *La*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*—3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*—2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*—The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*—The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*
Bray, William G., *Ind*
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*
Brooks, Overton, *La*—4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*—Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*—Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*—2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*
Byrne, James A., *Pa*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*—1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.

Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*—The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*—The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*—Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*—1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo*
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill*—2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*—3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*—The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*—1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*—2480 16th St.
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*—The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*
Cramer, William C., *Fla*—Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind*.
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*—3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*—4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*—2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*
Dawson, William A., *Utah*
Dawson, William L., *Ill*
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*—2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*
Dies, Martin, *Tex*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*—The Congressional
Dingell, John D., *Mich*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*—3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*—The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*
Dowdy, John, *Tex*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*—3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*—The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*—3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*—3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*—5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*—3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*—200 C St. SE.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*—Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*—The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*—3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*—4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*—514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*—The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*—Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J*—3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*
Fulton, James G., *Pa*
Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*—6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*
George, Myron V., *Kans*—3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*
Granahan, William T., *Pa*
Grant, George M., *Ala*—4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*
Green, Edith, *Oreg*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*—2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*

Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*
Hale, Robert, *Maine*—2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*—4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*—The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*
Harris, Oren, *Ark*—1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*—4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*—314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*—The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*
Healey, James C., *N. Y*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*—104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*
Heselton, John W., *Mass*
Hess, William E., *Ohio*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*
Hill, William S., *Colo*—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*—100 Maryland Ave NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*—Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*
Holt, Joe, *Calif*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*—3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala*.
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*

Ikard, Frank, *Tex*

Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*—200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*—2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*—630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*—3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*—3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*—3083 Ordway St.

Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*—2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*—Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*—1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*—The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*—The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*—3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*
King, Cecil R., *Calif*
King, Karl C., *Pa*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*—112 Schotts Court NE.

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass*
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md*
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y*
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif*
Long, George S., *La*
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak*—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa.*
McCormack, John W., *Mass*—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C*—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill*—The Coronet
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash*
Mahon, George H., *Tex*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn*
Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
Meader, George, *Mich*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*
Miller, A. L., *Nebr*—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md*—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif*
Miller, William E., *N. Y*—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va.*
Morano, Albert P., *Conn*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa*
Morrison, James H., *La*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., Jr., *Calif*
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa*—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn*
Natcher, William H., *Ky*—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine*
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark*—2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill*—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn*—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis*—4201 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J*
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La*
Patman, Wright, *Tex*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn*
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky*
Pfost, Gracie, *Idaho*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass*
Phillips, John, *Calif*
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y*
Poage, W. R., *Tex*—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va*
Polk, James G., *Ohio*
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y*
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga*
Price, Melvin, *Ill*
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn*—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*
Quigley, James M., *Pa*
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich*
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y*
Rains, Albert, *Ala*
Ray, John H., *N. Y*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn*
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis*—1650 30th St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa*—1809 Franklin St. NE.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz*
Richards, James P., *S. C*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala*—6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va*
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky*—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo*
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla*—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex*
Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn*
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y*
Saylor, John P., *Pa*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans*—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill*
Shelley, John F., *Calif*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif*
Short, Dewey, *Mo*
Shuford, George A., *N. C*—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa*—5205 Lawn May, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill*—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss*
Smith, Howard W., *Va*—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis*—2480 16th St.
Smith, Wint, *Kans*
Spence, Brent, *Ky*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va*
Steed, Tom, *Okla*
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo*
Taber, John, *N. Y*
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa*—4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex*—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J*
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich*
Thompson, T. A., *La*—1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash*
Trimble, James W., *Ark*
Tuck, William M., *Va*
Tumulty, T. James, *N. J*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz*
Utt, James B., *Calif*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Velde, Harold H., *Ill*
Vinson, Carl, *Ga*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio*—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill*—The Congressional
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa*
Watts, John C., *Ky*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla*
Widnall, William B., *N. J*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn*
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass*—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss*—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y*—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La*
Wilson, Earl, *Ind*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis*
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich*—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J*—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex*
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill*
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev*—2705 Westminister Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y*

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), *Alaska.*—1718 33d Pl. SE.
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
J. Chester Wilfong, 4408 Fourth Road North, Arlington, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 1200 North Stuart St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 You Place, SE.

Appendix

Address by Hon. J. Glenn Beall, of Maryland, at Dedication of Northeast Hebrew Congregation Synagogue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I recently had the great privilege of participating in the dedication of the new synagogue of the Northeast Hebrew Congregation, in Mount Rainier, Md. Although the event was a happy one, and our prayers were for peace, our thoughts were inevitably drawn to the sorrow and tension of the Middle East. Perhaps some day we shall be able to dedicate our synagogues and churches in an atmosphere untainted by trouble and hatred. At present, however, we must face the existence of such things, and must determine that all of our places of worship shall stand as symbols of our continuing hope for friendship and peace. I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks included in the Appendix of today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BEALL AT DEDICATION CEREMONIES FOR THE SYNAGOGUE OF THE NORTHEAST HEBREW CONGREGATION, 4601 EASTERN AVENUE, MOUNT RAINIER, MD., ON APRIL 29, 1956

I am very happy to be here at the dedication ceremonies of your new synagogue and religious school.

I understand that although you were organized about 7 years ago, you will now for the first time be occupying a building of your own—in which, however, some bank or mortgage company may have a slight interest.

The addition of a house of worship to any locality is a cause for celebration, not only by the members of that congregation, but also by the whole community which it serves.

No principle is more fundamental in our system of government than the one expressed in the phrase: "separation of church from state."

Its meaning, however, must not be misunderstood or misinterpreted.

What our Constitution guarantees is that no church shall become the state; that no form of religious worship is to be hindered or prejudiced; and that no church or denomination is to be extended benefits and privileges not offered on an equal basis to others.

It was never intended, however, that the state should or would separate itself from the moral principles which religion teaches, nor from the ethical ideals which the church or synagogue or temple—each in its own way—seeks to impress on its members.

Such a view would be contrary to the entire historical development of our country.

Our Founding Fathers received a great deal of inspiration and guidance from the Bible, and our American tradition is rooted in its teachings.

To the extent that the church or synagogue performs its functions of introducing into the lives of its people the divine purpose in life, the state—which means in essence your neighbors of whatever faith—is a direct beneficiary.

As you create in the minds and hearts of your worshipers an appreciation of spiritual values and higher ethical conduct, the moral tone of the community as a whole rises, and it becomes a better place to live in.

By its own means, the State can only exercise a negative influence in raising standards of conduct.

It can threaten punishment for violations, and it can then punish those violators which are caught.

Therefore, to some degree it might reach the conduct of the individual, but very rarely, if at all, does it affect the standards.

The synagogue and the church, on the other hand, have the capacity to exert a nositive influence.

Their task is to develop the proper moral and ethical beliefs which will reject a course of conduct which is contrary to them.

Put into practical terms, that means less crime, less juvenile delinquency, less unethical business conduct, and less conflict between economic classes, or between any groups which divide along lines of race, religion or color.

It means less meanness and less oppression, and greater tolerance and understanding of your fellow man.

In a world now dominated in large part by a Godless faith, communism, where true freedom of worship and religious teachings are denied, and where only recently we saw countries in which every synagogue was gutted and destroyed, the dedication of a Jewish house of worship represents a triumph of our Bill of Rights and our democratic principles.

The struggle for liberty is a never ending one.

Undoubtedly you are all acquainted with the great fight which was made in the Maryland Legislature by Thomas Kennedy, of Washington County, to remove the bar against Jews holding office.

The struggle, initiated by Solomon Etting and Barnard Gratz, in 1797, was taken up by Christian legislators in 1816, and for 10 long years Tom Kennedy, with his valiant band of devoted and dedicated men with a passionate love of liberty, kept up the battle.

In 1826, the bill was finally passed, thereby advancing the cause of religious freedom everywhere.

While we are accustomed to measuring achievement and progress in terms of industrial growth, increased productivity, economic expansion, or scientific development, such conquests gained in the realm of the spirit are the lasting ones.

Today the battle for liberty is on another front.

As men and women in a free country with individual opinions, we are bound to have differences.

Uniformity and unanimity exist only in a totalitarian state.

It is of the essence of a democracy that a diversity of views may exist.

However, under our system of government, our Constitution, as interpreted by the Supreme Court, is the law of the land.

When that Court has ruled, we obey, regardless of how violently we may disagree with the opinion.

I know, and I can well understand, the great revolution which the recent decision of the Supreme Court represents in the customs, habits, and beliefs of many of our fellow Americans.

Consequently, we should not ignore the great progress which the enlightened citizens of our great Nation have already made in advancing the civil rights of their colored population.

I believe, too, that the Supreme Court recognized the problems involved and, therefore, directed that we must aim toward the change; but that it need not be made—in fact, should not be made—with such haste as to destroy the very objective we seek to achieve.

I believe that the position taken by the Honorable Simon E. Sobeloff, Solicitor General, in recommending this procedure to the Supreme Court, was a very sound and sensible one.

It followed neither the course of those who would nullify the decision of the Supreme Court nor of those who would seek to put it into effect at once, without giving the communities involved the opportunity to adjust and condition themselves to the change over a period of time.

I have, therefore, fought for the confirmation of Solicitor General Sobeloff as a judge of the court of appeals for the fourth circuit, and I shall continue to fight for that confirmation.

I believe that the opposition has been unfair to a man who is not only a great jurist, but who also possesses an enormous amount of commonsense and an abundance of the human quality.

A few days ago marked the eighth anniversary of the independence of the State of Israel.

Speaking on an occasion such as this, it could hardly be proper not to allude to that event.

According to recent newspaper reports, a cease-fire has apparently been agreed upon between Egypt and Israel.

However, let us not delude ourselves.

Unless there is some radical change, this will be only one more temporary armistice which will falter because the basic conditions for its permanence have never been satisfied.

For 7 years since the armistice, Israel has been trying to sit down at a peace table with its antagonists to arrange for a just settlement of grievances, but to no avail.

We all know too well of the various economic and military pressures against which the fledgling nation had to contend in its early days.

Now the situation is infinitely more menacing.

Each week we hear new reports that the Communists are sending arms to the Arab nations, and each day we feel the tension mounting.

There is no need to ask ourselves why Russia is interested in the Middle East.

The motives of the Reds are frightfully obvious.

Behind the friendly overtures which are flowing from the Kremlin to Cairo and its sister cities is one central purpose—Communist expansion.

The roadblock is Israel, conceived in a spirit of freedom and dedicated to its preservation.

From the very beginning I have made my position clear.

I am, and have been, an advocate of mutual security pacts between our country and any nations in the Middle East that are willing to refrain from aggression.

I am not speaking in generalities.

Although the words I use might have lost some of their original impact through constant repetition, they nevertheless express the hard fact that this Nation must supply help—and I mean that word to include the very latest arms—to offset whatever aid is poured into the area for purposes of aggression.

This is not merely the only just thing we can do; it is also the only practical thing we can do.

Such a combination of incentives should leave us without the slightest doubt concerning our path.

Our thoughts during the past few minutes have been turned to turmoil, but behind them have been our hopes and prayers for peace.

This beautiful edifice that you are dedicating today is a symbol of the peace which we are seeking, and I therefore congratulate you and wish you Sholom.

Arab Economic Warfare Against Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents has sent to me the text of a talk delivered by Mr. Edward Robbins, assistant vice president of the Hollywood State Bank and cochairman of the board of the California-Israel Chamber of Commerce, at the luncheon meeting of the California-Israel Chamber of Commerce held on Monday, March 26, 1956, at the Biltmore Hotel in Los Angeles.

This talk is so informative and presents such a challenge to the weak and ineffective present policy of our State Department that I not only endorse the sentiments of Mr. Robbins but I hope that it will be possible for many of my colleagues to emphasize the facts and the conclusions which he so well sets forth:

ARAB ECONOMIC WARFARE AGAINST ISRAEL.

The Arab boycott began December 1945, 2½ years before the establishment of the State of Israel. At that time, the Council of the Arab League adopted a resolution banning the import of "Zionist" goods. This boycott directed at the Jewish community in Palestine, had limited effect, since it was difficult to distinguish between "Zionist" and "Palestine Arab products."

Since the establishment of the State of Israel, Arab boycott activities have reached the height of a full-fledged economic war.

First, there is the boycott against companies dealing with Israel. According to regulations issued in September 1952 by the Council of the Arab League and enforced in Arab countries, foreign firms will be boycotted "if they own an assembly plant in Israel, if they maintain a general agency in Israel, if they concede to an Israeli firm the right to use their name, or if they invest in an Israel concern."

Further, these regulations provide that "should any of these firms show itself ready to terminate its activities in Israel, the Arab governments will place at its disposal all possible facilities in order to enable it to transfer its plant to one of the Arab countries."

Although only a few of the foreign firms actually connected with Israel have yielded to this form of Arab pressure, these measures have had adverse effects on potential foreign investments in Israel.

Another form of boycott is in the field of sea communications.

The Suez Canal, despite the ruling of the Security Council of the United Nations, is not only barred to Israeli ships but also to foreign ships which might be bringing so-called strategic goods to Israel. The same restrictions hold true for the Gulf of Aqaba and the Strait of Tiran.

Thus, all tankers, of whatever origin, carrying oil to Israel are black-listed. When this takes place, they cannot call at Arab ports and do business with Arab countries.

This blockade affects in particular Israel's sea communications with Asia, east Africa, and south Africa. It also has resulted in discouraging to a great extent any foreign shipping company from taking cargo to or from Israel through the Suez Canal, even in transshipment through a third port.

A third form of Arab boycott is the blockade of air communications.

Under the "General Principles of Boycott" established by the Arab League, no aircraft may fly over Arab countries if, in the same course of its journey, it has made a landing in Israel. The Governments of Egypt and Saudi Arabia even have threatened to shoot down any aircraft flying over its territory on the way to or from Israel.

As a result of this blockade, the air links that had existed between Israel and the Far East were severed.

Finally, there is a fourth form of boycott, this one directed at companies whose owners are Jewish, or even whose labor is Jewish.

In the summer of 1952, an American firm received the following letter from a Saudi Arabian customer:

"We very much regret to inform you that our government has duly published a notice announcing that any importers of Saudi Arabia must not be permitted to import goods, any kind of goods, from any Jewish firm in the world.

"Further, they have listed you as being Jewish, and your firm as a Jewish firm. As these steps are taken suddenly against you, we are obliged to cable you to stop the shipment of our orders until we write you.

"However, we are obliged to ask you to let us have full particulars as to what faith your firm belongs, Jewish or Christian? And until we have full particulars from you we are obliged to stop our business with you."

On November 27, 1955, Mohammed Ali Suleiman, head of the Manufacturers and Merchants Association in Saudi Arabia, addressed a letter to a New York firm advising them that, under instructions from his government, business relations with any undertakings in the United States or any other country which are under the management of Jews must be avoided.

Questionnaires were also sent to business firms in Europe and America stating that the boycott has been extended not only to firms that have Jewish proprietors and employees, but also to firms in which Jews are substantial stockholders.

It is very obvious to the world that the purpose of this Arab economic warfare against Israel is to undermine and weaken the economy of Israel to a point where the tiny nation, as the Arabs express it, "will wither away or will become ripe for a military attack and destruction.

Therefore, this boycott must be recognized for what it is—aggressive warfare in the economic field, which, like military warfare, creates tensions, unrest, and damage.

And what has it succeeded in doing? First, it has encroached on American freedoms. An American airline may not fly from Lydda Airfield over the skies of Arabia. An American ship touching upon an Israeli port may not unload in an Arab port. An American business firm which may have some investments in Israel is not permitted to do any business in Arab States.

Second, the boycott discriminates against one class of American citizens, those of the Jewish religion. The letter which I had previously read, written to an American firm in 1952 from a Saudi Arabian customer, illustrates one effect of this discrimination. This particular letter was received by an exporter of wheat, flour, rice, and textiles whose business with Saudi Arabia ran close to $2 million a year. Under the terms of the International Wheat Agreement, the United States pays about 75 cents for each bushel of wheat shipped as a subsidy to American exporters. The effect of this boycott, therefore, was that the United States Government made grants to non-Jewish firms but Jewish firms were unable to benefit from such grants.

A third result of the boycott is the retarded economic development of the entire region, in general, and the Arab States in particular. This condition has resulted in increased dependence on and requests for American financial assistance. Jordan, for instance, is the granary of the region. If the Arab country were to sell its wheat to Israel, it would not need economic aid from the United States.

What should be done about this Arab boycott?

In Italy and Holland, business firms and Government authorities have denounced the Arab policy of discrimination and have refused to cooperate with it. The Bonn Government of Western Germany was threatened twice by the Arab nations, but their efforts to prevent the paying of reparations to Israel failed.

Take the case of the airlines which were told to stop flying to Israel. They ignored the Arabs who have not dared to do anything about it. In all of these cases the Arabs yielded quietly.

But what of the United States?

The Jewish taxpayer in this country contributes to the foreign-aid program ostensibly in defense of the free world and its ideals. Yet this same taxpayer is the subject of gross discrimination in countries which he helps to support both economically and militarily. The United States Government, one of the two most powerful in the world, subscribes meekly to a system under which some of its citizens are accorded second-class status, and are perhaps even regarded as outside the protection of the law.

Gentlemen, if the Government of the United States is not prepared or able to defend the equal rights of its citizens wherever they may be, this policy must be regarded as a challenge to the principle of full citizenship and equal rights for American Jews in this country as well as abroad. No foreign government has the right to discriminate between one American passport and another.

In 1911, in the days of President Taft, we had a Government which had the courage of its convictions. When Russia refused to honor American passports held by American citizens of the Jewish faith, the commercial treaty between the two countries was abrogated by Congress.

Why can't we have a similar show of forceful action today?

Somewhere, somehow, we have heard a faint protest of disapproval by our Government of Arab actions. But why aren't these protests pushed with vigor and persistence? Are there no political or economic measures available to our Government to make its protests felt?

Gentlemen, American citizens have the right to expect their Government to protect their dignity, their good name, and their right to travel and to engage in commerce on an equal footing with citizens of other faiths.

It is time now—now—before it is too late—for the Government of the United States to do something about this Arab boycott in order to protect the fundamental rights of American citizens.

The Weakening Two-Party System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting an address delivered by the Honorable Alfred M. Landon, former Governor of Kansas. The address was delivered before the Midwest Federation of College Young Republicans Convention, Topeka, Kans., on Tuesday, April 3, 1956. Mr. Landon's speech is worthy of merit. He certainly delivered a most compelling address to the young Republican leaders of the Midwest.

The address follows:

THE WEAKENING TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

(Address by Alf M. Landon before Midwest Federation of College Young Republicans Convention, Topeka, Kans., April 14, 1956)

I am happy to have the privilege of talking with you young Republican leaders from 13 great States.

Your presence here evidences your willingness to exert yourselves in the great adventure of governing men.

The art of government must be preceded by the art of being elected.

The mere ambition to hold a public office—without pride of achievement and a desire for public usefulness is a dead end in life.

Therefore, I want to talk with you tonight about political parties as the agencies for formulating sound principles of government, and responsible to the American voters for achieving their decisions on those policies.

Tonight as we look the world over, we find the most stable governments are those based on the two-party system.

However, 2 of our last 3 Presidents have been stronger than their parties.

It can be argued with some validity that Mr. Truman was stronger in 1948 than the Democratic Party.

That either means the worldwide trend toward personal government is present in America or that the American people are not getting from either political party a competent and adequate expression of principles reflecting their thinking today on vital problems.

Tonight as we look America over we see evidences that both the major political parties are torn with internal strife on great and fundamental national domestic issues.

The difference between the two parties on foreign policies and national defense is more one of management. And for the Democratic Party to attack the Republican administration on that score is like the pot attempting to call the kettle black.

What are some of the accomplishments of President Eisenhower?

The chief one, of course, is gaining the confidence and the trust of the peoples of the world.

It is difficult for any American to understand the fear the peoples of the world had in our peaceful intentions.

As President, Mr. Eisenhower has commanded their respect and faith in his leadership for peace.

Another fundamental accomplishment of great importance to every American has been checking the steady slide in the value of the dollar which occurred in Mr. Roosevelt's and Mr. Truman's administrations.

It is not necessary for me to outline to this intelligent audience the vital necessity of that to our national life—present and future.

The question of the hour is the so-called farm bill.

As you know, it ignores in part the policy and the legislation recommended to the Congress by the President to get farmers and the Nation out of the trap we are caught in by reason of Democrat policies.

Personally, I do not believe this monstrosity of diverse and conflicting provisions solves a permanent long-range national land use program that is impressed with public interest.

Republican Members of the Congress and Democrat Members alike are divided as to its merits.

Neither party seems to be able to develop sufficient unity to meet and solve domestic issues.

The record of the Democrat administration from 1949 to 1953—a Democrat president and a Democrat congress, mind you—when set over against the party platform promises of 1948 is one of the skimpiest, do-nothing records in the political annals of this country. It was, in fact, a new record of futility and failure on virtually every platform pledge dealing with major domestic issues. Therefore, this attack on Mr. Eisenhower as a "do-nothing President" is with poor grace.

From January 1953 to January 1955, Mr. Eisenhower was unable to enact into law—without the aid of Democrat Members of the Congress—such pledges of the Republican platform that required legislation to redeem.

Of course, when a Democrat Congress gained control of the legislative branch of our great Republic in January 1953, it became less possible to enact legislation to put the Republican platform into effect.

But also as significant as this confusion over broad-base political principles of government within both major political parties, is the weakening of party lines.

It started with the Republican Party in 1912 and 1914, and with the Democrat Party in 1928 followed by 1936, 1948 and 1952.

It is highly significant that most of the Bull Moose bolters were not eliminated from public life.

In 1928, all the bolters in the South were punished in succeeding elections.

But that has not been the case of the bolters in either 1948 or 1952.

Therefore, I think there is evidence that the Democraty Party does not have a broad enough and a complete enough agreement on principles and philosophy of government to sustain a permanent political party.

It is apparent that with all its political success, the Democrat party cannot and will not hold together because it is not able to agree on a consistent set of principles.

No longer is it possible to conceal the deep and bitter differences which divide that party.

From the conflict over both domestic and foreign policies between President Eisenhower and Republican Members of the Congress, there is evidence of divergent and contradictory views on vital issues in the Republican Party.

It is apparent that the legislative branch of our glorious Republic has been, and is now, controlled by a Republican and Democrat coalition that finds more agreement in a broad consistency of policies than in the stated objectives of their party platforms as interpreted—in the Republican case—by the head of the party.

A President is head of his party in the Nation as well as Chief Executive of all the people.

A governor is head of his party in his State as well as chief executive of the Commonwealth.

As far as the Republican Party is concerned, it is up to President Eisenhower—going on to 5 years more of his leadership—to hold it together and make it strong by a stand for a set of clearly thought out, vital principles, adequate to the problems confronting us both in foreign affairs and at home.

Political parties arise and are kept alive by great movements of political thought.

When the left wing of both Democrat and Republican Parties have more in common than they do with the right wing of their own party, there is confusion that threatens the stability of America.

I believe the basic domestic issue is coming to a head.

Throughout the last quarter of a century, there has been a constant drive to weaken not only State laws and State responsibility, but city responsibility also.

When that vacuum is once created, not only by congressional legislation—and more particularly by appropriations—presidential policies and court decisions—the Federal Government moves in.

That is the policy the Democrat Party stands for today—that the Federal Government must control farms, industrial plants, and eventually labor, too—not by regulation, but by management. There is a world of difference between the two.

That is the policy the Republican Party must oppose.

The Republican Party, equally with the Democrat Party, derives from Thomas Jefferson—the decentralist—the opponent of oppression and the enemy of omnipotent planning.

Today the Republican Party must resume its fight for these basic principles of freedom and a Republic.

That offers opportunity for a definite lineup based on fundamental principles—the principles of historic liberals who were equally opposed to government oppression by ordering the farmers, labor, and business what they must do to be wise and competent in the management of their affairs, and also were opposed to economic oppression by gigantic monopolies and concentration of the power of money.

Upon one condition is this position possible.

The Republican Party today must remember that Jefferson opposed not only excessive power by government but also excessive power by wealth.

None of us wants to see our country ruled by Fascist or bureaucratic government on the one hand or by the power of money on the other. The average man can lose his political and economic security either way.

That does not mean an attempt to swing the pendulum of government back to the dominant rampant individualism of old, but the attempt to prevent the complete elimination of individualism with the destruction of all the precious freedom of democracy.

As I have said many times, if people must choose between concentration of economic power in the hands of government or the concentration of economic power in the hands of a few individuals, they will choose the government.

We do have a distinct problem to solve the distribution of prosperity. Every wise statesman—in every period of time—has been concerned with the equitable distribution of production.

If that problem is not met with intelligence, it has in the end always been met with violence.

The Republican Party must remember that Jefferson believed that the American citizen should have no despotic master, either governmental or economic.

The Republican Party must resolve accordingly to free this country from all oppressive dictation whether by bureaucracy, official, or financier; whether by industrialist or by labor leader; whether by public money or by private money; whether by the force of the militia or by the force of the mob.

If the Republican Party can take so broad and honest a view of its mission, it will last through a multitude of years. It will stand as a bulwark against a hitherto unknown oppression in America. It will be of immeasurable service in preserving our great and glorious Republic.

Tenth District, California: A Story of Growth and Growing Pains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, this is a story of progress, growth, and growing pains. Some time ago, I requested various communities in my congressional district to furnish me with statistical information to help me keep my records up to date. I much intrigued by a brochure issued by the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Sunnyvale which, at the bottom of a list of figures, carried this notation: "Warning: Sunnyvale statistics become obsolete hourly."

This, Mr. Speaker, is literally true, and it applies not only to that one locality, but to all of the county of Santa Clara in which it is located, and to the wonderful, amazing tricounty district I have the honor to represent. So rapid is the progress in almost every phase of human endeavor, so staggering the changes that are taking place before our wondering eyes from day to day, that I know my colleagues are interested in hearing about it. To illustrate the miraculous progress of the 10th Congressional District of California, I will have to quote figures. I assure you that they are as recent as I have been able to obtain. In all fairness, however, I, too, wish to add this paraphrased warning: Statistics pertaining to the 10th District of California become obsolete hourly.

Growth and progress are expressed in many ways. The use of land, the modernization of communications, greater soil productivity, and increased output of our manufacturing plants are some of them. So are the quality of housing, the availability of schools, and the whole list of items that come under the general heading of "Standard of Living." Progress can be quantitative and qualitative. In the 10th District of California you will find all of these.

Above all, growth is measured in people. Let me tell you about the fantastic migration of population to our area. In 1940, a year before Pearl Harbor, there were 175,000 people living in Santa Clara County which reaches from the south shore of San Francisco Bay up the green and fertile Santa Clara Valley. It is separated from California's great Central Valley by the Mount Hamilton Range of mountains on the east, and protected from the Pacific by the Santa Cruz Mountains on the west. During the war and immediate postwar years, our poputon climbed from 175,000 to 290,000, but this proved merely a beginning. By 1953, there were 355,000, in 1954 there were 370,000. Santa Clara County had 407,000 residents on January 1, 1955, just a little over a year ago. On January 1, 1956, our population exceeded 456,000, a growth of 12 percent in a single year and 57.2 percent since April 1950. The estimate on the 1st of April of this year was 461,900.

People, needless to say, are not merely statistics. They are human beings who work and earn and produce and create assets. Taxes provide a good yardstick for the latter. In 1940, the assessed valuation of property in Santa Clara County, Calif., was a little over $159 million. In 1950, it was nearly $350 million. The net assessed valuation for the current 1955–56 fiscal year is $623,921,820. And as industry keeps coming into the county the valuation keeps growing steadily, too.

Industry—that more than probably anything else is the word that changed the face of Santa Clara County and is still changing it. In a way, all the other changes are byproducts of industrialization. Yet, Santa Clara County is historically an agricultural region, and even today it ranks 20th in the entire Nation, with an agricultural production of $88 million in 1954. More than 80,000 acres alone are still covered with orchards which have made this area one of the greatest fruit and nut growing centers in the world. Of all the fruit crops, prunes account for almost one-fifth of the dollar value, followed by strawberries, pears, cherries, and apricots. More than 18,000 acres are planted in vegetables. Other important crops are hay, barley, sugar beets, and, to a lesser degree, wheat, oats, and alfalfa.

The orchards still fill the valley with bloom in spring, but nearer the bay of San Francisco, along the rail lines of the Southern Pacific and Western Pacific railroads, an industrial community is growing with giant strides. For years, the city of San Jose, hub of this empire, has been a cannery center unequaled anywhere. In addition, such industries as Food Machinery & Chemical Corp. and Permanente Cement Corp. have provided industrial payrolls and are contributing immensely to the economy of the area. To these we can now add a continuously growing list of corporations whose names read like the Who's Who in American Industry: Ford Motor Co., General Motors, Westinghouse Electric, Lockheed Aircraft, IBM, Eastman Kodak. With them come supplier industries and service organizations. With them, too, come work forces, men and women and their children, people who build homes and buy food and clothing and attend churches and who belong to service clubs, lodges, and the PTA.

Stanford University is fast becoming the medical center of the West, with a $21 million VA hospital scheduled for construction, and the Stanford Medical School expanding its activities. Stanford Research Institute is called upon for work by all of the American industry. The electronics industry is gravitating more and more to the Palo Alto area.

Mr. Speaker, this growth, astounding as it is, is only beginning. Contrary to many other areas, we have a long way to go before we reach the saturation point. Just to cite one example, of nearly 600 acres zoned for light industry in the city of Mountain View, about 65 percent is still vacant and available.

Growth cannot take place without also creating problems. One of our most pressing problems is that of water. The fertile soil of our valley needs water to produce its crops. Water, too, is needed by the industries moving in. And water—in ever-increasing quantities—is needed by the rapidly increasing population for domestic use. With characteristic vigor, the people of my district have taken measures to conserve every drop of water that can be stored during the short months of winter rainfall. Two great water-conservation districts, formed many years ago, have with their own resources constructed reservoirs and dams. The northern district alone has invested some $10 million to date in water-conservation works. At the present time their total storage capacity is 143,700 acre-feet, but only 91,000 acre-feet per year can be percolated, and current pumping amounts to some 125,000 acre-feet per year. This rate is rising. Back in 1945, 85 percent of the water used in the district was for agricultural use. This is now down to 70 percent, since industry and domestic use takes an even larger share of the water resources.

Yet, the water table continues to sink. Where in World War I days, the water table was less than 40 feet below the ground, it has fallen more than 150 feet at the end of recent irrigation seasons. With local efforts at a maximum, importation of water has become a necessity. Even now, the Army engineers are constructing a model of San Francisco Bay and its tributaries as part of a comprehensive survey to study barrier plans. The Bureau of Reclamation of the United States Department of the Interior has requested funds for an engineering survey to determine the feasibility of integrating Santa Clara County and neighboring San Benito County to the south in the Central Valley project. I have also introduced legislation which would modify the 1914 Baker Act to permit sale of Hetch Hetchy water, now in surplus supply, to utilities in my district.

Mr. Speaker, water may be the gravest single problem. There are, of course, many others. The new population centers pose growing demands on transportation and communications, too. State and counties are doing what they can to construct highways which are adequate to carry the enormous traffic flow of our motorized society. The city of San Jose, with aid from the Federal Government, has developed a first-class airport which is rapidly becoming the third major landing field in the San Francisco Bay area. And even here, there are problems since every parcel of land needed to lengthen the runways and to construct maintenance and passenger facilities is also coveted by indus-

try ready to move into every available parcel of vacant land. Recent floods created another serious problem that will be solved by cooperative efforts of local, State, and Federal agencies.

And again, the human problem gains overriding importance. The tanned, healthy children growing up in our sunny climate require schools, and in spite of almost constant school construction, our school districts are hard put to provide sufficient classroom space. More than 13,500 elementary pupils attended double sessions in Santa Clara County this last term. Total elementary school enrollment was 72,800 last fall, as compared to just 39,400 in 1950. Similar problems confront our high schools, junior colleges, and the four major institutions of higher learning, Leland Stanford, Jr. University, the University of Santa Clara, San Jose State College, and Lick Observatory of the University of California.

One would think that the huge influx of industrial workers would also find reflection in organizational ferment. I am very happy to state that the contrary is true. Labor-management relations in the 10th district of California set an excellent example of sensible moderation and mutual respect. Organized labor is as much a part of our community and industrial life as is any other form of organization. Employment is high. So are wages. Practicing wise moderation, both labor and management have achieved a harmony which has greatly aided the continued prosperity of our area.

The face of the valley changes from day to day. Thousands of new homes now cover many areas which were meadows or woods or orchards only a scant few years ago. Shopping centers flank brand-new roads. New plants, new churches, new hospitals, new recreation areas and parks, indeed, entirely new cities have grown and incorporated and continue to grow. In the eastern foothills and along the west valley slopes, new residential districts offer the livability which is not the least of the attractions our area offers to individuals and corporations alike.

All these things, Mr. Speaker, are indications of the explosive growth of Santa Clara County, Calif. It stands to reason, that the shockwaves travel well across county lines. In this age of high-speed transportation and communications, events cannot take place in one city or sector without causing repercussions in others which are within easy driving distance. It certainly is true in the 10th District of California. Beyond the range of the Santa Cruz Mountains, washed by the waters of the Pacific Ocean and Monterey Bay, lies Santa Cruz County. To the south, between the Diablo and Gabilan Ranges, stretch the rich pastures and agricultural lands of San Benito County. Here, too, progress is felt wherever you go.

This is a brief sketch of the 10th Congressional District of California, the area in which I was born and reared and which I have now the honor to represent in this House. Those of us in and out of public life who take an active part and interest in the development and growth of these counties are, of course, attempting to project the events of the past and the trend of the present into the future. We know that only far-sighted planning and long-range preparation will eventually help us to meet all the challenges confronting us as a result of the changes now taking place. Yet, while we are able to project ourselves into 1960 or even 1975, there is no ceiling, no limit in sight.

We can easily visualize our district as part of a solid urban and suburban metropolitan area extending in the shape of a "V" along both sides of San Francisco Bay, with San Jose as the southern hub, and San Francisco and Oakland, respectively, forming the northern points. We can foresee the need for rapid transit, for additional 6-lane or 8-lane freeways, for jet-age airports, and for the water, the utilities, the housing and schools for 600,000–700,000 or even 800,000 people.

A few years ago, I expressed the conviction that some day, San Francisco could be referred to by the people of my district as the little city to the north of San Jose. Facetious as this may sound, the phrase is well on the way of becoming true. No other area in northern California has had the rate of growth we have experienced, and few other areas have the potential we possess for the future. Santa Clara County, Santa Cruz County, and San Benito County, Calif., are not resting on the laurels of the past. With confidence, they are looking toward a future which we all feel can be described in two words: "Opportunities unlimited."

Constitution for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, on April 24 last, the people of Alaska had before them in the primary election the proposition of adopting or rejecting the constitution for the proposed State of Alaska written during 75 days last winter at the constitutional convention held at the University of Alaska. That proposition was overwhelmingly adopted and in that connection, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have reproduced here an editorial appearing in the April 26 issue of the Washington Daily News:

ALASKA COMES OF AGE

Those who have had their doubts that the Territory of Alaska has achieved political maturity and is ready to take its place as a State of the Union need only look at the returns from Tuesday's election.

Turning out in larger numbers than ever, even at a general election, Alaskans ratified a proposed State constitution by margins running as high as 4 to 1 in some precincts, and apparently well over 2 to 1 in the Territory as a whole.

Americans do not lightly vote for higher taxes in these times, and Alaskans already pay every Federal tax residents of the 48 States pay. Yet the Alaskans, like our own ancestors, have signified their willingness to pay the price of self-government.

Statehood, of course, is their only choice. There is not the slightest sentiment in Alaska for political separation from the United States, and virtually none for the bogus commonwealth status advocated by some statehood opponents in Congress.

Alaska is thoroughly American. Indeed, its rapid population growth has been due to a migration wave like that which built the West—vigorous, adventurous young people who are pioneers in the best sense of the word. Their industriousness is building a sound economy to back up our vitally important military outposts in face of Russian threats. Their loyalty has stood every test.

Presidents, Congresses, and Government agencies have been shamefully apathetic toward Alaska. The Territory long has been asking for statehood. But now it is armed with evidence fairminded men will find hard to disregard.

The Administration at Last Seems Ready To Support SUNFED

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Associated Press reports an interview with United States Ambassador to the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge, which is most heartening to those of us who have urged United States support for the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development—SUNFED. Long urged by the Scheyven Committee in reports to the U. N., it was asked for repeatedly but in vain by the representatives of the "have not" nations who comprise the majority of the world's population, now determined to achieve economic development in the shortest possible time.

Ambassador Lodge's statement, spelling out as it does a similar statement made April 10 by Assistant Secretary of State Francis O. Wilcox, seems to mean that the United States is now prepared to support the financing through the United Nations, by grants and loans, of basic development projects, such as harbors, highways, water and sewage systems, irrigation, schools, and hospitals, and so on, which are essential to carry agricultural and industrial development programs beyond the preparatory education and training stages.

As I stated December 15, 1955, in a letter addressed to President Eisenhower:

Without SUNFED, point 4 and other technical assistance programs may turn out to have educated, trained, and improved the health of millions and dressed them up with no place to go to work, either on the land or in industry.

I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of my letter to President Eisenhower under date of December 15, 1955,

and a report from the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 30, 1956. Also, because of their long and steadfast advocacy of SUNFED, I am including here excerpts from the 1955 resolutions adopted by the United Auto Workers as well as the AFL–CIO. These great labor organizations, along with many other national organizations devoted to the support of international economic cooperation, have seen the vital importance of SUNFED as part of the necessary kit of tools for building a durable peace of, by, and for free men.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 14, 1955.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am taking the liberty of writing to you to call to your attention the need for strong support on the part of the United States of the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development (SUNFED), a proposal which has lacked the endorsement of our country and in which the United States has not participated. Members of the U. N. are again being asked to state their position in regard to the proposed special U. N. body and members of the New Jersey Delegation are interested in having the United States give wholehearted support to the early establishment of this very worthwhile organization.

With billions of dollars being appropriated for military security and military aid to other nations, the United States should immediately make known to the world its support of SUNFED as a prime essential for providing more production, more jobs, more purchasing power and higher standards of living for the people of the underdeveloped areas of the world. Without SUNFED, point 4 and other technical assistance programs may turn out to have educated, trained, and improved the health of millions and dressed them up with no place to go to work, either on the land or in industry.

The recent course of Soviet Russia in its relations with other nations make two things abundantly clear. One, we can expect no relaxation of Soviet efforts to achieve their objective of world domination and, two, they are making every effort to win the minds and hearts of the uncommitted people of the world by a whole complex of methods, among the most important of which is economic aid on a large scale. We can, and indeed must, block their efforts in this direction, even as we have thus far succeeded in blocking their attempts at domination through a preponderance of military power.

SUNFED is not a new idea, since last session I joined with other Members of Congress in asking support for the proposal. SUNFED and other multinational programs, by their very nature, cannot be smeared as vehicles for new efforts at colonialism. In fact, as compared with bilaterial proposals being made by Communist traveling salesmen, such programs can fairly be recommended as anticolonial and essential for strengthening and maintaining healthy nationalist movements of liberation, self-determination and self-government.

Therefore, I do feel that it is of the utmost importance that the United States lift its long-standing veto against SUNFED, which is most desired by the so-called "have-not" nations in those areas of the world where the contest between Communist imperialism and Democracy is going to be won or lost in the months and years immediately ahead.

At this time when major administration policy for the coming year is being drafted and approved, I earnestly hope that you will find it possible to recommend United States participation in this program. Such participation by our country would be strong evidence that we stand ready to do our share in fighting communism with adequate measures for military security and, of equal importance, with economic means as well.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 30, 1956]

LODGE ASKS AID THROUGH U. N.

(By Rex Harrelson)

UNITED NATIONS, N. Y., April 29.—Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., said today the present world situation requires the United States to channel a larger share of its foreign aid through the United Nations.

In meeting the challenge of the new Soviet competition, he said, such a move would offer "some real advantages over a program sponsored by the United States alone."

"Multilateral aid," Lodge added, "offers a way to prevent the so-called auction which some are trying to promote between the United States and the U. S. S. R. as to which will spend the most in an underdeveloped country."

The chief United States delegate outlined his views when asked about the current reappraisal of the foreign aid program now under way in Washington. His statement was the strongest indication to date that the Eisenhower administration might divert substantial amounts of economic aid through the U. N.

UNITED STATES CHIEF SUPPORTER

It had been known, however, the administration was concerned both by the stepped-up program of Communist economic aid and by increasing criticism of the United States bilateral aid program.

Asian leaders have been pressing for a new emphasis on multilateral programs, particularly those of the U. N. technical-assistance program and the proposed special U. N. Fund for Economic Development.

Up to now the United States, although the major supporter of the U. N. aid program, has channeled only a tiny segment of its foreign aid through this medium. Russia has given little more than token contributions.

The United States, for example, gave $15.5 million toward the 1956 U. N. technical-assistance program in comparison with $153 million spent on its bilateral point 4 program. Russia contributed nothing to the program until 1953 and has since given only about $1 million a year.

BID TO RUSSIA TOO

Lodge's statement was a bid for Russia, as well as the United States, to join in pooling more of their aid under U. N. supervision. He expressed the belief the proposed move would offer special benefits to the recipient countries.

One advantage, he said, is that a sound multilateral program would provide "no cover for engaging in political penetration, which is what the Communists do and which we are unjustly suspected of wanting to do."

Lodge suggested that U. N. technicians, sent into the underdeveloped countries, might be given special uniforms which would make it difficult for them to engage in "surreptitious political activity."

The Russians have supplied few technicians under the U. N. program. In 1955, for example, out of 564 experts supplied by the U. N. only 5 were Russian. The United States supplied 95 and Britain 84.

Lodge said the United States should maintain both bilateral and multilateral programs.

POINTS TO WORLD STATUS

"But," he added, "the present world situation is one which requires our giving new emphasis to multilateral programs. We can do this without any additional expense by diverting a percentage of our foreign aid funds to multilateral channels."

Allocation of substantial increases to the U. N. would raise several questions in Washington and in the world organization.

In the past, the United States has insisted on a matching arrangement under which it would contribute no more than 53 percent of the total technical assistance. A question, therefore, would be whether the United States would raise or abandon this ceiling in the event other countries would match larger United States contributions.

Another would be whether the United States would drop its opposition to the U. N. Special Development Fund and start it off with a substantial contribution. Refusal of countries like the United States and Britain to support the fund has been responsible for the long delay in its establishment.

FROM UAW INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS RESOLUTION ADOPTED APRIL 1, 1955, CLEVELAND, OHIO

It should be abundantly clear that our chances of avoiding atomic war, or, if such war should come, our chances of winning it, will depend upon the kind of leadership which the free world is able to provide to the millions of people who are at this moment in open revolt against hunger and oppression. We must make obvious by deeds and action that there is a democratic alternative to the false hopes held out by Communism. We must establish again by deeds and action our faith and our belief in the right of all people to win freedom from despotism, whether it be imposed by other nations which bind them to colonial status or by foreign corporations which extract their wealth without just compensation or by their own ruling classes which monopolize their land and exploit their workers. To the struggling people of the Middle East, Africa and Asia, we must demonstrate that we are on their side in support of their aspirations for genuine political and national independence.

Representatives of 30 Asian and African nations will soon gather in Bandung, Indonesia, to consider these vital matters. We urge the President of the United States and the Congress to continue and expand our technical and economic aid directly and through the United Nations to the underdeveloped and uncommitted countries of the world. Such concrete action will be fresh proof that the American people do not look upon these peoples as merely forces against Communist imperialism but that we have a deep and genuine concern with their well-being.

We strongly urge Congress to approve and provide the $80 million for the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development (SUNFED) in order to further demonstrate the deep concern of the people of America to take immediate and practical steps toward world peace.

FROM AFL–CIO 1955 CONVENTION RESOLUTION ON FOREIGN POLICY ADOPTED DECEMBER 7, 1955

Resolved, conscious of our responsibilities at this crucial period, the AFL–CIO herewith declare their support of the following guiding principles for an effective American democratic foreign policy and sound international labor relations:

1. Effective foreign policy cannot be improvised and piecemeal. It must have a clear and definite orientation and be consistent, sustained, and vigorous in its application. Its motivating and paramount aims must be the mobilization of all our moral and material resources for developing a system of international relationships to maintain peace, protect freedom and national security, and enable a growing population to enjoy a rising standard of living.

2. Integration of our foreign political and economic policies is essential, if the great technical resources and mighty industrial potential of the United States are to be geared to increasing the productivity, raising the purchasing power, and improving the living standards especially of those economically underdeveloped countries which are devoted to human liberty and peace.

3. Undeveloped and underdeveloped continents and regions where many hundreds of millions nurse their grievances and their hopes constitute a fertile field for Communist operations. In dealing with rudimentary human problems the world over, we must be concerned primarily with two immediate needs—the need for food, health, and irrigation in the underdeveloped countries and the burning desire for independence and equality. By ministering to such fundamental needs we will be on firmer ground as we seek to win new adherents to the free world.

4. We know that communism is a false solution; we believe that democracy is the true solution. Communism is weakened when democracy is strengthened. The representatives of democracy must go out into the underdeveloped regions with specific plans, programs, and projects to help raise living standards, for helping to end all colonialism, for winning these peoples as equal members of the free-world community. Thus, we will make it possible for them to have a stake in the defense of a civilization worth defending.

5. Our country has done some of this. UNRRA was a beginning. American labor supported the Marshall plan because it was conceived and largely administered in this spirit. Point 4 was an imaginative gesture in the same direction, but tragically all too little. Toward the same end, the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development (SUNFED) provides real possibilities for developing and expanding worthy projects for the fundamental improvement of the economic conditions of the needy peoples. Our responsibilities include, but are not limited to, a firm and effective military defense of established positions against Communist subversion and aggression. Positive measures for social and economic betterment are an indispensable part of the program for the defense and victory of the free world.

This Science Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Members of the House will be interested in excerpts from a speech delivered by Dr. Louis T. Benezet, President of Colorado College, before the district Rotary convention in Colorado Springs, Colo., on April 23, 1956. Dr. Benezet calls attention to the importance of science teaching in our schools and colleges, and the necessity for developing the scientific talents of our new graduates. I take pleasure in presenting this fine address by Dr. Benezet:

THIS SCIENCE BUSINESS

It is wonderful to live in this comfortable world that science has created for us. Yet the reaction, I am afraid, has set in in the schools to the extent that some students now come seeking that education too be made as comfortable as the comforts in their homes. This has produced a strange paradox. Material blessings in America were made possible by men over the past 100 years who penetrated the mysteries of science. To the comforts that science has provided that day's generation has become so imbued by the comforts that science has provided that more and more students are refusing to study science in college—because it's not a comfortable subject to take. Our life has been made easy by electronics; it even opens doors for us. The fundamentals of electronics come from mathematics. Mathematics is an abstract science and rough going; so, why take mathematics? You can get a good job without it.

What I am trying to say, in other words, is that this universal standard of a comfortable life we have invented for ourselves—which by the daily practice of our life we have stamped as holy—has now invaded the school curriculum; and you blame the schools because this is so. The result is that students in greater numbers come seeking careers in the processing of men and materials for some commercial gain, rather than careers dealing with the origins of knowledge. The course is easier and the career pays better.

Another great part of our trouble with science comes from a very stark fact. That fact is, we no longer have high-school science teachers. The number of teachers available for high-school physics, chemistry, and mthematics has dropped over 50 percent in 5 years—this, in the most highly advanced technical Nation in the world.

In the State of Oklahoma in the past year 31 high schools eliminated mathematics and physics altogether from the curriculum. The reason: they could not find any teachers to teach the subjects. A national expert has said this is typical throughout the country.

Where are the teachers who used to start our young people toward scientific careers, or at least scientific understanding in the high schools? Why, they are working in industry, where the pay is better and the life freer. And what is industry saying? Why, industry is saying "Where in heaven's name are we going to get enough scientifically trained people next year?"

Educators receive a good deal of finger-wagging about how woolly headed they are in contrast to hardheaded, practical businessmen. Let me give you a description of how hardheaded industry is approaching the problem of too few scientists and technicians. Industry is currently committing an almost perfect example of the man who killed the goose that laid the golden egg. Because it can't get enough young science graduates, it is hiring away the high science teachers; and thereby it guarantees the drying up of future supplies of new scientists. The high school science teacher goes to work in the industrial company. The school superintendent throws up his hands, and drops physics and mathematics from the curriculum. The high school students then go on to college without these subjects ever having crossed their paths. Naturally they do not pursue them in college, lacking the background to do so. We, too, are losing a science professor to industry next year. When they graduate 4 years later, the ranks of science majors are very thin indeed. The placement men from industry then come around and say to the colleges, "What's the matter? You aren't giving us any science majors any more."

We face a crisis in our industries because of the shortage of people to do their technical thinking, and their research for them; yet industry, growing more desperate, moves toward making the situation catastrophic by picking off the high school teachers who might send young scientists their way in 4 or 5 more years. As a result, those who are eligible are being offered ridiculously high starting salaries. I could recite stories of industrial offers and special inducements for these men to come to work for them that would sound almost as princely as what a big university alumni club will do to get itself a winning football team. The techniques are remarkably parallel. The sad thing is, industry knows this is happening; yet little has yet been done to stop the merry-go-round.

Although we may educate just enough scientists to keep our civilization going, we shall find we have produced a tiny race of ruling geniuses surrounded by millions of scientific numskulls. Plato called for a republic ruled by philosopher-kings; but the base of his republic was supplied by slaves. I don't think the situation bodes too well for democracy. It is a dangerous thing to have the elements of power in the hands of a few; and to have the power of science known to few Americans might prove no exception.

We are in a box in this science business. What is the way out?

In the first place, we must lay hold on all the science teachers we have left and make it worth their while to stay. When I say that, I am also asking a better return for the whole teaching profession; for if you have ever tried to run a school, you know you do not pick out a certain type of teacher and elevate his station above the rest.

We must, second, help our science teachers see more clearly the ties between their teaching and the future of society. We should bring them to science institutes—as our college happens to be doing next summer—to let them mingle with top people of research and technolcgy, so that when they return to their schools they can have a better sense of their mission, and a better knowledge of how their subject relates to the rest of the world of science.

Teaching chemistry in high school thus becomes more than memorizing 92 elements, or the properties of potassium, or that H_2S makes rotten eggs. Teaching chemistry can show a boy the vision of a whole new world.

By starting with the conservation of those science teachers left, we can preserve the original producers of scientific thinking in the young. It will be a bare stopgap, for we need many science teachers and as soon as possible. How shall this be done?

The quick answer is a totalitarian answer: require math and science of every student in school and college. It is a bad answer, however, and one due to failure. It will only succeed in producing some very bad scientists, or an engineer who might build a bridge that crumbles beneath you one day. It denies the real facts of differing mental ability—that your boy may have real talent with numbers, problems and space relationships, while my boy simply doesn't have this gift, but is good with words, ideas, and human situations. And it would also crowd out other needed subjects, which we have not had a chance to talk about today.

Rather than requiring science of all students, we should work harder in the schools to bring out genuine science talent earlier and stay with it. To encourage scientifically talented boys and girls toward the fascinating and useful careers that lie ahead, we must firmly ask that industry restrain itself from grabbing the best of them. The best of them should not be industrial technicians or applied researchers, they are needed as pure researchers and teachers. Today teaching has to take what's left; and there isn't getting to be anything left.

In addition to identifying and sticking with young scientific talent in the earlier stages of school, we need to work harder on

general courses of modern science understanding—courses for the majority who will not become scientists. We need to shed some of the frowning mystery of science to the layman.

This calls for courses to present, for instance, the march of new knowledge over the past 100 years: what it has done for man's living, what it can do in the future, and—this may be of more importance than anything else—what science by itself cannot do. Such broad science-understanding courses can help build a climate in the schools that makes it easier for those with science ability to want to push on. Too often in high-school students' minds the word "scientist" is preceded by the adjective "mad," and comes straight out of the TV late show. Another popular illusion is that a boy must have the genius of an Einstein to handle science at all. Good scientists need to be bright, but no brighter than good lawyers, or good business heads, or good ministers.

The German-Polish Boundaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, in his remarks published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 8, 1956, which were called to my attention recently, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE], while criticizing the separate from Germany of territories to the east of the Oder and Neisse Rivers, deals at length with the particular problem of East Prussia. He supports in this connection the views expressed in an attached memorandum of Dr. Richard Sallet, a native of that province. Congressman REECE's conclusion is:

That the Government of the United States as well as the Governments of the United Kingdom and the French Republic, should not leave the shadow of a doubt that East Prussia and the other German provinces east of the Rivers Oder and Neisse are, according to international law, a part of Germany within her boundaries of December 31, 1937, that are today still under wartime Red Polish and Soviet administration. The Government of the United States should seize upon a proper moment to restate the legal position in no uncertain terms.

As a general remark may I remind my colleague that the actual territorial changes between Poland and Germany have taken place as a result of the outcome of World War II. This war was provoked on September 1, 1939, by Hitler's brutal assault on Poland. In violation of international law, large parts of Poland were incorporated to the Reich and the population expelled from there to the so-called General Government, formed out of the remaining parts of the country then under German occupation. An unprecedented reign of terror prevailed throughout the whole war in German-occupied Poland during which over 3½ million people were tortured in concentration camps and executed. Warsaw, the capital of the country, was razed to the ground, private property confiscated, and Polish culture systematically destroyed.

At Potsdam the United States, United Kingdom, and the U. S. S. R. arrived at the decision to place under the administration of the Polish state the territories east of the Oder-Neisse. They recognized at the same time in article XII the right of transfer of the German population to Germany.

In execution of the latter provision the Inter-Allied Control Committee in Berlin accepted, on November 20, 1945, a detailed plan which stipulated in article 1 that the entire German population to be removed from Poland—3½ million persons—should be admitted to the Soviet and British zone of occupation. In article 3 points (a) and (b) it was further stated that 2 million Germans should be directed to the Soviet zone and 1½ million to the British.

Millions of Germans having already left the country at the approach of the Soviet armies, the number of 3½ millions indicated by the Inter-Allied Committee covered practically the majority of those who had so far remained on those territories.

It is therefore evident that a de facto situation has been thus created with the consent of the three major powers.

The final settlement of boundaries at the Peace Conference can therefore be only envisaged as a formal recognition of the existing state of affairs. The more so, as since 1945 those lands have been repopulated by millions of Poles who have contributed through their efforts to the economic postwar reconstruction and industrial development of this territory.

To ask the United States Government—as suggested—for a declaration on German frontiers, based on the status of 1937, seems to be outside the scope of a realistic approach. Such a declaration would in fact alienate the people of Poland and other captive countries while playing in the hands of Communist propaganda.

It would do no good to our international position and be a heavy blow to our prestige.

It seems strange that the case of East Prussia has been chosen to support German revisionistic aims in the United States, as the history of that province was marked by the "Drang nach Osten" policy, one of the main causes of both World Wars.

Another Curtailment of States Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, when a snowball starts rolling down a mountainside, it gathers both speed and momentum as it rolls. The same is true when the United States Supreme Court adopts a policy of curtailing the powers left to the States by the Constitution. The present Supreme Court Justices are speeding up that process.

Last Monday the Supreme Court invaded the police powers of the State of Illinois and declared by a 5 to 4 decision that an Illinois court in a criminal case involving the crime of robbery had failed to comply with a legal technicality in its treatment of the case.

David Lawrence has discussed the incident so well in an article entitled "Extending Federal Police Power," that I include the same as a part of my remarks:

[From the Washington Evening Star of April 27, 1956]

EXTENDING FEDERAL POLICE POWER—NEW MOVES SEEN OPENING WAY FOR UNITED STATES TO ACT IN LOCAL CIVIL RIGHTS CASES

(By David Lawrence)

The day is not far off when the Federal Government will take over some of the important functions of maintaining law and order which hitherto have been considered by the courts to be solely the responsibility of States, counties, and cities. An extension of the Federal police power is underway.

The latest move whereby the House of Representatives is being asked by its Judiciary Committee to pass legislation permitting the Attorney General to bring civil suits to enforce civil rights—if confirmed as constitutional by the Supreme Court in a future case—would mean that Congress could provide criminal penalties, too. In fact, Chairman CELLER of the House Judiciary Committee recently sponsored exactly such a provision which, for reasons of political expediency, was temporarily dropped from the committee's bill on civil rights in favor of one being pressed by the administration.

What it all means is that the new measures, although not aimed at labor unions, will be feared by them—at least by those unions which depend on goons and strong-arm men to overturn a worker's auto at the factory gate and beat him up. For, if the new measures on civil rights are passed and sustained in the courts, it's the opening wedge toward protection of the right to work both by the Federal Government and the States.

Historically, the Constitution has been interpreted as meaning that no State can pass a law abridging the right to vote or the freedom of the press or any of the privileges and immunities of citizens. But up to now this has been construed by the Department of Justice in administration after administration and by the Supreme Court in decision after decision to mean that, unless it can be shown that State enforcement machinery has actually broken down, the Federal police power cannot be lawfully interposed.

Only last Monday, however, the Supreme Court of the United States reached into the procedures of the State of Illinois in a case which didn't involve a Federal crime at all—indeed, it was a local case of robbery—and ruled that the State court hadn't complied with a technicality in procedure. Who is to decide, for instance, whether a stenographic copy of the testimony shall be given free or charged for when a petition for appeal is filed? Up to now, the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois has thought it could handle such a question as a State matter. The Suprime Court of the United States by a 5-to-4 vote this week said the Illinois court was wrong. Justice Harlan of the Supreme Court, in a minority opinion, said:

"As I view this case, it contains none of the elements hitherto regarded as essential to justify action by this Court under the 14th amendment. In truth, what we have here is but the failure of Illinois to adopt as promptly as other States a desirable reform in its criminal procedure. * * * I think it is beyond the province of this Court to tell Illinois that it must provide such procedures."

Thus, the trend is toward Federal usurpation of police power, while complete control of State court procedures by the Supreme Court of the United States, even to the minutest detail, passes from the States to the Federal Government.

The Constitution now, in other words, is what the Department of Justice and the Supreme Court together may say it is. The Constitution heretofore has been construed by the Supreme Court to mean that no State can make any law abriding the right to vote on account of race or color, and that no State may fail to guarantee the right of the citizen to "life, liberty, and property." But up to now the Department of Justice has not intervened to punish murder on the picket line or in racial troubles unless there was evidence of a breakdown of the enforcement machinery of the State itself.

Recently—in 1953—the labor unions closed down several newspapers in New York. The unions acted in concert and some of them ignored their contract obligations to work. They accomplished together by conspiracy the denial of a constitutional right. They abridged freedom of the press. But the Department of Justice held this was a State matter. Likewise, in case after case of violence at the factory gate, the Department of Justice has not intervened, even though unions do act in concert and carry on their activities as organizations sanctioned by Federal law.

With the new proposals that look into "economic pressure," on the other hand, the Attorney General would be given the power to enforce civil rights instead of leaving it to aggrieved citizens to bring suits. It would be a short step then to Federal intervention and the enactment of criminal penalties to deal with labor-union violence and coercion and intimidation and labor-union elections and membership activities.

Maybe on balance the gain for the country on the "right to work" side for many millions of white and Negro workers would, in the long run, far outweigh the disadvantages to a few States in the South which have, by one means or another, discouraged Negroes from voting. So far as these State laws on qualifications for voting are concerned, the record is clear—they apply to both whites and Negroes. But in enforcement there is a question. The new civil-rights measures, therefore, if passed, would permit the Department of Justice to look into pressures behind all State laws affecting individual rights. It would be a far-reaching change.

Farm Problem Is Now Political

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave and revise and extend my remarks I am calling attention to the excellent editorial, entitled "Farm Problem Is Now Political," which appeared in the Gibson City Courier of last week. This is an outstanding weekly newspaper in my district.

I think the editorial explains exactly what has taken place in connection with farm problem. It expresses what I have expressed many times; and I frankly think that our farmers resent the fact that politics has played a major role in dealing with their difficulties, with the result that there has been undue delay and failure thus far to enact constructive legislation.

No sound solution to the farm problem will ever be found unless it be treated solely as an economic question, without regard for any political considerations and possible consequences.

The editorial follows:

FARM PROBLEM IS NOW POLITICAL

Democratic leaders in Congress have done what they set out to do. They have made the farm problem a political football. They did this, not because a vast majority of them believed in 90-percent rigid supports, but because they wanted to get President Eisenhower down in the political arena with them. No President since George Washington has been able to remain as aloof from politics as Mr. Eisenhower. This has caused frustration among the Democratic politicians who have been unable to attack him directly. They have tried to attack his administration as a "big business" one, and have without any success whatever attacked his handling of foreign affairs. They had to sink to attacking his ability to physically serve, and that met with little response from voters.

As a result they maneuvered him into a position where he had to veto the farm bill. They have attacked him personally as one who is without feeling for the welfare of the farmers. They intend to make this an issue in the campaign, really the only strictly political issue they have. The sad part of it is that the farm question should not be political.

President Eisenhower could easily have allowed the farm bill to become a law either with or without his signature, telling the people that while it was not up to the standards he set, he would attempt next year to secure a better bill. That would have been the smart thing to do, according to many politicians.

The President, however, does not always accept the easy way. He places principle above expediency. He is in the habit of doing what he thinks is right, and did not change his practice.

Many farmers and farm leaders believe the President acted wisely when he vetoed the farm bill. Charles Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, former president of the Illinois Agricultural Association, and himself a Democrat, was satisfied with the veto, saying, "The President's veto was obviously based on sound economic facts and not on expedient political considerations. He will be applauded by most farmers of the Nation. His veto has given Congress another opportunity at this session to adopt sound farm legislation."

On the other hand, the large number of farmers who believed the farm bill would help solve their problems will not take kindly to the veto. The Farmers Union has declared that the veto leaves that organization with no other course than to fight against the reelection of President Eisenhower next November.

Mr. Shuman believes the President will gain in stature "because most farmers, even if they wish high supports, will respect the President's integrity in vetoing the bill."

P. O. Wilson, secretary-manager of the National Livestock Producers, made a statement along the same lines, hailing the President's courage in vetoing the farm bill and added that the bee is now on Congress.

Mr. Eisenhower did not meekly send the bill back to Congress with a veto attached. He went before the American people, speaking particularly to farmers. He told them it was a bad bill, and one which would do harm to agriculture in the long run. There are many farmers who honestly disagreed. Even if they are wrong and the President is right, they will blame him for not signing the farm bill which the Democrats maintained would bring relief to hard-pressed farmers.

Mr. Eisenhower immediately raised supports on major crops, telling his radio and television audience that this act would put a half billion dollars into farmers' pockets. Then he asked that Congress pass at once his soil-bank plan, and called upon the lawmakers to provide for advance payments of another half billion dollars. These two acts would place a billion dollars in farm accounts.

Furthermore, the President let Congress know that he would call a special session following the political conventions, in the event Congress failed before adjournment to pass the soil-bank plan.

This was a fighting Eisenhower, willing to meet his opponents at their own game, while still maintaining his personal integrity. He will fight the Democratic politicians for the good will of American farmers, and in his down-to-earth, friendly, man-to-man style he started his campaign with the speech directed to farmers.

A lesser man might have been willing to send his veto, and depend upon the support of independents and city people to uphold him. Not the President. He thinks he is right. He is not one to run from a fight.

The President knows, as does everyone else, that the Democrats in Congress are using the farm issue as a political football. He has put Congress on the well-known spot. Congress has approved his soil bank plan, but the Democrats told the President he would have to accept everything else in the bill if he got the soil bank program.

Now, Mr. Eisenhower says in effect, "If you Congressmen want to help agriculture, pass the soil bank plan. We all can agree on that. It will at least be a start."

President Eisenhower has given evidence that he realizes, as much as do his opponents, that the political campaign for the Presidency is underway. While the Democrats did manage to get the President into the political arena where they can criticize him, he has also managed to put them in the light of refusing to pass a type of farm legislation, the soil bank, upon which all can agree. He can go to the country on his position.

The Democrats in Congress were prepared, if he had signed the farm bill, to charge the President with playing politics, substituting a desire to please people for his principles. They thought they had Mr. Eisenhower either way. If he signed, he was a demagogue; if he vetoed, he was against the farmer.

Instead, Mr. Eisenhower has emerged ahead. Even if he should lose the votes of 200,000 farmers in Illinois, which of course is very doubtful, he will have strengthened his position with independents and with the country as a whole. He carried Illinois by nearly half a million votes in 1952.

The politicians are dealing with a man whom they do not understand too well, for he is forthright and honest.

Communist Campaign for Repatriation of Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, one of the problems confronting the

Western World today is that of the Communist campaign for repatriation of refugees. Although this campaign has not been very effective to date, there is a danger that it could so become unless we take proper effective steps to counteract it.

The Assembly of Captive Nations in New York has recently issued a memorandum on this subject, which I believe to have very valuable suggestions and proposals. I therefore attach it hereto and commend it to my colleagues for study and consideration:

MEMORANDUM ON THE PROBLEM OF REFUGEES FROM THE CAPTIVE EUROPEAN NATIONS

In their statements before the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the USSR, the Soviet rulers have made it abundantly clear that they now expect to conquer the world without war. Their confidence in the achievement of this goal without a major holocaust was obviously based on their belief that the free world will allow itself to be morally disarmed. This is to be brought about, on the one hand, by allaying the fear and distrust felt by the free world toward the Communist system and, on the other hand, by promoting everywhere a "healthy respect" for the Communist military might.

To deceive the free world on the true nature of the Communist system, Moscow has confronted the world with several major moves:

1. The spectacular condemnation of one-man dictatorship and the equally insistent affirmation of the principle of collective leadership—both calculated to suggest that the Soviet Union is now evolving toward a normal form of government.

2. The revival of popular front tactics, implying that the triumph of communism might be achieved not only by way of violence and revolution, but also by the use of normal parliamentary procedures.

3. A pledge for the introduction of a 5-day working week and a raise in wages both intended to indicate that the benefits enjoyed by labor in the free enterprise system will also become available in the Communist world.

The statement made by Marshall Zhukov at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party in Moscow, to the effect that the whole area of the United States can be devastated by Soviet hydrogen bombs and guided missiles was destined to instill terror and fear in the hearts of all men in the free world.

The Communist campaign for the repatriation of refugees forms another part of the Soviet plan for moral disarmament of the free world. Its aim is to demonstrate to the free world that the new social system installed in the "people's democracies" exerts an irresistible attraction upon the political exiles from the captive European nations; that the latter have themselves given up hope in any change in the status quo; that the refugees themselves disavow and repudiate their own campaign against the Communist system and are ready to accommodate themselves to unalterable facts.

The use of all these psychological weapons should induce—in the view of the Communists—the average United States citizen to raise the question whether the Communist system is not approaching gradually the democratic one; and, if so, whether it is worthwhile to defend freedom at the risk of a war which would destroy civilization itself.

AIMS AND MEANS OF THE COMMUNIST CAMPAIGN FOR THE REPATRIATION OF REFUGEES

It is obvious that the campaign for the repatriation of refugees aims at lulling to sleep the conscience of the free world. The exiles and refugees from the captive European nations constitute strong anti-Communist centers in the free world. They are the best source of information on Communist practices, as most of them witnessed the workings of the Communist regime. They have unmasked the hidden aims of the Communist program worked out in Moscow, and thus, hinder the moral disarmament of the free world.

Moscow is intent upon stopping these activities of the exiles by inducing them to return home. The Soviets hold the political exiles and refugees responsible for the proclamation of the United States policy of liberation. They are credited with having influenced the respective ethnic groups who—in turn—are supposed to exert effective pressure upon the United States administration. The Soviets hope that once the exiles return to their homelands, the policy of liberation will be abandoned and forgotten.

On the other hand, the Communists hope that the return of refugees, especially of outstanding political and military leaders, scientists, writers, poets, artists and other intellectuals whom they may lure with special bait, will convince the subjugated nations of the futility of any hope for liberation. Should the exile leaders return home, this would prove that they have lost faith in the help promised by the West for the liberation of their nations. This would make it easier for the Communist regimes to break the resistance of the subjugated nations and to dominate them.

In order to induce the exiles to return home, the Soviets and their satellite Communist regimes have established special organizations for the purpose of establishing contacts with the exiles. Separate radio stations have been set up behind the Iron Curtain calling the refugees home. Thousands of brochures and propaganda leaflets are sent out to the exiles for the purpose of influencing them. Their families living in the captive countries are forced to write letters to their relatives living abroad urging them to return. They are even granted facilities to make phone calls, for instance from Poland to Great Britain at the expense of the Communist regime, to talk to their relatives to this effect. In some cases, exiles were even invited to come back for a short visit, their free return passage being guaranteed by the State. Last but not least, the Communist agents personally approached some of the exiles, making lucrative proposals in case they decide to return.

HOW TO COUNTERACT THE COMMUNIST CAMPAIGN FOR REPATRIATION OF REFUGEES

The free world is thus confronted with the need to counteract the Soviet plan by measures designed to render ineffective the repatriation campaign.

It should be understood that it is not the Communist propaganda which may influence some of the exiles to return home, but—the unfavorable conditions in which they are living in certain parts of the free world. A reappraisal of the free world's attitude toward the exiles would be necessary. The latter should be given the opportunity, denied them so far, to take full part in the fight against communism. To this effect, the following measures would seem to promise the best results:

(*a*) *Legal measures*

1. United States immigration laws should be liberalized to admit immigrants from territories where insecurity, lack of work, camp life, create ideal breeding ground for Communist propaganda. About 414,000 refugees are still under the care of the U. N. High Commissioner for Refugees, of whom about 65,000 still live in camps.

2. Better possibilities should be created for those who are eligible under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 to come to the United States, and the expiration date of the RRA, set for December 31, 1956, should be extended so as to give all refugees who so desire the possibility to immigrate into the United States.

3. The exiles and refugees, especially recent refugees, should be given in the countries of their residence all the necessary social and legal aid.

(*b*) *Social and economic measures*

1. Special facilities should be made available in order to enable each refugee to find work suited to his skills and capabilities.

2. Special training should be organized for those refugees who cannot practice their old profession, and have not acquired a new one.

3. For those who are unable to work because of age or infirmity, suitable homes should be set up, and medical and other necessary care provided.

4. Fellowships, grants-in-aids or loans should be given to those who interrupted their studies or professional training, in order to enable them to continue and finish their studies, and thus, help them to return to their chosen profession. Easy credit terms should be extended to farmers from central eastern Europe to enable them to settle on farms.

5. The incurably ill should be properly cared for and admitted to suitable free countries, including the United States.

6. War veterans from the captive European countries should be made eligible for the benefits accorded to American veterans.

7. Charitable institutions, such as homes for orphans, etc., organized by or for the refugees and exiles in the free world, should get all necessary support.

(*c*) *Cultural measures*

1. The cultural heritage of the captive European nations should be preserved by promoting the establishment of institutes of creative work for exile scientists, writers, artists, and other intellectuals. Existing institutions should be assisted to continue and expand their work. They should be enabled to engage in publishing activities, in assisting writers, artists and other intellectuals to continue their work, to have their books published, pictures exhibited, etc.

2. Subsidies should be provided for existing refugee cultural organizations, scientific institutes, libraries, higher and lower schools, theaters, summer camps for children and other similar institutions.

3. It should be made possible for the children of refugees to learn the language and history of their nation and to grant them scholarships so that they would not be tempted by scholarship offers from the Communists.

(*d*) *Political measures*

The full mobilization of all available forces for the fight against the Moscow plan of peaceful world conquest requires the full participation of refugees and exiles in this fight. To this effect, the following further measures could be usefully adopted.

1. Raising the problem of peaceful liberation of the countries behind the Iron Curtain to the level of a foremost international question, and keeping it on the agenda of all international conferences.

2. Recognizing the political representations of the exiles, if not formally, then as de facto national representations, in order to enable them to carry on and further develop their activities.

Nixon Adds to Strength of GOP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following edi-

torial from the San Diego Union of Saturday morning, April 28, 1956:

VICE PRESIDENT'S DECISION—NIXON ADDS TO STRENGTH OF GOP

The Republican Party welcomes Vice President NIXON'S decision to seek renomination.

Although the Republican National Convention is 4 months away, Mr. NIXON'S decision, which was given a hearty second by President Eisenhower, makes it certain that voters again will have the opportunity to cast their ballots for the leadership combination which returned good government to Washington.

This will be a new crusade led by a President and Vice President who can campaign not only on the basis of what they hope to do but on what they have accomplished in the past 3½ years.

President Eisenhower will remain close to Washington most of the time during the election, limiting his travels to eight plane trips to regional points. He does not believe a President should go barnstorming across the country.

Mr. NIXON thus will carry the Republican crusade to the grassroots, a factor which will be important in the Republican effort to recapture control of Congress.

In 1954 he carried the brunt of the GOP national campaign. His capable presentation of the issues was credited with saving the GOP from more than mild defeat in off-year elections which normally would have been a strong swing to the opposition.

During the 1956 campaign, vice presidential candidates will be subject to close public scrutiny.

Although Mr. NIXON is not without critics, it is well to remember that most of the attacks against him stem from partisan opposition which recognizes him as an able and strong opponent. Even the Vice President's most partisan opponents seldom have questioned his ability in office.

RICHARD NIXON has proved to be a capable diplomat, a strong presidential advisor and a leader described by Mr. Eisenhower as the best-informed Vice President in history. He is an asset to the Eisenhower crusade and, more important, to the Nation. He put into words the other day what the administration has meant to the American people.

"We (the administration) decided to give the free American economic system a chance to work," he said. "We removed controls from the economy, we got the Government out of business rather than putting it in, we cut spending, we cut taxes, and we adopted fiscal policies designed to encourage the initiative, the dynamism, and the ingenuity of the American people."

The results, he said, are the good times we enjoy today.

Service Careerists Need Incentives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union of Thursday, April 19, 1956:

PLUGGING THE HOLE—SERVICE CAREERISTS NEED INCENTIVES

President Eisenhower's urging of Congress last week to increase incentives for Americans to choose military careers reflects a fundamental fact: We need first-rate men to man a first-rate military establishment.

Despite several notable improvements instituted during the Eisenhower Republican administration, there is still considerable loss of superior officers and men from the services to civilian life. The inducements of a long-term military service still are not on a par with those of comparable careers outside.

The President defined the problem: "Only when we have created a career military service which can compete with the attractive opportunities available in civilian pursuits will we be able to stop the wasteful losses from the armed service and attract individuals to those services."

How large are these wasteful losses?

Rembert James, military editor of the San Diego Union and Copley News Services, inventoried the losses in a series of articles for this newspaper in 1954. He pointed out that the taxpayers may have as much as $10,000 invested in the training of technical specialists but that close to 90 percent of them were leaving the service after fulfilling their selective service obligations.

One of his most disturbing findings was that only 19 percent of the United States Strategic Air Command were military careerists. With 4 out of 5 men reservists, the outfit assigned the major responsibility for any retaliatory mission must constantly train new men to take the places of those who leave for greener pastures.

Since the time that Mr. James made his survey, the dangerous trends which he described have been partially arrested. Service pay and allowances have been increased. Enlistment bonuses have been enlarged, particularly for men early in their careers. Fringe benefits, whittled away during the Truman administration, have been partially restored and established as part of service compensation.

But as the President pointed out, more must be done. Servicemen living in substandard military housing should not be forced to pay all of their housing allowance. Servicemen's widows should have adequate survivor benefits. Military dependents should have access to Government-sponsored medical care wherever they are. Other injustices and inequities should be corrected.

The career military man does not pursue his hazardous profession because he seeks great riches. But such a man cannot be expected to expose his wife and children to hardships and uncertainties.

When the civilion-service equation is put in better balance, there will no longer be any doubt about having enough first-class men for a first-class military service.

The Richmond County Medical Society's Plan for the Control of Narcotic Addiction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include therein the article entitled "The Richmond County Medical Society's Plan for the Control of Narcotic Addiction," by Herbert Berger, M. D., F. A. C. P., Staten Island, N. Y.:

THE RICHMOND COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETY'S PLAN FOR THE CONTROL OF NARCOTIC ADDICTION

(By Herbert Berker, M. D., F. A. C. P.)

In January 1953 the Medical Society of the County of Richmond in New York after considerable study passed the following resolution:

"1. Whereas the medical professional in its traditional role as guardian of the public health has been distressed by the narcotic problem and its apparent increase; and

"2. Whereas the average user of narcotics must spend from $15 to $100 per day to keep himself supplied with drugs; and

"3. Whereas the crime in drug addiction stems from the inability of persons of moderate means to purchase drugs at present illegal prices; and

"4. Whereas the most serious of these crimes is the conversion of each addict into a salesman with consequent formation of new addicts; and

"5. Whereas the use of morphine and heroin in themselves do not incite these unfortunate people to crime, as both drugs are depressants; and

"6. Whereas the narcotics trade exists only because of the huge profits involved (for example, 2 pounds of heroin can be bought for $10 in China and sold after cutting and packaging for $80,000 or more): Then, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Medical Society of the County of Richmond favors the legalizing of the distribution of narcotics free of charge with proper safeguards, hereinafter to wit:

"1. Establish narcotics clinics in all cities as the need appears under the aegis of the United States Public Health Service.

"2. Register and fingerprint all who apply to prevent reregistering in other clinics.

"3. Do not demand that they be enforcibly confined, as they are now.

"4. Determine the smallest amount of pure drug that will relieve the patient of his symptoms.

"5. Administer this uncut material by the doctor or under his supervision and under sterile precautions.

"6. Keep accurate records of dosages.

"7. No supply ever to be given to the addict, dosage to be given only at the clinic.

"8. Nominal charge for the actual cost of the drug, possibly 15 to 30 cents.

"9. Make an effort to effect a cure, where possible, using hospitalization if the patient acquiesces."

The passage of this resolution excited the enthusiasm of the public press and has been followed in turn by a not inconsiderable degree of interest among social workers, psychologists, psychiatrists, the clergy, and addicts themselves. Those who are seeking a solution to the problem of juvenile delinquency, as well as a number of organizations devoted to the study of criminology, have seen fit to comment favorably on these suggestions. After appropriate action by the coordinating council of the five counties comprising the city of New York, this resolution was presented to the house of delegates of the Medical Society of the State of New York. It was referred to the council committee on public health and education and studied for an entire year. In May 1954 the house of delegates of our State society passed this resolution and referred it to the American Medical Association. The problem is now before a committee of the American Medical Association. Therefore, it seems proper that the resolution be called to the attention of physicians throughout the United States who may now have an opportunity to understand the background and the thinking that went into the preparation of these thoughts. Similar joint resolutions have been introduced into Congress. If some of the material that follows seems elementary, it is written so only because by Federal

fiat the medical profession has been separated from the care of these sick people, the narcotic addicts. It is quite possible that many physicians have neither seen, recognized, nor treated a person afflicted with addiction.

THE NARCOTIC ADDICT AS A PERSON

There are few people in this enlightened country of ours who are so badly misunderstood and maligned as these unfortunates. Our novelists and some of our less well-informed sources of general information have pictured him as a fiend and a devil, subhuman, and possessed of none of the gentler civilized attributes. Since most physicians are inexperienced with the votaries of opium, even we, who of all people should be aware of this faulty characterization, know little about these individuals. I was utterly amazed to meet a veritable Casper Milquetoast, my first experience with a long-addicted person. Perhaps as this story unfolds the reasons for our lack of authoritative information in this important medical area may become apparent.

There are no individuals who do not at times experience periods of depression or elation. A mature personality recognizes these alterations in his mood as normal. Most of us have learned that blue days are temporary and will ultimately be followed by better ones. We overcome our despair with patience or sometimes by the finding of a new hobby, a vacation, a new job or home, or perhaps a new interest. The narcotic addict, however, cannot tolerate these depressions and valleys in his daily living. He is incapable of using his own native talents for overcoming these unpleasant episodes. He wants to reach and stay at the heights of elation and happiness constantly. This is a perfectly normal, human desire shared by all of us. Our narcotic patient, however, differs in that he seeks to attain this plateau of joy chemically rather than from the use of his own inner strength and convictions. Even this small introduction to a large and involved subject should make it apparent that drug addiction isn't even a disease. It is merely a symptom of one.

What then is wrong with the euphoria that these people seek to achieve endlessly? The fault lies not with the pleasant state of mind which they hope to perpetuate but rather with their lack of insight into themselves and their lack of understanding of reality. A problem deferred with narcotics remains unsolved. It persists tomorrow or the next day so that these individuals, like so many of the rest of us, are procrastinators of the worst sort. Whatever strength of character they may once have possessed is lost as they everlastingly retreat from life and the making of decisions. Without going into this subject to a length interesting only to the serious student of psychiatry, it becomes apparent that these are sick individuals, suffering not from narcotic addiction but from lack of will power and strength of personality. They differ little from those of us who eat too much and hardly at all from the alcoholic who seeks as well to solve life's problems chemically.

THE NATURE OF ADDICTING DRUGS

We physicians have been using narcotics for thousands of years, and we know full well the effect of these medicaments on our patients. They are sedatives, inducing sleep or relieving anxiety. With them our patients may achieve surcease from pain or worry. Their larger problems may become smaller or even insignificant to them. Can the lurid articles in the daily press make us, who have a grounding in pharmacology, believe that narcotics do anything else for an addict? Under the influence of opiates the addict like our other patients becomes relaxed and at ease. He is incapable of violent crime while under the influence of these drugs and cares nothing for sex. He is incapable of sex. Many of them tell me that their entire interest in this subject disappears when they are so sedated. In fact, many of these individuals are better citizens with narcotics than they are without. Please do not interpret this as a suggestion that they be used in the treatment of certain psychogenic states. An observation that those of us who are interested in this subject make, time and time again, is that the individual who has been using these materials as self-treatment for anxiety demonstrates all of his symptoms as he is removed ever further and further from the addicting material. Many calm and quiet individuals who are able to work steadily while using narcotics find themselves becoming antisocial, belligerent, and endlessly difficult without these substances.

This, then, should introduce us to a new concept of these patients because actually every reader of this paper probably has met, and knows now, a narcotic addict who may hold a position of responsibility in his own community extending from bank presidents to doctors to locomotive engineers. These people perform their work perfectly without detection until for some reason they run afoul of the law in their efforts to gratify their habit. Compare our addict, if you will, with a diabetic. The latter is able to lead a normal life as long as he gets all of life's necessities and insulin. The drug addict, similarly, is able to function adequately as long as he receives the same necessities of life that our diabetic needs, but he, in addition, needs not insulin but narcotics.

There are two features which are ascribed to narcotics as though they exhibited these pharmacologic characteristics alone. These drugs produce both tolerance and dependence. By the former we mean that it takes ever increasing doses to produce the same effect. Your self-treated constipated patient tends to use ever larger and larger doses of his favorite laxative in order to produce the same effect on his bowels. Dependence is some characteristic of the nerve cell which demands these materials in order to function properly. Such dependence appears in many other diseases, for example, the use of vitamin B_{12} in the treatment of pernicious anemia.

Let us picture for a moment a potential narcotic addict who has never met a peddler. He might be the antisocial person who throws a stone through the stained glass window of the church to which he does not belong or who sets fire to his school when he has been disciplined therein. Perhaps he is a member of one of our numerous lunatic fringe societies, or he may be found in our jails or in our underworld because some of his antisocial behavior has made him a criminal. Not too long ago such a person came to my attention who, after experiencing many difficulties in adolescence, became a moderate user of narcotics. For the past 45 years he has operated a railroad switch tower at a busy junction. He has been praised by his supervisor as a diligent, conscientious worker who never misses a day and on who he can depend utterly. This individual unfortunately acquired tuberculosis and came to my attention only when he was admitted to a sanitorium, thereby being separated from his usual sources of supply. In summary, then, these materials are used as self-treatment by certain mentally sick individuals. They do not incite the user to violence. In fact, the very opposite is true.

CRIME AND DRUG ADDICTION

If these drugs do not promulgate criminal tendencies, why are crime and narcotic addiction so closely allied in our minds? In the United States the addict is not recognized officially as a psychopath but rather as a criminal. Now this is an entirely man-made situation. We could make our diabetics criminals just as quickly were we to forbid them insulin. Similarly, our experience with prohibition proved to us that we could make criminals out of devotees to alcohol. We recognized this error in our thinking when the 18th amendment was repealed. Now, by the ukase of the Bureau of Narcotics, we have divorced the addict from a legitimate source of drugs. He may not obtain these materials from his physician, nor can be obtain them through his pharmacist. To him they have become a way of life. They are, in his warped reasoning, necessary for his very existence. Therefore, he obtains them through the underworld or by stealth. The peddler, like the bootlegger of the 1920's, was happy to have this artificial opportunity created for him my our legislative efforts.

Narcotics are not very expensive, costing little more than aspirin to produce. There is a rather large tax on these materials, but even so, 20 or 30 cents would supply the daily needs of most addicts. Actually, however, since the price of these materials has been artificially heightened by the nature of their source, many of these people spend from $15 to $100 a day to gratify their addiction. This, then, is the source of crime. How many individuals do any of us know who can spend $100 per day on drugs in addition to all the other expenses of living. It becomes apparent that few could hope to do this by legitimate means. Actually the situation is compounded even further by additional factors. The narcotic addict must keep his illness secret to avoid the censure of his neighbors, so that he can stay out of the clutches of the law. As we have pointed out before, the materials are sedatives so that every capacity which he may have once had for earning large sums has ben lost by this action of narcotics. Therefore, as one addict described the situation, each day is spent in a frequently futile effort to acquire sufficient money to gratify the habit.

The type of crime to which these individuals turn is interesting. Since many of these people are rather meek, their methods of acquiring money are rarely violent. They are shoplifters, policy slip runners, bookies, pilferers, and the like. Murder is a rare crime among them. Females practice prostitution. Married women have been known to sell the furnishings from their homes to obtain moneys which should have been spent for food and other necessities. Many prostitutes have never seen the money their efforts have earned. Instead their procurer or madam pays them in narcotics. This tends to keep them from leaving the house. In some cities of the United States as many as 86 percent of all apprehended prostitutes were narcotic addicts.

Actually these are the least of their crimes. The most serious is the introduction of neophytes to addiction. The narcotic peddler is usually an addict. In New York City he is given 25 percent of all the narcotics he can sell. Therefore, the addict is the largest single cause of the spread of this symptom complex. Who are these initiates? In most instances they are children of high school age who are easily induced to take narcotics as a new adventure. They want desperately to be one of the crowd and intensely fear criticism of being "chicken."

THE MAGNITUDE OF THE PROBLEM

Because the sale and distribution of narcotics is illegal in the United States, we have no accurate figures as to the number of addicts in this country. Actually, we know only of those individuals who run afoul of the law. This amount seems to be increasing. An estimate made in 1918 by a commission appointed by the then Secretary of the Treasury estimated that we had a million addicts. This was about 4 or 5 times the number of sufferers prior to the passage of our first law of control, the Harrison Act. None of the figures from any source, whether it be the Commissioner of Narcotics, our courts of law, the Federal hospitals for the care of narcotic addicts, our prison popula-

tion, or the Bureau of Customs who seize a certain amount of narcotics each year, are accurate. The United Nations estimates that no more than 10 percent of all of the material smuggled into the United States is ever seized. In 1952, 4,000 ounces were so acquired by the Government; and if this were 10 percent of the total, then 40,000 ounces were smuggled into the country, which should be sufficient to supply 180,000 addicts. The number of individuals who have been apprehended for narcotic violations has increased 1,200 percent in the last 7 years. The adoption of our resolution will lead to the acquisition of some accurate information as to the nature of this problem and its magnitude.

THE CAUSE OF OUR PRESENT SITUATION

Most of the narcotics introduced into the United States in the latter part of the 19th century and the first 14 years of the 20th reached this country through Chinese Tongs. A good deal of the material so introduced was powdered crude opium which was smoked in parlors, very much as liquor is consumed in saloons. An occasional non-Chinese member of our community used this substance. Perhaps even larger numbers of individuals had become accustomed to various proprietary medications which were sold across drugstore counters without prescriptions which contained more or less narcotics. Querulous children were treated with nostrums containing paregoric. This was a well-recognized remedy for teething. Women used such substances for the relief of menstrual cramps and discomfort. A great number of apprehensive people used patent medicines containing opiates rather regularly to reduce their nervous tension.

In an effort to cope with this situation which had become a matter for concern in the press of the early 20th century, there was passed the Harrison Stamp Act. The purpose of this piece of legislation was to control the sale of these materials and to tax them. Since that time each vial of narcotics carries a stamp very much like that found on bottles of liquor. It is obvious that the Congress expected that this would be a tax measure because its enforcement was placed in the Treasury Department. The term "narcotic addict" does not even appear in the act. As a result of rulings by the Chief of the Bureau of Narcotics and by subsequent interpretations of these decrees by the Supreme Court, it has become illegal for practicing physicians to administer narcotics to addicts. The legal machinations by which we in medicine were separated from these unfortunates is a story in itself. It has been told very well by Mr. Rufus King [1] recently in the Yale Law Review. Remember the regulations were made by the Bureau and not by Congress.

All of the legislation, Federal, State, and municipal, is punitive in nature. The net result of this type of control has been to make the acquisition of narcotics ever more difficult and consequently ever more expensive. It follows then that each new measure actually incites new crime. In every instance this observation has been borne out. I am sure that those who have profited enormously from the sale of these substances welcome every new legal effort at control. There is no need to question why there are so many who are interested in pushing narcotics. The profits are beyond all realization. Five or ten dollars spent for narcotics in the Orient easily secreted under the shirt of a seaman can be smuggled into this country and sold for over $100,000 after being properly cut, diluted, and peddled. When one considers how impossible it was to prevent the smuggling of alcohol, which is thousands of times more bulky and with a considerably smaller profit involved, one can readily sense the futility of legally controlling narcotic addiction by such means.

Senator Royal S. Copeland, a physician from New York, recognized that many addicts would be left without any legitimate source of supply after the enactment of the Harrison Act. He suggested, therefore, that clinics be made available for these individuals so that they might be able to gratify their needs at small prices without recourse to the underworld. These clinics followed none of the regulatory devices which are suggested in our resolution. Nonetheless, they were attended by thousands of patients throughout the country. They were not well conceived, but they were an attempt in the right direction. They might ultimately have been made to work properly, had they been given the opportunity to correct their own errors. They were closed by a decree from the Bureau following a report by a committee of the American Medical Association in 1919 which suggested that narcotic addiction could best be cured within an institution. While the Bureau of Narcotics acted rapidly on the AMA suggestion, closing the clinics at once, it was not until 1935 before proper, Government-controlled institutions were inaugurated, first at Lexington, Ky., and later in Fort Worth, Tex., in an effort to handle this problem.

At the present time the United States has become a vast game preserve stocked with hundreds of thousands of narcotic addicts, a few of whom can be apprehended at will by our enforcement officers. The apprehension of an occasional smuggler or of some user or peddler (and the latter two terms are frequently synonymous) receives newspaper headlines, and we, who may not be interested in the subject, might then feel that the problem is being solved.

PRESENT METHODS OF TREATMENT OF NARCOTIC ADDICTION

Narcotic addicts who are not convicted of a crime and, therefore, incarcerated in jails may either by their own volition or on recommendation of appropriate penal, social, or medical authorities be recommended for admission to either of the Federal hospitals. Only one of these accepts females. Treatment in these institutions is excellent, there being brought to bear on the problem not only medical but religious, social, and vocational guidance. The treatment is long, from 4 to 12 months, and costs on an average $4,000 per patient.

The relapse rate of these patients is unknown. It is probably extremely high. Authorities in the institutions speak of 69 or 75 percent in various articles. Addicts give us the impression that the relapse rate is practically 100 percent. One addict that I interviewed received his first dose of heroin, after leaving the hospital at Lexington, in Pittsburgh as he changed trains to New York City. It would seem that only 5 percent of these patients stay completely well. If this figure is true, and it is probably quite accurate, then each cure costs the taxpayers of the United States $100,000. We in medicine would never accept so poor a record in the treatment of any disease. It becomes very difficult to say much in favor of a program of therapy with so enormous a rate of failure.

Yet our Government is committed to this utterly untenable policy. Perhaps the degree of ineptitude of our methods can best be exemplified by studying the situation in England where addicts may be treated by their own physicians and where there are reported for the year 1953 311 addicts, and there may be, according to the British authorities, 50 or 75 more in the entire British Isles, an area with a population of 40 million.

There is some light to be found in this picture in that in Detroit, Chicago, and New York City some followup methods are now being utilized. The report of the Provident Hospital under Dr. Walter Adams [2] in Chicago makes excellent reading, and I commend it to those of you who are interested. In New York City where the problem is most acute, particularly in our underprivileged areas, we have some facilities for the hospitalization and followup of juvenile patients, but nothing for adults.

In the therapy of so complex an individual as a narcotic addict, embracing as it does every class of human being, it becomes apparent that some, perhaps many, patients are incurably addicted. For such an individual there remains only three possibilities: (1) Incarcerate him for life, (2) put him to death, or (3) grant him some narcotics legally under proper regulation.

The first of these is too costly and would take many valuable citizens out of circulation. In addition, the addicts themselves would not voluntarily enter hospitals. They rarely go to Lexington or Fort Worth now of their own volition and then it is not to break the habit but to "kick it down" to a price they can afford.

The second has been tried at various times in dictatorships in the Orient. It hasn't worked there, and it is not likely to be enacted in any civilized country like the United States.

The third represents to us the only likely approach.

THE RICHMOND COUNTY PLAN A PRACTICAL REMEDY

The plan which has been described in the original resolution is as simple as it is direct. It embraces really only two steps:

1. Recognize the addict for what he is, a mentally sick person whose prime symptom of illness is addiction.

2. Let us bring to bear on this unfortunate psychopath the whole weight of our great knowledge in medicine, sociology, psychiatry, religion, and humanity so that this sick individual may again be made well and to rehabilitate him so that he can live without narcotics if this can possibly be done. If this is not possible with our present state of knowledge, then let us carry him on narcotics under our control until we learn enough about this subject to effect eventually a permanent cure.

What can we expect from this program?

1. To learn the magnitude of the problem.

2. To stop crimes committed by addicts in order to obtain the price of drugs.

3. To stop the introduction of addiction to new people by the present users who are trying to guarantee their own sources of supply.

4. To prevent death and disaster to those addicted individuals who inject impure, dirty, infected materials into themselves. Many lose their lives from overdosage or from "hot shots" which contain poison. This is the way the underworld disposes of a dangerous addict who has no money to purchase drugs or who informs on the "higher ups."

5. To empty our jails of these noncriminals or those pople who have become criminals only through our own inept legislation.

6. To give us the opportunity to study addiction so that we may eventually discover a real cure for this disease.

Naturally such a program will require careful safeguards:

1. It will demand the establishment of clinics in our larger cities and individual physicians [3] in smaller localities.

2. Narcotics should be administered only at the clinic. The addict will never be given a supply of medications.

---

[1] King, R.: Yale Law Review, 62; 736 (Apr.) 1933.

[2] Adams, W.: Narcotic Drug Addiction and Outpatient Treatment, privately published by the Provident Hospital, 426 East 51st Street, Chicago, Ill.

[3] Howe, H. S.: New York State J. Med. 55: 341 (Feb. 1) 1955.

3. He must be fingerprinted and properly identified, registered, and photographed. Only those who are actually addicts can be treated. These can be readily recognized either by incarcerating them and withdrawing them from the narcotics after strict seclusion or by the administration of narcotic antagonists such as Nalline.

4. Hospitalize those patients who the medical personnel at the clinics feel can best be served by inpatient techniques. These should be individuals who request hospitalization after being so advised by the clinic physicians. They should not be forcibly incarcerated unless their physical or mental condition is so critical as to make them a menace to society.

OBJECTIONS TO THE PLAN

This plan is opposed by the Federal Bureau of Narcotics. I believe these gentlemen to be entirely sincere in their concept of narcotic addiction as a wholly criminal matter. I can only cite in rebuttal the existence of the problem after 40 years of such methods and its apparent growth under this technique. They feel that pride would keep addicts from registering in such clinics, and it is quite true that some might not, but 1,500 registered in the early clinics of 1918 on the first day. At the present time all addicts are cheats since they will do practically anything to secure the drugs they so urgently need. Under our plan some may continue to be dishonest, but that number ought to be a great deal smaller than it is now.

We hear a great deal about the contagious nature of addiction and that clinics, by bringing addicts together, will increase their numbers. Actually the necessity to sell drugs on the part of one addict to another in an effort to guarantee his own sources of supply is the most common cause of the spread of this condition. The disease itself is not contagious. There seems little reason to believe that an individual would continue to steal and commit crimes in order to obtain drugs when they can be obtained free.

Since some individuals use drugs frequently during the course of a day, we hear the objection that it will be inconvenient for them to return to the clinics as often as necessary. Pharmaceutical chemists [4] tell me that any time that the need arises they can prepare a repository narcotic that will have a 24-hour or longer effect.

CONCLUSION

It seems that narcotic addicts, like the rest of us, by normal attrition tend to reach the termination of their span on this earth. By such natural means many of our present incurable addicts will in time disappear. Should the pusher no longer find it necessary to induce our youth to become addicts to gratify his own narcotic needs, then it would seem that time alone under our technique will solve this problem even if we acquire no new information from our experience with these people when we have the opportunity to treat them. In view of the medical profession's extraordinary record of accomplishment in the past with the management of so-called incurable diseases, it seems probable, God willing, that we might find the answer to this one as well.

[4] Merck & Co., Inc., Rahway, N. J.

Development of the Mineral Resources of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Felix Edgar Wormser, before the joint session of the Lead Industries Association and the American Zinc Institute, at St. Louis, April 24, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, FELIX EDGAR WORMSER, BEFORE THE JOINT SESSION OF THE LEAD INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION AND THE AMERICAN ZINC INSTITUTE, ST. LOUIS, MO., APRIL 24, 1956

Three years in Washington serving the Nation in fostering the development of its mineral resources have been a rich but sobering experience. Time will not permit me even to highlight my impressions and observations, but I welcome this opportunity to pass on to you some thoughts which have come to me.

Let me begin by telling you, candidly, that I am proud of the record the present administration has made in the development and management of the country's natural resources since it assumed office. The record in the minerals area, as in other segments of resource development, speaks for itself.

The Bureau of Mines reported recently that last year the dollar value of minerals and mineral fuels produced in the United States broke all records. It was the best year in history, with an output of over $15 billion. Measured by the overall income of the American people—now over $300 billion per year—attractive corporate earnings, a buoyant stock market, and extraordinarily high employment, indeed, measured by almost any test that can be applied to an economy, the result is one in which we can all take pride.

Not everybody has shared in this prosperity. There are business failures every day. And there are many mines that cannot operate profitably even within this generally favorable economic environment. We have yet to devise a system that will ensure satisfactory results for everyone. No collectivists' economy has done it—not even with planned production and a lot of people busy at Government expense. The best they can do is to distribute the burden and make everyone poorer for the effort.

Others may differ with my own analysis of the fundamental prosperity of the mining industry. I observed in a recent report of the Western Governors' Minerals Conference a statement that the condition of domestic mining, with the possible exception of copper, ranges from poor to critical and its future is indeed uncertain. I thought there could be no possible doubt about the copper industry being prosperous with record-breaking prices prevailing, and certainly aluminum, iron and steel, lead and zinc, molybdenum, uranium, sulfur, and many others haven't suffered. They have had excellent years.

There are good reasons why the minerals industries are, by and large, experiencing great prosperity. The most important, I believe, is that this administration has restored the vital element of confidence in business planning—confidence that there will be no unnecessary intervention by the Government in the everyday activities of our citizens—confidence that there will be no effort to impose more controls over industry—confidence that business will no longer be the whipping boy of Government.

One of the greatest apprehensions the businessman has is that reasonable Government regulation, which we have come to accept, will deteriorate into arbitrary and punitive bureaucratic controls.

Perhaps equally important has been the unalterable determination of this administration to improve the international economic and political environment. Europe has been experiencing a boom and its appetite for metals and other minerals has grown to such an extraordinary degree that one can easily become a bit anxious as to how the total world demand for these materials will be supplied. A good illustration is the high demand for copper, even at extraordinarily high prices. The administration is seeking also to improve the purchasing power of underdeveloped countries so that countless millions abroad, some living virtually on the edge of poverty, may look forward to a better day.

These policies are, of course, directed toward the maintenance of peace. War inevitably brings about high prices, but the aftermath generally brings about chaotic conditions. This administration's policy is clear. It will leave no stone unturned in its foreign and domestic policies in the search for peace. War is a disturber of international markets and causes gyrations which plague both consumers and producers.

Under these policies our industrial activity is at an extraordinarily high level and, as I said before, the economies of other nations are similarly moving upward. The prices of metals and other minerals today by historical standards are good and the outlook, to my mind, is equally satisfactory. I cannot become pessimistic about the future of the minerals industries.

It was only 3 years ago, you will recall, that the administration was called upon to give serious thought to the precarious position of the lead and zinc mining industry. Lead was 12 cents and zinc was 9½ per pound. Soon thereafter the Government entered the market to make purchases for the military stockpile. These purchases siphoned off surplus American stocks and helped to bolster the entire world market. At the same time the spectacular growth in the European economy and our own sustained high level of productivity have brought world production and world demand for these commodities into virtual balance.

Those who characterize our domestic lead- and zinc-mining industry as in distress, obviously compare current output with that of the middle twenties when lead production

was over 600,000 tons a year and zinc production exceeded 700,000 tons. They point out that costs have increased far out of proportion to prices received, and they charge, too, that through national policies the domestic mining industries have been sold down the river to foreign interests.

It is true that current domestic mine production of lead is about half of what it was in the twenties, and zinc a little better than two-thirds. Imports have supplied the balance of our needs.

There has, of course, been a great increase in the cost of producing both lead and zinc. Those raw-material industries which have been able to maintain their competitive positions have done so mainly through the development of improved techniques to increase productivity per man per day. The opportunities of making the economies through mass production open to manufacturers will not generally be found in most metal and mineral industries by the very nature of the business. I need not dwell on this aspect of a problem with which most of you have to wrestle every day, for it is one well known to producers.

Needless to state, however, this problem is aggravated by the constantly declining grade of domestic ore. Since the twenties, we have been pushed more and more into a realization that the metal supply of the future will have to be derived from still lower content lead and zinc ores unless some new metal provinces are found containing richer deposits. Significant new discoveries would help. I believe there are still lead deposits to be found in the United States even though it is getting tougher and tougher to find them.

These circumstances place the domestic mining industry in a difficult position. In order to keep its customers, it must avoid undue advances in prices, which indubitably would destroy outlets that have been built up and cultivated over the years. Once lost, markets are difficult to recapture.

With reference to the criticisms of foreign economic policy, I'm sure we all fully realize how dependent American industries are on imports of lead and zinc. The problem of preserving a reasonable balance between imports and domestic production is extremely difficult, particularly during periods of partial mobilization. Sometimes Federal policies during these periods appear to work at cross purposes. During the Korean emergency, for example, Federal policies encouraged expanded production abroad as well as at home. During this period prices abroad were such as to attract considerable quantities of foreign production. At the same time the domestic-mining industry was denied the higher prices prevailing in world markets by the price-control program designed to curb inflation.

Following the Korean episode, demand projections did not fully materialize and we found ourselves with sizable commercial surpluses. These have now been largely removed by Government purchases for the stockpile.

Apparently, the greatest concern of those who feel all is not well with the lead and zinc mining industries is: What is to be done after stockpiling ceases? Everyone admits that Government purchases have provided a substantial support to lead and zinc prices. Ultimately, these purchases must cease. Will the domestic mining industry then require some form of assistance? And, if so, what?

In the belief that when stockpiling is complete, lead and zinc mining will require assistance beyond that offered by the present tariff, leaders in the industry have advocated the enactment of an import tax. They propose that the Congress now place a tax on imports of lead and zinc, in addition to the existing tariff, this tax to take effect only when the price of either commodity should fall below a predetermined level.

This scheme is similar in principle to the import tax on copper—a 2 cents per pound tax which the Congress has temporarily suspended so long as the price stays above 24 cents. It automatically becomes effective once again whenever the price falls below the 24 cents level.

The general principle of giving moderate protection to a domestic industry when it faces injury from falling prices appeals to me. A reasonable import tax, applied to lead and zinc, would help maintain domestic mining operations for both defense and commercial purposes and yet permit all needed imports. It should serve to give the domestic producer a slightly larger price than that of the world markets, and at the same time impose little penalty on the foreign producer selling in the United States markets. It would not, of course, protect the lead and zinc mining industries from major dips that might result from unforeseen changes to which our economy may be subjected, but it would be a much better device for assistance than a subsidy.

This administration recognizes that a strong, vigorous, and efficient domestic mineral industry is essential to the long-term economic development of the United States. What do we mean by a strong, vigorous, and efficient mining industry? To my mind, this means one that is able to stand alone competitively without artificial stimuli from the Government, and by stimuli, I mean devices which would involve dipping into the Treasury of the United States. A tariff or an import tax is a stimulus, to be sure, but it does not invite governmental controls.

Tariff increases, as you all know, have not been popular with this administration. The administration has not, however, favored the removal of tariffs at the expense of American labor standards or a sound domestic economy.

The President did, of course, reject the recommendation of the Tariff Commission 2 years ago that the duties on lead and zinc be increased to offset the injury being experienced by the domestic industry. It is not always recognized that the President, in acting upon a recommendation arising from an escape-clause investigation, must take into account many factors affecting the national interest. Sometimes these involve other segments of the domestic economy, sometimes important strokes in our foreign relations are at issue. There were such factors present when the decision on the lead and zinc escape-clause recommendation had to be made.

While attention has been focused on the President's statement at that time that purchases for the long-term stockpile would be undertaken, little thought has been given to another step which the President indicated he was taking.

"I am directing," he wrote to congressional committees, "the Secretary of Agriculture to initiate action designed to acquire lead and zinc of foreign origin * * * for the supplemental stockpile."

What significance does this action have for the lead and zinc industries?

Perhaps you know that the Commodity Credit Corporation has long had authority to exchange surplus agricultural commodities in its possession for other commodities and to sell the proceeds in the open market. In 1954 the Congress, in an effort to dispose of some of the surplus piling up after the Korean emergency, authorized the sale of 1½ billions of these agricultural surpluses for local currencies abroad. That act, Public Law 480 of the 83d Congress, known as the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, spelled our various ways in which the Government might make use of these foreign currencies.

One of the uses proposed by the Congress for these local currencies is to buy strategic and critical materials. You may ask what is to be done with them after they have been bought. They are to be placed in a supplemental stockpile under the same safeguards applied to the national strategic stockpile.

Public Law 480, in addition to authorizing sales of surpluses for local currencies, emphasized existing barter legislation and directed the Secretary of Agriculture to use every practicable means to export Commodity Credit Corporation commodities through barter.

What is the effect of all this to be? Simply that the Government is embarking upon a program of acquiring critical and strategic materials over and above those needed for military stockpiling and that these acquisitions are to be isolated from commercial markets in the same manner as the military stockpile. They will be frozen. Every effort is being made by the Department of Agriculture, working closely with the Interior Department, to prevent these transactions from creating unfortunate fluctuations in the metals and minerals markets. The important significance to the mineral industries is that these programs to dispose of agricultural commodities can serve to lift surplus stocks of minerals and metals from the international markets, and thus bring about higher prices. International metal and mineral markets are sensitive to shifts in supply and demand, even though such shifts may be created solely by Government intervention in the market place.

You will probably want to know how big an accumulation of strategic and critical materials can be procured. Obviously, with agricultural products worth billions available for disposition, it is easy to see that, theoretically, several hundred million dollars worth of metals and minerals might be obtained through these programs. The President, of course, will have the final determination as to the size of the supplemental stockpiles that may be acquired, but the goals in any event are bound to be high, and purchasing and bartering could go on for years. This will necessarily be a slow process as the very operation of barter, while having a stimulating effect on the metal markets, will have the reverse effect on the international agricultural markets.

From all of this you can gather that we may have here a new and powerful influence in international metal and mineral markets which could prove of material benefit to segments of our domestic mineral economy for some time to come.

While I am on the subject of agriculture, let me take a moment to discuss the Government's relationship to agriculture and to the mineral-producing industries respectively. All of you know that over the years we have followed national policies of supporting the prices of basic farm products, but have not accorded the mineral industries similar treatment. It is not only in the basic policy of price supports, now firmly fastened into law, that agriculture seems to occupy a more favored position. Many agricultural exports, such as wheat, are subsidized, and rigorous controls are established on the imports of numerous agricultural commodities, especially sugar. Indeed, should the mining industry ever become imbued with the idea of international commodity controls, they have the example of sugar before them to see what can be done. My own preference, if an industry must have it, is Government assistance free of control.

Moreover, agriculture is assisted by section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, whereby the President is authorized to impose quotas on the imports of farm products when such imports threaten to render ineffective a domestic price-support program. There are, of course, fundamental differences between the problems of agriculture and those of mining which we need not go into here. Suffice it to say, that through tech-

nology farmers have not only increased their hourly yield per worker, but have materially increased their yield per acre. In contrast, instead of getting more out of an acre of land, as the farmers do, we, in mining, have to take the mineral resources as nature fashioned them, and, as we are keenly aware, they have become leaner and leaner. We are getting less per acre of mineral ground than we did a few years ago.

I know that at times miners have toyed with the idea of using the parity concept to assist them, but, if we were to apply the same parity principle to metals as we do to farm products, we should find that metal prices are considerably higher than any parity formula would provide. Nor do I think that the mining industry would enjoy the Government controls accepted by agriculture. What miner wants to have the Government tell him what to produce, and how, and where to market it? I have an idea that the domestic mining industry would prefer other avenues of Government assistance when conditions warrant some measure of support.

Important in current discussions today is the pending measure in the Congress that would authorize the United States to join the Organization for Trade Cooperation, or OTC as it is popularly known. I am aware that the American Mining Congress and other mining groups have publicly opposed OTC. May I tell you quite frankly that I believe some of the fears expressed about OTC are groundless and stem largely from a misconception of the intent of the legislation and the nature of the organization itself.

Charges have been made that the Executive has gone beyond the authority granted by the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and committed the Government to arrangements under the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade, by which the Congress of the United States has been completely estopped from enacting legislation affecting foreign trade. This is not true. But beginning with this bogeyman, opponents of OTC have proceeded to build it into a supra-national agency with powers of life and death over our foreign trade. Nothing could be farther from reality. The general agreement is a multilateral trade agreement, negotiated under the authority of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. OTC will provide minimum machinery for the agreement, will sponsor multilateral trade negotiations, and will offer a forum for international consultation and the discussion of trade disputes which so often occur when trade agreements come into force. It will have no police power.

The approval of OTC by the Congress would give no additional authority by Congress to approve lower tariffs, and would, by no stretch of the imagination, constitute an abdication by Congress or a delegation of its authority to some international agency. OTC, while expected to stimulate an expansion of world trade, is no subversive movement to bring about free trade. I can well understand how some segments of mining may have been unhappy over some of the tariff concessions made by the United States pursuant to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, particularly by the apparent failure to distinguish between cutting ad valorem rates and cutting specific rates. I believe, however, that anyone who will take the time to study the record prosperity in our great country over the last 3 years, will conclude that a significant factor in this prosperity has been the program of trade liberalization. It is certainly to our own interest to foster international trade, provided, of course, we establish proper safeguards against injury to domestic producers.

OTC is not an international commodity agreement either. I think you know where I stand on the subject of international controls. This administration has made abundantly clear its opposition to international commodity agreements designed to stabilize prices and control production. It may be, of course, that some future administration may be attracted by such agreements, but OTC would not alter in any way the existing authority of governments to enter into or to refuse to enter into commodity agreements, and there certainly is no encouragement in it for the promotion of such economic illusions and pitfalls.

President Eisenhower has strongly urged the creation of OTC. He sees in it an important forum for the interpretation of the American way of business. It is an essential part of his overall program of maintaining the peace, and of sustaining a high level of economic activity in the United States.

OTC represents, I believe, an opportunity to impress the nations of the world that the wonderful achievements of industry in the United States have been made by following competitive business practices. It is an opportunity to encourage other nations to dispense with Government enterprises, rid themselves of cartels, and lift the heavy hand of bureaucratic controls. It is an opportunity to sell capitalism.

I don't know how many of you heard the extemporaneous comments which the President delivered before the recent meeting of the Advertising Council in Washington, D. C. At that time, he made a plea for more attention abroad to the features of our own competitive enterprise economy which has given us such an extraordinary high standard of living. He termed it "free competitive capitalism." I was delighted at this endorsement for so often capitalism has proven to be a smear and a sneer word. In fact, over the last hundred years, capitalism has taken quite a beating while socialism—or communism—has been heralded as the best economic system to increase the fortunes of the masses.

I have spoken much longer than I originally intended. I could go on indefinitely to speak of many problems which cross my desk every day, and which, though they may appear at first to be remote from your direct interest, are of vital importance to the mining industry, but I have spoken enough. I should like to conclude on an optimistic note.

If we continue to be successful in maintaining the peace of the world, and if the energies of people everywhere continue to be expended in improving living standards, I do not believe we shall have to worry much about tariffs, quotas, stockpiling, barter, or subsidies to assist domestic mining industries. My own concern is that inadequate supplies of some of our metals and other minerals may actually retard our progress and that of the free world. We are experiencing the greatest prosperity any nation has ever known. American labor is receiving the highest wages in history. Confidence in the future characterizes most of our business.

I am proud, pardonably so, I hope, to be a member of President Eisenhower's administration to which a measure of credit must be given for some of these accomplishments.

United States Supreme Court Decision in Squire *v.* Capoeman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in the case of Squire versus Capoeman, the United States Supreme Court decided last Monday that Indians are exempt from the Federal capital-gains tax on funds obtained by the sale of standing timber on an individual trust allotment. The majority opinion, written by Chief Justice Warren, concludes with the strong statement that to impose the tax would be "at the least, a sorry breach of faith with these Indians."

The Capoeman decision constitutes a significant victory in the continuing legal battle to stop the elimination of traditional Indian tax exemptions. In holding for the taxpayer, the Court cited both treaty and statutory safeguards over Indian property, and stressed the present-day need to prevent reductions in the direct income of individual Indians from their trust lands. The Court further quoted with approval of the time-honored principle that "Doubtful expressions—in the law—are to be resolved in favor of the weak and defenseless people who are the wards of the Nation, dependent upon its protection and good faith."

Most Members of Congress are familiar with the deplorable poverty on Indian reservations, and with our efforts to raise the living standards of Indians throughout the country. In the Capoeman case, the Supreme Court has recognized and affirmed a national policy laid down by Congress to protect the income of Indians from trust property during the period that the United States remains charged with that trust and with the responsibility to foster Indian welfare.

I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the opinions in the Capoeman case be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the opinions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES—NO. 134—OCTOBER TERM, 1955—CLARK SQUIRE, COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE FOR THE DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON, PETITIONER, *v.* HORTON CAPOEMAN AND EMMA CAPOEMAN, HIS WIFE—ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

APRIL 23, 1956

Mr. Chief Justice Warren delivered the opinion of the Court.

The question presented is whether the proceeds of the sale by the United States Government of standing timber on allotted lands on the Quinaielt Indian Reservation may be made subject to capital gains tax, consistently with applicable treaty and statutory provisions and the Government's role as respondents' trustee and guardian.

When white men first came to the Olympic Peninsula, in what is now the State of Washington, they found the Quinaielt Tribe of Indians and their neighboring allied tribes occupying a tract of country lying between the Coast Range and the Pacific Ocean. This vast tract, with the exception of a small portion reserved for their exclusive use, was ceded by the Quinaielts and their neighbors to the United States in exchange for protection and tutelage by the treaty of July 1, 1855, and January 25, 1856, 12 Statute 971. According to this treaty, the Quinaielts were to have exclusive use of their reservation "and no white man shall be permitted to reside thereon without permission of the tribe." Article II. Years later, Congress passed the General Allotment

Act of 1887.[1] Thereunder, Indians were to be allotted lands on their reservations not to exceed 160 acres of grazing land or 80 acres of agricultural land,[2] and 25 years after allotment the allottees were to receive the lands discharged of the trust under which the United States had theretofore held them, and to obtain a patent "in fee discharged of said trust and free of all charge or incumbrance whatsoever,"[3] though the President might extend the period.[4]

Respondents, husband and wife, were born on the reservation, and are described by the Government as fullblood, noncompetent Quinaielt Indians. They have lived on the reservation all their lives with the exception of the time served by respondent husband in the Armed Forces of the United States during World War II.

Pursuant to the treaty and under the General Allotment Act of 1887, respondent husband was allotted from the treaty-guaranteed reservation 93.25 acres and received a trust patent[5] therefor dated October 1, 1907.[6] During the tax year here in question, the fee title to this land was still held by the United States in trust for him, and was not subject to alienation or encumbrance by him, except with the consent of the United States Government, which consent had never been given. The land was forest land, covered by coniferous trees from 100 years to several hundred years old. It was not adaptable to agricultural purposes, and was of little value after the timber was cut.

In the year 1943, the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the United States Department of the Interior entered into a contract of sale for the standing timber on respondent's allotted land for the total price of $15,080.80. The Government received the sum of $8,418.28 on behalf of respondent in that year.[7]

Upon demand of petitioner, collector of internal revenue for the district of Washington, respondents filed a joint income tax return on October 10, 1947, for the tax year 1943, reporting long-term capital gain from the sale of the timber in that year. Simultaneously, they paid the taxes shown due. Thereafter they filed a timely claim for refund of the taxes paid and contended that the proceeds from the sale of timber from the allotted land were not subject to Federal income taxation because such taxation would be in violation of the provisions of the Quinaielt Treaty, the trust patent, and the General Allotment Act. The claim for refund was denied, and this action was instituted. The district court found that the tax had been unlawfully collected and ordered the refund (110 F. Supp. 924). The court of appeals, agreeing with the district court but recognizing a conflict between this case and the decision of the 10th circuit in the case of *Jones* v. *Taunah* (186 F. 2d 445), affirmed; (220 F. 2d 349). Because of the apparent conflict, we granted certiorari (350 U. S. 816).

The Government urges us to view this case as an ordinary tax case without regard to the treaty, relevant statutes, congressional policy concerning Indians, or the guardian-ward relationship between the United States and these particular Indians. It argues:

"As citizens of the United States they are taxable under the broad provisions of sections 11 and 22 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, which imposes a tax on the net income of every individual, derived from any source whatever. There is no exemption from tax in the Quinaielt Treaty, the General Allotment Act, the taxing statute, or in any other legislation dealing with taxpayers' affairs.

"Even if it be assumed that the United States would be prohibited from imposing a direct tax on the allotted land held in trust for the taxpayers, there would, nevertheless, be no prohibition against a Federal tax on the income derived from the land, since a tax on such income is not the same as a tax on the source of the income, the land."[8]

We agree with the Government that Indians are citizens and that in ordinary affairs of life, not governed by treaties or remedial legislation, they are subject to the payment of income taxes as are other citizens. We also agree that to be valid, exemptions to tax laws should be clearly expressed. But we cannot agree that taxability of petitioners in these circumstances is unaffected by the treaty, the trust patent or the Allotment Act.

The courts below held that imposition of the tax here in question is inconsistent with the Government's promise to transfer the fee "free of all charge or encumbrance whatsoever." Although this statutory provision is not expressly couched in terms of nontaxability, this Court has said that—

"Doubtful expressions are to be resolved in favor of the weak and defenseless people who are the wards of the nation, dependent upon its protection and good faith. Hence, in the words of Chief Justice Marshall, 'The language used in treaties with the Indians should never be construed to their prejudice. If words be made use of, which are susceptible of a more extended meaning than their plain import, as connected with the tenor of the treaty, they should be considered as used only in the latter sense.' *Worcester* v. *The State of Georgia*, 6 Pet. 515, 582." *Carpenter* v. *Shaw*, 280 U. S. 363, 367.

Thus, the general words "charge or incumbrance" might well be sufficient to include taxation. But Congress, in an amendment to the General Allotment Act, gave additional force to respondents' position. Section 6 of that act was amended to include a proviso—

"That the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, and he is authorized, whenever he shall be satisfied that any Indian allottee is competent and capable of managing his or her affairs at any time to cause to be issued to such allottee a patent in fee simple, and thereafter all restrictions as to sale, incumbrance, or taxation of said land shall be removed and said land shall not be liable to the satisfaction of any debt contracted prior to the issuing of such patent."[9]

The Government argues that this amendment was directed solely at permitting State and local taxation after a transfer in fee, but there is no indication in the legislative history of the amendment that it was to be so limited.[10] The fact that this amendment antedated the Federal income tax by 10 years also seems irrelevant. The literal language of the proviso evinces a congressional intent to subject an Indian allotment to all taxes only after a patent in fee is issued to the allottee. This, in turn, implies that, until such times as the patent is issued, the allotment shall be free from all taxes, both those in being and those which might in the future be enacted.[11]

The first opinion of an Attorney General touching on this question seemed to construe the language of the amendment to section 6 as exempting from the income tax income derived from restricted allotments.[12] And even without such a clear statutory basis for exemption, a later Attorney General advised that he was—

"Unable, by implication, to impute to Congress under the broad language of our Internal Revenue Acts an intent to impose a tax for the benefit of the Federal Government on income diriyed from the restricted property of these wards of the Nation; property the management and control of which rests largely in the hands of officers of the Government charged by law with the responsibility and duty of protecting the interests and welfare of these dependent people. In other words, it is not lightly to be assumed that Congress intended to tax the ward for the benefit of the guardian."[13]

Two of these opinions were published as Treasury Decisions.[14] On the basis of these opinions and decisions, and a series of district and circuit court decisions, it was said by Felix S. Cohen, an acknowledged expert in Indian law, that "It is clear that the exemption accorded tribal and restricted Indian lands extends to the income derived directly therefrom."[15] These relatively contemporaneous official and unofficial writings are entitled to consideration. The Government makes much of a subsequent Attorney General's opinion,[16] which expressly overruled an earlier opinion,[17] on the authority of *Superintendent of Five Civilized Tribes* v. *Commission* (295 U. S. 418).

This case is distinguishable from the case at hand. It involved what the Court characterized as "income derived from investment of surplus income from land,"[18] or income on income, which Cohen termed "reinvestment income." The purpose of the allotment system was to protect the Indians' interest and "to prepare the Indians to take their place as independent, qualified members of the modern body politic." *Board of Commissioners* v. *Seber* (318 U. S. 705, 715.) To this end, it is necessary to preserve the trust and income derived directly therefrom, but it is not the necessary to exempt reinvestment income from tax burdens. It is noteworthy that the Superintendent case did not involve an attempt to tax the land "surplus."[19]

The wisdom of the congressional exemption from tax embodied in section 6 of the General Allotment Act is manifested by the facts of the instant case. Respondent's timber constitutes the major value of his allotted land. The Government determines the conditions under which the cutting is made.[20] Once logged off, the land is of little value.[21] The land no longer serves the purpose for which it was by treaty set aside to his ancestors, and for which it was allotted to him. It can no longer be adequate to his needs and serve the purpose of bringing him finally to a state of competency and independence. Unless the proceeds of the timber sale are preserved for respondent, he cannot go forward when declared competent with the necessary chance of economic survival in competition with others. This chance is guaranteed by the tax exemption afforded by the General Allotment Act, and the solemn undertaking in the patent. It is unreasonable to infer that in enacting the income-tax law, Congress intended to limit or undermine the Government's undertaking. To tax respondent under these circumstances would, in the words of the court below, be "at the least, a sorry breach of faith with these Indians."[22]

The judgment of the court of appeals is affirmed.

Mr. Justice Reed, dissenting.

My view is that the sale price of the timber in excess of its market value on March 1, 1913, was a capital gain, subject to Federal income tax. *Jones* v. *Taunah* (186 F. 2d 445), *Cf. Choteau* v. *Burnet* (283 U. S. 691); *Superintendent* v. *Commissioner* (295 U. S. 418). The gain is taxable income like the value of annual crops.

Mr. Justice Harlan took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] 24 Stat. 388, 25 U. S. C. sec. 331 et seq.

[2] 25 U. S. C. sec. 331.

[3] *Id.*, sec. 348.

[4] *Ibid.* The trust period here involved has regularly been extended by Executive Order. See note following 25 U. S. C. sec. 348, and see 25 U. S. C. sec. 462, which provides: "The existing periods of trust placed upon any Indian lands and any restriction on alienation thereof are extended and continued until otherwise directed by Congress."

[5] The term "patent" inadequately describes respondents' interest. "Congress * * * was careful to avoid investing the allottee with the title in the first instance, and directed

Footnotes at end of speech.

that there should be issued to him what * * * is in reality an allotment certificate." *Monson* v. *Simonson* (231 U. S. 345).

[6] In pertinent part, the patent provides:

"Now know ye, That the United States of America, in consideration of the premises, has allotted, and by these presents does allot, into the said Horton Capoeman, the land above described, and hereby declares that it does and will hold the land thus allotted (subject to all statutory provisions and restrictions) for the period of 25 years, in trust for the sole use and benefit of the said Indian, and that at the expiration of said period the United States will convey the same by patent to said Indian, in fee, discharged of said trust and free of all charge or incumbrance whatsoever. * * *."

[7] This sale seems to have followed a pattern generally adopted by the Government in selling timber from Indian allotments. Huge areas of forest are put up for competitive bids by lumber companies. These tracts include the tribal forest lands and individual allotments, with the consent of tribal councils and indiviual aliottees. The successful bidder is required to make an immediate advance payment of a large proportion of the estimated value of the lumber in the tract. Since as much as 640 million board-feet have been sold at one time, this requirement makes it economically infeasible for any but the largest companies to submit bids. The uncertainties of such large-scale operations, which are to be carried on over 25- or 30-year periods, coupled with local quality and accessibility variables, has resulted in substantially lower than prevailing market bids. In some instances, the return to other sellers of comparable timber was 2 or 3 times that received by the Indians. See Transcript of November 28, 1955, Joint Hearing of Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight Function of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and of Subcommittee on Public Works and Resources of the House Committee on Government Operations, 2151-2217, and passim.

[8] Brief for petitioner, pp. 7-8.

[9] 25 U. S. C., sec. 349.

[10] See S. Rept. No. 1998, 59th Cong., 1st sess.; H. R. Rept. No. 1558, 59th Cong., 1st sess.

[11] This provision was relied upon by Chief Judge Phillips, dissenting in *Jones* v. *Taunah* (186 F. 2d, 445, 449).

[12] 34 Op. Atty. Gen. 275, 281 (1924). And see id., 302 (1924).

[13] Id., 439, 445 (1925). This ruling was followed in 35 Op. Atty. Gen. 1 (1925). And cf. id., 107 (1926).

[14] T. D. 3570, III-1 Cum. Bull. 85 (1924); T. D. 3754, IV-2 Cum. Bull. 37 (1925).

[15] Cohen, Handbook of Federal Indian Law, 265. He distinguished cases permitting the imposition of income taxes upon income derived from unrestricted lands, and upon reinvestment income. Id., at 265-266. Mr. Cohen was Chairman of the Department of the Interior Board of Appeals, and Assistant Solicitor for the Department. The handbook has a foreword by Harold L. Ickes, then Secretary of the Interior, and was printed by the United States Government Printing Office.

[16] 39 Op. Atty. Gen. 107 (1937).

[17] 34 id., 439.

[18] 295 U. S., at 421.

[19] The Government also relies upon *Choteau* v. *Burnet* (283 U. S. 691), but that case also is not controlling, since it held only that a competent Indian, who had unrestricted control over lands and income therefrom, was not exempt from income tax solely because of his status as an Indian. Such a tax is specifically authorized by section 6 of the General Allotment Act.

[20] See *United States* v. *Eastman* (118 F. 2d 421).

[21] See 220 F. 2d, at 350. In its answer filed in the District Court, the Government admitted that the lands are generally unsuitable for agricultural purposes (R. 31).

[22] 220 F. 2d 350.

Taxes in Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, it is embarrassing to announce anything detrimental to a Senator's own State. However, we are all anxious to build a stronger America. Taxes are giving Pennsylvania a disadvantage.

I am placing the following articles in the RECORD because to my mind one of the most serious things in the United States today is the increasing cost of government. It should be our aim to cut the cost of government.

From a Federal standpoint, we should be giving constant thought to the reduction of the public debt. I feel that heavy public debt and taxes are more dangerous to our security than are invading armies and bombs.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph of April 26, entitled "Suicidal Taxes," an editorial published in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of April 27, 1956, entitled "Leaving the Valley," and comments by John M. Cummings in the Philadelphia Inquirer of April 30, entitled "Industrial Growth Hit by Tax Flaws in State."

There being no objection, the editorials and newspaper comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph of April 26, 1956]

SUICIDAL TAXES

Has Pennsylvania, as represented by the government at Harrisburg, set out to kill itself as a manufacturing State?

The question is not so mock-sensational, not quite so ridiculous, as it may seem to be.

It is prompted by the Westinghouse Electric Corp.'s announcement that it plans to build a new plant in Indiana and transfer one of its departments at East Pittsburgh there because, among other reasons, the tax situation in Pennsylvania is "unfavorable."

During the legislature's discussion of Governor Leader's proposed manufacturer's excise there was impressive testimony that the excise would keep new industries from coming to Pennsylvania and might cause some now here to leave.

Comparative figures showing the extent to which corporations are taxed here and in other States do not present Pennsylvania in an inviting light, so far as corporations are concerned.

Some of them say their tax burden has become almost intolerable.

The Westinghouse company's decision is particularly convincing.

Here is a corporation which was born in Pittsburgh, derives its name from a Pittsburgher, and has its largest plants and its general offices in Pittsburgh.

Innumerable ties—economic, historical, and sentimental—bind Westinghouse to Pittsburgh.

The company has found it necessary to expand the plant at East Pittsburgh, where it makes switchgear apparatus. There is no room for expansion at the existing location.

Still the company was reluctant to remove the business from Pennsylvania. A. C. Monteith, Westinghouse vice president, says the company considered two localities in Pennsylvania for the new plant. But he adds:

"An unfavorable tax situation in the Commonwealth was a contributing factor in our decision to locate elsewhere."

So Pennsylvania is to lose a multi-million dollar manufacturing establishment employing some 450.

Governor Leader talks of bringing new industries to the State to provide employment for people in the industrially depressed areas such as the coal mining regions, where many miners are idle.

The way to attract industries is to make the State attractive.

Governor Leader has not contributed to this by his tax program.

Nor has he helped by his administration's attitude that the recent Westinghouse strike was not a strike but a lockout.

It is to be hoped that the company's decision to remove one of its East Pittsburgh departments out of the State will produce some sober thinking on the subject at Harrisburg.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of April 27, 1956]

LEAVING THE VALLEY

Westinghouse will move its switchgear department from East Pittsburgh to a new, multi-million dollar plant near Bloomington, Ind. It is doing so for several reasons, says the company, among them "an unfavorable tax situation in the Commonwealth [of Pennsylvania]."

The new plant, which is to be completed by 1959, will employ about 450 people and will directly and indirectly contribute to the prosperity of Bloomington and Indiana. Pittsburgh and Pennsylvania will be the losers.

Westinghouse cannot be blamed for the move. It is in business, competitively so, and cannot afford to make decisions, however commendable in sentiment, that are not largely justified in dollars and cents. Rather, the blame must rest with this district and with the government in Harrisburg if an industry, and especially a home industry, finds it can fare better elsewhere.

We suspect that Westinghouse had other reasons for withdrawing its big switchgear operation from East Pittsburgh that were fully as compelling as those regarding taxation. And one of them, we further suspect, has to do with the labor history of Turtle Creek Valley.

Westinghouse's plants in East Pittsburgh have long been beset with union troubles almost unmatched elsewhere in the Nation. During 1954 and 1955, some 40 walkouts occurred there. For causes good or ill, leadership of the IUE local in East Pittsburgh, many of whose members once belonged to the old Communist-dominated U. E. local, has seemed notably truculent. It will be recalled that Westinghouse production at East Pittsburgh was shut down for 6 weeks late last summer in a labor dispute that proved a curtain-raiser to Westinghouse's recently ended strike of 5 months.

Moreover, the governmental tone in Harrisburg and elsewhere in this State has not been such as to attract industrialists. While Ohio and particularly the city of Columbus acted vigorously to curb violence and vandalism during the Westinghouse strike, the Leader administration and politicos in some of our cities were inclined to look the other way. The ruling by the Leader administration that the Westinghouse strike was a lockout, thus making unemployment compensation available to the strikers, was a most flagrant and political wrenching of the

facts. It could hardly elicit confidence in the fair play and impartiality of Pennsylvania government in an industrial dispute.

The Westinghouse move does not toll a bell for industrial development in Pennsylvania, but it certainly rings an alarm. State and local officials would do well to hear it and undertake what for Pensylvanians is a needed, if agonizing, reappraisal.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of April 30, 1956]

INDUSTRIAL GROWTH HIT BY TAX FLAWS IN STATE

(By John M. Cummings)

It isn't likely Governor Leader will be back in Harrisburg tomorrow to welcome the return of Senators and Representatives who have been on a brief vacation which had its roots in the primary election. Some of the lads will return to what they call the job as lawmakers' reject. They were given the old heave-ho by the voters.

At last accounts the governor was aboard a Navy vessel somewhere in the Atlantic. This put him at sea in a literal sense in contrast to the figurative sailing he has been doing since the beginning of his administration.

With the governor out of the picture, we are reduced to the extremity of addressing a few words to the members of the assembly. At the time a recess was decreed the tax problem was still very much in the forefront of discussion on Capitol Hill. This discussion will be resumed, picked up just where it was dropped when the solons headed for home to mend their political fences.

Let us have your attention, then, Mr. Speaker Andrews, of the house, and you, Lieutenant Governor Furman, and President pro tempore Taylor. You all will recall that a little while back there appeared in this corner of the paper a learned dissertation on the woes of the Pennsylvania Railroad in its effort to build up business along its right-of-way in our noble Commonwealth. It contained these paragraphs:

"In the 12-month period ending April 1 new industries with a total value of $534 million located along the right-of-way of the Pennsylvania Railroad in the State of Ohio.

"In the same period new industries along the right-of-way in this State were valued at $9,600,000."

Many, if not all, the industries which picked Ohio locations had an opportunity to settle down in Pennsylvania. But they refused to come into this State because of the uncertinty of the tax setup.

It is not the desire of this corner to have the lawmakers run away with the notion that this was an experience peculiar to President Jim Symes and the Pennsylvania Railroad. Gentlemen of the general assembly, meet Joe Fisher, president of the Reading Co.

Only recently it seemed likely one of the largest manufacturing concerns in the Nation would take title to a 40-acre plot in Northeast Philadelphia. Here was to be erected a plant which would have given employment to some 3,500 to 4,000 skilled workers. It was along the Reading Railroad, since the company is of a type which demands ready access to rail transportation.

The manufacturing division of the company in question approved the site. So did the sales division because it was right in the center of the big eastern market. But when the proposal was laid before the corporation's top officers at general headquarters in a large Midwest city it was rejected. Why?

The same old story. The company had no way of knowing what the tax setup would be in Pennsylvania this year or at any time in the foreseeable future. It wasn't a question of looking for tax-free land. The company was perfectly willing and happy to pay its share of the load. But its officials would like to have some inkling of the kind of taxes they may be expected to pay.

So, from present indications, the plant will be located in New Jersey. On the other side of the Delaware they have a stabilized tax setup. An industry locating there is not buying a pig in a poke—a tax pig, that is.

This is only one of several experiences of a similar nature which have troubled the Reading as well as the Pennsylvania. For the chaotic conditions of Pennsylvania's fiscal affairs, Governor Leader, as Democrats and Republicans so well know, must shoulder a major share of the blame. Already he has slumped $36 million which would have been collected had he displayed a modicum of horsesense before the old sales tax law expired. It's time for action of a constructive sort at Harrisburg.

Careful With That Facade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial dealing with the Capitol, published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAREFUL WITH THAT FACADE

Springtime seems to move people to refurbish their homes and yards, and Congress is no different. Thus Congress plans a $100 million expansion inside and around the Capitol. Since the Capitol is not only a building but a public symbol, the American people ought to know what Congress plans to do with it.

The legislators already have authorized a second Senate Office Building, a third House Office Building, remodeling of the 3 present office buildings and purchase of land on the fringes of the present 135-acre Capitol tract. Honest work is much to be admired, so few citizens will quarrel with Congress' demand for working space.

But there is a distinct and important quarrel with Congress' plan to rebuild the east front of the Capitol itself, moving it 32.6 feet farther east. A recent editorial in Architectural Forum called this project a "monumental folly" and a "prize piece of architectural boondoggling." The magazine further said the initial expenditure of $5 million was "sucker bait" to start a job which would cost $15 million.

Time and again, the magazine said, Capitol architects had proposed this idea under one pretext or another. This time Congress wants more hearing rooms and corridor space. Time and again the American Institute of Architects has opposed the idea for fear that the alterations would upset the balance of the building and destroy the unpretentious sensitive architecture of the east facade, where the Capitol undeniably puts its best face forward.

The governing board of the American Institute of Architects has even offered to help solve the internal space problem without ruining the facade. But congressional leaders have defended their right to alter the building and their sense of esthetics.

Is it wise for Congress to ignore such distinguished counsel? For Congress does not own the Capitol, but only lives in it. The people own the Capitol. We suspect that in matters architectural, the people would rather listen to the American Institute of Architects than to Congressmen.

Sidney Hillman Foundation Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the announcement of April 19, 1956, from the Sidney Hillman Foundation describing the special awards in the fields of journalism, magazines, and books for 1955 by that foundation.

Particularly, I wish to call attention to the award won by the weekly newspaper Labor, which is published by the Railroad Brotherhoods of America. When I was a good deal younger than I am now, a college student at the University of Oregon, in fact, I can remember reading in Labor about the great legislative feats of such liberal Senators as George W. Norris, Robert M. La Follette, Charles L. McNary, Burton K. Wheeler, Robert F. Wagner, and many other giants of the past. Labor always has been a publication which has worked for humanitarian legislation and which has helped to keep the torch of civilization burning brightly.

It is my understanding that the editors of Labor submitted two main groups of entries in the Sidney Hillman contest. These were: First, a series of editorials which exposed and disclosed the packing of Federal regulatory agencies with appointees either hostile or indifferent to regulatory laws they are supposed to enforce; and, second, a series of news articles analyzing the threats to American civil liberties and civil rights posed by witch hunts and so-called guilt by association.

I extend my personal congratulations to the editor and manager of Labor, Mr. Ruben Levin, and to his entire staff and to the Railroad Brotherhoods of America for this recognition which has come to one of the most courageous and forthright weekly newspapers in the United States.

There being no objection, the announcement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Awards in recognition of outstanding work in daily and labor journalism, magazine and book fields during 1955 were made today, Wednesday, April 18, by the Sidney Hillman Foundation in the grand ballroom of the Biltmore Hotel.

Ben Bagdikian, columnist and special writer for the Providence (R. I.) Journal and Bulletin, received a $500 award for a series of articles analyzing Government security programs and revealing the defects in them.

Murrey Marder, reporter for the Washington Post and Times Herald, also received a $500 award in daily journalism for his ar-

ticles on various aspects of civil liberties. Mr. Marder had previously won an honorable mention from the foundation for his reportorial work.

Dr. Robert Engler, professor of political science at Sarah Lawrence College, won a $500 Sidney Hillman Award in the magazine field for a series of six articles appearing in the New Republic, dealing with oil and politics.

Ruben Levin, editor of Labor, the weekly published by the railway unions in Washington, won the $500 labor press award for a series of articles dealing with the emasculation of Federal regulatory agencies, and with various aspects of civil liberties.

John Lord O'Brian, outstanding constitutional lawyer, won the $500 award in the nonfiction field with his "National Security and Individual Freedom," published by Harvard University Press. His book warns that fear and mutual suspicion will not purchase security.

The Sidney Hillman Foundation was created in 1947 to keep alive the late labor leader's ideas of enlightened labor-management relations, race relations, civil liberties, world peace and related interests.

Dr. Harold Taylor, president of Sarah Lawrence College, was the principal speaker at today's ceremonies which were broadcast over station WNYC from 3 to 3:55 p. m. Jacob S. Potofsky, president of the Sidney Hillman Foundation and the late labor leader's successor as president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL–CIO, presented the awards.

The judges who made the awards today were: William L. Shirer, novelist and commentator; Lewis Gannett, book editor, New York Herald-Tribune, and Evans Clark, editorial writer, New York Times.

The Sidney Hillman Foundation, during the past year, has awarded $35,000 in labor and related fields. These include scholarships, grants-in-aid, prizes for distinguished public service and for lecture series at colleges and universities in various parts of the country.

Refrigerators and Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on occasions in the past few years, a wave of horror has gone over the country as children became trapped and lost their lives in abandoned refrigerators. At long last, it appears that an enterprising and alert producer has taken stock of this danger and done something about it. It comes to my attention through an editorial in the Wallace Enterprise of Wallace N. C., on April 19, 1956, entitled "Children and Refrigerators" and I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REFRIGERATORS AND CHILDREN

In spite of nationwide publicity over the past several years, in spite of the fact that 36 State legislatures have passed laws designed to prevent these tragedies, 18 more children suffocated inside refrigerators in 1955!

In the past 10 years, 113 children over the Nation have lost their lives through the impulse to hide in an abandoned refrigerator—the perfect, too perfect, hiding place. Hence the legislation making it a misdemeanor (it should be a felony) to throw out a refrigerator without removing hinges and doors. But, it should be remembered that not all of these children have died in discarded equipment on vacant lots or trash heaps. The kitchen refrigerator, empty and open for defrosting, is just as tempting when a hide-and-seek game is on and mother has gone to the store or is talking on the phone. In many homes, this death-trap may be on the back porch or even in the basement.

But today, while Congress is considering ways and means of putting an end to these hideous mishaps, a long-range answer, better than any legislation, comes from a manufacturer. The Admiral Corp. has announced that all its new dual-temp refrigerators will be equipped with a safety release, by which the door may be opened from the inside. A luminous plastic button on the inside-release, that glows in the dark and attracts the hidden child's attention, requires only a slight push to open the way to safety and freedom.

In view of the great concern of American manufacturers for the safety as well as the quality and convenience of their products, we may be sure that the rest of the industry will follow Admiral's lead. But, even so, for years to come—until the last of these old-fashioned booby-traps is reduced to scrap—the responsibility of removing the doors before discarding is a vital one.

Think of the 13 adventurous little people who will never play hide-and-seek again. Think of August 12, 1953, when five youngsters from the same family perished in airtight blackness in Proctor, Ark., and of August 13, 1953, when 4 more—3 from 1 family—met the same fate in Richmond, Va. In a word, think.

Fortieth Anniversary of the Irish Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, at the request of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an eloquent recognition of the proclamation 40 years ago of the freedom of the Republic of Ireland.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Forty years ago Easter Monday fell on the 24th of April. It is a date which will always remain the brightest and most significant in Ireland's history, for it was on that date that Ireland once again asserted its national independence. It was on Easter Sunday, 1916, that the Republic of Ireland was proclaimed a republic designed to take its place among the nations of the world as the rightful government of a free, united Ireland.

Forty years have gone by since the Easter week rising and the proclamation of the Irish Republic. Seven patriots placed their signatures on the proclamation: Clarke, McDermott, Pearse, Connolly, McDonagh, Kent, and Plunkett. These men knew when they signed the proclamation that they were doomed, but this knowledge could not keep them from signing. They knew that they were standing for liberty; they were willing to die to focus the attention of the world upon Ireland, the fact that it was not free to govern itself. They were speedily captured and promptly executed.

They will never be forgotten by those who know, as George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and all the patriots who founded the United States knew, that freedom is a divine gift to people. They shared the faith in liberty that has always characterized the men and women of the Irish race.

The seven men who knew they were facing death could still write in their proclamation of Easter week in 1916 these words of Christian forbearance as they once more tried to throw off the foreign yoke:

"We place the cause of the Irish Republic under the protection of the Most High God, whose blessing we invoke upon our arms, and we pray that no one who serves that cause will dishonor it by cowardice, inhumanity, or rapine."

The proclamation of the Irish Republic, which follows, is a literary gem of liberty:

Dated Monday, April 24, 1916, in the city of Dublin:

"We declare the right of the people of Ireland to the ownership of Ireland and to the unfettered control of Irish destinies, to be sovereign and indefeasible, the long usurpation of that right by a foreign people and government has not extinguished the right, nor can it ever be extinguished except by the destruction of the Irish people. In every generation the Irish people have asserted their right to national freedom and sovereignty; 6 times during the past 300 years years they have asserted it in arms in the face of the world; we hereby proclaim the Irish Republic as a sovereign independent state, and we pledge our lives and the lives of our comrades in arms to the cause of its freedom, of its welfare, and of its exaltation among the nations."

An Open Letter to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial by Regis F. Cusick, Jr. from the Voice of Fort Black, official newspaper of the Fort Black Post, No. 538, American Legion, Department of Pennsylvania, Hazelwood, Pittsburg, Pa., entitled "An Open Letter to Congress," dated April 6, 1956:

AN OPEN LETTER TO CONGRESS

APRIL 6, 1956.

Members, House of Representatives, United States of America.

DEAR SIRS: There is now before your Veterans' Affairs Committee, bill H. R. 7886, which calls for a liberalization of existing laws concerning veterans pensions. As a citizen and as a veteran, I urge all of you to use your influence to the end that this bill may become law.

Some might say my interest is a selfish one as I am a veteran. Be assured that my daily prayer includes the request that the merciful God will continue to help me, at least to the extent that I may never qualify for benefits under this legislation. I would include all veterans of the world wars in that prayer but, alas, it is already too late for some.

The bill concerns the veterans who by reason of disability or age have become to all intents and purposes unemployable. It

would raise the monthly benefits to these veterans a few dollars and would increase the qualifying income limitations slightly. But chiefly it declares that when a veteran has reached the age of 65, he will automatically be considered unemployable and will receive a pension if he qualifies under the income limitations as set forth in the bill and is otherwise eligible. It is not a general pension.

You will be high pressured by certain groups to vote against this bill. You will find among them, to an extremely large extent, people, industries and organizations who have benefited in one form or another (for the most monetarily) from laws you have made in the past because you felt their passage justified. Among them too, you will find those who had some very fine defense contracts during the world wars that were on a cost-plus basis.

Not so the veteran. In these dire emergencies he raised his right hand and swore to defend his country at the cost of his own life if necessary and was assured a few dollars per month and keep adjustable to existing conditions. A grateful American people later granted him benefits under certain circumstances as the cost of war and to my belief the provisions of H. R. 7886 are also the cost of war but make it the plus if you will. In any event bring a little equalization to the contract of the veteran.

To those who cry "cost" I ask you to remind them that a sound economy is based on the ability of all to purchase the necessities of life and that through this purchasing comes the means of defraying such costs. We will all contribute. Most of us gladly.

In conclusion allow me to urge you to make firm the steps of the disabled veteran, to allow the "old soldier" to square his shoulders and with uplifted head say, "In 1956 the Congress of the United States personally thanked me for my service to the country. They approved H. R. 7886. In my infirmness, in my old age, I shall not hunger."

Please accept my thanks for your considerations.

Sincerely,

REGIS F. CUSICK, Jr.

Third House of Congress?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. FORRESTER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, the Daily Mirror, New York City, April 25, 1956, issue carried an editorial entitled "Third House of Congress?"

This editorial demonstrates that there is a tidal wave of resentment arising over our land concerning the United States Supreme Court invading the legislative field. I think this editorial will be of genuine interest to the membership of this House, and the people generally.

The editorial reads as follows:

THIRD HOUSE OF CONGRESS?

The constitutional question before the American people, since Earl Warren has become Chief Justice of the United States, is whether the Supreme Court is a third house of Congress legislating on its own.

The Constitution clearly defines the functions of Congress and the procedures concerning the passage of legislation.

The Constitution does not with similar clarity define the functions of the Supreme Court. Chief Justice John Marshall, however, by a series of basic decisions, determined the supremacy of the Court in matters constitutional. But nowhere has it been asserted that the Supreme Court is a legislative body.

Nevertheless in the case involving the United Mine Workers District 50 against the Arkansas Oak Flooring Co., the Supreme Court does legislate. No question of constitutionality is raised. The Court makes new law.

Under the Taft-Hartley law, officers of a union are required to file an oath to the effect that they are not Communists. This John L. Lewis has refused to do for no better reason than that he will not do it. His choice is to disregard the law which was also the choice once upon a time of Al Capone and others who believed that the Volstead Act was all wrong and that they would not abide by it.

The National Labor Relations Board, obeying the law, has required union officials to take this oath before they would be certified for collective bargaining purposes. Now along comes the Court and upholds the right of a union official, if he chooses, to violate the law.

By taking this position, the Supreme Court reopens the entire labor field for infiltration by Communists, many of whom have been forced out of labor unions by this provision of the Taft-Hartley law. Actually a a number of labor unions were expelled from their national organizations because of Communist affiliations.

In effect, this Supreme Court decision requires an employer to bargain with a labor union even if all its officers are known Communists and therefore agents of Soviet Russia.

The Supreme Court does not declare the Taft-Hartley law unconstitutional. It simply makes its optional for a labor leader to obey the law or to ignore it, and it requires an employer and the NLRB to abide by whatever decision the individual labor leader makes as to whether he will be law-abiding or not.

Such a decision is encouragement for disobedience of the law and could be used as a precedent for all sorts of evasions. There is, for instance, a tax law. Why should not each individual American citizen, following the reasoning of the Supreme Court decide for himself whether he chooses to obey the law, file a return, and pay the income tax? Using the language of this decision, failure to file could not be regarded as a "confession of guilt," but rather the choice of the individual as to whether he would make certain information public. If it is a good law for John L. Lewis, why not for any gander?

Something curious has crept into the Supreme Court and it has become very disturbing to the American people. It is difficult quite to analyze what has happened, but the same judges were not legislating before Earl Warren became Chief Justice. Maybe he has given a new tone to the Court, the tone not of a high judicial body but of a third House of Congress.

Mr. Speaker it was not so apparent to the press and the public, but fairness demands that lawyers admit that our Supreme Court has been legislating for more than 20 years. It is true, however, that the Supreme Court, under Justice Warren, has become so bold in its legislative activities that the press and the public are discovering that the Supreme Court is acting as a third House of Congress, in defiance of the Constitution. I have the idea that the press and the public intend to do something about it.

The Dangers in Doing Nothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in a recent issue of the New York Times, and reprinted as an advertisement in the Washington Post and Times Herald, as well as in the New York Herald Tribune, through the interest of A. N. Spanel, chairman, International Latex Corp.

The editorial, entitled "The Dangers in Doing Nothing," is worthy of close study.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DANGERS IN DOING NOTHING

There are many items of dispute concerning the Middle East, but on one aspect everyone except the Russians is agreed—the situation is deteriorating. Such being the case, what is the United States going to do about it? We must be clear in our minds that the United States cannot much longer sit back and do nothing, which has been the case for the past 6 months or so. No other country in the free world is in a position today to exercise real, decisive power.

The story for these whole 11 years since the war ended has been one of protecting and strengthening the Middle East against Russian pressure in the light of the collapse of British and French power. The Truman doctrine of 1947 bolstering Greece and Turkey, the extension of NATO to the eastern Mediterranean and beyond to Pakistan, the economic and military aid—these and other measures have been positive exertions of American power, often made with our allies. But last September the Russians moved into the Middle East with arms for Egypt, with offers of arms to other Arab countries, with economic and technical aid. There has been a new upsurge of Arab nationalism. The whole of French North Africa has been in ferment and today Algeria is like a keg of dynamite. The British completed their withdrawal from the Suez Canal Zone to Cyprus and now Cyprus is in flames. The Arab-Israeli conflict has gone from bad to worse.

There has been and still is a good deal of talking going on behind the scenes with the British and French and perhaps something will come of it. We try quietly and diplomatically to prevent a fire from breaking out here or there. Yet the situation goes on deteriorating.

We encouraged the formation of the "northern tier" of states into the Baghdad Pact of Turkey, Iraq, Iran, Pakistan, and Britain—but we refused to join it. Why? If it is good for these states it is good for the United States and in any event the Baghdad Pact has no reality without us.

We are parties to a Triparte Declaration of of 1950 with Britain and France guaranteeing opposition to either the Arabs or Israelis if there is an aggression against the present frontiers. But this is a mere declaration of intention that has never been submitted as a treaty to our Congress. It is a weak instrument with which to keep the peace in such a tense and heated region.

We say we will not furnish arms to Israel because we do not want to see an "arms race." This merely confuses the issue. How have we kept the peace in the world

against Russia since the war except by arming ourselves and our allies to the point where the Russians do not dare to start a war? It is not an "arms race" to let Israel acquire fighter planes for defense against the Ilyushin bombers the Czechs have sold to Egypt. There may well be war in the Middle East if one side gets much stronger than the other. We even failed to back France in shipping a standing order of 12 Mystere jet planes to Israel.

We are letting the British and French Governments condemn the nefarious activities of Egypt in stirring up bloodshed and hatred in North Africa and the Middle East without ourselves saying a word.

It is argued that we must not antagonize the Egyptians or the Arabs of the Moslem nationalists or the Greeks or the Turks or, evidently, anyone except our old allies the British and French. Is it possible to be the greatest power in the world and not antagonize someone?

These gnawing, insistent questions keep cropping up as one thinks about the dangerous situation in the Middle East. One wonders why we are apparently doing nothing. One wonders what we can do. The only unquestionable fact is that we cannot let the situation deteriorate much further without grave peril.

Blast Given Farm Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Blast Given Farm Bureau," from the Portland Oregonian of April 22, 1956. The article describes criticism of present Farm Bureau agricultural policy by Marshall Swearingen, a cattle rancher in the vicinity of Bend, Oreg.

In my opinion, Mr. Swearingen's disagreement with the agricultural program of the Oregon Farm Bureau Federation is particularly significant because for 6 years Mr. Swearingen was secretary and executive president of the Oregon Farm Bureau. Yet Mr. Swearingen now realizes that the farm program backed by the Oregon Farm Bureau—and by the American Farm Bureau Federation—is not consistent with the best interests and welfare of family-size farmers, neither in Oregon nor in the Nation.

I also ask unanimous consent that the letter by Mr. Swearingen, as published on the editorial page of the Oregonian of the same date, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. In the letter Mr. Swearingen the former head of the Oregon Farm Bureau Federation, challenges sharply the philosophy motivating President Eisenhower's veto of the farm bill. I think it is pertinent for Members of the Senate to read the personal observations of this Oregon cattle rancher, as he describes the fate of himself and his own family under the agricultural price decline which has prevailed during the 3½ years of the present administration.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLAST GIVEN FARM BUREAU

An ex-president of the Oregon Farm Bureau Federation Saturday charged that the bureau was motivated by politics and was not representing the majority of its members in its position on farm policy.

Marshall Swearingen, Bend rancher, who resigned in 1953 after 6 years of service as secretary, executive vice president, and president of the Oregon Farm Bureau, made his charges in a letter to Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

The Farm Bureau has been a stanch supporter of flexible farm price supports and other farm policies of the Eisenhower administration.

Swearingen challenged Shuman to poll Farm Bureau members on the question of whether the farm policies of the organization "and the political action of its officers and spokesmen" are helping the farmers' economic position.

RANCHER BLASTS BUREAU

In his letter, the Bend rancher said:

"After an extensive trip through the country talking with present and past members, I am convinced that Farm Bureau has not for the past several years and does not now represent the majority of its members on farm policy."

He asserted the living standards of 3 million commercial family farmers have hit the skids "while you editorialize about free enterprise, while your organizers, State secretaries, and Washington representatives mimic your Republican policy of boom for the big and bust for the small."

DOMINATION CHARGED

Swearingen declared the Farm Bureau has become dominated by large and semilarge operators "who have the time and money to become self-styled spokesmen for the farmer."

Objective, he said, is liquidation of the family farmer. The letter continued:

"I charge that the philosophy of the present administration of the Farm Bureau is the same as the present Republican administration in Washington—the philosophy that in bigness only is there efficiency."

SHAME ON IKE

To the EDITOR:

Your editorial, The Farm-Bill Veto, does a good job complimenting President Eisenhower for what you hope to be his greatest political move of the campaign.

His 9-point farm program should be called 9-hole program. He and Benson could then bury the family farmer and still enjoy a game of golf over their economically dead bodies.

Low supports or low prices cause the present surplus, not high or rigid 90 percent supports. That cost-price squeeze, plus the loss of 25 percent of our foreign market, plus a lagging domestic ability to buy, has resulted in a surplus.

What would you do if your advertising rates dropped 30 percent? You would do what the farmer has done—try to produce more.

From the Department of Agriculture we find what has happened when prices on supports are lowered. Between 1952 and 1955 supports on oats dropped 22 percent, production increased 30 percent, supports on sorghum grains dropped 24 percent, production increased 173 percent, soybeans support dropped 20 percent, production upped 30 percent, barley supports dropped 23 percent, production shot up 71 percent, butter supports down 17 percent, production up 9 percent, and so on.

My unsupported price on hay and pasture and cattle dropped 3 years ago until our living standard suffered a real decline. I simply produced more hay, planted more pasture, and fed more calves.

What about the soil bank? Ike could have started a soil bank under existing legislation. Why didn't he? If you would check with the Senate Agriculture Committee you will find he did not want it. His Department of Agriculture wrote the Senate committee on September 30, 1955: "The Agriculture Department recommends against the enactment of this soil-bank bill sponsored by Senator HUMPHREY. We do not believe it would be an effective means of obtaining adjustments in production."

Why does your great paper get so excited about these surpluses? There was only 3 months' supply of wheat, 1½ months' supply of corn, and 2 months' supply of feed grain when Benson took over. There are only 2 commodities, wheat and cotton, in over 8 months' supply today.

Thousands of your readers have worked for the two-price system on wheat. Ike could have accepted that 3 years ago.

Why not admit the fact that unless the present philosophy of government is changed and the present trend toward feudalism stopped, there will be no more small business?

MARSHALL SWEARINGEN.

General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I beg to advise the House that today I presented to the Congress a petition from the Ohio Glass Workers Protective League of Newark, Ohio, over the signatures of their president, William A. Daugherty, and their secretary, James Burden. It sets forth their opposition to enacting H. R. 5550 and instead to bring the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade before the Congress in accordance with the treatymaking provisions of the Constitution.

I respectfully ask the membership of this body to analyze carefully this petition.

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition and memorialize you in accordance with amendment I to the Constitution of the United States of America, to refrain from enacting H. R. 5550 and instead to bring the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade before the Congress of the United States in accordance with the treatymaking provisions of the Constitution, for the following reasons:

1. Passage of H. R. 5550 would impair the right of petition and redress guaranteed in our Constitution, since tariff policy and foreign commerce would be made subject to determinations by an international agency.

2. H. R. 5550 would hinder labor and business from obtaining effective action by the Congress of the United States, as guaranteed by article I, section 8 of the Constitution, which declares: "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imports and excises * * * to regulate com-

merce with foreign nations, and among the several states * * *"

3. H. R. 5550 would remove from Congress its full and effective freedom to exercise its Constitutional responsibilities in these fields.

4. H. R. 5550 would remove tariff and trade policy determinations from the Federal Government and subject them to an international organization in which the people of the United States are not adequately represented and where the United States delegate would have but one of the 35 votes, the same as the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, Haiti, and other countries with populations less than many cities and States in this Nation.

Now, therefore, we request that this petition and memorial be formally placed before the Congress of the United States.

WILLIAM A. DOUGHERTY, *President.*
JAMES BURDEN, *Secretary.*
Ohio Glass Workers Protective League.

Concentration of Economic Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith an address I made before the Economics Society, the City College of New York, on April 27, 1956:

CONCENTRATION OF ECONOMIC POWER

(Speech of Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, New York, before Economics Society, the City College of New York, April 27, 1956)

I am pleased to discuss with you the problems posed to both our competitive economy and to our political institutions by the increasing concentration of economic power in the United States. Increasing control over a growing percentage of American business life by a relatively few corporate empires is one of the critical developments in our postwar society.

As Chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, at the beginning of this session of Congress, I established a subcommittee concerned exclusively with antitrust problems. Early in the first session, the Antitrust Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, conducted extensive hearings into current antitrust problems facing the country.

During these hearings the subcommittee heard testimony from 52 witnesses representing all points of view on numerous economic problems. Nearly everyone of these witnesses discussed in some degree the problems flowing from the economic fact that today a preponderance of the economic life of the country in many fields has been garnered by a few large corporate organizations.

There are two main reasons why I am concerned about the concentration of economic power in the United States. First, is that concentration of business, if it progresses sufficiently far, unavoidably will lead to some kind of state socialism, dictatorship, or some other form of excessive governmental control over the lives of individuals. Such extensive governmental supervision and regulation is not in the heritage of the American people and, I am convinced, it is not the desire of the American people. The other reason for my concern is that a concentrated industrial system is inefficient when compared with the flexibility which this country has demonstrated flows from a business community competitively organized.

We have only but to look at the history of the other industrial countries in the Western World to ascertain the political results caused by the channeling of the business life into the hands of a few. The unrestrained growth of monopolies and cartels inevitably has resulted in the development of private concentrations of power so strong that necessarily the issue became whether big business would control the government or whether the government would have to seize control of big business. This was the history in Germany and in Italy. In Germany the business interests thought they could take over the government by using Adolf Hitler as the puppet. As a result, the German people found that a system of private monopoly led to dictatorship and ultimately to disaster.

As to the efficiency argument, I believe, it is misleading to argue that a high degree of industrial concentration is the price of technological progress. This is illustrated by Mr. T. K. Quinn, a former vice president of the General Electric Co. in charge of the appliance division, in his book, Giant Business, Threat to Democracy. Mr. Quinn says "original inventions are no more plentiful, proportionately, in big than in small organizations." Citing concrete examples, Mr. Quinn argues that "in the electrical appliance industry, the better clothes-washing machines have not been produced by the monster companies but by the relatively small, independent companies specializing in one or two products. This is also true of ranges, vacuum cleaners, radios, toasters, mixers, home freezers, fans, clocks, heaters, air conditioning units, etc." The accomplishments of the giants lie not in the field of inventing, but in using their capital advantage for the purpose of moving in, buying out, and absorbing the smaller creators. In Mr. Quinn's opinion the prospects of technical progress are greater where the centers of initiative are diffused, where thousand of individuals and organizations have the incentive to work and think for the future.

Following World War I the economic growth of the country during the 1920's led to increased concentration in business. That pattern has been followed in the industrial expansion succeeding World War II.

Since the war numerous studies have been made which demonstrate that our economy is tending to become more controlled by a handful of giant corporations.

The Senate Judiciary Committee in the 81st Congress reported an industrial concentration in the United States as follows:

"The extent to which the American economy has become concentrated and centralized in the hands of a few giant corporations was strikingly revealed before this committee in figures presented by Dr. Wilfred I. King, professor emeritus of economics at New York University. The figures which he presented reveal an extraordinary level of concentration. Thus, his figures show that in 1946, the latest year for which such data are available, one-tenth of 1 percent of the total number of all American corporations—the giant firms with assets of $100 million and over—owned 49 percent of the assets of all American corporations; 2 percent of the number of corporations owned 78 percent; 8 percent of the number owned 89 percent of the assets; and 12 percent owned 92 percent of the assets. At the other end of the scale, 45 percent of the number of corporations—the small firms with assets of $50,000 or less—owned less than 1 percent of the assets."

At the end of 1952, corporations with more than $100 million of assets had 52 percent of all the assets of manufacturing corporations. Two and one-half years later, 57 percent of the assets were held by corporations of this size. If this rate is not checked it will take about 20 years for all of the manufacturing assets of the country to become concentrated into such giant corporations.

The growing domination of the marketplace by larger corporations and its effect on small business was recently highlighted by the Senate Small Business Committee which reported these facts: "While the prosperity of 1955 brought a profit rate of 14.4 percent to the biggest corporations (those of assets over $100 million) the smallest corporations (those with assets of less than $250,000) reported earnings in the first 6 months of 4.5 percent. * * * Between the first halves of 1952 and 1955, while the giant companies' earnings 'went through the roof' the smallest manufacturing plants' profits headed for the cellar. Expressed in percentages the earnings of the small concerns fell off 27.4 percent between the two periods while the earnings of the large companies increased by 58.5 percent. * * *

"There is an ominous significance" the report concludes, "in an economic atmosphere which makes it possible for the Nation's mammouth corporations to reap profits while the general run of small enterprises are worse off than they were 3 years ago."

This industrial concentration is perhaps most graphically expressed by the following:

At the present time 3 companies make more than 90 percent of all our silk; 3 companies make over 95 percent of our tin cans and tinware; 3 companies make 90 percent of our linoleum. Three huge corporations control cigarettes, whisky and automobiles.

Prof. Adolph Berle in the statement to the Antitrust subcommittee remarked on the industrial structure becoming characteristic of American business. He said: "In industry you find a standard pattern of not less than 2, nor more than 5, large corporations which have 50 percent or more of the volume of that industry between them." This pattern Mr. Berle said "is typical of more than half of American industry, and the most important half."

An important aspect of the pattern of concentration in the United States is that rarely is an industry controlled by a single firm, a monopoly in the popular or classical sense of the term. Where an industry is dominated by a concentrate of a few large companies, however, their actions in many instances result in the same bad effects as a true monopoly.

More and more it is apparent that in those industries in which are relatively few, large-scale, heavily financed companies of comparable size are dominant in production and distribution, there is not active price competition in the industry. In many industries where this condition prevails there appears to be a "follow the leader" policy in pricing and selling. Each member of the industry, both the large and smaller concerns, individually elects to follow the policy of not changing his prices until the "leaders" change their prices. When prices do change, each company, strangely enough, individually elects to charge precisely the same prices as the leaders.

Although the effect upon the consumer of this practice is the same as in the case of a monopoly, it is a difficult condition to correct under the antitrust laws. If the Government can establish the existence of an actual or tacit agreement among the various companies in the industry to adhere to and to follow the prices or other market practices of a leader, then the companies can be charged with conspiracy or combination to monopolize or restrain trade. In many instances, however, it is not possible to find evidence of an actual agreement and the courts have been reluctant to infer the existence of a conspiracy in the absence of some direct evidence of an agreement. This is one of the problems of concentra-

tion that has been plaguing antitrust enforcement officials in dealing with this problem.

Because of the difficulties surrounding attemps to correct abuses of concentration by means of antitrust laws, some people have advocated alternative proposals to deal with the problem of concentration. It is significant to note that most of these alternative proposals, although emphasizing the benefits of competition, nevertheless call for an increase in the supervision and regulation by the Federal Government over economic behavior.

Prof. Louis B. Schwartz, of the University of Pennsylvania, for example, recommends the creation of a free enterprise commission to take over the antimonopoly functions of the Federal Trade Commission. Such a free enterprise commission would have the power by regulation to define and prohibit anticompetitive practices; and to prohibit intergration and mergers unless specifically approved. Such a commission also would have the power to compel reorganization of excessively large enterprises as well as other broad regulatory powers over the economy.

Other witnesses before our subcommittee recommended legislation comparable to the Public Utilities Holding Company Act be enacted in order to empower agencies of the Government to compel, in appropriate instances, the dissolution of the giants in the economy to smaller economic units.

Whether concentration has progressed to a degree which requires such far-reaching proposals at this time is debatable. I would much prefer that the solution to the problem of concentration be reached within the basic framework of our existing antitrust legislation. I am reluctant to impose additional supervisory, regulatory, or planning authority over the economy unless the growth of large-scale firms precludes any other solution for adequate protection of the public.

Another aspect of the problem of consolidation of economic power which needs emphasis is the role of the Government itself in contributing to increased concentration. The Government, by its administrative decisions, influences in a significant manner whether industrial capacity shall be concentrated in the hands of a few or whether economic power shall be sufficiently dispersed so as to provide a favorable climate for free enterprise. The procurement policies in both World War II and the Korean war are cases in point.

During World War II, for example, in military procurement the 100 largest corporations received 66⅔ percent of the prime contracts awarded. More than 51 percent of such contracts went to the top 33 corporations. During this period the top 10 corporations got fully 30 percent of the war contracts.

Moreover, the major portion of subcontracts also went to the largest companies. It is significant that in 1943 prime and subcontract records of 252 of the nations largest corporations, receiving the bulk of the prime contracts, showed that these companies subcontracted only 34 percent of the value of their contracts and three-fourths of the value of those subcontracts went to firms with over 500 workers.

In the first year of the Korean war the concentration of defense contracts was even greater. According to the findings of the Senate Small Business Committee, the top 50 corporations got almost two-thirds of the dollar volume of defense contracts while the top 10 corporations got 40 percent of the total. For the 5-year period from July 1950 through June 1955, 100 companies and their subsidiaries received 62.6 percent of the military prime contract awards. In the 2-year period from July 1953 through June 1955 the top 100 companies received 65.4 percent of military prime contract awards. And in the 6-month period from January through June 1955 the top 100 companies received 68.4 percent of the military prime contract awards.

There are several reasons underlying the flow of Government defense contracts to the larger corporate organizations. Defense orders, for one thing, tend to be heavy in industries already dominated by a handful of large companies. In the short run at least, procurement officials have little choice but to make use of the facilities and know-how of the giant organizations. Moreover, it is the easiest course for military procurement officials to deal with one large firm than it is to deal with a multitude of small firms.

Further, large enterprises enjoy certain obvious advantages in getting Government business. They can afford to employ agents in Washington who keep them informed about pending governmental action, the considerations that are likely to influence such action, and, most important, the persons who are likely to make important decisions. Unlike smaller operators, they can afford to assemble information to support their interests and make sure this data is in the hands of appropriate people at the proper time. The consequence is that Government officials become more familiar with the point of view of big business and imperfectly informed about the point of view of smaller concerns.

Another illustration of the type of Government action which contributes to increasing industrial concentration is found in the surplus-property-disposal programs following World War II. The War Assets Administration reported that the 250 largest manfacturing corporations in 1946 had acquired 70 percent of the total surplus disposals. Since these companies owned and operated 67 percent of the Nation's manufacturing facilities before the war, it is apparent that the agency's plant disposals helped increase industrial concentration above the already excessive 1939 level.

In the field of antitrust enforcement itself administrative decisions sometimes result in weakening the volume of competition in the economy and crystallizes the pattern of industrial concentration. The recently negotiated consent decree between the Government as plaintiff and the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and the Western Electric Co. as defendants is a case in point.

In that case, the Government in 1949 filed an antitrust complaint designed to put an end to the Western Electric's illegal manufacturing monopoly which had been developed and existed under the protection of the monopoly enjoyed by the American Telephone & Telegraph as a public utility. While the operations of American Telephone & Telegraph are subject to public utility regulation, the manufacturing functions of its wholly owned subsidiary, Western Electric, were not so regulated.

In its complaint the Government charged type of activity least susceptible to effective regulation. The benefits flowing from competition in a free enterprise system are generally considered to be most readily realized in the manufacturing area of the economy.

In its complaint the Government charged that Western Electric manufactured and supplied more than 90 percent of all telephones, telephone apparatus, and equipment sold in the United States. It also charged that American Telephone & Telegraph required its operating companies as well as its long lines department to buy substantially all of its equipment from Western Electric. The significance of this is indicated by the fact that American Telephone & Telegraph owns and operates more than 98 percent of the long distance telephone facilities in the United States, and owns and controls operating companies which furnish approximately 85 percent of the country's local telephone service.

To remedy the almost complete lack of competition in the manufacture, distribution, and sale of telephone equipment, the complaint sought a separation of Western Electric from American Telephone & Telegraph and a dissolution of Western Electric through competing manufacturing concerns. Relief of this kind was the principal reason the case was brought.

In the consent decree terminating this case on January 23, 1956, however, attempts to secure this kind of relief were abandoned. Instead of separating Western Electric from A. T. & T., the decree solidifies Western Electric's subordination to A. T. & T. and gives Government sanction to the very monopoly which the complaint was designed to break up. Western Electric is left with some 80 to 90 percent control of the manufacture and sale of telephonic equipment, and A. T. & T. will purchase its equipment only from Western Electric.

If Western Electric had been separated from the domination and control of A. T. & T., being a strong, substantial entity in its own right with ample resources for independent research and development, it would have been in a position to give effective competition to RCA and to Westinghouse in many electronic manufacturing fields. Competitive rivalry in these fields could not but have resulted in benefits to the public.

Under the decree, however, we are faced with the specter of these corporate organizations of planetary magnitude by Government fiat restricted to separate majestic orbits in their own spheres of the economy. Further, by extending the public utility concept from A. T. & T. to include Western Electric's manufacturing operations, the decree requires the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and the courts to take the role of regulatory bodies. This is a role foreign to their primary functions and which they are ill equipped to perform. By extending such regulatory functions to manufacturing, the decree abandons the competitive principles underlying our free enterprise system and is contrary to the most basic philosophies of antitrust enforcement.

Another instance where Government antitrust action contributed to maintenance of monopolistic condition and increased concentration of economic power is found in the Attorney General's approval, in September 1954, of the Iranian Consortium. In his approval the Attorney General permitted the same companies named as defendants and participants in a pending monopoly case to combine and carry out a joint operation in Iran. In the Oil Cartel case, filed April 21, 1953, the Attorney General charged these companies have since 1928 engaged in a conspiracy to control the petroleum trade of the world. According to the complaint the defendants have: Agreed to eliminate competition among themselves by establishing market quotas, fixing prices, curtailing production, and limiting facilities, secured and maintained control of foreign petroleum production; divided among themselves foreign production and marketing territories; and monopolized pipeline transportation facilities, tankers and patented processes relating to refining.

The Iranian Consortium is an organization composed of the major international oil companies, who produce at least 87 percent of the free world's oil, created to reestablish the Iranian oil-producing industry.

In essence, what occurred was this: The Iranian Government decided to nationalize the properties of Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. (now renamed British Petroleum Co.) which for years had an exclusive concession to produce oil in Iran. The British Government owns more than 50 percent of the stock of that company.

Nationalization culminated the disagreement over the amount to be paid Iran and

other terms of the concession. Western oil governments and the other oil companies having concessions in the Middle East countries, supported the British.

Iranian public feeling, however, made it necessary that the British monopoly be at least partially displaced. The new international cartel was the answer. Perhaps it was the right answer, from the military-diplomatic point of view, despite some indications that we may have succeeded in diverting a portion of Iranian ill will from the British to ourselves, and despite rumblings of protest heard in Europe against the economic consequences of the Near-East oil cartel.

Prof. Louis Schwartz described the effect of the approval of the consortium to both the Antitrust Subcommittee and the Attorney General's Antitrust Committee as follows:

"Objections to the plan from the standpoint of American antitrust policy are formidable. Here were huge enterprises already established on various concessions in the Middle East with more than adequate reserves of oil. Some of them had already been officially accused of conspiring to maintain an artificially high price for this cheap middle eastern petroleum. The Wall Street Journal reported the open secret that one of their main concerns in entering this pool was to see to it that Iranian production should not return to the world market too rapidly so as to hurt the world price. Only the antitrust laws stood in the way. This obstacle was surmounted by an extraordinary dispensation granted by the executive department, without sanction of any statute of Congress. Moreover this executive exemption contained no conditions designed to safeguard the public interest or the interest of American oil refiners who must buy foreign crude. When the American Five and their European partners meet to discuss Iranian production policy they must inevitably take into account their production and sales from other concessions and even at home. Discussion of production becomes in the end discussion of the market and of price. No representative of the American public sits in on these discussions. There is no guarantee of any sort that this private cartel coordinating production of the world's cheapest oil will give the public the benefits of its low costs."

During our investigation into current antitrust problems, our subcommittee attempted to evaluate the arrangements made in the Idanian consortium. The subcommittee, however, has been unable to secure copies of the contracts and arrangements among the oil company participants in the consortium necessary for such an evaluation. Even though the contracts are between private companies, distinguished from governments, the Secretary of State informed the subcommittee, "it would not be in the interest of the United States to divulge their contents at this time, since making them public would affect adversely the foreign relations of the United States."

The Secretary of State informed the subcommittee that he had conferred with the Governments of Iran, Great Britain, France, and the Netherlands and has ascertained that all of these Governments strongly objected to the disclosure of the various documents among the oil company participants. In view of this objection the subcommittee has been unable to make a definitive analysis of antitrust aspects of this matter. It is clear, however, that approval of the consortium has reinstituted the control of the major internation oil companies over this important natural resource in Iran.

During this session of Congress, the Antitrust Subcommittee is conducting an investigation of monopoly problems in industries which are under the jurisdiction of the Federal regulatory agencies. These hearings were instituted as a result of the frequent allegations made in our hearings on current antitrust problems, that, in operation, Federal regulatory agencies had become unduly industry-oriented and had sanctioned excessive economic concentration in the industries subject to their jurisdiction. The purpose of the investigation is to determine whether or not it is true that public regulation has gradually shifted its objective from protecting the public interest to protecting the monopolies created under its aegis.

Thus far, the subcommittee has received information from representatives of the Department of Justice, and from various academic experts in this field. We have also probed deeply into the activities of the airlines industry and its regulatory agency, the Civil Aeronautics Board. Since the investigation is incomplete with additional evidence still to be received, the subcommittee is not in a position to come to any conclusions as to these problems. Sufficient testimony has been adduced thus far, however, to make one question the wisdom of increasing the scope of regulation by the Government in additional areas of the economy.

The problems involved in maintaining effective supervision in the public interest over the operations of regulated industries by public agencies are formidable. While it is still too early to assert that governmental regulation by commission or board has failed to adequately protect the public interest, I am firmly convinced that to the maximum extent possible, the public interest in the long run will be better served if the impersonal forces of competition are the determining factors in establishing prices and controlling the growth of business opportunities.

One of the most basic values of free competition is that it minimizes governmental intervention. Competition is a viable, self-perpetuating system within which men conduct their economic activities free from dictation by the government. It is an institutional arrangement consistent with our historical concept of limited government. In view of our experience with direct government intervention in economic matters, it doesn't seem to me that the best answer to the problem of economic concentration is to broaden government regulation over industry. A far less dangerous course would be to assure that automatic forces of competition in the market place be the determining factor in the solution of this problem.

In conclusion, I think that you will all agree that the problems presented by increasing concentration of economic power in the United States, are most intricate. Further, the problems are of such gravity that no precipitous action should be undertaken on any particular phase. Tinkering with the economic processes without a full comprehension of the results likely to ensue could create more problems than are solved.

I am convinced that it is essential to maintain in full vigor enforcement of the antitrust laws to cope with these problems even though in some respects results to date have not been fully satisfactory. It is clear that without the existence of antitrust legislation and enforcement, the problem of concentration would be much more acute than it presently is. Monopolies in the classical sense long since would have become the rule in most of our major industries.

I am also convinced that much can be done under existing antitrust legislation to solve the special problems presented by the current pattern of economic development we have discussed. If proceeding in this manner is inadequate, however, and further Government regulation is required, I am convinced a great deal more consideration must be given to assure that the regulatory bodies are surrounded by sufficient safeguards to protect the interest of the general public.

Underemployment in Rural Sections as Well as Unemployment in Industrial Localities Should Be Embraced in Legislation for Government Aid to "Distressed Areas"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, there is pending before the House Banking and Currency Committee a bill introduced by the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. SPENCE, to provide Government aid for distressed areas. The bill, while containing many admirable features, does not include rural areas suffering from underemployment but in its present form is confined to industrial situations. On previous occasions I have called the attention of the House to the economic difficulties of rural areas caused by underemployment, and yesterday I was given the privilege of appearing before the Committee on Banking to urge that economic difficulties in the rural sections be embraced in pending legislation. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include excerpts from my statement to the committee as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to appear in support of the bill to provide Government aid to industrial regions which are not sharing in the general economic advance of the country. I appreciate the courtesy of the Committee in giving me this opportunity. I am most concerned, however, over the fact that the bill's present wording does not give significant attention to the very real problems of rural areas of underemployment as distinguished from unemployment. Before I go into a detailed discussion of this matter, I wish to make it very clear that I would not lend my support to any measure that would cause unemployment in any other region of the country by providing Federal funds to redistribute existing industrial potential. The rural areas, however, are entitled to share more equitably in the continuing expansion of American industry and they do not wish to profit at anyone's expenses by taking away something he now has.

The Joint Committee on the Economic Report has pointed out the paradox of modern economic society, that geographic pockets of chronic unemployment and underemployment remain during periods of full employment. This problem is particularly acute in certain agricultural regions of the country where the farmers are unable to earn an adequate income from their small holdings. Available data from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Information Bulletin No. 108, June 1953, indicates that 37.7 percent of the commercial farms of the United States are classified as low-production farms, defined as farms with a $250 to $2,499 value of sales in 1949 with the operator working off farm less than 100 days and farm sales exceeding the value of other farm incomes. The percentage of farm-operator families receiving under $1,000 per year net money income (in 1949) was 28.1 percent with an additional 24.8 percent receiving between $1,000 and $1,999 (Columbia University Study, 1955). Whatever income increase has taken place since 1949 has easily been offset

by the rise in the cost of living and therefore from 25 to 50 percent of our farm families are in a relatively low-income bracket, with regard to constant dollar purchasing power.

I should like to propose an amendment to the Spence bill to include such rural underemployed areas within the bill's coverage. With loan funds made available as well as technical assistance, rural areas could be aided in increasing their per capita or family incomes. This would be in accord with the joint committee's recommendations in its report of January 5, 1956, on low income population that the Federal Government aid, by means of technical assistance and Federal loan guarantees, recognized and approved local groups engaged in attracting new industry into the area, and also develop other ways of providing off-farm employment. It is my belief that such loan funds would provide a real stimulus to private investment in such areas which have particular economic advantages not now being realized. The industries I have in mind are the food-processing ones which could be designed for part-time labor in conjunction with farm operations. The establishment of such small industries would not only give employment to people who prefer to live on the farms, but would also provide ready markets close to the farmer. A good example of this in Arkansas is the Atkins pickle plant which enables the farmers to enjoy extra income from a good crop of cucumbers. The payroll has been a boon to farm people and the business interests of the community. Encouragement of more such activity would benefit the entire country without causing any damage to any existing industries. The Secretary of Agriculture, in his report on the problems of low-income farmers in April 1955, said that "measures should be taken to bring low-income-farms areas into full consideration in industrial expansion," and I can see no better way to start this process than by including underemployed agricultural regions in the assistance provided by this bill.

Mr. Chairman, a few days ago a distinguished constituent of mine, Mr. Winthrop Rockefeller, was in Washington. He is chairman of the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission and in describing the commission's work he emphasized the fact that he shares my views regarding food and timber processing plants. He stressed the lack of capital for this purpose now available in Arkansas and other States.

I am joined in this effort by Senator FLANDERS, of Vermont, who, I am advised, will introduce a similar amendment to bills pending in the Senate dealing with the problems of unemployment. This should be convincing evidence that there are no elements of sectionalism in this proposal. Above everything, Mr. Chairman, I am eager for the committee to understand that we do not wish to take away from any area any part of the industrial strength that they enjoy. We believe that the industrial areas have a stake in the sound and balanced economic life for the agricultural sections, and it is in that spirit that we press for consideration of the rural industries idea.

A New Fresh Hard Look at Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the Janesville (Wis.) Daily Gazette on the subject of foreign aid:

FRESH HARD LOOK AT AID

Two proposals made by Paul G. Hoffman, currently an automotive company executive and former administrator of the Marshall plan, are deserving of greater consideration than they are likely to get.

Speaking at a national church conference, Hoffman said that "peace can only be built by nonmilitary means," and that there is need for bringing the advantages of freedom and democracy to the attention of peoples all over the world. America, he believes, is failing to gain the full advantage of its costly aid programs because it is not expounding the part which freedom and the American system play in making such vast aid programs possible. One of the best means of reaching the ear of peoples in distant lands is via the church, he told the conference.

His other suggestion was that an independent citizen commission of experts take "a fresh hard look" at the entire foreign-aid program. The suggestion was that such a group be appointed by the Secretary of State to make a determination of the resources and needs of beneficiary nations and to choose the means by which American programs could be effectively carried out.

As for his other proposals, Hoffman retains the giveaway attitude so common among those who have had any contact with the foreign-aid program. His estimate that $200 billion will be needed in the next 5 years appears fantastically generous, and his assignment of $175 billion of this to military aid seems to belie his expressed idea that peace will not be won by military power.

Foreign aid on its current or an enlarged scale will continue just as long as the American taxpayers will stand for it. Literally hundreds of projects for which tax dollars are being spent abroad have almost no relation whatsoever to American interests or security, or to the efforts to convince wavering populations of the merits of the American system as against communism.

We have three possible excuses for spending tax money abroad, to bolster military defenses for American security, for rendering aid to needy peoples in the form of free-will charity, and of countering as well as may be the Communist propaganda campaigns which are intended to discredit America in the eyes of foreigners.

A good many of the aid programs would hardly fit in any of these classifications. Foreign aid is strictly a Washington affair, and the chance that any independent, citizen commission will be permitted to put its fingers in as Hoffman suggests is extremely remote.

The Next President of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a very informative and inspiring address by the Honorable David L. Lawrence, mayor of Pittsburgh and Democratic committeeman for the State of Pennsylvania. The address was delivered to the District 11 Conference of the United Steelworkers of America, held on Saturday, April 28, 1956, at the Penn Harris Hotel in Harrisburg, Pa. The rousing applause given Mayor Lawrence by the steelworkers' delegates at the conclusion of his speech is the best indication of the fact that the audience which packed the huge ballroom of the Penn Harris approved his hard-hitting analysis of the 1956 Presidential campaign. Mayor Lawrence's address follows:

Less than 28 weeks from now—in 191 days, to be exact—the quadrennial of American democracy, presidential election day, will take place once again.

Measured in the course of history, that's not much time.

But reckoned in the light of human frailty and political fate, 28 weeks can bring whole new political developments and political results.

No one could have believed, in November of 1952, that the Democratic Party would rebound as quickly and as energetically as it did the following year, and every election that followed after that.

The Democrats made an astonishing political recovery from the Eisenhower defeat of 1952.

We are a stronger party today than we have been for many years.

In the special Congressional election of 1953, Democrats won seven of the eight seats in contest.

In 1954, we won control of the Congress.

In 1953, we won the governorship of New Jersey for the first time in many years.

In 1954, we won eight more governorships from the Republicans—including New York, Pennsylvania and Minnesota.

And last November, the trend to the Democratic Party was universally expressed across the country.

We gained important cities in New York and Connecticut; we gained state senators in New Jersey; we held the governorship of Kentucky by a record-breaking majority. In New York City, we held the pivotal borough of Queens.

Indiana—a farm State—was amazing.

There were 30 Democratc mayors in Indiana on Election Day. The next day, there were 73 Democratic mayors-elect.

Here in Pennsylvania, quite frankly, we were all surprised at the extent of the gains, and, of course, delighted.

In 1954, we elected our first Democratic governor in 20 years. George Leader's majority was 284,000. That tide is evidently still at flood.

The mayoralty contest in Philadelphia received much national attention. The young Republican candidate was given the slickpaper buildup in national magazines. He was taken to the White House and made one of "Ike's Boys." He was given the special blessing of the Republican national chairman. Our two Republican Senators, neither of whom live in the Philadelphia area, campaigned for him.

And with all this, Richardson Dilworth defeated him by a greater majority than the Democrats had achieved the last time out.

In Allegheny County, of which Pittsburgh is the seat, we won everything. No Republican is in elective office in the county, except in two minority offices which they must have by law.

But, while gratifying, these victories were not unexpected.

It was the sweep around the State that made political history in Pennsylvania last November.

Democrats won 7 mayoralties from Republican control, and lost 2 which we had held. The population of the cities which we gained is 443,000. The population of the two cities we lost is 25,000.

Democratic mayors preside over every city in the State with more than 100,000 population—Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Scranton, Erie, Reading and Allentown.

Political realists have long said that the measure of a party's strength is in its courthouses.

In Pennsylvania, 11 county governments were Democratic before election.

Now, there are 25.

Nowhere in Pennsylvania did we lose a county government to the Republicans. We gained the county commissioners in 14 counties, with a combined population of more than 1,800,000 people.

Oldtime Democratic counties, lost in previous elections, came back to the fold. More important still, we broke entirely new ground.

A Democratic board of county commissioners has taken office in Bucks County, the home county of the venerable Joseph R. Grundy, arch apostle of Pennsylvania republicanism.

A Democratic board of county commissioners has taken office in Beaver County, a county whose Republican tradition goes back to the Civil War and the enormously powerful Republican leader of olden days, Matt Quay.

Seven Democrats defeated seven Republican judges in the State.

In county after county, where the Republicans have held undisputed power since the Jackson era, Democrats were elected to county and local offices.

Beyond any question, the party never did so well in this traditionally Republican State even at the peak of the Roosevelt days.

Anyone can argue, of course, over what constitutes a trend; in the final analysis, to be sure, you do not pay off on trends. You have to go out and win the big one.

But trend or not, the fact is clear that the Democratic Party has made consistent, solid, crunching gains—steadily for a period of 3 years.

Control of Congress is a fact, not a trend. Control of State houses, court houses, city halls, is a fact.

It doesn't matter whether these elections have been straw votes or not. What does matter is that they have settled, each of them, their particular issues, and the Democratic Party is far stronger across the country than it has been for many years.

It is the kind of order of battle that any Democrat likes to see, as a presidential election comes upon us.

For we have built in our States and cities exactly the right defense against the massed weight of Republican power in industry, in finance, and in the medium of opinion.

They have the concentration of corporate efficiency and skill.

We have the concentration of political efficiency and skill.

The Democratic official, the democratic political worker, the democratic citizen, has a buoyancy, a pride, a resilience that the Republicans never know—and I suspect that we have a sheer love of combat as well.

The great men of our party have been the dedicated men, from Jefferson to Wilson, from Jackson to Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry Truman.

The great days of our party are always the days when the Nation and the world need inspired leadership, and we serve as the instrument of that leadership.

A Democratic Secretary of Agriculture believes he should fight for improvement in the economics of the farm—not fight against the farmer.

A Democratic Secretary of Labor believes he should fight for labor and a constant rise in our living standards—not weakly compromise the issues.

A Democratic Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would really believe in health, education, and welfare.

And a Democratic Secretary of State might avoid the television playlets, the tourist diplomacy, and the consequent confusion of world peace with soap opera and nervous excursions to the brink of war.

If there was ever any doubt about the character of the Republican team in Washington today, or the job they cut out for themselves, the outgoing Secretary of the Interior, millionaire Douglas McKay, set matters straight at the outset of the Eisenhower administration.

"We are here in the saddle," he said, "representing business and industry."

Despite the usual remote relationship between Republican words and Republican deeds, Mr. McKay's statement of purpose has been given firm substance by booming corporation profits during the months of the Eisenhower era.

General Motors, this last year, profited to the annual rate of $1,300,000,000, an all-time world's record to equal the 4-minute mile.

There is still more proof in the figures which show corporation profits generally last year, after the Republican tax bill was put into effect, were up 27 percent over those of 1954.

Now, there is nothing wrong with corporations making money—that's what they are in business for.

But there is something wrong, shabbily wrong, when big business profits zoom up 27 percent, while the average person's take-home pay increases a meager 4 percent, which was the extent of his progress this past year.

Income for stockholders, that 8 percent of the American public, climbed a clean 12 percent in 1955.

But for the 15 percent of America's population which lives on farms, the economic trend has been in a less favorable direction.

Three years ago, under a Democratic administration, the farm families of this country had an annual income that came to $13,500,000,000.

Last year, in 1955, under a Republican administration, farm income was more than $4 billion below that figure. In 1955, in fact, farmers' income declined 9 percent below 1954 earnings, going from bad to worse, with little hope or encouragement coming from the Eisenhower administration in Washington.

What's wrong here, of course, is that farm families are not listed on the New York stock exchange.

Or take another example:

During 1955, the income of such industrial giants as Monsanto Chemical, United States Steel, and Jones & Laughlin climbed between 70 to 100 percent above 1954 returns.

But in the same year 10,969 other businesses went out of operation, failed, closed down.

These were the small manufacturers, the corner groceries, the clothing stores and the furniture shops that were once the strength and core not only of our American economy, but of our whole American society as well.

Almost 11,000 of these enterprises, which were in operation at the beginning of 1955, had ceased to exist at the year's end. During the 3 years of the Republican administration, the average number of business failures has been 10,300, while, in the 7 Democratic years preceding Eisenhower, the average annual number of failures was only 6,300.

Small business certainly isn't sharing the business optimism or the business profits of the large corporations under the Eisenhower banner of peace and prosperity.

What is wrong here, again, is that the butcher and the baker are not listed on the New York stock exchange either.

Not much in the way of dividends or investment income comes from them, or from the farmers, or from the workingmen.

To the obvious misfortune of many Americans, the big business character of the Eisenhower administration has more faces than the bullish corporate profit statements or the blueblood collection of millionaires in the National Cabinet.

By becoming so onesided, so devoted to a single viewpoint and a single interest, the Republicans have violated a basic principle of American public life.

The American people, through their history, have expected their major political parties to be cross sections of the Nation, of the people, by the people and for the people.

They expect the parties to maintain a balance, to provide for the interplay of forces, to equalize pressures so our whole society may achieve harmony and progress.

Today's Republican Party has thrown all this overboard, giving, instead, a Government of big business, by big business, and for big business.

I think this should be made clear: business and corporate enterprise are not evil forces.

They are an integral part, a vital factor, of our capitalistic society and of our entire social and economic structure.

They have helped vigorously in building this Nation, and they have contributed immensely to the material progress of the country.

Men of great ability and of unquestioned integrity are active in the management of banks and corporations.

But to turn over the vast machinery of the Federal Government, with its great economic influences and its management of the whole complexities of our economic system, to one group of our people is as dangerous as it is unjust.

The point is that we Democrats have no quarrel with business, big or little.

We do quarrel with the belief that only the corporate point of view is to prevail.

We admire the qualities which lead to business success, and the everincreasing productivity which business leadership is bringing to our lives.

But we also admire the qualities of scholarship and thought—the qualities of the despised egghead.

We admire the life of the farm, and the desire of men to live in contact with the earth and growing things.

We admire the press and push that comes from labor, the reluctance to be satisfied with things as they are; the desire to move forward and to move one's family forward into a rising living standard, year by year.

The Republicans accused us for years of being a class party.

It is ironic that in their tenure of office they have made themselves into the tightest of class parties—the party of the business executive and no one else.

They are a mirror image of the Wall Street Journal, except when a moment of political dismay rushes them into some gesture they hope will hold the farm vote or the labor vote or some equally mythical racial or religious vote.

The truth is that you do not get these votes by gestures.

You get the support of the majority of the American people—from the farm to the factory, from the schoolroom and the office, from Americans of every race and religion—when the people feel that they have not been excluded from your councils and heart.

In the Democratic Party there are no mental barriers.

And when election day comes around this November, the confident Republicans of April will be jittery and afraid because, by that time, the sober second thought of the American people will be in full evidence.

By that time the massive strength of the Democratic Party—the Nation's majority party—will be in full deployment.

By that time, the Eisenhower record will be fully known to the American people, and the President will have been finally forced to accept responsibility for his own appointees and his own administration.

Up to now, we have had 3 years of sidestepping.

The declining hog market was Benson's.

The rising stock market was Eisenhower's.

The failures and frustrations in our foreign policy were Dulles'.

The Geneva spirit—remember that?—was Eisenhower's.

The polio vaccine snafu was Mrs. Hobby's.

The conversion of the Republican Party to the welfare state was Eisenhower's.

We have had a conscious effort to create a myth of an American President as a personal symbol of the State—above party and above criticism as is the Queen of England in her island kingdom.

Eisenhower is guided politically by a formidable group of political manipulators—Dewey, Brownell and Hagerty—the old crowd from New York now practicing at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

The Secretary of State in this administration will go before a committee of the Senate and shamelessly pretend that all is well in our world position when the whole world knows that we are weaker than at any time since Pearl Harbor.

The Attorney General in the administration will use the instruments of justice for political prosecutions, and leak the threat of more to come.

The Vice President in this administration will involve the Supreme Court and the infinitely difficult question of integration in a boastful political speech.

There is no desire to lead the American people.

There is, instead, a constant attempt to manipulate, to falsify, to play a game of let's pretend.

We are facing a public relations approach to Government in which the accomplishment is nothing while the appearance is everything.

Fortunately for the country, this whole complex of Eisenhower political advantage can be defeated.

The Democrats must count on the fundamental good sense of the American people.

They have the Democratic Party as the instrument of that good sense.

The Democratic Party is the majority party of the American people because it has willingly served the interest of the majority.

It is the workingman's party; it is the farmer's party; it is the party of the schoolteacher and of the small-business man.

It is content to let the Republicans be the millionaire's party.

The Democratic Party is not afraid of leadership, not afraid of change, not afraid of action.

George Leader has proved that fact as Governor of Pennsylvania, in an administration which has been maligned by the press but which is setting a pattern of accomplishment that will serve as a high standard of achievement for years to come.

A Democratic President will reestablish America's leadership throughout the world, revitalize our own efforts for social and economic progress, invigorate the fight for higher standards of living which must be our goal and our search in meeting the future.

A Democratic President will get this country back on the track, where we say what we mean, and mean what we say.

That President—the next President of the United States and all the Presidents in the foreseeable future—will inherit immense problems.

We must recapture America's position of leadership in the world.

We must learn how to compete for the minds as well as the fears of men.

We must be able to achieve a world where freedom and security are not incompatible, where we can challenge the Communists, not in atomic warheads alone, but in the preservation of peace and the advancement of mankind.

The next President of the United States must bring the farmer back to parity in our society; not the parity of dollars in the market place alone, but in the respect and understanding of his fellow citizens, as well.

The next President must deal with the problems of race relations, making sure that the power of the Federal Government will be used temperately and wisely so all Americans will gain the birthright of our Constitution and our professed beliefs.

The next President must be concerned with the continuing expansion of our economy, with full employment in the face of automation, with a steady increase in the standard of living for all Americans.

The world is full of dangers, the seething Middle East, the constant menace of Formosa, the discontent of our allies everywhere, the continuing collapse of the old diplomacy and the old colonialism.

But it is also full of hope.

Man's ingenuity, his ability to construct as to destroy, has never been so great in all recorded history.

The next President of the United States must know a time for greatness. He must not be tired; he must not be spent; he must be ready for the future, whatever the future holds.

He must be a man of leadership, of courage, of action and of good and strong faith.

Such a man can come only from the Democratic Party, whose ideals and philosophies encourage action and stimulate leadership, while Republicans skirt action and shun leadership.

That is why I am sure that with the Democratic Party ready for the conflict, the people of America will not fail either us or themselves.

That is why the candidate nominated by the Democrats in Chicago this August will be the next President of the United States.

Federal Highway and Highway Revenue Acts of 1956

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 27, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10660) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I consider it essential that sound Federal-aid highway construction legislation include a provision requiring prevailing wage standards as outlined by the Davis-Bacon Act. This act provides a sound and fundamental concept of the role of Government in Federal programs sponsoring construction. The principle of the law is time-tested and has been valuable as a remedial measure to protect contractors and craftsmen from unfair contract bids. Failure to include it is manifestly unfair to law-abiding contractors who may be underbid by other contractors paying below local existing wages. It is a necessary measure to eliminate existing unfair bidding advantages of contractors who pay low wages in areas where union rates prevail. The Davis-Bacon provision in the highway-construction measure would provide a proper wage scale.

This provision would prevent the Federal Government from becoming a party to the breaking down of existing prevailing practices regarding wages, hours of work, health, welfare, pensions, overtime provisions, and other working conditions which have been privately negotiated between contractors and construction craft unions.

Originally, the Davis-Bacon Act was enacted in 1931 because the Congress of the United States realized the seriousness of the labor problems created by Government construction contracts which, at that time, were operating to the advantage of the lowest bidder and creating an imbalance in the labor market when nonunion workers were brought into a State to work for exceedingly low wages.

Since 1931, however, when the Davis-Bacon provision has been applied by the Congress it has to its credit the following accomplishments:

First. Equality of bidding opportunity has been guaranteed to all contractors. It protects them against unfair competition and restricts the area of competition to economy and efficiency.

Second. Local employment has been assured by the provision because no advantage can be gained by importing workers from lower wage rate areas.

Third. It protects the standard of living of the local craftsmen.

Fourth. It has fostered industrial peace wherever it has been applied because it removes the prime cause of disputes on these projects.

Fifth. Collective bargaining has been encouraged by it.

Sixth. It has prevented the disturbance of local economies.

Seventh. Through this provision contractors have been able to receive an adequate supply of skilled, experienced, and competent construction craftsmen at the wage rate contained in the contract specifications.

Federal acts which have provided for a prevailing wage clause include the following:

Housing Act of 1937, as amended by the 1949 act;

Federal aid for public airport development of 1946;

Hill-Burton Facilities and Hospital Construction Act of 1946;

School survey and construction of school facilities in federally affected areas of 1950;

Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Service Act of 1951;

Slum clearance and urban renewal program in the Housing Act of 1954;

Multifamily rental housing under the Federal Housing Administration Lease Purchase Contracts Act of 1954.

In my opinion, it would be an act of gross neglect for the Congress, in the light of these facts, to enact legislation for a large highway-construction program without the Davis-Bacon provision. This would seriously hamper the program and the interests of labor.

Case of Personal Products Corp. Before National Labor Relations Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it appears that in certain remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] on the functioning of the National Labor Relations Board, he alluded to a case cited as that of the Personal Products Corp.

This corporation was represented by the firm of Seyfarth, Shaw & Fairweather, a very distinguished and reliable firm of attorneys. On reading the remarks by the Senator from Oregon, they wrote him at considerable length and sent me a copy of their letter. I believe in the interest of presenting both sides of the matter that this letter should be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to have it published in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEYFARTH, SHAW & FAIRWEATHER,
Chicago, April 23, 1956.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We have read with considerable interest your remarks to the Senate concerning the functioning of the National Labor Relations Board under the Eisenhower administration and, particularly, that portion dealing with the Personal Products Corp. case (at pp. 4873 to 4874 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD), since our law firm represented the employer in that case.

We feel that many of your statements were based on an inadequate analysis of the facts and the law involved in the case. They also incorrectly imply that the case was instigated and decided by Eisenhower appointees to the Labor Board. We are therefore setting forth below facts which we feel you should consider in the hope that you will correct the statements which you made on March 23.

1. The alleged unreasonable attitude of Personal Products Corp. in collective bargaining.

You stated that "although the company admitted that it could afford to increase wages, and although other companies across the Nation were granting wage increases, this company refused to offer any wage increase at all." Undoubtedly this statement was intended to convey the impression that the company approached the bargaining table in a completely arbitrary and unreasonable frame of mind. Both your facts and conclusions are wrong.

During the negotiation, the company did make at least two separate and substantial proposals for increasing the wages of their employees and improving their fringe benefits. These proposals were made despite the fact that the wages and fringe benefits paid by this company were already far above the average in the State of Illinois and in the country as a whole. These proposals were also made in the face of union demands totaling about 70 cents per hour in cost and an announced position of the union representative that fairness is out insofar as bargaining was concerned. Early in the negotiation, the union negotiator announced that wages would be established at this company solely on the basis of the driving force of the bargaining agent. You may verify these facts by examining the NLRB hearing transcript which we will be happy to make available to you. We call your attention particularly to page 1310 of this transcript.

2. The union did not strike, because the plant was located in a private industrial area where the union would not be permitted to picket.

You stated that one of the reasons why the union did not call a full-fledged strike was because the company's plant was located in a private industrial district where the union could not even engage in peaceful picketing. On September 1, 1953, the union did call a strike and did picket the company premises. The company made no attempt to halt peaceful picketing. Only when violence later erupted did the company seek an injunction to restrain the violence.

3. The company filed its unfair labor practice charge with the "Eisenhower Board."

You stated that the company "filed a charge with the Eisenhower Board." This remark was undoubtedly intended to convey the impression that Eisenhower appointees were employer biased and responsible for issuance of the complaint and the decision. Again both your facts and your conclusions are wrong. The facts in this regard are as follows:

(a) The unfair labor practice charge was filed on February 16, 1953, and the complaint was issued on June 5, 1953. All of the personnel involved with processing of the charge and issuance of the complaint were appointees and hirees of the prior, Democratic administrations. We are referring in particular to the field examiner, the chief field examiner, the regional director, and the General Counsel himself. Even the five members of the Board itself were still Democratic appointees at the time the complaint was issued.

(b) The attorney who tried the case before the trial examiner was hired by the Board during the Democratic Truman administration.

(c) The trial examiner who heard the case was hired under the Democratic administration.

(d) The decision of the Board, finding the union guilty of bad faith bargaining, was a unanimous decision by 2 Democratic appointees and 2 Eisenhower appointees. Incidentally, one of the concurring members was Mr. Peterson, who, we understand, was closely associated with you prior to his appointment to the Labor Board.

(e) The decision of the Board was based on a prior decision of the Board in *Phelps-Dodge Copper Products Corp.* (101 NLRB 360 (1952)), wherein the Board had stated that slowdowns and intermittent stoppages were "irreconcilable with the act's requirement of reasoned discussion in a background of balanced bargaining relations upon which good faith bargaining must rest." This decision was issued before President Eisenhower was even inaugurated, by a Board composed entirely of members appointed by Democratic Presidents.

4. It is clear that a slowdown is not a violation of the Nation Labor Relations Act.

You stated, "Now if there is one thing that is clear in the act it is that a slowdown is not a violation of the act." You thus cavalierly disposed of a question which the United States Supreme Court recently decided to review. (*NLRB* v. *Textile Workers Union of America* (case No. 690, April 2, 1956).) In your argument on this point, you state that the National Labor Relations Act "legalized the so-called slow down as a strike weapon," and you concluded that slowdows cannot be enjoined or restrained. In support of your conclusion, you cite the United States Supreme Court decision in *United Automobile Workers* v. *Wisconsin E. R. B.* (336 U. S. 245). The case you have cited actually refutes your argument. There the union contended that slowdowns and "quickie" stoppages were protected as lawful strike action under section 13 of the act, which you have cited. The Supreme Court ruled that section 13 conferred no such immunity. The Court stated:

"If we were to read section 13 as we are urged to do, to make the strike an absolute right and the definition to extend the right to all other variations of the strike, the effect would be to legalize beyond the power of any State or Federal authorities to control not only the intermittent stoppages such as we have here but also the slow down and perhaps the sit-down strike as well. [Citing cases.] And this is not all; the management also would be disabled from any kind of self-help to cope with these coercive tactics of the union except to submit to its undeclared demands. To dismiss or discipline employees for exercising a right given them under the act or to interfere with them or the union in pursuing it is made an unfair labor practice and if the rights here asserted are rights conferred by the Labor-Management Relations Act, it is hard to see how the management can take any steps to resist or combat them without incurring the sanctions of the act. It is certain that such a result would be inconsistent with the whole purpose disclosed by the Labor-Management Relations Act amendments to the Labor Relations Act. Nor do we think such is the result of any fair interpretation of the text of this act."

You have lifted from context the statement of the Supreme Court that the Labor Board has no authority to deal with the problem of slowdowns and "quickie" stoppages. We are enclosing a copy of the amicus curiae brief that we filed with the Supreme Court in support of the Board's petition for writ of certiorari in the Personal Products case. We feel that the argument which we presented in this brief should be considered by you before you conclude erroneously that the Automobile Workers case stands for the proposition you have pronounced. Certainly, the mere fact that the Supreme Court has granted review in the case should cast considerable doubt on the logic of your position.

In the light of the granting of certiorari by the Supreme Court and in the further light of the facts we have set forth herein, we hope that you will review and correct the remarks which you made concerning the Personal Products case.

Respectfully,

SEYFARTH, SHAW & FAIRWEATHER.
By JOHN T. VANAKEN.

The Effects of Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the attributes of brevity and impact are not traditionally the most outstanding characteristics of the communications of many men in public life. Therefore, when a man in high office combines those two features and uses them for a noble cause, the occasion is more than worthy of note.

An example of such a case is a pamphlet recently prepared by Mr. Anselm Sodaro, State's attorney for Baltimore City. Although the publication is addressed to the youth of Baltimore, its blunt, factual message concerning the effects of crime is actually an open letter to all American youth.

More than 30 States have requested copies of the pamphlet since it was first printed recently, and 52,000 copies have been ordered for distribution. In an effort to help bring the fine work to the attention of still more young men and women, I request unanimous consent that the pamphlet be included in the Appendix of today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the pamphlet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Youth of Baltimore:

It isn't worth the chance.

Here's why:

Do you realize that committing a crime means —

Disgrace and embarrassment to you.

Grief to your parents and your loved ones—they also must share in your disgrace.

Expenditure of money by you or your parents to employ a lawyer and engage a bondsman to furnish bail pending your trial.

Imprisonment in a penal institution pending trial if you or your parents are unable to furnish bail.

Possible imprisonment after trial, and perhaps for many years.

Your conduct and movements will be checked because you will be a criminal who has to be watched.

You will be avoided by decent people and become the object of contempt or pity.

Yes; the road of crime is not only the most hazardous, but the least profitable.

Do you know that—

By being arrested or found guilty of a crime your future is handicapped.

Getting a job is difficult when you have a criminal record. A criminal record will seriously affect your ability to obtain a good job after leaving school. In the business world, or with the city, State of Federal Government, employers shun persons with a criminal record. You may be deprived of gainful employment during the best years of your life.

You may lose certain citizenship rights, if convicted of certain crimes, your right to vote will be taken away.

Your changes of dating and marrying a fine person will be lessened. No respectable young lady or young man wants to date or marry a person who has come into conflict with the law or has a criminal record.

You are doing a disservice to your country. The high rate of juvenile crime is providing unfriendly governments throughout the world with effective propaganda.

Remember—The Youth Court is a criminal court, and being young or a first offender does not necessarily mean you'll get off.

Do you know that—

If you steal an automobile you can be sentenced to the penitentiary for 15 years and if you ride in a stolen car you are just as guilty as the one who stole it.

If you break into a house or building you can be imprisoned for 20 years.

If you rob with a weapon you can be imprisoned for 20 years.

If you carry a weapon or a switch blade knife you can be sent to prison for 2 years.

If you use narcotics you can be sentenced to 5 years for the first offense, 10 years for the second offense and 20 years for the third offense.

Keep in mind that 953 offenders between 16 and 20 years of age were put on trial in the youth court in 1955, and 504 were sent to prison, and many for a long time.

A WORD TO THE PARENTS

Delinquency can be prevented. The ultimate solution of the problem is in the hands of the parents, through closer supervision of children, inquiring of their whereabouts and knowing the kind of company they keep.

Many youthful offenders come from good American homes and potentially good parents, and all are not the product of broken homes or families facing economic instability.

Statistics reveal that 80 percent of the 16-to-18-year-old offenders turn to crime after 10 o'clock at night. This, I call the "hour of danger."

Parents: Ask yourself each night at 10: Where are my children? With whom are they associating? What are they doing? How much time am I giving my children?

I am sure that you will agree with me that we, as parents, are in a much better position to prevent juvenile crime than any or all of the law-enforcement agencies.

ANSELM SODARO,
State's Attorney for Baltimore City.

What the President Said After the Lights Went Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a column by Mr. Williard Shelton in the current issue of the AFL–CIO News:

(This column might be subtitled: "What President Eisenhower said to American editors—not the people—after the lights went out.")

The lights are the little red lights on the TV cameras that tell a speaker he is on the air. The occasion was a dinner of the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington.

The President, for the cameras and the country, made a formal speech telling the new Soviet rulers that they should right Stalin's wrongs. He proclaimed America's opposition to colonialism.

This speech, although telecast domestically, was obviously aimed abroad—at the Soviets, our western allies, at the uncommitted or neutralist countries.

But President Eisenhower decided on a postscript. After his party arrived at the dinner, the chairman was told the President would like to talk informally after the TV section was ended.

So the TV lights wents off—and Eisenhower began talking off the cuff, from just some key phrases arranged on cards.

As frequently happens in such cases, the Presidents' sentences became involved, lengthy and sometimes difficult to follow exactly. As an example, after mentioning Japan's trade difficulties, here is what the transcript says:

"But the next thing we come up against, we are very certain in our own minds that some of these nations—not all the United States people, you know—but some of them are very loud in their denunciation of any country that trades with the Communist countries. So they (presumably the Japanese) can't trade with their natural markets, with Manchuria and China. So finally all of these southeastern markets—all the southeastern Asia markets, have been largely destroyed—they are so poor they can't support Japan. So what does Japan do? Where are we chasing her? Chasing her to one place. She has to look less and less—I mean to the mainland next to her. She has to, now, begin to look rather longingly, unless something is done.

"Now that is the kind of cross purpose that comes up, and this goes on around the world. Britain and France and Germany, indeed every country with which we deal, has some problem different economically from our own."

What the President seemed to be saying was that by refusing to trade with Japan sufficiently the United States is driving the Japanese into the arms of Red China or the Soviet Union.

He also seemed to be saying that to adopt a fixed stand against trading with Communist nations would sacrifice one of our great assets.

"There are no easy panaceas. You can't say 'we simply won't trade with the Communist nations'—make that work for all of us. In fact, such a statement is, to my mind, giving up one of the great strengths for which the Yankee has always been noted: he is a good trader."

Now if this means the two things suggested, Eisenhower is asking for a major shift in American foreign policy—and one that might cause him trouble.

But the President didn't talk directly to the people. He seemed to be telling the editors he would like them to go home and let the new idea trickle down to their readers.

The speech was a domestic speech—a speech pleading with Americans to support new concepts. But his speech aimed abroad was telecast here, and his speech asking American support wasn't telecast.

It is an extraordinary reversal of the usual White House practice—and the speech went almost unreported. It came late on Saturday night, its meaning was obscure, tried to interpret it hastily—and relatively few know anything about it.

The explanation seems to be that the White House was upset by Adlai Stevenson's speech to the editors assailing the Eisenhower administration's foreign policy; and was further upset by a 2-to-1 vote among the editors themselves asserting that the United States is losing the cold war with Russia.

So the President apparently decided close to the last minute on his postscript and talked almost as long in the postscript as in the formal speech.

The question may be asked: If the President thinks that a major change in policy is necessary to keep Japan from slipping into Soviet arms, to help Britain, France, and Germany solve their economic problems by trading with Communist countries, why not take it to the people?

Why not trust the people and tell them what the administration thinks? Why save it for a handful of editors?

A Farm Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks, I include in the

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a letter written by my colleague, Hon. PAUL C. JONES, of Missouri.

Mr. JONES represents one of the great agricultural districts of the Mississippi Valley and has long been a member of the Committee on Agriculture and is considered to be an authority on the subject which he discusses in the accompanying letter.

The letter is as follows:

APRIL 19, 1956.

ST. LOUIS GLOBE-DEMOCRAT,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR MR. EDITOR: I have just read two of your editorials, A Very Bad Bill and Veto the Farm Bill, both published before President Eisenhower's veto of the farm bill, and I think both of these editorials emphasize the fact that you know as little about the farmer's problems as does the President.

I note particularly your statement, "the reason the overwhelming majority voted for General Eisenhower was because he represented integrity in America." It appears that you omitted two very important words from that statement which should have included the words "they believed" between the words "because" and "he". I say this advisedly, for there is no question but that the farmers of America believed the President when he said at Brookings, S. Dak. on October 4, 1952, "The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of the 90 percent parity price support, and it is pledged even more than that to helping the farmer obtain his full parity, 100 percent parity, with the guaranty in the price supports of 90."

How can you justify the use of the word integrity when the President has done nothing to carry out the pledge he made to the farmers in his election campaign of 1952?

Like so many of our city friends you accept the false premise that the high prices paid by the consumer are a result of "high" prices received by the farmer, and there are no facts to bear out this statement. For instance, 10 years ago wheat was selling at $3 per bushel in the United States and the average price of bread was 13.8 cents per pound, whereas today with wheat bringing about $2 per bushel, you are paying approximately 18 cents per pound for bread. This is just one of many examples which could be presented. Never before in the history of the world have consumers been able to buy so much food for an hour's labor, and the farmer's share of this same food dollar was never less.

You, like so many others who have gone off on a tangent, and the further you go the further you are from the truth, insist on referring to 90-percent price supports as "high" supports. If the subscription price of your paper was $10 a year which it is not, would you consider that you were getting a high price if I sent you a check for $9 to cover a year's subscription? Yet, when you ask a farmer to accept 75 percent of parity, he wouldn't even have the $7.50 to pay for a subscription.

Farmers are not asking "parities up to the ceiling" of 100 percent. They are asking that they be treated in a manner that will permit them to at least keep their heads above water. Farmers are not demanding subsidies despite the fact that they have been contributing to subsidies for other segments of our economy, including your own newspaper for many long years. They are giving something in return for a guaranteed price-support program, agreeing to bring production in line with demand. This administration has failed miserably in its efforts—because it has made no effort—to bring about consumption of an overabundance of production. There is no surplus of food in the world today; there is no surplus of fiber, but there is an underconsumption because of an administration that has devoted all of its efforts to to prove that a farm program that has enabled the farmer to enjoy some of the comforts of life will not work.

If the President is not playing politics, why did he at the time he vetoed the farm bill which would have helped all farmers, raise the price supports for wheat, grown principally in an area which is traditionally Republican; why did he raise the price supports on corn with no limitation on production to influence the farm vote in Iowa and other traditionally Republican areas; when he stated at the same time that higher supports would encourage greater production and add to the surplus?

And while I am asking questions, why don't you change your masthead to tell the truth that the Globe-Democrat is the same Republican newspaper that it has always been, beating the drums for the GOP?

Democratically yours,

PAUL C. JONES,
Member of Congress, 10th Missouri District.

What the Postal Workers Want and Should Get

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, it was my distinct privilege and personal pleasure to address the annual rally of the joint conference of Affiliated Postal Employees, held in New York City on Sunday afternoon, April 29. I discussed some of the current problems and the objectives presently being sought by the postal workers, as well as the need for early enactment of these measures.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to insert the text of my address on the above occasion:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN VICTOR L. ANFUSO AT JOINT CONFERENCE OF AFFILIATED POSTAL EMPLOYEES, NEW YORK, SUNDAY APRIL 29, 1956

President Dave Silvergleid, Roy Hallbeck, and all my good friends in the postal service, it is always a great delight for me to join with you at these public rallies and to have the opportunity to exchange a few thoughts. Let me thank you first for extending the invitation to be here with you today and to address this fine gathering.

During the years that I have come to know your leaders and your membership more intimately, I have found that you are an alert group, always prepared to speak your mind freely, forcefully and intelligently. You do not hesitate to speak up and to criticize where criticism is needed. And this is the way it should be in a democracy.

You may have heard the story of the two German fishermen who were trying their luck on opposite banks of the Rhine River. The one on the bank of the American zone was hauling in plenty of fish, but the one on the Russian side couldn't get a bite. Finally, the fisherman on the Russian side got disgusted and he shouted:

"How do you manage to catch so many fish, while I get none?"

"Very simple," replied the man on the American side. "The fish over here aren't afraid to open their mouths."

In a democracy like ours we are not afraid to speak our minds and to say what we please—Even if we are Government workers. Your rally today is an excellent example of that freedom, of bringing your gripes into the open, of criticizing, and of seeking the means to improve your lot, your working conditions, your benefits, and your security in life.

Last year, the question of a salary increase was uppermost in your mind. That matter has been resolved, though not as satisfactorily as I had hoped. You may recall that I advocated an $800 increase for all postal and Federal employees, and I voiced the opinion that anything less than a 10 percent pay increase would be inadequate. I still feel as strongly about it today as I did a year ago, and it is my sincere hope that in the not too distant future Congress will rectify the shortcomings of last year's pay increase. Your request for a $600 increase is justifiable. I need not tell you that I shall be glad to support it. It will not be an easy task to reach this goal. As a good friend of yours I must tell you that you are facing an uphill fight, and you must therefore gird yourself well if you want to be successful.

This year, other problems and other objectives are holding your attention. I refer specifically to such matters as the need for a better and more liberal retirement system, recognition of employee organizations, the establishment of a system for merit promotion, and seniority established by law. Every one of these objectives is a good one and should have been enacted a long time ago. I know that you and your families are vitally interested in achieving these objectives in the near future. With the proper campaigns and push—as I know from experience that you postal workers can do—you ought to be successful before very long.

The one that stands the best chance for early achievement, it seems to me, is the retirement bill (S. 2875) by Senator OLIN JOHNSTON, chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. As you undoubtedly know, the committee gave its unanimous approval to this measure recently, and the chances appear to be quite good that it may still be enacted during this session of Congress.

I don't want to go into a lengthy discussion of the major provisions of this bill. I am sure that most of you are by now generally familiar with these provisions. Suffice it to say, that the average retirement annuities would be increased by about 25 percent; retirement would be possible at any age after 30 years of service; benefits for the disabled would be increased substantially; survivors benefits would also be considerably increased, and a number of other important benefits. Let me assure you that there is not an employee in the Federal service, regardless of his salary or his age, who would not benefit greatly through the enactment of this bill.

No wonder the measure is described as "the greatest forward step in Federal employee legislation in 30 years." I regard it as the most far-reaching step in the revision of our retirement system in many years. This measure meets head-on most of the retirement needs of all those who are now on the Government payroll.

Let me caution you, however, as a good friend, that as long as the bill has not been enacted there are always dangers. In this instance, too, there are some hurdles which must still be crossed before it becomes law. The biggest of these is the fact that the Republican administration is opposed to the retirement bill, primarily on the old lame excuse of economy.

You must remember also that we still have to push it through Congress. I want you to know that I am not only for it and will strongly support it when it comes before the House of Representatives, but I have

done more than that. I have personally talked to Congressman MURRAY, the chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and to several members of the committee regarding the bill. I have their assurance it will be given prompt and proper consideration. This measure is among the top bills on my list for this session.

Incidentally, let me assure you that in my talks with Mr. MURRAY and other committee members, I also mentioned other legislation in which postal workers are vitally interested. For example, I stressed the importance of recognizing employee organizations, like yours and others of similar type. It is most unfortunate that Federal employees do not enjoy certain rights in the field of labor-management relations as do employees in private industry. Government workers have a right to join unions of their choice, but the unions cannot impose upon them an obligation to strike against the Government. There is also no requirement that the Government recognize such unions as spokesmen for Federal employees. Thus, effective labor-management relations are practically nonexistent in Government service.

This is an injustice which needs to be corrected. Several bills have been introduced which call for practical machinery to deal adequately and fairly with labor-management problems which come up in Government service. They provide official recognition of employee unions, the requirement that departments and agencies deal with the unions on personnel matters and employee grievances, and also recommend arbitration of disputes. While as yet there has been no action on these bills, I am happy to know that the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee will begin hearings on May 15. I do hope such legislation will be enacted at an early date. The principles and objectives of union recognition are reasonable and just. I regard this legislation as among the most important Federal employee measures now before the Congress.

As for the question of merit promotion, all I will say at this time is that we should have had it a long time ago. A sensible and workable program for the promotion of employees on the basis of merit is long overdue. Unfortunately, there is a disposition in certain quarters to discredit the civil service merit system and to wreck it by filling positions on the basis of political endorsement. It is wrong and it is harmful all around. The whole present system is not working satisfactorily. I know this from the letters I receive at my office, and I know it from the views expressed to me by employee organizations which are sponsoring this legislation. Senator JOHNSTON has recently introduced a bill (S. 3456) along these lines, and I am all in favor of its enactment into law.

In conclusion, let me assure you that Congress is working hard on various phases of legislation and I am certain that the end of the session will show a fine record of accomplishments. Gradual progress is being made in the field in which you are interested, not only in the problems I discussed with you today, but also in others, such as the question of seniority, health insurance for Government employees at no additional cost to you, and other matters.

You have many good friends in Congress who are constantly on the alert for your interests. But your organization and similar organizations cannot let up for a minute. You too must pitch in and get behind us with enthusiasm. I know you can do it, when you want to. It is like the old saying: Even if you are on the right track, you will get run over if you just sit there.

The Dedication of the New Passenger Terminal at the Cleveland Hopkins Airport, April 28, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, permit me to call the attention of my colleagues in Congress to the dedication of the new passenger terminal at the Cleveland Hopkins Airport in Cleveland, Ohio, on April 28, 1956. This new $3,500,000 passenger terminal is the latest phase of a $22 million modernization program which is designed to place Cleveland's air terminal in the front ranks of America's airports.

The city of Cleveland has every right to be proud of this new terminal. It is an exemplary step forward in the field of air travel in our rapidly shrinking world. The construction of this terminal was made possible by the passage of a local bond issue paid for by the citizens of Cleveland although the airport serves the entire metropolitan area.

Of particular interest to the air traveler is the big new parking lot providing adequate accommodations for the commuter who leaves his motorcar at the airport for a day's business in another city.

The next items for construction on the agenda at the Cleveland Hopkins Airport are two privately financed airplane hangars estimated to cost $4 million and a new north concourse soon to get underway.

Federal contributions have been a great factor in the construction of the airport facilities in Cleveland, but the local citizens have made every effort to contribute their fair share toward this important community asset.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*.....
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*.....120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Jenner, William E., *Ind*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Laird, William R. III, *W. Va*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*.....Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*.....
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*.....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*.....
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*.....
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*.....
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*.....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass.*—2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*.....Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*.....
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Wofford, Thomas A., *S. C*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Johnson of Texas, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Barkley, Anderson, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Morse, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Wofford, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Laird, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Wofford, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Laird, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Scott, Wofford, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Appendix

Yellowstone National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, on March 29, 1956, I included with my remarks on the need for improvement in national park facilities an article by Prof. A. R. Patton. The former Montana resident recalled Yellowstone National Park as it was in the 1920's thereby demonstrating the need for improvement in park facilities today.

Among the letters prompted by appearance of the article is the following from Mr. Harry W. Frantz, correspondent of foreign service, United Press, Washington:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 3, 1956.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Representative from Montana, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. METCALF: Friends of Yellowstone Park find great interest in the article about Yellowstone in the twenties, which you inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 29, 1956.

Prof. A. R. Patton has evoked nostalgic memories of the park in a period when the tremendous tide of motor tourists was still in an early stage.

Yellowstone Park has a great wealth of western pioneer traditions, no less than scenic wonders, and inspires among its countless visitors an "all America" feeling which is not soon forgotten.

I venture to send you a minor contribution to the Yellowstone annals which I wrote in 1923, about the time when the Patton family was saluting Old Faithful.

Attached to my story is a brief article, which is self-explanatory.

Cordially,

HARRY W. FRANTZ,
Correspondent of Foreign Service, United Press, Washington, D. C.

The article mentioned and an excerpt from Haynes Yellowstone Guide follows:

THE GRAND LOOP ROAD OF WONDERLAND

(By Harry W. Frantz)

YELLOWSTONE PARK, WYO., September 15, 1923.—History loves roads. Tradition follows the route of a great highway. The story of Japan lingers along the Tokaido, linking the east capital at Tokyo with the west capital at Kyoto. In the dust of the Grand Trunk Road is the mystery of India. Of Rome what was greater than its great highways—the Via Appia and the Via Ignatia? Nor can American history ever be disentwined from the overland route and the Santa Fe Trail.

Gravel and bridges and engineering skill alone do not make a road great. The footprints and the hoofmarks and, if you will, the tireprints of countless travelers are required. And, too, the road must lead somewhere—to a mosque, to a shrine, to a sacred river, to Tartary or to Mecca.

Slowly but as certainly as mathematics the Grand Loop Road of the Yellowstone Park is becoming a great national highway. It is a road entwined in the lives and the dreams of an ever-growing number of people, the path of pilgrims seeking the god of the open air. About it, too, there accumulates a great volume of traditions—the passing of presidents and princes, the meetings of poets and peasants.

There is no road in America of more varied appeal or charm. Already it is the route of citizens from every State. Sometimes, too, it is the pathway of elk and deer and bear. Beside it bloom great fields of magic wild flowers. It leads past the remarkable hot springs formations, into the world's greatest geyser basins, along the shores of America's most beautiful lake and to the brink of a canyon unparalleled for the sheer gorgeousness of its coloring.

Think a minute as you swing along the Grand Loop—it is barely born in the sense of history, yet it is hallowed by great associations. In whole or in part it was the route of Sheridan, of Arthur, of Roosevelt, of Harding, of Kipling, of Burroughs, of Chief Joseph, of General Howard, of Buffalo Bill Cody—to mention a very few. Into its making went the genius of many engineers—Chittenden perhaps the greatest among them—and the labor of many men. This Grand Loop Road is barely 150 miles in length, but from it radiate roads into every community of the land. So the pilgrims come hundreds to traverse its tens of miles.

Every guidebook will tell you the geography of the Grand Loop Road. You can reach it from the north or the south or the east or the west. It starts at Mammoth, once the old post of Fort Yellowstone and now headquarters for the park. It goes past Liberty Gap and the terraces of Mammoth Hot Springs, around the foot of Jupiter and skirting Angel. Next there are the Hoodoos, the Silver Gate, the Golden Gate. The snowy peaks of the Gallatin Range loom over the road as it crosses the plateau. Of Obsidian Cliff the guidebook tells, and of the terrifying steam-vents of Hellroaring Mountain.

The road passes Norris Geyser Basin with its fearful drift of steam clouds, tarries at the bulb-blubbing Mammoth Paint Pots, leads down the gorge of the Gibbon and up that of the Firehole, introduces you to the geysers and immense pools of Lower Basin, enchants you on the brink of the Morning Glory pool, and finally arrives at every park traveler's objective, Old Faithful.

The Grand Loop then twice crosses the Continental Divide, and the traveler sees in the remote distance the lovely mountains of the Teton Range, the Grand Teton, guidepost of the pioneers, looming highest among them. Down to Yellowstone Lake it drifts, trestling into the very home of the trout, then cutting across the mountain past the Knotted Woods to the Natural Bridge and again to the shores of the lake. Northward it leads now, through great meadows grazed by elk, past the silvery placid childhood of the Yellowstone River, and down to its hectic youth in the falls and Grand Canyon.

There is a bridge with lines as light as lace and the road runs over it to Artist Point. From this magic vista the road sees no need of taking one farther, so doubles back to the east side of the canyon. Then northward the loop road climbs, over Dunraven Pass, along the shoulder of Mount Washburn, past the straight-ribbon canyon of the middle-aged Yellowstone, under Overhanging Cliff, and into a region of broad open spaces bound by the distant peaks of the Absarokas. Now the road leads through a land loved of animals, the home of antelope, beaver, and mule deer. The long mesa of Everts rises again on the right, the Electric Peak stands ahead, and the Grand Loop finds its end on the meadow at Mammoth.

Such, very briefly, is the geography of the Grand Loop Road of the Yellowstone. But the scenery does not exhaust its charm. Everyone will find his fascination in sights or experiences akin to his interest.

Is it flowers that you love? Suppose it is early in July. The purple-fringed gentian, which many think the most beautiful flower of the Rockies, is blooming by the roadside. On the hot springs terraces is a yellow flower known colloquially as butter and eggs. There are water lilies in Isa Lake at the Continental Divide, and immense fields of yellow dog-tooth violets await you on Dunravan Pass. The pink wild geranium grows everywhere. There are violets if you look for them—and asters and wild roses and, amid the sagebrush and greasewood, the rare rock rose.

Or perhaps you are more interested in animals? Well, Jesse James, the highway bear, lurks in the shadows near Continental Divide, and it may be your sugar ration that he will demand. There is very chance that you may see herds of noble elk grazing in the Gibbon Meadows, and deer in the woods at any point along the road. The pronghorn antelope may cross the road before you as you cross the Crescent Mountain. There are beaver dams by the loop at many points; woodchucks and ground squirrels test out their speed under the flying wheel of automobile wheels. By a little detour you can see the buffalo.

Not flowers, not beasts; then people perhaps.

Lend your eye to the traffic on the Grand Loop Road: Automobile camp outfits with canvas tops, successors to the covered wagons, sheltering sagebrushers just off the plains; touring cars bearing licenses from New York or Toronto or Los Angeles or where you will, their occupants avid for distance; long caravans of yellow buses laden with tourists, passing with the regularity and precision of military convoys; hitchhikers carrying their own packs but ever hoping for a lift from a friendly automobilist; uniformed rangers patroling on horse or motorcycle; cowboys or horse wranglers riding before or after the pack outfits from dude ranches; cook wagons, road gangs, truckloads of Boy Scouts from Wyoming or Idaho, horseback parties of red-neckerchiefed girls from the East; everyone coming from somewhere and going somewhere else—the Grand Loop Road their temple for a day.

Round and round the pilgrims go, ever seeking the new and strange, finding it or not as they are trained to know it. The Grand Loop cannot help them; it only paves the way for them. Some will love the peaks, some will love the road itself—its good granite base, its timbered parapets, and, even at times, its gray drifting dust.

[From Haynes' Yellowstone Guide]

THE GRAND LOOP ROAD OF THE PARK—THE ADOPTION OF THE NAME

"Gravel and bridges and engineering skill alone do not make a great road. The footprints and the hoofmarks, and if you will,

the tireprints of countless travelers are required. And, too, the road must lead somewhere—to a mosque, to a shrine, to a sacred river, to Tartary, or to a Mecca.

"Slowly but as certainly as mathematics the Grand Loop Road of the Yellowstone Park is becoming a great national highway. It is a road entwined in the lives and the dreams of an ever-growing number of people, the path of pilgrims seeking the god of the open air. About it, too, there accumulates a great volume of traditions—the passing of presidents and princes, the meetings of poets and peasants."

Harry W. Frantz, publicity director of Yellowstone National Park during the season of 1923, wrote a splendid article entitled "The Grand Loop Road of Wonderland," from which these paragraphs are quoted. The title has been officially approved by the National Park Service and will be perpetuated in Yellowstone nomenclature.

Supt. Horace M. Albright, of Yellowstone National Park, in a letter dated December 17, 1923, to J. E. Haynes, wrote in part: "I have your letter of December 3 and am heartily in favor of adopting your suggestion that hereafter we call our 'loop' road system 'The Grand Loop Road of the Park' * * *. I will advise the other franchise holders and the railroads."

The Grand Loop Road of the park is reached by way of all park entrances. It connects Mammoth Hot Springs, Norris Geyser Basin, Lower Geyser Basin, Old Faithful, West Thumb of Yellowstone Lake, Lake Outlet, Grand Canyon, and Tower Fall. Its net length, exclusive of optional side roads, is 137.9 miles. The distances from the park boundaries to the Grand Loop Road are as follows: From the north, 4.5 miles; west, 13.5 miles; south, 23.6 miles; and from the east, 27 miles.

Mr. Frantz has made a more intensive study of the Yellowstone region than almost any other writer. He made a vagabond tour 12 years ago, and came again to the park in 1923 with a sincere desire to help the American public to appreciate its natural wonders and its animal population.

The closing paragraph of The Grand Loop Road of Wonderland carries a thought important to every person interested in the development of a greater general appreciation of the park:

"Round and round the pilgrims go, ever seeking the new and strange, finding it or not as they are trained to know it. The Grand Loop cannot help them; it only paves the way for them. Some will love the peaks, some will love the road itself—its good granite base, its timbered parapets, and even at times its gray drifting dust."

Mr. Speaker, in spite of narrow highways and overcrowded campgrounds, the Grand Loop Road is a road of wonderland enjoyed by more thousands each year.

Establishing a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure

SPEECH
OF
HON. RUTH THOMPSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 30, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7500) to establish a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss THOMPSON].

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the passage of the bill H. R. 7500. I believe it is a good bill and hope it will be enacted.

Make It the Real Thing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, it appears that in the very near future the Congress will again be asked to vote on the question of an enlarged foreign-aid program. It has become increasingly evident that the American people are wary of the effectiveness of these programs. Whatever may have been the experiences of the past, it has forcibly demonstrated that we cannot buy friends nor can we buy peace.

Questionnaires sent to the constituency of my congressional district over the past few years and most recent tabulation of my present questionnaire indicates that a majority favor substantial decrease and in a great many cases a discontinuation. It is for this reason that I would favor a thorough reappraisal of this program so that the American people may have all the facts, figures, and results.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial on this subject published in the New York World-Telegram of April 30, 1956.

The editorial follows:

MAKE IT THE REAL THING

It's an old bureaucratic custom to call for a study of a program when criticism by Congress and the taxpayer gets hot, or when the bureaucrat doesn't know what to do next. The objective of the bureaucrat, with a vested interest in the program, is to load the study in his favor.

That's what is happening on the foreign-aid program.

Never has a major government program needed such a thorough reappraisal and overhaul.

The foreign-aid program has dispensed some $55 billion in grants and loans since the war. Most observers abroad, including some of our best allies, agree that the present system is obsolete and, in some cases, doing more harm than good.

Yet for many months both the administration and Congress merely have been trying to patch up the old program to cope with the new dynamic moves of the Kremlin.

Belatedly, far too late to do any good for the pending appropriations requests, both Congress and the administration are conceding the need for a thorough study of the aid program.

But what kind of study group will be set up? Will it be executive branch officials, dominated by and dependent on the professional foreign bureaucrats? If so, the time and money will be wasted.

Rather, study should be made by a group of men who can be critical but constructive, forward-looking but not hesitant to profit by past mistakes. There must be no suspicion that the study's major purpose is just to perpetuate a program which admittedly is in dire need of the sharpest analysis.

To be of any value at all, such a study must be made under the jurisdiction and authority of Congress; preferably jointly by the House and Senate. We suggest a commission of two groups—Members of the Senate and House, and a group of non-Government citizens.

Furthermore, the commission should investigate not only economic aid but military aid, which is by far the greater program now.

To do any good, the study must be real, not just a front to hide unpleasant facts.

Parcel Post Limitations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I know there are many Members of the House who oppose the present parcel-post size and weight restrictions. The following resolution of the Northwest Apparel Manufacturers Association indicates the hardship of such limitations on small industries of this type in my part of the country because in the State of Washington as elsewhere we have many small communities served only by parcel post.

I trust favorable action on H. R. 9566 will be forthcoming. Meanwhile on behalf of the major producers of sportswear and related apparel, I include the following resolution in support of this bill:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF H. R. 9566

Whereas the existence of an efficient, economical parcel-post system is essential to the pattern of life of our citizens and businesses in both rural and urban areas; and

Whereas the present discriminatory parcel-post size and weight limitations seriously disrupt the service once enjoyed by all at great and unnecessary cost and inconvenience; and

Whereas there is no nationwide substitute for parcel post that can and will serve all citizens regardless of address; and

Whereas the present size and weight limitations have been both a financial and an administrative burden to the Post Office Department; Be it hereby

Resolved, That the Pacific Northwest Apparel Manufacturers Association, representing 17 businesses in Portland and Seattle, favors immediate enactment of H. R. 9566 and restoration thereby of uniform parcel-post size and weight limits. It is respectfully requested that Representative THOMAS M. PELLY insert this resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that he request the chairman of the Post Office Committee to schedule hearings now on parcel-post size and weight so that the citizens of Seattle, Wash., and Portland, Oreg., may have relief from the present law before the current legislative session is concluded.

Indian's Day in Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], and I joined in a 40-minute discussion on the floor of the House to protest an attempt by the Justice Department of the Eisenhower administration to emasculate the Indian Claims Act of 1946.

This act has been rightly termed by students of history as one of the highest acts of conscience of any civilized country in dealing with its aboriginal people.

The present situation is succinctly stated in an editorial appearing in the Washington Post and Times Herald last Monday. Those of us in Congress who are interested in justice for the Indians wholeheartedly endorse the Post's conclusion:

We think the life of the Commission should be extended without crippling restrictions so that it may finish the job that Congress gave it.

I present herewith the full text of this editorial:

INDIAN'S DAY IN COURT

The fight over the jurisdiction of the Indian Claims Commission has attracted little public attention, but it is of great importance to some groups of Americans. The Department of Justice is seeking to amend the 1946 act creating the Commission on the ground that the courts have misconstrued the intent of Congress and opened the door to payment of Indian claims which might aggregate as much as $5 billion. Friends of the Indians assert that the act has been correctly interpreted and that the estimates of Government liability under it are grossly exaggerated.

As to the meaning of the law, it is noteworthy that the Court of Claims, which has dealt with more Indian claims than any other court, examined the legislative history of the act with great care. It concluded that Congress did authorize the Indian Claims Commission to exercise jurisdiction over original Indian title cases. The Department of Justice petitioned the Supreme Court to review that decision, and the court declined. In the light of this judicial record it would be most unusual and arbitrary for Congress to throw out by legislative action many cases already begun at substantial cost under the act of 1946. The Association on American Indian Affairs estimates that the proposed amendment would upset about two-thirds of the cases already filed with the Indian Claims Commission.

Experts who have been dealing with these cases for many years say that, while claims have been large, recoveries have amounted to only 1.7 percent of the amount claimed. If this experience should hold true in regard to future cases, recoveries would not amount to billions of dollars, but to about $135 million. Important also is the probability that, if this amendment should be accepted, Congress would itself once more be deluged by special bills to permit the consideration of tribal claims. It was largely to free itself from this legislative burden that Congress in 1946 gave broad jurisdiction over such claims to the Commission. We think the life of the Commission should be extended without crippling restrictions so that it may finish the job that Congress gave it.

Do We Want the Second-Best Air Force?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call to the attention of the Members an article that appears in the current issue of the Reader's Digest which is entitled "Do We Want the Second-Best Air Force?" This is the first of two articles by Francis and Katharine Drake. My attention was drawn to this article by two distinguished citizens of my district, former Mayor Luke F. Ryan, of Northampton, and Theodore Farnham Loeb, of North Wilbraham. I would like to have the first article included with my remarks.

DO WE WANT THE SECOND-BEST AIR FORCE?

(By Francis and Katharine Drake)

(The first of two articles telling what must be done for the United States Air Force at once if Soviet Russia is to be deterred from ever starting world war III. Written after 4 years of patient research at Air Force bases across the world, this is the story of men, the humiliating record of how a great nation is treating those on whom it depends for its very existence. The second article will concern machines—the truth about the combat planes our Air Force has and others it desperately needs.)

Creeping paralysis is today overtaking our entire Air Force. One third of our planes are grounded for lack of sufficient skilled men to keep them flying. In Strategic Air Command, the world's No. 1 peace-enforcer, 30 percent of our precious global bombers are earthbound, powerless to strike back at an aggressor. In Tactical Air Command (responsible for shorter missions) it is the same story. In Air Defense Command (entrusted with the defense of our cities), hundreds of our latest jet fighters are unflyable in battle.

This shocking situation is of formidable importance to the Nation. Unless it can be remedied, it will eat the heart out of our ability to deter aggression. World war III can be prevented only so long as we can maintain peace by deadlock, i. e., promise total destruction to any aggressor starting total war. Our planes must be able to take off at the drop of a hat and cancel out many hundreds of key enemy targets in one great saturation attack. We are losing this vital ability.

It is a grim fact that today, out of every 100 of our global bombers, 30 are grounded at any one time. Moreover, of the remaining 70 that take off, 15 more have to turn back because of malfunction in the air. Only 55 can be depended on to strike their targets. These appalling figures are not guesswork. They derive from current practice missions.

This wholesale breakdown in combat readiness is due to one main factor: the inability of the Air Force to hang on to its skilled help. Recent dropouts have been as follows: 1954—186,000 failed to reenlist; in 1955—213,000; in the first half of fiscal 1956 the rate has risen to 260,000.

The critical part of these losses is that the dropout rate is highest among the men who are needed most—the skilled technicians who are the mainstay of the service. In SAC, for example, 80 percent of the K-system-bombsight mechanics eligible to quit in 1955 did so; so did 88 percent of the radar technicians, 81 percent of the electronic experts, and 75 percent of the jet-engine mechanics. In that year 42,600 of SAC's trained men left the Air Force.

Because of these losses SAC is only 50 percent manned in the high-skilled levels. Its flight personnel has been similarly hard hit. Today its brilliant flying teams cannot fully muster even 1 crew apiece for its global bombers, whereas we should have 2 crews for each ship.

To replace these losses the Air Force is perpetually enlisting fresh volunteers. But it's an endless struggle: no less than 90 percent of the newly trained skilled technicians quit at the end of their first 4-year term. This means that the average skill of our airmen is constantly sinking. Modern combat planes are tremendously complicated weapons, involving a total of 239 assorted skills. Men who work on them need long and costly training. It takes an enlistee 3 years to qualify for bomber maintenance; it costs $25,000 for his training. It takes 5 years and costs $618,000 to train the triple-rated commander of a B–47. When such men quit, not only does their training cost go down the drain but the same amount again must be forthcoming to train replacements.

In 1955 personnel losses in SAC alone cost the taxpayer $837 million. Losses for the entire Air Force totaled no less than $2 billion. In short, taxpayers are being forced to pay for the training of 10 men to retain 1.

What is back of this mass walkout? Why are so many of our most capable young men turning their backs on an Air Force career? The answer is twofold. First, pay at the skilled levels is miserably low, far below that offered by industry. Second, living conditions are miserably inadequate.

There is a public impression that all service families enjoy the life of Riley—free housing, free medical care, generous insurance, income-tax exemption, cutrate buying at base stores—fringe benefits that traditionally bridged the gap between service and industry pay. This is not true. Today fringe benefits are all but nonexistent. The Government has reneged on them.

To appreciate the predicament tens of thousands of Air Force personnel, suppose we trail Airman Bill Smith through his first hitch.

Bill is 19 when he joins the Air Force, intelligent, ambitious. Classified for radar training, he spends the first 30 months rewardingly enough, his head in a book or over a workbench, learning his job from master technicians, training for duty in SAC. Living in barracks, he has few expenses, few complaints.

Then he makes airman first class ($140 a month before taxes), sends for his girl, marries, and applies for family housing. The recruiting promise was free housing for married personnel—but SAC has 90,000 families and only 16,800 houses. Instead of free quarters, Bill is given the regulation $77 a month allowance to rent civilian accommodations in the nearest town, 15 miles distant (most bases are isolated), plus $1.05 a day for food.

There are plenty of areas where $77 would rent comfortable quarters; but the vicinity of a large, underhoused air base is not one of them. For every vacancy, many applicants line up. When landlords see uniforms, rents soar; like most civilians, landlords think Uncle Sam pays for everything. Near some bases, especially in the South, Air Force families are paying as much as $100 a

month for unheated wooden shacks with outdoor privies. Overall, there are some 250,000 Air Force families who are forced to chip in $20 to $50 a month above their quarters allowance for shelter.

The Smiths finally get a furnished apartment for $95, including utilities. Besides this, Bill must dip into his own pocket for around $20 a month for gas and oil to commute to and from the base daily. After paying rent, taxes, gasoline, there is $29 a week left out of his pay and allowances for living. Food averages $15 a week. That leaves the Smiths exactly $2 a day between them for clothing, supplies, spending money.

Mrs. Bill figures on economizing by shopping at the post exchange, where discount prices are supposedly traditional. She has an uppercut coming. She finds that food prices are no cheaper, frequently higher than downtown; stocks are restricted, selections less attractive, and there are no specials. The newlyweds require some basic equipment. They find an electric grill priced at $23.50 in the PX; the the duplicate sells for $17.50 downtown. An identical set of dishes sells for $1.55 more at the PX than in the 5-and-10. When Bill squawks, he is told that base stores are now forced to make high profits and turn them over to welfare funds for swimming pools and other recreational facilities which Bill, in common with the public, assumed were paid for by the Government. (In 1955, SAC PX's alone turned in no less than $3 million net profit to welfare funds.)

The grapevine gives Bill the background of this squeeze play. Retail merchants have an aversion to low-priced sales by the Government to servicemen. Their powerful lobbies are agitating in Washington to have base stores closed altogether, have already succeeded in restricting their stocks, raising their prices, imposing a 3½-percent surtax on all foods and a 10-percent tax on all PX sales—a strange gesture of gratitude to the airmen who are protecting their homes and families.

About this time Bill Junior is on the way, and Mrs. Bill runs smack into one of the bitterest of all service grievances—lack of the promised medical care. The Air Force, overall, is 40-percent short of sufficient doctors, nurses, beds, facilities, equipment, even drugs, to care for its uniformed personnel alone. In SAC there are only 413 doctors to handle 180,000 men, scattered all over the world. The 304,000 SAC wives and children must make do with whatever care is left over. Men rate prior attention at all times; wives and children, even emergency cases, are often kept waiting for hours.

Of the doctors provided, over 80 percent are draftees fresh out of medical school, almost all of whom quit as soon as their 2-year hitch is up. There are no house calls, even for patients too ill to be moved. Only a minority of Air Force babies can be born at base hospitals, for lack of facilities. A shocking proportion of their mothers suffer from inexperienced handling and are forced to undergo subsequent repair work. At one of our largest bases, a veteran medical officer, a career doctor, told the authors: "Don't worry about exaggerating our troubles. It isn't possible. No matter when we get through, there are always 50 more waiting outside."

At Bill's base there is no obstetrician, virtually no prenatal care, no guarantee of a bed when the time comes. The Smiths wind up doing what most Air Force couples have to do. They borrow from their families, get a civilian doctor, and junior is born at the city hospital. From then on, the battle of the budget, on $2 a day, becomes a nightmare of spaghetti menus, patched shoes, evaporating savings.

But there are things on the credit side, too. There is the sense of fraternity shared only by men who stand guard over their country, the pride of belonging to an elite corps. Then, too, an airbase is a sociable place and, with hundreds of families in the same fix, nobody puts on airs, troubles are shared, everyone helps out. Dependents' Mutual Assistance, a volunteer organization started by Mrs. Curtis LeMay (wife of SAC's fighting boss), is a lifesaver at SAC, especially during those long weeks when men are away on global missions.

There comes the great day when Bill, superbly trained, master now of the most secret equipment in the Air Force, is tapped by SAC for the big stuff; he is aglow at having been found worthy of such great responsibility. He works with tough, dedicated men, from whom a nod of approval counts for more than a page of praise from anyone else. Hearing those eight screaming jets blast his B–52 in from a global mission, listening to the blow by blow from her crew, is an incomparable thrill. Bill becomes proudly possessive—my crew, my plane. He averages 14 hours a day making sure that his job is perfectly done. But now comes the career haymaker.

With its critical shortage of maintenance men, SAC is obliged to hire technical representatives from industry to help out. Often as not these tech reps are ex-airmen themselves, trained at the taxpayers' expense. Working alongside Bill on identical jobs, the civilians are earning up to $1,200 a month, compared to Bill's $247 (including allowances). When Bill thinks about reenlisting, the facts of life on the outside are brought home to him.

Here they are: Everywhere big industrial concerns are desperate for skilled help. Their representatives visit every base, their advertisements fill every paper. Highly paid jobs are waiting for all trained Air Force technicians. A C–124 panel engineer, drawing $194 from the Air Force, can make $545 for the same job with an airline. A master sergeant, drawing $400, can make $745 on the outside. A line chief, earning $375, is offered $600 as an airline lead mechanic.

These are only starting wages. Opportunities for promotion are unlimited. Firms are gunning for tens of thousands of additional skilled men over the next 5 years. The blandishments of industry, quite aside from high wages, are multiple and persuasive. They include the 40-hour week, paid vacations, group medical and dental care, moving allowances, retirement schemes and, frequently, valuable profit-sharing privileges.

The Smiths put in some sober thinking, but no amount of figuring can alter the essentials. The Air Force offer: a $639 bonus to reenlist; present pay $247 a month; eventual top pay, $450 a month; eventual pension, $152 a month after 20 years' service. The industry offer: present pay $550 a month, unlimited opportunity for advancement, and valuable fringe benefits. Bill has to decide what is best for his wife and baby. He quits.

The factors impelling enlisted men to leave the Air Force apply equally to officers. Officer paychecks are bigger, but so are the demands upon them, including regular assessments for charities (nonservice), clubs, incessant entertaining of VIP's and Congressmen. Out of 2,500 SAC pilots eligible to quit before 1958, no fewer than 2,000 plan to do so. This will have the alarming result of breaking up no less than 1,000 combat-ready crews. Who can blame these young men, when industry is waiting with pay scales which within 2 years will enable them to earn more than a brigadier general, in 8 years to earn more than a 4-star chief of staff of the Air Force. (A chief of staff earns $15,000 a year; a senior airline captain up to $20,000.)

If conditions in this country are unhappy, those prevailing at our bases abroad are worse. Even in up-to-date countries like England and France, thousands of our service families are living in privation. In Japan conditions are disgraceful, but the low point comes in Africa.

French Morocco, the Air Force's greatest overseas bastion, has been the scene of indiscriminate bombing and shooting. Here USAF families are quartered as much as 65 miles from bases; they live in insanitary, jerry-built houses, near turbulent native areas, without telephones, transportation or protection. In Sidi-Slimane, wives and children, hurriedly rescued from impending mob violence, have had to be housed for months in canvas tents pitched on mud 2 feet thick. For lack of barracks, airmen are crowded into wood-and-canvas Dallas huts, which leak in winter and are insufferable in the desert heat of summer. With few French doctors available, hospitals (mostly of the Quonset-hut type) are inhumanly crowded.

At one of them, staffed by 4 doctors for 5,000 souls, the authors saw men, women, and children crowded into the same ward. Male patients were required to use outside latrines in all weather. Women and children shared a single toilet which, shielded by a sheet, was in a cubicle occuped by a dying woman. Americans would burn with shame to hear foreigners snickering at the way in which the richest country in the world treats some of its finest young people.

The mass walkout caused by Air Force living conditions is gravely imperiling the advantage we have enjoyed over Russia. The Soviet air force has no trouble in keeping its skilled men. The reason is not, as many might suppose, the duress of the slave state. On the contrary, the Russians have made their air force careers so attractive, so laden with honor and prestige, that volunteers throng to join it. Soviet air officers enjoy the top 5 percent of the national living scale, with a standard of comfort excelled only by the Politburo. Their pay—nearly three times that of the infantry—is untaxed. Only the best housing is good enough for them. Many supplies, including uniforms and cigarettes are free. They rate a 50-percent discount at all stores and restaurants and on all forms of transportation. A single valor decoration entitles the wearer to free travel for life. Enlisted men share the same benefits in proportion to their ranks and skills.

Secretary for Air Donald A. Quarles sums up the USAF problem thus: "I can think of no invention, no new aircraft, no weapon, that would increase our Air Force capability in a measure so great as would be achieved by providing a stable corps of trained personnel."

If peace by deadlock is to be preserved, the Secretary's goal must be achieved. It can be achieved if the Congress, supported by the people, wills it. After 4 years of researching Air Force personnel problems at home and abroad, evaluating the living conditions of officers, airmen, and their families, it is the belief of the authors that it would require the following minimum program to reach the goal:

Pay: The present Air Force method of paying by rank should be replaced by the industry system of paying by skill, and pay will have to be increased by at least 50 percent for the highest skills. (A recent Gallup poll showed that taxpayers were almost 3 to 1 in favor of raising service pay.) This move would actually save money, for it is cheaper to raise a skilled man's pay from $3,000 to $5,000, providing he reenlists, than it is to spend $25,000 a year to train his replacements.

Since even a 50-percent raise will still not equal the pay offered by industry, the difference must be made up by (a) restoring the $1,500 tax exemption formerly granted servicemen, and (b) restoring the fringe benefits that have traditionally formed part of service pay, as follows:

Housing: Construction must be radically stepped up. The Air Force is 250,000 units

shy; it has only 20,000 under construction for the whole of 1956. There is a way to build the necessary houses and still save the taxpayers' money. The Air Force is now paying out $450 million a year in quarters allowances. This money disappears into the pockets of civilian landlords. Under the Capehart law, however, the Air Force has the power to order new houses, assume the mortgages, and pay them off out of this same quarters allowance. As things are, we shall pay landlords $3½ billion of rent during the next 8 years and have nothing to show for it. For the same money, in the same time, we could house every family in the Air Force, and have no further capital disbursements thereafter.

Medical care: A bill (H. R. 9429) has been introduced, providing for a group-insurance scheme under which service families would be able to use private doctors and hospitals, at Government expense, whenever service facilities were unavailable. This scheme would cost $10 a month per family. It is a good scheme, way overdue, a product of long study by numerous commissions. If it is adopted, it will banish at one stroke one of the major hardships of service life.

Commissary and PX privileges: The value of these privileges should be restored immediately. It can be done by removing the 3½-percent surcharge on food, the 10-percent tax on PX sales, reestablishing nonprofit prices and throwing out lobby-finagled curbs on what may be stocked and sold.

Education: Present Government subsidies toward college degrees should be made available to men who stay in the service, instead of being restricted to the men who get out. The Government now offers a man $639 for his first reenlistment, but, if he does not reenlist, it offers him $5,280 for a free college education. It would cost only $1,600 to subsidize the same education, through evening study, for men who agreed to reenlist for, say, another 6 years. This would not only raise the standard of education throughout the service but provide a major inducement to an Air Force career.

Life insurance: This should be increased to at least $25,000. The present maximum of $10,000 was established nearly 40 years ago when widows could bring up children at one quarter the present-day costs, and when the hazards of jet flying were unknown.

Air Force surveys indicate that if some such program were put through, the reenlistment rate for skilled men would jump to about 65 percent, which would be ample for all needs. Such a retention of trained men would permit a tremendous cut in the everlasting retraining programs. Without buying another new plane, we could greatly increase our combat readiness. SAC estimates that with even a 5-percent improvement in maintenance and operation, it would be enabled to place 200 additional bombers over targets on any given day.

From the human point of view, some such program is shamefully overdue. Men who forego the freedom and rewards of private industry and dedicate their lives to the defense of their country can never be repaid solely in money. But one thing we can do is to make sure that they will not be deprived of a decent American standard of living while guarding their country.

In the words of former Secretary for Air Harold E. Talbott: "We have the master weapons and the master plan. To persist in treating the master help like stepchildren is a reckless policy, for trained men are the only people in the world who can give plans and weapons any meaning. Our diminishing supply of skilled help in the Air Force is the most critical problem facing the Nation today."

Every American citizen who values the safety of his country should write his Congressman now and demand a decent living for the men who guarantee our safety.

The Discharge Petition and Home Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, occasionally I have found constituents who desired information on the procedure in the House of Representatives to prevent a House committee having absolute control over legislative bills referred to it.

It is generally known that the rules of the House of Representatives provide for discharging a committee from consideration of a bill, but the details of this rule and how it works are not always fully understood. In essence, of course, a discharge petition is a House motion to order a standing committee to desist from holding a particular bill for consideration and calling the measure to the floor of the House for deliberation so the will of the majority of the House may prevail as against the will of a committee.

Under unanimous consent, of course, any Member if recognized by the Speaker for that purpose, may make a motion to discharge any committee from further consideration of a bill. To supplement this procedure and force bills out of reluctant committees there is the so-called discharge rule XXVII, clause 4, of the Rules of the House.

Under this latter parliamentary procedure the first and only bill ever to become law, I am advised, was the wage and hour bill in 1938 in the last session of the 75th Congress. Others, however, have been passed under such a threat. The Bill Digest Section of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress at my request compiled some statistics on the motion-to-discharge rule. From the 61st Congress to date, 788 discharge motions have been filed; 29 motions obtained sufficient signatures to be printed on the Discharge Calendar; 21 of these were granted discharge hearings under the rule; 19 bills were discharged from committees, and 15 of these passed the House.

Six distinct forms of discharge rules have been adopted since the first one in 1910. The present one was adopted in 1931.

When any Member wishes to discharge a committee from further consideration of any bill, he or she must file a written petition at the Clerk's desk. A majority of the House membership or 218 signatures are required before discharge may be successful. When the necessary signers are obtained the petition and names of signers are printed in the RECORD and referred to Calendar of Motions to Discharge Committees.

Any bill or resolution must have been referred to a committee at least 30 days before a motion to discharge the committee from further consideration can be filed; or in connection with a resolution to discharge the Committee on Rules the bill must have been referred at least 7 days prior to such referral.

When a motion to discharge a committee is brought up before the House, it will be debated for 20 minutes—10 minutes for proponents, 10 minutes for opponents—hardly sufficient time, I submit, to make a full argument pro and con.

Discharge rules must be printed on the calendar at least 7 days, and during this time the committee having jurisdiction of the bill can make a report on the bill to the House and thereby block consideration of the discharge petition unless it is the Rules Committee. After such a report, if a bill is not otherwise privileged, it may stay on the calendar until adjournment unless a resolution to grant privileged status is introduced and then discharged from the Rules Committee by the regular procedure.

Furthermore the leadership by arranging a plan of recessing day by day instead of adjourning before discharge day arrives can block consideration.

What does this amount to? It means the House of Representatives has a unique procedure in case a committee refuses to make a report on a measure at least 30 days before the committee, and on which a majority of Members desires a vote. The purpose is to retain for the majority a possible power as against the program of leaders—committee or otherwise.

To sum up, the operation of the discharge rule works like this. Any Member may file a petition at the Clerk of the House's desk requesting recall of a measure from a committee to which it was referred when such committee refuses to make a report on that measure after it has been before it for 30 days—or 7 days if it is the Rules Committee. If and when 218 Representatives sign the petition, it is placed on the Discharge Calendar. After 7 days on that calendar, any signer may move, on the 2d and 4th Mondays of the month, that the House consider the motion. Then if the vote is affirmative the measure is recalled and either goes on the House Calendar or is immediately considered as previously explained.

The discharge rule is subject to wide conflict of opinions by the membership. Experience indicates that the rule gives leadership a means of obtaining consideration for bills it favors, but where leadership opposes a measure which is favored by a large segment of House membership, the procedure generally fails.

Many legislators oppose the procedure of the discharge rule as dangerous, and many Members personally observe a practice of not signing any discharge petitions. Why?

One reason given against signing discharge petitions is that consideration of bills without public hearing and full committee consideration is believed to lack proper safeguards and to constitute a dangerous practice.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that an exception to the above as far as safeguards is concerned would be a bill such as S. 669, the home-rule bill for the District of Columbia which the Senate passed 59 to 15 on June 29, 1955, after committee consideration and public hearing. Now the bill reposes in the House committee as it has in past years

with no action scheduled. Since it could be that the southern Democratic-dominated House committee is not representative of the thinking of the full House membership—and I judge this to be the case—and since a similar measure has been given hearings on three separate occasions and passed the Senate in 1949, 1951, and 1955, I think every other avenue has failed. It is time to force the Democratic leadership to live up to its platform and Republican like myself who favor home rule should act.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, after much thoughtful consideration I have determined, in this instance, to sign the petition at the Clerk's desk to discharge the Committee on the District of Columbia from consideration of S. 669. I have previously declared my support for this legislation.

If other Republicans would join me and with liberal Democrats we succeeded in securing the necessary signatures, it would soon smoke out who is responsible for burying this legislation.

Today, May 1, 1956, after 82 years of disenfranchisement the residents of the District of Columbia have enjoyed limited voting rights and are balloting for delegates to their respective national political conventions.

It has seemed to me an appropriate day, believing as I do in the right of self-government, to sign the discharge petition on S. 669, the so-called home-rule bill.

At least I have felt it a symbolic act signifying personal belief in the constitutional right of suffrage and civil rights even though I have some objection to the parliamentary procedure necessary to accomplish the objective.

Protecting the Consumer Under H. R. 496

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include a letter from the Honorable Irvine M. Levy, the able city sealer of Chicago, who has made an outstanding record that has won him national acclaim in the protection of the consuming public. Mr. Levy's suggestion of a strengthening amendment to H. R. 496, now under consideration, I am sure, will have strong support among my colleagues close to the consumers. His letter follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: A bill known as H. R. 496 has been presented to the Congress by Representative ABBITT, of Virginia, and has been referred to the Interstate Committee. The bill is of importance to all consumers.

The purpose of this bill is to require the weighing of hams and packaged meats at the time of sale to the consumer. In principle, this is a very fine idea, because meats do shrink; and if the consumer must pay for the weight marked on the package when packed, he will pay for shrinkage which he does not receive. However, under Representative ABBITT's proposal, the packers would put the weight of the package wrapping on the package, and this would be deducted from the gross weight when the entire package is weighed by the retailer at the time of sale; but here is what actually happens: The shrinkage from the meat is absorbed by the wrapping, which is airtight, and the shrinkage remains in the wrapper, increasing the paper or tare weight put on by the packer. This, of course, results in the consumer paying for the shrinkage which he does not receive.

In Chicago we have had a longtime practice of requiring the retailer to remove the wrapping from the hams and other packaged meats, showing the net weight at the time of sale. We believe that a bill which would include our practice described above (which does result in savings to the consumer) would in the aggregate amount to vast sums which would accrue to the benefit of the general public.

The National Conference of Weights and Measures will be held in Washington from May 21 to May 25, and I am sure this matter will be discussed by the weights and measures officials in attendance at that time.

Sincerely,

IRVINE M. LEVY,
City Sealer.

Nickies Still Hinting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, the recent program of the Russian leaders in their desanctification of Stalin makes one wonder why all this verbal propaganda rather than deeds and actions to prove the sincerity of their program. Now, we find a propaganda barrage for an invitation to visit the United States.

If we are considering such an invitation and I for one look upon the same with much suspicion, I suggest we not forget some things which could be done forthwith to demonstrate good faith, to wit:

First. Release the 400 Americans still illegally restrained.

Second. Permit the satellite nations to freely elect their own governments.

Third. Admit guilt for Katyn murders.

Fourth. Remove the falsity of the fabricated confessions of the Moscow trials.

Fifth. Reveal the truth of participation in the Korean conflict.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the New York Daily News of May 1, 1956:

NICKIES STILL HINTING

Red boss men Nikita Khrushchev and Nikolai Bulganin arrived home yesterday after their 10-day peek at Britain. They had praise for British hospitality in general, though they didn't care for some of the crisper cracks tossed at them by unawed British workers. In people's Russia, such wise guys become quickly dead.

The most significant feature of the Nickies' broadcast at Moscow's military airport, though, was their repeated hint that now they'd like to be invited to America.

Why the Nickies should want to see us, we don't know. Certainly the Bronx cheers they'd draw here would make those British hecklers sound real jovial by comparison.

However, if the new managers of Joe Stalin's old Red slaughterhouse are really sincere in wanting to impress the United States of America and the world with their change of heart and tactics, here's how they could start off:

Just take your claws off East Germany, boys, and permit the unification of that key country. Then give your Kremlin O. K. to genuine free elections in Russia's colonies—Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, the Baltic States, etc. Words are fine, but if Bulganin and Khrushchev really crave those good relations with the free world, they'd better come up with some authentic, reassuring deeds.

More About Cars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, our colleagues will recall that from time to time I have placed in the RECORD letters received from automobile owners. These letters indicated the need for the remedial legislation introduced by various Members of Congress, including myself, directed at improving automobile marketing practices. One such letter, dated March 12, 1956, appears at page A2543 of the RECORD of March 21 and refers to a new Ford car.

Subsequently I received a letter from the Ford Motor Co., dated March 31, 1956, indicating that they had been made aware of the complaints of this particular owner through the intercession of our distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER]. The company's letter also set forth the efforts which they had made to correct the complaints.

I think it is appropriate to now set forth the last letter received from the same car owner, as follows:

COLUMBUS, GA., *April 28, 1956.*

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
Member of Congress,
United States Representative,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: According to a recent issue of Automotive News magazine, my letter to you regarding the poor workmanship of the new Ford I purchased has been read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I would like to commend you on this action, as well as all the others, which you have taken in the interest of the consumers of America.

You no doubt will be interested in learning what has transpired in the past few weeks in regard to my dealings with the Ford Motor Co. In all I've made 24 trips to the dealer, traveled in the process 960 miles, and lost 41 hours from my work to date trying to get the car fixed. The Ford Co. finally sent the regional service manager in to work on the car, but only after I was forced to appeal to the Congressman from this district, the Honorable E. L. FORRESTER. Congressman FORRESTER not only wrote Henry Ford II about my difficulties but referred my letter to the Monroney committee of the Senate. Hon.

David Busby, special counsel for the Monroney committee, replied to Congressman FORRESTER's letter. He stated that this committee had received many, many complaints, both from the public and automobile dealers, about the poor workmanship of cars and the difficulties in obtaining proper service. Mr. Busby stated that one Florida dealer had even gone as far as to call today's new cars "Do it yourself kits."

It has been suggested by some sources that the reason why automobile manufacturers are so careless in the inspection and assembly of today's new cars, as well as being indifferent to their mistakes, is because they had contributed heavily to the campaign funds of the present administration. If this is true and they are running roughshod over the rights of millions of car buyers, it should be made one of the issues of the forthcoming elections. If this is true, you no doubt will have tremendous opposition and pressure against your bill to require manufacturers to road test all the new cars which they produce. But of one thing we can be reasonably certain: Next to a man's home and family, a car is his most cherished possession. For this reason, men in every walk of life would resent a situation which is contrary to his rights and where he fails to get value received for his hard-earned dollars.

Today, thanks to the help of Congressman FORRESTER, I've finally been able to get such things as defective steering corrected in my car which had endangered the safety of myself and family during the past 4 months. Even now, though, the car still has some defects that need correcting. During this period I have made frequent requests that the Ford Motor Co. either give me my money back or a new car. Of course this was greeted with total unconcern. Finally believing that they would not want me to have to pay for their mistakes, I asked them if they would reimburse me for the 960 miles I had traveled to and from the dealer and for the 41 hours I had lost from work. Mr. Carl T. Doman of the Ford Motor Co. replied that they could not do this since I had bought the car from a dealer 30 miles distant from my home. Even though the dealer brought the car over to my home in order to sell it. Even though I was not responsible for the many defects the car developed during the warranty period. Even though they failed to fix these defects and I had to call on my Congressman for assistance. Even though I bought the car in good faith thinking it was of good workmanship. The simple truth is that they want me to pay for their mistakes.

The Ford Motor Co. may be content with their policy which has caused me these many months of heartache and cost me almost $200. They may continue to take advantage of other buyers in the future who like myself placed faith in the integrity of the manufacturer. In so doing however they will be exploding the myth which now prevails in regard to the dependability of the Ford Co. and its products. The public will become more educated and able to avoid the pitfalls and blind alleys he might be led into when he buys a new car. The highly touted warranty will be revealed in its true light. A man may at some distant date get his car fixed under the warranty agreement but only when the manufacturer and dealer are so inclined. He may, as in my case, get such things as defective steering corrected, but, he will have to make 24 trips to the dealer driving in the process almost 1,000 miles, lose 41 hours from his work at his own expense, and appeal to his Congressman before he gets some degree of satisfaction.

I cannot say whether or not other automobile manufacturers would allow such a thing to happen to one of its customers. I can only speak from my own experience with the Ford Co. Of one thing I am sure and that is that no buyer in America who places his confidence and faith in a manufacturer should have to pay and suffer for that manufacturer's carelessness and indifference. Nor should any buyer be misled into believing he is buying a good product and find instead he has purchased one of inferior quality. It simply is not justice.

Even though the Ford Co. is satisfied that they are not even morally obligated to stand by their product to such an extent as to give me a new car, they should at least feel obligated to reimburse me for the expense I've undergone as a result of their carelessness and indifference. It just does not seem right that a great corporation can afford to give away millions of dollars and yet let a customer who has placed faith in their integrity suffer for their mistake.

I have every confidence that you, Senator MONRONEY, Congressman FORRESTER, and others will find the way to correct this situation. I also believe that you will explore the political significance of today's car market. Last but not least I know that you distinguished gentlemen will find ways and means for revealing to the buying public all true facts pertaining to this issue. I know there is some truth to the old saying that "The wheels of justice grind slow, but they grind."

Very truly yours,

WALLACE A. KITCHEN.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Are We a Nation of Softies?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, increasingly these days leaders in all walks of life are expressing concern with the rejection by the Armed Services of about 35 percent of our young men because of physical unfitness. In a recent editorial the Washington Star commented that:

Dr. Paul Dudley White, the most celebrated of the President's heart consultants, seems to have exaggerated a bit in recently declaring to a House Appropriations Subcommittee that ours is "one of the unhealthiest countries in the world today." Yet, although his statement does not square with statistics showing that average life expectancy in America is considerably higher than in most other lands, there can be little doubt that we are in danger of becoming a Nation of softies.

What is needed to meet this situation is a national program designed to make our people aware of the value of good health. Recently Dr. Joseph B. Wolffe, president of the American College of Sports Medicine, urged President Eisenhower to appoint a Special National Commission on Fitness, composed of leading medical, physical education, and other scientific, and welfare authorities, on Federal and State levels, to put the facts of the Nation's fitness together and hammer out a practical program for the Nation's health. Dr. Wolffe went on to say that:

We need more emphasis on play, and less on display. Fewer than 5 percent of our elementary schools have indoor gymnasiums, most of which are large enough for basketball only. Many stand idle, with sports equipment unused for hours, except when school teams are using them. Members of the cheering section need education for fitness even more than members of the varsities, and competitive sports are desirable only if youngsters are taught the joy of competing to improve and not merely to prove.

The Special National Commission on Fitness should, if established, make a study of the health programs of other countries and seek to make the experience of other peoples available to us.

Some of these health programs are amazingly thorough. I commented on some of these programs—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 27, 1955, page 4397, and May 9, 1955, page A3104—at the time I introduced a bill, H. R. 4109, to establish an advisory board of representatives of national organizations to assist the National Memorial Stadium Commission created by the joint resolution of December 20, 1944.

Sports Illustrated carried a very important article by Horace Sutton on April 16, 1956, entitled "The Olympian Fields of Moscow" which detailed the extensive plans of the Russians for four stadiums to be built in Moscow. How different is America's lack of concern with adequate sports facilities in our own Nation's Capital.

Fortunately, in recent days bills have been introduced in the Senate and House to remedy this amazing oversight in our own country. Senator FRANCIS CASE of South Dakota, introduced S. 3700 on April 23, and Senator PAT MCNAMARA of Michigan, introduced S. 3637 which is a companion measure to my own earlier H. R. 4109. In addition, I have introduced a companion measure to Senator CASE's bill, as H. R. 10740.

I include here the article from Sports Illustrated of April 16, 1956, for the information of my colleagues. I am convinced that we ignore the activities of the U. S. S. R. in the sports field at very grave peril to ourselves. Included, also, is a short statement by the Honorable Milo F. Christiansen, Superintendent of Recreation, District of Columbia Recreation Department, Washington, D. C., on Recreation for Physical Fitness. Mr. Christiansen, one of the country's really outstanding leaders in the field of recreation, is past president of the American Recreation Society.

[From Sports Illustrated of April 16, 1956]

THE OLYMPIAN FIELDS OF MOSCOW

(By Horace Sutton)

It takes but one fast glance down the Moscow River Valley from the escarpment in front of Moscow University's 38-story skyscraper to realize that Russia is not merely out to cop the Olympics in Melbourne in 1956 but that it will make a bid to win them on its own territory in 1964.

As the April thaws dissolve the white satin comforter that has lain over the Lenin hills and the Luzhniki suburbs since last fall, a vast park of nearly 350 acres splotched with the skeletal forms of the most ambitious sports plant ever built in Russia, in Europe and perhaps in the world is revealed for the first time.

Construction crews aided by volunteer flying squads recruited from the Soviet Union's most famous athletic aggregations are swarming over the developing shapes of a stadium that will seat 100,000, an open-air swimming pool with seats for 13,200, a small stadium to hold 15,600, and a covered arena that will seat up to 17,000.

Under the melting snows that run down the embankment now to swell the curving Moscow River are the outlines of 8 football fields, 30 tennis courts, 17 volleyball courts, and 15 basketball courts. Soviet athletes will be able to compete and practice in 24 sports at the same time. A playing area, separate and complete, is being built for children. An international youth athletic festival is on the books for 1957.

But the reason for the immediate rush—the work schedule for the giant project has been pegged at 23 months—is the giant sports show being planned for this July. A mammoth spartakiad will bring together some 10,000 of the best athletes culled from the 16 Soviet republics. They will fight it out in a program of 165 matches. The winners, sifted from all-Russia's best sports talent, will have plenty of time to catch a slow boat for Melbourne where the summer Olympics begin in November.

Soviet athletes in from the far Asiatic provinces, Tartars up from the Kazan, indeed, even sophisticated Muscovites all converging on the sports center for the old collective try this summer, can hardly but be dazzled by this razzle-dazzle sports extravaganza. Above the seats of the main stadium, for instance, will be a circular deflector. The device has been designed to shade the football field during playing hours which vary from month to month. It will also hold 500 floodlights for night football games and provide illumination for television and newsreels. Simultaneously it will help protect the arena from strong winds blowing across from the Lenin Hills. As Soviet sports officials point out, a wind velocity of more than 6.6 feet per second would make track records inaccurate.

The Russians are trying out a new gimmick in the smaller stadium, too. First-row spectators have been elevated one tier so as not to distract the players. As the Russian magazine Sporting Games indicates, "The calm white walls surrounding the arena will further help the players to concentrate on the game." Nor will teams be distracted by warming up on the playing fields. A pair of warmup halls is being built under the stadium. And when the game is done, a player will not merely repair to the showers; he may relax like a tsar, or a quota-meeting worker, in an oversized bathtub with a built-in seat.

A battalion of architects under the direction of Alexander Vlasov, the man who executed a 100-yard dash from New York back to Russia last year after being accused of overdecorating Moscow buildings, has designed a waterfall which will cascade over the outside wall of the swimming-pool stadium. However, they have also thought to install a functional heating system under the pool which will permit water-polo teams to practice 7 months a year. A freezing system in the covered arena will permit hockey players to disport themselves in summer. Playing hockey in the frostbite temperatures of a Russian winter never bothered a Russian, but it has severely hampered foreigners. A team from Britain played in the open-air Dynamo Stadium last winter before a crowd of 11,000 who sat in the unprotected stands in a temperature of 26 below. Cognac and wine were sold in the interests of self-preservation, but the situation wasn't serious enough to permit the sale of vodka.

Until now Moscow has never had a big indoor arena. Indoor events—boxing, for example—are usually staged in the circus at a time when the troupe is off playing in the hinterlands. When Sonja Henie came barreling into town from Oslo intent on staging her ice show in Moscow, the circus was busy playing the circus. When Miss Henie suggested requisitioning the Bolshoi Theater, that hallowed gold-and-plush auditorium sacred to the concert and ballet, the Russians were aghast.

The new covered stadium, completely air-conditioned, can hold as many as 17,000 spectators, depending on the games, and it will be larger than the Paris Velodrome d'Hiver. A

roomy training room can be converted into a meeting room at a moment's notice, and a collapsible platform can be raised in the main hall for mass meetings.

In the Russian athletic scheme, the arena under the stands is not merely a place to decide partisan feelings. The space under the main stadium is being divided into four floors each girded by a circular passageway wide enough to drive an electric car. On the top floor there will be lodgings for 340 competitors as well as a pressroom connected to the press box in the stands. The third floor will house 8 gymnasiums, a conference hall for 250, 2 movie theaters each holding 250, a restaurant for 300 and a cafe for 300.

The comfort of the Socialist Soviet spectator seems to have become a prime consideration. Five thousand citizens can eat at one time in the restaurants, snack bars, mobile kitchens and local automats. It will be quite an improvement over the situation this winter when I watched youngsters ski along a path to Dynamo Stadium en route to a hockey game, stop to buy snow-dusted, cream-stuffed crullers from a snow-dusted lady vendor. Between halves of the game (played with a ball and curved sticks) between the Sverdlovsk Officers Club and the local Dynamo team a spectator could stave off hunger with an 81-cent orange or a 90-cent chocolate bar.

In the Luzhniki sports center there will be tonic, too, for the Soviet soul. Burbling fountains will delight the ear, decorous pools will relieve the eye, leafy trees will shade the brow. Frescoes will decorate the principal buildings and wide promenades will lead down to the banks of the river.

A spur line of Moscow's famed subway is being extended to accommodate the university and the sports center. The Moscow River will be widened and a higher elevation provided for the park as a protection against spring floods. Boat races will be held on the river and piers are being installed "for the use of visitors in attaching their vessels." Not only will there be free parking for the comrades' yachts, but, says the Soviet architectural journal, "luxurious laws will serve as a background for the calm and bright outlines of the sports buildings. * * * This," the magazine concludes, "will create a feeling of triumph and glory." With all this new equipment, it would seem that Ivan is at last ready to play for keeps.

Opinion Poll Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, during the past several weeks, in accordance with my annual custom, I have been conducting an opinion poll among my northern Indiana constituents on some of the important issues currently confronting Congress.

Early in April, using a mailing list established from previous opinion polls, approximately 12,000 ballots were sent to voters in the Third District counties of St. Joseph, Elkhart, La Porte, and Marshall. Questionnaires also were printed in several district newspapers and readers were asked to fill them out and return them to me with their answers.

The response this year was well above the average for similar mail surveys. More than 4,000 ballots have been returned so far and they are still coming in.

Many voters added comments to their ballots explaining or qualifying their replies. Others expressed views on issues not covered in the poll. These have been carefully noted and have been helpful to me in determining the sentiment of my constituents on current problems.

The results of my 1955 poll are given below. Within the limitations implicit in any survey of this nature, they reflect the opinions of a substantial cross-section of voters in a typical midwestern congressional district.

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Not voting
1. Do you favor the Eisenhower administration program of flexible price supports for basic farm products?	78	17	5
2. Do you favor the transfer of unused immigration quotas from western European countries such as England and the Scandinavian nations to southeastern European countries such as Italy and Greece where immigration quotas are heavily oversubscribed?	30	64	6
3. In spite of the all-out effort of Postmaster General Summerfield to economize and obtain more efficient operation of the Post Office Department, the postal deficit is again approaching ½ billion dollars a year, and post-office buildings and facilities are steadily becoming more antiquated and inadequate. In view of this, do you favor an increase in postal rates to meet the postal deficit and to provide better post-office buildings, equipment, and service where needed?	74	22	4
4. Do you favor the granting of arms aid to Israel in the present Arab-Israeli dispute?	26	61	13
5. Do you favor the continuance of our foreign-aid program generally?	50	44	6

A separate tabulation of farmers voting on the first question revealed a vote of 66 percent in favor of the Eisenhower price-support program, 30 percent in opposition, and 4 percent undecided, amongst farmers alone.

In order to stimulate interest in public affairs among future citizens of my district, I also conducted a separate poll this year among high-school students. More than 1,000 students took part, voting on the issues in class under the supervision of instructors after a discussion of the pros and cons. Here are the results of the voting among high-school students:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Not voting
1. Do you favor the Eisenhower administration program of flexible price supports for basic farm products?	56	31	13
2. Do you favor the transfer of unused immigration quotas from Western European countries such as England and the Scandinavian nations to Southeastern European countries such as Italy and Greece where immigration quotas are heavily oversubscribed?	27	67	6
3. In spite of the all-out effort of Postmaster General Summerfield to economize and obtain more efficient operation of the Post Office Department, the postal deficit is again approaching ½ billion dollars a year, and post-office buildings and facilities are steadily becoming more antiquated and inadequate. In view of this, do you favor an increase in postal rates to meet the postal deficit and to provide better post-office buildings, equipment, and service where needed?	63	31	6
4. Do you favor the granting of arms aid to Israel in the present Arab-Israeli dispute?	19	67	14
5. Do you favor the continuance of our foreign aid program generally?	70	22	8

Economic Impact of the Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Economic Impact of the Highway Program," delivered yesterday by Mr. William S. Lampe, editor, Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, before the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, at its 44th annual meeting.

The Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph is one of the publications of the Hearst papers, which have in the past 4 years been one of the strongest advocates for better roads for the American people. They have used many thousands of words in their news editions and editorials to inform the American people of the emergent conditions which we face with our present highways.

Mr. Lampe's remarks reveal the time and effort which have been spent in collecting and assembling facts, not only with respect to the present conditions of our highways but the needs, benefits, and savings which can be expected when this legislation becomes law. His remarks are succinct and to the point, and I feel sure will be of interest to every Member of the House:

ECONOMIC IMPACT OF THE HIGHWAY PROGRAM
(By William S. Lampe, editor, Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph)

There are two ways to present an argument—assemble facts and state conclusions, or state the conclusions and give the supporting facts. As a newspaperman who was trained to put the conclusions in the opening paragraph and then support them, I incline toward that method. Therefore, I will

present three statements on the subject, two of which I borrowed and one of which is my own.

The first comes from the Governors' conference report to President Eisenhower, and I quote: —

"An adequate highway system is vital to the continued expansion of the economy. The projected figures for gross national product will not be realized if our highway plant continues to deteriorate. The relationship, of course, is reciprocal—an adequate highway network will facilitate the expansion of the economy which, in turn, will facilitate the raising of revenues to finance the construction of highways."

My second statement is contained in the Journal of the American Society of Civil Engineers. It is a statement by B. D. Tallamy, chairman of New York State Thruway Authority. He was discussing in this instance a limited-access highway, the New York Thruway, but his statement is appropos because the Federal highway program provides for limited access wherever it is indicated.

We will be using more of Mr. Tallamy's statement later, but here were his conclusions: "Experience with the New York Thruway has shown how limited-access highways foster safety, save travel time, reduce wear and tear on vehicles and drivers, relieve travel on parallel roads, and promote astounding economic development of the area through which the expressway runs. Conservative estimates credit the Thruway for attracting at least $150 million in new or expanded enterprises, with an annual payroll in excess of $100 million." Mr. Tallamy adds that the problem is how to finance the additional expressways that are needed across the nation, but for our purposes here today that problem has been solved where it was most difficult ot find a solution—in Congress.

Now for my own conclusions based on a reading of all of the material we had available to us. I am convinced that when the Federal highway bill becomes law in something like its present form, we are all going to be wondering, 5 years from now, why there had to be so much arguing and testifying and compromising and dealing to get the program underway. I mean that the benefits, both social and economic, are going to be so obvious to everyone that even the present opponents of the program (and there are some) are going to have to admit they were wrong. I think that not even the bald statistics of various phases of the benefits of adequate highway construction tell the whole story as it will be told in the years to come. I believe that even those antiprogram arguments that seem to have the most merit today all will have collapsed under a flow of benefits we can suspect only dimly in 1956.

In those three statements I think I have stated the conclusions I reached. The remainder of this discussion will be a recitation of surveys, reports, and studies that contribute, in one way or another, to the general findings.

THE ECONOMIC IMPACT

The economic impact will be felt directly and indirectly. It will be felt by differing segments of the economy at differing times. I will try to follow a more or loss chronological order.

DIRECT BENEFITS

The highways we are talking about first have to be planned, programed, provided with rights-of-way, then constructed. Many benefits flow from the direct act of construction; others follow when the road is in place and in use.

The highway construction industry has been operating at something less than 50 percent of capacity, and it feels able to absorb the expanded program. The increase in the use of construction materials will be about 50 percent for each of the first 3 years of the program, and the increase will reach a maximum in 1961.

The predictions—and I ought to say here that everything I am discussing is a prediction or an estimate or an educated guess—are that while there will be temporary, regional shortages of cement the program will not be seriously hampered thereby. In 1954 the total productive capacity of the cement industry was about 265 million barrels. Highways used 45 million barrels. It is estimated that the highway cement demand will reach 112 million barrels in 1959. We are told that with a 13-year highway program assured, the cement industry will expand to provide for the necessary increase in demand. In fact, it has been expanding to keep pace with the highway expansion of the past several years.

The asphalt industry produces 80 million barrels annually, and the highways use some 50 million barrels of that. Enormous expansion of this industry is a relatively easy matter. About 85 percent of the Nation's improved rural roads today use asphalt. One problem here is that there will be exhaustion of deposits of asphalt.

In 1954, the aggregates industries produced 810 million tons of stone, sand, gravel, slag, and other products. Of this total, 357 million tons went for highway uses. The aggregates industry believes that it can increase production about 40 percent with existing plants, but to handle the demand during the peak construction years there will have to be an additional 560 portable plants or their equivalent in large, stationary plants. This will necessitate exploration for new sources and longer hauls to construction sites. The costs of these materials can be expected, therefore, to rise.

It takes between 420 and 450 tons of steel for every million dollars worth of new roads. If total expenditures on all road systems rise to $11 billion a year, then it would require about 5,200,000 tons of steel, 7 times the amount used on the roads during 1954. This is metal actually used in construction and does not include that which will be needed for trucks, tractors, earthmovers, and other highway construction machinery. The steel industry expects to add 15 million tons to its capacity by 1959. While this probably will provide the basic metal, at present there is a shortage of heavy steel structural shapes and this shortage is expected to continue into next year.

This steel industry expansion already is underway, and for 1956 alone will require investment of about $1,200,000,000. The investment for steel's expansion in 1956–58 will be about $3 billion, with still more to come in the future. And when the President's signature on this new highway bill assures steel of a 13-year expanded demand for the structural shapes used in highway construction, certainly you will see expansion in that direction as well.

There are also steel substitutes which could play a larger part in construction. Thus if concrete is available for bridge construction when steel shapes are not, the engineers can specify concrete or, in some cases, other types of metal.

The construction-machinery manufacturing industry does about $2 billion worth of business annually, and about one-third of this is in machinery for highway building. The industry is operating at something like 50 percent of capacity and can readily produce the new equipment that will be needed. Machinery in the hands of contractors is idle about one-third of the time. It is estimated that highway equipment sales will rise about 70 percent the first year of the program and perhaps 150 to 200 percent at the peak of demand.

In addition to these basic materials, there are some miscellaneous products that are worth mentioning. An $11 billion program will require 908,000 new traffic signs in a single year, and the first 2 years of the program will require a total of 10 million gallons of paint. What about the direct employment of manpower in highway construction? It is estimated that by 1958 more than 130,000 additional on-site workers will be needed by this program. The employment total at present is about 220,000 so the total by 1958 would be 350,000. By 1961 this figure will become something like 500,000. Remember these are on-site construction workers only. We do not have any estimate on additional jobs created elsewhere because of the program, but we can be sure the number will be impressive.

It should be pointed out that the assumption by the Federal Government of 90 percent of the cost of constructing the National System of Interstate Highways is going to give the 48 States additional funds to spend on other systems of roads, including secondary roads.

I have gone into some detaill on these statistics at the great risk of boring you, but I believe they are not boring to anyone interested in the industries concerned. To them they must be the most exciting figures that they have seen in years.

Incidentally, in our preliminary research for the Hearst newspapers campaign, we came across statistics which we combined into a single intriguing statement. We printed it with some misgivings since we could not make up our minds whether it would be regarded as anti-American or anti-Russian. It can be read both ways. Here is the statement: "More automobiles are stolen each year in the United States than are produced each year in the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics."

A final direct beneficiary of the highway program will be the contractors. There industry, as we mentioned, was operating at less than 50 percent of capacity in 1954. It will be at capacity and that capacity will have to be increased during the life of the program.

The program, even before actuality, has spurred research into many facets of the highway industry. The latest tools of science are being studied to determine how they can be applied to the highway field. Before we are done we will see a transformed industry, much more efficient, more mechanized, and one that may make the estimated costs of the whole program lower than we believe today. These are some of the direct benefits that will come with the actual start and progress of construction itself.

INDIRECT BENEFITS

The indirect benefits will accrue to many millions who have no interest in construction.

First, let us take the passenger-car driver. This fellow is going to have to pay about $7 a year in additional taxes for his share of the Federal highway program. If he is driving now on obsolete highways—and he is a rare driver if he isn't—and drives in the future on modern roads—and he will—the savings are going to be at least 1 cent per mile. If he drives an average of 9,000 miles a year his savings will be something like $90 a year. His net profit is going to be $83 a year, and we presume he will do something with the $83, even if he invests it in Old Grand-Dad, that will redound to the Nation's economic benefit. In addition, many more of our citizens are going to be around to keep the $83.

Modernization of the Interstate Highway System alone is expected to save 3,500 lives per year. And the Interstate System is only 40,000 miles out of a national total of 3⅛ million miles of streets and roads.

There are many sets of figures in this field, but here is one generally accepted: The cost to motorists annually for driving on obsolete streets and roads is $5,300,000,000. This is more money than was spent on all street and road construction annually until very re-

cently. If we add to that cost, the economic loss due to death and injury and other nonoperating costs, we get a figure something like $7½ billion.

It seems odd, when you take a look at it, that we should pay more in auto-insurance premiums than we pay in gasoline tax to build roads that would cut accidents in half and, therefore, reduce our premiums. I doubt if any member of the United States Chamber of Commerce attempts to do business quite that way.

Of course, we're paying in other ways, too, but I don't know what the figure is. I don't even want to hear it if there is one. For instance, just about everything any one of us buys travels on a truck at some time. If a motorist wastes a penny a mile on obsolete streets and roads, what does a truck operator waste? The New York Truck Association figures it cost the trucks of New York $150 million in 1950—all waste.

A truck stopped in traffic might as well be back in the terminal as far as the truck operator is concerned, and he wouldn't be paying for the driver's time and the waste of gasoline. And when the operator pays for waste, we pay it to him in his rate schedule. As I said, I don't even want to know what that is costing me.

In short, then, adequate roads will save us money in operating costs of our own vehicles, operating costs of commercial vehicles, and presumably lower carrier rates, lower insurance premiums because of few accidents, and in other obvious ways.

One of the obvious ways that may not belong in an economic survey is the time you and I will save as individuals. What is time worth to us? How often have you sat stalled in congestion and wished there were some way you could get home before your disposition came completely apart? At those times would you have paid $7 to get there? Well, the $7 a year you're going to pay in additional Federal taxes will do the job for you in many cases.

What else happens when we build the roads that this program calls for? A new, modern, adequate road transforms the area through which it passes in many, many ways, and they all have a bearing on our economy. Land values increase enormously, and the tax rolls are so benefited thereby that the highway frequently pays for itself, as far as the taxing government is concerned, in a few short years. Here are some examples, selected at random: Land along the route of the Northern Sacramento Freeway in California sold for $600 an acre in 1947—before the freeway. Two years after the freeway opened for traffic the price was $1,100 an acre. In 1950 it was $7,100 an acre, and in 1951 it was $10,000 an acre. There were no similar land-price increases in the Sacrament area not served by the freeway. Land along the New York Thruway near Syracuse sold for about $714 an acre in 1951; $6,000 an acre in 1955. The Syracuse story as told by the Mr. Tallamy we previously quoted is an amazing one.

Access to the Thruway brought the Syracuse area a group of plants constructed by such corporations as General Motors, General Electric, Carrier Corp., Allied Chemical and Dye Corp., Bristol Laboratories, and Western Electric Co. At one of the Syracuse interchanges there was a piece of property containing 23 acres. No water, sewer, or gas facilities were available. The plot was worth $100 an acre before the Thruway. In March 1955 a machinery company bought it for $46,000, or $2,000 per acre. Remember, that the Thruway is not yet completed but where it is open certainly it is a new road. This development along it is only beginning.

Here is what the eloquent Mr. Tallamy has to say on this whole subject: "The tremendous toll that outmoded highways exact in lives, property damage, human misery, and sheer economic waste alone compensate for the cost of constructing modern highways against many factors, but paramount among them is the economic growth and development that have become synonymous with new expressways and major highway construction programs.

"We have underemphasized these benefits, in spite of the fact that they far outweigh the cost of providing the highways themselves."

Perhaps we should rest our case here on the theory that when you have made a sale, beat it. There are just a few more things that ought to be said. This program is not going to be all sweetness and light in your State, your county, or your hometown. There are going to be many vehement route squabbles, particularly in those communities that are afraid a limited-access highway will doom them to economic death. In this regard, let me say this: If the Federal program did not contain a limited-access provision for the interstate system, I very much fear that the Hearst newspapers would have had to oppose it. Without limited access, where studies indicate it is needed, you doom the road to obsolescence before you build it. It would be throwing away billions of tax money. I hope that in your own States you will support the engineers when they recommend limited access on other vital State roads not on the interstate system.

Residents of our larger cities are aware of the necessary destruction of private homes and business places that accompany the construction of expressways. Many, many smaller cities that have otherwise insoluble traffic-congestion problems are going to have to build similar expressways, and if they are on the interstate routes the Federal program calls for limited-access highways—or none. Again, there will be pained outcries from those who want congestion solved, but not through their living rooms, showrooms, salesrooms, or assembly plants.

Again, I hope that you will support the officials who will have to make these decisions.

CONCLUSION

Abraham Lincoln once described a man as "coming out where he went in at." I am going to requote my own personal conclusions after my study of the material that I have presented to you today:

"I am firmly convinced that when the Federal highway bill becomes law in something like its present form, we are all going to be wondering 5 years from now why there had to be so much arguing and testifying and compromising and dealing to get the program underway. I mean that the benefits, both social and economic, are going to be so obvious to everyone that even the present opponents of better roads programs (and there are a few) are going to have to admit they were wrong. I think that even the bald statistics of various types of benefits of adequate highway construction do not tell the whole story as it will be told in the years to come. I believe that even those anti-program arguments that seem to have the most merit today all will have collapsed under a flow of benefits we can only dimly suspect in May 1956."

Thank you.

Alben W. Barkley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1956

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Evening Star and the Washington Post:

[From the Washington Star of May 1, 1956]

ALBEN BARKLEY

The American political stage has lost one of its favorite players in the death of Alben Barkley. And that his death should come literally on-stage while speaking lines that singularly reflected his innate humility, provided a fitting curtain for a memorable career.

Alben Barkley began life on a Kentucky farm. When that life ended nearly 79 years later, it had become a mirror of three-quarters of a century of American history—the period in which a young but virile Nation arose from its post-Civil War suffering to move steadily on to unprecedented heights of greatness in strength and morality. For most of that time, Alben Barkley played a major role. Since 1913, save for the brief interlude of 1953–54, Mr. Barkley had been in the American Congress—eloquent as a youthful Congressman, powerful and persuasive as Senate majority leader during most of the New Deal period, benevolently forceful as Vice President. As a junior Senator during the past 2 years, he was an elder statesman whose proud devotion to party was exceeded only by his devotion to country.

The years had dealt kindly to Alben Barkley and it was understandable to those who knew him. Politics did not shape his character, or make of him a man obsessed with ambition and preoccupied with self-interest. To a greater degree, it was the warmly human Kentuckian who left his impact on the politics of his time. His humor and his kindliness rubbed off on many of those who shared a place with him on the political stage. It was fully in character that he died saying, "I would rather be a servant in the House of the Lord than sit in the seat of the mighty."

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 2, 1956]

ALBEN W. BARKLEY

Even in their expression of sorrow over the death of Senator Alben W. Barkley, his friends and acquaintances throughout the land are retelling his jokes, quips, and humorous stories. The big, good-natured man with the booming baritone voice made an impression on his fellow countrymen that will not soon be forgotten. Though he was a prodigious worker and a devoted public servant, he was never solemn about it. His hearty laugh and his spontaneous humor became his badge of identification and will ever be associated with his memory.

Mr. Barkley was a key figure in the history of the last two decades. People came to associate his name with almost every big contest which the Democratic Party waged in that period. Probably more than any living member of his party he was entitled to the cognomen of Mr. Democrat. But his partisanship had a genial quality that won him the affection of Republicans and Democrats alike. By relying upon humor instead of venom, he made his appeal universal.

His greatest work was done as majority leader in the Senate from 1937 to 1947. In that period he piloted through the Senate important legislation of Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal and Harry Truman's Fair Deal. Senator Barkley could be relied upon to go down the line for almost every administration measure. His record for party regularity in the House and later in the Senate was a large factor in his election as majority leader. The death of Senator Joseph T. Robinson in the midst of F. D. R.'s fight to enlarge the Supreme Court had left the Senate in a state of confusion. Only the President's intervention shifted the leadership to Mr. Barkley in preference to the more independent-minded Pat Harrison.

In appreciation for that support, Majority Leader Barkley stood by F. D. R. with remark-

able tenacity through the prewar and war years. He was not, however, a man to be walked on. When Mr. Roosevelt wounded his sensibilities in a tax veto message, he resigned his leadership and was overwhelmingly reelected. This dramatic demonstration of confidence in him did not go to his head, nor did the incident turn him against F. D. R. A few months later he presented Mr. Roosevelt's name for a fourth presidential nomination.

Mr. Barkley would have been the logical choice for the vice presidential nomination in 1940 and 1944 if he could have been spared from the position of majority leader. His election to the Vice Presidency in 1948 at the age of 71 was generally regarded as a reward for a lifetime of public service. But the Veep made it a working position and lent powerful support to the Truman administration without any show of sourness because a man of lesser political experience was in the White House. When Mr. Barkley, having retired from the Vice Presidency, once more demonstrated his vigor and invincibility in Kentucky by winning election to the Senate in 1954, he received an ovation from his former colleagues without any regard for party lines.

His friends and admirers were especially pleased when sunshine came to predominate in his personal life after long years of sorrow and struggle. His first wife, to whom he was devoted, Dorothy Brower, of Paducah, became an invalid, and he followed a rigorous schedule of lecturing, while he was majority leader, to pay the doctor bills her illness entailed. Mrs. Barkley died in 1947. Two years later, however, the hearty and irrepressible Veep met and married a charming widow, Mrs. Carleton S. Hadley, and this romance filled his remaining years with the warmth and satisfactions he had richly earned. Alben Barkley will be remembered as a man of many estimable human qualities, as well as a superb storyteller and a beloved leader in the great affairs of his day.

Site of Proposed Jet Air Base

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUTH THOMPSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to insert a letter from one of my good constituents in relation to the site of the proposed jet air base in my district, which merits your consideration:

HOWARD BLACK CHERRY CO.,
Traverse City, Mich., April 28, 1956.
Hon. RUTH THOMPSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MISS THOMPSON: May I extend to you my heartiest congratulations on the stand you have taken with reference to the jet air base. Your statement, as published in the Traverse City Record-Eagle under date of April 23, is particularly astute and to the point.

Frankly, I had wondered how long some of those weird statements this paper has been publishing for the past 2 years would go unchallenged. Now, you have "laid it on the line," the truth is out in the open, and the taxpayers of this region can easily see that it would cost them more in taxes than the "Dollar Patriots of Front Street" could possibly make from the personnel of the base.

Other items which the inarticulate taxpayer would have to pay, would be the cost of providing additional school buildings, additional teachers for the children of the Air Force personnel, additional fire and police protection, to say nothing of additional "off base" housing which would be necessary.

I am particularly gratified that you had the courage to make the statement that there were two sides to this jet-base argument; that it is not all "sweetness and light." Up to now, the people of this region have heard only that side of the argument as expressed by the local merchants, tavern keepers, etc.

Anyone who did not agree that the base should be located close to Traverse City was called unpatriotic and even communistic. We were told that "we would just have to get used to the noise and the intolerable conditions whether we liked it or not, and if our resort property was ruined, we should grin and bear it for the sake of national defense."

All this we should do in order that a very few of our patriotic citizens could make a "quick buck" from the air-base payroll.

In closing, I want to say that all honor is due you far taking the stand that matters of this nature are for the civil authorities to decide. When the Traverse City Chamber of Commerce set up the hue and cry, "Let the military decide where the base is to be located," they were acting in direct contradiction to the ideas of the men who founded this country, and contrary to accepted Government procedure and our American way of life.

I certainly hope I will never see this country in a position where our legislators will be forced to "let the military decide" on matters of purely local import.

Cordially yours,

HOWARD BLACK,
Chairman, Public Relations Committee,
Long Lake Association, Inc.

Every American Thrills to Sight of His President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "Every American Thrills to Sight of His President," which appeared in the New Castle (Ind.) Courier-Times, issue of April 25, 1956.

It is a very dramatic presentation of the events surrounding the recent meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors:

EVERY AMERICAN THRILLS TO SIGHT OF HIS PRESIDENT—RESPECT FOR OFFICE ATTACHES TO PERSON IN THE WHITE HOUSE

Every American thrills to the sight of the country's President and to the sound of his voice. Regardless of political affiliations or beliefs, all good citizens have a respect for the office that attaches to the person in the White House.

So it was that we felt especially privileged to be in his intimate presence when he addressed the American Society of Newspaper Editors in the ballroom of the Statler Hotel in Washington Saturday evening. Good fortune placed us in a point of vantage probably 25 feet in front of the elevated speaker's table and slightly to one side.

As the editors assembled speculation spread regarding whether Ike would come for dinner or show up just in time to make his speech, scheduled for broadcast beginning at 10 o'clock. Others took their places at the speaker's table, and it seemed likely that he would come later, but just then word spread across the room like one giant whisper that the President was in the hotel.

In a few minutes there he was passing within a few feet of us to ascend the end of the platform—and with him was Mamie, too. At the moment the President reached his place at the table the orchestra began the national anthem.

On one side of the speaker's platform stood the American flag and on the other side, the flag of the President with its blue field centered with the great seal of the United States, and around the seal 48 small stars. There were other notables at the table, including the Chief Justice and Mrs. Warren and James Hagerty, the Presidential press secretary. One fellow kept bobbing around the speaker's table, talking to the President occasionally and then to television and radio technicians, and others at our table informed us that this was Robert Montgomery, who coaches the President on his speaking.

How thin the President is. That was the first thing that struck us. And how very blue his eyes. As he sat through 2 hours of dinner and miscellaneous introductions awaiting the hour for his address, we were struck by the extreme modesty and humility with which he conducted himself. Here is a military man without arrogance; a politician without guile. No wonder people love him.

The President spoke for 35 minutes reviewing the administration's foreign policy. After a brief pause at the conclusion of the speech it was announced that "we are off the air now, and the President wishes to speak informally to those in the room." It was an off-the-cuff talk, the sort of thing in which the President handles himself so well. He spoke of the need for the press to help the American people understand the problems of foreign policy—stressing particularly the need of this country to trade with other countries if we are to keep the free world free. He pointed to Japan, which has no place to turn if we refuse to trade with her, and will certainly be driven into the arms of the Communists if our people demand tariffs against Japanese goods. He pointed out the terrific pressures under which the leaders of the new countries of Asia and Africa labor. Their peoples are expecting results in the way of better living conditions, and if they don't get them under democratic governments, then communism is sure to come in.

When the speech was over, the cheers acknowledged and the last famous Eisenhower smile flashed, the President waved goodbye, and 6 or 8 Secret Service men fairly enveloped him. They formed a protective escort that swept him toward the side door through which he had entered. He wasn't too happy about it. They had separated him from Mamie, and every few steps he turned, like a nervous bridegroom, to look back over his shoulder and make sure that she was coming all right.

Apportionment to States of Federal Highway Funds Pursuant to H. R. 10660 and Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Public Works has been receiving numerous inquiries concerning the

apportionment of Federal highway funds to the various States under the provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 (H. R. 10660), which passed the House April 27, 1956.

The following table sets forth the approximate amounts which will be apportioned to each State for the fiscal years 1957, 1958, and 1959:

Approximate apportionment of Federal highway funds pursuant to H. R. 10660 and Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954

PRELIMINARY—SUBJECT TO SUCH REVISION AS MAY BE REQUIRED TO CONFORM TO SEC. 108 (f) OF H. R. 10660

[Millions of dollars]

State	Fiscal year 1957			Fiscal year 1958			Fiscal year 1959		
	Primary, secondary, and urban ($725)	Interstate ($1,200)	Total ($1,925)	Primary, secondary, and urban ($750)	Interstate ($1,700)	Total ($2,450)	Primary, secondary, and urban ($775)	Interstate ($2,000)	Total ($2,775)
Alabama	14.7	19.6	34.3	14.9	26.7	41.6	15.5	31.4	46.9
Arizona	9.0	11.2	20.2	9.2	15.3	24.5	9.6	18.0	27.6
Arkansas	10.9	11.4	22.3	11.1	14.8	25.9	11.5	17.4	28.9
California	38.8	112.1	150.9	40.1	169.7	209.8	41.4	199.6	241.0
Colorado	11.3	9.2	20.5	12.0	11.4	23.4	12.3	13.4	25.7
Connecticut	6.6	26.2	32.8	6.9	40.6	47.5	7.1	47.8	54.9
Delaware	3.0	4.0	7.0	3.1	4.8	7.9	3.3	5.6	8.9
Florida	12.0	24.7	36.7	12.3	36.2	48.5	12.8	42.6	55.4
Georgia	16.9	34.9	51.8	17.2	51.2	68.4	17.7	60.2	77.9
Idaho	7.3	6.4	13.7	7.5	7.8	15.3	7.7	9.2	16.9
Illinois	32.1	55.1	87.2	33.0	77.9	110.9	34.1	91.6	125.7
Indiana	17.4	42.4	59.8	17.7	63.4	81.1	18.3	74.6	92.9
Iowa	15.9	15.7	31.6	16.1	20.2	36.3	16.6	23.8	40.4
Kansas	15.1	12.3	27.4	15.3	15.1	30.4	15.9	17.8	33.7
Kentucky	13.0	24.9	37.9	13.3	36.0	49.3	13.8	42.4	56.2
Louisiana	11.5	24.5	36.0	11.9	36.0	47.9	12.2	42.4	54.6
Maine	5.5	7.9	13.4	5.6	10.7	16.3	5.8	12.6	18.4
Maryland	7.8	21.3	29.1	8.0	31.8	39.8	8.3	37.4	45.7
Massachusetts	13.2	40.6	53.8	13.7	61.2	74.9	14.1	72.0	86.1
Michigan	24.9	63.3	88.2	25.5	94.7	120.2	26.3	111.4	137.7
Minnesota	17.6	25.2	42.8	17.8	35.4	53.2	18.4	41.6	60.0
Mississippi	11.7	13.7	25.4	11.9	18.0	29.9	12.3	21.2	33.5
Missouri	20.4	31.1	51.5	20.7	43.7	64.4	21.4	51.4	72.8
Montana	11.5	9.2	20.7	12.2	11.2	23.4	12.6	13.2	25.8
Nebraska	11.9	7.1	19.0	12.5	7.8	20.3	13.0	9.2	22.2
Nevada	7.1	5.1	12.2	7.5	5.4	12.9	7.7	6.4	14.1
New Hampshire	3.2	4.1	7.3	3.3	4.9	8.2	3.4	5.8	9.2
New Jersey	13.5	63.7	77.2	14.0	99.3	113.3	14.4	116.8	131.2
New Mexico	9.5	12.5	22.0	9.9	17.2	27.1	10.3	20.2	30.5
New York	45.6	71.1	116.7	47.1	97.8	144.9	48.7	115.0	163.7
North Carolina	17.5	15.3	32.8	17.9	18.0	35.9	18.5	21.2	39.7
North Dakota	8.6	6.6	15.2	8.6	7.8	16.4	9.0	9.2	18.2
Ohio	28.7	67.3	96.0	29.6	99.5	129.1	30.6	117.0	147.6
Oklahoma	14.1	19.7	33.8	14.3	27.5	41.8	14.8	32.4	47.2
Oregon	11.0	16.3	27.3	11.3	23.3	34.6	11.7	27.4	39.1
Pennsylvania	34.1	42.7	76.8	35.7	55.6	91.3	36.8	65.4	102.2
Rhode Island	3.9	6.5	10.4	4.1	9.0	13.1	4.2	10.6	14.8
South Carolina	9.3	10.4	19.7	9.5	13.4	22.9	9.7	15.8	25.5
South Dakota	9.2	6.3	15.5	9.2	7.0	16.2	9.5	8.2	17.7
Tennessee	15.3	20.4	35.7	15.6	27.7	43.3	16.1	32.6	48.7
Texas	44.2	48.3	92.5	45.4	63.7	109.1	46.9	75.0	121.9
Utah	7.0	12.1	19.1	7.3	17.3	24.6	7.6	20.4	28.0
Vermont	3.0	8.9	11.9	3.0	12.9	15.9	3.2	15.2	18.4
Virginia	13.8	28.6	42.4	14.4	41.7	56.1	14.8	49.0	63.8
Washington	11.7	23.4	35.1	12.2	34.2	46.4	12.6	40.2	52.8
West Virginia	7.9	13.5	21.4	8.1	18.9	27.0	8.4	22.2	30.6
Wisconsin	16.6	18.1	34.7	17.0	23.6	40.6	17.6	27.8	45.4
Wyoming	7.1	14.7	21.8	7.5	21.6	29.1	7.7	25.4	33.1
Hawaii	3.3	----------	3.3	3.4	----------	3.4	3.5	----------	3.5
District of Columbia	4.2	7.8	12.0	4.4	11.1	15.5	4.5	13.0	17.5
Puerto Rico	5.1	----------	5.1	5.2	----------	5.2	5.3	----------	5.3

The approximate apportionments of interstate system funds authorized under H. R. 10660 for the fiscal years 1957 through 1969—subject to such revision as may be required to conform to section 108 (f) of the bill—are as follows:

Interstate funds, fiscal years 1957–69, inclusive ($24,825,000)

Alabama	$389,752
Arizona	223,425
Arkansas	215,977
California	2,477,535
Colorado	166,327
Connecticut	593,317
Delaware	69,510
Florida	528,772
Georgia	747,232
Idaho	114,195
Illinois	1,136,985
Indiana	925,972
Iowa	295,417
Kansas	220,942
Kentucky	526,290
Louisiana	526,290
Maine	156,397
Maryland	464,227
Massachusetts	893,700
Michigan	1,382,752
Minnesota	516,360
Mississippi	$263,145
Missouri	638,002
Montana	163,845
Nebraska	114,195
Nevada	79,440
New Hampshire	71,992
New Jersey	1,449,780
New Mexico	250,732
New York	1,427,438
North Carolina	263,145
North Dakota	114,195
Ohio	1,452,263
Oklahoma	402,165
Oregon	340,103
Pennsylvania	811,778
Rhode Island	131,573
South Carolina	196,118
South Dakota	101,783
Tennessee	404,648
Texas	930,938
Utah	253,215
Vermont	188,670
Virginia	608,213
Washington	498,983
West Virginia	275,558
Wisconsin	345,068
Wyoming	315,278
Hawaii	-------
District of Columbia	161,363
Puerto Rico	-------

Results of Questionnaire mailed by Hon. John F. Baldwin, Jr., of California, to Residents of the California Sixth District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, early this year I issued a questionnaire to each family of registered voters in my district, which is the Sixth District of California. It has been most encouraging to receive such a fine response to this questionnaire. My constituents not only answered the questionnaire, but wrote additional comments on the back of the questionaire or on supplementary attached sheets. I have read all of these replies personally, and they have been most helpful to me.

The tabulation of the questionnaire is summarized below:

1. The Navy has proposed to acquire as a safety barrier more than 4,500 acres of property within a 2-mile radius of the loading piers at the Port Chicago naval magazine. This would include the town of Port Chicago, the town of Nichols, and portions of Clyde and Shore Acres.

Answers from Port Chicago residents: Do you favor (a) That the Navy be authorized to acquire the property, 28.3 percent; (b) That the Port Chicago naval magazine be removed from Contra Costa County, 53.4 percent; (c) That the Navy be denied its request to acquire the property, but the Port Chicago naval magazine be allowed to continue to operate within the confines of its present property, 15.5 percent; no opinion, 2.8 percent.

Answers from all of Contra Costa County: (a) 26.5 percent; (b) 30.9 percent; (c) 39.1 percent; no opinion, 3.5 percent.

2. The Army has proposed to acquire 22,000 acres of property in the Potrero Hills area near Suisun for use as an Army Outloading Ammunition Terminal.

Answers from Fairfield-Suisun residents: Do you favor (a) That the Army be authorized to acquire the property and funds be appropriated for this purpose, 53.4 percent; (b) That the Army be denied its request to acquire the property, 44.3 percent; no opinion, 2.3 percent.

Answers from all of Solano County: (a) 60.1 percent; (b) 33.8 percent; no opinion, 6.1 percent.

3. Present farm surplus production, and resulting lower prices, is now receiving much study. One proposal now under consideration is a soil bank plan. Are you in favor of the soil bank plan? 40.6 percent; or opposed to it, 50.4 percent; no opinion, 9 percent.

4. Congress now has under consideration a social security bill which would (a) lower the age at which women could receive benefits, from 65 to 62 years; (b) lower the age at which physically disabled people could receive benefits, from 65 to 50; (c) extend social security coverage to dentists, lawyers, osteopaths, chiropractors, veterinarians, and optometrists, and (d) provide for a one-half percent increase in the social security payroll tax on both employees and employers. Do you favor, 71.3 percent; or oppose, 24 percent, this measure? no opinion, 4.7 percent.

5. Congress now has under consideration a highway plan which would expand Federal expenditures for construction of Federal interstate highways, with the view to making these four-lane, divided highways. The expanded program would be paid for primarily by increased Federal taxes on highway users (the increase in Federal gasoline taxes might amount to about 1 cent per gallon). Do you favor, 81.3 percent, or oppose, 14.7 percent, the proposed expanded Federal highway construction program? No opinion, 4 percent.

6. Two alternate plans have been under consideration by Congress for the development of power in Hells Canyon of the Snake River between Oregon and Idaho. Do you favor (a) Federal construction of a high dam in Hells Canyon? 31.1 percent; (b) construction by a private utility company of three smaller dams in Hells Canyon? 31.1 percent; or (c) do you have no preference on it? 37.8 percent. (The results on this question were quite unusual. Of 11,687 tabulated responses, there was practically an exact tie between those who favored Federal construction of a high dam, and those who favored construction of 3 smaller dams by a private utility. There were 3,636 who favored Federal construction, 3,635 who favored private construction, and 4,416 who had no preference.)

7. The Veterans' Administration has proposed to close the Oakland Veterans' Administration hospital, which serves the veterans of the East Bay, including Contra Costa and Solano Counties. In its place the Veterans' Administration proposes to build a new hospital. The following two general areas are under consideration as a site. Please check which site you would favor: (a) Contra Costa County, 80.8 percent; (b) Palo Alto, 10.1 percent; no opinion, 9.1 percent.

Are We a Nation of Softies?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, recently I saw an editorial in the Washington Star commenting on the rejection as physically unfit for military duty of about 35 percent of our young men. Alarmed by this state of affairs I asked Mr. Milo F. Christiansen, the able superintendent of recreation of Washington, D. C., for a statement as to what our country's recreation leaders were doing to meet this grave situation. I submit this statement here and want to take this occasion to compliment Mr. Christiansen for his important and informative comment. Mr. Christiansen is past president of the American Recreation Society.

RECREATION FOR PHYSICAL FITNESS

(By Milo F. Christiansen, Superintendent of Recreation, District of Columbia Recreation Department, Washington, D. C.)

Are we a nation of softies? Doctors and physical educators say that we are. From our pioneer days Americans have always tried to turn a hard job into an easy one. The result has been the vast technological advance of the past 150 years.

As we have made our jobs easier we have found ways of improving our health. We have better medical care. We eat and live better, and we have more rest and leisure than ever before. Our life span is longer. A child born in 1900 was given an average life of 47.3 years. Today's children on the average are expected to live 69.8 years.

But improved health for the Nation does not necessarily mean better health for all individuals. We must take care of our physical body—keep it fit—if we are to benefit from the opportunities for better health and longer life. With all this potential, Dr. Paul Dudley White, foremost of the President's heart consultants, recently said America is one of the unhealthiest countries in the world today." Dr. Hans Kraus, of New York's Bellevue Medical Center, tells us that 78 percent of the American children he tested could not perform acceptably his tests of physical fitness while only 8.5 percent of European children failed.

We hear, too, that 35 percent of our young men are rejected by their draft boards because of lack of fitness. Other studies show that although American males are growing heavier for their age and height, there is no indication that this increased weight is due to anything but fat.

Nor is the problem restricted to our youth. The mortality rate from degenerative diseases, particularly heart disease, is exceptionally high between the ages of 35 and 55. Doctors indicate that the lack of regular physical exercise is a factor in this high mortality rate.

Apparently we are healthy enough to exist in this push-button age of automation, but not rugged enough to meet vital military standards. Our automobiles, soft mattresses, and well-heated homes make it difficult to stay fit. We have to learn how to keep physically fit and still enjoy the luxury of modern living.

Some people blame our high schools and colleges for our softness. They claim there is too much emphasis on competitive sports for a very few rather than physical fitness for all and particularly for those who need it the most. There may be some basis for this accusation, but fundamentally there is nothing wrong with a strong competitive sports program provided there is equal emphasis on an intramural and physical development program.

In fact, there may be an argument for even greater intensification of competitive athletics. The United States made a very poor showing before the Russian athletes in the winter Olympics. Informed sources rate the Russians as favorites for the summer games. A Russian victory will be our loss in the cold war. Such a loss would be of immediate propaganda value which may adversely affect America's foreign policy.

Another accusation against the high school and college sports program is that they do not teach sports skills which can be carried over into adult life. Again this may be true in some cases, although modern physical education theory recognizes the importance of a lifelong awareness of the need for exercise to keep physically fit and insure adequate health. The accusation then should be directed not to competition as such or an erroneous theory of physical fitness but to those individuals who do not take full advantage of the opportunities available to them.

For those of us who cannot make the first team, or even the intramural team, there are opportunities for our participation at our own level of skill in a recreation program sponsored by a public or private recreation agency. The trend for municipalities and counties to provide recreation facilities and leadership for their citizens brings physical fitness within the reach of all who desire it.

Virtually every major city in the United States has some provision for the voluntary recreation of its inhabitants. Over 3,000 cities with over 25,000 inhabitants have public recreation departments with most of them in operation all year long.

The modern recreation program is not just a play program for children. It is a means for every man, woman, and child to forget the cares and tensions of daily living and enjoy themselves. It is a way of satisfying basic human needs that cannot be satisfied in any other way. It is all to the good if, while satisfying these human needs, the American people are also keeping themselves physically fit.

Public recreation provides the facilities we need to keep physically fit. The open spaces of our cities include park areas for hiking, horseback riding, and camping. There are municipal golf courses for devotees of this sport at a minimum charge. Public bathing beaches or lakes provide opportunities for swimming, boating, and a variety of water sports. Tennis courts are lighted for evening play and often surfaced for use all year long. Recreation centers and playgrounds provide both outdoor and indoor facilities for physical development. Softball, baseball, and football fields are spotted throughout the cities for use by all. School gymnasiums are open after school hours and in the evenings for basketball, volleyball, badminton, and a host of other activities.

In addition, public recreation provides trained leaders and program organizers to form teams into leagues, teach skills, and coach the teams. There is no reason why a person of any age or sex cannot find some physical activity of interest with a group of the same approximate skill. Recreation leaders see to it that everyone who desires has an opportunity to participate. The volume of participation makes it possible to organize groups at several degrees of skill so that participants will not lose out just because they are not good enough for the first team.

Although recreation is comparatively new as a governmental service, great strides have been made in recent years. There is an awakening of interest in public recreation by progressive communities all across our Nation. We can look forward to the day in our generation when public recreation will be an integral part of every municipal governmental structure. Our cities must realize the importance of recreation as a means of enriching life, of keeping their citizens healthy and physically fit.

The important need now is to create a desire among all our citizens to keep physically fit. Until every American realizes the advantages of physical fitness we will remain a Nation of softies, a product of a push-button civilization that failed to take full advantage of its potential for balanced living. Constructive use of our leisure time and proper care of our bodies are as much obligations of citizenship as our responsibilities to vote and defend our country. A nation is only as strong as its people. Through recreation we can experience the joy of living to the fullest extent and reap the harvest of improved health, sound bodies, personality and character growth, social adjustment, and balanced living.

The Federal Highway Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, after many months of arduous and diligent labor, the Roads Subcommittee and the Public Works Committee of the House reported to this body a Federal highway bill.

This bill is one of the most important that will come before this session of Congress, and it is my hope that the Senate will pass the bill by a margin equal to the House vote of 388–19, and that this Nation will be provided upon pasage, with a good workable measure that will mean much to the safety of our citizens, the economy of our Nation, our national defense, and provide adequate communication between centers of economic interest.

The action of the House was universally hailed by my constituents in the First District of Florida, and the advantages to the State of Florida, and the Nation were well pointed out in the editorial columns of two of our leading newspapers. I believe these editorials will be of interest to the entire Nation, and, under unanimous consent, include the editorial of the Tampa Sunday Tribune, of April 29, 1956, and that of the St. Petersburg Independent of Saturday, April 28, 1956, in the RECORD:

[From the Tampa Tribune of April 29, 1956]

NOW FOR THE BIG PUSH

The House looked necessity in the face and acted responsibly in the interest of the entire Nation in passing by a 388 to 19 vote the $51 billion longrange highway construction bill.

The action is one of the bright spots of this year's congressional record.

At the core of this gigantic program is a provision to build 40,000 miles of superpriority highways linking 42 State capitals and 90 percent of all cities over 50,000 population. The military and civil defense aspects of this part of the improvement program do not need emphasis.

What should be underlined, however, are the great benefits Florida in general and the West coast area in particular stand to reap from final passage of the overall program.

Funds are provided in the bill for a third bridge across Old Tampa Bay, linking Hillsborough and Pinellas Counties. Moreover, Tampa is scheduled to have two connections on the national system of interstate highways.

This community would be the terminal point on a route running northward to connect with a cross State northern artery from Jacksonville through Lake City, Tallahassee and Pensacola, which would go on to New Orleans. The Tampa-St. Petersburg area would also be linked in the route running cross State through Lakeland, Orlando, and Daytona Beach and connecting with another interstate route from Jacksonville to Miami.

Under the bill, according to Representative William C. Cramer, Florida will receive some $70 million in the next 2 years. The biggest portion, about $58 million, will be allocated for the interstate highway system to be constructed in the State. More than $5 million will be available for primary roads, about $3½ million for secondary roads and a little more than $3 million for urban roads.

During the remaining life of the 13-year construction program, Florida is scheduled to receive an average of $50 million annually.

All this is sweet news to motorists and to those connected with business, agricultural and other interests in the State, who are well aware that extension and modernization of our highway system are basic requirements for the safety of our growing population and for the good health of our economy.

There's a not-so-cheering side to the picture, of course. The program won't come all laid down and paid for.

The House measure calls for new and increased taxes totaling $14 billion on the people who use the roads during the next 16 years. This includes a raise of 1 cent in the present Federal tax on each gallon of gasoline and diesel fuel. It also includes higher taxes on tires, trucks, buses, and truck trailers.

We think, however, this is the fairest way to finance the construction program. We certainly approve of the pay-as-you-go principle. It is far better than the proposal originally advanced by the Eisenhower administration to set up a separate corporation to issue bonds. And since those who use the new highways will receive the greatest benefits, it is only right that they should shoulder the biggest share of the burden.

The important thing now, of course, is to push the bill the rest of the way through Congress.

A quite different bill was approved by the Senate last year. It was more moderate, calling for some $18 billion in construction, and carried no tax provisions.

But the heartening fact is that leading Senators are agreed on the broad principles of what the Nation needs in the way of good highways. Many of them also seem inclined to approve the tax features of the House bill.

With such wide agreement, there is no occasion for any undue delay. Senators should roll up their sleeves and speed the final version of the program to the President in time to take advantage of good construction weather this summer and fall all over the country.

[From the Petersburg Independent of April 28, 1956]

LONG-RANGE ROAD PLANNING

The recent trouble experienced in attaining the rights-of-way for Tyrone Boulevard may well have been avoided under a provision of the multi-billion-dollar Federal highway bill approved by the House Public Works Committee.

For years action had been sought to rebuild and widen that section of Alternate United States 19—one of the most dangerous and rundown pieces of highway in the county. Both the State and county recognized the need. But finally when funds were available to rebuild and widen the highway the appraised value of the rights-of-way was so high that the project was nearly lost.

Had the rights-of-way been attained when the need for reconstructing was first recognized they could have been purchased at a reasonable rate and everything ready when the construction contract was let.

The Tyrone Boulevard case, of course, is not an isolated example. This sort of thing is experienced by the State frequently, particularly in urban areas where the price of land is steadily advancing. The State and county recognize the need for a new road. By the time construction funds are available, perhaps a new subdivision has sprung up in the vicinity, and the price of land has advanced. It may be necessary to move buildings adjacent to the highway or to take a strip of land so wide from a particular plot that the remainder becomes useless. Thus, the cost of the highway becomes exorbitantly high.

A provision in the new Federal highway bill, written into the measure by Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER, will permit the States to use Federal funds to purchase rights-of-way up to 5 years in advance of construction. If the bill is finally adopted by both Houses, the States will be able to purchase rights-of-way well in advance and avoid one of the factors in the high cost of road construction.

To be able to take advantage of the provision, however, the States will have to look well beyond current highway needs and provide a long-range highway program looking to the future.

The current State administration is doing just this—planning the highways that will be needed in the future. Unfortunately, however, our past experience has been that each change in administration is followed by an overhauling of road plans. Much that has been planned by a former administration is thrown out the window in order that the new administration may pay off its political debts with new highways.

The new road code adopted by the last legislature may go far in halting this practice. But the State still needs a long-range highway program that carries on from one administration to the next.

The Cramer provision in the new Federal highway bill should have the effect of encouraging long range planning by the States. At the same time it should aid in preventing situations like the Tyrone boulevard case in which a city is suddenly called upon for huge financial outlays for rights of way when there is no money in the till to purchase them.

The Democratic Party Will Win in 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party has not lost the election in 1956 despite the mighty blasts of press agentry emanating from the Republican Party and some of its house organs. The fact that the Democrats can win in 1956 is well recognized by Mr. Joseph C. Harsch, special correspondent to the Christian Science Monitor, in an article in the April 12 edition of that splendid paper.

For the benefit of all, I say that the Democratic Party will deserve to win and will win in 1956, if we come forward with a vigorous campaign, and a sound platform for the benefit of all the people of this country, and bring forth one of our many well qualified candidates.

I hope all will read Mr. Harsch's excellent article:

STATE OF THE NATION: THE ILLINOIS PRIMARY

WASHINGTON.—In the 1952 Illinois primary the Republicans obtained 68 percent of the total vote cast, compared with 32 percent for the Democrats.

In the 1952 Presidential election in Illinois Dwight D. Eisenhower obtained 60.1 percent of the vote and Adlai E. Stevenson obtained 39.9 percent.

In the latest primary election in Illinois the Republicans obtained a little more than 50 percent of the total vote cast and the Democrats a little less (the final totals are not in at this writing).

And in Cook County Mr. Stevenson ran well ahead of Mr. Eisenhower.

One primary doesn't prove anything, as political history in the United States has demonstrated so often.

But two things about this latest primary are of extreme interest to politicians.

One is that ESTES KEFAUVER did not secure the 10 percent of write-ins which his supporters had hoped for. This may have been small comfort to Stevensonians, but it was of comfort and it put him back in what one Democratic politician described as a "convalescent condition" after his misfortune in Minnesota.

Second, the Stevenson vote ran behind the Eisenhower vote, but by nothing like the proportions which public-opinion polls have been leading most people to expect whenever Mr. Eisenhower is pitted against any potential Democratic candidate.

There are probably many explanations of this second phenomenon, but there are some things about the political pattern in the United States which continue to be puzzling and this is another one for the list.

For example, since 1952 the Democrats have—

1. Taken nine governorships and lost none.
2. Won some 500 State legislature seats and lost 5.
3. Won both Houses of Congress in a period of booming prosperity, whereas Herbert Hoover held both at his midterm election in spite of the fact that the country was in the depths of the depression. (Democrats actually organized the House after the 1930 elections when an initial Republican advantage of two seats was wiped out by vacancies.)
4. Won 8 out of 9 special congressional elections.
5. Won many cities, including the surprising 1955 upset in the control of Indiana's main cities, an event which never has been explained adequately.

The most surprising thing about these election results is that the Democratic Party which won them possesses no single acknowledged leader, is riven by deep internal rivalries and divisions, has no national set of policies, and has had most of its stock of old issues preempted by the Republicans. And yet when it has gone to the polls locally it has done better than normally would be expected in a country which is booming with prosperity, is at peace, and is led by a President as undoubtedly popular as is Mr. Eisenhower.

There is no millstone on the Republican Party's neck today such as it had to carry into Herbert Hoover's midterm election of 1930 after the depression broke. And Mr. Hoover was not a popular President, as Mr. Eisenhower is. Yet it is a puzzling fact that the Hoover Republicans of 1930 did better than the Eisenhower Republicans of 1954. And now Adlai Stevenson, by no means a popular figure comparable to Mr. Eisenhower, comes fairly close to the Eisenhower vote in the Illinois primaries.

There are some facts about the Milwaukee vote in the Wisconsin primary which perhaps need a second look in the light of the Cook County vote in Illinois. There was a general assumption after the Wisconsin vote that the Democrats had lost ground in the city vote in Milwaukee and the Republicans had gained.

But a reexamination of the Milwaukee vote shows that the Republicans took 67.3 percent of the primary vote in 1952 compared with 56.8 percent this time.

And if one looks at two wards which could be particularly meaningful as to labor and Negro votes, the following comparison emerges:

The Milwaukee 12th ward is industrial. Republicans took 44.8 percent of the primary vote there in the 1952 primary. They took 40.6 percent this time.

The Milwaukee sixth ward is heavily Negro. The Republicans took 49.3 percent in the 1952 primary, and 42.9 percent this time.

None of this proves for a moment that the Democratic Party is enjoying a rising political tide in spite of Eisenhower popularity, peace, and prosperity. Each item in it does raise questions which have yet to be answered satisfactorily. There is something puzzling about the voting pattern. It doesn't fit entirely with the polls of Eisenhower versus Stevenson or Kefauver popularity. The voting fails to show the overwhelming Eisenhower strength which the opinion polls shows.

A Bill To Establish Federal Maritime Board as a Separate Independent Agency in the Executive Branch of the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. A. THOMPSON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to establish the Federal Maritime Board as a separate independent agency in the executive branch of the Government. It is appropriate, therefore, that I make this brief statement in explanation of the reasons why I believe this legislation should be enacted.

Under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 there was established the United States Maritime Commission. The Commission was vested with authority to carry out not only the regulatory powers contained in the several shipping acts, but also the operational and promotional responsibilities created by the 1936 act itself. As the years went by, serious deficiencies of administration were disclosed by several investigations of the Maritime Commission. As a result, the Commission was legislated out of existence by Reorganization Plan No. 21, which set up the Federal Maritime Board and the Maritime Administration in the Department of Commerce. The Board was composed of three members and was charged with responsibility for carrying out the regulatory functions performed by the former United States Maritime Commission. It also was vested with authority to perform the functions relative to the awards of subsidy and related matters. Maritime Administration, on the other hand, was charged with responsibility for carrying out all the other functions previously carried out by the Maritime Commission. This separation of functions was a step in the right direction, but unfortunately it did not go far enough. The main deficiency in the organization established by Reorganization Plan No. 21 was in the fact that the Chairman of the Maritime Board was made ex officio the Maritime Administrator. This fact alone has served to defeat the very purpose underlying the separation of the functions previously performed by the Maritime Commission. In submitting his plan to the Congress, former President Truman referred to the conclusion of the President's Advisory Committee on the Merchant Marine, which in 1947 stated:

> It appears to the Committee that the organizational structure of the Maritime Commission as set up in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 is wholly inadequate for the efficient conduct of the multitude of diverse activities for which the Maritime Commission is now responsible. The deficiencies of the statutory organization for administrative action are regarded by the Committee to be the most serious obstacle standing in the way of the development of the merchant marine of this country.

Experience in the workings of the two agencies, the Board and the Administration, since their creation in 1950, has demonstrated that the regulatory functions which suffered by reason of the limitations necessarily placed on the one individual who attempts to serve in both capacities. This was a mistake from the beginning. If the job to be done was too big for the five-man Maritime Commission, how could one man give the necessary time and attention to directing the activities of the Board and of the Administration?

During the past 8 months, I have served as chairman of a special subcommittee set up to consider the activities of foreign-freight forwarders and brokers. These are activities which are subject to regulation by the Federal Maritime Board under the Shipping Act of 1916.

We have held extensive hearings and investigations into this subject, and though the conclusions of the subcommittee have not yet been crystalized, it has been apparent to all the members that this field has been sadly neglected by the Maritime Board. I say this not so much in criticism of the Board, because I feel that the workload presently imposed upon the Chairman of the Board, who is also the Maritime Administrator, is beyond the capabilities of any one single individual no matter how capable he might be.

Only recently, there appeared in the press a story which illustrates how incongruous the situation can become where the one man tries to wear two hats. The Maritime Administrator is presently appealing to the Board for its ruling on some matters which are acted upon by the Administrator. So in effect, the Administrator is appealing to himself and to other members of the Board.

The bill which I have introduced would amend Reorganization Plan No. 21 so as to remove the Maritime Board from the Department of Commerce and make it an independent agency in the executive branch. This independence, I believe, is essential to the efficient performance of duties by a regulatory body of the nature of the Maritime Board. Under this organizational setup, the personnel and facilities of the Board would be entirely independent of the Maritime Administration.

One other change of significance which would be made under my bill is to lengthen the terms of the members of the Board to 6 years. This would serve a twofold purpose in that it would be more attractive as an office in the Federal Government. And also it would give a degree of permanence to the Board which it has lacked since its establishment in 1950.

In closing, I might say that I have discussed this bill with the chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, Mr. BONNER, and he has assured me that as soon as the executive branch has had time to adequately consider the proposal, he will assist in arranging early hearings on it. I might add also that in my discussions of this proposal with other members of the committee and with representatives of the maritime industry, I have received overwhelming support for the principles encompassed in the bill.

Rewarding Irresponsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON HAYWORTH
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of May 1, 1956:

REWARDING IRRESPONSIBILITY

For 7 sweltering weeks Washingtonians walked or bummed rides to work last summer. Efforts to bring the management of the Capital Transit Co. and the striking AFL transit union together had proved altogether fruitless, very largely because of the public-be-damned attitude of the company, which had in effect provoked the strike. Finally, recognizing that it was futile to hope that the company would place its public responsibility first, Congress passed a bill canceling the franchise of the Capital Transit Co. after 1 year. President Eisenhower signed the bill. After noting that neither party to the dispute had discharged its obligations to the public, he added: "* * * both the Congress and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia have concluded that the Capital Transit Co., beginning several years ago and continuing up to the present time, has failed to measure up to its responsibilities in the District."

It is this mood and frustration that the House of Representatives needs to remember in appraising the bill now before it to restore the franchise to the Capital Transit Co. This bill not only would renew the franchise virtually on the company's terms; it also would hand the company on a silver platter vast tax concessions and immunity from all but cursory regulation.

Has anything in the past 8½ months given indication that the company has developed a more enlightened labor relations policy or a heightened sense of responsibility to the community? It has not. Has anything changed the attitude of Louis E. Wolfson from his expression last summer that the "Commissioners represent the public, the union represents labor, and the board of directors, of which I am chairman, represents the stockholders" (thus totally ignoring the responsibility of a public utility for public service)? There is no evidence of it.

Admittedly the Senate bill, which instead of restoring the franchise would create an interim public authority to operate transit in Washington, does not provide any easy solutions. But the situation must be judged on the alternative available. Would the public interest be served by rewarding the irresponsibility of the Capital Transit Co., thus jumping from the frying pan back into the fire from which Congress rescued the community last summer? Such a weak-kneed "solution" would be monstrous. We hope the House will recall the sore feet and inflamed tempers of last summer, and the reasons for them, when it votes this week.

The Truth About Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to put into the RECORD The Truth About Taxes. The records are available for anyone to see and the publication of these records, Mr. Speaker, certainly should stop some of the wild remarks and statements that are being made relative to the tax program which we all admit is high. The record will show that unnecessary expenditures are being cut and that for the first time in many years, we have a balanced budget. We hope, with the continuation of these efficiencies that at an early date we will again be able to cut taxes and reduce our national debt. A reduction in taxes means an increase in buying power or an increase in wages for all.

I insert, herewith, an article entitled "The Truth About Taxes":

Democrats parroting the Truman fabrication that, of the "$7 billion tax cut * * * put across in 1953," by the Republicans, "corporations and people with incomes over $5,000 a year got 91 percent of the cut and all the millions of taxpayers with incomes of less than $5,000 a year got only 9 percent of the cut," should be corrected as follows:

1. Of the total $7½ billion annual tax cut made possible by Republicans in 1954, 62 percent of the cuts went to individuals, only 38 percent to corporations.

2. Not 9 percent, but 23 percent went to people in the under $5,000 category.

3. Most people got a 10–11 percent income tax cut; but for those in the highest brackets the cuts scaled downward to only 1 percent at the top.

4. The under $5,000 group received more than its fair share of the income tax cuts, because the people who paid 33 percent of the total income taxes collected under the Democrats got 37 percent of the tax reductions made possible by the Republicans in 1954.

(The above figures are official Treasury Department computations.)

5. The real "high tax party" is the Democrat Party, because 14 of the 15 income tax increases (but only 3 of the 10 reductions) since 1913 were enacted by Democrats.

LITTLE FELLOW GETS BREAK

6. The average $4,000 family man with wife and two children) in 1932 paid only $12 in Federal income taxes—but he paid $266 in 1952—22 times as much. Republicans made it possible to give the $4,000 man a 10 percent income tax cut. At the same time, the millionaire was given only a 1 percent cut in the 1954 Republican tax reduction, proving that, proportionately, the little fellow received a much bigger tax break than the big fellow.

7. The Roosevelt-Truman administrations in 20 years increased the Federal tax burden on everyone by 31 times—from $2 billion to $63 billion. Hidden taxes that were unknown in 1932 mushroomed under the Democrats to the point where by 1950 they exceeded $760 a year per family.

The Late Honorable Alben W. Barkley

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN C. WATTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1956

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, the death of ALBEN BARKLEY comes as a profound shock to all of us. It seems that in His plan of things the Almighty has provided that each generation will have an outstanding leader in a particular chosen field—an individual endowed with talent so extraordinary that he stands above comparison. It seems that this individual is especially touched by the hands of the Creator to be the example and the goal toward which all who would succeed must steer their course. Such a man

was ALBEN BARKLEY. But, Mr. Speaker, ALBEN BARKLEY was an exception to this exceptional rule. ALBEN BARKLEY excelled in statesmanship. He was possessed of an overabundance of those traits of character and human qualities from which flow the true spirit of Christianity and reflect the personification of gentlemanly principles.

ALBEN BARKLEY died while pronouncing the rule by which he lived. Measured by material wealth, his origin was laid deeply in the lower echelons. Measured by those intangibles of spiritual and character-building qualities, his origin was unsurpassed in its richness. He came from pioneer stock of the early Kentuckians. His boyhood and his early manhood were cloaked in an environment requiring long days of hard and arduous toil for mere survival. Throughout the whole of this, Mr. Speaker, the light of ALBEN BARKLEY'S exceptional qualities shone with the brilliance of the sun. The pinnacle that he achieved was willed to him by the people whom he served and whom he loved in an effort to evidence their respect, their esteem, and their affection for him.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation has suffered a terrific loss. Because of his vast experience in Government, his firsthand knowledge of international and domestic problems, his impeccable character and his love of country, the Nation was afforded a guarantor of its security and a defender of its freedoms that will be difficult to replace.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, ALBEN BARKLEY was great, but he was humble. Truly, today he must be "a servant in the house of the Lord."

I join with a saddened and mournful Nation in extending heartfelt sympathy to the members of his family.

"If TVA Is To Be Responsible to Congress, It Follows That Congress Must Be Responsible to TVA," St. Louis Post-Dispatch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, we hear many appeals that the TVA should be kept responsible to Congress. Those who know of the achievements of TVA know and realize that this agency of the Government reports to Congress, seeks its annual appropriation from the Congress and is responsive and responsible to Congress in its every demand. On the other hand, Congress has a responsibility with respect to this great agency of the Government. Responsibility is not a one-way street.

There are those who would deny to TVA a loan of any further appropriated funds and also deny to this agency the right to use its accumulated corporate funds. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch in a recent story, has well pointed out as we hear so many cries of responsibility that the Congress has a responibility toward a very coniderable part of our country which is solely dependent upon a Government agency for its source of electric power supply.

A summary of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch article is carried in a recent editorial in the Nashville Tennessean entitled "A Two-Way Street." This timely editorial is deserving of wide consideration, and I therefore ask, Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent that this editorial be reproduced in the RECORD for the benefit of all Members of the Congress.

The editorial follows:

With Congress deadlocked over proposals to permit the TVA to finance its own plant expansion either out of its power revenues or by issuing bonds, much is heard these days about responsibility—of a sort.

The TVA, it is said, should be kept "responsible to Congress," by which it is meant that the agency should not be authorized to undertake any new construction—regardless of how it is financed—without the express approval of Congress.

Among those holding this view is one of the stanch newspaper friends of the TVA, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. But the Post-Dispatch imparts to responsibility a considerably broader meaning than many of the Members of Congress do.

"If TVA is to be responsible to Congress," says the newspaper, "it follows that Congress must be responsible to TVA. Responsibility is not a one-way street.

"From the beginning of the Eisenhower administration, both Congress and the executive department have displayed little sense of their responsibility to TVA or TVA's responsibility toward the very considerable part of our country which it is solely responsible for supplying with electric power."

How true that is. And how ironic, when it is noted that defense installations of the Government itself are now consuming more than half of all the power produced by the TVA.

Despite repeated warnings of an inevitable power shortage in the TVA area, both the administration and the Congress have defaulted on their responsibility as though the TVA could build new generating units without either appropriations or some kind of self-financing plan.

Unless and until Congress is willing to fulfill its responsibility to the TVA, its talk of the TVA's responsibility to Congress thus will have a decidedly hollow ring.

Two Appraisals of Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, on the afternoon of April 21 the Honorable Adlai Stevenson addressed the American Society of Newspaper Editors, meeting in Washington, on the subject of our foreign policy. That same evening President Eisenhower addressed the same audience and chose to discuss the same subject.

The two speeches were analyzed editorially by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch in issues of April 22 and April 23. The analyses of the Post-Dispatch are extremely pertinent; and under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include these two editorials:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 22, 1956]

MR. STEVENSON'S APPRAISAL

Adlai E. Stevenson made a sober and sobering criticism of American foreign policy in his address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors Saturday.

It was an impressive, eloquent, responsible, and constructive appraisal. There was no partisanship in it. On the whole, it was fair to the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. Stevenson would have been more completely fair, in our judgment, had he given President Eisenhower credit for relieving the anxiety of the whole world when he made clear, through his conduct at the Geneva Conference, that the United States stands for peace. But it is true that the initiative the President held in his hands at that moment has not been followed up.

It is true that we, the American people, have been drifting steadily downward in world opinion; that we are all too often regarded as seeking military solutions to the exclusion of others; that our policy has fallen into a deadly sterility for want of fresh idea; and that unless we move rapidly to regain the initiative in the new era of world affairs now upon us, our leadership will atrophy dangerously in the days ahead.

These are facts which anybody not misled by Secretary Dulles' incantations can recognize. Neither President Eisenhower nor Mr. Dulles, let it be said, wanted a decline of American influence and prestige to come about. But it is not intentions that are at stake. Results are what count. It is essential that the United States recapure the political and moral leadership of the world which it has come so dangerously close to letting slip away.

Mr. Stevenson offers three thoughtful proposals for beginning that task, and all of them deserve the most earnest consideration.

Like Atomic Energy Commissioner Thomas E. Murray, he would explore the possibility of abandoning further H-bomb tests as a first step toward disarmament. He would channel more of our economic aid through the United Nations in an effort to create a great and truly international development fund for the aid of former colonial lands. And, third, he would change the spirit in which we conduct foreign policy—replace armed power as the symbol of our policy, end the sloganeering, bluff and bluster, cultivate a "decent respect for the opinions of others," and in general behave as the leader of a coalition rather than a big power dragging others to the brink.

As Mr. Stevenson said, what all this adds up to in essence is carrying out the program which President Eisenhower laid before the same society of editors just 3 years ago. The prospectus was brilliant. The blueprints were fine. But what has actually happened to the American position since that speech does not match the preview. It is high time that our direction be reversed.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 23, 1956]

SO FAR AS IT WENT

President Eisenhower's address at the annual dinner of the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington Saturday night was both reassuring and distinctly disappointing.

The address was reassuring because it summarized the basic elements of the President's peaceful approach to current international problems. It was disappointing because the speech was described in advance as a major foreign policy address and in

content and delivery did not measure up to that high billing.

On the plus side was President Eisenhower's statement of three guidelines, as he called them. These were:

First, our participation in the maintenance of a collective shield against aggression to allow the free peoples to seek their goals in safety.

Second, our cooperation in the partnership of the free community wherein the conditions of freedom will flourish.

Third, our striving by peaceful means to induce the Soviet bloc to correct injustices and pursue peaceful purposes with other nations.

In rather more specific terms, the President also used the occasion to plead for long-term foreign aid on the grounds that recipients of our economic assistance could not plan adequately if all commitments were on a year-to-year basis.

Thus so far as it went the President's address to the editors and to the country on television and radio was hopeful and in the right direction.

But the anticipation was for a truly important foreign policy address such as the moving statement of pacific plans just 3 years ago before the same audience, such as the President's historic atomic energy address to the U. N. or his appeal for peace at Geneva last summer. Measured by these previous Eisenhower efforts the address fell far short of expectations.

Actually, through some mysterious division of his subject matter by the White House staff, the President's more significant remarks were made informally to the editors and their guests after the close of the network address. He appeared to be relieved that the formal event was over and spoke with relatively more enthusiasm off-the-cuff.

But even then President Eisenhower showed little concern with the obviously dangerous drift in world affairs. Instead he listed Vietnam, Trieste, Iran, the Suez and other parts of the world as evidence that things are going better. He had little to say about the Middle East and he took no note of the fact that just that morning a substantial group of the editors had voted 2 to 1 that the United States is losing the cold war in the uncommitted areas of the world.

Following the Dulles line, the President accounted for the change in Kremlin policy as evidence that the Soviet leaders had come to view their course as unsuccessful. "Any time your policy is winning," he said, "you don't change."

Yet Mr. Eisenhower himself proposed the creation of "rotating advisory board" of private citizens to assist the Government in the formulation and development of policies, including apparently foreign policy. Using the President's own view of the Russian change, it may be wondered why, if the Eisenhower-Dulles conduct of foreign affairs is wholly successful, does the administration need outside help?

This idea of a board of detached consultants has merit but it would have had far more merit 3 years ago—after a presidential election, not a few months in advance of the next election.

Perhaps the President felt he might embarrass the negotiations now in process between the British and the Russians if he had been more positive or if he announced some new course or challenging departure in present policy. If that was in his mind then he might well have referred hopefully to the London meetings and given them encouragement from Washington.

What the Eisenhower foreign policy needs most of all is implementation in Congress and particularly among the Republicans in Congress.

Only last Thursday an important test—on the Bricker rider to the International Labor Organization appropriation—only eight Republican Senators voted to uphold the President. Thirty-five Republican Senators voted against him. Just two more Republican votes would have enabled the Democrats to carry the day for Dwight D. Eisenhower.

And so the President's address, though largely general, was good so far as it went. Yet, for the reasons indicated above, it disappointed his audience and doubtless the country as well. Meantime the White House liaison to the Senate had better get busy. When only eight Republican Senators back an Eisenhower stand for foreign affairs something more than words is urgently required.

Miss Margaret Moul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, as her Representative in Congress, I am pleased to invite the attention of my colleagues to the accomplishments of a lovely young Adams Countian, Miss Margaret Moul, of East Berlin.

This talented young woman, who will present her graduation recital at the Juilliard School of Music on Thursday evening, May 3, has won a Fulbright scholarship award and will continue her musical studies in the fall at the Vienna Academy of Music.

I congratulate Miss Moul on her accomplishments to date, and wish her continued success in her chosen career.

As a part of my remarks, I include a news story from the Gettysburg Times concerning Miss Moul:

COUNTIAN WINS SCHOLARSHIP TO STUDY ABROAD

Miss Margaret Moul, of East Berlin, dramatic soprano, has been granted a scholarship by the United States Government under the Fulbright Act to study at the Academy of Music in Vienna, Austria.

Miss Moul submitted a recording of her voice to the National Selection Committee last October along with her application and an essay on her purpose in studying abroad. Her recording was one of many chosen and she was invited to sing an audition for the committee on January 4. Three weeks later she was informed that her application had received the endorsement of the National Selection Committee. This meant that vocally and scholastically she had been found worthy of a Fulbright scholarship; however, the final decision would be made by the Board of Foreign Scholarships in Washington, D. C.

STUDIED IN COUNTY

After a character and background investigation by the FBI her recording was sent to the European school of her choice for its opinion and consideration. She has been accepted as a graduate student at the academy and will major in opera. Miss Moul will be coached in lieder and roles with Herr Ferdinand Grossman, director of the famous Vienna Academy Choir.

The musical education of Miss Margaret Moul began at the age of 5, when she started taking piano lessons. Like so many children, these studies were dropped, and, although she furthered her pianist talents on her own intermittently, she was not encouraged to develop them toward a professional career until she began to study voice with Mildred Rogers Dunstan, of New Oxford, a contralto, who had in prior years sung with such leading companies as the Boston, San Francisco, Chicago, Philadelphia, and St. Louis municipal operas. Mrs. Dunstan acquired most of her training abroad and was a protege of Edward Johnson, former general manager of the Metropolitan Opera Co. Miss Moul's vocal progress under her guidance resulted in her winning the Pennsylvania State championship in the alto-solo division of the Forensic and Music League contest while in her senior year, 1947, at the high school in her hometown of East Berlin.

After 2 years of academic study at Gettysburg College, Miss Moul was accepted as a private voice pupil by Mme. Marion Szekely Freschl, then of Philadelphia, who is on the voice faculty of the Juilliard School of Music in New York City. During her 9 months of study in Philadelphia with Madame Freschl, she took classes in theory and studied piano at the Philadelphia Musical Academy. She also coached opera roles and studied techniques of acting with Mme. Rose Landver, of the Catherine Long School and Hunter College, New York City. Subsequently she auditioned and was accepted as a full-time scholarship student at the Juilliard School of Music, where she will complete her studies next month, when she will graduate with a bachelor of science degree.

GIVES RECITAL MAY 3

When Miss Moul auditioned for entrance and scholarship to the school in the spring of 1952, she was heard by the director of the opera theater, Frederick Cohen, who accepted her as a member of the Juilliard Opera Theater, which is a rarity for a first-year student. On March 7 of this year Miss Moul sang the lead in Ernst Toch's opera, The Princess and the Pea. She scored a tremendous success in the role of the Queen, as was evidenced by the compliments she received from the teachers in the school with whom she has studied.

During these years of study at Juilliard, Miss Moul has been in demand to sing recitals and oratorios. She has been invited to sing with the York Symphony Orchestra next season. However, because of her being granted a Fulbright scholarship, this concert will be postponed until her return from study in Europe.

On May 3 at 8:15 p. m., Miss Moul will present her graduation recital in the recital hall of the Juilliard School of Music. After her graduation, she plans to spend the summer with her family in East Berlin and prepare for departure for Vienna in September.

The Nickel Situation in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, and complying with his request, I include a letter I received from the Honorable Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce. On several occasions I have placed information in the RECORD concerning the complex and aggravating problems respecting the nickel situation in the United States. The following letter of April 30, 1956, from Secretary Weeks explains in considerable detail some of the facets of the complex subject from his point of view:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, April 30, 1956.

The Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCCORMACK: In response to your letter of April 10, I am glad to have the opportunity to comment on Mr. Willard F. Rockwell's letters to you of March 23 and April 2 regarding the current situation on the supply and distribution of nickel. Since we are receiving many requests for information on this subject, I hope you will publish this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I shall endeavor to explain the nickel situation in detail, and enumerate the actions the executive branch has taken and is taking to meet the problems arising out of an insufficient national supply of nickel to meet all of our domestic requirements. A complete disclosure of all pertinent facts, however, is somewhat limited by security considerations applying to the national strategic stockpile and consumption of nickel for defense purposes.

Government allocation of nickel in the civilian market was discontinued in November 1953. Since the passage of the Defense Production Act in 1950, priorities have been in effect on the delivery of nickel for military and atomic-energy production and construction programs. Suppliers of nickel are required to fulfill all defense-rated orders in accordance with existing regulations. The balance of the supply is distributed, by nickel producers, to consumers for nondefense purposes.

The fundamental problem that both Government and industry face with respect to nickel is very simply stated. There is not enough nickel available to the United States market to satisfy actual total demand for defense and nondefense purposes. The demand for nickel has exceeded the supply since 1951. Under authorizations granted in the Defense Production Act, the Government has taken direct action to expand supply from several sources, including the Government-owned nickel-producing facilities in Cuba. This Government-sponsored and private industry expansion of supply has not kept pace with the increases in requirements for military production purposes, the needs of the national strategic stockpile, and the supplying of the requirements of a growing industrial economy. To offset the increase in military requirements, which otherwise would have further reduced the supply available for nondefense uses, the Government, early in 1955, authorized the diversions of deliveries from the national stockpile for industrial consumption. Such diversions total 24.3 million pounds in 1955; 12.3 million and 19 million pounds for the first and second quarters of 1956, respectively. With these diversions, total domestic consumption of nickel for all purposes during 1955 amounted to 216 million pounds, including 6 million pounds from consumers' inventories. On the basis of current stockpile diversions, it is estimated that new nickel availability during 1956 will approximate 260 million pounds. Due to the uncertainty of the defense requirements for the full year 1956, we cannot predict if the increased total available new nickel during 1956 over 1955 will actually benefit consumers of nickel for nondefense purposes. It is, indeed, fortunate that the Government undertook several years ago to underwrite the expansion of production of nickel.

To achieve an expansion of supply, it was necessary for the Government to either pay or guarantee a price, for delivery to the Government, that would make it economically feasible to utilize low-grade ores and maintain high-cost mining operations. In the case of NICARO, the Government invested considerable funds in the expansion of production and processing facilities. The initial deferments from stockpile deliveries, including nickel oxide from NICARO, were sold to industry at established prices, later diversions involved premium price nickel. The civilian economy is currently paying 3 prices for available nickel, a so-called market price of about 60½ cents for sinter (nickel oxide); 64½ cents for electro or cathode (metallic) nickel; a price ranging from $1 to $1.30 for Government set-aside supplies (diverted from scheduled deliveries to the stockpile); and $2.50 to $3 a pound for open-market supplies. Most of the latter is composed of nickel recovered from nickel scrap and imports.

With reference to Mr. Rockwell's complaint that his April allotment was cut 15 percent, he fails to indicate that this refers only to his market price nickel. He will, in fact, receive a quantity of the Government set-aside premium price nickel which will make up for approximately the 15 percent deficit about which he complains. We may add that the amount of market price nickel available each month is becoming progressively less due to the continually increasing defense requirements which consume only market price nickel.

Mr. Rockwell refers extensively to the so-called gray market in nickel and indicates that this market is supplied by those who procure nickel for defense purposes, and sell it in the open market, and consumers who are able to buy in excess of their needs for nondefense purposes and place the excess in the open market. As to the first alleged source of supply in the open market, I want to describe the extent to which we have maintained surveillance of the validity of defense-rated orders.

The defense materials system, under which priority deliveries of nickel for defense purposes are regulated, is administered by this Department. I can assure you that we have been continually checking and investigating the validity of the rated orders for nickel placed upon nickel suppliers. We have constantly taken measures designed to prevent the illegal or unwarranted diversion or escape of material purchased on military ratings. In March and June of 1954 we amended BDSA Regulation 2 to require purchasers of rated nickel who found that it was no longer needed to fulfill military requirements to hold such nickel for other military uses or return it for the benefit of the nondefense segment of the economy. Significant quantities were salvaged through these amendments.

Individual cases have been investigated as indications of violations have come to our attention and suitable action has been taken, in some cases by reference to the Department of Justice for criminal prosecution. In November of 1955 letters (copy enclosed) were addressed to all of the principal suppliers of the plating industry calling pointed attention to the strict requirements of the priority rating system and urging their full cooperation. The result of this action was gratifying. On the heels of this action surveys were initiated of all purchases of rated nickel in all areas of consumption. By comparison of the rated purchases reported by nickel suppliers with the defense needs of their customers, it was possible to determine with reasonable accuracy where unauthorized or excessive purchasing was taking place. Where this was found, directives were issued to the suppliers prohibiting their acceptance on a priority basis of further rated orders from designated customers and requiring that future orders be referred to BDSA for validation. While it is impossible to state precisely how much nickel was saved by means of this procedure, we estimate that 50,000 to 100,000 pounds a month may have been so conserved. This is in the plating area alone. We have had occasion to investigate 46 cases in areas other than plating of which 10 remain under study. Action will be taken in these cases if warranted.

Recently, after careful study and with the full concurrence and cooperation of the Office of Defense Mobilization, Department of Defense, and Atomic Energy Commission, directives were issued to all further converters and primary producers of steel controlled materials, including all nickel-bearing steels, requiring identification of further converters' orders for military use with the special symbol "FC." While this was not strictly a compliance action, we believe it will have important consequences in preventing slippage on nickel-bearing steel obtained by further converters under their specially authorized set-asides for defense purposes.

We believe that the recital of the foregoing measures should demonstrate that there has been no lack of energy in our compliance and enforcement program. We believe we have reduced any such illegal diversion to an absolute minimum. It is our estimate that the quantity of nickel moving in violation of our DMS regulations amounts to less than one-half of 1 percent of the total nickel available to the industrial economy. As to sale of excess nickel by purchasers for nondefense uses, it may well be that this takes place. It certainly is not illegal for them to do so. However, the nickel suppliers endeavor to keep very close check, so far as this is possible, on their customers' requirements and use of nickel products. It certainly is not to the advantage of the suppliers for their customers to be reselling nickel at premium prices and I believe that these suppliers would make every effort not to supply their customers who practice such resale tactics. As a matter of fact, all of the complaints have to do with an insufficiency of supply to consumers.

Mr. Rockwell states that the management of the company which supplies him with alloy steel, which he says is the fourth largest in the country, has informed him that 75 percent of their requirements is purchased in the market at premium prices. Through a review of the order and shipping records of practically all of the alloy steel producers, we have not been able to confirm this statement. We find it very difficult to believe that what is evidently a large alloy steel producer would find it necessary to purchase this proportion of their nickel requirements at premium prices. As heretofore explained, however, there is a fair supply of nickel available from imports and from secondary sources such as nickel and nickel-alloy scrap. Nickel steel producers not only use their own scrap but purchase scrap from either dealers or the customers to whom they supply nickel steel products. Obviously some portion of the nickel consumed by steel mills in the manufacture of nickel-bearing steels may be at prices commensurate with the open quotations for imports and nickel obtained from secondary sources.

As to the prices paid for nickel diverted from shipment to the stockpile, I should say that the domestic industry is indeed fortunate to be able to purchase nickel at these prices. If the Government had not undertaken an expansion program, which I have mentioned heretofore, there would not have been this nickel available at any price. Generally the lowest price nickel is being consumed for defense purposes. This is of direct benefit to the taxpayer since it reduces the cost of military procurement. I might add that I believe it is commendable that the producers of nickel have maintained a stable price situation irrespective of the demand which would indicate that much higher prices could be obtained. I would call your attention and that of Mr. Rockwell to what has happened pricewise with respect to copper in recent months.

Mr. Rockwell raises a question as to why his company was not consulted in connection with our investigations of the distribution of nickel. It was not necessary to solicit information from all users of nickel since the information needed was available in the of-

fices of the producers and suppliers. In our investigation we were concerned with two basic matters: First, the validity of rated defense orders for nickel; and, second, the method by which producers and suppliers distributed nickel to consumers for nondefense purposes after the defense requirements had been met. We satisfied ourselves that the suppliers were keeping very close track of the needs of all of their customers and so far as possible adjusting their sales to meet changing conditions in the affairs of their individual customers.

I will not make any specific comment or express an opinion on Mr. Rockwell's observations with regard to the national strategic stockpile. I am a member of the Defense Mobilization Board which advises the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization who has direct authority from the President to establish and maintain the strategic stockpile. I and other members of the Defense Mobilization Board are in accord with the current stockpile program.

In his letter to you Mr. Rockwell states, "We have absolute proof that some steel companies have sold nickel which they received in excess of their requirements for military orders." We are not sure just what Mr. Rockwell means by this statement. If a steel company was producing nickel-bearing steel only for military uses and so rated their orders, then any nickel sold in excess of their needs would be a violation of law. If this is the situation for which Mr. Rockwell has proof, it is his duty as a citizen to come forward with any information which would aid us in eliminating such illegal practices. We are going to request Mr. Rockwell to furnish us with information to support his statement.

If Mr. Rockwell refers to situations in which a steel company produces nickel-bearing steel for both defense and nondefense purposes, obviously the company would receive a total amount of nickel for both purposes in excess of its requirements for defense-rated orders. If such a company should have an excess of nickel for nondefense purposes, there is no law or regulation which prohibits the company from selling such nickel to other users. However, we seriously doubt that any nickel-steel producer is indulging in this practice. The requirements for nickel for military purposes have been on an upward trend for many months. These requirements reached a peak for the month of April this year. We do not expect a reduction for the next few months. In fact there may be an increase. If there is a substantial increase in the military requirements, it could result in a further reduction of the availability of nickel for nondefense purposes.

I apologize for the length of this letter but I felt that in view of the general interest of many industries in this subject I should try to explain the situation as fully as possible. Having been associated in the past with manufacturing companies which used nickel, I am fully aware of the problems faced by manufacturers in trying to conduct their operations in the face of an insufficient supply of a raw material. We in the executive branch have tried conscientiously to take every action which would benefit industry and at the same time not jeopardize our defense production and our long-run national security. It has been advocated by some that the Government should reimpose controls on the use and distribution of nickel for all purposes. I should be very reluctant indeed to undertake this since Government controls would not increase the total supply of nickel, and the Government would be placed in the position of interfering directly in the private affairs of a great many business firms. Furthermore, with Government controls, it would probably be necessary to restrict or prohibit the use of nickel for decorative or nonfunctional purposes. If this should be the case, the Government would be making the decision as to which private business establishments were more important than others to the national welfare, which is a function of Government quite contrary to our basic concepts of a private enterprise economy. Those who advocate Government controls in this particular case should examine their own particular situation since they might find that under Government controls they would not be permitted to consume nickel.

If there is any further information on this subject that you desire, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUSINESS AND DEFENSE
SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, November 21, 1955.

GENTLEMEN: You have directed certain questions to this office concerning the acceptance by your company of orders for nickel which purport to carry a priority rating. In order to assist you in determining what orders may properly be regarded by you as entitled to priority we are advising you as follows:

The basic rules of the priorities system are set forth in BDSA (formerly NPA), regulation 2. Additional regulations relating to the use of priority ratings are DMS regulations 1 and 2. Marked copies of these regulations are enclosed. Under unusual circumstances ratings may be placed under certain other regulations but for all practical purposes you may expect that any lawful ratings will require certification under one of the three regulations designated above.

You will note that in addition to the requirement of inclusion of the appropriate program identification symbol there is a requirement that every rated order be certified and signed by the customer. The certification must be in the form "Certified under [here insert appropriate regulation]." Orders not carrying this formula are of questionable validity as rated orders. It is a futher requirement that rated orders specify a delivery date.

We understand that some of your customers have sought to identify their orders as rated orders without complying with the formalities required by the regulations. In our opinion this is an irregular practice and orders in this form should not be treated as entitled to priority. We point out that orders not properly rated are junior to rated orders. Properly rated orders must be filled first, irrespective of the degee of shortage.

We should like also to draw your attention to section 18 of BDSA (formerly NPA), regulation 2. Under this section, if you know or have reason to believe that the material which you are delivering will be accepted, redelivered, held, or used in volation of any regulation of this agency, you are neither required nor authorized to deliver on such order. It has come to our attention that in certain cases orders have been placed by customers who may, to your knowledge, not have facilities adequate to process or use the materials ordered by them on priority ratings. We regard this as a suspicious circumstance and as one which justifies withholding delivery until the validity of the purported rating has been established to your satisfaction or to that of this agency.

An additional circumstance which gives rise to question as to the authenticity of a rated order is purported certification under a nonexistent regulation such as CMP Regs. 1, 2 and 3. These regulations have long since been revoked and have not been in effect since the controlled materials plan was superseded by the Defense Materials System in 1953. Another suspicious circumstance is the use of nonexistent program identification symbols. The only symbols currently in effect are A through E followed by a single digit.

Because of the critical shortage of nickel an incentive exists to resort to illegal practices and subterfuges to obtain it. Nickel obtained by these practices at normal market prices can be resold in the "black" or "gray" market at exorbitant figures. The priorities accorded to military and AEC orders under the regulations of this agency are to all intents and purposes the equivalent of currency and must be safeguarded against counterfeiting or falsification just as currency is safeguarded. While experience has demonstrated that we can largely rely upon the good faith and integrity of the business public to assist us in protecting the priorities system against raids we are nevertheless prepared when necessary to take appropriate measures against willful violators.

You are in a position to make a significant contribution to the welfare of the Nation and of your industry by assisting in the prevention of violations. We urge you to insist upon strict observance on the part of your customers with the requirements of the system and to refrain from accepting or filling, on a priority basis, "rated" orders which are either irregular in form or of such doubtful validity as to create a reasonable doubt of the customer's authority to employ the rating. You are further requested to communicate the contents of this letter to all personnel in your organization who are charged with the soliciting of orders from customers and the processing of orders received from customers so that they may be fully apprised of your policy to insist upon adherence to the requirements of law.

Sincerely yours,

JONATHAN B. RINTELS,
Enforcement Attorney for Business and Defense Services Administration.

The Late Honorable Alben W. Barkley

SPEECH
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1956

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, in the market place of public affairs good men and great men have influence far beyond their own knowledge. Most of the time they themselves are unaware of their own impact. Such a man died on Monday last, ALBEN W. BARKLEY.

I saw a great deal of Senator BARKLEY in the last 10 days of his life. For him I am certain that they were happy days as, I believe, were most of his days. Beginning on Saturday, April 21, I saw him and listened to him at the Democratic testimonial dinner for Woodrow Wilson. There he delivered, in his usual magnificent style, a moving tribute to a great American who had undoubtedly greatly influenced ALBEN W. BARKLEY himself.

On the following Monday I went to a luncheon in the Senate where he gave a report on the approaching meeting of the Interparliamentary Union in Bangkok, Thailand. I marvelled at his knowledge of world affairs, his approach to the problems of other peoples and other governments, and his sustaining interest in public affairs.

And then on Wednesday night of last week at the annual Press Club party for

the Members of the Congress he stole the show—his wit, his humor, his humility, his understanding brought him a standing ovation from members of the press and from his colleagues of both parties in both branches of the Congress.

On Saturday last, April 28, the National Broadcasting Co. was celebrating the 10th anniversary of its famous program, Meet the Press. The principal speaker was Senator BARKLEY. His attendance at that program was his last public appearance in the Capitol of the country that he loved and served so well. On that night he spoke of our basic freedoms of press and our right to information. He emphasized the importance of an informed electorate in a democracy. He told how the dictators, either of the left or of the right, invariably suppress information. And on that night he did something that I had seldom heard him do—he reminisced. Normally he looked to the future in discussing the problems of the present. But he talked about his years in Congress dating back to 1913—years of service which covered the rise to greatness of the United States of America.

And on Monday, fully in character, talking to young Americans he died saying, "I would rather be a servant in the house of the Lord than sit in the seat of the mighty." He wrote his own magnificent epitaph.

Mr. Speaker, this man shall live in the hearts of all Americans. His life portrayed the man—his sincerity of purpose, his humility—his love of party, his paramount love of country.

I believe those of us who serve in public office appreciate more than others sincerity of purpose. Unfortunately there are some who come to public office who, in pursuit of the senational, the headlines, and the acclaim of the moment, sacrifice sincerity and objectivity. Their colleagues get to know them and they cease to have any influence.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, Senator BARKLEY was the epitome of the American ideal of public service. He understood the greatness of America and the goodness of America, and because of him our country is stronger and better and happier.

The Bradley Report of the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the National Tribune—the Stars and Stripes of Thursday, May 3, 1956, on the Bradley report of the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

The article is as follows:

ABERNATHY BITTER OVER VETS' REPORT—SUGGESTS CONGRESS WILL NOT ACCEPT THE BRADLEY FINDINGS—QUESTIONS PRESIDENT'S MOTIVE

Immediately after Gen. Omar N. Bradley's presentation of the report of the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs last week, John V. Abernathy, national commander of the Pacific War Veterans of America released the following statement to the National Tribune:

"The Bradley Commission's major recommendations were fully expected. Truly they embrace and exemplify a unique revolutionary, socialistic, and pauperistic philosophy under development for the past three decades by a self-perpetuating clique of Federal bureaucrats with the aid of sundry sociologists, psychologists, theorists, and assorted eggheads."

RECALLS ECONOMY ACT

"The report is a brazen attempt to wrest from the Congress the traditional overall prerogative of determining the national policy to be followed in treating with veterans and their survivors—a 180-year-old prerogative the Congress will never relinquish. Beginning about 100 years ago, the executive department has been generally hostile toward veterans' welfare. The most notable examples are President Cleveland's veto of the Civil War Service Pension Act; President Coolidge's veto of the World War I Soldiers' Bonus Act, and bills for payment of that bonus vetoed by Presidents Hoover and Franklin D. Roosevelt. In 1933, however, the executive department gained the upper hand and persuaded the Congress to accept the infamous "Economy Act." But that act was short-lived and, for the most part, the Congress restored the veterans and their survivors to their rightful place in our society. Having experienced the ramifications of that act, the Congress will never again impose such undeserved penalties upon our veteran population, regardless of the prestige of a popular President who may himself be a distinguished war veteran.

"Advocates of the Bradley report say that veterans' welfare is in no wise connected with our foreign aid programs. Foreign aid appropriations, we are told, are used to promote human welfare among foreigners in foreign countries. If there is no connection with the welfare of our own veterans, certainly there is a relation. The question, purely and simply, is, "Do we want to provide for the welfare of our own veteran citizens, or do we want to deprive them while helping foreigners, many of whom bore arms against us in several major wars?"

"The antiveteran crowd screams that our present policy toward veterans will eventually break the Treasury, but they will not agree that foreign aid is having any effect on the mounting public debt. Billions for foreigners, but pauperism for American war veterans."

CATCH PHRASES EMPTY

"In justification of the report, we are told that military service is an obligation of citizenship. That applies to every citizen; and until every citizen performs military service that catch phrase is as empty as the Confederate treasury. It just so happens that but a small percent of the total population has seen war service in our wars since the War of the Revolution, and a grateful Union has always provided for those "who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan," a truth which the Republicans might well repeat at each Lincoln Day dinner.

"The Commission subtly recommends that if any reductions or terminations in compensation and pensions are made by the Congress, they be deferred for 1 year. Could there be politics in that recommendation? Could it be that the Administration is seeking to prevent the report from being a political issue in a presidential election year? It is a political trap at which the experienced Member of Congress will take a long look before he nibbles at the trigger."

"Where does the President stand?", the Abernathy statement concludes. "The Bradley report is a report to the President. Has the President approved it? Are we to infer that General Bradley's presentation of the report on behalf of the Commission to a committee of the Congress assures us of Presidential approval? Let the President speak up. Is he for or against us? And, by the way, who pushed the President into this leaky boat?"

Iran Still Bars Baha'i Worship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call attention to the religious ban imposed last May and still in effect against Baha'i worship in Iran, as evidenced by the following article in the New York Times of Sunday, April 29. It is certainly our hope that true freedom of worship, which is a foremost American principle, can soon be brought into being by Iran:

IRAN STILL BARS BAHA'I WORSHIP—MEMBERS ARE NOT ASKING FOR LIFTING OF BAN FOR FEAR OF INCURRING NEW TROUBLE

(By Sam Pope Brewer)

TEHERAN, IRAN, April 21.—Iran's largest religious minority, the Baha'i sect, still is outlawed and cannot hold services.

It was suppressed last May by order of the Minister of the Interior, Assadullah Alam, although the pressure of world opinion has kept Parliament from formally acting against it.

More than 500,000 Iranians thus are barred from publicly practicing their religion. Property worth millions of dollars, principally in temples, is in Government custody on the plea of protecting it against possible damage.

The 165-foot-high dome of the main temple, known as the Haziratulghodes, has been stripped of the glazed tile covering that ornamented it. Now it is covered with sheets of tin, and the building is used as the office of the Military Governor of Teheran.

Members of the sect are wary of discussing the situation. They are afraid they will bring new trouble on themselves. One of them said today: "Things are quiet at present, but we never know when there may be a new explosion."

Asked whether any formal action was being undertaken to get Government consent to resuming services in their temples, he said there was none. He explained that it was better to walk softly and hope for better times.

Baha'i adherents are afraid that any overt move might lead to a new outburst of fanaticism on the part of the Moslem mullahs, or teachers.

Meanwhile, they make no attempt to hold services. It is one of the rules of Bahaism never to resist the will of the government of whatever country one may be in. Members of the sect worship privately in their own homes in Iran at present.

Bahaism has been persecuted periodically in Iran ever since it was founded in the middle of the last century. Three other religious minorities are tolerated—the Christian, the Jewish and the Zoroastrian.

All of them were in existence before Islam was founded. All are regarded as religions "of the book," and they are not molested.

Bahaism, which emphasizes the spiritual unity of mankind and advocates universal peace, started as a heretical offshoot of Islam. It went through a process of evolution into a distinct religion. But the Moslems still look on it as a heretical sect.

About 20,000 members of the sect are reported to have been massacred in various outbreaks of violence during the 19th century.

The latest trouble was started last year by a mullah named Mohammed Taghi Falstafi. During the holy month of Ramadan, he broadcast a series of talks inciting the public to drive out the sect. He charged that they were planning to revolt and set up their own government in Iran in the spring of 1956.

Mullah Falstafi had first appealed to Shah Mohammed Riza Pahlevi to ban the sect and turn its temples into mosques. No action was taken, but the Government did not interfere with the violent hate campaign that the mullah then proceeded to carry out.

Baha'i believes and the Iranian authorities give different versions of what went on. Neutral observers, however, say that first Mullah Falstafi, going on the radio, stirred up the public, then other mullahs and minor Government officials encouraged the mob to violence.

There was rioting in places. It is extremely difficult to get accurate news in Iran of anything that does not happen within one's own sight. Still, there was no doubt of widespread violence.

At the height of the trouble, the military governor of Teheran, Brig. Gen. Timur Bakhtiar, stepped in. He seized the great Baha'i temple and ordered the bright tiles stripped from its dome.

Although the act might seem inconsequential to a Western mind, diplomatic sources in Teheran say that it was apparently the move that brought peace. When the work started, the riots subsided. At about the same time, the end of Ramadan brought an end to the harangues of the Mullah Falsafi.

This year he has not been allowed to deliver his Ramadan series on the radio.

Iranians were dumbfounded at the reaction abroad to persecution of the Baha'i sect.

Struggle for Polish Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, on this May 3 people of Polish ancestry throughout the world join in spirit with the people of Poland in observing the anniversary of the Polish Constitution which was adopted in 1791, just 2 years after the adoption of our Constitution of the United States.

Poland gained freedom only through the valiant efforts of the Polish people who through the ages have struggled against tyranny and oppression. At the end of World War II they had high hopes that freedom would be reestablished, and that Poland might regain her rightful place in the family of free nations.

The infamous Yalta agreement dashed these hopes, and the people of Poland have been forced to remain subject to Russian enslavement.

We in the United States have tremendous admiration for the courage, the patience, and the fortitude the Polish people have displayed in their struggle to regain their independence.

As a nation dedicated to the principles of liberty and individual freedom, the United States maintains the right of the Polish nation to independence and will never be reconciled to Poland's subjugation by Russia.

On this Polish Constitution Day, we Americans join with the people of Poland and those of Polish ancestry in a prayer for Polish independence and the restoration of individual freedom for the citizens of Poland.

May the struggle of the Polish people against oppression triumph, and may their confidence and faith in the might of justice and the destiny of Poland culminate in the reestablishment of Poland as a free nation.

Pennsylvania Hurt Again by Excessive Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the April 28, 1956, issue of the Tyrone (Pa.) Daily Herald and reveals what the intolerable taxation at every level is doing to the efforts of industrial development committees in the Keystone State to attract new industries.

The editorial speaks for itself.

PENNSYLVANIA HURT AGAIN BY EXCESSIVE TAXATION

Once more, the deplorably excessive tax situation in Pennsylvania has cost this State industrial expansion and, necessarily, the employment and general economic gain to be realized from that growth. A spokesman for Westinghouse Electric Corp. Wednesday announced it will erect a multimillion dollar plant near Bloomington, Ind., and said Pennsylvania had been by-passed because of "intolerable taxation" at every level. It's an old story, becoming more monotonously repetitious every day—but that hardly helps take out the sting.

In the case of the new Westinghouse plant, Pennsylvania will be hurt in more than the usual ways. Workers already here, and employed in East Pittsburgh, will be transferred to Bloomington. Fine thing.

A similar situation developed some 2 weeks ago, too, with the announcement that General Motors chose a site near Lordstown, Ohio, rather than in this Commonwealth for its proposed huge Chevrolet assembly plant. The Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, understandably riled, inquired editorially into the matter, and in first place among its three major reasons why Ohio won, the Post-Gazette put taxes.

"The situation in Ohio was far more favorable," it commented. "That State relies upon industry for only about 15 percent of its revenues, while Pennsylvania taxes business more heavily than any other State, getting more than 50 percent of its revenues from that source.

"The administration (of Governor Leader) is, apparently, more interested in courting organized labor than it is in obtaining new plants. And that, in the long run, is the greatest disservice it could do labor.

"For the fact is that labor can thrive only where there are job opportunities. Unhappily, the current climate in Pennsylvania is not conducive to the provision of new jobs."

Certainly, Ohio has served her own best interests by playing fair with industry. And this is continually proven at the polls whenever a real issue has arisen. Ohio voters elected and reelected Robert Taft and other candidates in the face of the stiffest sort of union-leader opposition. Last November, they defeated the CIO proposal to hike unemployment compensation benefits by a tremendous margin. The Cleveland Plain Dealer and other outstanding Buckeye State newspapers editorially fought the proposal because it could have penalized Ohio businesses, particularly small businesses, and that would have reduced Ohio's attraction for new industries and new expansion enterprises.

This line of reasoning apparently made sense to a lot of workers, for the majority of them voted against the compensation increases, although emotionally they might have been expected to endorse those payments at the highest possible level.

Granted, the tax question is not Ohio's only drawing card. The other two top reasons for its attraction given by the Post-Gazette—favorable locations and availability of land—are heaven-sent, of course. But in providing a good climate for business, Ohio has proceeded intelligently, and the workers, skilled or unskilled, union or nonunion, have made a good name for themselves for productivity and quality.

The story might have been different.

Hon. Victor Wickersham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, being a former Oklahoman and member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I would like to praise one of our Oklahoma colleagues and include an address honoring VICTOR WICKERSHAM, Member of Congress from Oklahoma.

At a special ceremony in the Armed Services Committee room of the United States House of Representatives at 9:45 a. m., May 1, 1956, the District of Columbia department, Veterans of Foreign Wars, made its annual Loyalty Day award to Congressman VICTOR WICKERSHAM, of Oklahoma.

A plaque was given to the Congressman for "exhibiting those qualities in private and public life that make for a greater America."

Rutherford Day, chairman of the department Loyalty Day committee, presented the award following an address in which he said that loyalty to one's country is best reflected in "the work we do and the manner in which we do it." He also said the annual award is made to a figure of national prominence who does his work not as a means of personal aggrandizement but in a way that reflects interest in the end to be sought and reached rather than for gain of fame, and that this is the highest test of reputation and meaning of loyalty.

Mr. Day's address follows:

ADDRESS BY RUTHERFORD DAY, LOYALTY DAY CHAIRMAN, DEPARTMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, DELIVERED 9:45 A. M., TUESDAY, MAY 1, 1956, AT THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE ROOM, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Today the Nation and the world is saddened to receive the news that we have lost a friend, Alben W. Barkley, a Senator of this Congress and former Vice President of the United States.

On this few acres of ground we call Capitol Hill are focused the eyes and fond remembranches of our countrymen.

Once more history's page turns and once more those who march across this small stretch of land take that march from reality to the ages. The line of the column often passes into the realm of our national tradition, seeming without pause, and the marching of shadows is joined from time to time to form a great company of those we have loved and watched and those farther shadows who we remember only by their works and for their very shadow-substance itself.

Clay, Webster, Pinckney, Taft, are names to us now, but are, for all that, realities today as they were in a different and current sense in earlier times.

So it is fitting that today we meet to honor one who labors in the busy and fruitful vinyards of our national life—that person is VICTOR WICKERSHAM.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars want to introduce a man, a friend, Congressman VICTOR WICKERSHAM, to some who may not have made his acquaintance—this is the purpose of our award.

Loyalty Day is a day we celebrate a rededication to the principles of America and our loyalty to our country.

Loyalty is shown in many ways and we feel that one of the most, if not the most important means of demonstrating loyalty to our country, is the work we do and the manner in which we do it.

Thus we feel an award should be made to one who does his work, not as a means of personal aggrandizement, but rather in a way that reflects interest and honesty in approach, with thought of the end to be sought and reached rather than for gain of fame.

This is the highest test of reputation and is in the highest sense, the meaning of loyalty.

Mr. Speaker, the ceremonies were recorded for broadcasting overseas by the Voice of America. Robert L. Redeen, special events officer, said the Voice was covering the nationwide celebration sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars as a method of showing the world the work of national patriotic groups.

Omar B. Ketcham, national legislative director of the VFW, broadcast a talk on the meaning of Loyalty Day, pointing out that the VFW sponsored the celebration, which is held in every State in the Nation, as a means of gaining publicity for those who hold their loyalty to this country uppermost and as a means of balancing and counteracting the May Day celebrations of Communist groups which are traditionally held on this date.

Congressman WICKERSHAM, in reply to Mr. Day and Francis Wood, department commander, VFW, stated that he received the award not only for himself but also for the people of the State of Oklahoma in tribute to those from that State who served in the Armed Forces of the United States and are still so serving. He also stated that the VFW was doing a fine job in aiding the side of the United States in the battle for men's minds.

Some Words of Wisdom on United States Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the significant editorial, written by Mr. John S. Knight and carried in the editorial columns of the Chicago Daily News of Saturday, April 21, 1956:

SOME WORDS OF WISDOM ON UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

A recent conference of 19 Scripps-Howard editors in Washington brought forth some impressive words of wisdom from foreign editor Ludwell Denny and his predecessor, William Philip Simms.

Because their thinking is so akin to my own, particularly with reference to the need for reappraising our policies, Mr. Denny's summary is offered for your consideration:

This global crisis cannot be cured by putting patches on the prewar world. New worlds are in the making.

Any speedy cure is quackery. The American idea that we can cure everything with a few billion aid dollars, a few Madison Avenue advertising stunts, a few divisions and bomber bases abroad—all without sacrifice of luxury living at home—is insane.

Our democracy is not exportable. Democracy is indigenous, or it is nothing. We can help others achieve it, but not by trying to make our brand fit divergent heritages and different conditions.

We cannot buy allies. Military aid should be concentrated on genuine allies—those determined to fight for their own freedom. Except for charity and the minor nuisance value of subsidies, economic aid should be limited to point 4 technical assistance and foreign financing should be left to the World Bank and the Export-Import Bank.

The world is not to blame for communism but for chaos. A united Europe and a healthy Middle East could not be endangered by Soviet infiltration, or a strong Asia by Chinese expansion.

Finally, in our long-overdue reappraisal of United States foreign policy, let us remember the simplest fact of all: America is not God. There is a limit to our capacity and our responsibilities. We cannot run the world. We cannot alone set it right.

The best we can do is to preserve our own strength in a weak world, sharing where our kind of help is wanted, preserve our sanity in a mad world which may profit by our successful example, preserve our faith in human decency in a dark world which needs that more than all our money, munitions, and manifestoes.

We can defeat ourselves by our fallacy of easy solutions and quick victory, by the delusion that we have all the answers—or could make others accept them if we had.

The world is in a chaotic transition from an old Western civilization to a new global nuclear age whose nature is unknown. We, in strength and in patience, must keep the faith and make the long, long fight.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Eyes on the Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by David Lawrence, entitled "Eyes on the Dollar," which appeared in the U. S. News & World Report, April 27, 1956:

EYES ON THE DOLLAR

(By David Lawrence)

From time immemorial the key to the economic future of any nation has been the stability of its monetary unit.

Adam Smith, in his famous work, the Wealth of Nations, published in 1776, emphasized the tendency of governments to repudiate their war debts. He said that almost all states, "ancient as well as modern," cheated the people by devaluing the currency.

Two world wars in the last half century have debased the currencies of Europe and Asia. Likewise, in that period the purchasing power of the American dollar has been cut by two-thirds.

We in America are at the crossroads now. We have a choice between further devaluation of the dollar and an upward rise in its purchasing power.

In the one direction lies more inflation—higher and higher prices, strikes for higher wages to meet rising costs of living, and hardship to persons with fixed incomes.

In the other direction lies stability and a greater opportunity for everybody to share in the benefits to be derived from the strong fiscal position of America.

A crucial decision will have to be made in the next few weeks on the course the dollar must take.

For, happily, the United States Treasury by June 30 next will show a budget surplus and a cash surplus—the first time in several years that this will have happened.

If, as now indicated, there's a budget surplus of about $2 billion—which is nearly 10 times as big as was forecast last January in the President's message to Congress—the political clamor for tax reduction will be heard from one end of the country to the other.

Politicians will be seeking to give away that surplus to those in the low-income brackets on the mistaken theory that this will be of real benefit to them. Yet this would be the very group hurt by inflation.

What would be of more benefit to more people would be to reduce the national debt by $2 billion.

As a result largely of World War II, the public debt went from around $40 billion

in 1939 to $276 billion today. Measured against the wealth and income of the country, this is not in itself precarious but it is too big a sum to go untouched year after year. A government that doesn't pay off any of its debt begins to look as untrustworthy as an individual who avoids payment of his current obligations. This would be a serious detriment to the financing of a third war if it should be thrust upon us.

If a people show no desire to reduce their debt, and if they keep on curtailing their own taxes while they let the debt remain high, this must inevitably be interpreted in the monetary markets of the world as a sign of weakness—as a symbol of repudiation.

Economic advisers to both the Democratic and Republican administrations in the past have argued that taxes should never be reduced when the Nation is prosperous and that tax relief should be reserved for those occasions when it is necessary to give a stimulus to the economy, as in time of depression.

Certainly in the present boom period there is no need for further incentives to spend or borrow. The Federal Reserve Board in the last few weeks has been taking steps to restrict borrowing by business. It has done this in order to keep the boom from becoming a runaway affair and to reverse the trend toward price inflation which has been under way since last June. A tax cut would be the last straw. It could point the way to a speculative era such as that which preceded the 1929 crash.

So the best thing to do with the $2 billion surplus is to cut that amount off the public debt. This isn't much of a reduction, but it will be regarded everywhere as of transcendent importance. For it will mean that America at last has made a start toward debt reduction. The principle is worth far more than the sum involved in any tax-reduction plan.

If the dollar—which now is at about 52 cents in purchasing power compared to 1939—is to rise gradually, it will be because of the sound monetary policies pursued by the Treasury.

A tax-reduction move would be inflationary. It could send prices up so high as to cause a buyer's strike. It could devalue the dollar. Certainly it could break down the best-laid plans of industry to spend money on plant expansion. If the prices that have been figured, for instance, on construction were swept away in another upward spiral, many such comments for spending in private enterprises would have to be revised, if not canceled.

It is dangerous to tinker with the dollar. The whole world would be benefited if the dollar were strengthened instead of weakened. Other nations can buy more and more goods and crops from us if our price level is stable.

Throughout the world all eyes will soon be turned on the American dollar. It must remain strong. This can be assured only by a policy of sound money.

Problems Encountered in the College Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in San Francisco, Mr. John C. Hazeltine, Commissioner, Community Facilities Administration, of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, addressed the 18th annual meeting of the Western Association of College & University Business Officers. He discussed some of the problems his agency meets in the administration of the college housing program. Because the talk is interesting and enlightening. I have asked unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include it in full. The address follows:

Friends of WACUBO, it is a great pleasure to be able to join your meeting today, especially here in beautiful San Francisco. I am particularly happy to see our chairman, Mr. Wahlstrom, in a more secure seat than the one he occupied only a few weeks ago. At that time I was startled to see his picture in one of our Washington newspapers after the plane in which he was riding had ditched in Puget Sound. Amazing, isn't it, what some people will do to get their picture in the paper. But seriously, we are indeed fortunate that Mr. Wahlstrom is with us today after surviving this tragic accident. The fact that he boarded the next available plane to continue his ill-fated trip East is sure proof of his courage and tenacity of purpose.

My subject today is the problems which we have encountered in the college housing program. I would like to think that we have faced them and will continue to face them with the same courage and tenacity which has been displayed by Mr. Wahlstrom and that no temporary setbacks will deter us from pursuing our long-range objectives.

The first problem encountered in any loan program is money. How much money? When will it be available? The deluge of applications for college housing which has poured in upon us starting last fall has required that we of the administration face up realistically to the demands upon us. I found my self attending conference after conference at the Bureau of the Budget and even at the White House attempting to explain your needs and to tell the story of the housing conditions at campus after campus where I have visited. As you are aware, it was finally decided that the entire balance of the $500 million authorization should be released. I wonder if you realize what a generous endorsement this was by any standard of measurement. In effect it released more funds to be available for this current year than had been released during the entire life of the program. This endorsement was further emphasized by President Eisenhower's budget message in January when he called for an additional $100 million for the program. So much for our first problem. The necessary funds have been made available.

The second problem concerns the fundamental nature of the program. Is it to be merely a program of continuing direct responsibility of the Federal Government alone with added annual increments to increase its borrowing authorities from United States Treasury? Or can this program be so conceived and administered that it can trigger a much larger program which will encourage private investment participation in college housing? The first concept strikes me as being very unimaginative, simply a check-writing operation against the beleaguered Federal Treasury; a concept that places quick immediate benefits above the long-range gains possible for higher education as a whole. The second concept envisages the Federal college housing program as a sort of catalyzing agent which can act to release many times the amount of the Federal authorization from the private investment resources of the Nation. This latter concept appears to me as a challenge to our initiative and resourcefulness and the kind of an enlightened self-interest with which we must approach our long-range problems.

Nearly all of you know my thinking on this subject. Last month I testified before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee concerning the administration's proposal to increase the authorization for the program and at the same time establish an interest rate formula which would be connected with the true financial values involved. This formula would produce a slightly higher interest rate, actually 3⅛ percent based on the average Treasury yield during February and March.

I can assure you that this suggested increase in inteerst rate was not dictated by any desire on the part of any of us to increase the income to the Federal Government at the expense of the educational institutions. Rather it was chosen as the lowest possible interest rate which would permit competitive bidding by any private investors. It is not nearly as high as the current market would seem to demand. Recent issues of tax-exempt revenue bonds for college housing have sold privately at about 3.4 percent but it is a rate that might make many of the bonds of our tax-supported institutions interesting either in part or in whole. Perhaps private investors would be itnerested in the first 15 to 25 years of the issue in which case the Government would take the longer maturities. By this kind of participation by this type of diversion, of some of the burden of the great college housing need, the staggering requirements over the next 10 years, may be met.

Previously our program for developing this necessary private participation had been making great strides. Four issues with maturity up to 40 years had been sold in their entirety to private investment houses after these issues were developed through original applications to the Agency. Other issues were split with the Government taking the longer maturities. This type of development most certainly has a great bearing on the long-range needs of the program but it was given a temporary setback by reason of the unnatural low interest rate which now prevails. I am confident that as the shape and form of the program becomes clear to all of you and to the Congress, we can again proceed toward our goal.

At this point I would like to square off and refute a rather insidious canard which has been given considerable circulation by one of the house organs which most of you receive. It is to the effect that we of the Community Facilities Administration are deliberately retarding the processing of applications pending the possible increase of the interest rate. To me this is hitting a little below the belt and I will tell you why I feel this way.

Many of you are aware that while the Housing amendments of 1955 increased the authorization for this program to $500 million and made retroactive to all uncompleted loans the lower interest rate, there was no increase in funds available for administering the program. We have been in the position of processing and reprocessing more applications and loans during this year than during the previous 5 years in the program and have been able only slightly to increase our staff. Although our processing rate is well above the previous years it is only natural that backlogs have developed. To couple these inevitable delays with an ulterior motive, even by inference, is unfair to the loyal and overburdened staffs, both in our regions and in Washington, who are sincerely endeavoring to carry the expanded load. In any event this criticism should now be completely dispelled in view of an amendment which I proposed to the Senate Banking and Currency Subcommittee at the hearings on March 20. The gist of that amendment was that the interest rate under

the proposed new formula would apply only to applications filed after that date. It semed only fair to me, and to all of us, that no application made in good faith before that time should be adversely affected by any natural and inevitable delays which might have occurred.

Incidentally, our rate of processing is moving up month by month; supplemental administrative funds have been made available by the Congress for the balance of this year, and the prospects are excellent that sufficient administrative funds will be available for next year. The overall picture is encouraging although we are faced with some serious problems in the immediate future.

There is another aspect of the administration of the college housing program which I wish to call to your attention. I hope that this aspect has never occurred to you for if it has not we have been successful thus far in coping with the various influences involved.

I refer to the inevitable tendency toward dictation of principles and policies, of Federal interference with the freedom of the applicant institutions.

We, all of us, who are entrusted with this great college housing problem stand solidly opposed to any thought of regimentation in the use of the available funds. I am sure all of you realize that such a policy is not an easy one to maintain. There are forces which inevitably tend, both in Government operations and in all other operations, toward establishment of mandatory standards both in objectives and in actual construction requirements. There is the tendency to establish codes and restrictions which might stamp all residence halls from the same mold. These forces would dictate that the supposedly superior wisdom and experience of a Federal office should establish the pattern which you are to use. Even should such dictation be disguised by the term "advice" you might feel obligated to conform if it came from the holder of the purse strings. I do not intend to infer that we will shirk our responsibilities in any way, always available to you will be our experience and assistance in your legal, financial, and engineering problems. As the boys from the country are so adept in doing, to sum it all up "we are here to hep but she's yore baby." In the college housing program we have tried at all times to keep squarely before us the principle that these buildings for which you are requesting loans are your buildings; that they are designed to serve your purposes; that the great strength of the American way of higher education is its individuality and its diversity. I am proud that Housing Administrator Albert Cole was able so sincerely to emphasize in an article in the Architectural Forum:

"The provision of housing for students and faculty on the campus of a university presents unique and challenging problems to the university officials and their architects. Here as in many other areas of American life, where its diversity is part of its brightest promise, it is difficult to generalize or to attempt to impose rigid, pre-conceived designs. • • • There appears to be no single or simple answer; on the contrary, the approaches which the colleges and universities have taken under the college housing program have all the variety which has characterized American higher education from its inception."

The point was further stressed in the same issue of the Architectural Forum by architects who had participated in the program. Their letters were unanimous in confirming the freedom which they had enjoyed in working with our people. I assure you that the respect for this individuality will continue to be a major policy of this agency.

We are using the same approach with regard to the new types of facilities which have become eligible as the result of the 1955 amendments. I have heard charges that the Agency was refusing, or in large measure discouraging, applications for student unions or that it was imposing impossible conditions in an effort to avoid the clear intent of the Congress. I believe that these charges arise from a misunderstanding regarding our objectives and I am glad to have an opportunity here to talk frankly to you about it.

When the amendments of 1955 broadened the program to permit inclusion of dining halls and cafeterias separate and independent from the dormitories, student unions and student centers, health facilities and other essential service facilities, we were confronted with yet another problem. With the very apparent insufficiency in total funds to satisfy the demands both for housing and other facilities we were forced to attempt some yardstick by which the relative needs could be measured. Both in their testimony before the committees and in conference with us the educational associations were unanimous that housing and dining facilities should take priority over any other type of construction. Recently, nearly a year later, Dr. Meck, of Dartmouth, repeated this point of view in his testimony before the Senate subcommittee that "the real problem is to feed and house the students. That is the first priority."

The legislation, as passed, placed a maximum limitation of $100 million on the amount of funds which could be used for facilities other than housing and feeding. These statements by the educators, and the limitation by the Congress, have thus become our guideposts in the administration of the program.

While giving full weight to the priority for the warm bed and the good meal we cannot but realize that there are many individual situations which would include social and recreational facilities as an essential part of the well rounded campus life. Applying our policy of attempting to provide in each individual case those requirements which the applicant feels most essential, and at the same time attempting to husband the funds at our disposal, we have come up with a procedure which we hope is best patterned to the problem. We are asking the cooperation of all institutions who desire student unions in lieu of, or in addition to, dormitory facilities in helping us work out reasonable projects. We feel that funds which are available to the institution from other sources should be applied where possible to those projects described as "other essential service facilities." We also feel that the other essential service facilities projects should be planned at the minimum; and we further feel that if a project such as a student union can be so operated as to be considerably more than self-liquidating the term of the Federal loan should be reduced accordingly. This, I believe, is only sound business practice. On a bank loan for a new plant I am sure that any good banker would apply the same policy. If the plan is unusually profitable then the indebtedness should be more quickly retired. We are careful, however, to take into consideration that the institutions will not be deprived of additional revenues which they were already enjoying from an operation which is later to be incorporated into the overall union project. I am sure that you cannot but agree with me on the soundness of our approach to the difficult and varying situations encountered and I can assure you that we will do our best to assist.

We have instructed our regional offices that each application be considered on its merits and forwarded to Washington after free and full discussion with the institution involved. Several applications for student unions have been approved and others are in process.

As concerns the 90-day limitation on the filing of the full application, after the preliminary approval and reservation of funds, I should like to enlarge on our policy in this respect. The original limitation was made for the purpose of attempting to assure orderly administrative procedure. We must be certain that the applicant who has obtained a reservation will, with due diligence, proceed toward the closing of a loan agreement. However, in this as in all other phases of the program we are not arbitrary. If circumstances beyond the reasonable control of the applicant require that further time be permitted and we are provided with a reasonable substantiation we will be pleased to grant additional time. You on your part should assist us by keeping the regional offices advised of your progress.

In closing I would like to repeat that we consider each loan under the college-housing program an individual financing and engineering project. We are attempting to apply the same good principles and practices that would be applied in any other legitimate business deal. If you as college and university business officers consider the proposition which you are putting to us to be fair, reasonable, and workable, and that you, were you in our position, would so consider it, I am sure that we both can always arrive at a mutually satisfactory agreement. We both must remain objective in our approaches, giving consideration not only to our own problems but to those of all the other educational institutions of the Nation who are involved in this great enterprise of enlightenment, and so conduct ourselves that the best good will inure to the greatest number. I would like to feel that a great area of mutual trust and understanding has been established between us, and that you think of us as backing you to the hilt not only by providing direct loans from Federal funds but by attempting to develop further for you the outside channels and support which you need to meet the vast housing problems which are facing your institutions now and in the future.

Thank you.

"One-Party Press" a Fallacious Theory, Fleming Explains—Sees Charge as Factor in 1956 Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, the American Press in its April 1956 issue carried an editorial by a Hoosier that is worthy of being brought to the attention of the Members of Congress.

Under unanimous consent, I include this article in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

"ONE-PARTY PRESS" A FALLACIOUS THEORY, FLEMING EXPLAINS—SEES CHARGE AS FACTOR IN 1956 ELECTION

Fed up with the charge that there is a one-party press in this country, Wray Fleming, attorney, and manager of the Hoosier State Press Association, recently wrote an interesting analysis of the situation headed, "One-Party Press Fallacy." His editorial on the subject follows:

In every national election since 1936, newspapers have been figuratively kicked around because the editorial policies and opinions of a majority of them did not coincide with the results registered by voters at the polls. The climax came in 1952 when it was charged that there is a one-party press in the United States. It appears now that

this will be a factor in the 1956 election campaign.

Whether newspapers should defend the charge or trust to luck that it will make no impression on the people is a question that ultimately must be settled. If they put up a defense it cannot be of the wishy-washy variety. If they lay off there is a grave possibility that the people will have again lost in the battle for a free press which newspapers have the obligation to preserve.

Assuming that conscientious newspaper leadership will choose to defend, it seems logical that the opening shot should be a repetitious campaign of educating the readers of newspapers on the meaning of freedom of the press. It should not be difficult to prove that no political party does control or ever has controlled the policies of a newspaper. That holds even for those newspapers which profess allegiance to a political party. The editor of a newspaper, like the voters at the polls, may subscribe to the fundamental principles of a political party and at the same time not agree with the diversions from those principles. This does not warrant the charge that those who fail to go along with the diversions are guilty of instituting a one-party press. That is as fallacious as to claim that because the top candidates of 1 political party carried all but 2 States in the 1936 election, the United States had become a 1-party nation.

RUGGED INDIVIDUALISTS

There is probably not a profession, industry, or business in which the leaders are more rugged individualists than can be found in the editors and publishers of newspapers. Each is a power unto himself in his thinking. It is therefore absurd to even assume there has been a concert of thinking or some sort of conspiracy that has caused a majority of editors to hold back from supporting what they do not believe is for the best interests of the American form of government. The one-party press critics would prefer that the people believe that. In its defense, the press might well point out that before there is a 1-party press there must be a 1-party system. It is not the fault of partisan political editors that principles of the two major political parties have changed to the extent that it is difficult to distinguish the difference between them. It is not the fault of the press that there has not been a well-defined difference between the platforms of the two parties at the national level in any election over a period of 20 years. That fault lies with the critics who now charge there is a one-party press.

Granted that many of our newspapers do not publish strongly worded editorials that once featured the political scene, there may be a reason. It is possible the editors are confused over supporting a party principle today that may become a dead duck tomorrow in this era of expediency in political maneuverings. There is still a 2-party press in the United States and will be if leadership of the 2 parties hold still long enough on vital principles that newspapers can square off and interpret the differences between the 2 parties.

Television for Isolated Communities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill, H. R. 10944, which would direct the Federal Communications Commission to provide for the licensing of low-power television reflector facilities and VHF translator facilities to provide television reception to geographically isolated communities and individuals.

These automatic facilities are the cheapest and most satisfactory method yet devised to bring television programs into the homes of the people living in "shadow" areas behind hills and mountains where the rigid television signals do not reach. At least 70 reflector facilities or VHF translator facilities are known to be in operation throughout the country, and the number may be as high as 200. I have received reports of their use in the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, New York, Oregon, South Dakota, Washington, and Wyoming. There undoubtedly are other States where reflectors have been used or contemplated.

Most of these facilities are constructed and maintained through spontaneous community action in the finest American tradition. They provide very satisfactory television reception at a very moderate cost. In no case that I know of does one of these facilities cause objectionable interference with anyone's reception of television or with any other use of radio-energy transmissions.

In spite of the obvious advantages of these facilities, the Federal Communications Commission consistently and obstinately has sought to shut them down. Within the past month at least one reflector facility in the State of Washington has stopped transmitting because of the issuance of a Commission cease-and-desist order. Another community, Bridgeport, Wash., has appealed from a Commission cease-and-desist order to the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and that case is pending before the court. Cease-and-desist proceedings have been instituted against additional reflector facilities in the State of Washington. Reports I have received indicate that Commission representatives actively are engaged in starting cease-and-desist proceedings in other sections of the country.

The Commission's unwillingness to license or otherwise permit the operation of reflectors and VHF translators stems from its unwillingness to adopt flexible administrative procedures under which applications for the facilities can be considered on a case-by-case basis. The Commission prefers simply to deny hundreds of small communities throughout the country the benefits of television reception rather than face up to the task of finding a practicable method for fitting them into the national television system.

I am convinced that the Commission never will get around to licensing reflectors and VHF translators on its own initiative. I also believe that a favorable court decision in the pending case will not bring about a change of heart by the Commission, and that it still will attempt to proscribe these facilities, by one means or another. Consequently, I have been forced to the conclusion that only by the enactment of legislation such as that which I have introduced will the smaller isolated communities of this country be able to provide themselves with satisfactory television reception through the most practicable and inexpensive method yet developed.

Briefly, these facilities consist of a simple receiving antenna constructed on a hillside near the town where the signals of the originating station can be received, a small amplifier, and a simple transmitting antenna which retransmits the programs down into the valley. The residents of the community can receive the programs on ordinary television sets with the use of standard antennas. A reflector facility retransmits on the same channel as the originating station; a VHF translator retransmits a VHF signal on another VHF channel.

The facilities operate on a very low power. The one at Bridgeport, Wash., for example, has a power output of less than 1 watt. The usable signal from the facility extends over a cone-shaped area which in one case is as small as 2 miles long and 2 miles at its widest point. The facilities work automatically and require only occasional maintenance. Power can be supplied by an ordinary 110-volt line, by battery or by a gasoline-motor-driven generator. I have been told that for the facility in a small town in the Black Hills of South Dakota one of the townspeople goes up every afternoon and puts enough gasoline in the motor to keep the transmitter on the air until around midnight.

The cost of the facilities is very low. A typical installation in the State of Washington provides reception on two channels at a cost of $1,500. One battery-powered reflector was constructed for $500. I believe the costs vary up and down from these figures depending on the nature of the equipment, the strength of the original signal and the area sought to be covered.

In every instance that I know of, the facility has been constructed by a group of interested individuals in the community sought to be served. The money is raised by public subscription. In some instances the association has been very informal; in others, a nonprofit community corporation has been organized. Several owners of licensed television broadcast stations have indicated a willingness to construct reflector facilities in order to extend the service of the station to small valley communities.

To date, the Commission has come up with no practicable solution to the problem of providing the geographically isolated communities with satisfactory television service. Recently the Commission proposed rules and regulations under which certain UHF translators would be licensed. These UHF translators would retransmit the original signal over 1 of the UHF channels from channel 70 through channel 83.

I do not feel that these proposed UHF—ultra high frequency—translators are a practicable solution to the problem, and I feel they should be required only when the considerably less expensive and more satisfactory reflector facilities and VHF—very high frequency—translators cannot be employed.

There are a number of very serious objections to the UHF translators. First,

where a reflector can be built for $500 to $750, the UHF translator unit alone will cost $2,750, to which must be added the costs of the receiving and transmitting antennas and the power system. This cost is out of the question for many small communities. Moreover, each set owner in the community will have to spend $20 to $50 for a converter to enable his set to receive the UHF signals or buy a more expensive set, and also will have to install a more expensive rooftop antenna.

Second, the UHF picture is less clear and more subject to distortion than a VHF picture. The difficulties increase with the increase in the frequency of transmission. There are 13 of the lower VHF channels; there are 70 of the higher UHF channels. The Commission proposal is to compel the UHF translators, serving the small communities, to transmit on the top 14 channels. These are the least desirable channels.

Third, the UHF translator will not cover the same surface area which would be covered by a reflector or VHF translator. The higher the frequency, the more rigid the signal and the more unaccountable its behavior. It has been estimated, for example, that if one community in the State of Washington were to substitute a UHF translator for the reflector now in use, half the people of the community who now receive television from the reflector would be unable to pick up the translator programs. In such a case, the community would have to build one or more subsidiary UHF translators to retransmit the main translator signals.

Undoubtedly, television from a UHF translator is better than no television at all—where the community can afford the cost. However, I think it is obvious that the cheaper and eminently more satisfactory on-channel reflectors and VHF translators should be permitted where they can operate without interfering with any other use of the radio-energy spectrum. Since the Commission has demonstrated its determined refusal to allow reflectors and VHF translators to operate, the only remedy is enactment of a bill such as that which I have introduced.

There follows a section-by-section analysis of the bill:

Section 1 redefines the term "broadcasting" in the Communications Act to exclude transmissions by television reflector and VHF translator facilities. This will eliminate certain statutory requirements applicable to ordinary broadcasting stations and permit simplified procedures in granting licenses.

Section 2 defines "television reflector facilities" and "VHF translator facilities." The definition specifically limits the use of these facilities to those communities prevented by geographical barriers from receiving television reception, and provides they shall retransmit the original programs without significant alteration.

Section 3 directs the Federal Communications Commission to prescribe rules and regulations for the granting of licenses to reflector and VHF translator facilities where their use does not cause harmful interference with any form of licensed television or radio reception. It provides that such "rules and regulations shall be devised, and licenses shall be granted thereunder, so as to promote the extension of satisfactory television reception to the smaller communities and isolated individuals at a reasonable cost."

Section 4 eliminates the requirement of a prior construction permit for reflectors and VHF translators.

Section 5 provides that any reflector or VHF translator in operation on or before May 1, 1956, may continue in operation until the operator has had a reasonable time to comply with the licensing regulations. It directs the Commission to draft and publish the first set of proposed rules and regulations within 6 months of the effective date of the act.

Absent Presidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I would like to call attention of the Congress to an editorial which was published in the Clay Center (Kans.) Dispatch under the date of April 27, 1956.

Recent comments in the press regarding the performance of Presidential duties led me to look back through the records to determine what pattern, if any, had been established by previous Presidents. While so engaged, my attention was directed to an editorial written by Mr. L. F. Valentine, veteran Kansas journalist and father of Mr. Harry Valentine, publisher of the newspaper in which the editorial appeared. Since his comment on the subject is derived from a full lifetime of active observation, I herewith submit it for consideration by all Members of Congress:

ABSENT PRESIDENTS

This writer's memory goes back to the time when Cleveland was President, recalling quite vividly the many, many newspaper articles read and the derogatory talk which went around, finding fault with Cleveland because, as the articles complained, he was always going on fishing trips, neglecting duties in Washington. He also recalls the many criticisms about Woodrow Wilson for the time he put in playing golf and the days he was away from his office. We can recall the first time a President made a trip outside continental United States. He can recall much criticism of different Presidents who were away from Washington for, as it was said, too much of the time. Most of such criticism seems to have been directed at Democratic Party Presidents. Now Democrats are directing such attacks at President Eisenhower.

The criticism is not well taken.

For two reasons. One is that it is old stuff, directed at many a President. The other is that the days spent away from Washington never did seem to do any damage to the Nation and is not doing any damage now.

The fact of the matter is that a man who can get away from close attention to his problems—fishing, playing golf, hunting, or what have you—is more apt to think things through clearly and arrive at a correct solution, than one who stays too closely to his desk or advisers.

"You can't see the woods for the trees." Neither can you get a good mental perspective without viewing problems from a distance and through quiet mediation.

Good for those Presidents who solved matters in the quiet of their own communion. Good for Ike, that he can get away once in a while and think things out for himself. Hurrah for the Nation that we have had and have such Presidents.

And fie on those politicians who try to make political hay out of the fact that a man, weighted with heavy questions needing correct solution, gets away from politics occasionally and communes with his innermost thoughts.

As Usual, the Administration Tries To Blame Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this morning the New York Herald Tribune carries a very important article by Marguerite Higgins, certainly one of the country's outstanding correspondents, saying that President Eisenhower is seriously thinking of asking Congress to approve a new plan for making available $80 million in foreign aid for distribution by the United Nations and challenging the Soviet Union to do the same.

The article makes the point that Burma recently turned down $30 million in American aid, because it did not want to be tied to any bloc. If aid were channeled through the U. N., it would be far more acceptable, it is felt.

The Congress of Industrial Organizations has been making the point for years that economic development must be accompanied by courageous and intelligent policies that will bring about abandonment of prejudices and archaic customs, adaptations of social and legal institutions, elimination of social and economic discriminations, and support for fair and adequate tax systems.

These complex and delicate matters require the introduction of reforms while maintaining full respect for the sovereignty of the underdeveloped countries. It is much easier to carry out such reforms through the U. N., which is in a good position to spare national susceptibilities, the CIO maintains.

Miss Higgins' article contains such phrases as "the sum of $80 million was tentatively arrived at in the draft plan given to the President, because it was believed such a sum would not upset Congress."

Also, "the plan is an important departure in recent foreign-aid thinking, and administration sources conceded that there may be considerable congressional resistance to voting money to be spent by an international agency."

That the major opposition to the development of this important program has come from the administration rather than the Congress is shown by a reply I received from the Department of State to a letter I sent the President on December 14, 1956.

This letter and the article by the brilliant reporter Marguerite Higgins are included here for the information of my colleagues:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 23, 1955.

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: The Office of the President has called the Department's attention to your letter of December 14, 1955, expressing your support for the proposed Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development (SUNFED).

The Department of State shares your interest in assisting the less-developed countries of the world to better their economic lot. Even if the cold war did not exist, we in the United States could not view with unconcern the conditions of poverty and stagnation which serve as a breeding ground for political and social unrest in many parts of the world. The efforts now being made by the Soviet Union to exploit these conditions in order to attract the countries concerned into the Soviet orbit only serve to add another element of urgency.

The evidence of the United States interest in the progress of the less-developed countries is to be found in our contributions to the United Nations technical-assistance program, the loans being made by the Export-Import Bank to finance development projects abroad, the extensive grants and long-term loans repayable in local currency under the mutual security program to finance development projects not suitable for bank or private financing, and a variety of measures to promote the flow of private capital into productive investment overseas. This Government has given full support to the lending activities of the International Bank, to the constructive work of the Colombo Plan Organization, and we are seeking means of giving effect to the economic cooperation clauses of the Southeast Asian Defense Treaty. The President has proposed and Congress has enacted measures authorizing United States participation in the proposed new International Finance Corporation, which is designed to increase private investment in less developed countries by making capital available without Government guaranty. We are supporting the establishment of an International Atomic Energy Agency to make nuclear technology available in all its aspects and to allocate fissionable materials for peaceful uses. Our surplus agricultural commodities are being used abroad, not only to relieve suffering, but also to help finance economic development.

It is the firm resolve of this Government to continue to seek the most effective means of promoting the economic growth and vitality of the countries of the free world. In this connection we have given the most serious consideration to the proposal to establish a Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development (SUNFED). But our careful study of the proposals thus far advanced convinces us that SUNFED could not be an effective organization at this time. Until international disarmament frees resources for constructive use, SUNFED would have difficulty in attracting substantial contributions from the developed countries. On the other hand, even if we were prepared to ask our people to bear a hugely disproportionate share of the cost of SUNFED, this would in itself distort the very nature of the proposal. The size of the United States contribution to this, as to any other international organization, must bear some reasonable relation to the contributions of others, else the organization would be international in name only.

At the present time SUNFED could at best be only a token organization. A significant part of its resources would have to go into overhead and a major portion of its energies would be absorbed by efforts at coordination. The resources which SUNFED might now expect to command would not justify establishing a complex international apparatus which, because of its global responsibility, would be unable to concentrate on the most urgent and pressing problems but would have to spread itself thinly over many continents.

For the reasons cited above we have been unable to support the proposed creation of SUNFED at this time. We have, however, made clear our intent to join with others when sufficient progress has been made in internationally supervised worldwide disarmament, in devoting a portion of the savings thus derived to an international fund, within the framework of the United Nations, for development and reconstruction. We are now engaged in most earnest negotiations to prepare the way for effective international disarmament. If these efforts succeed, there will be good hope that a sound and effective organization can be set up to devote a portion of the savings to the promotion of the economic and social well-being in the countries of the free world.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

[From the New York Herald Tribune of Tuesday, May 1, 1956]

EISENHOWER WEIGHING FOREIGN AID VIA U. N.—UNITED STATES WOULD PUT EIGHTY MILLION IN FUND AND CHALLENGE RUSSIA TO DO SAME

(By Marguerite Higgins)

WASHINGTON, April 30.—President Eisenhower is seriously thinking of asking Congress to approve a new plan for making available $80 million in foreign aid for distribution by the United Nations and challenging the Soviet Union to do the same, administration sources said today.

According to present administration views, a Russian contribution would not be a prior condition to the creation of a new United Nations fund for foreign aid in which all nations with sufficient economic strength would be invited to join.

GOOD BEGINNING

The sum of $80 million was tentatively arrived at in the draft plan given to the President because it was believed such a sum would not upset Congress, being small as compared with the overall foreign-aid budget of $4,900,000,000, yet substantial enough to have real meaning in the establishment of a new U. N. fund for foreign aid. As one official said, "it is enough to make a good beginning. If the experiment is valuable we can do more."

Although there are technical-assistance groups in the U. N. there is no foreign-aid fund as such.

Meantime, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee today that it was President Eisenhower's considered judgment that any appreciable reduction in the foreign-aid program would gravely endanger the security of the United States. Mr. Dulles talked with Mr. Eisenhower by telephone before going before the committee, where he appealed in his own right for the $4,900,000,000 program asked for the year starting July 1.

In talking over the U. N. plan with congressional leaders, the administration is expected to make these points in favor of putting more foreign aid, most of which is now bilateral, onto a multilateral basis:

The new world situation created by Soviet entry into the foreign-aid field makes it imperative for the United States to gain the maximum effectiveness for what it does. One of the biggest hindrances is suspicion in some parts of the world of United States motives.

Burma, for instance, recently turned down $30 million in American aid because it did not want to be "tied to any bloc." But if the aid were channeled through the U. N. it would be far more acceptable, administration sources argue.

Also, the establishment of a world fund would diminish at least some of the confusion caused by competition between the United States and Russia through foreign aid offers for the favor of underdeveloped countries.

Within the administration a strong proponent of the plan is Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., Chief American Delegate to the U. N., who believes that "multilateral aid offers a way to prevent the so-called auction which some are trying to promote between the United States and the USSR as to which will spend most in underdeveloped countries."

Although the point is not settled, the $80 million United States contribution toward setting up a U. N. fund would probably be a diversion of funds already requested for bilateral foreign aid.

SEE CONGRESS FIGHT

The plan is an important departure in recent foreign aid thinking, and administration sources conceded that there may be considerable congressional resistance to voting money to be spent by an international agency.

But they feel a case can be made that multilateral aid is the only answer in countries where pride or suspicion cause rejection of United States aid since these nations might otherwise rely increasingly on the Soviet bloc.

Important evidence of Asian thinking on this point was recently given by David Owen, head of the U. N. technical assistance board who after a tour of the world reported that "Asian leaders underlined over and over the importance of an international multilateral approach to the provision of technical aid."

MUST TAKE INITIATIVE

It is also the conviction of United States officials such as Ambassador Lodge that if America does not take the initiative in this matter it will certainly be taken by the Communist bloc.

From a psychological point of view, if the Russians accept the President's challenge it will lead to more orderly and responsible big-power action in the foreign field. If the Russians refuse, they will be shown up before the world to be insincere in expressing a desire to help underdeveloped countries, it is felt in Washington.

If a new "world fund for aid" is developed, the United States would also consider making available for distribution certain stores of food and other surpluses but only on the understanding that they would be distributed so as not to interfere with other nations' regular markets. It would be up to the U. N. fund to make this decision and thus the United States could not be accused of putting forward the proposal so as to dump surpluses abroad.

What Constitutes Effective Political Advertising?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from an address given by former United States Senator William Benton before the Advertising and Sales Executive Club, of Kansas City, Mo. Mr. Benton spoke on effective political advertising. His remarks follow:

KANSAS CITY, Mo., April 9.—Republicans are relying too heavily on Madison Avenue, the Advertising and Sales Executive Club was told here today (Monday) by a 1936 graduate of that legendary New York advertising thoroughfare.

William Benton, Connecticut Democrat, who retired from his own Madison Avenue agency 20 years ago, then won one campaign for the United States Senate and lost another, hailed President Harry Truman as "worth more in politics than all Madison Avenue rolled together." Benton had been invited to speak by Mr. Truman and was introduced at the club luncheon by the former President.

"If I were a candidate today, I would far rather have Harry Truman as an adviser than Batten, Barton, Durstine, and Osborne—plus, for that matter—my old firm of Benton and Bowles and the rest of the big six," the Connecticut publisher said.

Benton praised the contribution advertising has made to the United States standard of living and urged sales and ad executives to get into politics. Then he added:

"Because advertising sells goods and services so successfully many without long political experience overestimate its ability to sell political ideas and personalities. Voters don't want their political ideas in packages, like breakfast food. They will think far longer and harder about who should be President than about their choice of a toothpaste or cigarettes, and they will think for themselves. In politics they suspect the slick slogan, the oversimplified solution, and the overstated promise.

"Similarly, they suspect the smooth and glossy personality. They look for sincerity and integrity; when they recognize them in a Harry Truman they cast their votes for these qualities, despite what they read in their newspapers. They expect some human frailties; NIXON'S success with his little-dog TV show seems to illustrate this latter point.

"With Lux and Post Toasties the claims, the gimmicks, and the cutouts on the boxes, are expected and accepted. But the public neither expects nor accepts gadgets, with a President or a presidential candidate." (Mr. Benton invented the "cutouts" on cereal boxes while in the agency business.)

"Repetition and perpetual reiteration don't have the same impact in politics. Nor will the most skilfully televised TV show, complete with teleprompter, take the place of issues in campaigns. Franklin Roosevelt was said by his Republican opponents to be successful because of his golden voice. That's a fallacy, in my opinion. He had the good issues—he was on the right side, with the right issues at the right time."

Television will be increasingly important in politics, Benton said, but not by following the advertising pattern. "Indeed, it will become so important and so costly that equal time should be furnished free, and financed by the Federal Government, to major candidates of political parties. But the candidates will make a mistake if they fail to develop techniques to match their own personalities, and techniques which are appropriate to the issues under debate. In selling cigarettes, roughly the same TV techniques can be used effectively for any brand. That is not true in politics."

Reporting, at the request of the club, on his recent visit to the Soviet Union on behalf of Encyclopaedia Britannica, of which he is publisher, Senator Benton disclosed that the Russians are beginning to go in for advertising. They use it in four ways to promote state purposes: first, to encourage consumption of crops such as soy beans, which are easy to grow; second, to encourage savings in state banks, in order to divert money out of consumption and into heavy industry; third, to promote the sale of nonessentials, such as inexpensive beverages, which are easy to make and have a wide profit-margin and which take money that might create demand for boots or vacuum cleaners or any scarce commodity; and fourth, for the social and political aims of the state.

"The Russians use pictures of men rather than girls in their advertisements," Benton said. "For instance, one bank avertisement showed a young man leaning against an automobile, with the legend, 'Save your money to buy a car.' (This would require a lifetime's savings for most Russians.) One display I saw featuring a girl was for Russian champagne; and she was holding not a dainty wine goblet but a brimming tumblerful. That seemed enticing to me.

"Perhaps half of all Russian poster advertising can be called political—for example, posters welcoming the 20th Party Congress, or glorifying manual labor, or extolling peace. I am excluding the millions of statues and pictures of Lenin and Stalin; these classify as political propaganda rather than advertising as we would identify it. In a sense, all communication in the U. S. S. R. from Pravda to the circus, is political propaganda. There has been no such thing as straight news or pure entertainment in the Soviet state. Thus the 'commercials' on Russian TV are political plugs, and the entertainment is designed to build the audience for the propaganda.

"What is now emerging which is new is commercial advertising for economic purposes. I had many reports that Anastas Mikoyan, minister of commerce and a member of the party Presidium, and other leaders are increasingly alert to the great possibilities in advertising for the development of the Soviet economy."

"TVA Never Claimed To Be a Yardstick for Private Industry," Said Mr. Clapp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, one of the claims most frequently made by proponents of the Tennessee Valley Authority is that it was set up as a "yardstick" against which private utility rates and methods could be measured. There has of course been no justification for this claim, as TVA operates with benefits and subsidies which a private utility does not have.

It is interesting therefore, Mr. Speaker, to read the hearing on the Government corporations appropriation bill for fiscal year 1948—H. R. 3756—80th Congress, 1st session, at page 132. Mr. Clapp, the Chairman of the Board for the TVA, was being questioned by a member of the Senate committee. The question was asked, regarding TVA:

At one time, was it not supposed to be used as a yardstick for private industry?

To which Mr. Clapp replied:

Well, there have been claims made that the TVA power system would set up a yardstick. The TVA has not developed or elaborated on that or made that claim.

That, Mr. Speaker, should quiet that particular fallacy about the benefits of the Tennessee Valley Authority under the existing system.

New Soil Bank Bill in House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, no one in the last 3 years has worked harder in the House for the general interests of agriculture than the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Two years ago he was one of the sponsors of Public Law 480, more commonly known as the Surplus Agriculture Disposal Act of 1954. The purpose of this act was to make possible a larger sale of our surplus agricultural goods in foreign markets.

When I was chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture in the 83d Congress, the gentleman from Illinois was one of the first outspoken advocates of the soil-bank plan. He has worked continuously for the enactment of that legislation over the last 3 years.

I was happy to learn that one of his constituents has expressed it in an editorial. Mr. Speaker, I append herewith an editorial from the Moultrie County News of April 27, which I have received today, on the services of the gentleman from Illinois in behalf of agriculture:

NEW SOIL BANK BILL IN HOUSE

Congress can pass a soil-bank bill this year if it will compromise its partisan differences and start hearing soon on a bill introduced last week by WILLIAM L. SPRINGER, Representative from the 22d District, which includes the county of Moultrie. Mr. SPRINGER introduced the new bill, designated as H. R. 10608, on Thursday, the day after the vote to override the President's veto failed.

In introducing the bill Mr. SPRINGER told of the need to pass the soil-bank plan this year so that it can be fully effective in 1957. He pointed out, as did this newspaper last week, that it is virtually impossible for Congress to convene in January and have time enough to pass a farm bill the same year that can be put into full effect.

Mr. SPRINGER has been a strong supporter of the soil-bank plan for the last 3 years. In fact he was a supporter of such a plan before it was ever considered by Congress. Since he represents in Congress the agricultural district in Illinois where the soil-bank plan originated, it is most fitting and proper that he sponsor this new House bill.

It should also be recalled that Mr. SPRINGER was one of the authors of the Surplus Agricultural Disposal Act. This is a bill to help sell surpluses overseas, and the records show that it has succeeded remarkably well.

Mr. SPRINGER has the interests of agriculture at heart, and is working diligently at the task of getting legislation passed that will help the farmer.

Targets for the Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues who witnessed the impressive display of Navy might at Guatanamo Bay last month should ask themselves the question, "Why this show of American strength at sea?" Or, as one of the great leaders of World War II puts it, "Is the Navy building targets for an enemy?" For a supercarrier, with its satellites—cruisers, destroyers, submarines, and other auxiliaries—is certainly a vulnerable target in this air-atomic age. Modern radar being what it is, there can be no safe place for the supercarrier flotilla to hide from enemy aircraft; nor will speed save it, for the flotilla can move no faster than its slowest component vessel.

If the supercarrier and its satellites make good targets for enemy aircraft, they make equally good targets for enemy submarines. Russia is turning out modern submarines at the reported rate of 75 a year. Aircraft—land based or carrier based—can be used to fight submarines; but carrier based aircraft with their own base destroyed by the enemy, may find no place to land.

The most important question which the supercarrier raises, however, is a question of the economical use of the Nation's resources. We can achieve bankruptcy in building defense. Certainly we can do that very quickly—and achieve defeat as well—if we build weapons we don't need, and can't use effectively, while neglecting to build the very weapons—the long-range, land-based bombers—on which our survival as a Nation may well depend.

Mr. Speaker, with the consent of my colleagues I wish to insert in the RECORD some terse and impressive remarks on this subject made by that great air leader, Gen. Carl Spaatz, USAF, retired, former Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force. How the Navy has adjusted itself to the atomic age, if not to the realities of national defense in the atomic age, is the subject of General Spaatz' remarks in Newsweek magazine of April 16, 1956. The survival of our Nation or the survival of the United States Navy is the question, and General Spaatz gives his answer, as follows:

IS THE NAVY BUILDING TARGETS FOR AN ENEMY?

The array of 50 warships assembled by the United States Navy last month at Guantánamo Bay made an impressive show of American might at sea. It also was instructive as a preview of the Navy's adjustment to the atomic age. What it showed was that the new Navy is to be a collection of supercarriers, or floating air bases, each attended and guarded by a swarm of supporting surface craft.

The theory is that these bases can be moved rapidly to any part of the globe where air strength is needed for offensive operations and that they will be less vulnerable than fixed land bases on the defensive. This is a plausible enough theory but subject to question on several counts.

Obviously, the first question is whether the Navy, by placing so much reliance on supercarriers, isn't just building targets for the Soviet Union's submarine fleet. With Russia turning out submarines at the reported rate of 75 a year, it would appear that the United States Navy's most urgent task is to find an antidote for the weapon which plagued us in both the First and Second World Wars and is bound to be a serious threat to our survival in the third world war, if and when it comes.

While the supercarriers can be used to fight submarines, it is highly questionable, to say the least, whether it is the most efficient or the least costly instrument available for this purpose.

The second question raised by the supercarrier concerns its own ability to survive in an atomic world at war. The argument that its speed and maneuverability make it relatively invulnerable won't bear close examination. It must be remembered that a carrier is not just a carrier but the center of a swarm of ships—cruisers, destroyers, submarines, and other auxiliaries—and that it can be no faster than the slowest of its satellites.

Modern radar being what it is, enemy air reconnaisance of sea areas will be efficient in another war, day and night, regardless of weather. A few modern airplanes can patrol a tremendous area. There will be no safe place for the supercarrier and its supporting units to hide.

The third vital question about the supercarrier has to do with economical use of the Nation's resources. Modern weapons are all expensive, not just in terms of dollars but in resources—material and human. Unless our resources are used wisely and economically, we shall bankrupt ourselves in the long struggle ahead. The time has come for a very searching analysis to determine in what weapons and weapon carriers the national-defense dollar should be invested to get the greatest return.

Our very survival as a Nation depends upon the foresight we use in the maintenance of the proper forces in being, now and in the future, with a minimum expenditure of our resources. The taxpayers are entitled to a critical examination of the roles and missions assigned to the military forces. This examination should be nonpolitical and beyond the influence of service pressures in its conduct.

Loyalty Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars have served their country well in establishing Loyalty Day as an occasion on which every loyal citizen may "stand up and be counted." In place of the shrill whinings and rumbling threats of a few Communists and fellow travelers, following the red flag in a May Day parade, we have the full-throated shout of millions of citizens, united in their love of the flag of the United States of America. On this day we can show, to ourselves and to the world, the strength of a people devoted to freedom.

Almost 25 centuries ago Herodotus wrote:

While the Athenians were ruled by tyrants, they were no better in the things of war than any of those that dwelt round about them; but when they were rid of tyrants, they became the best by far. From this it is plain that while they were held under, they fought ill purposely, as men that work for a master, but when they were set free, each one was eager to accomplish somewhat for himself.

Through the centuries it has been true, and it is true today. The man who fights for freedom, and, in freedom, the man who fights for his neighbor and side by side with his neighbor, is the most formidable of warriors. This fierce love of freedom is no matter of oratory or easy platitude, but a strength that, unspoken, fills the very food we eat, the ground we walk on, and the air we breathe. The American hears it in every voice of nature, from birdsong to thunderbolt. It is good to take this occasion to let the world hear, from our 150 millions, the ringing slogan, "Loyalty means liberty."

Flammable Fabrics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, while no further action has been taken in recent weeks by certain Japanese and American lobbyists to revive the campaign to amend and thereby weaken the Flammable Fabrics Act, we who were sponsors and supporters of this protective legislation must not interpret this as a sign that all is well, and allow our vigilance to be relaxed.

The danger of death and painful injury is too real and too present. We need go on farther than the neighboring city of Baltimore, where but for a quick-thinking clergyman and a woman worshipper, a little boy's life might have been lost. There can be no more impressive testimony to the need for unswerving resistance against any and all attempts to debilitate the effectiveness of the Flammable Fabrics Act, than the following Associated Press story that appeared in a recent issue of the Paterson (N. J.) Morning Call:

COAT AND HOLY WATER USED TO DOUSE FIRE ON ALTAR BOY'S GOWN

BALTIMORE.—The filmy dress of 9-year-old altar boy Albert Longmire caught fire as he was lighting candles yesterday during novena services at St. Edward's Catholic Church.

His cassock and surplice blazed up.

The Reverend John Kerr, conducting services, leaped from the pulpit, hurdled the altar rail, grabbed a woman's coat, wrapped it around the boy and beat out the flames. A woman helped put out the flames with holy water.

At Lutheran Hospital the youth was reported in serious condition with third-degree burns over the upper half of his body.

Soil Bank's Saga

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, now that the administration has tenderly clasped the soil bank to its political bosom it might be well to review a little of the idea's past history.

The Washington Post of April 29, 1956, carried an interesting account of the soil-bank idea. Included in the summary is the fact that my good friend and colleague the Honorable FRED MARSHALL, of Minnesota, revived the idea in the present era. Here is the Post's summary.

SOIL BANK'S SAGA

The administration's soil bank—now smack in the center of a bitter Democratic-GOP farm feud—had its beginning 2 years ago in an atmosphere of complete bipartisan harmony.

It was a Democrat—Representative FRED MARSHALL, of Minnesota—who first brought the notion to Washington. MARSHALL in turn got the idea from constituents. While visiting his district, he heard his farmers talking about a proposition they called "diverted acreage."

Some asked him if something could be done legislatively to reward farmers who were willing to take cropland out of production and plant it in cover crops.

When MARSHALL got back to Washington, he found some of his fellow Members thinking in much the same terms. He talked the idea over with his GOP colleague, Representative H. CARL ANDERSEN, of Minnesota. Both agreed to put in identical bills. Across the Capitol, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, put one in, too.

A few months later the American Farm Bureau Federation indorsed the same general notion, under the new and impressive title of soil bank. It was under this title that the administration later came out for it, with a few added wrinkles, after stoutly opposing the original plan.

In the battle for political credit which followed Mr. Eisenhower's veto of the farm bill, Democrats insisted Mr. Eisenhower already had authority to set up such a bank.

For their authority they went back to a law enacted 20 years ago, near the end of President Roosevelt's first term—the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

Last week Representative CLIFFORD R. HOPE, Republican, of Kansas, whose knowledge of farm problems has earned him the nickname of "Mr. Agriculture" at the Capitol, recalled the circumstances under which that first soil bank was born.

On January 6, 1936, the Supreme Court had voided the New Deal's AAA processing taxes. The Roosevelt farm program practically collapsed.

Overnight the Democrats had come up with a new plan to make payments directly to farmers in return for soil-conservation practices, which included taking cropland out of production.

HOPE revealed that the real authors of that original 1936 act were just a couple of very bright Washington newspapermen. They suggested the idea to AAA Administrator Chester Davis.

Their names: Felix Belair of the New York Times and James Russell Wiggins, Washington correspondent for the St. Paul Pioneer Press. Wiggins today is vice president and executive editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald.

The Last Word on Welfare Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of talk about so-called abuses in the handling of employee welfare and pension funds. I would like to call your attention to the fact that a colleague from my State of Illinois, the senior Senator [Mr. DOUGLAS], has conducted an investigation and turned in a report that has been strongly endorsed by union leaders, including President George Meany, of the merged labor federation, the AFL–CIO.

It is not generally realized that the abuses in handling welfare and pension funds included improper practices by a few insurance companies, banks, and businessmen, as well as by a small number of faithless union officials.

It is not generally realized that the report turned in by Senator DOUGLAS said that even pension plans operated by employers alone should be subject to strict accounting and that the rights of employees under such plans should be safeguarded by acquainting them, annually, with the deferred pay they are promised in the form of pensions.

It is not generally recognized that while Mr. Meany has praised the work of the Douglas Senate subcommittee, and with minor reservations endorsed its demand for full disclosure of all details of all employee pension and welfare funds, the Senator has not yet received similar support from equally eminent spokesmen of the insurance and banking and businessmen communities.

Under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I offer an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on the thorough and extensive report on welfare and pension funds issued by the Senate subcommittee headed by Senator DOUGLAS:

THE LAST WORD ON WELFARE FUNDS

The Douglas subcommittee in the Senate has just filed a 182,000-word report on employee welfare and pension funds. This ought to exhaust the subject, and the result of the group's long work and lengthy report is important to millions of Americans.

In sum, the bipartisan committee under Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, proposes Federal legislation requiring full financial disclosures from nearly all employee welfare and pension funds. The group suggests that some Federal agency be given power to compel honest disclosures.

Why is this important to the public? Because the subcommittee found that more than 75 million persons—employees and dependents—are covered in some measure by such protective funds. That is about half the Nation's population.

Moreover, between twenty and twenty-five billion dollars have been amassed under these programs to help provide for the risks and illnesses and old age of employees. Those promised such protection have an interest in knowing whether they are getting it.

Last year a New York State Insurance Department report showed that 62 of 135 union welfare funds under study had been mishandled. The AFL–CIO has already looked into such reports, and its president, George Meany, says he welcomes the Douglas report and agrees with it in general principles.

But the Senate group was interested in the whole broad field of welfare financing and not just union funds. And in their search the Senators found that while ignorance and extravagance had indeed caused a dissipation of some funds, many abuses involved certain insurance practices, such as excessive commissions and fees.

In consequence, the Douglas subcommittee's disclosure plan makes no distinction between funds operated by unions, management, or trustees. It makes no distinction between funds built entirely with employer's contributions and those to which the employees contribute. All such funds covering more than 25 employees would have to be registered, and all covering more than 100 employees would have to be reported in detail.

The Senators' reasoning here is that both Congress and the courts have held that employer contributions are in the nature of compensation for employees. Thus, employees have a right to know how the funds are administered. In addition, the sums involved are of such magnitude as to be a matter of consequence to the national economy. Hence, the Government has a right to know whether the money is in good hands.

Both the exhaustive work behind the Douglas subcommittee report and the logic of its conclusions ought to command the attention of Congress.

A Stark Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial entitled "A Stark Warning," which appeared in today's New York Herald Tribune:

It is indeed a stark warning which Gen. Curtis LeMay, chief of the United States Strategic Air Command, has just delivered. In his realistic testimony before the Senate subcommittee investigating this country's adequacy of air power as against the U. S. S. R., the general has made it very plain that we are losing ground. While he believes that for all the Soviet advances the United States now possesses "the capability of winning any war the Soviets might start," this victory would not be achieved without "receiving very serious damage." But he goes on to say: "Five years ago we could have won the war without the country receiving comparatively serious damage."

As for the future, General LeMay sketches a grim prospect. Asked about 1958–60, he

testified: "I can only conclude then that they will have a greater striking power than we will have in the time period under our present plans and programs." What is happening is that in the contest for long-range air superiority the Soviets are outproducing the United States. According to General LeMay, the U. S. S. R. is turning out its Bison and Bear jet bombers "at a combined rate substantially higher than we are producing B–52s." And unless there is a change in our plans and programs, it is perfectly obvious that the relative strength of the SAC can only be expected to decline. Coupled with General LeMay's criticisms last week of how combat effectiveness is additionally hampered by inability to retain and develop skilled manpower, the whole picture is most disturbing. In short, we need both more planes and more men.

The object of being strong is to maintain peace. Strength is the active deterrent against any potential aggressor. No other country is going to risk war when it thereby invites the certainty of instant retaliation and complete destruction. But neither can the United States afford anything less than the fullest measure of self-insurance for itself and the rest of the free world. We must continue to keep that margin of leadership in air power and atomic weapons which on this less than ideal globe remains the compulsive deterrent for peace. It will be costly, of course, but here there can be no real option. We must be strong—in arms, in morals, in selfless leadership—to preserve freedom and peace.

Even at the expense of balancing the budget.

Needed Postal Rate Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Passaic (N. J.) Herald-News of April 30, 1956:

NEEDED POSTAL RATE INCREASES

The most successful business in the world at losing money appears to be the United States postal system. We are the only Nation, with the possible exception of Argentina, that does not run its postal agency on a break-even basis. In the last 10 years ours has lost an average of $460 million annually. On top of that the interest on the nearly half-billion postal debt costs us more than $100 million a year.

The reason is simple. The post office is paying present day prices for the things it buys and charging 1932 prices for what it sells. Of every dollar spent, 77 cents goes for wages which Congress sets, and 18 cents goes for transportation costs whose rates are fixed by either the Interstate Commerce Commission or the Civil Aeronautics Board. The 5 cents for other expenses is a slim area in which to expect any further economies in operation of the post office.

The average American's share of the postal deficit—paid out of general revenues—is about $11.50 a year. Yet 80 percent of the first-class mail and all the bulky second- and third-class mail comes from commercial firms. This is an unfair burden on individuals. Raising the rates so that those who use the mails would pay the cost would correct the imbalance.

Artificially low rates have been deceiving the taxpayers long enough. Four cents for regular letters, 7 cents for air mail, and other reasonable increases asked of Congress would put the expense burden where it belongs. The proposed rate boosts would still leave an annual deficit of some $63 million, but that would be a shining improvement over the present deficit.

Address by the Honorable Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce, Before the 44th Annual Meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, May 2, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following address was delivered by the Honorable Sinclair Weeks Secretary of Commerce, before the third general session, 44th annual meeting, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., May 2, 1956:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE SINCLAIR WEEKS BEFORE THE THIRD GENERAL SESSION 44TH ANNUAL MEETING, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES, PRESIDENTIAL ROOM, HOTEL STATLER, WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 2, 1956

On the general theme of preserving private enterprise you have heard some very interesting discussions concerning the businessman's responsibilities in such fields as promoting economic understanding and informed governmental action at all levels. I am informed that my own contribution to this session will be most useful if I discuss the necessity for a close working relationship between businessmen and men in public office.

This is a difficult assignment, especially in an election year, when some people, in search of an issue, call it a mortal sin when close relationships between business and government are encouraged. Even without this added complication, the job of describing the importance—in fact, the utter necessity—of close relations is difficult.

As a former businessman and a present public official I've been on both sides of the fence—and sometimes in the middle. The experience is educational, even though occasionally painful. But nothing compares with the reward—a sense of participation in public service. And this is particularly true in an administration under such dedicated leadership as that of our truly great President, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Because your policy committee has made its recommendation and because its passage means much to the program of President Eisenhower, may I divert for a moment to the bill (H. R. 5550) now pending before the Congress to authorize the President to accept United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation (OTC).

Let me say first that reciprocal trade treatymaking is the settled policy of this Government. The process originated with a proposal of President McKinley—the motion was seconded by Theodore Roosevelt, William Howard Taft, Warren G. Harding, and many others. In my opinion it is a better method of tariff ratemaking than the process of log rolling historically in operation.

Obviously the job can be well done or badly done.

In connection with reciprocal trade agreements one hears from time to time of an outfit known as GATT. GATT objectives closely correspond to established principles of American commercial policy—principles which include the most favored nation treatment, for example, which the United States in its own interest has long urged upon other nations. Generally speaking, in my judgment, as far as GATT is concerned, it is better from every standpoint to have 35 nations join in 1 agreement than to have to go through the motions 35 separate times with 35 separate agreements finally arrived at.

The combination of such negotiations produces results not possible in a series of separate bilateral agreements and to my mind, certainly makes it possible for the United States to obtain greater trade benefits than could otherwise be achieved.

The Department of Commerce has an important interest in the Organization for Trade Cooperation (OTC) and because of this, I have carefully reviewed the proposal for it from every angle. Both as a member of the President's Cabinet and as a former manufacturer, I earnestly hope that the Congress will approve this vital legislation promptly.

I have personally examined very carefully the criticisms made against OTC which have led to honest doubts in the minds of some businessmen. I want to say that as far as I am concerned there is no foundation for these doubts.

The agreement for the OTC has been so drafted that United States interests are fully safeguarded. OTC would not be supranational. It could not change a single tariff rate. It could not impose new obligations on the United States without our consent.

So long as it is the policy of this Government to carry on foreign trade under the aegis of reciprocal trade agreements and to do it by the GATT process, I am convinced that the creation of the OTC will enable American industry and trade to derive additional and increased benefits from the GATT and the tariff concessions we have received.

Now to get on with my subject—let us first consider the impact of government on private industry.

When prosperity is rolling along on a high plateau—like today—some nearsighted businessmen may deceive themselves into assuming that, because our economic momentum is so strong, it makes little difference what signals are called in Washington.

In my judgment such an attitude is slightly shortsighted.

History clearly reveals that, from the industrial revolution to the present, rulers and parliaments have used their power both to help business up and to push business down. Governments have plagued business with red tape; burdened it with heavy taxes; strangled it with controls and—behind the Iron Curtain—have completely destroyed it.

If it makes scant difference to our economic system who sits at executive desks and in legislative chambers, why are so many left wingers trying to force so much anti-business legislation through the Congress?

Why are so many radical politicians bursting their lungs with tirades against business and businessmen in government?

Why are so many left wing groups planning campaigns to oust public officials from both parties who support sound economic principles?

We as a nation are not going to preserve private enterprise if local, State and national governments are run by people who misunderstand private enterprise, mistrust private enterprise, and mistreat private enterprise. You cannot raise sheep in a den of wolves.

Speaking as a member of the Eisenhower administration, I assure you that our mission in the economic field is to preserve private enterprise. Its record is proof of its value to all Americans. Look at this amazing record: Under private enterprise this Nation has advanced to history's highest standard of living.

A century ago 94 percent of all work was by human and animal muscle. Today only 6 percent is done by physical labor of man and beast—all the rest is by machine. A century ago the average worker toiled a full 70-hour week. Today the workweek is around 42 hours and most labor is easier.

Since 1900 our population has doubled but our per capita production has tripled. Even after allowances for price changes, our national income today is 7 times what it was at the start of the century. I think it is hardly any wonder, as a consequence, that we of this administration rely on free enterprice and the unchecked flow of its dynamic power to continue to bring material well-being to the American people.

From its very inception over 3 years ago, this administration's objective has been to let the free enterprise system run itself. Controls were dropped. The tax system was redesigned to raise taxes and not to change the social order. A policy of trying to get the Government out of business was instituted. The results I think speak for themselves, including the report the other day of the Council of Economic Advisers announcing the gross national product for the first quarter of 1956 at a new high—at an annual rate of $399 billion.

But ours is not a negative, hands-off approach. We recognize that the Federal Government in this century of giant industrialism and long-range guided missiles cannot shirk its responsibility in the economic field. Desertion could permit an eventual drift to inflation or depression. Both extremes would be bad for business, bad for defense, and bad for America.

We believe that the purpose of private enterprise is to create wide prosperity fairly shared. Else why is our economy so geared that competition continually drives the price down and down until the products of private enterprise—the only real wealth we have—are distributed to our people on an ever-widening scale.

We set barbed-wire fences beyond which Government should not go in the field of private industry. But we do not hesitate to use persuasion and the power of Government to do what needs to be done for the national welfare which the private factor of the economy cannot or will not do itself.

That policy is neither socialism nor standpatism.

It is dynamic conservatism.

It is economic commonsense.

In our desire to do what is best for 167 million Americans, we have brought to Government able talent of all kinds. We have picked some of the best from science, technology, agriculture, labor, finance, and industry—each person contributing his experience and brains in managing honest, forward-looking Government.

At first the individual business man in government undergoes a new bewildering, and frustrating experience—the strange gobbledygook language of bureaucracy—the duplication and the age-crusted redtape—the gigantic size and complexity of government.

Every conscientious executive wants to keep on top of his job—not only to manage properly but to think things out. There are never hours enough in the day to get things done.

One of the time-consuming jobs is the search for qualified top-rank executives for important posts in Government. Their skills are urgently needed. But, unless a prospect is independently well-off, the pay scale is often far too low to attract the cream of the crop.

The readjustments involved in scaling down personal finances, missing out on promotive priority, giving up established homes, and breaking into educational commitments are substantial hurdles.

Amongst business executives who come to Washington, the Nation has been fortunate to have the services of volunteer experts, called WOC's because they are loaned by private industry and serve without compensation. These men are helping to gear Government-industry participation in mobilization preparedness and in the current defense and atomic-energy programs—so that our military might will be a strong deterrent to war.

Surely these experts and technicians deserve well of this country. But what do they get from some circles?

It shocks anyone aware of the hazards of these times and anyone with a sense of fair play to find the chairman of a House investigating committee pouring out misrepresentations about WOC's and advocating a reckless course of action which could deprive the defense program of these urgently needed industrial specialists.

I don't believe the American people want the national defense effort made more difficult just to gratify the spite of those—in or out of Government—who hate private enterprise and who always are ready to smear any businessman anywhere in Government.

I think instead that the American people are everlastingly grateful to these able and honest businessmen who are serving their country in the cause of peace.

While I praise the contribution of businessmen to Government in this day and age, I would add that it is my sincere belief that this Nation needs something more from businessmen than aptitude in any particular field. It needs business statesmanship. It needs the positive leadership of businessmen in keeping our country on the right road.

The more I study modern conditions the more I am convinced that the way to preserve private enterprise is to preserve sound government. I doubt that we can keep government sound unless the champions of priate enterprise spend just as much time fighting for sound policies in government as they do in making and selling a product.

Businessmen are able to sell a product but they are infants in the task of selling an idea—and remember well that it is ideas, sound or otherwise, which have most to do in influencing the direction in which we as a nation shall travel.

But here comes the rub. Here's where a bit of human perversity enters the picture. Most of us businessmen—and I used to be one—are red-hot defenders of good government and free enterprise—in principle. Yet too often some businessmen want to make an exception in their own particular case.

Generally speaking, they're all for private enterprise—until their own ox is gored. At the first pinch of metal scarcity they want controls restored. They're for balanced budgets—but not if it requires them to pay at least the cost of special Government services indispensable to their operation.

Postal rates in large part have not increased in 24 years. Most business is willing, but some business fights tooth and nail to keep from paying its fair share of the cost of operating the Post Office Department. How many other costs of business have remained static in this quarter century period?

Let me make this point clear. We welcome hearing the views of businessmen on any subject that concerns their own business or the economy. That's our job: to listen, to advise—and where possible—to help. In fact, the bulk of our operation—at the Commerce Department—is a great service station for businesses of all sizes. And we pass along industry views to other areas of Government, including the Congress.

However, cooperation between business and Government should be a two-way street.

If we as a nation are to preserve private enterprise, we must preserve initiative and research and competition and free markets and sound money and credit policies of Government. Of course, it is natural for a businessman to exercise self-interest because if he did not pay attention to his own shop, he could not stay in business.

If we are to keep prosperity and foster long-range economic growth, however, businessmen also must be economic statesmen with a vision and a sense of duty that embraces the well-being of the entire Nation.

For if businessmen—of all people—neglect or fail to champion private enterprise and the Government policies that encourage private enterprise, how can private enterprise continue to survive The alternative to free enterprise is captive enterprise. It is the fall of conservatism and the rise to power of radicalism with its jargon of class warfare, its dangerous lideologies, and its chains for business.

This administration will continue to do what it can to preserve private enterprise by carrying forward sound programs to strengthen the economy—by fighting for the soil bank and other measures to give the farmers a better chance—by proposing to Congress new assistance, including certain loans, to enable communities with chronic unemployment to help themselves.

We shall continue to advance programs for economic growth, such as necessary aids to small business; inducements to home building; commercial atomic power; establishment of the Organization for Trade Cooperation to spur world commerce; additional air traffic control facilities for safer air travel; construction of the great national highway program, and other plans for building a prosperous future.

We welcome the vigorous cooperation of business in our fight to maintain a climate in which business will continue to flourish, employment will expand, and other fruits of healthy economic growth will be harvested by all of the American people.

Rocky Marciano

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Shirley Povich appearing in Sunday's Washington Post and Times Herald in response to my friend and neighbor, the world's heavyweight champion, Rocky Marciano.

The article is entitled "Marciano Comes Shining Through to the Last":

MARCIANO COMES SHINING THROUGH TO THE LAST

(By Shirley Povich)

BOSTON, April 28.—There were strong motives, of course, that spurred Rocky Marciano to toss his world heavyweight championship back to the mob and walk away from bigger money than he had reaped in 10 rugged years in the prize ring.

They were impelling reasons, but at the same time so simple and so honest that

Rocky could not quite succeed in communicating them to his whole audience, especially those uncomprehending folks known to infest the prize fight business. Rocky's desire to exalt his wife and family above the glamour and profits of the heavyweight title, couldn't quite ring a bell with them.

Even as The Rock took his leave of the title officially, by saying he was all through with fighting, "because that's what my family wants and that's what I want," the skeptics began looking under the bed for angles that would explain his move. Love of family couldn't be accepted, per se.

So they said that Rocky was doing this thing as a favor to the International Boxing Club, which is being sued by the Government as a monopoly, to show that the IBC doesn't control the heavyweight title. And they said he was just paving the way for an elimination series that would bring him back to fight the winner for a monster gate. The idea of a man quitting because he loves his wife and baby and mother had to be rejected.

Conceivably, a fellow giving up the title like Rocky did, could have been coached to do so by the IBC as a desperate move to beat a Government suit, but I have grave doubts that Mary Ann Marciano, age 3½, could be coached to say what she said last night.

Little Mary Ann apparently was answering all the phone calls at the Marciano household on this great day in the life of the Marcianos, and there were few preliminaries in her response, which went like this:

"Hello, you. My daddy does not going to fight nobody no more at all. My daddy does not going to fight nobody no more at all, goodby."

Back in Brockton these last 4 years since Rocky was defending his title, Mrs. Marciano was keeping a rigid box score. "He was home only 152 days in those 4 years. Never for more than 2 weeks at a time.

"I told Rocky it was embarrassing to have to reintroduce him to his own daughter every time he came home."

Rocky's place among the heavyweight champions may long be debated, and there are some who will contend that his skills were limited to two facets, his ability to absorb a punch and deal one out. But indisputable is the brightness of the record he takes into retirement with him: 49 fights, 49 victories, no draws, no defeats, no peers at the trade in his own time.

Just as he refused to be beguiled by the glamor of the business of being the heavyweight champ, Rocky remained the hometown boy in his final act as champ. While the big city reporters in New York were assembling at the press conference he had called, and wondering what the nature of his announcement might be, Rocky bethought himself of an old friend in Brockton.

Rocky telephoned Mrs. Marciano in midmorning saying he was keeping his pledge to her that he would retire before May 1. Then he said, "I'm announcing it at noon. But call Vic Dubois at the Enterprise and tell him he can have the story right now because I want him to have it first."

And so it was that Rocky, even on his busiest day, was remembering the home town sports editor who helped to launch him to fame, and so it was that Vic Dubois of the Brockton Enterprise had a clear beat on the big story.

I happen to know that the thought of retirement began to germinate with Rocky last summer when he went into training for the Archie Moore fight, and that it was greatly intensified the same night he knocked Moore out at Yankee Stadium.

At Grossinger's, Rocky didn't go in for much fight talk. The light of his day was the evening phone call to Brockton and his long conversation with first his wife and then with little Mary Ann. Talking to his daughter, he was at play. He was every wonderful little girl's fond daddy, and the fact that he was champion of the world was easy for him to forget.

That night he knocked out Moore in Yankee Stadium there was usual postfight celebration at the Hampshire House. Never did a winning fighter appear to be so unhappy. For his well-wishers, Rocky smiled only weakly. He was exulting not at all. His chagrin at the fact that Moore had dumped him on his pants in the first round was still showing, unobliterated by the fearful beating he finally dealt out to Moore.

"Barbara wants me to quit fighting," he said that night, "and it's about time maybe that I started listening. All the people in Brockton like me so much I don't ever want to lose a fight. Every time I fight I always hear them yelling, 'Attaboy Rocky,' and I can't let them down."

It was typical of Marciano's honesty that he named Archie Moore as the No. 1 contender for the title he vacated. Moore was the only fighter he had actively disliked. Archie's name-calling campaign before getting the title fight had hurt the sensitive Marciano, yet after he beat the man, he could still rate him best of the rest. As in all of his other tests, Marciano once more could come shining through.

The Smear Nixon Crowd Still at It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it would seem that the smear attacks leveled at the Vice President are to continue with undiminished virulence despite his overwhelming endorsement by rank and file Republicans throughout the country and his complete acceptance by President Eisenhower as his running mate. Poor old Herblock keeps up his running fire against NIXON in his best smear technique, and inconspicuous columnists such as Fleeson—and Stokes—torture the Chotiner incident to make it virtually appear that NIXON'S one-time campaign manager has been using the Vice President's office as his headquarters. And the letters-to-the-editor columns still carry an occasional shot at him, although the writers conveniently neglect to specifiy just what they find wrong with him officially or privately.

As usual, it has taken fair-minded and objective David Lawrence to bring things into focus, which he does in his column appearing in yesterday's Evening Star. As Mr. Lawrence points out, these smear artists conveniently overlook the fact that Mr. Chotiner was also at one time the campaign manager for Chief Justice Warren and Senator KNOWLAND, and these two outstanding public officials are conveniently spared the guilt-by-association charges which come so readily to the tongue and pen of those so-called liberals who on other occasions have decried the smear technique when their New Deal pets were under attack. Mr. Lawrence's article, included herewith, deserves your perusal:

LIBERALS SMEAR NIXON—THEY WEEP OVER GUILT BY ASSOCIATION BUT DON'T LAMENT CHOTINER CASE

Guilt by association has caused many an outburst of indignation in recent years by so-called liberals and others who have said it is rank injustice to associate the name of an innocent man with someone either accused or suspected of wrongdoing.

But the pious organizations dedicated to the crusade against guilt by association seem to be weeping no tears and issuing no statements of lament at the smear job done in the last few days on Vice President NIXON by certain news dispatches and headlines. The American people read in the last few days such headlines as these: "NIXON'S Aid Gets Probe Subpena," "Probers Call NIXON'S 1952 Manager," "NIXON'S 1952 Manager Involved in Inquiry on Clothing Contracts," and "NIXON'S 1952 Manager Got Legal Fee in Fraud Case."

The headline writers themselves were certainly not at fault. They rightly based their headlines on what the news articles and dispatches conspicuously emphasized in the first few paragraphs. Not one of the articles in the various eastern newspapers which printed the above headlines told the people the whole truth, which is that Murray Chotiner was campaign manager not only for Mr. NIXON but also once for Earl Warren, now Chief Justice, when he was elected Governor of California. Nor did the news articles tell the reader that Mr. Chotiner was the campaign manager for Senator KNOWLAND when he ran in 1946 and also in the 1952 primary when he won both the Republican and Democratic Senatorial nominations. Nor did the articles state that Mr. Chotiner was campaign manager in southern California for Governor Dewey, of New York, when he ran for the Presidency in 1948.

None of this information was, of course, really pertinent to the story except that, if one man—NIXON—was mentioned, all others should, in fairness, have been included. The inference left with the reader was that Mr. NIXON was somehow implicated in an alleged wrongdoing on the part of Mr. Chotiner. There seems to be an overeagerness on the part of political opponents these days to smear the Vice President.

There was, indeed, no more reason for the headlines to speak of "NIXON'S aid" being in trouble than to call him "Chief Justice Warren's aid." Actually Mr. Chotiner today isn't the aid of Mr. NIXON, nor is he his campaign manager. He is not a member of Mr. NIXON'S staff or of Chief Justice Warren's or Senator KNOWLAND'S. He is a close friend of them all.

What the news articles didn't tell the reader is that Mr. Chotiner is perhaps the leading lawyer in criminal cases in southern California and that his law practice is confined to this type of activity while politics is with him an avocation.

A headline saying that a lawyer got a legal fee from a client involved in a fraud case would not have been news. It was the fact that the lawyer in question was once a manager for NIXON which seemingly made it news. Yet there was no evidence to back up such a plain case of "guilt by association."

The client of Mr. Chotiner named in the Senate inquiry got into trouble during the Truman administration when some Government contracts for clothing for the Army were allegedly obtained under fraudulent means. Since then the client in question was tried and convicted. It was in 1953 that the client employed Mr. Chotiner personally on legal questions growing out of the episode.

There isn't the slightest scintilla of evidence—nor will any ever be produced, because there is none—that Mr. NIXON knew even the fact that Mr. Chotiner had any such

client. The news articles, following the exposures by a Senate committee which insisted on summoning Mr. Chotiner for testimony, properly reported the committee action and that the Democrats were pressing it. But there has been nothing to indicate that Mr. Chotiner's relations with his client were anything but the normal relation of a lawyer practicing in criminal cases. Not so long ago the National Lawyers Guild, a radical organization, raised a fuss because some of its members were criticized for defending Communists. It was rightly argued here that no lawyer in good standing, and himself not implicated in the Communist conspiracy, should be condemned in the court of public opinion because he chooses to give any defendant the benefit of his counsel.

Certainly the news articles written about Mr. Chotiner imply that he did something wrong in defending a client who was involved in a criminal case. The effort to tie the Vice President into the whole business, moreover, by giving prominence in the press to his former relationship with the lawyer is an attempt to imply "guilt" by association"—a practice that merits condemnation when there is no evidence of guilt.

On the Right Road

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, in enacting the highway construction bill last week the House of Representatives took a long stride toward making the lives of many Americans safer and more enjoyable.

The prospect of having 80 million cars, a decade hence, jammed together on today's highways was unappealing and frightening. The program we have started will provide a network of improved roads from the interstate to the local level.

In my State of Washington, the Federal Government will be spending $35.1 million in 1957. Primary, secondary and urban roads will receive $11.7 million, which will be matched dollar for dollar by State funds. Highways 99 and 10, our two interstate arteries, will receive $23.4 million plus a 10 percent payment by the State. Highway experts estimate about 4,000 new jobs will be created in my State over a period of the next 13 years. In all, some $498 million will be spent in the State of Washington during the construction period.

I believe one of the salient features of this bill is its provision for more primary and secondary road funds. As the topography of our State and its highway development limit us presently to two interstate highways, much of the beneficial effect of this bill would have been lost without the changes in the State's role. Under the new bill, the States portion of interstate road construction is lowered and the consequent savings can be matched dollar for dollar by Federal money for those roads that our citizens use in traveling from farm to market, from town to home or from town to town.

Our State has done an outstanding job in developing its highway system under the stress of financial limitation prompted by the rapidly expanding need for roads and the slower expansion of the revenue base. We have the best roads, commensurate with construction funds available. Now the State can go ahead with plans for new roads for congested areas and restoration of roads which require expensive renovation projects.

It is my belief that the President's bond-financed program would have been a more sound, better financed, generally superior plan for solution of the highway problem. However, it was obvious that the leadership of the committees which considered this bill would not have brought out another bill had this one been rejected, thus it was this bill or none.

I am not in accord with all of the revenue-producing features of this bill, but I believe in the long run its ultimate benefits will outweigh the poor and in some ways inequitable taxation portions it contains. With this in mind, I joined in support of this measure and am in hope the Senate will see fit to complete early and favorable action on it so our program can be started soon.

The Farm Veto and Another Promise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1956

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, the Smithville Times, published in Smithville, Tex., by C. K. Mick, publisher and owner, is recognized as an outstanding weekly newspaper.

At the annual convention of the South Texas Press Association in San Antonio, Tex., April 20 and 21, the Smithville Times was awarded a first-place trophy for the best commercial printing in towns of less than 3,500 population and five certificates of award in newspaper contests conducted by the association.

The certificates of award were for first place in commercial printing, second place in newspaper photography, third place in best all-round newspaper, and honorable mention in column writing and editorials.

In addition, it has been the winner of the plaque for outstanding community service in 1947–48, 1950–51, and 1954–55.

An example of why this newspaper has received such splendid recognition is a very timely and excellent editorial on the problem presented by the President's veto of the farm bill, which appeared in the April 27 issue. The editorial the Farm Veto and Another Promise is one which all of us who realize the predicament faced by the farmers of the Nation will deeply appreciate.

The editorial is as follows:

It's happened again. The farmer, hopefully eyeing the prospects of an even break in national economy, has been left holding the bag—a bag lined with empty promises.

The Presidential veto of the farm bill adds another hole to the farmer's bare and threadworn pocketbook. And the chances of patching it are mighty slim.

Our farmers are left with only the promises made in an attempt to justify this unjust action. The administration proposes as a substitute, that the Congress pass a soil-bank program which, they claim, if passed right away could give the farmers up to half a billion dollars in aid this crop year.

The soil bank has been the administration's mainstay, their obsession, and their cure-all for the farmer's ills. This, of course, is not entirely true. It has definite benefits, but is certainly no miracle medicine to cure the low-price plague of our farmers. No single program could be expected to dispel the recent years of mounting farm depression.

The now-dead farm bill was one which was written by the farmers themselves. The Senate and House Agricultural Committees worked tirelessly with rural people all over the Nation laying groundwork for the legislation. The bill was not 100 percent perfect, but it would have at least given the farmers something to hold on to and would have stopped the price declines which are shoving farm economy steadily downward.

In the words of congressional leaders, there is no hope of passing another general farm bill this session. Administration claims of immediate price boosts on some commodities will be bogged down by laws now in effect, and the old farm enemy—the sliding parity scale—will likely stay with us.

Texas farmers are tired of promises. They haven't forgotten those made by the President at Waco during the last presidential campaign. The supports promised then were no more real than the economic boosts our farmers are now being promised.

Our agricultural population loses most through this tragic act. But in the long run, they won't suffer alone. Sound farm economy is essential to national well-being, and continued depression of agriculture is eventually sure to affect us all.

Postmaster General Summerfield and the Postal Rate Increase Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, permit me to call to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Mr. George Rothwell Brown on the postal rate increase bill which appeared in the New York Journal-American on April 20, 1956:

POSTAL RATE INCREASE BILL; DEMS WOULD GET THE BLAME

WASHINGTON.—The unusual spectacle of three members of the Cabinet plugging in unison for a bill which repeatedly in the past Congress has been most reluctant to pass, has been one of the main attractions in Washington this week.

Treasury Secretary Humphrey, and Sinclair Weeks, the Secretary of Commerce, have been backing up Postmaster General Summerfield in his effort to obtain the enactment of a postal rate increase bill that would add $400 million to the annual tax load of the American people.

So far as this writer can recall—and he has been around the Capitol a good many years—this is the first time that one member of the Cabinet ever enlisted the services of another in high pressuring Congress, and Mr. Summerfield has recruited two of them. He's a wonder.

"PUNCH LINE"

Mr. Weeks stated his "categorical conclusion" that the proposed new higher rates "will not impede or hinder business."

That was his "punch line," and the reason for his being before the House Post Office Committee. He brought to the support of this conclusion the fact that the National Association of Manufacturers, and the executive committee of the United States Chamber of Commerce, favor the administration's objective, which by the admission of Secretary Humphrey, is to balance the budget at the expense of the people who use the mails.

Secretary Humphrey indeed put it very bluntly, that failure to enact the Summerfield bill, which would increase postal revenues by $400 million a year, "would to all practical purposes eliminate the very thin $400 million surplus which the President's January budget envisioned for fiscal 1957."

That was letting a couple of cats out of the bag. It tagged the Summerfield bill as a tax bill, a definition which its supporters have been trying to avoid, and of course, it is a tax bill. For this reason the Senate Post Office Committee repeatedly has refused to consider similar proposed legislation prior to action by the House, in which constitutionally all tax legislation must originate.

So here we have a Republican Secretary of the Treasury seeking to induce a Democratic Congress, in a campaign year, to help balance the Eisenhower budget.

WHAT HE DIDN'T SAY

This would be an accomplishment that would be of immense political advantage to Republican candidates this year right down the line, while the Democrats would have to take the blame for raising taxes on everybody—including their friends the farmers.

It is quite true, as Secretary Weeks told the committee, that the executive committee of the chamber of commerce did endorse the rate proposals, back in 1953. What he neglected to say is that since then a special policy committee has been studying the whole postal problem, and has not yet stated the position of the chamber as of today.

Mr. Summerfield would be able to make a lot of political hay if he could go to the country next autumn with the proud boast that he was the first Postmaster General in history to put the postal service on a pay-as-you-go basis, and that he had made the balancing of the Eisenhower budget possible.

But where would be the political fodder in that for the Democrats?

Administration of Wildlife Refuge Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the April 18, 1956, issue of the Bakersfield Californian calls attention to the recent report in which the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries was highly critical of the administration of wildlife refuge lands by the Department of the Interior:

COMMITTEE REPORT SCATHING

Before President Eisenhower makes any appointment to succeed Douglas McKay as Secretary of the Interior he should study a report approved unanimously by the Members of the House of Representatives Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The report is the result of hearings held by the committee on the subject of the Department of the Interior's administration of the Nation's wildlife refuges, a type of administration that has compelled Congress to frame legislation to protect the refuges, although this protection legally and morally should be provided by the department itself.

President Eisenhower should read this report and others before committing himself to the appointment of Clarence Davis or any other policy-making official to the office of Secretary of the Department. Chances of confirmation of such an appointment are slight.

The committee reports that "the record of the hearings is a picture of extreme administration confusion. There has been absolutely no effective liaison and coordination between several of the bureaus in the Department of the Interior, between the Washington office and the field of the Fish and Wildlife Service, or even between the various branches within the Fish and Wildlife Service."

It will be recalled that many of the career men in this Service were forced out several years ago when the "new philosophy" was introduced into the Department. This "new philosophy" is responsible for allowing 274 oil and gas leases to be issued by the Department. This occurred when the Department was assertedly framing new regulation to "protect" the refuges, but news stories and special studies at the time revealed that peculiar instances of favoritism occurred and whatever protection the refuges needed came too late. Not since the day of Albert Fall has there been such a case.

The House committee report disclosed these and other facts that clearly call for a change in the manner in which the Fish and Wildlife Service is handled, and the elevation of the second in command to the top job is no way to do it.

It has been pointed out that most of the development, maintenance, and management of the Nation's wildlife refuges is paid for by the fees from duck stamps purchased by sportsmen, and these people are not happy at the misuse of the lands.

The handling of the wildlife refuges and the often surreptitious opening of these areas to lease to favored companies have excited the criticism of sportsmen and of all who believe that the Department of the Interior has a protective assignment rather than that to which it has been committed in the past few years.

The fact that the House committee report received unanimous concurrence and that it is receiving widespread attention in Congress shows promise at least some protection will be afforded our precious wildlife refuge system, if it has to be done by passing more legislation. The administration should take its cue.

When President Eisenhower makes his appointment of a new Secretary to replace Mr. McKay, he will have the opportunity to choose a man who will correct the conditions described in the committee report.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch commented editorially on this opportunity in the issue of April 8, 1956. I commend this editorial also to the attention of my colleagues:

EISENHOWER'S OPPORTUNITY

President Eisenhower soon will be filling the sixth major vacancy in his Cabinet in a little more than 3 years. This vacancy is in the office of the Secretary of the Interior. It is one that presents the President with an opportunity, greater in some ways than any of the others that have come to him previously through Cabinet resignations.

The first top-level Cabinet change occurred in President Eisenhower's inaugural year when the late Martin P. Durkin, of Illinois, resigned as Secretary of Labor and was succeeded by James P. Mitchell, of New Jersey. The second change was the departure of Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, of Texas, from the new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and her replacement by the able Marion B. Folsom, of New York.

Three major resignations have occurred in the Department of Defense, just below the level of Secretary Charles E. Wilson, of Michigan. The President's first choice as Secretary of the Army, Robert T. Stevens, of New Jersey, a central figure in the McCarthy battle, was succeeded by Wilber M. Brucker, of Michigan. Robert B. Anderson, of Texas, was succeeded as Secretary of the Navy by Charles S. Thomas, of California. Harold E. Talbott, of New York, who got tangled up in conflict-of-interest troubles, resigned as Secretary of the Air Force; his successor is the eminently qualified Donald A. Quarles, of New Jersey.

Now Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay will be leaving the Cabinet in a few days to go home to Oregon to run against Senator WAYNE MORSE, who is the White House's No. 1 senatorial target this year. We hope the President chooses as well in selecting the McKay successor as he did in picking the successors to the Durkin and Hobby seats. For if he does he will raise the level of the Cabinet notably.

This would be good for both the country and for the Republican Party. The conservation and natural resource policies of the Federal Government under Secretary McKay have favored oil, waterpower, timber, and land exploiters. This record is so clear that it does not need to be reviewed here.

Why a constructive change from Secretary McKay would be so good for the Republican Party ought to be equally clear. But somehow it seems to have been forgotten. Three years ago the Post-Dispatch printed an editorial entitled, "A Record To Be Proud Of." It told how many advances in conservation had been made under Republican Presidents. Here are a few of the high spots:

Grant: Creation of Yellowstone National Park as first of the national parks.

Harrison: Creation of first national forests.

McKinley: Passage of organic law under which national forests were administered.

Theodore Roosevelt: Establishment of the United States Forest Service. Passage of the Reclamation Act.

Taft: Authorization for national forests in other parts of the country besides the West.

Coolidge: Establishment of Federal game refuges for migratory birds. Regulation of fisheries.

Hoover: Authorization of the first major public-power and multiple-purpose dam (Boulder, later renamed Hoover Dam).

It is a strange thing that the Republican Party which compiled this splendid record should go back on it under the first GOP administration in a quarter century. It is strange that the party has turned a deaf ear on the sound counsel of Republican Theodore Roosevelt, the first great conservationist in the White House. He said:

"In the administration of the forest reserves, it must be clearly borne in mind that all land is to be devoted to its most productive use for the most permanent good of the whole people, and not for the temporary benefit of individuals or companies.

"Where conflicting interests must be reconciled the question will always be decided

from the standpoint of the greatest good for the greatest number."

As we said May 7, 1953, these words apply to every other national treasure as much as they do to the forests. They apply to minerals, to waterways, to range. They apply to still other resources. They apply today in Hells Canyon.

The opportunity President Eisenhower has is to appoint a Secretary of the Interior who will be a watchdog for the interests of the American people. His opportunity is to find another Republican like Gifford Pinchot to battle for the public against the demands of predatory extractors and exploiters.

May he make the most of it.

Raymond Clapper Awards Voted by American Editors to Exposures of Inadequacies of Eisenhower Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, all of us are acquainted with the fact that this administration claims a unique virtue in the sense of being "clean as a hound's tooth." We are acquainted with the fact that it claims all virtue, honesty, and good judgment.

Is it not interesting that the Raymond Clapper Award for exceptional service in journalism went to a reporter, Clark Mollenhoff, of the Des Moines Register and Tribune, who exposed the bad judgment and wretchedly inadequate so-called security procedures of the administration?

Is it not interesting that American editors, through whom the Raymond Clapper Award is given, also voted honorable mention to another reporter, William H. Lawrence, of the New York Times, who exposed the conflict-of-interest activities of a former Eisenhower appointee as Secretary of the Air Force, who was given a commendation even as he was drummed out of office following the exposure?

And is it not interesting that President Eisenhower was "annoyed" when the editors made these awards in his presence?

Under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I include the following editorial on these subjects from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

IN THE PRESIDENT'S PRESENCE

The Raymond Clapper award of $500 for outstanding work in reporting the news of the National Capital in 1955 has gone to Clark R. Mollenhoff, of the Des Moines Register and Tribune for his series of articles on the high-handed dismissal on security risk charges of Wolf Ladejinsky, land reform expert then in the Department of Agriculture.

The presentation of this award took place under conditions both appropriate and embarrassing. The conditions were appropriate because the ceremony was at the annual dinner of the American Society of Newspaper Editors with Kenneth MacDonald, executive editor of the Des Moines paper presiding. The conditions also were embarrassing because President Eisenhower, who was the guest speaker, had to sit by and listen while Correspondent Mollenhoff was praised for being so persistent in his reporting that Agriculture Secretary Benson finally had to reverse himself. Secretary Benson fired Mr. Ladejinsky as a bad man to have around only to have the fired civil servant hired by Foreign Aid Administrator Stassen for sensitive work in Vietnam. This looked pretty crazy to Mr. Mollenhoff and he stayed with his story until Secretary Benson, doubtless under belated White House pressure, grudgingly yielded and cleared Mr. Ladejinsky.

Actually the President's embarrassment was compounded. Honorable mention went to the disclosures by William H. Lawrence of the New York Times that the Eisenhower administration's first choice as Air Force Secretary, Harold E. Talbott, had used his office and official stationery to assist his private company. All this forced Mr. Talbott to resign under fire. No wonder President Eisenhower did not join in the applause for enterprising, valuable Correspondents Mollenhoff and Lawrence. No wonder the President looked annoyed and drummed his fingers on the table and waited for it all to be over.

Continuing Egyptian Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 10 and 11, 1956, Ambassador Abba Eban directed three letters to the Security Council detailing the extent and nature of Egyptian attacks upon Israel since April 9. The letters, which appear in the Israel Digest of April 31, 1956, are worthy of the attention of our colleagues:

TEXT OF LETTERS TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL LISTING EGYPTIAN ATTACKS

LETTER OF APRIL 10, 1956

I have the honor to refer to my letter of April 9, and to submit a further list of violations of the Egypt-Israel General Armistice Agreement committed by Egypt during the past 24 hours:

On April 9, 1956, at 13:15 hours, an Egyptian position opened automatic fire on a tractor near Nahal Oz. The driver was wounded.

During the afternoon of April 9, one member of an Egyptian murder gang was captured in the Lahish area.

At 21:00 hours, a waterpipe was blown up at Beit Reim.

At 21:30 hours, an Israel patrol north of Naharayim encountered an Egyptian armed band which was making its way toward Jordan. During the ensuing exchange of fire, the attackers managed to cross the Jordan border.

At 22:50 hours, fire was opened on a watchman of the Gilat settlement.

During the night, waterpipes were brown up near Tekuma, and a police car was attacked south of Beersheba. One policeman was wounded.

On April 10, 1956, at 04:00 hours, one member of an Egyptian murder gang was killed near Nehusha.

At 05:30 hours, one member of an Egyptian murder gang was killed at a point 20 kilometers distance from Beersheba. A second member who was seriously wounded, was captured.

At 06:20 hours, an Israel command car was blown up near Magen. Three of the passengers were wounded.

At 10:30 hours, an exchange of fire took place in the vicinity of Zikim, between an Israel patrol and an Egyptian gang.

I also wish to inform you that one of the victims of yesterday's attack on an Israel command car between Beeri and Beit Reim, which I reported in my letter of April 9, has since died of his wounds.

Investigations conducted by the Egypt-Israel Mixed Armistice Commission and interrogations carried out in the presence of United Nations observers of two members of an Egyptian murder gang captured on April 9, in the Lahish region, more than 30 kilometers from the Gaza strip, revealed the following facts:

Egyptian murder gangs were dispatched into Israel in the early hours of the evening of April 6. They crossed the lines near Beit Hanun, at the northern end of the Gaza strip, after receiving a briefing in Gaza from Capt. Mustafa Gamosh of the Egyptian Army. Members of five groups, who were about to cross the armistice line, were present at the briefing which was also attended by Col. Said Saga, commanding officer of the Fedayeen unit to which all those present at the briefing belonged. The orders given at the briefing included the following objectives: To blow up bridges; to kill people; to fire on vehicles and to mine roads and tracks. All the members of the gang to which the two captured belonged were armed with Carl Gustaf submachineguns, and were to make their way back to the Gaza strip. If for any reason this should prove to be too difficult, they were to advance in an easterly direction and to cross into Jordanian territory.

The interrogation of another member of one of the Egyptian murder gangs revealed that he had been sent into Israel territory by Maj. Mustafa Hafez, of the Egyptian Military Intelligence Headquarters at Gaza. In his testimony before a United Nations military observer, the man related that he had been ordered to penetrate deeply into Israel territory. He identified his personal arms which consisted of a Carl Gustaf submachine gun and of 330 bullets. He disclosed that he had been trained at a military camp in the vicinity of Cairo, but that arms had been issued to him at an army camp close to the railway station at Gaza. He had received his pay from Capt. Hamad Amin.

I have the honor to request that the contents of this letter be brought to the attention of the members of the Security Council.

LETTER OF APRIL 11, 1956

Further to my letter of April 10, 1956, I have the honor to bring to your attention the text of a broadcast by Radio Cairo, a government controlled station, made on April 10, 1956, at 06:45 hours.

"The Israelis believed that the Egyptian forces would not reach them and that penetration of any military forces into Israel would bring about intervention of the Great Powers. The operations carried out by the Fedayeen on Saturday last put an end to the quiet enjoyed by Israel. Egyptian Fedayeen reached the town of Migdal. This surprise paralyzed all possible Israeli action. The Fedayeen were able to open fire and to throw hand grenades in the center of the town and they left it ablaze. This event has extraordinary significance because the war is not now confined to firing or attacks along the border but has reached the heart of Israel and places which were believed to be safe from all danger. Following these incidents the whole of the Negev is in a state of tension, preparedness and panic. Inhabitants were ordered not to leave their houses after sunset. Indeed, the quiet reigning in the villages and towns remote from the armistice line has

turned to terror and fear. The recurring incidents proved to the Israelis that inside Israel territory there operate a large number of Fedayeen. Awe inspiring stories on Fedayeen activities circulate in Israel."

Commenting on the broadcast, an Israel foreign ministry spokesman stated on April 10, 1956, that it constituted clear evidence of Egyptian responsibility for the incursion into Israel of Egyptian armed murder and sabotage gangs, the so-called Egyptian Fedayeen.

The spokesman declared that the broadcast boasting of acts of aggression against Israel civilians followed an urgent appeal by Major-General E. L. M. Burns to Colonel Nasser to ensure the cessation of all acts of hostility. He noted that the broadcast was an open declaration of Egypt's aggressive designs. Major-General Burns, he added, had stated that Egyptian responsibility for these acts would place her in the position of an aggressor.

In conclusion, the spokesman drew attention to the fact that while Cairo was making this broadcast, a new wave of aggression was launched against Israel's territory. Acts of sabotage and murder were again renewed in many parts of the southern area of Israel.

I have the honor to request that the contents of this letter be brought to the attention of the members of the Security Council.

LETTER OF APRIL 11, 1956

I have the honor to refer to my letter of April 10 and to inform you of the latest violations of the Egypt-Israel General Armistice Agreement committed by Egypt in Israel territory.

On April 10, 1956, at 16:55 hours, an Israel military command car was mined near Kissufim. Three soldiers were wounded.

This brings the total number of casualties suffered by Israel as a result of the operations of Egyptian murder gangs in Israel territory during the period April 7–10, 1956, to 9 persons killed and 18 wounded. Two of the killed and seven of the wounded were soldiers.

The relative period of quiet which had prevailed since the afternoon of April 10 was broken on April 11 at 17:30 hours when two workers were attacked by hand grenades in an orange grove between Hatzor and Gan Yavne.

At 17:30 hours, an Israel position spotted a group of 15 Egyptian soldiers who had crossed into Israel territory about 2 kilometers west of Erez and opened fire at them. The Egyptian soldiers retreated under cover of strong rifle and submachinegun fire from two Egyptian positions. The exchange of fire lasted for about 30 minutes.

At 19:00 hours, a crowded civilian bus and a civilian truck were fired on while traveling on the main road between Beit Dagon and Sarafand. Six of the bus passengers were wounded.

At approximately 20:30 hours, an Egyptian murder gang entered the Agricultural Boarding School for Boys at Shafrir. They fired on a goup of 12 boys who were in the synagogue saying their evening prayers with their teacher. Three of the boys were killed on the spot. Four other boys were wounded, three of them critically.

This fiendish butchery of young children at the sacred moment of prayer was committed in the heart of Israel territory more than 50 kilometers north of the Gaza strip and only 7 kilometers away from Tel Aviv.

At 21:30 hours, an Israel policeman was shot and wounded near Lod.

At 21:35 hours, hand grenades were thrown into two buildings in Ahiezer about 9 kilometers southeast of Tel Aviv. A man, his wife, and their 18-month-old baby were wounded.

On April 12, mines were found near the water installations at Azikam and at Shafrim.

On April 12, at 12:15 hours, rifle fire was opened by an Egyptian outpost on an Israel outpost near Erez. The fire was returned and the exchange of fire lasted for 20 minutes.

At 12:16 hours, Israel planes intercepted four Egyptian planes flying over Israel territory in the heart of the Negev. Two of the Egyptian planes were piston-engine aircraft and two were Vampire jets. In the ensuing battle one Egyptian Vampire was hit and crashed in flames at Avdat, 10 kilometers south of S'de Boker and about 30 kilometers east of the border. The pilot was wounded and taken prisoner.

The inescapable conclusion from this new series of outrages is that Egypt has dispatched new forces to engage in murder and sabotage inside Israel despite the fact that during the past 24 hours the Secretary-General of the United Nations has been in Cairo, together with Maj. Gen. E. L. M. Burns, trying to persuade Egypt to honor her obligations under the armistice agreement and to refrain from all acts of hostility. The intensified series of hostilities against Israel which has reached its peak in the last 24 hours, seems to be Egypt's answer to these appeals.

I have the honor to request that the contents of this letter be brought to the attention of the members of the Security Council.

Economic NATO No Giveaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following editorial from the May 1 edition of the Washington Evening Star by David Lawrence entitled "Economic NATO No Giveaway":

ECONOMIC NATO NO GIVEAWAY—DULLES' NEW PROPOSAL IS INTERPRETED AS BASED ON DIRECT INTEREST TO UNITED STATES

For several months now there has been a steady propaganda designed to influence American public opinion to give away lots and lots of money to Asia and Europe "with no strings attached."

Many Americans have been duped by the propaganda, and even some Senators are openly saying that America must give away her money through the United Nations or some other group because this would be giving it away "without any strings."

The propaganda is astonishing because it ignores completely that the President and the Secretary of State are going to have a hard time getting Congress to agree to the foreign aid program already proposed, even though most of the money is earmarked specifically for an American purpose—defense.

The "giveaway" folks inside and outside Congress are few in number, but they manage to wield quite a lot of influence. The amazing thing about it all is that they lately have suggested the United Nations as a sort of vehicle for giving away American money to "underdeveloped" countries—but again without America even getting the slightest credit for helping those countries that need it.

It is a curious paradox—the very persons here and abroad who are advocating that America give away her money "without strings" are laying down specific conditions by telling the American taxpayer he must grant funds and expect nothing in return. Uncle Sam has been called "Uncle Sap" in congressional debate many times heretofore, but nobody ever has assumed that the United States Government, under any administration, would be so foolish as to offer billions of dollars—with no questions asked—to nations whose rulers are openly unfriendly to the United States.

Some indication of the peculiar atmosphere that prevails in certain quarters here and in Europe can be observed from the reaction given to the speech of Secretary of State Dulles the other day. He mentioned vaguely that the time had come to expand the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. So obsessed have many observers been with the idea that only money given freely to Europe and Asia can solve all current problems that they immediately jumped to the conclusion that Dulles had capitulated and was getting ready to ask Congress for more money for an "economic" NATO.

The truth is the Secretary of State puts first things first. Unless there is a broadening of NATO on a political basis so that Europe will be able to become more integrated, there isn't much sense of thinking in terms of more economic aid. Even the present program may be jeopardized—and this involves $4.6 billion—unless some way can be found to interrelate security in the Middle East with the security of Western Europe. That's the real objective of broadening NATO. It's basically military.

Dulles wisely put the issue up to Congress on a basis of direct interest to this country. The United States will not engage in any group programs except in relatively small amounts or in any giveaway schemes with no strings attached. Money doesn't grow on trees in the United States, and no other nation is throwing money around without having some assurance of what it is going to achieve by its appropriations. The sooner the rest of the world begins to understand this simple proposition, the sooner will there be a realistic approach to the problems of helping underdeveloped countries, and the sooner also perhaps will the so-called uncommitted countries begin to realize that they can't ride the high horse of indifference to the American taxpayer or pursue neutralism indefinitely.

Dulles, in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said the President, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and he, himself, are all convinced that this expenditure is necessary for the security of the United States.

Dulles sketched the military situations in Korea, Formosa, Vietnam, Japan, the Philippines, and Thailand. He spoke of the alliance of America with Turkey and Pakistan. He said southeast Asia required about $1.8 billion and the Middle East aid of about $800 million. Then he described the needs of NATO in Europe, and estimated that would cost about $1 billion.

Finally, the Secretary said Asia, Europe, the Middle East, and Latin America would require about 83 percent of the mutual-security program for next year. Only 17 percent of the program, however, or about $700 million, is earmarked for use in areas which are threatened by Communist subversion and which contain people, resources, and strategic locations which in our own interests, as well as theirs, should be secure from hostile domination.

Thus does Dulles put the direct interests of the United States plainly before Congress. He will have a hard time getting the money even that way. As for the fuzzy-minded who think there are plenty of billions more available for abstract purposes of prestige or anonymous generosity, they have another guess coming as to when, if ever, any such policy will materialize.

This Nation Under God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD the address given by Father C. J. Steiner, president, University of Detroit, to the Washington pilgrimage on April 29.

Father Steiner spoke at the National Archives Building and it was my pleasure to be among those present to hear this great educator and American:

How appropriate is this setting for the consideration of our theme, This Nation Under God. Through the windows of the historic documents of these Archives we view our past. The stately and majestic monuments of the city itself towering toward the skies proclaim our present position of world leadership with its responsibilities and opportunities.

What does America, its past and its present, mean not only to me but to all mankind? The land so spacious, various, and beautiful excites wonder and admiration. The struggle with frontiers carried on from generation to generation, the spread of plenty and well-being over so vast an area, the unprecedented opportunities afforded young and old for education, philanthropy on a scale never practiced before inspire a sense of confidence and hope. Even more important than land, and schools and material things is man's view of man, the opportunity for man to prove that he can govern himself, the ideal and fact of unity in spite of wide diversity; the confidence that man can be trusted with freedom: freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom to develop his God-given talents without government dictation.

How are we to account for this exciting and dramatic success story of America's past and present? The theme of the Washington pilgrimage suggests the answer: This Nation under God.

In 1776, hundreds of years of Christianity had come and gone. Only in one land, America, in 1776 did men have the courage and vision to translate the truths of the Judeo-Christian tradition into a political philosophy and way of life. Our leadership of the Western World, our material progress and spiritual vitality, our freedom of opportunity under God as individuals, and as a Nation, are undoubtedly the fruits of our substantial loyalty to the political philosophy which is uniquely ours.

Our Nation is truly a religious Nation. Faith in God, the God of the Old and New Testament and faith in freemen as His responsible creatures have inspired our lives and history from the earliest days of the Nation. This faith is embodied in our laws, documents, and in our institutions. How fortunate our Nation has been from the beginning and throughout its history in having as leaders men who were keenly aware of the religious foundations of American democracy and the imperative need of divine providence in the conduct of the affairs of state and men. We are familiar with the Presidential Thanksgiving proclamation of our first President, George Washington: "Whereas it is the duty of our Nation to acknowledge the providence of Almighty God, to obey His will, to be grateful for His benefits and humbly implore His protection and favor, etc." We are all familiar, too, with Washington's Farewell Address of 1796. I quote these lines: "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. * * * Let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion * * * reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in the exclusion of religious principles."

President Dwight D. Eisenhower began his inaugural ceremony with a prayer and frequently throughout his administration has expressed the conviction that we will never begin to understand our Nation and our precious freedom unless and until we realize that our roots are deeply embedded in religious truths.

I pause here to consider the religion that has been at once the inspiration, motivation and source of strength of our Nation. Religion in the traditional American sense does not mean the worship of nature or man or science; nor the totality of human values. By religion is understood the sum of man's duties to himself, to his fellow men, to God, his Creator and Father as far as these duties are made known by reason and divine revelation.

Why and how is religion important in our world of today? It is a naive but common oversimplification to hold that the one big challenge of our day is communism. The economic, political and international conflicts which threaten our very existence are in a large measure due to a moral breakdown. This moral crisis, however, is only the expression of a deeper spiritual crisis. Mores, or ways of life, the requirements of binding obligations are bound up with accepted views of the nature of man and of the world. Over a large part of Europe and Asia binding convictions are lacking and there is confusion, bewilderment and discord. The whole complex of traditional belief, habit and sentiment on which convictions are founded has collapsed. The old gods are dethroned and none have taken their place. The real issue, I am convinced, which confronts us today is not communism, or socialism or totalitarianism, but the nature and dignity and ultimate destiny of the human person. Unless we understand what man is, whose he is, and why he is here on earth, we cannot know what is good and what is bad for him, what is right and what is wrong, what is true and what is false; nor can we know what kind of government or society is to be preferred as far as the real good of man is concerned, and we cannot know the complete answers to these questions about man without the aid of religion.

Since the 17th century man has been experimenting with the possibility of freeing himself from divine revelation. Divorcing himself from faith, rejecting the belief that man is dependent upon God, he has progressively put his faith in human reason and human will. For a time man sought to preserve the Christian ethics while at the same time rejecting the Christian religion. This experiment has borne fruit in the 20th century in the repudiation of reason, in the deterioration of the Christian conscience as freedom has rapidly degenerated into license. Where in former times men looked to God for help in the problems of their personal and national life, they now looked to science and technology. Paradise on earth was substituted for eternal salvation, and this paradise was to be achieved solely by the proper execution of a plan to be discovered in the truths and with the methods of the material sciences. The results of such a concept of man and life are vividly recorded in modern history and in our own times.

I knew a Germany, in fact I lived there, when there was not a Nazi in the land. I was a witness to Adolf Hitler's rise to power. I was still in Europe when Hitler's philosophy prevailed. You know what that philosophy was: "Der staat ist alles, du bist nichts." "The state is everything, the individual is nothing." Good and bad, right and wrong, truth and falsehood, freedom and everything were determined and measured by the good of the state alone. And the good of the state in the Nazi philosophy was prestige and power. "Deutschland uber alles" was more than the words of a song. The Nazi salute was substituted for the sign of the cross. Pictures of Hitler instead of Christ and the saints hung on the walls of civic buildings and homes. The world will never forget man's inhumanity toward man that marked that era of the world's history. Germany itself will always regret the scars left upon its land and people because the true God was denied, and the true nature of man and his destiny forgotten or distorted.

Twin of the Nazi philosophy of life is that of Soviet Russia today. To Soviet Russia the individual person is nothing, has no rights, no freedoms, no destiny except that of an atom of mass to be merged with other atoms to become the massman. Temporarily, the state is important, but only until such a time as when the ultimate objective of communism is achieved, an impossible, fantastic earthly paradise, utopia. The way to this utopia is through conflict. The present status of human persons is slavery, degradation, and terror. The root cause of what is happening in Russia is a wrong concept of man, his nature, and his destiny; and the explanation of this wrong concept is the shutting out of the land the one source of light that is adequate to give us a clear and certain understanding of human life. That source of light is, of course, religion.

We will do well to learn from the present and from the past, to be humble enough and wise enough too, to look to religion, to Divine revelation to give us an adequate and right view of the nature of man and the meaning of life. Religion is necessary to obtain a complete view of life for religion deals with ideas, facts, things, words; it runs through all of life. It is life itself. A fact is a fact whether it be discovered in a biological laboratory or revealed by God. In a city of man from which God is banned, man's view of life will be forever incomplete. Philosophy and science of their very natures give only partial answers to the world riddle. How can history be understood unless the part played by Christ the Son of God be shown. He is the central figure of history, the Son of God, and not as the positivists, naturalists, and humanists would have it, merely a wandering Galilean carpenter deserving a place in the friezing of history along with Aristotle, Pluto, Socrates, Marcus Aurelius.

A psychology that refuses to face the facts of revelation concerning the nature and destiny of the human soul is, by so much, a truncated and untrue psychology. Indeed, greater knowledge and appreciation of our human nature can conceivably be gained by taking into due consideration the facts of sin, the incarnation and redemption of the human race, than can be secured by 10,000 brass instrument experiments in a psychological laboratory. In regard to the role of religion in political science, a science with which we must daily occupy ourselves as American citizens, I quote here John Hollowall, professor of political science at Duke University: "The way in which we conceive of the end of the state depends upon what we conceive to be the end of man. Before we can decide whether a policy is a good one, whether it will promote the best interests of human beings we must first ask ourselves: What is man? What is his essential nature and ultimate destiny? And in seeking the answers to these questions we may well ask an additional question, namely, who is man? It is not indeed the function of political science to answer these questions, but political science cannot adequately fulfill the tasks peculiar to it until it sought the answers to these questions and sought them

from the disciplines most competent to answer them.

"The political scientist cannot know whether the means he prescribes are appropriate, adequate, and possible unless he knows the nature of man and the end for which he is destined. For knowledge concerning the nature of man and that which is good for him as a human being, political science must, of necessity, look outside of itself to other disciplines. It must look to psychology, to philosophy, and especially to ethics and religion."

I wish to take a moment here to say a word about freedom in the traditional American sense and its relationship to our religious heritage. The traditional American concept of freedom is built on the conviction that there are truths, objective truths, that always were and always will be. Some of these truths are self-evident, others can be known from reason, still others are revealed by God. To hold that there is a changeless truth is in no way in conflict with the freedom that should characterize an intelligent citizenry. Actually, objective truth is a prerequisite to freedom. Academic freedom, for example, means the right of a competent professor to teach his class without any control except that of his own conscience. This is a definition which I feel confident would find favor with any member of the teaching profession. What does it mean? First, it certainly does not mean the right of a teacher to instruct as he personally pleases, irrespective of truth. Freedom implies not only that we are free from external coercion, or pressure, but also that we are free for something. That something is the acquisition, preservation, and communication of truth.

Our Founding Fathers did not shake off their chains and then ramble around in irresponsible liberty. That would have been not freedom but mere license. The historical fact is that our Founding Fathers created a democratic charter that expressed positive goals toward which America would direct its energies.

Freedom implies, too, moral responsibility, and in the case of academic freedom the responsibility to teach the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. I am aware that there are Americans today who hold that a teacher must not be dismissed even if he is a thousand times wrong. Why? The basic reason must be that the university authorities are not sure of any truth. They do not believe that objective truth exists. To them, all truth is relative. Hence, assent to any proposition is necessarily hesitating and provisional. They are reluctant to condemn obvious error for fear that it may become truth tomorrow.

I hold that this position is not only absurd but that it is a tragic abdication of our responsibility to youth. It is also a source of the feeling of uncertainty and insecurity so prevalent today. If we are dedicated to truth we must be the relentless, unremitting enemy of error. It is commendable to create and maintain an atmosphere of free inquiry and bold experiment, but after all these are only means to an end, and the end is the attainment of truth. A person more interested in free discussion than in truth itself is like a quarterback who is more interested in talking of plays than in making touchdowns.

In conclusion I wish to make the following statement with all the emphasis and sincerity of which I am capable. A whole world of peoples, if not governments, looks to us for light and strength and ultimate security. Military strength is imperative; highways and skyways with cars and planes, houses and schools and all the material things that the most advanced technology makes possible are desirable and even necessary. More important, however, is the soul of America drawing its light and strength from our religious heritage. It is the preserving and strengthening of this soul of America that we and all Americans should dedicate ourselves not only during these days of special pilgrimage and ceremony but always. This dedication will mean peace and truth and prosperity not only to us but to all mankind.

American Committee on Italian Migration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly fitting that the American Committee on Italian Migration, which is a member agency of the National Catholic Resettlement Council, receive credit for the many worthy services it has rendered. During his recent visit to this country, President Gronchi of Italy paid some richly deserved compliments to the work of the committee. He pointed out that the committee has done a splendid job of implementing the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 and also paid tribute to President Eisenhower's initiative in calling for more liberal immigration laws.

At a conference held recently in Rochester, N. Y., it was pointed out that the resettlement committee in that city ranks ninth in the country in sponsoring refugees. Under the chairmanship of the Honorable Charles P. Lambiase, the Rochester chapter of ACIM has compiled a remarkable record of resettling refugees and immigrants.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of President Gronchi's remarks before a group of ACIM leaders in New York City, and an article telling of the conference of upper New York State chairmen and officers of the American Committee on Italian Migration, held in Rochester on April 8. Both pieces appeared in the April issue of the American Committee on Italian Migration Dispatch:

REMARKS OF PRESIDENT GRONCHI

It is indeed a great pleasure for me on this occasion of a meeting with the leaders of the American Committee on Italian Migration to express to your President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, the appreciation of my people for his interest in the need for Italian migration. Through his state of the Union message and subsequently through his special message to Congress, the Chief Executive of the United States has outlined a sympathetic program designed to modify existing legislation on migration.

This program is most vital. The Watkins bill (Refugee Relief Act of 1953) under the provisions of which 28,000 Italians per year have been able to emigrate to the United States, is due to expire at the end of 1956. We Italians greatly appreciate that it contributed toward solving the problem of our surplus manpower but we feel that after its expiration, the reversion to the permanent quota of some 5,000 Italian immigrants per year would be both incomprehensible and unrealistic.

I am certain that both Congress and the people of the United States will understand the spirit that motivated President Eisenhower to make certain recommendations which are of extreme importance to our country.

I am also certain that the American Committee on Italian Migration (ACIM) which has been a vital factor in the successful implementation of the Refugee Relief Act will continue to be of invaluable assistance in the work of disseminating to the American public the urgency of new and even more generous provisions and legislation that will aid Italian migration.

My heartiest compliments to the American Committee on Italian Migration for the good work it has done and my best wishes for the success of their future efforts which have been given impetus by the initiative of the President of the United States in the interest of an ever-growing friendship and cooperation between our two countries.

ROCHESTER HOLDS UP-STATE ACIM CONFERENCE—BISHOP KEARNEY PRESIDES AND ADDRESSES DELEGATES

A conference of upper New York State chairmen and officers of the American Committee on Italian Migration at which the Most Reverend James E. Kearney, D. D., presided and served as honorary chairman, was held at the Manger Rochester Hotel in Rochester on Sunday, April 8, under the auspices of the Rochester ACIM chapter.

Bishop Kearney welcomed the delegates and addressed them on the importance of the work, emphasizing that "the objectives of ACIM are founded upon the virtue of Christian charity" and that ACIM's work, "is American, for this country has always given help to immigrants." He concluded with a word of congratulations for what has been accomplished and with a blessing for continued success in the future.

Following a luncheon, the meeting was opened by the Honorable Charles P. Lambiase, chairman of the Rochester ACIM chapter who introduced the Honorable Joseph Farbo, vice mayor of the city. Mr. Farbo extended an official welcome to all the delegates and pledged the wholehearted cooperation of the city administration to the ACIM program. Credit for the outstanding success of the meeting goes to Judge Lambiase and the Reverend Albert L. Simonetti, priest consultant of the Rochester ACIM chapter. Others from Rochester who participated in the conference are: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Arthur E. Ratigan, Rochester resettlement director; Dr. P. Frederic Metildi, conference vice chairman; Mr. Louis A. Valenza, arrangements chairman; Mr. Joseph A. Anzalone, arrangements cochairman; Miss Marlene J. De Mattia, field liaison, Rochester resettlement committee; Mr. Antonio D'Agostino, conference secretary; Attorney Thomas Laverne, publicity; Dr. Frank J. Gianforti, reception chairman, and Miss Alma Pavia, recording secretary.

Judge Marchisio and the Reverend Caesar Donanzan were present to take part in the proceedings as were chapter chairmen and officers from Niagara Falls, Buffalo, Syracuse, Utica, Amsterdam, and other upstate cities.

Father Donanzan complimented the assistance of Rt. Rev. Msgr. A. E. Ratigan, who as director of the resettlement committee of Rochester, has appointed Miss Marlene De Mattia, field liaison, Rochester resettlement committee, to the work of resettling the refugees and immigrants. Monsignor Ratigan stated that from February 1956, Rochester had processed 732 assurances, mostly for Italians, which would permit the issuance of more than 2,000 visas. He and Miss De Mattia guaranteed another 200 assurances within the next few weeks. He was proud to state that Rochester ranks ninth in the country for sponsoring refugees.

Judge Marchisio, in his speech, recapitulated the accomplishments of ACIM which

through its more than 90 chapters and in conjunction with the National Catholic Resettlement Council, have made the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 a complete success as far as the Italian phase of the program guaranteeing 60,000 visas for Italians is concerned.

Testimony of Former Senator William Benton on Shortage of Scientific and Engineering Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the testimony of William Benton, publisher, Encyclopedia Britannica, and former Member of the United States Senate from Connecticut, before the Subcommittee on Research and Development of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

Mr. Chairman, I do not know how to begin my testimony better than by quoting your own words. In the preface to your committee's new report—Engineering and Scientific Manpower in the United States, Western Europe, and Soviet Russia—your opening lines are these:

"It should be no secret that the United States is in desperate danger of falling behind the Soviet world in a critical field of competition—the life-and-death field of competition in the education and training of adequate numbers of scientists, engineers, and technicians. But although it is not a secret, the facts have not sunk into the public mind."

In these two sentences you went straight to the heart of the matter. If we Americans are to meet a radical challenge with a radical answer our first need is to focus the gaze of the Congress and the public on the gauntlet that has been flung at us. Our first need is to arouse our people and our legislative representatives from their sleepwalking, to arouse them to the accelerating danger. Our second requirement is to hammer out the solutions.

Among those who have sought the facts, there is little disagreement about them. I cannot recall a post-Korean issue coming to the Congress where the facts, as distinct from policy, have been clearer. If there is disagreement about the facts, it is only as to whether they are alarming or catastrophic. Your committees' report seems to put Dean John Dunning, of the Columbia University Engineering School, in the latter camp. He said:

"As it stands, nothing can be done to prevent the Russians from gaining on us in scientific and technical manpower at a ratio of 2 to 1. Already we have lost the battle of engineering manpower—at least in numbers."

I have read British studies on Soviet professional manpower, and I have reviewed the impressive 400-page study by Dr. Nicholas DeWitt, of Harvard, which forms the basis of your committee's summary. In my judgment, and on the basis of my interviews with leaders of Soviet education, Dr. DeWitt is too conservative in his recital of Soviet achievements. I do not believe he gives sufficient weight to the mounting momentum of Soviet educational growth. The Soviet decision to make compulsory its basic 10-year school—to make this compulsory for all boys and girls from 7 to 17, thus adding 3 years to the former minimum—was decreed only in 1951. It is to be achieved by 1960. I was told in Moscow and Kiev that it is already 70 percent realized, with the full 10-year program now effective in all cities. There seemed to be little doubt that this will be 100 percent by the end of the current 5-year plan. This in itself will constitute an enormous spurt forward in the training of Soviet manpower.

Dr. DeWitt tells us the Soviets sometimes withhold figures, and sometimes change the statistical base unexpectedly, but that in this area at least, they never practice outright fraud. The figure I was given for enrollment in higher institutions—1,825,000—was about 100,000 higher than his. My figure on enrollment in the tekhnikums—2,500,000—exceeds his by about 800,000. My figures are somewhat more recent. They may indicate the accelerating momentum.

Questions of judgment enter here. Mr. Khrushchev announced in February that all tuition fees in the Soviet Union are to be abolished this fall. Is not this a still further indication of the Soviet drive to develop and exploit the full potentialities of its manpower? How far will such a drive succeed, and how rapidly? My judgment is that both the chance and the speed of success are higher than statistical tables could possibly reveal.

We want our statisticians, our experts, to be cautious, to provide the qualifications and the footnotes, and to point up the exceptions. The task of statesmanship, the task of this committee, is to see the larger meaning, to interpret and propose and persuade, and to look ahead and guess the future and prepare the American people for it.

Your report shows that the number of trained engineers in the U. S. S. R. increased from 41,000 in 1929 to 541,000 in 1954—an increase of 500,000 in 25 years—or 1,300 percent. In the United States our increase was from 215,00 to 500,000 in approximately the same period—about 225 percent. Your report shows that the number of engineers graduating from Soviet higher institutes increased from 28,000 in 1950 to 63,000 in 1955. In the same period the number of engineering graduates in the United States plummeted from 52,000 down to 23,000. There is reason to believe the trend is being reversed in the United States. But there is no reason to believe it is being reversed in the U. S. S. R. Let us remember Mr. Khrushchev's exclamation to the people of India last December: "We shall see who has more engineers, the United States or the Soviet Union."

Soviet gains in the production of scientists, especially research scientists, are equally startling, though by comparison less dismaying.

How can these trends be dramatized so that we can produce the actions the crisis demands? Surely not merely through the tables of figures in the smallest type of the Government Printing Office. The GPO could make Patrick Henry sound about as inflammatory as a tired dishrag.

Let us first ask, what accounts for public and congressional apathy? Why have the facts "not sunk into the public mind?" In part this may be because the administration keeps talking about the defeats it has inflicted on the Soviet Union. Mr. Dulles even hinted last year that the Soviets are on the verge of collapse. But there is a deeper reason. It is our American folklore. Our folklore says that Russians are either moody philosophers or crafty peasants. They don't know what to do with machines. Our folklore says that Americans are the world's greatest inventors and the world's best mechanics and gadgeteers; we subscribe to the belief that God gave us extraordinary talent for "know-how." How can anyone learn to make or handle machines better than we Americans do; and especially, how can the Russians?

Everyone who has had to deal with public opinion knows it's easier to utilize folklores, and the cliches of folklore, than to change them. In this case we must change them. Only last month came a story from Moscow which gave me wry amusement, a kind of man-bites-dog story. A Texas corporation, no less, was granted the right to manufacture a Soviet turbodrill, no less. This drill was developed by the Soviet petroleum industry for diggings wells through hard rock. The New York Times said it was "10 times as fast as our conventional rotary drill." Detroit engineers report report automation matching our best. Each day and week there is a new story of Soviet technological advances.

When I was Assistant Secretary of State 10 years ago the Soviets were entering a particularly chauvinistic phase. They were laying claim in their world propaganda to one great invention after another, most notably radio. We wondered when they would claim credit for baseball. I wrote to my editor in chief of Britannica, Mr. Walter Yust, a good Taft Republican who reads the Chicago Tribune every morning, and asked, What about these claims? He replied, in effect, let's not discount them without examination. He reminded me of the scientific tradition of 19th century Russia. He reminded me that in the first decade of the 20th century more world patents were applied for by Russian inventors than by the inventors of any other nation. The Russian economy wasn't then capable of developing the inventions, so the Russians tended not to get the credit. Gentlemen, there's no doubt that the Russian economy today, which is expanding at a much more rapid rate than our own, is capable of developing its own—and other people's—inventions.

Further, some people have liked to delude themselves by explaining away Soviet advances in nuclear explosives and nuclear energy, and in the development of guided missiles and in other fields, as the achievements of captured German scientists, or as due to espionage. Others have deluded themselves by placing too great weight on the deadening effect of political dogmas or interference on scientific thought. The degree to which the scientists and engineers have been imposed on by the politicians has in my view been greatly exaggerated. Many Soviet engineers and scientists are not members of the party. The Marxist-Leninist dialectic does not impinge itself on the physical and mathematical sciences—at least to any degree that bothers a creative scientist. The most spectacular example of such interference in biology, the Lysenko theory in genetics, now seems headed for the ashcan.

Finally, some people may like to console themselves with the thought that the quality of Soviet scientific and technical education (training is perhaps a better word) is inferior to ours. The curriculum of the Soviet 10-year school should explode that myth—if we can get our people to listen: 5 years of physics, 5 years of biology, and 4 of chemistry compulsory for all students; 10 years of mathematics, up through trigonometry, and 1 of astronomy, compulsory for all.

I saw at firsthand something of the rigor and discipline of the Soviet school system—the long hours, the 6 days a week and 10 months a year at school, the vacations which included compulsory work in factory or on farm, the frequent and searching examinations.

The contrast with our own primary-secondary-school curriculum is startling. Lewis Strauss, chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, recently told the Thomas Alva Edison Foundation: "I can learn of no public high school in our country where a student obtains so thorough a preparation in science and mathematics, even if he seeks it—even if he should be a potential Einstein, Edison,

Fermi or Bell." What Admiral Strauss is saying amounts to this: Every youngster in the Soviet Union gets a better scientific grounding than any youngster in the United States. As an aside, I point out to the committee that, with our long summer vacations, dating back to the days when the young people were needed for work on the farms, and with our light schedules of academic work, we keep the youngsters in public school for 12 years and achieve far less than the Russians and other Europeans do in 10. (A quick way to relieve the teacher shortage would be to squeeze 2 needless years out of our system; and this, with a 10-month school year, would make it very easy greatly to raise the salaries of competent teachers, even on present budgets.)

At the level of higher training in the U. S. S. R. we have Dean Dunning's statement that "on the master's and doctorial levels they (the Soviets) appear to have been giving degrees to probably 3 or 4 times as many as we have."

Out of the 67 members of the Council of Ministers of the U. S. S. R., 39—more than half—have had a scientific or technical education. Mr. Yelutin, the Minister of Higher Education, whose ministry controls the 33 Soviet universities and shares control of the 800 or more technical institutes, is a metallurgist.

Let me now add a new dimension to the urgency of the problem posed for us by the new Soviet threat—a dimension you would scarcely deduce from studying the mere statistics. Manifestly we are worried because technology can change the balance of military power. That is worry enough. Further, we are worried because technology, through its impact on heavy industry, can change the world balance of economic power.

The problem, however, is wider and deeper than both these concerns suggest. These two apprehensions, though they are real enough, do not sufficiently take into account the new Soviet tactics of "competitive coexistence." I have seen no comment—other than my own cries of distress—about what the rise of Soviet science and technology is doing and can do to the "psychological power balance." I am not fearful that the Soviets will outdo us in the export of automobiles, or tractors, or business machines; these earn for us not only money but envy. I am upset about the Soviet talent and capacity for exporting ideas. They are today producing almost three times as many new engineers as we are, yet their own industrial capacity is still only half the size of ours. What will happen to this growing crop of trained men? Bulganin at the 20th Soviet Congress in February said that under the new 5-year plan, 4 million graduate technicians would pour out of Soviet institutions, as many as under the last two 5-year plans put together. Where will they go? Most assuredly a substantial block will be exported. Every graduate, as at West Point and Annapolis, is, for the first 3 years, under orders from the state, which paid for his education. The Soviet scientists, engineers, and technicians can be sent anywhere in the world, just as though they were frontline troops. The countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America are hungering for the knowledge and know-how these men command.

The new propaganda of the Kremlin, emphasizing economic, political, and ideological competition, clearly reveals the long-range Soviet plan—a plan so potent as to make military maneuvering seem by comparison tactical and even diversionary. Central to it is this schooling for export of scores of thousands of indoctrinated and capable engineers, scientists, schoolmasters, and technicians of all kinds. These are being trained to help convert the world to communism. In Burma last December Khrushchev and Bulganin offered to build and staff a technological institute in Rangoon, "a gift to the people of Burma from the people of the Soviet Union," as they put it. An advance guard of technicians is now in India, in connection with the steel mill the Soviets are building for India. A technical institute has also been offered to India, and enticing inducements have been advanced to Egypt, Afghanistan, and Latin America.

Did you notice that 6 years of foreign-language study is compulsory for every Russian boy and girl in his first 10 years of schooling, and that further foreign-language study is required in higher education? I was astonished in Moscow to learn that there are some schools where all the teaching is conducted in a foreign language. Thus, my son, John, age 13, visited a school in Moscow where everything except Russian literature is taught in English. The name of this school is Moscow School No. 1. English, by the way, is the favorite foreign language. It is the new language of science, and gives access, with Russian, to the world's scientific literature.

I have a suggestion to you this morning on how you can begin to convey some sense of the urgency of this new problem—at least to your colleagues here on the Hill. You aren't likely to do it with statistics. Even though I had spent weeks preparing for my trip of last fall, including 2 weeks in London, I was aroused myself only by my first-hand exposure to what is going on.

On my first day in the Soviet Union I toured the huge Lenin Library in Leningrad. I gathered that I was the second American since the war to visit it. Its director claims it houses 12 million volumes. Every desk and chair in the great reading rooms adjacent to the scientific stacks was occupied; the silence was absolute; the concentrated zeal of hundreds upon hundreds of earnest-looking students was to me a bit breathtaking. I said to my librarian guide, "Are these students from the university?" "Oh, no," he replied, "the university has its own library; these are workers from the night shifts of the factories, and by night our reading rooms are crowded with those from the day shifts. We operate day and night. This is how the workers prepare for examinations for advance training in the universities and the institutes."

One sees youngsters in their mid-teens, and young Russian married couples, in the bookstores browsing at the sections featuring scientific works; they buy books on nuclear physics in preference to novels or handbooks on interior decoration. This is how to get ahead in Soviet society today.

In Moscow I spent several hours with the pro-rector of the University of Moscow, Professor Vovchenko, a chemist. The unversity, which enrolls 23,000 students, dominates the city. Its gleaming new 33-story central tower is dedicated to the sciences. The recent investment of 3 billion rubles for this new building, completed in 1953, is astonishing by our standards. It is equivalent to at least $150 million, figuring the ruble as 5 cents, the lowest estimate of its value given anywhere. Thus this building cost more than has been spent for the complete physical plant of all but a very few American universities. It contains 1,900 laboratory rooms. It symbolizes to all Russia what lies ahead in the fulfillment of Soviet ambitions for youth. Here work most of the 2,000 professors of the University of Moscow who teach students. Here, too, are the 500 scholars dedicated to research, from whom no teaching is expected. All 2,500 must seek to make their own individual scientific contributions in the laboratories. If they don't they are fired. Those who succeed receive the highly prized doctorate, a top or super degree for which we have no equivalent. The impact of that structure, which can be seen from everywhere in Moscow, and the busy life within it, can convey the sense of urgency far more vividly than most statistics.

In Kiev I visited a tekhnikum. Dr. De Witt estimates there are some 3,700 tehknikums in the U. S. S. R. They are a unique Soviet institution—a kind of vocational college producing "middle-trained" specialists. For example, a tehnikum maintained by the Ministry of Health will produce "feldshers," graduates about halfway between the level of a nurse and a doctor. The tekhnikums give 4-year courses for those who have finished 7 primary and secondary grades, or 2 or 2½ year courses for those who have completed the 10-year school. Soon all tekhnikum sudents will be 10-year graduates.

My Kiev tekhnikum is 1 of 50 maintained throughout the Soviet Union by the Ministry of Coal and Coke. It is a sprawling brick building, not very different in appearance from a large city high school in the United States. As with too many of our own big city schools, the overall effect of the exterior is dingy.

The director told us that his tekhnikum, of which he was immensely proud, taught courses in four special fields of coal mining: the construction of coal mines, the construction of coal mine buildings, roadbuilding for coal mines, and the construction and use of communications equipment in coal mining. Eleven years ago his school had only 255 students. Now it has 2,500 and a faculty of 88.

He bustled us down a hall and into a laboratory. Here the machines began and the shabbiness ended. The laboratory was stocked with expensive machinery and electric models of coal-mining equipment. Some of the models, the director said, were made by his students. The more elaborate ones had been built to order at factories, with parts of the operating mechanism visible through openings in the sides.

The department head had been warned of our coming, and was eager to show us how each of his models worked. Oozing confidence and enthusiasm, he led us to laboratory after laboratory. The variety and excellence of the equipment astonished me. Surely few, if any, of our own technical schools can match such equipment. Manifestly it was worth hundreds of thousands of rubles, and the director went so far as to place the value at "millions." I think he was right.

In another laboratory, there was a large and detailed model of the entire transportation system of a modern mine, including a complete electric train. Another showed a mine's complete electrical system, and still another showed a telephone system, switchboard and all. There was a 50-foot long "coal combine," a huge machine that eats its way right into the face of the coal, picks it up, cuts it in chunks, and carries it away. One room, more than 50 feet long, had 40 or 50 big machines lined up along the walls, something like pictures on the walls of a museum, many equipped with elaborate dials and meters. Again, the department head wanted to push all the buttons for us.

The problem of getting students to apply "voluntary" for a coal-mining tekhnikum interested me because I don't believe that coal mining, even at the technician level, is exactly popular as a career in the United States. The director intimated that this problem is solved by propaganda and promises. As he put it, the graduates of the 10-year schools are "guided" into specific tekhnikums by what he called the process of popularization. This is a fine Soviet propaganda phrase designed to obscure the fact that the students have far less choice of fields than they may think. By incentives and scholarships, as well as "popularization" in the form of the propaganda of the various ministries which operate the tekhnikums, the students are siphoned into aeronautical engineering, let us say, instead of into history (where scholarships are rare).

The director of the Kiev tekhnikum told us that the graduates of his school would be sent to the coal mines, perhaps in the Donetz Basin of the Ukraine, where an alumnus might work as a foreman or in any number of supervisory positions. We had an appointment with the mayor of Kiev, but our tekhnikum director was gladly prepared to make us late for it. Again and again he delayed our departure, insisting that we see "just one more room, just one more laboratory." Even when we finally made the break, explaining that we had only 4 minutes in which to drive across the city to meet the mayor, the director was still saying, "just one more."

That episode left me with more sense of urgency than most statistics possibly can.

So here is my proposal: I urge the entire membership of this subcommittee to go to the Soviet Union and see for yourselves. Let us apply for visas which put to the test "the spirit of Geneva," the new Soviet propaganda slogan which was being hammered in all media when I was in Russia. Apply for the visas now, so that you will be sure to have them by the time Congress is ready to adjourn. Take some key members of the Appropriations Committees along with you. Visit the Ministries of Education and of Higher Education, and the various government ministries which finance the technological institutes and the tekhnikums. Visit the universities, and the technical institutes, and the 10-year schools. Talk to the students, and watch them at work. You will come back prepared to convey that sense of urgency which is so urgently necessary. You will also come back with some very good speeches, perhaps even some campaign issues.

Ten years ago, as Assistant Secretary of State, back in the days when there were only a few Assistant Secretaries and we thought we amounted to something, I was trying to create our Nation's first peacetime program of international information. I faced the same kind of apathy—indeed the same kind of folklore: "propaganda" was a horrid word, and Americans didn't practice it. Further, after the 1946 election of the 80th Congress, my operation became a party issue. I was told that I didn't have the basic legislative authorization. And I didn't have the understanding attention of the Appropriations Committees. So I went from office to office up here on the Hill, arguing that the committees involved should go abroad and appraise the problem, and appraise for themselves the need for our operation. They did so, and I believe that is the chief reason the Smith-Mundt Act was passed. At the time I was told that my efforts blazed the path for the subsequent and widespread practice by committees of the House and Senate of making study-trips abroad. With the aid of a few friendly editorial writers, I helped kill the journalistic idea that such trips were junkets. The word stayed dead until the ill-fated Cohn and Schine.

What should you then seek to do, once the acuteness of the problem has broken through into congressional and public consciousness? I have a few suggestions which I do not pretend are comprehensive or adequate, but which are at least a very good beginning.

We cannot duplicate in this country the full array of pressures and incentives the Soviet Union is able to bring to bear on its young people—and we wouldn't want to duplicate it if we could. Theirs is a highly centralized, push-button system. The curriculum is standardized throughout the Soviet Union right up to what we would call the graduate-school level, with only one basic choice open to the student, the seeming choice of a career which he makes at the end of the 10-year school. If he's bright enough and is well advised, he will aim at maximum training which brings not only rich rewards but also draft exemption.

To the usual incentives of patriotism and of pride in national progress, Communist leaders have added most tangible allures to prospective scientists and engineers. They have made the life of science among the most satisfying in the Soviet Union.

A typical Soviet professor gets 6,000 rubles a month, 10 times the average workman's 600 to 700 rubles. An outstanding Soviet engineer or research scientist can earn up to 40,000 rubles a month, when his outside consulting fees are included. In comparative standard of living, this would put him in the class of big-time American corporation presidents. Indeed, how many corporation presidents earn 70 or 80 times as much as their file clerks? The contrast has been so extreme in the Soviet Union that a dispatch in the New York Times last week reported that the big pay and prerequisites are going to be reduced. But we can be sure they will still provide plenty of incentive to the scientists and engineers.

Mr. Chairman, I want to quote once more from your own preface:

"I recognize (you say) that the question of general Federal aid to schools is a controversial subject.* * * I suggest we could reach agreement that, since it is a constituted Federal function to provide for the common defense, Federal spending is proper to provide enough well-trained engineers and scientists to sustain our security in an age of great scientific breakthroughs."

Mr. Chairman, no one who has looked into this momentous problem can quarrel with that proposition.

I have mentioned the developing Soviet program to use its engineers to outmatch our technical assistance program—our point 4. Yet, according to my information, the United States is finding it increasingly difficult to persuade qualified people to go abroad on our technical-aid missions. And indeed, why shouldn't a young engineer prefer to build his career in Bridgeport or Topeka, rather than in Kabul or Jakarta? Why indeed? If your son were an engineer and he were choosing between Pratt & Whitney in Connecticut or the Irrawaddy River of Burma—which choice would you advise if you wanted him healthy and wealthy?

I suggested one answer to this national problem at the memorial luncheon this year for former Secretary of War Patterson, known to many of you. That is the creation by the United States Government of Technical Assistance Academies, comparable to the United States Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies, but designed to produce foreign-aid specialists. In the Journal of the Foreign Service Association I read recently of a proposal for a career service in technical assistance. Of this I am doubtful, but my proposed academies should require 3 years' service overseas from the graduates, in return for their free education, and from such beginnings I agree that a career service could develop. These technical academies or institutes should be operated in conjunction with existing high-level institutions such as MIT and the California Institute of Technology. The entire student body should be fully supported while in school, and be given a special status under the draft such as reserve commissions on graduation.

These "West Points of point 4" should teach not only engineering and technical subjects adapted to the needs of underdeveloped nations. They should include emphasis on the recognition of human values, including the use of educational techniques, and they should insist on a thorough grounding in liberal arts designed to help graduates to become symbols and spokesmen abroad of our concepts of freedom and justice.

West Point was founded, and was sustained in its early years, not only to provide an officer corps for our Army but to train the engineers needed for the development of the West. Wasn't it our first engineering school? Would we even have had it when we did without the crying need of the West for engineers?

I concede that a chain of such academies would serve only a limited function, measured against the problem posed by the Soviet threat. Further, I concede that the institutes would take time to build and that we must promote a program at once.

What we require today, and at once, as Chairman PRICE says, is a "crash program." How can this be launched, and at once? It seems to me that the beginning of such a "crash program" must consist of Federal scholarships on a dramatic scale.

Last month in Chicago, before the Association for Higher Education, I proposed a national competitive scholarship program beginning with 20,000 scholarships a year, each covering 4 years of college. I further proposed that this number should be increased as rapidly as the administration of the program and the absorptive capacity of the colleges and universities permit—to a level of 100,000 scholarships a year. To these should be added 20,000 or more graduate fellowships. Trained manpower, I said, is like money in the bank for the United States. It is our most important national resource. Premier Bulganin referred to Soviet trained manpower as "our (Soviet) gold reserve."

Our United States high schools abound with talent worthy of such scholarships. Secretary Folsom recently cited an estimate that "each year about 60,000 students of high ability drop out of high school before graduation * * * and half of the students in the upper one-fourth of their high school classes do not go on to college." Dr. Dael Wolfle tells us that 150,000 pupils from each yearly age and class who could enter the important specialties fail to go to college. About half fail to go on because of the cost, another half because of lack of incentive. Both conditions are curable. All who look into the matter agree that for every student in an American college, we have another of equal ability who doesn't get in. Of the top 20 percent of our high school youngsters, two-thirds don't finish college. In my judgment, the main reason is economic.

We would be perfectly justified, in view of the emergency we have been discussing, in earmarking a proportion of any proposed Federal scholarship program for science or engineering, or indeed even of initiating the far larger program with scholarships and fellowships limited to the areas we are discussing.

When I mention priorities for scientists and engineers I don't for a moment mean to suggest that more scientists and more engineers will solve our problems. For our national defense, and our national well-being, we need better educated citizens in many fields—political scientists, historians, and psychologists, for example—and we need them as much as or possibly even more than we need engineers. I am willing to give engineering, physics, and chemistry a short-run priority because there is an emergency shortage in these fields. But I fear the dangers in a lop-sided program of Federal aid, one which is geared too heavily to the sciences. I have just seen figures on the first 359 boys who have won the newly established national merit scholarships. The boys were chosen without regard to career choice. They rate for the moment as our "brightest boys." They won the philanthropic jackpot comparable to the $64,000 question. Sixty-three percent of them now choose engineering and scientific research as their future careers. Let us not ignore the danger that too high a proportion of our best young talent can be funneled into science and engineering. They are needed elsewhere at least as much.

I realize there are many complications in my Federal scholarship proposal. Who should administer the scholarships? One of the most significant steps taken by the Congress in this area in recent years has been the establishment of the National Science Foundation. Its budget, however, is far too small. It is today supporting about 2 percent of all graduate students in science, mathematics and engineering. Whether it should attempt to administer a huge program at the undergraduate level I cannot say.

I have a further immediate suggestion. I heard recently that only 125 new teachers of physics were available last year for the 28,000 high schools of the United States. The reasons are several, but I believe a partial cure could be achieved by paying substantially higher salaries to high school teachers of mathematics and the natural sciences. If mathematics and the sciences are harder to learn, and harder to teach, why shouldn't the teachers in those fields get higher salaries? And should they not be exempted or deferred by Selective Service? If a young man is more likely to secure exemption or deferment as a physics teacher than as an English teacher, or than as an employee of General Electric, will we not secure more high-school physics teachers?

My comment here is subject to the same qualification I made about scholarships. I believe we must come in the long run to Federal assistance of teachers in many fields.

Mr. Chairman, many other proposals could be made. I happen to be chairman of a company that makes classroom motion pictures, Encyclopaedia Britannica Films. You would be dismayed to see how slowly the educational world adapts itself to advances in the technology of education itself. And as Mr. Philip Coombs, research director of the fund for the advancement of education, told you in testimony last week—the possibilities in bringing technology to the classroom are "wonderful to contemplate."

Another grave problem is the control exercised by teachers' colleges, which some call monopolistic. An honor graduate in physics from Yale cannot teach physics in the public schools of my home State of Connecticut until he has earned a certificate from a State teachers college. Neither can a Princeton physics cum laude, in New Jersey. These are problems you no doubt regard as outside your power or purview.

Let me conclude with this thought: Education is one area where we in America most surely have nothing to lose if we accept Soviet claims and the Soviet challenge. Intercontinental competition in education need be no challenge to an arms race or a war. If the Russians goad us to do a better educational job ourselves, then we shall only do what our own best tradition calls for—what we should be doing even if the Soviet Union were to sink suddenly into the sea. But if we are complacent about our educational efforts and system, if we allow ourselves to fall behind the Russians, we may find ourselves outwitted, outmaneuvered, outthought, and outbuilt throughout the world.

The Small-Business Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct to the attention of our colleagues the following letter, forwarded to me on April 28, 1956, by Mr. Daniel F. Caldemeyer, president of the National Furniture Manufacturing Co., Inc., of Evansville, Ind. I am in complete accord with Mr. Caldemeyer's view that action must be taken to relieve the Federal income-tax burden on small business.

NATIONAL FURNITURE MANUFACTURING CO., INC.,
Evansville, Ind., April 28, 1956.

Hon. Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Being a small-business man and having a small business located in the Farm Belt of Kansas, we are directly affected by the farmer and his ability to buy.

In my opinion, we small-business men and individual farmers would be far better off throwing out all the subsidies and getting out from a paternalistic, controlling-type government. If we could all be put on our own again whereby we could set up reserves if we have a good year and use those reserves when we have a bad year, our problems would be far less. As it is, the Federal Government takes tremendous sums from us in the good years and gives none back to us in the bad years; thus, small-business men, farmers, lawyers, doctors, and others of us who must make our living in the ups and downs of market places, and the ups and downs of farming such as weather, et cetera, would be better off.

For instance, in 1954 the income of the average furniture manufacturer dropped 50 percent. 1955 was a good year but Uncle Sam took most of it away from the manufacturers through heavy taxes. I cannot help but feel the same is true of farmers. Unfortunately, they have not had even a good year in the last 3 years. However, I do believe that if they were put on their own, they like a marketing report I just received, would do the following:

Better profit ratios don't just happen, even in good times. They must be earned and this is the job of we as individuals. I believe our income-tax structure is the most serious problem facing American today causing undue mergers, unwarranted tax-free manipulations and the taking out from our society men in the bracket of 45 on up who can take the earnings they have and invest them in tax-free Government bonds, get a small job on the side, and still make more money than they could operating a good, sound business enterprise. In my opinion, we are in a very sad state of affairs.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL F. CALDEMEYER,
President.

Communist Activities in Hong Kong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a letter which I have just received from the Mencius Educational Foundation in Hong Kong. The writer of the letter, Dr. Frank S. Wong, also includes a statement concerning the growth of anti-Communist sentiment in Red China, and he also has something to say about Communist activities in Hong Kong. I believe that Dr. Wong's correspondence will be of interest to the Members of Congress. The letter and statement follow:

MENCIUS EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION,
Kowloon, Hong Kong, April 25, 1956.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
Member of Congress,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C., U. S. A.

DEAR MR. BYRD: I have received with many thanks your letter of April 13 and am very pleased to note that the material I sent you is intended for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. If there is not too much trouble, I would like to have a copy of the RECORD containing such matter.

In a separate paper enclosed I am giving an account of the latest developments in Red China and suggest roughly what the United States Government should do to cope with the new offensive. I shall be glad to answer any specific questions that you or your colleagues would raise, so that we all may fight for the same cause more effectively.

At present, world communism seems to be gaining ground. We should not only check its growth but push it over the precipice. In particular the Communists are becoming more active in Hong Kong, the listening post and anti-Communist center. There is much that can be done only if the United States authorities would take the initiative, otherwise the Reds would take over culturally at least by default.

I shall be very glad to hear from you again.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

FRANK S. WONG.

ANTI-COMMUNIST SENTIMENT RISES IN RED CHINA

The Communists have allowed unrestricted entry of Chinese from Hong Kong to Red China. Over 130,000 have visited their native homes between November and April. Their general conclusion is that the economic situation has gone from bad to worse and that the people are very bitterly against the Reds to a point of vocal disapproval. If there were external support, uprising would flare up here and there. The harassed people are anxiously scanning the skies for liberation, but what they see is only a few patches of cloud.

CHINA AS SEEN BY HONG KONG CHINESE

What Hong Kong Chinese saw and heard in Kwangtung province, south China is this: The people in Canton and other places in Kwangtung are hungry and in rags. Their earnings are used to buy food and yet they are half starved, leaving nothing for clothing and other amenities of life. The visitors from Hong Kong, mostly domestic servants, planned to stay a fortnight but found the conditions so distressing that they came back here after a few days. The visitors returned with swollen eyes, having wept at seeing the miserable conditions of their relatives.

One servant gave her rationed rice to her relatives when leaving them after 4 days on a scheduled stay of 2 weeks. Then they had a little more rice to make up the long standing deficiency, so they had a full stomach but the cadres or party workers found out the departure of the Hong Kong resident and deducted the amount of rice obtained on the basis of their ration card. After fairly full meals, the poor relatives are now more hungry, as they are given less rice after the deduction.

An elderly servant went back to her village to witness the wedding of her son. She cried for 3 days on seeing the pitiable conditions and stopped on the fourth day when the wedding ceremony took place. Then the bride arrived. The mother then resumed crying because she found that her son and his bride had to work for the Communists on the side without pay. They had to work immediately after the wedding. Their regular employment did not bring sufficient remuneration.

The so-called agrarian reform in 1953 brought havoc to many farmers, who without means of livelihood went to the city to look for work. Now the Reds in Canton want to repatriate 300,000 people to the country where they will not be able to find any work and will be starved. The Communist authorities are sending away those without jobs, those partly employed and those who arrived in Canton only recently. Others are to be sent to the semi-barren northwest, and this is dreaded by all.

Many people committed suicide by jumping down the streets rather than to be sent back to the country and to the dreaded northwest. On the persons of such victims were found orders of "back to the land to produce."

When Hong Kong visitors left their village or Canton, they left behind their handkerchiefs, towels, underclothing, socks, tooth brushes, and toothpaste for their relatives, who are in dire need of them. Many went to the mainland with more personal effects than needed, intending to give them away. This shows the shortage of consumer's goods.

Visitors also carried foodstuffs to Red China to relieve their hungry kinsmen. In Hong Kong travelers even bought canned food from Swatow and Shanghai, as it is much cheaper here than in the interior for the same stuff. This is due to the dumping of all kinds of Chinese goods into Hong Kong and elsewhere in the free world in order to obtain the much needed foreign exchange.

Thus the people in Red China are badly in want of the bare necessities of life. Then there is the persecution for counter-revolutionary activities. Those who can find employment and receive pay sufficient to buy food for 1 person are considered fortunate but they have to work 10 or 11 hours a day and spend 3 or 4 hours at night to attend meetings and indoctrination lectures. Hence life is most difficult and trying.

The Peiping regime is furthering the exploitation of the people by confiscating their factories, enterprises and farms in the name of "state-private joint operations" and "collectivization." While the people are dead against such robbery, agricultural output and production of manufactured goods have fallen low. The people have no incentive to work long hours at meager pay and are virtually slaves of the Red masters.

WHY RED CHINA UNDERSELLS ABROAD

But the Communists are scraping the barrel bottoms to provide for the exports to different places in Southeast Asia. The objectives are (1) to obtain foreign exchange, (2) to impress on overseas Chinese and others that Red China is abounding with much resources and production, and (3) to show that Red China is not afraid of embargo.

As exports from Red China are marked down for competition, the profits are very small. The sufferers are the 400 million Chinese who work hard as slaves, have their property confiscated, and eke out a difficult living.

Peiping is also in a difficult position. The 5-year plan is way behind schedule owing to the lack of enthusiasm of the exploited workers. Economic deterioration is seen everywhere. Furthermore, the anti-Stalin move embarrasses Mao Tse-tung and encourages other Reds to clamor for collective leadership.

Observers generally agree that now is the time to exert stronger pressure on Peiping.

COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN HONG KONG

In Hong Kong Communist agents are making every effort to make a good impression on the 2½ million Chinese in the hope of turning them into neutralists. Hongkong Chinese are overwhelmingly anti-Communist, because they know what is actually going on behind the Bamboo Curtain and have had, by personal experience or reliable information, a bitter taste of communism. Now the Reds want to win them over by luring them to visit Canton and Peiping. They are promised free trips to Peiping to celebrate May 1.

Efforts are made to cultivate newspapermen, writers, stage and screen personalities, professors, et al. They are promised facilities, money, and jobs. The whole idea is to neutralize Hong Hong Chinese, to whom the 14 million overseas Chinese look for guidance and inspiration. Hong Kong is at the moment the cultural hub of Free China.

The United States Information Service or other United States agency should be strengthened to combat communism, since Taiwan has no money or other means to do so. Unfortunately, the USIS is charged with cultural work elsewhere in southeast Asia and takes Hong Kong for granted as anti-Communist point. This assumption does not hold water now, since the Reds are sparing no efforts to convert the people here to their cause.

A part of the United States aid to Asian countries may well be used to back up scholars, professors, writers, newspapermen, stage and screen people, who could be utilized to fight communism other than by force. If this were not done, sooner or later they would be forced to go over to the other side of the fence. Many cultural and educated people, who are hopelessly underpaid, would be happy to do some extra work to earn additional money to support their families. They could be utilized to serve the cause of freedom and democracy by writing, lecturing, and acting.—F. S. W.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

Appendix

Morals of Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, because it is an inspiring challenge to young law students, and because it will be well for all Members of the Congress and the entire Nation to heed the timely remarks of this fine lawyer and great American, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the heart of a speech delivered on April 14, 1956, by the Honorable Loyd Wright on Law Day at the University of California School of Law, Los Angeles.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The ethical obligations of the lawyer encompass more than complete honesty, truthfulness, and fidelity to the courts, clients, and fellow members of the bar. Just 100 years ago Judge Sharswood, of Pennsylvania, first published his lectures on Professional Ethics, the first American study of the subject. Judge Sharswood divided his work into two main branches. The second branch he headed those duties owed by the lawyer to his professional brethren and his clients. The place of first importance he reserved for the topic he called Those Duties Which the Lawyer Owes to the Public or Commonwealth. This first obligation in legal ethics, the duty of public service, finds an obvious source in the monopoly we enjoy as members of the bar of the rights of rendering legal services, giving legal advice, and appearing before the courts on behalf of others. But the duty of service to the Commonwealth is not simply a quid pro quo exacted by the State as consideration for privileges conferred. Rather, the obligation finds its roots in our training and our abilities in the arts of government. As the only group in society devoted to the practice of the techniques of legal control, we inevitably bear the burden of using these capacities in the interests of the community at large. We must, accordingly, be prepared to serve in public office when called upon to do so, to advise the electorate on the legal aspects of public questions, and to advance and foster the reforms necessary to keep the law and its administration in touch with the demands of the times. Some of these public responsibilities can be discharged by the individual lawyer, but many of the public tasks which naturally fall to the legal profession can only be performed by lawyers collectively. It is here, of course, that the organized bar and the bar associations find their function. Matters such as law revision and reform, improvement of the administration of justice, and the maintenance of professional standards can ordinarily be achieved through no other agency. The faithful discharge of your professional obligation will therefore require your active participation in the organized reports of the bar. As the thought was put by Theodore Roosevelt, "Every man owes some time to the upbuilding of his profession."

As perhaps you already realize, bar association activities provide the lawyer with opportunities both for perfecting his technical competence through lectures, conferences, and continuing education programs, and for enriching his professional life through increased contacts with his fellow lawyers. But you may not appreciate that only an insignificant share of the efforts of the bar organizations are directed toward the selfish interests of the profession; the major concern of a bar association, and its reason for being, is and must be the fulfillment of the profession's public obligations.

The national organization has adopted as indicative of its present efforts the slogan the Era of Service. Our constitution sets forth the following purposes: "To uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States and maintain representative government; to advance the science of jurisprudence; to promote the administration of justice, and the uniformity of legislation and of judicial decisions throughout the Nation; to uphold the honor of the profession of law; to apply its knowledge and experience in the field of the law to the promotion of the public good; to encourage cordial intercourse among the members of the American bar; and to correlate and promote such activities of the bar organizations in the Nation and in the respective States as are within these object, in the interests of the legal profession and of the public." This obviously can only be accomplished by an association of lawyers and to fully accomplish them it is necessary to be active at all levels.

There is one more thing you ought to think about while you still have time to think. That is the matter of developing your personal philosophy of law. Perhaps this sounds like a formidable job. But what I mean is simply that you should, at this stage of your legal career, give some time to serious reflection upon the nature of this thing called law to which you will devote the rest of your active life. Without some understanding of our legal system and an appreciation of its inherent purpose, you will miss the sense of direction that offers the highest kind of human satisfaction.

Probably 30 or 40 years ago it would never have occurred to anyone to suggest to law students that the time to think about these things was while they were in law school. The development of a philosophy about law could wait until the lawyer had seen enough of practice to make mature judgments concerning the legal system. But 40 odd years ago, when I finished law school, the practice of law was a different sort of animal from the practice which awaits you upon graduation. Then the young lawyer could supply himself with a set of codes, a few volumes of statutes and a set of official State reports, and he was pretty well prepared to handle anything that might come his way. And, typically, the lawyer of that day did handle whatever came along. Torts, corporate and business matters, taxation, criminal law, divorce, real estate, and probate were all within the competence of the general practitioner, and by working with law in these varied manifestations the typical lawyer gained an understanding of the processes of the law and became a sort of legal philosopher. His was a philosophy of modest pretensions, of course, but he ordinarily had a feeling for the whole fabric of the law, and a sense of how and why the law had developed as it had, and of where it ought to lead.

Today, however, none of us can hope to master more than a small corner of the law. In the past 40 years, 3 hot wars and several cold ones, a major economic collapse and desperate rehabilitation measures, changed political philosophies, and accelerated business and industrial expansion have brought a rain of laws, regulations, rulings, and opinions from State and Federal courts, legislatures, agencies, boards, bureaus, and commissions. Specialization in the legal profession has become inevitable, and today's graduate must expect to immerse himself in some relative narrow field of law, never again to encounter the subjects of much of his law school work. Of necessity the advantages of specialization involve a cost in the sacrifice of breadth of judgment. An expert who devotes his time exclusively to income tax problems can hardly be expected to grasp the full sweep of the law or to see the patterns and purposes which such a viewpoint alone can reveal. For most of you, law school will mark your broadest acquaintance with the whole of our legal system, although not of course your deepest understanding of any part of it. Now, then, is the time to start thinking about what law is all about.

To set the wheels in motion, you might ask yourself several questions. What is the purpose of law? What are the human values served by the processes of the law? What are the morals of the legal system as we know it?

The analogy is sometimes drawn that a legal system is only a box of tools that can be used for any desired purpose. But even a tool has limitations of purpose. A saw is not much of a tool for driving a nail, and a hammer is hardly effective if the purpose is to bore a hole. Legal processes, like tools, are not means to any desired end; the processes contain within themselves a quality of purpose, of what they can be used to accomplish. And conversely, it is meaningless to talk about values and goals without considering the means of accomplishing them. The right without a remedy is a familiar example of the futility of an end without a means. This interrelation of legal processes and values or morals can perhaps best be brought home by a rhetorical question: could Communist-Russia exist if they depended upon the Anglo-American system of law as we know and practice it?

If, as I believe, the processes of the law as we think of it do have purposes, moral elements, or values, it seems fair to expect the lawyers who devote their lives to the law to make an effort to know them. It is this appreciation of purpose that I call a philosophy of law. Like a wife, a philosophy is worth having only if you have made the discovery and choice yourself.

Any discussion of philosophy of law, or morals of law, must encompass Judge Sharswood's "duties which the lawyer owes to the public or commonwealth." To properly explore this vital field of our professional obligations would consume much more time than I can with good grace here employ. It is true also that in this area personal experience,

convictions, education, and environment tend to create honest and deep differences of opinion. Upon this premise and only because I have recently had an unusual opportunity to exchange ideas with the members of the legal profession in all parts of the country, I wish to discuss a few random thoughts that I believe have a first call on your consideration of any philosophy of law you may develop.

You are compelled to examine the record against the background of the American concept of the lawyers' public responsibilities, and of the bar as the guardian of individual liberty and as the protector of limited constitutional government to determine if your predecessors in recent years have fully met the challenge. Perhaps a little historical review will help you take your bearings.

Recall, please, that the great guaranties against the coercive force of government that today are commonplace were largely forged in this land. When a permanent English settlement was first established on this continent at Jamestown in 1607, the common law was in its formative stages, and English lawyers were too preoccupied with conveyancing and feudal tenures to concern themselves with the place of the individual in relation to his government and his fellow men. Magna Carta was four centuries old, but it had not yet been transmuted by the magnificent hand of Lord Coke from an agreement between the King and his barons into a bulwark confining the powers of government over the lives of men and subjecting the sovereign to God and the law. By modern standards, the Government of England was still an autocracy at the time of our American beginnings.

In early colonial history, the place of the lawyer in man's struggle to be free remained unrecognized. In those days the work of the courts was often at the mercies of untrained laymen on the bench and ignorant pettifoggers at the bar. Professional lawyers were regarded with suspicion, and attorneys were roughly handled in the colonial legislatures. In Georgia, for instance, lawyers, along with rum, were outlawed. In New York, the provincial council in 1677 resolved that pleading attorneys should no longer be allowed to practice, and the fundamental constitutions of Carolina drawn up for the English proprietors contained this unrealistic provision: "It shall be a base and vile thing to plead for money or reward; nor shall anyone * * * be permitted to plead another man's cause, till, before the judge in open court, he hath taken an oath, that he doth not plead for money or reward."

But these attempts at government of laws without lawyers to administer the laws were inevitably doomed to fail. It was soon evident that trained lawyers alone could provide the kind of law free men demand, and the professional bar assumed its rightful place of leadership in the struggle for liberty. By the year of John Marshall's birth 2 centuries ago, the Colonies had seen the rise of the lawyer to a place of eminence he has seldom since attained.

The colonists' first attempt to govern themselves after independence had been won proved to be a failure. The States in league under the Articles of the Confederation lacked a central authority adequate to bring the conflicting interests of the weak and quarreling Colonies into accord and to meet the needs of the new and growing nation. Once more it fell to the lawyers to recognize and to correct the shortcomings, and of the 55 wise men who gathered in Philadelphia in the summer of 1787 to frame a new basis of government, more than half, or 31, were lawyers. The document they produced, and its significance in the history of human striving for freedom under law, needs no elaboration here. In the familiar words of Gladstone, "the American Constitution is the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

But we would be misled to believe that the founders of this Nation, in a flash of invention, extracted their lasting principles from thin air. Like all enduring human institutions, the Constitution of the United States was solidly grounded in human experience. The lawyers who rebelled against the tyrannies of the Crown and who laid the framework of this Government did not seek to experiment or to innovate. Their aim was rather to restore the ancient and natural rights of free men denied by a newer form of oppression. These are the words of Jefferson, the lawyer who drew the document by which our freedom was proclaimed, "this was the object of the Declaration of Independence. Not to find new principles, or new arguments, never before thought of, not merely to say things which had never been said before; but to place before mankind the commonsense of the subject, in terms so plain and firm as to command their assent * * * it was intended to be an expression of the American mind."

In setting up the institutions and processes of Government by which these ancient liberties were to be preserved, these lawyers of the constitutional convention were tendered a choice unequalled in political history. As they observed, "We have opportunity to form with some deliberation, with free choice, with good advantages for knowledge; we have opportunity to observe what has been right, and what wrong, in other States, and to profit by them." As we well know today, they made good use of this chance to pick and choose. They could and did study every form of government known to man to the present day, from the absolute monarchies of Europe to the theoretical communism tried and found wanting in several of the early colonial settlements. They drew from the Hebraic law of the Bible and from the Koran, from the model of the Greek city states and from the Roman Empire.

But, true to the lawyer's learning, they drew most heavily upon the tried and tested principles evolved in their own experience in the colonial struggle for limited self-government and individual freedom. We are often inclined to forget this period in our national development, and to date our history from 1787. It may be worthwhile to recall, then, that our experience under the Constitution is still today exceeded by our experience in self-government in the Colonies. Between the formation of the first representative body empowered to make laws in America, in 1619 in Virginia, and the ordination of the Constitution in 1788 lay 169 years of striving for justice and liberty under law; the age of Government under the Constitution is still short of that figure by 2 years. Nearly every clause of the Constitution finds a clear antecedent in this colonial history of resistance to bureaucratic controls vested in authorities insulated either by distance or by the lack of responsibility to the electorate from the will of those who were governed.

After these monumental milestones in the story of the lawyer-citizen came a period that shines no less brilliantly with the names of men of the law. John Marshall, Daniel Webster, and Henry Clay were among the olympian figures who, during the next half century, breathed life into the paper of the Constitution and made practical working rules of government of the vision and ideals of their predecessors. Their labors contributed to our glorious heritage as surely and as enduringly as those of the Founding Fathers.

Despite the challenges of the levelling trends of the age of Jackson, the concept of the lawyer as a citizen responsible to the public for maintaining liberty through law stood firm and strong through the Civil War, where it found a new dimension in the person of a man called Lincoln, a lawyer who reminded us that that government is best that governs least, and who taught us once more that "you cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves."

These are the bold bright threads in the fabric of our heritage as American lawyers, the clear, abiding landmarks of the path our fathers marked out for us. These are some of the segments that make up our history of "morals of law." For no apparent reason, since the turn of the century, and I believe as a companion to the ever-widening encroachment of the industrial revolution our people have become restive and too many of us have turned our backs to the ancient landmarks. We have drifted down the path of paternalism, looking more and more to security, wherever or however it may be found, and abandoning the good old American traits of thrift, dignity in work, independence and price of accomplishment, and the joy of succeeding by overcoming all obstacles.

The pattern of the decline is clear. On every hand our people are alining themselves into opposing factions and pressure groups based upon economic interests, national origins, religious beliefs, and geographic divisions, each organized for the avowed purpose of currying special favor at the hands of Government and at the expense of the rest of society. The farmer, the labor union, the veteran, and industry and business are seeking protection from the necessity of proving their worth at the market place. Some of our people and too many of our legislators, have apparently come to believe that every human want and need should be satisfied through the use of the coercive forces of Government.

Every hyphenated American, who puts loyalty to his economic, geographic, religious or political affiliation above his duty and loyalty to the interests of the public at large adds momentum to the drift from the principles upon which our form of government is premised. It matters not what the source of the hyphen may be; the effect upon our future course as a Nation is the same.

We have traveled a vast distance along the road to the ordered state since 1916, when that great statesman Elihu Root served as president of the American Bar Association. But I think we can still listen with profit to what he had to say on the subject of ethics in his annual address:

"The people of the United States need in one important respect, a change of the individual attitude toward their Government. Too many of us have been trying to get something out of the country and too few of us have been trying to serve it. Officers, appropriations, personal and class benefits have been too generally the motive power that has kept the wheels of Government moving. Too many of us have forgotten that a government which is to preserve liberty and do justice must have the heart and soul of the people behind it—not mere indifference. Too many of us have forgotten that not only eternal vigilance but eternal effort is the price of liberty. Our minds have been filled with the assertion of our rights and we have thought little of our duties.

"The second general truth is that national strength requires the spirit of solidarity among the people of the Nation. Sectional or class misunderstanding and hatred or dislike are elements of vital weakness. National wealth and prosperity are made up of the wealth and prosperity of individuals, and

we cannot pull down each other without suffering as a people."

Listen to his philosophy of law. He states: "There is no body of citizens to whom this duty should appeal more strongly than to the lawyers, because the subject vitally affects the relations between the individual and the State regulated by law and the fundamental conceptions upon which our system of government is based."

Thus, you see, a vast area of activity must be yours as a lawyer. Yours will be the responsibility to forthrightly serve the Nation. Such questions as arise for instance as that of obtaining qualified judges, is peculiarly within your province; insisting that judges be judges and not philosophers, is another of your task. Our courts have all too often forgotten that the cornerstone of our Anglo-Saxon system of jurisprudence is "precedent." Our predecessors who gave their all to help fashion our form of government would, if they could read some of our recent decisions, miss the guiding beacon of legal precedent—the controlling case on "all four corners" has been too frequently replaced by the round peg decisions based upon individual ideologies bereft of the sobering restraints of fundamentals found in precedent. These decisions, mushrooming as they are, become law by judicial fiat and belong only in those unhappy jurisdictions that are ruled by men as contrasted to rule by law. Fundamental principles do not change, and expediency and passing fancy are poor substitutes for principle.

We, of my generation, have indeed failed and we must look to you to be articulate in all phases of professional ethics if this glorious country of ours is to retain a theory of government of delegated powers only. A Government subservient to the will of the people and under which the dignity of the individual is supreme. As officers of the court, as lawyers, yours is the responsibility to see that the erosions of our system of jurisprudence and of our form of government shall cease. We, all of us, inherited our blessings of freedom and if we fail to pass them on to posterity unimpaired, we will have failed our trust.

I have full confidence you will not fail, for you are better prepared than were your predecessors and there is ample evidence throughout the land that there is a determination among the younger members of the profession to justify your professional inheritance.

The Late Honorable Alben W. Barkley

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1956

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I was profoundly shocked this morning when I heard of the tragic passing of Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY, of Kentucky.

He was one of the finest men I ever knew, and I am sure that his place in the hearts of many of us will never be filled. When he suddenly fell near the end of a speech at Washington and Lee University's mock Democratic Convention, he apparently died almost instantly. It is fitting to note that his pasing occurred in an atmosphere he loved best—the political forum. He always enjoyed and liked young people, and he was idolized and deeply admired by them as they saw in him the personification of those qualities we have always sought in our national leaders.

In September of 1948 it was my great privilege to accompany Senator BARKLEY to Europe to attend an Interparliamentary Union Conference in Rome. We visited Madrid, Paris, and Berlin, and I can well recall the trip as one of the highlights of my life.

The Senator was a man whose courtly manners and gallantry added much to the happiness and public life of our country. He was a real southern gentleman, and his penetrating intellect, wit, and wisdom endeared him in the hearts of the American people. His passing is not only a great loss to the Nation but also to the entire civilized world. His distinguished career as a Congressman, Senator, and a great Vice President has never been surpassed.

I join with my colleagues in mourning this lovable and outstanding public servant and extend to his widow, children, and grandchildren, my deepest sympathy in their hour of bereavement.

Choice in Transit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN. J. FLYNT, JR.
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Washington evening Star on Wednesday, May 2, 1956, and which deals with the pending transit legislation which is soon to be considered by the House of Representatives.

As a member of the subcommittee which considered this legislation over a period of many weeks, I feel that the editorial writer for the Washington Star has correctly stated that which took place. This subcommittee truly and in fact gave Washington's involved transit problem the most careful and dispassionate consideration possible. No member of this subcommittee held any brief for or against any interest or group.

The sole purpose which this subcommittee had in mind was and is to bring out a piece of legislation which will give adequate, safe, convenient and necessary transit service to the residents of the Washington area at the lowest possible cost to those who ride the transit system and to the taxpayers alike.

The editorial, as it appeared in the Washington Star, follows:

CHOICE IN TRANSIT

The House Commerce Committee, under its subcommittee headed by Representative OREN HARRIS, gave Washington's involved transit problem the most careful and dispassionate consideration hitherto received from any source.

This detached approach was possible because the committee had no political axes to grind, was not concerned with saving anybody's face, it was not preoccupied with the enticing mysteries of public ownership at the expense of the taxpayers, nor with the idea of punishing Mr. Wolfson for his alleged sins. In brief, the committee made an honest effort to decide what is best for the public under existing circumstances.

Its resulting legislation, expected to come before the House within the next few days, restores the franchise to the Capital Transit Co., making possible continued operation after next August 14. It gives to the transit company substantially the same concessions that would have been available to any other qualified operator, had one been found. It is the immediately sensible solution. We hope the House will support its committee and pass the bill.

If the same intelligent appraisal of realities displayed by the House Commerce Committee had been forthcoming from the Public Utilities Commission in the 6 months preceding last summer's strike, there would have been no strike. There would have been none of the political shenanigans which the strike produced. There would have been no empty promises, by people who did not know what they were talking about, of a rush by private investors to establish a new transit system.

That, however, is water over the dam. The choice now is between continuing private operation of the transit system, or destroying the company in order to embark on a highly dangerous form of public operation. For the form of public operation proposed as the alternative to restoring the franchise is a face-saver, inviting endless public expense and inefficient operation. It lacks the virtues of such transit authority plans as those adopted in Cleveland and Chicago, originally recommended by the Commissioners. It is a politicians' bill, inviting all of the evils and costs of public ownership exemplified in New York and Boston. A really sound transit authority measure, with protection against political pressures and wasteful practices, could still command respect. But no such measure is now pending in Congress.

If the House acts in the public interest, it will restore the transit company franchise, under conditions that are reasonable, by passing the bill proposed by the Commerce Committee.

The Late Honorable Alben Barkley

SPEECH
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the news of the sudden passing away of Senator ALBEN BARKLEY brought deep and sincere sorrow not only to his colleagues, and to the people of the State of Kentucky, but to our entire Nation.

In the turbulent decades of our recent history, the name of ALBEN BARKLEY became known in every household across the land. ALBEN BARKLEY—whose entire life was devoted to public service—became the personification of the wise and benevolent statesman that boys dream of becoming, and that men strive to emulate. His dedication to the public interest; his gracious manner; and his inimitable art of story telling endeared him to the hearts of the American people.

In the death of our beloved Veep, we have lost more than a distinguished public servant. We have lost a part of Americana that may never be duplicated again. We have lost a man, a leader

who came from the best tradition of the past but who looked to the future and who strove with all the energy at his disposal to fashion a better Nation and a better world for all of us to enjoy.

We are aggrieved by his death, but proud that we have lived in the same age with him and known him. His name shall go down in history for he has served his country well.

I wish to extend my deepest sympathy to his widow and his family in their bereavement. May they be consoled in their loss in the thought that the good Lord has chosen him to be among His very own.

The Farm Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL M. HARDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of editorial comment in the Nation's newspapers on the President's veto of the catch-all farm bill last month. Last week I inserted several editorials from papers in the Sixth Indiana Congressional District, all of them commending the President's courage in vetoing a bill which he felt unworkable and unfair. Today I am happy to insert another fine editorial expression which I clipped from the April 26 issue of the Rockville (Ind.) Republican. The author, William B. Hargrave, is a close personal friend and one for whom I have great respect. He is, moreover, a lifetime resident of Parke County, Ind., and knows the problems of Parke County farmers. I know his views represent those held by hundreds of his farmer-readers in the Sixth Indiana District and I commend the editorial to each Member of this House:

THE FARM BILL VETO
(By W. B. Hargrave)

Most people thought President Eisenhower would commit political suicide if he vetoed the farm bill and many leaders of the Republican Party and his loyal supporters urged, even demanded, that he sign it.

To have signed it would have been a shabby act of political expediency. The President has never made a decision which was influenced by its mere political expediency. And I think he never will—he's just not that kind of a person. What a refreshing contrast to our last two Presidents—both master politicians in the worst implications of the term.

What has happened? During the days between the passage of the bill and its veto, the market did slump, but right after the announcement of the veto and the new parity figures, the market prices started up and as of now the farm picture is brighter than it has been in over 2 years.

As I see it, the leaders in the Democratic Congress rigged that bill so that whether he signed it or vetoed it, their party would have benefited next November. In fact, I don't think they believed he would dare veto it. It should be obvious that had he signed the bill he would have rejected the principles he enumerated in his original request for a farm bill. Then they would have had him.

When the Democratic leaders foolishly forced a vote to override the veto, they quickly found out the Nation's reaction to the Presidential veto—even members of their own party, as well as some weak-kneed Republican Congressmen, who originally voted for the bill, changed their votes.

Congresswoman CECIL HARDEN voted against the bill and her reasons for doing so, and her analysis of the bill, were so sound that her article was placed on the front page last week, so readers of the Republican would not miss it.

The one who is really taking a beating in this hassle is the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson. I think if more people knew more about the man, it would take off the sharp edge of criticism that is directed against him.

In the first place, he is a farmer with a capital F. He was 1 of 11 children born in the same farmhouse in Utah. From the age of 4 he had his work to do and as he grew older he did all the farmwork and chores any farm boy does. He attended three colleges and got a masters degree in agricultural economics. All his life has been devoted to farming and church activity, being since 1943 a member of the Council of Twelve, the governing body of the Mormon Church. He and his brother operated a farm in Idaho and declined to accept Government payments for soil-conservation work, because they did not believe they should be paid for work they should be doing anyway. He is a grassroots person and knows what farmers are thinking. Above all, the best interests of the farmers and farming are his sole guides in all his decisions.

It will take much more than the farm problem to defeat the Republican Party next November.

The Interposition Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, the question of State sovereignty and individual liberties is constantly before the country at this time. Whether or not we shall have State sovereignty and individual liberties as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States of America is rapidly approaching a decision. This question is of vital importance to every man, woman, and child in America.

Many of our people fail to see the significance or the importance of this to us. Many are sitting idly by while branches and agencies of the Federal Government continue to whittle away the rights and privileges of not only the States but the people themselves. If we are to continue to maintain our way of life, if we are to stop the octopuslike growth of a despotic Federal Government, if we are to stop an arrogant Supreme Court of the United States which has arrogated unto themselves powers never given them by the people of the States of this country, we must assert ourselves as freedom-loving individuals regardless of the sacrifices necessary to save our very way of life. The Judges are determined to set up the Court as an all-powerful arm of the Federal Government with the intent and purpose of changing the mores, habits, and customs of our people, which have meant so much to us down through the years, to coincide with the social and political philosophy of the members of the Court, regardless of the plain language of the Constitution that was handed down to us by our forefathers.

Now is the time of great decision. Now is the time for men and women of determination, men and women who love this country, who respect the rights of the people as well as the sovereignty of our States to rise up and demand that the rights of the majority be respected and that our way of life be preserved.

There appeared an editorial in the Farmville Herald on Tuesday, May 1, 1956, written by Mr. J. B. Wall, owner and publisher of that great paper. Mr. Wall knows and realizes the problem confronting our people as well as any living person. He has dedicated his life to the preservation of constitutional government as well as the preservation of individual dignity and is rendering a real service in pointing out the grave danger that is now confronting our people. I commend him for the great work that he has done, is doing, and will continue to do in the future.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include therewith the above-mentioned editorial:

THE INTERPOSITION RESOLUTION

When the Virginia General Assembly with only two dissenting votes passed the resolution "interposing the sovereignty of Virginia against the encroachment upon the reserved powers of this State, and appealing to sister States to resolve a question of contested power," it was taken at face value. (See the resolution printed in full in another column.) South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, States in which legislatures were then in session, supported the Virginia resolution, several in even stronger terms.

Members of Congress understood that these States, through this action had taken a stand to challenge the usurpation of power by Federal agencies, in this case the United States Supreme Court. A manifesto supported by 101 Congressmen strongly supported the States in their position.

Listen to these resolves:

"That the General Assembly of Virginia expresses its firm resolution to maintain and defend the Constitution of the United States, and constitution of this State against every attempt * * * to undermine the dual structure of this Union and to destroy those fundamental principles embodied in our basic law, by which the delegated powers of the respective States have long been protected and assured. * * * That the State of Virginia did not agree in ratifying the 14th amendment, * * * that the power to operate racially separate schools was to be prohibited to them thereby * * *. That this declaration (May 17, 1954 decision) upon the part of the Supreme Court of the United States constitutes a deliberate, palpable, and dangerous attempt by the Court itself to usurp the amendatory power that lies solely with not fewer than three-fourths of the States * * *. Virginia is duty bound to interpose against these most serious consequences * * * now appeals to her sister States for that decision which only they are qualified under our mutual compact to make, and respectfully requests them to join her in taking appropriate steps, pursuant to article V of the Constitution, by which an amendment, designed to settle the issue of contested power here asserted, may be proposed by all the States * * * that until the question here asserted by the State of Virginia be settled by clear constitutional amendment,

we pledge our firm intention to take all appropriate measures honorably, legally and constitutionally * * * to resist this illegal encroachment upon sovereign powers."

Having taken this action the Virginia Assembly changed no Virginia laws regarding public schools. Until this "issue of contested power" has been "settled by clear constitutional amendment," we do not believe Virginia can, in honesty and good conscience, do anything.

It would appear to us that Governor Stanley and the State Board of Public Education would be proper in proclaiming a policy for segregated schools for the coming year, thereby stabilizing the public school system and allowing the governing boards of the counties to complete a budget according to law. In the meantime it is to be hoped that this "issue of contested power" may be resolved. Until this has been accomplished there is no move to be made except to enforce the provisions of the Virginia constitution.

A great and important constitutional principle is involved far beyond the importance of the issue of schools, as important as that is.

If we believe that the compact of States, from which the Federal Government derives its power, is no more, then we must accede to the dictates of the Federal Government—the executive, or the judicial branches. If we believe the principles set forth in the resolution of the Virginia General Assembly and joined in by other legislative bodies of sister States, then it would be impossible to move in any direction, until "the issue of contested power" has been definitely settled.

Prince Edward County, and its people are law-abiding lovers of freedom with a long history in the resistance of tyranny. The history of the county shows no unwarranted acts of defiance, and the people intend no such action now, but they have simply a determination rightfully to maintain self-government and liberty.

We believe the general assembly represented the sentiment and had the support of the thinking people when it passed almost unanimously the interposition resolution.

Singing Rockets, Student Choir, Rich Township High School, Park Forest, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, it will be my pleasure tomorrow to welcome to our Capital City a fine group of students from the Rich Township High School in Park Forest, Ill., which is located in the Fourth Congressional District that I represent. Rich Township High School serves the 30,000 residents of Matteson, Olympia Fields, Park Forest, Richton Park, and adjoining rural areas. About three-fourths of the student body comes from the new city of Park Forest, which is located 30 miles south of Chicago's Loop. While Park Forest is only about 7 years old, it has a population of about 25,000 people. It has been recognized as a model, new community and recently received the National All-American City Award.

This group of approximately 70 boys and girls has been selected from 350 students in regular vocal training at Rich High, and are known as the Singing Rockets. It is my hope that some of you will have the opportunity to hear them when they sing on the steps of the Capitol at 12:30 tomorrow afternoon.

They are the only choral group in their class to receive superior ratings in all competitive categories in the Illinois State music contests. Singing in seven foreign languages, performing equally well spirituals and religious numbers, popular music, and ballads, the Singing Rockets are in wide demand at local and State meetings and conferences, as well as at national conventions.

Gov. William G. Stratton, of Illinois, has designated the Singing Rockets to be the official State representative on the Ed Sullivan Show commemorating National Music Week on Sunday, May 6, 1956. I feel confident that should you, my colleagues, see their performance on the Ed Sullivan Show, you will feel that my pride in calling them to your attention is highly justified.

Seniors and juniors are included in the Singing Rockets, and there are about an equal number of boys and girls. Their annual tours are financed through fundraising projects which are entirely student directed. This year they have raised $7,000 for their trip to Washington and New York by doing odd jobs, babysitting, and benefit performances. Their annual tour last year included performances in three States—Illinois, Indiana, and Michigan. Their choral work is done in addition to their regular class work. Meeting but 2 hours a week in rehearsal, they are recognized by well-known choral experts as one of the truly great teen-age student choirs in the Nation.

America, the greatest Nation in the world, has little to fear that juvenile delinquency will break down the moral fiber of our country, when it can proudly present such fine young citizens.

Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, the self-termed "collective leadership" of the Soviet Union have good reason to fear the date of May 3. The 3d day of May is the Polish Constitution Day, the day of unity of though and action for all Poles worth of the Polish heritage of freedom.

Press dispatches on April 20 brought out that Poland's Communist regime had fired or demoted the Minister of State farms, the prosecutor general, and the chief military prosecutor general.

Press dispatches of April 21 announced the dismissal of the minister of justice and the downgrading of the minister of culture by Poland's Communist regime.

Press dispatches on April 22 pointed to the freeing of 30,000 Poles and the reduction of prison sentences to 70,000 others by Poland's Communist regime.

What is the meaning of this shift in command among Poland's servile Communist leaders?

In my opinion, Shakespeare best expressed the meaning of this readjustment when he wrote in Macbeth, "It is a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing."

Tools of the Stalin Commnist faction in Poland have merely been replaced by tools of the Communist collective leadership faction. It is highly probable, also, that those who have been released from prison by the alleged amnesty are either Communists or true Poles, so broken in mind and body, that they are no longer considered a threat to their Communist oppressors.

Buried deep in the news dispatch of April 22 is the real cause of the feverish activity among Communists in Poland.

Reuters quotes the Communist Polish radio as saying:

> Emigre criminals will be pardoned if they return to Poland before July 22, Polish National Day.

July 22 is the day the Communists of Poland want to impose on the Polish people as their day. It is no true Polish holiday.

May 3—Polish Constitution Day, the day Communists fear—is the day all true Poles honor.

The Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, was inspired by the awakened consciousness of human rights, the same awakening which led to the adoption of the French Declaration of Rights and the Constitution of the United States.

The May 3 constitution of Poland was adopted in an hour of utmost national peril. Even as the men who formed it were deliberating, the absolute powers of Russia, Prussia, and Austria were preparing for the final partition of Poland. In spite of the success of absolutism over freedom, the May 3 constitution remained, with its lofty ideals of liberty and national and individual integrity, as a beacon for guidance—a living testament for future generations of Poles that it was their God-given right to be free.

After the rebirth of Poland in 1918, a new, a more modern constitution was enacted. Nevertheless, May 3—the day of the 1791 constitution—was proclaimed as the national holiday. It remained the national holiday throughout World War II. It was abolished as such only when the Communist regime gained complete control over Poland in 1945.

We of the United States have been aware that Poland has been under Communist domination since 1945. We are, also, aware that any attempts at active resistance by the unarmed Polish people would be instantly and brutally crushed by their Communist oppressors. But, we are also strongly aware that, although overt resistance is impractical, passive resistance continues with uninterrupted force.

The Catholic Church—free under the May 3 constitution—is a glowing lamp of liberty.

The Catholic Church and its adherents, representing 95 percent of the total present-day population of Poland—has always been identified with Polish patriotism and with Poland's unrelenting fight for independence.

What has been the Communist attitude toward the Catholic Church in Poland?

Communist propaganda maintains that there is freedom of religion in Poland.

The truth is that there have been frontal attacks against the Catholic Church by the Communists since 1945. Both Stalinist and collectivist Communist leaders have tried in vain to impose thought control in religious matters upon the Polish people. When they failed to sway the Polish people from their deep-rooted beliefs, they began to systematically persecute the church leaders. Cardinal Wyszynski was imprisoned. Prison gates clanged behind Bishop Adamski, and his brother bishops, Bieniek, Bednorz, Kaczmarek, Baraniak, and Bernacki. Hundreds of minor parish priests met the same fate. Still more hundreds were deprived of their right to carry out church duties.

What has been the end result of this planned campaign to paganize Poland?

Today, churches are overcrowded. There has been no material drop in the percentage of communicants in the Catholic Church in Poland. In fact, because the Communists oppose the Catholic Church, church attendance is one sure way for the true Pole to assert his anti-Communist feelings.

The May 3 constitution allowed free Polish to cross the boundaries of their nation at will.

In 1956, the Communist oppressors have to watch the frontiers. Guarding these frontiers are long stretches of barbed wire, mine fields, police-dog patrols, searchlights, and thousands of soldiers. These warlike preparations are not designed to protect Poland from outsiders. Rather, they are created to prevent Poles from leaving their native land for the free West.

Have these police-state methods succeeded?

The answer is a resounding, "No." Notwithstanding these elaborate precautions, flights from Poland take place every day. Those who seek and find sanctuary in the free West represent every strata of Polish population. There are university professors among them. Government officials, soldiers, peasants, workers, and students daily risk their lives in the pursuit of liberty.

Polish seamen are specially eager to be free. The number who have run the Communist gantlet runs into hundreds, even thousands. Only a few weeks ago, a group of Americans of Polish ancestry financed and equipped a ship whose crew, for the most part, is composed of seamen who have jumped ship from vessels of the Communist Polish merchant marine.

This ship is named *Wolna Polska*—meaning free Poland.

The May 3 constitution firmly established the right of the Polish peasant to own land.

The Communist regime in Poland has tried to introduce the system of agriculture prevailing in the Soviet Union—to deprive the peasants of their land, to coerce them into joining collectives. The favored peasants who still keep their land must pay taxes approximating half of their income. In addition to this tax, the peasants are forced to turn over to their Communist oppressors staggering quotas of grain, milk, livestock, and potatoes. Quite recently, the Communists have admitted that peasants are often forced to buy grain on the free market in order to meet this compulsory quota. What is more, the peasants have to pay four times the official price for this free-market grain.

In spite of this fierce pressure, the Polish peasants still resist collectivism. So strong has been this resistance that the Communist regime has only succeeded in collectivizing 9 percent of the arable land.

The Polish peasant does not want to be a farmhand on a collective farm. He wants to be free to work his own land—his by right of inheritance, his by the letter and spirit of the May 3 constitution.

The May 3 constitution encouraged self-expression among Polish musicians, artists, and writers.

The Communist regime halted all intellectual progress. Art, and particularly literature, has been under strict supervision from the outset of the Communist occupation. It has been under the restriction of the principles of the so-called socialistic realism since 1949. This Communist doctrine orders all creative artists, in their productions, to carefully avoid showing the true picture of life as they see it. Instead, they are ordered to produce a distorted picture of life, designed solely for use by the Communists for propaganda purposes. Directly due to these restrictions during the 11 years of Communist occupation, there has been a steady decline of original and worthwhile Polish art.

The creative artist had one choice to make. He had to chose between the Communist line and starving to death. Some abandoned their art entirely. Others created only to survive.

Resentment grew in the minds and hearts of these Polish creative artists. Finally, during the March 1956 meeting of the Art and Culture Council, which controls all art in Poland, this resentment came to a head. After a bitter debate, these artists surmounted their fear of reprisal by the Communist regime and condemned the unnatural principles of socialistic realism.

The creative artists of Poland had reverted to the freedom spelled out in the constitution of May 3, 1791.

The Communist oppressors of Poland well know the anti-Communist feeling of Polish peasants, workers, priests, and professional people.

As a result, they have falsified election results, outlawed free political parties, suppressed the opposition press, and denied the Polish people access to news of the outside world.

More than anything else, however, they have tried to stamp out the memory of the May 3 constitution. May 3 was, and is, the rallying point of all free Poles. They are even willing to bribe Poles who have fled their Communist oppressors with false liberty, provided they return by July 22. They hope that July 22 will erase May 3.

It never will.

The people of Poland cannot celebrate May 3 in the open in 1956.

Let us in the United States, we who are free, honor that day for them. Let us honor our own Constitution as we honor that of the people of Poland. Without our Constitution we could never have attained true freedom. With our Constitution, true freedom can never be lost.

Let us bow our heads and think of Poland on May 3.

Reds Step Up Activity Below Mason-Dixon Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following article by Victor Riesel, published in a number of newspapers over the country:

REDS STEP UP ACTIVITY BELOW MASON-DIXON LINE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This column has been prepared by Victor Riesel's staff after a conference with the injured columnist.)

There's a new line paralleling Mason-Dixon—a Commie line aimed at colonizing key southern communities and unions and infiltrating political clubs. It is a directive which is stripping highly trained agents from their current assignments in the North and transplanting them South for future action.

Already the party has reached into its cadres in the teamsters, butchers, furniture workers, paper workers, woodworkers, packinghouse workers, hotel and restaurant employees, textile workers, and garment workers unions and assigned them to special posts in the embattled Southland.

The comrades are set to duplicate the tactic that enabled them to capture scores of key posts in the old CIO when John L. Lewis first set it in motion back in 1936. The gimmick is to have specially briefed people on the scene ready and willing to do the "dirty work" necessary for important political campaigning or mass unionizing drives.

John L. fell for this line, and it took the anti-Communist CIO leadership 15 years to wipe out the pockets of subversion that had been created. It is the same strategy that gave a readymade apparatus to Harry Bridges when he tried to capture control of Hollywood studio unions—and almost succeeded—in the mid-forties.

Latest directive from the Soviet's secret agents in charge of post-Stalin activity here calls for intensifying propaganda on the community level as well as inside labor. It tells party members that:

"It is clear that the organizing drive in the South, to succeed, must be a political and social movement, as well as an economic movement."

The comrades were also told to "develop legislative action through whatever channels available. * * *" This call for infiltration of non-Communist groups is coupled with specific directives to enroll in Democratic clubs in all areas. In the South this could

pay particular dividends if the regular Democrats there bolt the Chicago nominating convention. Control of the formal machinery of the Southern Democratic Party will then be up for grabs and the Kremlin's "carpetgrabbers" will be reaching fast—and perhaps first.

The party is also dispatching trusted personnel to work in church groups, YMCA's and YWCA's, Lions Clubs, Elks Clubs, and NAACP, on southern campuses and in other civic and labor organizations. Much of this phase will be directed by ostensible representatives of front groups such as the Commie-controlled Sobell Defense Committee which recently opened offices in six Southern cities to spark a drive for the release of the convicted atomic spy now in Alcatraz.

The Communists also have been ordered to step up their special schooling for future agents in the southern infiltration operation. The propaganda chiefs decided that "to grapple with such questions in a mature and sure-handed way, the masses of our members must achieve mastery of the theoretical and tactical principles which underlie the program of our party. This means study—systematic study.

"Such study and discussion must come to be the lifeblood of every club, section, and regional committee. There must be increased self-study by individual comrades. And there must specially be fuller use of * * * the Jefferson School of Social Science."

Here then is the specific implementation of the new line in the South. But, while they are concentrating on work among the Negroes at the moment for political purposes, the party leaders have their eyes on future unionizing drives in the South.

They are aware of the rapid industrialization. They know that sooner or later the AFL-CIO will have to launch huge campaigns for new members.

When that time comes, they will be there with their "sleepers" on the scene, ready and willing to do the dirty work again.

Helping a Competitor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of March 14, 1956, which presents an interesting discussion of the problems existing between various kinds of transportation services—rail, airlines, barge, and truck. St. Louis, Mo., is a great center of various transportation media including rail, air, barge, and truck:

HELPING A COMPETITOR

Now that our great new airport has been dedicated, and praise has been heaped on all who had a part in it, we want to speak a special word of one group whose participation has, until now, been perhaps unnoticed and unhonored—the railroads.

This is quite a contradiction in terms, for the railroads and the airlines are competitors. The railroads, however, have contributed substantially to the construction of the airport through the taxes which they pay to the city and the Federal Government.

While the railroads have been subsidizing their competitors, the airlines on the other hand have been receiving a whacking subsidy from the Federal Government, in spite of the fact that the airlines, in 1955, had the biggest year in their history, making tremendous alltime high profits.

Subsidies for airlines unquestionably made good sense in the late twenties and early thirties, when the resources of the Federal Government were necessary to establish the fledgling airline industry. They make absolutely no sense today when the airlines are able to stand on their feet, and subsidies are simply an added burden to the much harassed taxpayer.

The trouble with subsidies is that once they get on, they almost never come off. In this session, when the Congress is considering legislation reducing subsidy payments to farmers, it might well eliminate the airline subsidies which simply make a rich enterprise richer at the expense of the taxpayer.

While on the subject of reducing subsidies, we hasten to mention daily newspapers. Last year the Post Office Department subsidized daily newspapers to the extent of $60,559,000, which represents the loss on daily newspaper second-class mail.

Most of the newspapers in the United States are in reasonably healthy financial condition, certainly healthy enough to pay the cost of moving their own papers. This newspaper, and we think most right-thinking newspapers in the country, does not want a subsidy in any form from the Federal Government or anyone else.

The Globe-Democrat is in favor of raising the rates of second-class mail to a point sufficiently high to make this service of the Post Office Department self-supporting.

Getting back to the plight of the railroads, we believe they have unfair competition, not only in the subsidies which they helped to pay for the airlines but also in the toll-free operation of canals and other inland waterways at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars. We see no reason why barges and other users of inland waterways should not pay tolls, at least sufficient to pay the cost of locks and other maintenance operations of the waterways such as buoys and devices necessary to water traffic.

The truckers, too, pay less than a fair share for use of the road. Other taxpayers must in effect subsidize these carriers for their share of the maintenance and construction of new highways.

Even the much-buffeted transit companies now pay a use tax for city streets which, by all accounts, is less than the actual damage done to the streets by the transit vehicles. Any tax which is less than the cost of ure inevitably results in a subsidy by all other taxpayers.

As a final blow, the railroads have been prohibited by the Interstate Commerce Commission from fixing rates which would make them competitive with either the barge carriers or the truckers. This inevitably forces some business to the other carriers which might more properly be a rail shipment.

With alternate choices of carriers available in most instances, the case for governmental control is a weak one at best.

We hold no brief for the railroads. Certainly this newspaper has criticized them when we have felt that criticism was merited. We do feel, however, that the railroad alone, among common carriers, pay a large share to subsidize their competitors in that railroads must buy and maintain their own rights-of-way and still pay city, State, and Federal taxes which, in some part at least, become a subsidy for others.

In the interest of fair play, the Government should either subsidize all domestic carriers of people and goods or none at all. A realistic reappraisal of taxation with regard to common carriers is much in order, and certainly long past due.

Address of Deputy Attorney General Rogers Before the District of Columbia Chapter of the Federal Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Deputy Attorney General William P. Rogers which he delivered on April 25, 1956, before the District of Columbia Chapter of the Federal Bar Association:

Most of us here today are lawyers. We have professionally and personally dedicated our lives to the prompt and effective administration of justice. Here are a few basic facts concerning our Federal judicial system.

Do you know how much of the budget is allocated to the administration of the court system? About one-twentieth of 1 percent—little more than the cost of 1 destroyer or 1 light cruiser.

How many persons would you estimate are employed in our judicial system? There are about 300 judges and 4,000 employees. This constitutes the entire manpower of 1 of the 3 branches of Government. Over 40 times this many people are employed in the administration of veteran affairs. The entire Federal judiciary, including the Administrative Office, is operated on a budget half as large as that used in the administration of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

I use these illustrations, not to suggest that some special significance should be attached to them but rather to show that speaking relatively the size and cost of the courts are insignificant in terms of service rendered.

In nearly every year since 1942 the civil cases commenced have exceeded those terminated. The continuous yearly increase in the pending caseload is illustrated by the fact that the 1955 caseload is nearly 150 percent greater than the 1941 figure. This, like many other problems of the courts is a continuing one. With the growth and progress of our society, and changes in legislation and economic conditions, the courts are constantly presented with new problems and requirements.

We Americans pride ourselves in our independent and impartial judiciary. We believe in the rule of law and look to the courts to safeguard our rights and to preserve our institutions of freedom. Yet how long does a person have to wait to have his case tried? In many districts litigants must wait from 1 to 4 years to have a case tried. By means of extraordinary effort, the district courts in the Southern District of New York, in Washington, and elsewhere have made valiant strides in decreasing the backlog during the past year. However, in most jurisdictions the problem continues to be most serious. The unfortunate fact is that very few persons know this except the judges, lawyers, and the litigants involved.

The solution of this problem will not be found in one panacea or magical formula. I am convinced, however, that solutions would soon be forthcoming if the spotlight of public opinion, so much a part of our democratic system, were focused on the judicial branch so that both its accomplishments and its operational difficulties and its weaknesses would be matters of public knowledge. Once

the facts and the problems are generally known, I believe corrective action would follow.

As one of the three coequal branches of Government, the judiciary needs a strong and effective spokesman. It must be provided with a voice to make known to the Congress and to the people of the United States its needs and requirements—its accomplishments and its failures. It is my sincere conviction that great value would attend a report by the Chief Justice to each Congress on the condition of the courts.

I publicly recommended such a proposal in 1954 and the response was almost unanimously favorable. Judges, leading members of the bar, Members of Congress, and others agreed that it was essential that the courts be provided with an effective spokesman to make known objectively and persuasively, their problems, needs, and plans for more effective performance of their vital functions in our society.

Judge Parker of the Fourth Circuit, in an address to the American Bar Association meeting in Philadelphia last year, said:

"Last year, at the Judicial Conference of the Fourth Circuit, Deputy Attorney General W. P. Rogers made a proposal that the Chief Justice be invited * * * to address the two Houses of Congress in joint session as to the needs of the judiciary. His proposal has received the unanimous indorsement of that conference; and, in my opinion, it is one of the most important proposals affecting the judiciary to be made since the foundation of our Government.

"Congress must provide funds and pass the laws necessary for the proper administration of justice. It is important that it be correctly advised as to what funds and what laws are necessary for that purpose; and there can be no better way for this to be done than for the Chief Justice, who as Chairman of the Judicial Conference of the United States, knows better than anyone else the needs of the judiciary, to lay these before Congress in joint session. In this way, not only will all Members of Congress be fully advised of the needs but the public presentation by the Chief Justice will attract the attention of the citizenship at large to the work that the judiciary is doing and the importance of giving it adequate support."

Legislation was introduced in Congress and hearings were held in February 1955. I think you would be interested in some of the testimony.

Lloyd Wright, then president of the American Bar Association, testified in complete support of the proposal, stating in part:

"The American Bar Association has long felt that there has been a shocking lack of understanding as to the Federal judiciary of the United States. * * * The judiciary was removed, as it should have been, from political influence, and hence it has had no one to constantly champion in the legislative halls its needs and requirements in order to fully meet the obligations of service imposed upon it by our form of government."

The late Judge Stephens, for many years the chief judge of our circuit court here and of whom it has been said that he gave his life by his continuous activities in promoting the cause of justice, also testified in favor of the proposal. He stated:

"I do not have in mind some dramatic, actor-like pressure or presentation by the Chief Justice of the United States. What I have in mind in suporting this resolution is that the Chief Justice could in a dignified manner, once each session or once each Congress, in the first place, tell the whole Congress and, therefore, tell the whole people of the importance of the Federal judiciary and what it means to freedom, what it means to our liberties, and what it means to the peaceable settlement of our controversies between man and man and between man and his government in the Federal courts."

Judge Biggs, chief judge of the third circuit, observed that in 33 years that circuit had never been up to date in its work. The late John W. Davis telegraphed his approval of the proposal "provided that it would not prove an undue tax upon his [the Chief Justice's] time and energy." The Chief Justice, in response to an inquiry from the subcommittee, wrote: "If the Congress should be of the opinion that it, and through it, the public might become better informed on the subject through a statement of current conditions and recommendations of the Chief Justice, I would be happy to cooperate."

Despite overwhelming support, a few objections were made to the proopsal. First, it was suggested that the plan might be embarrassing to the judiciary by tending to impair its independence and impartially. Second, it was questioned whether the Chief Justice could have anything of sufficient importance to say to justify an address before a Join Session of Congress. Finally, it was said that it had never been done and therefore should not be done. I would like to address myself to these contentions.

The suggestion that a factual report on the conditions of the courts by the Chief Justice might somehow be inappropriate or impair the independence of the judiciary seems to me without foundation.

No one has ever suggested that the doctrine of separation of powers requires that there be watertight compartments with no right of interchange of information. Progress can hardly be accomplished in a vacuum.

In his capacity as head of the Judicial Conference of the United States, the Chief Justice is already required by statute to submit an annual report to Congress. This report by the Chief Justice has nothing to do with the merits of cases or to the judicial as distinguished from the administrative aspects of the courts. The proposal that the Chief Justice personally present factual data to a joint session of Congress does not contemplate any change in this respect. To permit him to present orally to Congress every other year information of immense importance to the conduct of judicial affairs so that proper emphasis could be placed upon those aspects deserving particular attention is only commonsense. It would substitute an effective way to present these views for the present ineffective way.

The contention that the Chief Justice would have nothing of sufficient importance to say to warrant an address before a joint session of Congress strikes me as being equally without merit. One of the statutory functions of the Judicial Conference of the United States is to make recommendations to the Congress. Undoubtedly this program directly affecting the administration of justice would receive favorable and widespread consideration if it were personally presented by the Chief Justice of the United States who is Chairman of the Conference. Certainly Congress should be apprised, for example, of the backlog situation, its causes, its effects, and possible remedies for it. In the interests of economy and efficiency, Congress should also be fully informed at regular intervals of all fiscal and administrative problems of the courts.

Does information relating to the judicial branch effectively reach Congress? Compared to the executive branch which, as you know, has the benefit of the President's state of the Union message, special messages, testimony of Cabinet, and other top-level officials, and which is otherwise constantly in touch with Congressmen, it does not.

Prior to 1939, the Attorney General spoke for the courts. While this procedure provided the courts with a spokesman, it had one substantial drawback. It tended to make the judicial branch appear subservient to the executive branch; it was also dependent upon its chief litigant to present its case for appropriations to Congress, to fix the salaries of its employees and to approve its expenditures for books and travel. This was hardly consonant with our traditional view, as well as constitutional provision, for the complete equality of position between the three branches of Government.

Since 1939, the responsibility for the management of the fiscal and administrative affairs of the courts has been lodged in the courts themselves, the judicial conferences, and the administrative office of the courts. This system has not been too effective because their recommendations do not receive adequate attention.

Each year, as you may know, there is a judicial conference in each circuit where local problems are discussed and assessed and recommendations are made. The chief judge of the circuit presents the recommendations of his circuit to the Judicial Conference of the United States. At the Conference material compiled by the administrative office on the status of the courts is presented and discussed.

The result of this process is a printed report which is probably read by very few Members of Congress. No Member of Congress, however diligent, can possibly read all material presented to Congress. After hearings of the Judiciary Committees of the House and Senate, at which court administrative officials and district and circuit judges testify, the subcommittee reports to the committee, the committee reports to the Congress, and Congress considers the recommendations. Because of lack of attention worthwhile recommendations are often pigeonholed.

Over the years failure of Congress to respond to the pressing needs of the courts is a recurring problem. Of the 57 judgeships created between 1945 and 1954 only 6 were created during the year in which the recommendations were first made. Twelve were not created until 3 years later and three were not created until 5 years later.

There are presently pending in both Houses of Congress omnibus judgeship bills which propose to carry out the current recommendations of the judiciary conference. If enacted, it would create one additional circuit judgeship and 20 additional district judgeships. The Department of Justice has strongly urged the enactment of this legislation and it is hoped that favorable congressional action will be forthcoming shortly.

The final objection which has been made to the proposal is that it would result in a break in tradition—that because no Chief Justice of the United States has ever appeared before Congress in person, such as innovation should not be instituted now. Customs and traditions should be continued only so long as they serve a useful purpose. When it can be demonstrated that adherence to obsolete procedures is not productive, it is time to search for new and more effective measures which will bring about sound and desired results. In a matter so important and vital as the preservation of the strength and vitality of our judicial system, the choice is an obvious one. We cannot permit the legitimate needs of the judiciary to go unattended because they are presented in such form and manner that they miss the mark.

Regrettably, a Congress, or to emphasize a point, a subcommittee of a committee, despite the support of the chairman and the ranking minority leader, took no action on the proposal in 1955. I am firmly convinced that eventually Congress will approve this proposal which has such general and widespread support. An invitation to the Chief Justice of the United States to address Congress on the conditions of the Courts would provide an important stepping stone in the drive to bring justice up to date. I believe that the idea is one which deserves the wholehearted support of the Federal Bar Association.

The Meaning of Alger Hiss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks, I enclose a speech by Willard Edwards, Washington bureau, Chicago Tribune, delivered at Princeton University on April 25, 1956, before the Aquinas Foundation. The meeting was held at McCosh Hall and attended by over 600 students with thousands turned away. Mr. Edwards was invited to Princeton by Fr. Hugh Halton, Roman Catholic chaplain of the university and founder of the Aquinas Foundation, so that the students might have the truth about Hiss, who had previously been invited to address the Whig Cliosophic Debating Society on April 26. Mr. Edwards' talk was received with enthusiasm and won for him a standing ovation by the students. As one who attended the meeting I can attest to the success of Mr. Edwards' patriotic endeavor. At this same meeting both Father Halton and myself were booed. The next day Hiss the faithless was cheered. Mr. Edwards' speech follows:

THE MEANING OF ALGER HISS

(Speech by Willard Edwards, Washington bureau, Chicago Tribune, at Princeton University, April 25, 1956, before the Aquinas Foundation)

I come here as a reporter of facts gathered from official records. It is my assignment to appraise, in the light of those facts and my own observations over a period of years, the credibility of Alger Hiss who comes to Princeton tomorrow night to discuss The Meaning of Geneva.

Those who have sponsored this meeting think it proper that the opinions of Hiss be considered in the reflection of his background and character. They believe that the context should be set for his remarks so that listeners may judge his qualifications as an unbiased and truthful expert on American foreign policy.

Since Hiss plans, I understand, to compare the Geneva meeting of 1955 with the Yalta Conference of 1945, in which he was a participant, I shall also discuss his role at that parley in the Crimea, presenting some recent evidence on that subject which may be new to you.

At the end, I shall propose a series of questions to Hiss which I think he should answer before he seeks to instruct the American public on matters affecting national security. I hope he does not choose to ignore them.

I do not intend to enter into the controversy over whether Hiss should have been invited here. The invitation was issued; it was accepted. President Dodds and the board of trustees, while disapproving, have decided it would be unwise to overrule the inviting society. The question remains: Is Hiss a truthtelling, honest, and trustworthy witness on foreign affairs whose views may guide us on a safe course in a troubled world?

Some of your alumni, including the new Ambassador to Canada, Mr. Merchant, who has been Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs and who knew Hiss as a fellow State Department official, have protested that his appearance will do lasting damage to the university. He did not say, as he might have, that Hiss had damaged the prestige of the State Department as no other man in history.

I have a suspicion that the original invitation was prompted not entirely by the fact that the views of Hiss would be "of general interest to the faculty and student body." I sense a pardonable curiosity to see and hear in person the central figure in two of the most famous spy trials of the century. The same curiosity attracts great crowds to a movie star's wedding and has made the sideshow a consistent source of profit in the American entertainment field.

I think this review of Alger Hiss' career and a study of his moral attitudes is important. It has been proposed that I confine my discussion to the Yalta Conference and ignore an analysis of the Hiss record with which, it is implied, everyone is familiar. I could not agree to that restriction. When Hiss appears to present his views on foreign policy in a public forum, there should be recalled not only the fact that he is a convicted perjurer but a man of infinite guile—a perilously plausible advocate who has proved to the satisfaction of many supporters to this day that black was white.

I assure those of you who will see Hiss in action tomorrow night that he will give a dramatic performance. You will be observing as brilliant, as adroit, as charming a personality as I have witnessed in more than 30 years of newspaper experience. He will fascinate you. He will be plausible and seemingly sincere. Although he is now 51 years of age, he retains a certain boyish appeal of which he is not unconscious. He is the very picture of the all-American boy grown up. You will find it difficult to believe that you are listening to a man convinced by a jury of willful perjury under oath to conceal his role as a traitor and a spy.

I will never forget an interview I had with a woman juror after the first Hiss trial ended in a deadlocked jury, 8 to 4 for conviction. The presiding judge in that case had given the jurors no instructions against talking to the press. They were eager to explain why they remained hopelessly split after 29 hours of debate in a locked juryroom.

This woman was one of the minority of four who believed Hiss innocent. I asked her on what she based her verdict. She was a mature woman of middle age, the embodiment of commonsense. But she breathed like a schoolgirl as she said:

"From the moment I set eyes upon that fine boy (he was then 44) I knew that anyone so charming and with such a good face could not possibly have stooped to anything so low as spying."

Six weeks of evidence, both documentary and verbal, had not changed the good lady's opinion.

The lean good looks of Alger Hiss, coupled with a winsome personality and a pleasing voice, have been among his most valuable assets in a career which led him to high places before his downfall.

He was, and is, a man of great talents. It is interesting to speculate on what his public stature might be today if he had not been exposed in 1948. He might have become a Secretary of State or a Governor or a Senator. He had all the surface qualifications for gaining national respect as a great American statesman.

He has been something of an undergraduate prodigy at Johns Hopkins University—president of the dramatic society, editor of the college daily, Phi Beta Kappa, in his junior year. The senior class gave him the supreme accolade—they voted him "best handshaker" in the school.

When he moved into a somewhat tougher league at Harvard Law School, he proved that he was no morning-glory. He was elected an editor of the Law Review, one of the school's highest honors, and he became a star of the highly exclusive seminar conducted by Prof. Felix Frankfurter. After he graduated cum laude, he was given, upon the recommendation of the professor, one of the most coveted posts open to a man leaving law school—secretary to the celebrated Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes. Just as he was later to win the friendship and loyalty of a very host of Government officials, Hiss gained the affection of the great jurist.

Alger Hiss and I came to Washington about the same time in the early 30's. We did not move in the same circles. He was one of the brightest of the bright young men imported into the Government on the recommendation of Professor Frankfurther who himself joined Washington society as a Supreme Court Justice in 1939.

Neither I nor any other newspaperman knew that in 1939 another man came to Washington—a fugitive from the dark underworld of Soviet espionage. This was Whittaker Chambers who had revolted a year earlier from service as a spy for the Russian secret police.

Chambers came to the Capital to unburden his conscience. He tried to see the President but was shunted off by a White House secretary to Assistant Secretary of State A. A. Berle, then in charge of State Department security. To the astounded Berle, Chambers gave his story of communism in the Government. He named names and one of those names was that of Alger Hiss.

Berle did not know whether to believe Chambers but he thought that the charges should certainly be investigated. But influential friends of Hiss rallied to his defense, as they again rallied many years later, and joined in enthusiastic endorsements of the rising young diplomat. An unbelieving President, who thought Communists were something you saw under the bed at night, scoffed at Berle's report.

As the first Government official to raise a question about the probity of Hiss, Berle was a marked man from then on. Eventually, he was forced out of the State Department, the victim, as he has testified, of what he called the "pro-Russian" group headed by Dean Acheson and Alger Hiss.

Chambers went back to New York where he eventually gained a reputation and financial success as a magazine writer. Sometimes he brooded over the silence which had greeted his efforts to expose a plot against the security of the Nation but he kept his peace for 9 years.

Nothing can really be kept secret in Washington for long and inevitably rumors about Hiss were whispered in the years that followed. But nothing disturbed his rise to power. Dumbarton Oaks, Yalta, San Francisco—Hiss pursued his smiling career. He became principal adviser to the American delegation at the United Nations. Then, in 1947, he resigned to become president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, a position carrying great prestige and a $20,000 salary.

Eighteen months later, the storm broke over his head. The House Committee on Un-American Activities stumbled accidentally upon the existence of Chambers and summoned him to testify, utterly unaware of the bombshell he carried with its 9-year-old sputtering fuse. Wearily, knowing that he was destroying his own career, Chambers repeated his charges against Hiss, this time in public before a congressional committee where no Government censorship could apply.

It was my duty in the next 3 years to cover the Hiss affair in all its dramatic ramifications. I have calculated that I spent more than 500 hours in that period, watching Hiss in action, listening to him testify at hearings and court trials.

I watched him as he made an impressive first appearance before the House committee, evoking almost unanimous sympathy as he

indignantly denied the Chambers allegations. I never witnessed a more convincing display of righteous wrath as he swore that he had never laid eyes upon Whittaker Chambers. He blinked at a photograph of Chambers in utter amazement. He did not know such a man. The whole story was a monstrous fabrication.

Less than a month later, Hiss, confronted with Chambers himself, was to confess that he had indeed known the man and known him intimately. He had entertained him a number of times as an overnight guest in his home and had given him an automobile.

But where another man would have been covered with confusion, near a breakdown, Hiss was unembarrassed, the picture of injured innocence, profuse in explanations of why he had failed to recall a man whose appearance was exactly that of the man in the photograph shown him. His retreat was a masterpiece of strategy. He had known Chambers under another name, that of George Crosley, and it had never occurred to him to think that the committee might be talking about Crosley. He had known Crosley as a "dead-beat" newspaperman, he said, and of course he had not known him as a Communist.

It was at this point that I began to realize that Alger Hiss was a dangerous man. Despite this devastating exposure of his own prevarications, his protests were plausible enough to keep many persons convinced that the Chambers charges were false.

That is why I think these details are highly important. You might remember that Hiss is a convicted perjurer as he talks to you tomorrow night but your memory should also be refreshed about the many lies he told before he was finally brought before the bar of justice. The denial that he knew Chambers was the first big lie in the frantic campaign of Hiss to avoid exposure. It set the pattern for what was to follow.

When Hiss tells you tomorrow night, as he will tell you on the basis of his published writings, that the Russians, not the Western Powers, made concessions at the Yalta Conference; that we gained a great diplomatic triumph instead of suffering a disastrous defeat, let his first denial that he ever laid eyes upon Whittaker Chambers be remembered.

I think most of us have forgotten the twists and turns, the evasions, and distortions and falsities uttered by Hiss in his first days under public examination. It should be remembered that the original charge of Chambers against his former friend was not espionage but Communist affiliations only—and affiliations dating back more than 10 years. Chambers has said that he did not make the more serious charge because he hoped that Hiss, given time to reflect, would admit the allegation of past Communist connections and thereby avoid more serious consequences.

If this highly placed diplomat had confessed at that time that he, like too many others in the Government in the thirties, had indeed toyed with Communist doctrines for a time, he would have been quickly absolved of blame in the Washington climate of that era. He would have continued to receive the overwhelming support of officialdom, perhaps could have remained in his post as president of the Carnegie Endowment. The persistent loyalty of his friends was well expressed by Secretary of State Acheson, who told a congressional committee on the very day that Hiss was sentenced to prison that he would never turn his back on Alger Hiss. How quickly his legion of supporters would have rushed to his defense if he had admitted a temporary enthrallment with the Communist philosophy.

Chambers had no evidence to offer after the year 1938, when he himself broke with the party. He could not know whether Hiss was still in bondage to the Soviet cause 10 years later or had long since, like Chambers himself, severed all connections. It was only after weeks of watching Hiss squirm and listening to his frenzied invective that Chambers realized, as he has written, that Hiss had never parted company with his Soviet masters.

It was not in Hiss, however, to admit that he had ever strayed so slightly from the path. This brings me to another trait of this complex character which is displayed only when he is dealing with those whom he considers his inferiors. I am sure that you will not see it tomorrow night. In his contacts with Members of Congress and with Government attorneys at his court trials there was always a distinct arrogance in the Hiss attitude.

This arrogance was not lessened when the President of the United States declared that the charges against Hiss and others were a "red herring" designed to distract attention from the misdeeds of the "do-nothing" 80th Congress.

Hiss poked fun at the chairman of the House committee, Representative MUNDT, of South Dakota, now Senator. He remarked slyly that the photograph of Chambers looked more like MUNDT than anyone else he knew. During his perjury trial, he snickered openly when the big red-faced Government prosecutor, Tom Murphy, made a mistake in grammar.

It was apparently this conviction that little men could not drag him down from his lofty position that led Hiss into a series of little lies at the congressional hearings, even after he had been forced to admit that he had indeed known Whittaker Chambers, the man he had originally sworn he had never laid eyes upon.

These lies were exposed, one by one, under the relentless questioning of another Congressman, RICHARD NIXON of California, now Vice President of the United States, and the committee's chief investigator, Robert E. Stripling.

Hiss was shown by official records to have lied from start to finish about the automobile which he said he gave to Chambers. A petty detail but it illustrates a propensity against truth. An analysis of the hearings shows Hiss, the skilled lawyer, actually denying that he had said in previous sessions what the record showed him to have said. I suggest again that there is a pattern in these largely forgotten hearings worthy of study today when Hiss seeks to explain the Yalta conference to the American people.

He was also a master at diversionary tactics. He hauled in the names of a very galaxy of prominent Americans who, he said, would testify to his good character. He called the roll of his friends—three former Secretaries of State; 3 Under Secretaries; the widow of President Roosevelt; ambassadors, Supreme Court Justices, eminent lawyers, admirals, and generals.

Nor was he exaggerating his claims. Many of these individuals, including two of the Supreme Court Justices and a governor of Illinois now seeking the presidency for the second time, offered testimony to his reputation for truth and veracity at his first trial. That imposing parade presumably helped the first jury to split on a verdict.

Hiss proved himself also to be a bold gambler. In a calculated bluff, which well might have proved successful, he challenged Chambers to repeat, outside the immunity of the committee room, the charges he had made. If this was done, there would be a suit for libel and slander, he said, which would forever clear his record.

Unfortunately for him, Chambers called the bluff and promptly repeated his charges on a radio program. There followed a period of 4 weeks during which Hiss took no action. Editorial murmurs began to arise, even among the pro-Hiss newspapers. Where, they asked, was the libel suit? Finally, a $75,000 action was filed in Baltimore.

Up to this point, Chambers had testified only that he knew Hiss as a Communist. He had never mentioned espionage. Now, faced with possible loss of his property and savings, Chambers dug out of a dusty hiding place 65 typewritten pages of secret State Department documents and 3 rolls of microfilm, laid away 10 years earlier against just such a contingency.

The typewritten copies, according to evidence later at the trial, were proved to have come from a typewriter in the Hiss home. Chambers also produced four memoranda in Hiss' handwriting, conceded as such by the defense when they were placed before a jury.

The typewritten pages were produced by Chambers at a pretrial hearing of the libel suit which promptly began to wither away. He hid the microfilm temporarily in a pumpkin on his farm, producing it later for the House committee amid a national uproar.

Now, for the first time, Chambers revealed that Alger Hiss was not only a Communist but a spy. This was his story:

He had come to Washington in 1934, at the commands of the Russian secret police, to set up a new espionage group. He found Alger Hiss, he said, already a member of the Communist cell in the Agriculture Adjustment Administration who was about to be loaned to a Senate munitions investigating committee. The two men became close and intimate friends.

Chambers says Hiss agreed without question to procure Government documents which could be photographed by Chambers with a Leica camera and then returned to the files. Hiss used his position with the Senate committee to obtain secret State Department papers, presumably for use by the committee. The photographing was done in the Hiss home.

The spying apparatus swung into 24-hour operation in 1936 when Hiss transferred to the State Department. Hiss went to New York City and was interviewed by Col. Boris Bykov, head of Soviet intelligence in the United States, and arrangements were made for Hiss to steal documents and get them into the hands of the Russians.

As outlined by Chambers, here is how Hiss operated: About once a week he would bring home a briefcase containing State Department documents. Chambers would visit the Hiss home in the early evening, take the documents, drive 40 miles to Baltimore, where the papers would be photographed in a workshop set up for that purpose, and then drive back to Washington, returning the documents to Hiss late at night or early in the morning. Hiss would return them to the files when he went back to his office that morning. It was a simple, safe, and efficient system.

The microfilmed copies of the documents were delivered by Chambers to Bykov in New York.

Later, Bykov insisted upon a greater flow of material. Hiss was instructed to bring home a briefcase of papers each night, make typewritten copies of the material, and save them for the pickup by Chambers. When Chambers arrived, he would be given these typewritten copies, as well as the original documents brought home that night.

Sometimes also, important documents would pass through Hiss' hands at his office but he would be able to keep them only for a short time. He took to making penciled copies of such papers or notes on their main points. These he also turned over to Chambers.

Chambers was supposed to destroy the typewritten copies after they had been photographed. But when he broke with the party in 1938, he kept a number of these typed documents, some of the penciled memos by Hiss, and several rolls of film of original documents. It was this evidence which he dug out of hiding to protect himself against the Hiss libel suit.

Hiss was only one of a half-dozen Government officials who were feeding Government secrets to the Russians. Why did he and these other highly educated Americans engage in espionage? Did they never suffer qualms of conscience? Chambers says the Communist mind is such that they regard any government that is not Communist, including their own, merely as the political machine of a class whose power they have organized expressly to overthrow by all means, including violence. The problem of conscience had been settled long before when they accepted the program and discipline of the Communist Party.

In the face of thes revelations, the powerful corps of believers in Hiss could no longer help him stave off the inevitable outcome. Some 15 months and two trials later, in January, 1950, he heard a jury pronounce him guilty.

There is no need to review here the exciting developments at those two trials. They constitute an absorbing chapter in the history of espionage in the United States.

But the behavior of the defendant in the courtroom is again worthy of discussion as we now examine his qualifications to speak out on matters of public policy, affecting the welfare of the United States.

Hiss was consistently contemptuous of the evidence against him. He had the best lawyers in the land and a defense fund reported at $40,000 contributed by secret donors. He had, at the first trial, a jurist who was openly hostile to the federal prosecutor and his witnesses. When the jury deadlocked, he was calmly confident that his innocence would soon be established.

As the evidence piled up against him at the second trial, presided over by a veteran jurist of utter impartiality, Hiss remained smiling and assured. Confronted in cross-examination by discrepancies in his own testimony, he was the urbane man of charm, flashing his smile at the jury as explained away annoying contradictions.

There was much testimony at the trial about the "psychopathic personality" of Chambers, a man the Hiss experts said, with an irresistible tendency to make false accusations. The typewritten documents, the typwriter itself, the handwritten notes, the microfilmed evidence—all could be ignored. Chambers somehow had forged them.

The Government called no psychiatrists. But surely, one of these experts after questioning and observing Hiss, would have come up with a verdict that he was a man of passionate and almost pathological convictions of his own rectitude regardless of overwhelming evidence of guilt.

After he had been sentenced, he stood up and announced in loud, clear tones, tinged with scorn: "I am confident that in the future the full facts of how Whittaker Chambers was able to carry out forgery by typewriter will be disclosed." He was still making that claim when discharged from prison 17 months ago.

YALTA

I do not know what Hiss will have to say about Geneva but there is no mystery about his view on Yalta. He has written a lengthy article, published in pocketbook form last October, entitled "Yalta—Modern American Myth."

The theme of this work is that the American people have been deluded for 10 years about the Yalta Conference. Instead of doleful conclusions that the decisions of Yalta paved the way to the Soviet conquest of China and Eastern Europe, there should be jubilation, Hiss says. It was a famous victory.

Just as Hiss lightly dismissed the weighty evidence at his trial as psychopathic in origin and forged in content, he now pictures this Nation as the victim of a grand hallucination about the deal at Yalta.

When Mr. Roosevelt made vast concessions to Stalin to secure Russia's entry into the war against Japan, at the price of a betrayal of our ally, in China, it was in reality, Hiss tells us, a shining diplomatic victory.

Incredible? I assure you that all this will be made to seem very plausible tomorrow night.

What did we give and what did we receive at Yalta? In the Far East, Russia was given the south half of Sakhalin Island, the Kuriles, restoration of the Soviet lease on Port Arthur, a joint share in the Chinese Eastern and South Manchurian railroads, and the internationalized port of Dairen.

Germany was to be dismembered and jointly occupied by the victorious powers, a decision from which we are suffering deeply to this day. Poland was carved up and the Soviet-sponsored Lublin government, already installed in the ruins of Warsaw, was endorsed. Plans for the founding of the United Nations were laid and the United States agreed that the Soviet Union should have 3 votes to its 1.

In return for all this, Russia agreed to enter the war against Japan at some vague future date, fixed as within 2 or 3 months after Germany surrendered. As we know, Russia belatedly rushed into the Pacific war to fight the last 6 days of a conflict that lasted 1,347 days. That was the service it rendered for one of the great bribes of history.

The main argument in behalf of this bribe, coupled as it was with the sellout of China, was that military leaders at the conference believed that the war against Japan would last another 18 months and that Soviet participation was absolutely essential.

If this was true, was the bribe necessary? The record now discloses that Stalin, 2 years earlier at the Moscow Conference of 1943, had promised Secretary of State Hull that he would join the war against Japan when Germany was defeated. Even Stalin, keenly aware as he was of American gullibility, did not think at that time of exacting a price for this pledge of support to a nation which had helped save Russia from the German hordes with a tremendous outpouring of arms and materials. He repeated this pledge, again without naming a price, in October 1944, 4 months before Yalta.

No one reminded him of those pledges at Yalta and it can be imagined with what secret amusement Stalin placed his services on the auction block and listened to the bidders. The Kremlin must have rocked with laughter when Stalin gave his reasons for demanding concessions. Gravely, the great dictator told Roosevelt and Churchill that it would be hard to persuade the Russian people to war against Japan.

Thus, Stalin was given the gains, which enabled the spread of Soviet dictatorship to one-third of the human race, in return for a pledge already freely given—and never necessary.

There is much talk now—and you may hear it from Hiss tomorrow night—about all this being hindsight. Critics of the Yalta agreements, we hear, are Monday morning quarterbacks. But there were some Saturday afternoon quarterbacks on the scene back in 1945 who were not even allowed to coach from the sidelines.

Almost forgotten now is a 1945 intelligence report put into the record of the MacArthur hearings in 1951 which warned that the entry of Russia into the Pacific war was unnecessary and would have disastrous effects.

A group of intelligence officers joined in drafting this report which was ignored and buried in the files.

"The entry of Soviet Russia into the Asiatic war would destroy America's position in Asia as effectively as our position is now destroyed in Europe east of the Elbe and beyond the Adriatic," they wrote.

"If Russia enters the Asiatic war, China will certainly lose her independence to become the Poland of Asia; Korea the Asiatic Rumania; Manchukuo the Soviet Bulgaria."

Moreover, Russian entry into the war, they warned, would betray China and be an act of treachery that would make the Atlantic Charter and our hopes for world peace a tragic farce.

The Yalta agreements, of course, were a complete abandonment of the aims of the Atlantic Charter, signed by Roosevelt and Churchill, and endorsed by Soviet Russia in 1942. That charter declared that the Allies sought no territorial gains and would assent to no territorial changes unless the peoples concerned desired them. It pledged restoration of sovereign rights and self-government to subjugated countries and acknowledged the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they would live.

Hiss now makes the astounding contention that Nationalist China's interests were furthered at Yalta because a basis was laid there for a Chinese-Soviet treaty that Chiang Kai-shek greatly desired for the enhanced domestic and international prestige that it gave him.

It is hard to understand why, if Chiang was to be transfixed with delight by the Yalta agreements, that it was thought best to keep those agreements secret from him, with Mr. Roosevelt engaging to persuade him eventually of their desirability.

It was, indeed, thought best to keep the world unaware of the Far East decisions. On March 1, 1945, Mr. Roosevelt, addressing a joint session of Congress, after his return from Yalta, said:

"Quite naturally, this conference concerned itself only with the European war and with the political problems of Europe and not with the Pacific war."

Senator KNOWLAND, in what I regard as a magnificent understandment, recently labeled this statement as "nearly a false official report" to Congress.

Why the dark secrecy which enveloped the Far East agreements at Yalta for so long? If it was a superb triumph of diplomacy, as Hiss contends, why was the full text of the agreement withheld for 2 years, long after the shooting had stopped, and why were the details of the negotiations themselves withheld for 10 years?

As I read the statements of Hiss about Yalta, I thought back to the many scenes in courtrooms and committee rooms in which I heard him defend himself against charges of treason. There is a reminiscent flavor about his present writings. Just as he fumed about psychopathic accusers then, charging them with grotesque and lurid tales, he now writes than the American public has been "lured to confusion and panic by fanciful dark tales of duplicity and greed" at Yalta.

The pattern is consistent. The evidence at his own trial was forged and the product of diseased minds. The evidence at Yalta has been twisted and distorted into a myth and delusion. In Hiss's mind, the Crimean folly was a magnificent effort at a sound postwar peace. American statesmen bamboozled Stalin into entering a war against his own convictions. Black is white. War is peace. Freedom is slavery. Ignorance is strength. The slogans of Orwell's totalitarian world of 1984 are coming upon us.

The whole truth about Yalta is yet to be told. Last October, an attempt was made to forcibly retire two State Department historians—men of the highest standing in their field. One of them, Prof. Donald M. Dozer, is still fighting to retain his post. The Civil Service Commission ordered him reinstated but he was again fired and is arguing his second appeal. The other historian was Bryton Barron, a State Department veteran

of 30 years, who eventually accepted retirement on a pension.

In fighting for vindication, Dr. Dozer filed sworn affidavits with the Civil Service Commission in which he revealed that important documents were suppressed when the Yalta papers were finally published by a reluctant State Department in March 1955.

Dr. Dozer charged that he and Barron had been penalized because they fought "a partial and distorted compilation" of the Yalta records. He said that State Department officials who took office under the Roosevelt and Truman administrations eliminated data which might have been embarrassing to those administrations.

The professional competence of Dr. Dozer is unquestioned. He has been known in historical circles for a quarter-century. He taught history at Harvard and three other universities and is the author of numerous articles on historical subjects and foreign policy. He has been in the State Department since 1941.

Among the documents suppressed, Dr. Dozer said, was one showing that Mr. Roosevelt insisted upon taking Alger Hiss with him to the Yalta Conference. The late Secretary of State Stettinius was quoted in this paper as stating that Mr. Roosevelt demanded that Hiss go along.

Omission of this record helped play down the part that Hiss played at Yalta. It has been said that Hiss was just a "technician" who was a very minor figure. The record, incomplete, as it is, does not support that contention. Hiss, himself, has not been humble about his participation. When the charges of communism exploded around him in 1948, he was asked if he had drafted, or participated in drafting parts of the Yalta agreements. His answer:

"I think it is accurate and not an immodest statement to say that I did to some extent; yes."

And at his second trial, he testified that he advised President Roosevelt on all matters pertaining to the proposed United Nations and "handled all of Mr. Stettinius' communications and drafted replies to them." Stettinius, in his memoirs, revealed that Hiss was indeed his right-hand man.

But the gravest and most significant charge concerning suppressed documents of the Yalta Conference concerns the notes taken by Hiss himself. Sworn testimony by a State Department official has revealed that there were several folders of these notes. But when the supposedly complete Yalta record was published last year, the contents of only a single Hiss folder were made public. These disclosed little of his role. They were confined to a single subject—the Roosevelt commitment to give Russia three votes in the United Nations.

A Senate investigation has been promised of these allegations that the Yalta papers were censored—that history has been doctored to protect the reputations of men in high places. My own investigation of these charges, based upon interviews with the two State Department historians and sworn statements, indicates that many thousand words of pertinent data were deleted.

I suggest that Hiss would contribute to the enlightenment of the American people if he, tomorrow night, before discussing the meaning of Yalta and Geneva, would answer the following questions:

1. Is it true that copious notes made by you at Yalta have been held back from the official record of the conference?

2. Do those notes show your interest in the subject of reparations to be assessed by Russia against Germany, a subject outside the scope of your duties as you have yourself outlined them?

3. Were original documents from Russian sources included in your file holders?

And finally, I would like Hiss to explain the testimony given in February 1952 by Nathaniel Weyl, a Washington writer and former Government employee.

Hiss and his supporters have always stressed the fact that only one witness, Whittaker Chambers, testified to personal knowledge of Hiss' activities in the Communist underworld. Chambers, they insisted, was a pathological liar and it was strange that no other witness, who knew Hiss as a Communist, came forward during the congressional hearings or at the two trials.

Weyl testified that, while in Government employ in 1934, he and Alger Hiss were members of the same Communist cell. He had kept back that fact when summoned before the House committee in 1943. He said he protected Hiss at that time because he had no way of knowing whether Hiss had followed his own example in leaving the Communist Party many years earlier.

Four years have passed since Weyl delivered that testimony under oath. Hiss, to my knowledge, has never commented upon it. Is Weyl another psychopath with an irresistible urge to make false accusations against Hiss?

Is Weyl another man upon whom Hiss has never laid eyes? I think the public, which is now urged to weigh the interpretation of foreign policy advanced by Hiss, is entitled to an answer from him on this testimony.

Hiss comes here tomorrow as a guest of a Princeton society. He is entitled to courteous attention. He has an unquestioned and constitutional right to air his opinions wherever and whenever he is invited to expound them.

But he has no right to demand acceptance of those opinions without conisderation of his conviction as a perjurer. Law and public morals recognize this limitation on felons after they have served their prison terms. Hiss, for example, has lost the right to vote. He has been disbarred from legal practice in the Federal and State courts. He may never again, except through presidential pardon, hold Governemnt office.

I believe that the controversy and dispute which have arisen over this affair have done much to alleviate the danger that Hiss' statements will be swallowed unthinkingly and without consideration of his past record and present motives. I hope this meeting and this review of his past career will complete the job of removing that danger.

It may be said that he has paid the price for his crime and should be listened to in a spirit of forgiveness. I am completely sympathetic with the efforts of Hiss to make a living and to rehabilitate himself in society. I could wish, however, that some expression of repentence for the crime of which he has been convicted would accompany those efforts.

But there is a stipulation attached to the earning capacity of a man who has served in prison for a crime. A bank may be considered uncharitable but most reasonable men will agree it is practical when it refuses to hire a convicted safecracker. A convicted rapist would scarcely be entrusted with a post at a young ladies' finishing school.

So I do not think it unfair or heartless to utter a warning of caution when a man convicted of lying to conceal complicity in Soviet espionage chooses a career in which he seeks to instruct the American people in the meaning of our relations with the Soviet Union.

And I hope that a precedent is not established here for university lectures by men with prison records. A number of Communist Party leaders have just been released after serving terms in prison for conspiring to teach and advocate the overthrow of the United States Government.

These are all men eager to speak in public upon any occasion. But I think little profit would be gained by students from an address by Eugene V. Dennis, general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States, on, let us say, "the meaning of the fifth amendment." Or by John Gates, editor of the Daily Worker, on "the meaning of press freedom."

In this country, when a man takes the platform to advise us on matters affecting our national security, we give that amount of respect to his words which he has earned by his deeds. Surely, it is not inhuman to suggest that Alger Hiss be judged by this standard.

The Cure of Delinquency and the Making of Good Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the ever-increasing problem of juvenile delinquency challenges some form of solution by responsible citizens. One who has taken the lead in the solution of this major problem is one of our first and finest citizens, an eminent and elder statesman, the Honorable Herbert Hoover, who has served as chairman of the board of directors of the Boys' Clubs of America for the past 20 years, and who has devoted practically all of his life to public service and good government.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, and in order that responsible citizens may have the benefit of his thinking on the subject, I request unanimous consent to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address by this great statesman and former President of the United States, at the cornerstone laying of the new building of the Columbia Park Boys' Club, San Francisco, Calif. His message is most inspiring and is a direct approach to the solution of this cancerous problem, which is mushrooming up and about us all over the Nation. It is a plague to our local and national enforcement officers. We have an effective weapon in combatting juvenile delinquency through the medium of the Boys' Clubs in every area of the United States. Let us give our wholehearted support to the work of these clubs as one of our most effective and immediate means of fighting for the welfare of our youth:

THE CURE OF DELINQUENCY AND THE MAKING OF GOOD CITIZENS

It is an honor to participate here in the laying of the cornerstone for a new building of the Columbia Park Boys' Club. This was one of the earliest boys' clubs established in the United States. It was due to that great San Francisco spirit, Maj. Sidney Peixotto, and it has shed blessing on this city now for 61 years. Among its good deeds was the start in life of Mr. John Costello, who is today the chairman of the board of directors and A. J. Shragge, cochairman of the building committee, both eminent Californians, who were members of the club as boys.

Major Peixotto was one of the founders of the national organization of the Boys Clubs of America. I have been on this team for only 20 years as chairman of the national board. In my time alone I have witnessed the number of clubs double—from 200 to

about 400. I have seen them established in 300 towns and cities. This is no paper organization. To build and equip a club like this costs from $300,000 to $500,000. We have in this 20 years had the satisfaction of the growth of a nationwide investment in these clubs from $20 million to over $120 million.

The clubs have become one of the great character building institutions of our country. They turn out every year thousands of assured loyal and patriotic citizens. And every club is a voluntary institution supported by the generosity of the citizens of their city. There is no governmental hand in them.

Our country is greatly agitated over the growth of teen-age delinquency. There are a multitude of proposed remedies. Most of them gyrate around ideas of how mothers and fathers and teachers can do a better job. Most of these remedies ignore four primary forces insofar as our congested districts are concerned.

First. These boys are endowed with dynamic energy. The world is new and must be fully explored. They have an impelling desire for adventure, discovery, and great undertakings. They have competition and combat in their bones. Their primary instinct is to hunt in a pack in search for adventure and joy.

Second. We have laid pavements and cement over most of their out-of-door space in our congested city districts.

Third. These boys can no longer find outlets for their energies in the woods or on the streams and the animals to be captured.

Fourth. We send these youngsters to school for 6 or 8 hours during the day and we leave them to the paved streets for the evenings and Saturdays and Sundays.

Do you wonder that with these innate qualities and the surroundings that these boys conspire by gangs to engage in destructive joy and the excitement of battle?

This is where the boys clubs come in. Here we provide a place where the gang spirit and competition expend themselves in organized games. If the youngsters need to do combat, they are given the gloves and operate under rules of sportsmanship. Here in these clubs they expand their creative spirits through the mysteries of woodworking, machine tools, books, and musical instruments. Here they find their bent for future life. Here they conduct their own government and their own discipline. Here they receive constant sympathetic friendliness and guidance from a trained staff of devoted men and women. When they are in these rooms, mother has no anxieties and father broods over no homecoming chastisement.

These clubs are the greatest cure for delinquency in our country. I could prove it to you by the statistics from 300 cities. In one Chicago district alone, the number of boys in the hands of the police every year decreased from 80 percent to only 12 percent.

There are facts which cannot be ignored. The boy members of these clubs cannot afford streetcar or bus fares. Their walking distance is about 1 mile. Thus the clubs become a bright spot of decency within a 2-mile radius or a little more. And there are 3 million pavement boys in the United States. The Nation needs, and San Francisco needs, more of these clubs.

Two years ago I had the pleasure of participating in the dedication of the new San Francisco boys' club on Page Street. Today is the day of the Columbia Park Boys Club. Its chairman, Mr. Costello, its board of directors of leading citizens, and its director, Mr. Julian Hargrove have undertaken to erect this modern building and equip it at a cost of about $500,000. Their support has come from generous citizens of San Francisco, the contribution of materials from many manufacturers and contractors. And especially among these contributions has been the free labor from the labor unions. The club needs more support to complete its new building and its operation. That support costs less than police, the courts, and the reformatories for here is a white spot in delinquency, a stimulant and a training and creation of good citizens. This will be a better city because of it.

My admiration goes out to all who have a part in it.

Worthy of Midwest Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks an editorial from the Marshalltown Times-Republican, published in Marshalltown, Iowa, in support of the Fryingpan-Arkansas water diversion project in Colorado. This editorial indicates the interest in this project in the Midwest. The writer of the editorial, I am sure, expresses the sentiments of a large number of residents of that area, who would like to see this project authorized and constructed. The importance of the project is recognized, not alone to Colorado but to the entire country.

I wish to emphasize, as mentioned in the editorial, that this project will not bring any new land into cultivation, but merely provides supplemental water for some 322,000 acres of land now under cultivation in the Arkansas Valley, Colo. This water will also be used for domestic purposes, and is urgently needed by cities and towns in this area.

The editorial follows:

WORTHY OF MIDWEST SUPPORT

Here in the Midwest, where the farm surplus problem is most acutely felt, any Federal reclamation project that may put more land in cultivation is likely to meet bitter opposition—and with good reason. It doesn't make sense to pay farmers for not producing crops, on the one hand, and, at the same time, bring more wasteland under cultivation.

That is why far western irrigation projects with Federal aid are likely to meet midwestern opposition on general principles, but occasionally such a project may have indirect benefits to the Midwest itself.

One project that appears to fit this category is the so-called Fryingpan-Arkansas water diversion development for southeastern Colorado that is soon to be given committee hearings in Congress.

Briefly, the Fryingpan-Arkansas project is a self-contained reclamation project for the collection and transmountain diversion of 69,200-acre feet of surplus water from the Fryingpan and other tributaries of the Roaring Fork River in western Colorado to the Arkansas River in eastern Colorado.

This water that is now quite largely wasted will be utilized as supplemental water for irrigation, for municipal use, electric power, flood control, sedimentation control, protection of fish and game resources, and preservation of tourist attractions.

The project represents an investment of $156 million, but $136 million is expected to be paid back eventually through the sale of irrigation water to farmers, sale of water to municipalities and industries, sale of power, etc. Only about 18 million for flood control and $1,800,000 for fish and wildlife conservation will be the final Federal cost.

Where this project may actually aid the Midwest farmer, its supporters claim, is in the development of that area's livestock feeding business to the extent that more Midwest corn may have to be imported for feed.

Wheat is grown on nonirrigated land and the only corn now grown in that area is used for ensilage and feed, so it is not a project that will add to the presnt farm surpluses, its supporters assert.

Furthermore, the Fryingpan project will not bring any new acreage into cultivation. The project will supplement the water supply of presently irrigated land to assure the farmer of sufficient water to irrigate his crops during the last weeks of the growing season.

With that explanation we see no reason why the Fryingpan project, filed in the House under H. R. 412, and in the Senate as Senate file 300 should not receive Midwestern support.

Polish-American Congress Promotes Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader Evening News on Monday, April 30, 1956, which calls attention to the outstanding contributions made over the past 12 years by the Polish-American Congress:

POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS PROMOTES FREEDOM'S CAUSE

The visit of Attorney Charles Rozmarek, national president of the Polish-American Congress, to Wilkes-Barre tonight to install officers of the northeastern Pennsylvania division at a dinner meeting in Hotel Sterling is a reminder of the tremendous contribution this organization has made to the cause of freedom since it was founded in 1944.

The Polish-American Congress was the first American organization to warn America and the world of the Communist threat. Attorney Rozmarek and other leaders saw the danger of appeasement of the Soviet Union on the grounds of wartime expediency. The sacrifice of Poland at Yalta brought a vigorous protest from the Polish-American Congress which pointed out the need for a free and independent Poland as a cornerstone of European stability. If the advice of Attorney Rozmarek and his associates had been taken in its entirety a dozen years ago, the world might have been spared most of the headaches and heartaches that plagued it subsequently.

The purposes and objectives of the Polish-American Congress, as stated at the time it was founded, were, briefly, to support the United States Government to win a just and lasting peace, to inform the American public of Poland's historic role, to organize the 6 million Americans of Polish ancestry for unity in support of American democratic principles, to combat the growth of communism at home and abroad and to work for the restoration of a free and democratic Poland.

While Poland is still enslaved, the Polish-American Congress has accomplished a great deal in alerting the world to the menace it faces. The congress has exposed un-Ameri-

can elements, countered alien propaganda, enlisted labor, religious, and other groups in the fight for democracy and a durable peace, helped in the solution of the displaced person problem and lent its facilities to the Government to carry on the fight against aggression. These, of course, are just some of the highlights; the details would fill a page of this newspaper if they were enumerated.

Nowhere has the Polish-American Congress been more loyally supported than in our own community. This not only is a personal tribute to Attorney Rozmarek, a former local resident, now living in Chicago, but an expression of the community's concern over conditions in Europe, especially in Poland, where so many Luzerne County families have their roots.

It is indeed inspiring to note the perseverance of these people who have dedicated themselves to liberty and to peace with justice, not only for Poland, but for all nations. They realize that no country in the world, the United States included, is safe, so long as one is under the oppressor's heel.

The Claims of Former Polish Prisoners of War Now Residing in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, May 3 is the anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day, and this time of year therefore seems appropriate to call attention to the plight of Polish former prisoners of war now living in the United States.

These soldiers were members of the Polish armed forces and fought with the Allies against the enemy in various theaters of operation. During the course of the war, some of these soldiers were captured by the Nazis. Now, according to the provisions of the Geneva Convention of 1929, to which Nazi Germany was a party, prisoners of war are entitled to certain benefits as well as good treatment. Article 34 of the convention provides that upon their release prisoners of war shall receive both their unpaid military pay and wages for labor while they were prisoners. The convention also provides that prisoners who are forced to live in unsanitary conditions and who are not provided with food equal in quality and quantity to that provided by the country to its own soldiers, shall receive compensation. The Polish exprisoners claim that Naxi Germany violated all these provisions.

The normal procedure for adjusting claims for violations of the Geneva Convention is for the country of which the prisoners of war are citizens to handle it. For example, in the United States, claims by Americans who were prisoners were adjusted through the War Claims Act of 1948. The fund established by this act was made up of confiscated assets of Germany and Japan, and money from this fund was used to pay American citizens who filed legitimate claims.

Unfortunately, these Polish former prisoners, now residing in the United States, found themselves in an unusual position after the war. Since Poland had been occupied by the Communists, they refused to return to their homeland, and the Communists therefore ignored their claims against Germany.

To add to their predicament, the German authorities insisted that any claims against the German state or its legal successor could not be made by an individual alien citizen, but only by his government. They also stated that these Poles should have collected their claims through the reparation fund established for Poland at the Potsdam Conference and controlled by Poland's Communist government. The Polish exprisoners have therefore been unable to collect their just claims.

Many of these Polish ex-prisoners now living in the United States have just claims and have been denied them largely as a result of their refusal to return to Communist Poland. We have met the similar claims of our own former prisoners of war out of the captured German assets that were put into the war claims fund, and it seems to me there is a case for adding to the list of those eligible to compensation from that fund these Poles who are now living in the United States. In the spirit of justice and equity, then, I would like to urge the Department of State, to whom these Polish former prisoners of war have presented their case, to give every consideration to their pleas and to arrange some way of satisfying the legitimate claims of Polish ex-prisoners now living in the United States from the war claims fund established to meet the similar claims of Amercan citizens.

Dr. Flemming's Comments on the Nickel Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter I received from Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. The letter from Dr. Flemming is a reply to my letter of January 11, 1956, in which I propounded 11 questions concerning the nickel situation.

The letter follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., April 30, 1956.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. McCORMACK: This has further reference to your letter of January 11 in which you raise a number of questions with regard to the nickel situation. In accordance with your letter of April 26, 1956, the memorandum furnished you on April 24 has been modified to an unclassified form.

The questions in the body of your letter and our replies thereto are listed below in the order of your presentation.

A. What are the quantities and sources of high-price nickel being sold in the United States market?

It is the opinion of the Business and Defense Services Administration that the 4 million pounds of high-priced nickel, which it is estimated may have been sold in the domestic market in 1955, came from the following sources:

	Pounds
France	1,200,000
Japan	70,000
Germany	152,000–200,000
Recovery of secondary nickel	balance

B. Can ODM, BDSA, or the suppliers cope with a situation where according to reports scrap dealers supply mills with certain materials and receive nickel in return?

The BDSA has received reports that such transactions occur but it cannot verify them since no specific information as to possible participants has been furnished. In any case the Government is not in a position to take action about them other than in those cases involving nickel obtained through rated orders for defense production, since controls over the distribution and use of nickel were terminated on November 1, 1953.

With regard to possible action by suppliers, primary nickel sold in the United States is for the most part sold under terms and conditions which forbid resale or remelting for resale. This makes it possible for producers to cut off shipments where transactions of this kind are uncovered.

C. Is 75 percent of the released stockpile nickel used for defense purposes; if so, should not all stockpile diversions be earmarked for commercial users in order to break the high price market?

Your information that 75 percent of the nickel diverted from the stockpile is used for defense purposes is not exactly descriptive, although in effect it approximates the situation.

Most of the nickel diverted to industry served to replace nickel withdrawn from the market for defense production through rated orders. If 75 percent of the diverted nickel did in fact go for defense production, the effect thereof was to free a comparable amount for industry which in the absence of the diversion would have gone to defense.

In such circumstances even if assurance were obtained that all diverted nickel were to be used by nondefense consumers it would not affect the current deficit, since any portion of the diverted nickel redirected from defense orders for civilian consumption would be replaced by an equivalent drawdown on the balance of the civilian supply through the application of priority orders for defense.

Below are listed the replies to the numbered questions on page 2 of your letter:

1. How have the stockpile objectives been set? By whom? When last reviewed? And what consideration was given to the fact that the source being principally from Canada is virtually domestic and free from being cut off?

(a) Stockpile objectives are set as follows: First, estimates are made of supplies and requirements for military and essential civilian purposes during a mobilization period. The supply figures are then discounted for strategic and other factors based on advice from the Joint Chiefs of Staff and other agencies. The difference between the requirements and the factored supply results in the estimated wartime deficit, provision for which is made by a number of means, the principal one being that of stockpiling. From the above factors a minimum stockpile objective is established.

In arriving at the long-term stockpile objective, all foreign sources of supply are

completely discounted except for those nearby sources which are believed to be secure and readily accessible.

(b) Prior to June 12, 1953, when Reorganization Plan No. 3 became effective, stockpile objectives had been set by the Munitions Board of the Department of Defense. Since that date, such determinations have been made by the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. In carrying out stockpiling responsibilities, the ODM depends on its various delegate agencies to provide basic data through several interdepartmental commodity committees. Proposed actions resulting from the data received from such committees are submitted to the Interdepartmental Materials Advisory Committee (a committee of assistant secretary level) on which are represented the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, the Interior, State and Labor and the General Services Administration. In the light of the recommendations of the foregoing, the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization establishes or modifies stockpile objectives.

(c) The nickel stockpile objective was last reviewed on January 26, 1955, and revised on February 7, 1955.

(d) Full consideration was given to the availability of nickel from Canada in time of war.

2. Please verify your statement regarding the date of the establishment of the allocation base and advise if it should be brought up-to-date in view of industry changes, new businesses, etc.

(a) We note that information you have received does not confirm the statement in our December 19, 1955, letter with regard to the methods used by the producers for developing nickel distribution patterns for nondefense purposes. We have been assured by the BDSA, which has a detailed knowledge of the matter, that our previous general statement is descriptive of the method used by the International Nickel Co. to determine quotas for individual nondefense consumers and that our reference to the basic historical periods of pre-Korea and late 1953 is correct. We have also been assured that the method is up-to-date and takes into account the restrictions on end uses during the Korean emergency, and makes provision for new businesses. It is the opinion of BDSA that the distribution system so devised has proven to be generally fair and equitable.

3. What are the historical figures showing the allocations between defense and nondefense purposes since 1949?

(a) The historical figures on defense and nondefense consumption of nickel, 1949–56, cannot publicly be revealed since they involve classified information.

4. Does authority exist in ODM, BDSA, or any other agency to take such action as may be needed to insure fair and equitable distribution of nickel to commercial users?

The Office of Defense Mobilization has authority to direct an agency such as the Department of Commerce to allocate materials where necessary to promote national defense. Also, if the requirements of the national defense for nickel create a significant dislocation of the normal distribution of such material in the civilian market in such a manner as to create appreciable hardship, the Office of Defense Mobilization has authority to direct that steps be taken to control the general distribution of the material.

In November 1953 we decided to stop controlling the distribution of nickel in the civilian market. Our reasons for such action were reflected in a memorandum that we filed with the Joint Committee on Defense Production. This memorandum is quoted herewith in full:

"OCTOBER 5, 1953.

"MEMORANDUM FOR THE FILES

"SUBJECT: NICKEL DECONTROL

"The Department of Commerce, on July 29, 1953, proposed the removal of controls on nickel distribution and use in the civilian economy. The proposal specifically reserves for continued operation the controls necessary to meet military and stockpile requirements. It is the purpose of this memorandum to review considerations which have led me to approve the proposal of the Department of Commerce, including the facts as known and the applicable law, the advice of informed groups and the understandings reached as to future operations both within and without the Government.

"Existing controls on the distribution and use of nickel are extensive. Under NPA Order M–80 and related schedules, the use of nickel is controlled quantitatively and qualitatively; the industrial user is limited in the amount of the material which he may process and in the use to which he may put that limited amount. Cigarette lighters, hair curlers, letterboxes, and doorknobs, for example, may not be nickel plated. Except for users of very small quantities, application must be made to the Government for permission to deliver or accept delivery of primary nickel.

"The basic justification for such detailed controls as those presently existing needs to be stated. In time of full mobilization the national economy is substantially reoriented to production for war, and under such circumstances the Government must take responsibility for providing a substitute for the normal operation of what are called the economic laws. At the present time there is no such disruption of markets and supplies as occurs in time of war. The reasons for controlling nickel during the last several months have been special and specific. They originated with the necessity for assuring supplies of nickel to the current military program, Atomic Energy Commission program, and stockpiling program. Provision of these national defense requirements has left a balance of supply substantially less than the balance of demand. The Federal Government was obliged to provide for the national defense and in doing so it created a shortage of nickel for which it had to accept responsibility. To the extent that Government action may relieve or assuage the hardships and dislocation resulting from such a shortage, the Government has a duty to act.

"This concept of governmental responsibility in time of limited emergency is well expressed in the Defense Production Act as most recently amended. In section 101 the President is authorized to require preference in the performance of contracts and to allocate materials where necessary to promote the national defense. On this authority there is imposed the restriction that 'the powers granted in this section shall not be used to control the general distribution of any material in the civilian market unless the President finds (1) that such material is a scarce and critical material essential to the national defense, and (2) that the requirements of the national defense for such material cannot otherwise be met without creating a significant dislocation of the normal distribution of such material in the civilian market to such a degree as to create appreciable hardship.'

"A justification for the decontrol of a shortage material must, of course, speak in these same terms. It is not anticipated that the supply of nickel will be adequate to meet total demands for many months. It is not argued that the shortage will fail to cause dislocation and hardship. There is dislocation and hardship under the present allocation and use controls, and the essential premise of decontrol is that the continuance of the controls will not serve to relieve or assuage that dislocation and hardship. In other words, at times like this it is not enough, to justify continuing controls, that national defense requirements create a shortage; it must also be true that the difficulties which flow from the shortage will somehow be eased by the continuance of the controls.

"There is the obvious danger in undertaking decontrol that dislocation and hardship will be increased. It is to that possibility that our attention is first drawn by the decontrol proposal. The less apparent but more serious danger is that the Government's first responsibility, the national defense, will not be adequately provided for. Both of these possibilities must be covered in the decision here being made.

"Compelling among the considerations favoring decontrol is the fact that competition in a free market is a major factor in the maintenance of a strong and dynamic economy. We have ample evidence that a controlled economy, with the best of intentions and the highest of skills, is not likely to prosper. In an emergency controls can save an economy, but if long continued they are almost certain to stifle and warp it. There is, therefore, a burden of proof upon the proponent of continuing controls to establish clearly and persuasively that distribution of the shortage material in a free market, under present circumstances, will be less effective or less equitable or less orderly than Government distribution to a degree that will aggravate existing dislocations and hardships.

"The steel industry in the United States consumes nearly one-half of our total nickel supply. It is therefore particularly significant that the task group of the Steel Products Industry Advisory Committee in its second supplement to Report and Recommendations on Decontrol recommended that all controls on the distribution and use of nickel in the civilian economy be discontinued on September 1, 1953, and that national defense programs be supported and protected by preference ratings and production directives.

"There is also evidence that industry comprising the second largest class of nickel users, the makers of nonferrous nickel alloys, favor a similar decontrol.

"The nickel-plating industry is on record, through its advisory committees, as favoring the discontinuance of end use restrictions, and at least some elements of the industry have recommended the discontinuance of all allocation other than for national-defense contracts.

"The Small Business Administration has advised the Department of Commerce by letter that it believes the present restrictions on end use are subjecting many small concerns to serious handicaps. The administration states it to be 'unfair to our own business community to continue controls while their foreign competitors are free to sell in our markets the articles our companies are forbidden to manufacture.'

"The International Nickel Co., which supplies 80 percent of the nickel consumed in the United States, has advised the Secretary of Commerce that 'after taking care preferentially of the military and AEC requirements the balance of our nickel as reported quarterly will be distributed to the civilian economy in a fair and equitable manner.' Further in response to the Secretarys' concern over possible price increases resulting from unrestricted civilian demand, the company advised that 'as far as our own prices are concerned, the record speaks for itself.'

That record, over the last 25 years, shows a gradual increase from 35 cents per pound in 1929 to 60 cents per pound in 1953, a rise of 71 percent. During the same period the Bureau of Labor Statistics index of nonferrous metals generally rose 70 percent.

"Generally, it can be said that the elements of American industry most directly concerned, or their representatives, have expressed the feeling that under present circumstances the continuance of Government distribution controls will not result in a distribution more effective, more equitable, or more orderly than can be accomplished in the open market.

"It is not illogical to expect that supplies of nickel made available to the United States will increase upon the removal of end-use restrictions. This country has long used over two-thirds of the free world's supply and as the producing industry's best customer its demands can be expected to find willing attention. While it is not possible to insure a continuing or increasing supply at reasonable prices, the probability is not less than that upon which businessmen daily rely in making forward commitments.

"With respect to military and Atomic Energy Commission requirements, the International Nickel Co., as above noted, has indicated that it will give such requirements preferential consideration. This commitment, plus the authority conferred on the executive branch under the Defense Production Act, assures our ability to take care of the military and AEC needs.

"In a classified supplement to this memorandum there is a table showing minimum stockpile acquisitions which must be made in the future. The Government has agreed on a program of regular purchases that will assure our meeting the schedules. This agreement will be adhered to even though it may be necessary to make slight reductions in the present availability to the civilian economy, although reductions in military requirements and increases in supply will probably make this unnecessary.

"Notice of this decision may be released publicly and appropriate amendments to Order M-80 and Defense Production Order I, shall be made effective on the earliest date practicable.

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING."

We do not believe that the controls that were taken off in November 1953 should be reimposed at this time. We believe that if they were reimposed, it would be necessary to control the end use of the nickel. This could have an unfavorable effect on the civilian economy generally. Also, it could lead to a situation where nickel would be in a competitively disadvantageous position as compared with another material. This could very well lead to a situation where it would be necessary to control other materials in order to preserve an equitable relationship between materials.

While all of this was going on, we would still face the basic fact that the demand for nickel is considerably in excess of the supply. Therefore we feel that the only way in which to provide a fundamental solution to the problem is to do everything that can be done to accelerate the bringing into production of additional sources of supply. Within a few weeks we intend to announce a program designed to provide incentives for achieving expansion additional to that already underway.

5. What is the legal relationship between ODM and BDSA so far as the allocation of nickel to commercial users is concerned?

The legal relationship between ODM and BDSA, so far as the allocation of nickel is concerned, stems from the authority of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the delegations of authority which have been made thereunder. However, the Government removed controls on nickel on November 1, 1953, except to the extent necessary to assure the availability of adequate supplies for defense and AEC orders. As of that date it relinquished its responsibility for the allocation of nickel to commercial users. Thus, ODM's legal responsibility, in cooperation with BDSA, is to be prepared to take whatever action may be necessary if it is found that the material defense requirements for nickel are such as warrant the exercise of controls authority.

6. How are the stockpile releases geared into INCO's allocations to insure fair and equitable distribution? Also other producers—Falconbridge, Sherritt Gordon, Nicaro, Hanna, etc.?

ODM does not exercise control over nickel diverted from deliveries to the stockpile. Any effort to do so would represent a partial imposition of controls. We believe that the distribution of nickel in the civilian economy should either be completely under Government control or completely out from under control. We do not believe the Government should attempt to occupy a middle ground. When the diversions are authorized and appropriate contractual arrangements are made, the Government, in effect, releases the producer from his obligation to deliver nickel to the stockpile or DPA inventory and permits the producer to sell the nickel directly to industrial customers. However, the producers are requested to use their best efforts to sell the diverted nickel in an equitable manner. It should be noted, also, that when nickel has been diverted it has been with an agreement that it would be made available to United States industry. Furthermore, arrangements are made to avoid windfall profits for producers when the material is sold to industry.

7. How frequently does BDSA audit the producers' books? When was the last audit? What recommendations were made? Were they accepted or rejected?

The BDSA reports that producers' books are audited every month and that the last audit was for the month of April 1956. Major shippers have voluntarily allowed BDSA personnel to conduct these audits to be sure that consumers do not place duplicate orders with different suppliers. BDSA did not make any recommendations.

8. Is ODM satisfied with the system of audits? And does it consider that there is fair and equitable allocation to the nondefense users?

The Department of Commerce through the Business and Defense Services Administration has maintained close cooperative liaison with the suppliers of primary nickel to assist them in making an equitable distribution of nickel to all of the normal consumers. The Department of Commerce, in a statement furnished the Office of Defense Mobilization, states that, in its judgment, the periodic surveys and audits of the distribution system by the BDSA, with the cooperation and voluntary permission of the suppliers, have indicated that there has been an equitable distribution of nickel since decontrol. The only way in which the Government could be sure that there was an equitable distribution of nickel would be to impose controls. Our reasons for not taking such a step are set forth in our answer to question No. 4.

9. At what price is stockpile nickel from the various sources furnished to industry?

Nickel diversions to industry in general have been sold by producers at the cost price to the Government plus allowances for selling, packaging, and special administrative expenses in connection with the diversion. In other words, the producers made no more profit from selling to the market than they would have made by selling to the Government. As indicated to you in our letter of December 19, by far the greater portion of diverted nickel was sold at market price in 1955. Of 23,950,000 pounds specifically diverted during the year, 2,200,000 pounds represented premium price nickel, of which 1 million pounds came from the Hanna Nickel Smelting Co. and 1,200,000 pounds from the International Nickel Co.

10. What right of appeal is afforded businessmen who feel that the present allocation system is not fair and equitable?

BDSA advises us that businessmen may appeal to their source of supply if they feel the distribution system is not fair and equitable. In the event they bring their appeal to the Government, the BDSA will investigate. Where inequities are observed the Department of Commerce calls this to the attention of the supplier who decides of his own volition whether or not to make such adjustments as may be necessary to correct such inequities. During 1955 only 1 case out of 350 claims audited by the Department of Commerce was found to warrant adjustment.

With regard to Dr. Townsend's nickel survey, the report, as you know, was prepared for use in reaching decisions in the executive branch on future actions and programs. It involves data of a highly classified nature as well as restricted data furnished by the Atomic Energy Commission.

In testimony before the Joint Committee on Defense Production I made the following statement relative to this report:

"In his report, Dr. Townsend recommended that the Government pursue a vigorous policy of encouraging and, if necessary, assisting private industry to expand sources of supply for nickel. He stated that he felt that a policy of this kind was entitled to a higher priority than our policy of stockpiling nickel.

"In line with Dr. Townsend's recommendations, I have requested the appropriate agencies of the Government to present to me a proposed plan of action for accelerating current industrial programs or encouraging the development of new programs for increasing the sources of supply of nickel. I expect that the Government will be in a position to announce such a plan of action within a short period of time."

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director.

Liberation Day—Ethiopia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to send greetings to the Ethiopian people, His Imperial Majesty Haile Selassie I, Emperor of Ethiopia, and His Excellency Yilma Deressa, Ambassador of Ethiopia, on the occasion of the celebration of the 15th anniversary of Liberation Day, May 5, 1956.

Ethiopia has been an independent sovereign state from time immemorial. Ethiopia was a great power when recorded history began. With the march of tyranny and totalitarianism across Europe in the years immediately preceding World War I, the Government of Ethiopia was forced to take refuge outside its own territory. Ethiopia, as well as the United States, never recognized Italian sovereignty over Ethiopian soil.

When in 1935 Ethiopia tested the League of Nations on the principle of collective security very little comfort was

given her. Emperor Selassie was one of the few men of courage who read correctly the signs of those turbulent times. He cautioned the free world to resist the advance of totalitarianism and pled with the world to rally its forces to stop unwarranted agrression. Emperor Selassie voiced the cry not only for Ethiopia but for liberty-loving people everywhere. While the free world slept, appeased, or turned its attention away from Africa, the forces of nazism and fascism pursued their deadly course.

Ethiopia virtually stood alone against a towering enemy. The people of Ethiopia fought valiantly for the life of their nation. After a series of military reverses, the enemy destroyed the independence of Ethiopia for the first time in 3,000 years. Emperor Haile Selassie I took his cause to the League of Nations. When that organization failed to respond to his plea for the principle of collective security he was forced into exile.

On May 5, 1941, exactly 5 years after occupation forces had taken over Addis Ababa, His Imperial Majesty reentered Addis Ababa at the head of his resistance forces and with British troops which had fought their way into Ethiopia from the Sudan. One of his first official acts was to call upon his people to follow Christian principles and forego acts of revenge against the tens of thousands of Italians who had been trapped by the liberation forces.

In the years since liberation, Ethiopia has tenaciously bent her energies toward the reestablishment of the country and the continuation of forward-looking projects which had been interrupted by the invasion and occupation. On July 16, 1931, less than a year after he assumed leadership of his country, Emperor Selassie had given the people their first written constitution. Through this act the Emperor demonstrated his adherence to the basic principles of democracy. The constitution, in effect, transferred part of the Emperor's authority to a parliament and a judicial system and provided for administrative departments. Another integral part of Haile Selassie's preoccupation program consisted of efforts at modernization of the country. Special attention was given to the development of health services and a broader system of education, the opening of hospitals and schools, and the recruitment of doctors and teachers. It will be remembered that the occupation authorities, as a matter of policy, suppressed all educational activities between the invasion and the liberation. As a part of the nation's reconstruction program a program was launched which took advantage of every instructional facility offered the nation from abroad. Ethiopia appropriated a large portion of the nation's budget for educational purposes.

Ethiopia and the United States have passed the midcentury mark in the history of their diplomatic relations. Friendly and cooperative relations with the United States in full support of the principle of collective security are the bases of Ethiopia's foreign policy. Ethiopia was one of the first countries to come to the support of the United Nations when the General Assembly condemned Communist aggression in Korea and asked member nations to assist in halting hostilities. Ethiopia reports that:

Ethiopia's Kagnew Battalion, integrated into the United States 7th Division, served until the Korean truce was arranged and established a unique record for troops in that conflict. None of its members were captured, although the battalion suffered casualties as great as those of other units around it. When positions held by Kagnew soldiers were overrun by the enemy, all Ethiopian troops died at their posts. None surrendered.

Ethiopia can look with pride upon its record. I salute this nation of stalwart people and pray for them continued peace and prosperity as they go forward into a new year of national life.

Expanded NATO: An Urgent Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Dulles' recent statements regarding the need for expanding NATO have been a very encouraging development. For some months it has seemed to me that the urgent need to provide NATO with new vitality was very apparent. Indeed, I feel that a step in this direction is long overdue. But the statement which Secretary Dulles made before the Associated Press was very broad in nature.

I would like, therefore, to call the attention of the Congress to my resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 216, introduced in February, which outlined four specific nonmilitary activities which NATO could undertake. This resolution was sent to the State Department by the Foreign Affairs Committee in mid-March, for the Department's comments. I regret that we have not yet received a report from the Department, but I am hopeful that the Secretary's recent expressions on this subject will now permit the Department to recommend specific kinds of functions, which would give NATO new life.

In this connection, I would like to call attention to an excellent editorial which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor:

NEW SCOPE FOR NATO

For the Western World this is a very big moment.

At least half a dozen front-page stories are saying so—if you put them all together. But the moment is even bigger than the headlines.

Looking back on these last few days of mid-April 1956, future historians may well say either (1) that they marked a turning point in world affairs away from war and nuclear menace toward an infinitely more abundant, more orderly way of life for all free peoples; or (2) simply that these days offered an opportunity which statesmen, politicians, and people missed.

Surely if we could see this opportunity in terms of the forest instead of the trees we should all be impelled to grasp at it even at the cost of some dislocation of our routines, at some pain to our prejudices, at some risk to our pocketbooks.

For consider what has been happening.

WASHINGTON MOVES

At Washington the President of the United States puts American foreign policy on a new tack, perhaps belatedly but with a sweep that should help to make up for lost time. The partnership which he had earlier urged as an attitude for the American people toward their allies is now to be a touchstone for official action. It will aim not simply at military defense of the NATO countries but at the development of their internal economic and social strength.

As President Eisenhower put it: "Within the free community we must be a helpful partner in creating conditions where freedom will flourish."

That is the promise, at least. And it is timely. Today the future of NATO, even just as an alliance on which America's world position partly rests, depends more and more on this sort of effort. The promise has been immediately underwritten by the American Secretary of State. Mr. Dulles has now moved to reinspire the North Atlantic Treaty Organization with some of its originally stated but as yet undeveloped purposes.

He has stated that the American aim is an expanded NATO, to be discussed at a Paris meeting of the North Atlantic Council next week. It could bring NATO to the fore as the major free-world agent for aiding underdeveloped nations. It may help NATO to work through peaceable means for a relaxation of fetters on satellite nations, fetters which may be becoming obsolete even from Moscow's point of view. It would support many other purposes on which NATO governments can cooperate toward peaceful strength.

THE PICTURE'S OTHER SIDE

Striking as are the implications of the administration's moves during the last few days, they do not, however, as yet make up the bigger part of the challenge emerging on the world scene. Against them we must set two accomplished facts:

The Soviet Union is forcing the pace on the development of nuclear weapons, the latest evidence being Russian possession of a hydrogen-headed guided missile. The Soviet Union has broken out of "containment." It has moved with disturbing effectiveness into the Middle East, Western oil reservoir and strategic bridge for Britain and other free-world nations. And not only that, but its diplomacy now moves with increasing influence over most of Asia and even into Africa.

There has been indeed no diminution of the Soviet Union's global pressure on the free world since the passing of Stalin. It has changed form, that is all. And so the problem of Western leadership has become more complex than in the days when arms alone might spell the difference between a Soviet advance and retreat.

The apparent military pressure on NATO countries has lessened; likewise the will of NATO peoples to bear the burdens of armaments. Some such development was at the outset foreseen by the architects of NATO. That is why they inserted article II in its charter providing for civilian projects.

NATO members have hoped this would mean provision for increased trade, for joint financing of common peacetime projects, and so forth, which would underpin the new European prosperity and make whatever arms are needed easier to pay for. Disappointed in these hopes, they have lost their initial enthusiasm for what was to become a great North Atlantic community and not just another military alliance.

NATO AS FREE WORLD UNITY

Yet some Europeans are keenly aware that things have been going the wrong way. A Netherlands Socialist leader stated this view forcibly at an important Strasbourg gathering last week. Pointing out that Moscow still aims to damage Western unity, he said:

"What we need more than ever now is a pledge by all the NATO powers that they will never hold talks with the Soviet Union independently and on their own, but that at all times they will form a joint political front. What we need more than ever now is a general staff for the cold war on which the highest representatives and the best experts of the NATO powers should take seats."

To move on this front alone would engage the sympathies only of the best-informed elements of the Western nations. It would spread new alarm among the neutral nations. This move is needed. But it must be embodied in a broader effort.

MATCHING THE MOMENT'S NEED

Had the Soviet military threat to Western Europe never existed, NATO probably would not have come into being even as a military organization. Had the new military-political-economic threat of the post-Stalin Soviet Union never developed its present peaceable aspects, it is possible that NATO would have remained chiefly military and perhaps withered, as military alliances do.

It could do this even in the face of the new Soviet strategy unless freemen recognize the great need of the times. This is to readapt their defenses to meet changing pressures along a vast military, economic, and social front.

The importance of this moment lies in the fact that free-world leadership has recognized this need. The importance of the moment lies also in the question whether free peoples will likewise recognize it and support their leaders with imagination and a compelling sense of both crisis and opportunity.

Petition Opposing Alcoholic-Beverage Advertising in Interstate Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, it is my pleasure to submit herewith for the RECORD a petition which I have received from the members of the WCTU, First Methodist Church, in my district:

To Our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We the undersigned, respectfully petition you to exercise the proper discretion vested in you by passing legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air, a practice which nullifies the rights of States under the 21st amendment to control the sale of such beverages.

At a time when 1 out of 10 drinkers is becoming an alcoholic, there should be no encouragement to increase the use of such beverages. Children and youth are being misled to consider them harmless, especially by the powerful audio and visual suggestions of radio and television.

Mrs. John H. Moncrief, Mrs. G. W. Canterbury, Mrs. J. N. Harbin, Mrs. Flora Mae Pike, Mrs. B. L. Hinkle, Mrs. G. C. Boner, Mrs. C. G. Thomason, Mrs. J. H. Coburn, Mrs. W. L. Gibb, Mrs. L. M. Kelley, Mrs. G. T. Faust, Mrs. T. M. Tharp, Mrs. J. R. Thompson, Mrs. O. M. Golden, Mrs. George V. Kilgore, Mrs. Fred L. Allen, Mrs. L. E. Foster, Mrs. Susie S. Tindall, Mrs. M .A. Geno, Mrs. J. F. Brady, Mrs. F. E. Hearn, Mrs. G. D. Shubert, Mrs. M. C. Ledbetter, Mrs. Walter E. Barnes, Mrs. M. Oakley, Mrs. B. F. Mason, Mrs. V. Pennington, Mrs. P. A. Morgan, Mrs. R. L. Summers, Mrs. Roy Smith, Mrs. John Chadbourne, all of Alabama.

A Freedom Manifesto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address entitled "A Freedom Manifesto," by Senator Nelson S. Dilworth, delivered before the California Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, April 16, 1955:

A FREEDOM MANIFESTO

(Address of Senator Nelson S. Dilworth delivered April 16, 1955, in San Francisco before the California Society of the Sons of the American Revolution)

Mr. President, members of the California Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, and guests, we are meeting here at the conclusion of a year's distinguished service by the California Society to the people of our Republic. It is also the occasion of the commencement of another year of, we shall hope, even more effective leadership in defending and strengthening the institutions of freedom which our honored forebears so wisely established.

As we look forward to the momentous and stormy days ahead, we must choose a wise course. To do so we must determine where the hidden rocks lie that menace the safety of our ship of state which is laden with every treasured liberty that has been our privilege and enjoyment for the last 170 years. Five generations of fathers and sons, sometimes 6 or 7, have taken as a matter of course these new freedoms and given little heed to their preservation.

The idle years of security have gone with the new technique of cold war waged by secret fifth columns. We live in the days of the incandescent mushrooms billowing up 20 miles in the sky. Apathy at such a time can only be the prelude to swift enslavement, to a bitter servitude of mind and body bound by the chains of fear and torture by totalitarian police state executioners.

It is only prudence to consider the fate that has befallen other free governments. The czars of Russia, in the evolution of time and progress finally granted the people a parliament, a Duma, in the year 1905. Progressively the elected representatives of the people accomplished faltering but well directed steps toward freedom. In the debacle of 1917 with military disaster a harsh reality, the Duma set up a republic to be rid of the incompetent hereditary rulers. Political freedoms were declared and political prisoners released from jail and dungeon. As the new republican leaders rallied their armies to defend their native homeland they allowed opposition parties to organize and even to arm themselves in the name of liberty. In a few months, as the republic's leaders and soldiers faced the foreign invader ill-armed and with paltry munitions, they were stabbed in the back at Petrograd by the party of Nicolai Lenin. A regiment of revolutionary conspirators rushed the Duma and made prisoners of the elected representatives of the Russian people. Arsenals were raided and before the armies at the fighting front could move, the homeland had fallen into the bloody hands of Lenin's well-disciplined party. And what party was it? It was the Socialist Party. Lenin was a Socialist. As a Socialist he came to power, but to force his socialism on an unwilling people he had to have a secret police organized under a released bank robber from the Caucasus. The socialism of Lenin was but a high sounding name to screen a tyranny and oppression never realized under the worst of the czars. And it all happened so quickly, so unexpectedly. It happened in days, even in hours. The trip from freedom to slavery is quick, like passing through a door. The return trip from slavery to freedom takes whole generations, yes, centuries of sacrificial struggle by the noblest and best youth of the land. All the accomplishments of the Russian people in a hundred years of struggle for freedom were swept away in minutes as Lenin's regiment of rifle-bearing revolutionaries rushed into the Duma and made prisoners of the elected representatives of the Russian people. Nothing remained to stop Stalin from displacing Lenin and setting up rule by violence.

A thousand miles and more to the west and south of Petrograd, Lenin and Stalin were copied. A conspiracy was organized within a country enjoying constitutional freedom under the nominal leadership of an indulgent and popular king. Benito Mussolini was allowed to organize to use force by the tolerant government. He marched on Rome and rather than shed blood the government allowed him to take over. And who was he? He was the leader of the Socialist Party. It is true that he copied the emblem of the Caesars, the bundle of sticks and battleax called fasces, and became known as a Fascist, but he built his organization out of the Socialist Party on socialist theories.

Faced with popular dissent and reluctance, he too turned to secret police and bathed Italy in the blood of her sons and daughters. The indolent Italian citizen content to leave the government to others paid a thousandfold in labor, blood, and tears under the dictatorship for his apathy during the years of his freedom. Yes, and in the loss of his sons in rash military adventures the Italian father's aged head was brought low to an unhappy and lonely grave. All because they neglected to make the sacrifice of time and effort to preserve their free institutions when they had them.

Freedom will not operate itself. It is but a chance to achieve liberty for ourselves. We must accept the responsibility and labor to operate our popular Government or become slaves. For evil men to succeed it is only necessary that good men do nothing.

By the time the people of Italy were ground under Mussolini's iron heel, Stalin had long since drugged and eliminated Lenin. The mantle of Lenin dead was more useful to Stalin than his annoying and restraining presence. Power-mad dictators want no interference with their absolutism.

Next a man with a cropped mustache reached for the leadership of the Socialist Party in Germany. With inflamatory speeches and promised glories for Germany he bound to his will the Socialist organization. The German Republic was tolerant. The leaders were hesitant, their currency valueless. Adolf Hitler was allowed to organize with military methods.

As a Socialist he came to power by election. To carry out his Socialist decrees he, too, had to organize a gestapo and secret police, yes, and huge crematories and charnel houses to liquidate and dispose of millions of his countrymen. By the chance of history this Socialist dictator came into political com-

mand of the German general staff, the world's greatest war machine, and plunged the whole world into the mass carnage of World War II.

And what shall I say to the Germans who neglected to keep their constitutional republic and voluntarily chose a Fuhrer. In exchange for their freedom they got poverty, destruction of homes and loss of livelihood, wounds without number, death and a national and racial condemnation and dishonor on the unchangeable pages of history. All because they would not accept the friendly duties and responsibilities of free government.

Freedom is but an opportunity, I repeat. We must grasp it and use it or become slaves.

So I say to you tonight that we must save our American economic institutions from socialism whether it be attempted by the Government or by political conspiracy. Our political fredoms have so released the energies and ambitions of American men and women that they have produced here the highest standard of living ever known in any land. It is this freedom to produce competitively and to keep a large measure of their production that has made our American life a delight and a joy to be proud of the world over. Also, we must testify to our young people about the benefits of the competition we face all around us. Business success is attained by securing public favor and demand in the face of competition. The public is the umpire and the banker is the scorekeeper. Every time you buy a Packard automobile, you make that manufacturing corporation bigger. Every time you buy Texaco gas you promote the growth of the Texas Co. You have your choice. You may buy Union or Richfield gas. That manufacturer will grow. You may buy General Motors cars, Chrysler, Ford, Studebaker, or Nash. You choose. Competition gives you your choice. Competition lets you, the people, decide what you want. Competition is another word for freedom. It is an indispensable part of American liberty. Competition has made America the wonderland of the world.

Competition is natural in this world. It exists all around us in the world of nature, between the grasses in our lawn and the trees in our forest, between wild animal life for survival, yes, even among our bird life for life itself.

Competition and freedom to produce can only be maintained under political freedom. Again, political freedom can only exist where there is competition for control of the Government. A choice must always be given the people at intervals to choose from competing candidates the representatives they want in their Congress and legislatures, and executive authority. I repeat that competition is another word for freedom for the people.

It is this competition that socialism destroys. By means of regulative decrees, by excessive taxation, by the paralyzing hand of political management, business withers and fades. This is followed by forced labor, secret police terrorism, and military campaigns, with the population reaping the results in misery, want, and degradation, daring not to protest and living every night in terror of the heavy footsteps coming to claim a victim.

The days when citizens can revolt are gone. Rifles can no longer wage war. What can citizens do to stop enemy bombers? Military campaigns are mechanized and only large governments can equip themselves with weapons that are affective. The days of popular revolt are gone in the mechanized nations.

Another thing we must protect from the deadening hand of socialism is the education of our youth.

Standards and goals of learning must be set. Rewards must be offered. Recognition of achievement must never fail. Competition properly supervised on the athletic field is good sport. It is thrilling. It builds strong bodies and teaches never-ending lessons of fair conduct and striving to do one's level best. It inspires to great endeavor for school and team. But let me ask you, if you had no goalposts and no one was allowed to keep score, what sort of a football game would you have? What would the players learn in either skill or good sportsmanship? And who would care to watch?

Competition in the classroom can be supervised to be as beneficial and as thrilling as on the athletic field. It will build strong minds, alert and capable of exploring new fields of knowledge and advancing the progress of mankind. But superior effort must be recognized and rewarded with recognition. Goals must be set and scores must be kept, at least for those that excel and make the varsity team. Our youth can be taught to compete successfully and fairly, to be good sportsmen in the classroom as well as on the athletic field. Yes, they can be taught to try as hard to excel in learning as in football and their whole lives will be immensely enriched in accomplishment and their ability to serve their community and Nation multiplied.

We live in a competitive world for survival of nations, survival of political parties, survival of public officials as officials, survival of customs and ways of life, survival of businesses and industries. You, the people, are the judges. By your choice you decide.

Our students should receive a clear explanation of these realities. They must not spend their formative years in a false and misleading school of uniformity and play. They should be prepared for life as it is and allowed to strive, encouraged to excel, and inspired to achieve great things. Yes, our education must be saved from infiltration by socialism in practice and also in text. We have strict laws on the selection of textbooks. They must be observed in spirit and to the letter. Books that glorify socialistic schemes and projects are books of propaganda and unsuited as school texts. We must not allow our textbooks to condition the minds of our youth to accept communism later on.

Textbooks can be thrilling in their exposition of the achievements of the American people. We have little to learn from the old world in business and economics. America is pioneering a new fields of accomplishment and in the achievement of comfort, security, and culture. The blight of socialism has nothing to add, only discouragement, oppressive taxation, and scarcity.

Not only must our educational methods be patterned on American freedoms, our texts vibrant with the recitation of the facts of American liberties and accomplishments, but we must seek as teachers for our youth loyal leaders who are deeply in love with American freedoms. Behind the closed doors of the classroom without parental check or control, the character and ideals of the future citizens of America are being formed and developed. There is room in no classroom for microphones in America, and no child should feel obliged to report on his teacher. The relationship of teacher and student should be one of complete trust and cooperation. Any person unworthy of such trust is unacceptable as a teacher.

We entrust our property to employees. We commit our earnings to bankers for safekeeping. We depend on physicians for our health. But for the development of the highest ideals of character in our children, for their training and competence in the affairs of this life, we depend on the teacher. There is no greater earthly trust, no higher responsibility.

Has not your heart ever thrilled to the sight of a herd of cattle gathering in a circle around their calves when a band of strange dogs cross their pasture. Do we as human beings care less for our children than dumb cattle for their young?

Purveyors of strange ideologies are enemies indeed who would cripple our children in mind and pervert their honor and understanding.

We cannot safely allow teachers of the public schools merely to teach about communism. Some teachers, so disposed, could teach communism. The responsible officials of the schools cannot listen to every class. Teachers and texts must emphasize the obvious evils of communism.

Teachers much approach this ideological area from a positive point of view. They must emphasize what is good and great and fine about our country. America is 90 percent all right, and the remainder is under construction.

If children are thoroughly grounded in the ideals and accomplishments of America and in the thrilling history of how our people struggled to build this freedom, few will ever listen to Communist deceit.

The abundant opportunities in America to our young people to choose their work, to strive to excel, to rise in their profession, to succeed in life and establish a home with security in financial rewards have always inspired American youth to valiant endeavor and superior service to their community.

This should continue to be the prime objective of all school systems. To employ a Communist as a teacher or one of Communist sympathy or influence, or a teacher uncertain and confused is to obstruct the main purpose of public education and to wreck the moral and social growth of the child who has the tragic misfortune to be compelled to sit in the classes of such a teacher.

Children can be made mental cripples and moral misfits for life by Communist ideology in the classroom. To face life with perverted ideas on economies and political institutions cripples a youth more destructively than automobile collisions or polio diseases. Certainly the State must not employ teachers who cripple minds and morals.

We cannot as Americans be loyal to all the magnificent achievements of our compatriots and those who have gone before us, and sit apathetic amidst a revival of the Yalta spirit and weakly surrender our youth to the brain washing and slavery of Communist indoctrination and deceit.

There can be no Republic in America operating in constitutional liberty to express the will of the people unless we have citizens and leaders who are devoted to the Republic and who have been well taught in their youth all the methods and means of preserving freedom.

I come now to an even more serious part of my message. There is a group of people that we must save in order to save our freedoms. What nation would expect to win a war if every young man who volunteered to fight for the nation was ridiculed, attacked, and slandered. Our soldiers must be supported and equipped. In equal necessity we must save and protect those in public office who dare to speak out against socialism and the power behind the Socialist drive, the organized Communist conspiracy. Speaking out against communism is good but not enough. Action must be resolute and forthright.

To emphasize its importance, I repeat that, "For evil men to succeed it is only necessary that good men do nothing." For Communists to take over and enslave Americans it is only necessary that freedom-loving Americans do nothing. I am speaking now of freedom-loving Americans in public office and responsibility. They must resist the Socialist front of the Communist conspiracy or it will take over. The freedom-loving President of Czechoslovakia was not removed when the Communists seized the republic. The freedom-loving majority in Parliament was not immediately replaced. They were just intimidated into doing

nothing to hinder the Communist organization at work.

The last step in Czechoslovakia that sealed the doom of freedom and the end of the Republic was when the newspapers refused to continue printing the facts developed by the parliamentary commissions exposing the organizational methods of the Communist conspiracy. In ignorance of the truth the people allowed themselves to be the pawns of the organized conspiracy. The Communists boasted that they would make the non-Communists destroy the Republic, and they did. The long sharp blade that drew the life blood of freedom from the heart of Czechoslovakia was the non-Communists stupidly participating in organizations directed and controlled by the concealed Communists. The Communist Party was only the handle of the blade and the rough hand on the handle was that of the Politburo in the Kremlin.

I remember years ago Congressman Costello of the Dies committee defeated by Communist propaganda attack in the Democratic primary in Los Angeles. I remember Congressman Starnes also of the Dies committee defeated in the Democratic primary in Alabama. I have not forgotten Congressman McDowell, stalwart supporter and coworker with the chairman of the Dies committee, defeated by the same methods in the Republican primary in Pennsylvania.

Some years ago there was a courageous and intelligent Committee on Un-American Activities appointed by the legislature of the State of Washington. They published two revealing and powerful reports on Communist activity. I attended one of their hearings in Seattle and they commanded my admiration and respect both for the committee membership and for the investigators. At the first following election five were defeated by the people.

The list is too long for me to go through it 1 by 1. Let me remind you, that this ominous list is growing at each election. In November last, three of the most outstanding champions of freedom who had courageously exposed communism in our midst were defeated by the people. We lost from Congress Buseby of Illinois, Clardy of Michigan, and Kersten of Wisconsin. You know of others. The list is long and growing rapidly longer.

Today in our Republic it is political suicide for a public representative to really expose people who carry the message of the known Communist press such as the dailies they publish and the periodicals. With virtual immunity sympathizers of the party convert its program into action on platform and in official position. Communist philosophy and propaganda has infected popular thinking so deeply in some areas that people destroy the public officials that are sacrificially trying to defend them from the international Communist conspiracy. A large majority of our people still dislike communism, but for some reason they also disapprove and defeat public officials who effectively identify and expose the Communist conspirators. No man active in exposing Communists and communism when I entered public life has escaped being driven from office.

What must we do to save our freedoms? I ask you. Must we not save the men who are working to save our freedoms? Must we not root for the home team and not for the enemy?

But you say they make mistakes. Are you surprised Is it not human to err? Do Communists make no mistakes?

When the quarterback on your football team calls the wrong signal, do you start rooting for the opponents just because your quarterback made a mistake?

Our courageous anti-Communist officials are on our team trying to preserve our freedoms. They are trying to do the necessary things to rescue us from our own apathy. To save our freedom we must keep them on the job.

Behind the Iron Curtain are they so gentle and considerate of accused persons? Do they observe the fifth amendment? I could quote you a hundred documents that prove that every Communist is required to be an informer to the police on his friends and acquaintances every day of his life. You will be required to be an informer on your friends if the Communists ever succeed in this country.

Communists in this country are no different from Communists in China, Poland or Indochina. They study the same textbooks. They are under the same discipline. They will commit the same horrible cruelties here if they get the power.

As long as anti-Communists are promptly driven from office, conditions in our country will worsen. A way must be found to uphold the hands of those brave men who dare to act against the agents of the Communist conspiracy.

Another thing we must do to save our freedoms is to deal forcefully and effectively with treason. Occasionally a Communist is punished for contempt of court. A few have been convicted of perjury. But of treason only 2 or 3. Somehow our people must wake up to the fact that the cold war is a real war. Czechoslovakia, taken by cold war, has less liberty and more cruelty than Poland taken by the marching Red Army. We just have not begun to fight communism in earnest in our country.

There is one more vital thing that we must do to protect our freedom. We must not permit the organized Communist conspiracy, or any organized group to prepare to use force or violence for any purpose in our country. Ultimately, and in the decisive hour, communism is only established by organized groups using force and violence. In a free country where the government is controlled by the people there can be no lawful excuse for organized preparation to use force. The very freedoms we cherish and seek to preserve are being used to prepare to destroy all freedom. We cannot claim to be doing a realistic job of fighting communism in America until we destroy and disband any organization based on the use of force or unlawful means.

Also, in our efforts to save our freedoms we must save the mechanics of the freedoms, our political restrictions on governemnt to protect the individual. Even though these very legal safeguards may be used by Communists to shield them in their destructive attacks on our Governemnt and society we still must save the procedures of freedom.

While we are protecting these humane and necessary safeguards there is no need for us to be foolish and unrealistic. The use of the fifth amendment by the Communists to escape questioning about their conspiratorial activity is a case in point. We should preserve the fifth amendment, and are preserving it. It was never more in use than today. The phrase in question reads, "No person shall * * * be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself." This is wise law. However, just because a person escapes exposure of his crime by pleading the fifth amendment does not mean that he is a safe occupant of public office or qualified to teach children in their impressionable years. Until proven guilty they should be allowed their freedom to seek their livelihood, but refusing to testify because to answer the questions would tend to incriminate the witness certainly disqualifies such a person from holding any office or position of public trust or responsibility in government, whether policeman, teacher or administrator.

Our American Constitution is not a suicide pact. Freedom provided by our Constitution does not include freedom to conspire to destroy the Constitution.

There is yet another priceless heritage that we must preserve, cost what it may, to safeguard our freedom. I speak now of our national independence. We cannot go into governmental partnership with the gangster despots of the Iron Curtain world.

Wherever a large city in one of our States falls into the clutches of a corrupt political boss, he in turn corrupts the State government. It was not an idle thought of the framers of our Constitution that they placed therein the authority, the responsibility upon the National Government to guarantee, to reestablish in any State if lost, a republican form of government. Certainly, if one or more of the States became dictatorships they would corrupt the National Government and freedom itself. Of equal force is the warning that we cannot share our governmental power with despots, oriental or otherwise. As a forum for debate, consultation and cooperation the United Nations is valuable. As government, as a military and taxing power over us it would end every vestige of freedom.

Liberty, wherever it has blossomed has been the child of nationalism, of near fanatical patriotism. Whether it be ancient Greece, Rome in its early days of the republic, in England or America, freedom has been achieved by the struggle and sacrifice of the patriots resisting the powers of their own government and succeeding in establishing firm limits on bureaucratic officials. The supremacy of the executive power over the legislators of the people is tyranny. The supremacy of the people's legislators, each elected from separate districts with equal power, over the executive government is freedom. A people must be protected from their own government by their legislators and their courts.

Our enemies are all aware of this truth. Every Communist advocates world government, in fact, that is what the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is, a plan of world dictatorship absorbing new lands at every opportunity. The Iron Curtain world is governed from the Kremlin.

To save our freedom we must save our own independent Army, Navy, and Air Force and keep them strong for our defense. This hour calls for a new declaration of independence from all this one world Communist conspiracy.

People ask me why don't you tell us who the Communists are. It is most difficult. For many years now no written records of party membership of any kind have been kept in this country. There are no card-carrying Communists now, and have not been for years. Only the rank-and-file Communists ever had cards. There have always been the higher leaders who were never endangered by any tangible connection with the party itself yet were decisive in determining its policies and startegy.

But you ask, how are we to know who the Communists are. The answer is not easy. When you step on a dog's tail and his mouth bites, you know there is a connection between the tail and the mouth. When you or we expose a petty Communist, fifth-amendment variety, or a more active agitator, and a great national organization instantly springs to attack us in the performance of our official duty and another wealthy national organization musters money and lawyers to defend the exposed Communist, we know there is a connection. The same blood flows in the dog's tail as in his mouth. The same ideology energizes the Communist as motivates the defending organization and the purveyors of brutal calumny that attack the official who has done his duty.

Do you ask me again to tell you who the concealed Communists are? Again I say it is most difficult and only a legislative committee with the power of subpena can reveal the truth and then often only partially.

There is every shade and degree of subjection to Communist domination. Beside the disciplined party members there are recruits in training, there are many more fellow travelers who go along without joining, then there is every degree of acceptance of communism from the completely dominated reader of the Communist press to the careless imitator who thinks it intellectual to be a liberal and smart to be a crititic of our present imperfect society. Yes, it is imperfect because it is human. But its imperfection and improvement mean that it is closely akin to our imperfect human ways and desires.

But, you insist again, how do we spot a Communist. Well, first, every concealed Communist denies he is a Communist, indignantly and with a show of outraged innocence. Second, Communists say and advocate the same things that the Communist press and Communist text books say and advocate. This is important for actual party membership is of little consequence if the individual is a propagandist for the party program. He may be even more dangerous outside the party and able to deny membership under oath. In fact, we think that some of the most effective agents of the Kremlin are deliberately put outside the party to continue subversion without the hazard of identification and exposure.

Again, concealed Communists usually either defend any exposed Communist or indignantly condemn the public official who has exposed a Communist. In fact, their most effective activity to date has been to attack and destroy loyal public officials who have done their duty to inform the American people who their enemies are.

Sometimes people with no connection with communism do these same things for reasons known but to them. In doing so they render greater service to the Communist conspiracy than the Communist Party's own members can render to it.

The American people are willing to fight Communist attacks on freemen overseas, but have not begun to defend those courageous men who protect American freedoms in public position here at home from wholly obvious Communist-inspired attack. Our most dangerous enemies are not marching under foreign flags but infiltrating here in our own homeland. Of what avail is it that our brave sons win costly victories on bloody foreign battlefields if the people allow followers of the same enemy ideology to continue in classroom or Government office at home. For that matter, the Communist conspiracy prefers for public office in the infiltration stage, just common cowards who will do their bidding rather than face opposition and abuse.

I hope that you now see clearly that the Kremlin wages the cold war by the printed page and by the word of mouth to weaken, deceive, and divide prospective victims. For block-busting bombs they use ideas. Catch phrases are their machinegun fire. For deadly land mines they use appeals to our American generosity for the support of front organizations and foundations.

Communist rule is established under the familiar language of freedom. They announce the liberation of the people of any country they conquer. They proclaim the new dictatorships to be people's democracies. They call their despotisms republics.

Communists have stolen the language of freedom and successfully perverted it to serve their own methods of conquest and subjection. They use our most precious words to enslave unsuspecting peoples.

Yes, this is a war of speech and pen for the control of the minds of all mankind. We must meet it now while there remains the right to speak.

The people now under the dictatorship of the proletariat would not let the Communists again deceive them and seize their liberties a second time but they have no second chance. Communism is something you cannot try and discard. Communism is permanent. Like arsenic and cyanide to the body, communism is fatal to freedom. In these days of airpower and panzer divisions, the people cannot revolt.

So today is our last chance. We will have no other. The cold war is real. It is not easy to fight communism. Your antagonists deny loudly they are Communists and in resisting them you feel utterly alone. Your friends do not see behind the mask and they will tell you bitterly that you are wrong.

In fighting communism one of the first things you have to learn, says the hero President of Guatemala, is that few of your friends will stand beside you. Most of them will mock you, with taunts of "what communism" and "it only exists in your imagination." Yes, the cold war is real. Battles are raging.

There is still another thing we must do to preserve our freedoms. We must preserve our faith as a people and as a Nation in Almighty God. No other defense against communism is as powerful and as universal in its effect.

It will not be enough that a few people retain their belief in God. It must be a national and popular trust in God.

No nation or people in the entire history of mankind has ever contributed anything constructive and helpful to the advancement of the human race unless they believed in a Creator and a future judgment. And so today I appeal to you to strengthen the churches of your choice by worship with them and participation in their activities. Other organizations beside the American Legion could well join in a national rededication of our lives to faith in our Creator.

Our distinguished forebears who established our free institutions, lived with God's Holy Bible under their arm as they walked by day. It was beside their pillow at night and open on their knee with their children about them. So today our Nation can well renew our interest in the word of God.

Probably a hundred billion people have lived on this earth, but not 1 billion has ever known freedom as we have enjoyed it in America.

Freedom has not been the natural state of human society. It is an achievement. Only by the willing sacrifices of life and blood by the noblest and best of our youth in every generation has our freedom been established. The American and European peoples have cradled liberty and fostered freedom always at the cost of never-ending sacrifices of life and treasure. Few peoples of the world can or will keep freedom if it is bestowed upon them. There are ready despots to seize power in every race or nation.

Freedom is a fragile thing like some unusual and exotic flower growing almost hidden in the shade of a glen, easily trampled by the rough heels of ruthless men. Once trampled it will be long years before it blooms again. When the free cities of the ancient world were opened and the destroying armies marched in, it was 1,500 years of oppression and misrule before a measure of political liberty was again obtained by the people of those lands, 15 centuries, 50 generations of fathers and sons before the air of constitutional liberty once again wafted its refreshing breezes through their hills and valleys. Freedom comes but once in the history of a nation and people.

Freedom is not static, it cannot be built into marble and bronze. Freedom is a living, moving thing, constantly growing with the movement and development of a nation. It is necessary that laws constantly change and that their provisions be promptly adapted to the progress of civilization and science. Liberty cannot be frozen in ice for preservation or it will die. Neither can it be locked in a vault for safekeeping. Freedom is a manner of living, a way of life of a people, only possible in a nation strong enough to defend itself from all foreign enemies and resolute enough to deal firmly with traitors at home. Only the brave can long be free, because freedom is so valuable and precious that those who enjoy its privileges must be ever ready to fight to protect and preserve their liberty. Freedom only exists in those favored lands where the bravest and best young men have always thought it better to die than to lose their freedom.

As the breath of pure mountain air on the mountain top is to the stag as he goes forth to feed in sunset shadows, so is liberty to this soul of ours.

As necessary as the morning sunshine is to the life of the brilliant California wild flowers, as vital as the gentle soaking rain, so necessary and so universal must freedom be to assure contentment in the heart of the American patriot.

On clear and sunny days have you not often gazed into the great blue yonder at the dazzling vapor trails, made by our daring youth in combat planes? Do you consider how much it matters to each of us, whether the vapor trails shimmering high in our California skies are made by the sons of free men, or by the slaves of foreign dictators?

Yes; it matters much. It matters everything to us. Age has become the dependent of youth for protection.

Some months ago a fine robust youth of my acquaintance was taken into the Army. He was sent to infantry training. Being in the vicinity I visited him in camp on a day when friends were invited to the post.

This young man of more than average physique had been placed with other young men selected for perfect bodies without physical defect of any kind for advanced infantry combat training. Their daily companions were the grenade and bayonet. In absolute darkness they were trained to grapple with an enemy and silently disable or kill him with their hands. Oh yes, a heavy price may yet be paid in young life and blood to defend us in hot war from the dictatorship in the Kremlin, paid in the blood of our finest and best youth. Is their sacrifice to be in vain? Shall we not also train to win the cold war? Shall there not also be trained battalions to meet the enemy in the cold war? Certainly battalions must be trained in expressed loyalty of word and deed to America.

The picked troops for the deadly hand-to-hand in fighting of the cold war of ideology are gray heads and shoulders weighted with the many years of experience. It is from our elder citizens that we must expect the elite shock troops of defense for America in the decisive battles of this new cold war. Will you join me in saying that I would rather live a short time on my feet a free man than a long time on my knees under Communist police?

As I look about this distinguished audience I am convinced that no finer group of men for the coming combat exists in America today. I challenge you to engage the enemy, be he a member of your lodge, your church or your club. Speak out for freedom and America. Hide not your faith in meaningless platitudes or cultured phrases. Courageously denounce the enemies of freedom. Know the truth of the ideological greatness of our free republic and meet the enemy in forum and auditorium. As many of you responded to the call for volunteers in your youth to follow the flag in battle, tonight I sound a greater call for more urgently needed volunteers with even stouter hearts in a more decisive battle for the native land we love. I call for volunteers to speak in defense of American liberty. I call for volunteers for the duration of the cold war, or until death.

Radioactive Fallout and Radioactive Strontium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled, "Radioactive Fallout and Radioactive Strontium," by Dr. W. F. Libby, member of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, and himself an eminent scientist. This article appeared in the magazine Science, issue of April 20, 1956, and is based on a speech given by Dr. Libby earlier at Northwestern University:

The radioactivity that falls out of the atmosphere after the explosion of a nuclear weapon is called the radioactive fallout. In the ordinary atomic bomb, for example, for each 20,000 tons of TNT equivalent of explosive energy, about 2 pounds of radioactive materials are produced. In these 2 pounds are some 90 different radioactive species varying in lifetime from a fraction of a second to many years. This mixture of radioactivity decreases in radioactivity in such a way that for every sevenfold increase in age, the total radioactivity is decreased tenfold. Thus the radioactivity by 7 hours after the explosion has decreased to one-tenth the radioactivity of 1 hour, and in 49 hours to one-hundredth, in 2 weeks to one-thousandth, in 3 months to one ten-thousandth, and so forth.

The conditions of fallout are largely determined by the amount and type of material vaporized into the fireball of the bomb itself. A bomb fired in the air contributes such a relatively small amount of matter to the cloud that the particles formed after dissipation of the enormous energy released are of necessity very tiny and therefore very slow in settling. The result is that most of the radioactivities are expended in the air and the area over which the fallout occurs is rendered very large, indeed, extending to the ends of the earth in minute although detectable amounts.

A bomb fired on the surface of the earth, however, may have an appreciable portion of its radioactivity reprecipitated within relatively short distances, while bombs fired beneath the surface of the earth may place essentially no fallout radioactivity in the atmosphere. Therefore, the question of the area of contamination to be expected from nuclear weapons cannot be answered categorically without specifying the degree of contact of the fireball with the surface of the earth and probably also specifying the characteristics of this surface. Obviously water would differ considerably from soil in its ability to precipitate radioactive fallout. The coral in the southern Pacific islands that are used for the larger United States weapons tests will under the great heat decompose to form calcium oxide, which will then dehydrate to form calcium hydroxide. which in turn will absorb carbon dioxide to form a crust of calcium carbonate. Obviously such a complicated series of chemical reactions will make the fallout particles from the great tests at Eniwetok differ from what would be observed if the same weapons had been fired over ordinary sand or granite. We cannot imagine all of the details in which the nature of the soil will affect the local fallout, but it is clear that the effects will be substantial.

In the weapon test operations, great care is taken to insure that no danger results from fallout. Criteria are used that are meant to insure that this is so. However, it is will to note that it is from the test operations that we have learned what we do know about the problem of civilian defense against fallout. We must speak of test experience, for it is the only source of experimental information about the phenomena of radioactive fallout.

The radioactivities resulting from the burst of a nuclear weapon can be classified as follows: (i) radioactivities induced in the environment and (ii) products dependent directly on the nature of the weapon. The environment can be made radioactive only by neutrons, but all nuclear weapons involve large numbers of neutrons, some of which are certain to escape into the surroundings.

RADIOACTIVITIES INDUCED IN THE ENVIRONMENT

Taking air bursts first, our problem is: What do neutrons do to air? The answer is simple. They made radioactive carbon, C^{14}, which has a half-life of 5,600 years. Fortunately, this radioactivity is essentially safe because of its long lifetime and the enormous amount of diluting carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. The cosmic rays themselves make neutrons, which, of course, make radiocarbon. In fact, the earth has on its surface a total of 80 tons of radiocarbon from the cosmic radiation. Now, since each neutron forms one C^{14} atom of mass 14 times the neutron's mass, this corresponds to 5.2 tons of neutrons, and we see that this enormous number of neutrons would have to be produced and escape in order that nuclear weapons would just double the feeble natural radioactivity of living matter due to radiocarbon. Such an increase would have no significance from the standpoint of health. The atmosphere itself contains only 1.5 percent of the total carbon with which the cosmic-ray-produced radiocarbon is mixed, the main part being dissolved in the sea, so we expect that nuclear weapons could produce a short-range rise in the radiocarbon content of the carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, which later would decrease as the atmospheric carbon dioxide mixed with the sea. Therefore, only 1.5 percent as many neutrons would be required to double the natural radiocarbon content of atmospheric carbon dioxide for this time before mixing with the sea could occur, or about 78 kilograms or 170 pounds of neutrons. To orient ourselves, the 20,000-tons-of-TNT-equivalent atomic weapon involves the fission of 1 kilogram of uranium or plutonium and the liberation of about 10 grams of neutrons. If all these neutrons escaped into the atmosphere, it would obviously require 7,800 such weapons to double the radiocarbon content of the atmospheric carbon dioxide even with no mixing with the sea, and about 520,000 with complete mixing. These, correspond to explosive energies of 156 and 10,400 megatons of TNT, respectively, if all neutrons formed escaped. A reasonable escape figure might be 15 percent, so we can expect that nearly 1,000 megatons of fission would be necessary just to double the atmospheric radiocarbon content, and that about 66,000 megatons would be necessary for the same effect on a long-term basis.

The interchange between the atmosphere and the sea water, which is constantly taking place, would deplete and remove the excess radioactive carbon dioxide. Now it is known from measurements of the radioactive hydrogen, tritium—which is also made in the atmosphere by the cosmic rays—that this interchange is slow. In fact, we learn that the radioactive water that is formed by the burning of the tritium made by the cosmic rays is not diluted by more than the top 100 meters or so of sea water in its lifetime of about 18 years. The carbon dioxide dissolved in this water is about equal to the total in the air. In other words, a dilution by more than the twofold that corresponds to the dissolved carbon dioxide in the top 100 meters of ocean water would take longer than 18 years. However, the dilution by this factor of 2 would occur essentially immediately within a matter of weeks or months. Therefore, we would have to double our estimates for even the short time scale activation of the atmosphere to reach the enormous figure of 2,000 megatons of fission required. Thermonuclear weapons, of course, also involve neutrons. For a given energy release, they produce somewhat more neutrons than fission weapons; however, the order of magnitude of atmospheric activation would not be greatly different. So our estimates apply to all nuclear weapons. The essential point is that the atmosphere is difficult to activate and the activities produced are safe. In addition to carbon-14, there are a few others produced in low yield; they include tritium and very short-lived products, but none is produced in sufficient amounts to be hazardous.

For weapons fired on the surface, the activation of the surface materials is a possibility, but in general it appears that most of the neutrons form stable isotopes and that the amount of radioactivity produced, at least with ordinary surface materials, is relatively small. The principal radioactivities produced by nuclear weapons are produced in the weapons themselves, and not in the environment.

RADIOACTIVITIES PRODUCED IN WEAPONS

Turning now to the radioactivities naturally produced in nuclear weapons themselves, probably the most important is radioactive strontium, which has a half-life of 28 years. The first reason this is so important is that strontium is chemically similar to calcium, which is one of the main mineral constituents of the body. Bone consists principally of calcium phosphate, and for this reason radiostrontium, like calcium, is deposited in the bone. The amounts of ordinary nonradioactive strontium naturally present are so small that the radioactive strontium will follow ordinary calcium into the body. The second reason that radioactive strontium, Sr^{90}, is an important fallout radioactivity is that it has a long but finite lifetime—28 years half-life, 40 years average life—and thus has a persistent effect. Third, because of its bone seeking property, it stays in the body a long time. Fourth, the probabilities of body ingestion can be high. Finally, the fifth reason for its importance is that strontium-90 is produced in high yield in the fission reaction—about 4 or 5 percent of all fissioning atoms yield this isotope.

In order to orient ourselves about this, let us consider the maximum permissible concentration recommended by the National Committee on Radiation Protection for AEC workers for radiostrontium—1 microcurie for the standard man, whose body is taken to contain 1,000 grams of calcium in total. The maximum permissible concentration is of course well below any level at which one would expect any damaging effects to appear. On the basis of experiments with animals, statistically observable increases in the number of bone tumors should not be expected to appear at less than 10 times this level. As we go above this figure, the chance for bone tumors occurring increases rapidly so that the likelihood of bone cancer with 30 to 40 times that figure is appreciable.

INTAKE OF STRONTIUM-90

Let us consider in some detail the mechanism by which this most important fallout radioactivity produced in nuclear weapons might be expected to enter the human body. The first point is that from the point of view of fallout there are essentially two classes of nuclear weapons—the high-yield megaton

weapons and the lower-yield kiloton weapons. All nuclear weapons produce atomic clouds that rise to heights dependent on the energy released, and the clouds from the megaton class of weapons rise rapidly up through the tropopause and pass into the top layer of the atmosphere, which we know as the stratosphere. This part of the atmospere is essentially isolated from the lower layer in which we live, the troposphere, and where all of our normal winds, storms, and so forth, occur. Therefore, radioactivity produced in megaton weapons is placed largely immediately in the stratosphere, while the smaller kiloton weapons produce clouds that in general do not reach into the stratosphere, but stop near the tropopause—the imaginary boundary between the stratosphere and troposphere—and have the bulk of their radioactivity left in the troposphere.

In the troposphere where rain occurs, any particulate matter will be washed down in a period of days or weeks. It is easy to show, for example, that one-tenth inch of ordinary rainfall will probably remove essentially completely all particulate matter except for that which is so mall as to be almost of molecular dimensions. In other words, for one-tenth inch of rainfall one can be quite certain that the air between the layer in which the rain originates and the ground is washed clean of fallout activity, except for the minute fraction that may be so small that it moves with the air out of the way of the falling raindrops as they make their way toward the earth; and even this tiniest fallout material is likely to be precipitated also, for it will migrate rapidly by molecular-type motion and in this manner is likely to absorb itself on other particulate material and so be rained out. For these reasons, tropospheric radioactive fallout does not stay in the atmosphere for more than a matter of weeks. It may make 2 or 3 trips around the earth in a given latitude before being entirely removed, but its lifetime in the atmosphere will be a matter of weeks.

This is in very sharp contrast to the material that is placed in the stratosphere by megaton weapons; this material appears to stay there for a matter of years. Perhaps 10 years is a good average, at least for the weapons fired to date. It is well to bear in mind that this conclusion may be dependent on the nature of the material carried up in the cloud, but our present experience indicates that the fallout from megaton weapons that does not occur essentially in the first few hours or days, and is therefore deposited mainly locally, is deposited only at a very slow rate corresponding to an average time in the stratosphere of about 10 years. As a result of this long residence time in the highest layers of the atmosphere, the winds mix and distribute the radioactive material broadly over the earth and one finds, when the fallout does finally find its way down into the troposphere where the rain and snow wash it out, that the rates of precipitation are relatively uniform over the entire earth's surface.

Returning now to radiostrontium, at the rate of 1 kilogram of fission for 20 kilotons of TNT equivalent, 2 megatons of fission energy would be equivalent to very nearly 1 millicurie of strontium-90 per square mile of the earth's surface, or about 79 disintegrations per minute, per square foot of the earths' surface. The average soil of the earth has about 20 grams of calcium that is in a form available for plant metabolism in the top 2.5 inches for each square foot of area. Now, recalling the maximum permissible concentration level of 1 microcurie per standard man and noting, as will be shown later, that in order that this concentration not be exceeded, the topsoil of the earth should not contain any more radiostrontium than would correspond to 10 times the concentration in the human body that is just permissible—that is, 1 microcurie per 1,000 grams of calcium, or 2,200 disintegrations per minute, per gram of calcium—we find that 11,000 megatons of fission energy would produce this average level of radioactivity. Actually, as I will indicate, there can be a concentration of strontium-90 in the soil about 10 times greater than the recommended maximum permissible concentration before one would expect a man living in such an environment to accumulate a maximum permission concentration. The afore-mentioned 11,000 megatons of fission energy would yield a strontium-90 content in human beings just equal to the maximum permissible concentration (MPC); at less than 10 times this value, or below 110,000 megatons energy equivalent, statistically observable incidence of bone tumor should not appear; but at 30 to 40 times the MPC, or 330,000 to 440,000 megatons, the likelihood of untoward effects would be appreciable. Even the lowest of these figures is very far in excess of the total energy released to date.

KINDS OF FALLOUT

High-yield weapons fired near the surface have a portion of their activity deposited in and on particles large enough to fall out in the first few hours or days. Thus, we have three kinds of fallout from high-yield weapons.

1. The first, or local, is due mainly to large-sized particles. This may cover a considerable area depending mainly on winds. In the February 15, 1955, release of the Atomic Energy Commission that described the experience in the Marshall Islands in the Castle test series in the spring of 1954, some 7,000 square miles were described as being contaminated by this type of fallout.

2. The second fallout from the high-yield weapons is that portion which resides on the small particles, but which never reaches the stratosphere and thus stays in the troposphere until it is carried down by rainfall or settles out. There is thus a band of fallout in the same general latitude as the test site; the material may circle the earth two or three times before it is precipitated, but it does fall out within the first few weeks.

3. However, a large part—half or more depending on firing conditions—of the radioactive yield from high-yield weapons resides in the third category, which is the fallout that occurs from the stratosphere itself. Of course, some of the large local fallout may form particles which were lifted into the stratosphere, but which were so large and so bulky that they fell out rapidly anyhow. The finely divided material that reaches the stratosphere apparently stays there for years in the main. A slow leakage through the tropopause into the troposphere occurs—apparently something like 10 percent per year descends. Measurements of the strontium-90 content of soils, rain and snow, and biological materials on a worldwide basis have all shown that strontium-90 fallout occurs all over the world at rates that are not very dissimilar from one another, except that there is a tendency in the middle latitudes in which the tests are conducted for an extra fallout, presumably of the aforementioned tropospheric variety. Since the completion of the Castle series of tests 2 years ago, this worldwide rate of fallout has approximated 1.5 millicuries of radiostrontium per square mile, per year. We thus see that radioactive fallout from the stratosphere is a very slow process. This is very fortunate indeed, since the high-yield weapons thus have a major part of their radioactivity dissipated in the atmosphere in a harmless way if they are fired in the air or on the surface.

The fallout apparently occurs in the final step by a washing down of the tropospheric air by rain together with direct falling. The radiostrontium descends from the stratosphere into the troposphere by the processes of diffusion and falling, and is then caught up by the tropospheric weather and in a matter of a few days is deposited. Reasonable estimates for the middle latitudes indicate that the average life in the troposphere is about 1 week.

DEPOSITION OF STRONTIUM-90

The radiostrontium comes down mainly in raindrops although fine morning mists and fogs may be particularly effective in this regard also, as well as surface contact and direct falling. It descends on the foliage and on the soil. That fraction of it which falls on plant leaves has a good chance of being absorbed directly into the plant—much in the way that most modern leaf fertilizers operate. The Eniwetok tests were conducted on coral islands and as a result their fallout may be largely water soluble. In any case, direct measurements of the radiostrontium content of alfalfa and other crops showed them to be appreciably higher in radioactivity than the soils on which they grew, strongly indicating that a leaf assimilation mechanism is important. The rain falls and carries radioactivity, but when it runs off to the rivers and the seas it is nearly pure because of the action of the soil in absorbing the fallout, so that rivers are essentially free from radiostrontium. Lakes and reservoirs have a content that corresponds approximately to their surface areas only. The radiostrontium is absorbed in the top 2 or 3 inches of soil and held there very tenaciously. Plowing, of course, buries it more deeply, but it appears that in unplowed soil the radiostrontium does not move in a matter of 2 or 3 years.

The researches on radiostrontium conducted by the Atomic Energy Commission have been extensive. The AEC has sampled soils on a worldwide basis and submitted the sample for analysis of radiostrontium content to the Health and Safety Laboratory of the New York Operations Office of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Lamont Geological Observatory of Columbia University, and the Enrico Fermi Institute for Nuclear Studies at the University of Chicago. Direct fallout collected on gummed papers, milk and cheese, alfalfa, animal meat and bone, and even human bodies has been extensively studied. On the basis of the information so obtained, it is possible to say unequivocally that nuclear weapons tests as carried out at the present time do not constitute a health hazard to the human population insofar as radiostrontium is concerned, and it is believed with good reason that radiostrontium is likely to be the most important of the radioactivities produced. It is well to note that since radiostrontium is assimilated in the bones it constitutes essentially no genetic hazard, for its radiations do not reach the reproductive organs.

The milk and cheese radiostrontium content is not as high, relative to that of the grass which the cows eat, as one might expect. There appears to be a discrimination against the fallout material such that the calcium in milk and cheese is roughly one-fifth to one-tenth as radioactive with radiostrontium as the grass that the animals eat. There are various possible physiological explanations of this, and the conclusion itself may not be completely certain, but the data available to date indicate this to be true. In addition, the plant uptake of radiostrontium from soil does discriminate somewhat against radiostrontium as compared with calcium. The calcium taken up from the soil into the plant has in general about one-half the radiostrontium content that the soil calcium has. These two results protect the human population against ingestion of radiostrontium, since milk and cheese are the principal sources of calcium in the human diet. We find, therefore, that the radiostrontium content of human bodies is the lowest of all animals measured and is lower than the average soil and the average

foliage by tenfold. The Sr^{90}-to-calcium ratio in young people—whose bones are still forming—corresponds to about one-thousandth of the maximum permissible concentration recommended for adults—1 microcurie per standard man containing 1,000 grams of calcium. The average soil in the United States contains about 10 times more, whereas abroad the radiostrontium content in other areas of the world not subject to the local test fallout is about one-third of that for the United States.

The surface air itself contains radiostrontium due to the fallout from the stratosphere and corresponding to the average time between rainstorms in which it can collect. Filtration of air at sea level discloses radiostrontium on filters if the filters are fine enough, even in periods when bombs are not being tested; thus the only fallout is from the stratosphere reservoir from the high-yield weapons. Measurements in the antarctic on snow samples collected there show that the fallout rate in January and February 1955 was comparable with that observed in the middle latitudes.

CONCLUSION

Finally athough the main part of the radioactivity from high-yield weapons fortunately dissipates in the stratosphere, the small but very significant part that falls out within a few hundred miles of the site of the explosion for weapons fired on the surface constitutes a very real hazard and nothing I have said should be interpreted otherwise. The weapons tests are conducted with great attention to this and the other dangers and every effort made to protect against misadventure. What we have learned from the studies I have described—which by the way have been conducted under the name Project Sunshine—is that these local precautions should be entirely adequate and the worldwide health hazards from the present rate of testing are insignificant.

The Cordell Hull Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on April 18, the Committee on Foreign Trade Education presented its annual Cordell Hull award to Paul Hoffman, former Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration, and present chairman of the Studebaker-Packard Corp.

This award by a bipartisan group doing important work in the field of increased public awareness of the significance of international trade is a well-deserved tribute for Mr. Hoffman's splendid contribution to our foreign economic policy. I had the privilege of participating in the program at which the award was presented and was impressed by the speech which Mr. Hoffman delivered. I think it is particularly timely in its theme and I would like to call it to the attention of the Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would also like to insert the complete text of the Cordell Hull Award, which was delivered by the Honorable Jacob K. Javits, attorney general of the State of New York:

TEXT OF CORDELL HULL AWARD

In recognition of his national leadership and the great tradition of public service he established in a career of more than half a century as Secretary of State and as a Member of both the United States Senate and House of Representatives, and in appreciation of his historic sponsorship of the reciprocal trade agreements program, the Committee on Foreign Trade Education, Inc., honors the memory of Cordell Hull, and in tribute makes the second annual presentation of the Cordell Hull Award for leadership in building United States foreign economic policy.

The 1955–56 award is made to Mr. Paul G. Hoffman.

Mr. Hoffman has throughout his career in business and public affairs advocated an effective, modern tariff-trade policy in accordance with the goals first set by Cordell Hull. Mr. Hoffman, as the first Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration, succeeded brilliantly in reviving international commerce and industry and, as a consequence, in stiffening war-ravaged Europe to meet the threat of communism. Mr. Hoffman has also made a historically important contribution to the development of United States foreign economic policy by means of the leadership he has exerted in the United States business community, having, through the formation of the Committee on Economic Development during World War II, and in the years that have followed, made many of the most important segments of American business fully aware of the economic and political danger to which the nation is exposed by the retention of out-of-date protectionist sentiment.

Award made this 18th day of April 1956 for the Committee on Foreign Trade Education, Inc.

JACOB K. JAVITS,
Attorney General, New York.

UNITED STATES SURVIVAL AND THE RUSSIAN ECONOMIC OFFENSIVE

(Remarks of Hon. Paul G. Hoffman, chairman of the Studebaker-Packard Corp., in receiving the annual Cordell Hull award for leadership in building United States foreign economic policy, New York, N. Y., April 18, 1956)

Mr. Chairman, Attorney General Javits, Congressman WILLIAMS, distinguished guests, members and friends of the Committee on Foreign Trade Education, thank you very much. I am deeply honored to receive the Cordell Hull award and to join with you this evening in tribute to the man who pointed the way to a realistic and modern foreign economic policy.

It is also a pleasure to note the progress this bipartisan committee of volunteers has made during the past 2½ years in promoting throughout the country an interest in foreign economic policy, a subject about which too many Americans have for too long been quite unconcerned.

I am delighted that the Young Republican Club has joined you this evening in co-sponsoring the Cordell Hull award ceremony and also that so many representatives of the Young Democratic Clubs are present.

This bipartisan tribute to Cordell Hull, whom I had the great privilege of knowing, is very fitting. He was one of the outstanding leaders in the Democratic Party, but he was, first of all, a great American statesman. He was the first of our 20th century leaders to recognize the intimate relationship between foreign economic policy and the highest political goals. He was convinced even before World War I that "unhampered trade dovetails with peace; high tariffs, trade barriers, and unfair economic competition, with war," and that "liberal commercial policies • • • constitute an essential foundation of any peace structure the civilized nations might erect."

There is a new element in the world situation which makes an effective and enlightened foreign economic policy even more imperative, and that is the new Communist economic offensive. Despite the startling repudiation of Stalin on the part of Russia's new leaders, Khrushchev and Bulganin, the basic goal of the Kremlin is unchanged. It is world conquest. But whereas Stalin placed great emphasis on periphery military action and threats of military action to make progress toward that goal, the new leaders put their stress upon trade offers and offers of economic aid. Perhaps the most graphic statement of the crisis confronting us as the result of this new Communist economic offensive was made by our Nation's delegation to the United Nations. They stated:

"The present period in history may one day be recognized as a major turning point in the struggle between communism and freedom • • • The Soviet Union • • • (is) using economic and social collaboration as a means for jumping military as well as political barriers • • •. We are in (an economic) contest • • • which is bitterly competitive."

The United States delegation to the U. N., with the Presidents' specific endorsement, added that, "We could lose this economic contest unless the country as a whole wakes up to all its implications."

What are these implications? One is that the Russians are using trade to win friends and influence people. Communist trade boss Mikoyan's trip last month through Southeast Asia shows the design. He had, for example, a brilliant success in Pakistan. Although Russia's diplomatic and political relations with that stanch ally of the West are just about as bad as they can be, Mikoyan has told the Pakistanis that, all politics to the side, Russia wants trade. Pakistan, of course, desperately needs industrial equipment and also sorely needs an outlet for their hides, jute, cotton, and other agricultural products. Mikoyan has appealed to the pride of these newly independent people by assuring them that he is interested in a straight commercial proposition—trade as between equals—as opposed to aid with strings on it. As a result of major Soviet-Pakistan trade parley began in Karachi just this last Monday.

What comes next can be easily appreciated from these comments Pravda made on Mr. Mikoyan's visit to Pakistan: "The foreign policy principles which naturally follow from Pakistan's almost total orientation of her trade to the capitalistic countries of the West harmfully affect Pakistan's financial stability and the living level of her people. Thus," Pravda continues, "it is completely understandable that Pakistan society all the more often talks of the development of normal economic and trade relations with all countries of the West and the East. Business and trade circles of Pakistan understand that the U. S. S. R., the Chinese People's Republic and the countries of the Peoples Democracies may serve to stabilize the market for many Pakistan products and, in turn, assist in providing Pakistan's needs for the industrialization of her industry and trade." And Pravda blandly looks to the future with: "In these days it can be seen that the visit of A. I. Mikoyan has aroused a new wave of genuine interest in the Soviet Union and a massive desire to improve basic economic, trade, cultural, and friendly connections between the peoples of the U. S. S. R. and Pakistan."

Another of the implications of Russia's new economic offensive is that they are using trade to create dissension among the free nations and particularly to build up the resentment of all nations against the United States. Last February Mr. Khrushchev told the 20th Congress of the Communist Party that, "altogether they (the free nations) have more than enough grounds to be displeased with the United States which is dis-

organizing the world market by carrying on unilateral trade, fencing off its markets from foreign imports, * * * and other measures hitting hard at other countries."

Even more effective than this generalized propaganda of the Communists against us are their campaigns within the individual countries when the United States has made some unpopular trade move. I still recall vividly the campaign the Communists and fellow travelers staged against us in Denmark when we barred Danish cheese, and the criticism by Aneurin Bevan when we raised the import duties on bicycles. What the Communists will do to us in Japan if we bar Japanese textile products is something I don't like to think about.

While the Russians are carrying on their new trade offensive, what are we doing? Well, right at the moment a vicious attack has been leveled by the high protectionists against the President's recommendation that the United States join the Organization for Trade Cooperation. As you all know, a bill is now before Congress which would authorize our so doing. That organization, of which 35 nations will become members, is to be set up to administer the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. OTC, by the creation of an Assembly, an Executive Committee (on which the United States will have a permanent seat) and a Secretariat, will give a continuing administration to the General Agreement. We have, of course, been a contracting party to the agreement since its inception, and have participated with the other nations in stabilizing or reducing approximately 60,000 tariffs and lessening other trade barriers, all of which have had a very positive effect on United States prosperity.

United States membership in OTC is a simple, commonsense plan, providing permanent administrative machinery to perfect the operation of GATT. By means of OTC there will be a forum in which most of the free nations will be able to negotiate a continuing expansion of international trade. It will give us a quick and effective means to see that the other nations hew the line on their trade agreements with us. This sort of organized consultation is effective, as I know from my own Marshall plan experience.

Failure to authorize United States membership in OTC will, I am sure, confuse and depress the international trade situation and seriously compromise United States world leadership.

The authority for OTC is inherent in Secretary Hull's Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act. The high tariff people have, however, made wild attacks claiming that OTC threatens the "constitutional prerogatives" of the Congress in setting tariff policy. Charges like these are just plain nonsense and those who make them know it. OTC will not in any sense enlarge our tariff concessions or expand the President's authority. As a forum, and in making the general agreement more effective by permanent consultative machinery, however, it will be a welcome advance in our trade policy.

GATT, which OTC will administer, has already provided a very real value to the United States. Thanks to that agreement, 14 Western European countries between 1953 and 1955 lifted quota restrictions on more than 60 percent of their dollar imports. These concessions which we won through the machinery of the general agreement signaled a major increase in United States exports to Western Europe in 1955. While Western Europe's imports increased generally by 18 percent during 1955, its imports from the United States rose by more than 24 percent, a percentage increase worth hundreds of millions of dollars to United States exporters and the 4,500,000 American families whose income is directly dependent on export trade.

But, believe it or not, that's the sort of dollars and cents advantage for the United States which the high tariff people are so bitterly fighting.

Somehow or other we've got to persuade the protectionists to take the broad, long look instead of the narrow, short look on this question of trade. If they do, they will support the legislation authorizing OTC. The plain fact is that without expanding world trade we face disaster. We are living in an interdependent world and we are becoming increasingly dependent on that world for our economic survival. We cannot close ourselves off from the rest of the world except at a very great risk to ourselves. We need goods from the outside world if we are to have a prosperous and expanding economy here. And other nations need our goods in ever increasing amounts if they are to grow in strength.

Great Britain has known for well over a century that she must trade or die. She therefore adopted trade policies that helped expand world trade. We are rapidly coming to the point where our economic survival and strength, like that of Great Britain's, is dependent on world trade. We must face up to this reality and adjust our thinking and attitudes as the British did many years ago.

There are numerous examples of the stark reality of our need to import. We take justifiable pride, for instance, in our extensive use of steel. It is the backbone of our economic life. To produce 1 ton of steel requires 13 pounds of manganese. Of these 13 pounds, we produce in this country less than 2. There are other examples. We import 43 percent of our lead, 50 percent of our tungsten, 97 percent of our nickel, and all of our tin and natural rubber. As our economy expands and as we use up our own supplies of these basic materials we will need to import even more for the economical operation of our vast industrial machine.

There are also numerous examples of our need to maintain and develop export markets for the products of our farms and factories. You all know the extent to which agriculture is dependent on export markets for its prosperity. Our farmers sell abroad about 20 percent of their lard, almost 50 percent of their production of dry whole milk, 25 percent of their wheat, over 50 percent of their rice, a third of their dried fruit, a third of their cotton, and one-quarter of their tobacco.

There are any number of our United States businesses that literally must sell between 10 and 25 percent of their production for export in order to stay in a healthy and sound condition. I do not wish to take too much of your time by droning further statistics to you. So I will restrict myself to 2 important examples: 10 percent of our coal must go abroad; 20 percent of our textile machinery is for the export market. These levels cannot be maintained and expanded unless we as a nation are willing to let trade expand.

There is another hard fact about trade that I want to emphasize: any restriction that is placed on an import is in fact a restriction on our exports. Other free nations, if they are to have dollars to buy our goods, must have a chance to earn these dollars. Even if we should save jobs in one industry by raising the tariff on competitive imports, we will do so only at the expense of a loss of jobs in some other industry. For example, our textile industries are understandably concerned about the fact that during the first three quarters of 1955 the Japanese sold us $19 million worth of finished cotton goods. But we shouldn't forget that in that same period they bought from us $95 million worth of raw cotton. Those dollars that other nations cannot earn because of our import restrictions are dollars that American industry will not be able to earn through exports. This should be so obvious that it should not need stating. But almost every advocate of protection tries to give the impression that there is a net saving of jobs through such protection. This is just not true, but unless it is adequately challenged the people may think it is true.

The Nation must realize the tremendous importance of trade. It is part and parcel of our expanding prosperity and an all-important factor to our political survival. Despite these clear facts, self-seeking lobbies, well financed and fast talking, continue to exert a major influence on the thinking of the people and of the Congress. We must clear the air with truth—the Nation's future depends on it. That's why the task you members of the Committee on Foreign Trade Education have undertaken is of such primary national importance. Your efforts to spread the truth must be intensified.

May I close with the words that President Eisenhower used in his message to Congress urging the passage of the reciprocal trades bill: "If we fail in our trade policy, we may fail in all."

O'Brien's Talk an Oasis in Congressional Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on April 17, the gentleman from New York, Mr. O'BRIEN, presented to this House a plan for the forging of an effective weapon in the new economic phase of the cold war, a plan which calls for recruitment of more of our bright young people in what might be described as a division for peace.

I should like to associate myself with the idea of bringing Main Street into our Foreign Service by enabling our Government to compete with private business for the services and talents of our young people. I believe it would enhance our prestige abroad and persuade the American people to associate themselves more intimately with our foreign policy.

We should not lose an economic war. But we have lost the opening skirmishes. We need more manpower in the battle, more economic troops. They are all about us if we in Congress, and the White House, will face the problem boldly and swiftly.

The Knickerbocker News, of Albany, a distinguished newspaper published in the capital city of New York, suggested in a recent editorial that the plan advanced by the Albany Congressman was designed to get the Foreign Service "out of the drawing room and into the market place." I, too, subscribe to the theory that modern diplomacy should be as much at home in a business suit as in a top hat and tails.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in the RECORD the following editorial from the Knickerbocker News:

O'BRIEN'S TALK AN OASIS IN CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Our Congressman, LEO W. O'BRIEN, seems to have some ideas about the State Department.

He wants it to get out of the drawing room and into the marketplace to find budding young diplomats.

He'd like it to pass up Phi Beta Kappas for some rough, tough halfbacks from the University of Michigan. (At times they've considered a glee club singer from there—named Dewey—but maybe that's not pertinent.)

And he'd like a new Division of Economic Cooperation staffed with footloose young men who can teach others about our way of life without giving away money. He'd also like them to keep an eye out for places where American business can invest money.

He said most of this on the floor the other day; immediately drew the interest of the State Department, which seems to like some of his ideas. (Amid so many it ought to find something it liked.)

Personally we approve going into Main Street and hiring diplomats. We think the State Department tends to get too many college youths straight out of convertibles; youths who may have been sheltered from a big segment of America that they will have to represent.

Whether they should be Phi Beta Kappas or football players, we wouldn't know. Personally we're all for three-letter valedictorians—but they probably all go with the telephone company. Offhand, we're not worried about our diplomats having too many brains.

As for his proposed "sales force," the idea of America "investing" rather than "giving away" money has terrific appeal. So long as the "investing" goes on without exploitation—and we think it can—this in itself teaches others more about America than a regiment of diplomats can.

If, after they know about America, they want to borrow our ideology, that's fine. But as in "Teahouse of the August Moon," if they still prefer to build a "teahouse" instead of a "pentagon-shaped school," we'd better just let them.

Meanwhile, it's nice to bask in the unctuous luxury of having a Congressman with a few ideas.

Problems of the Small-Business Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to insert one of the most disturbing letters I have received in the 11 years I have been a Member of the Congress.

The independent businessman, sometimes called the small-business man, is one of the basic and most important segments of our political and economic democracy along with the executives of larger business, the service trades, industrial labor, our farmers, and the professions. If our country is to continue to prosper, each of these elements must share in the prosperity.

Of them all, however, the small or independent businessman best typifies the American ideal, because in most cases, and in most communities, he is the self-made man whose hard work has built up a personal equity in his own local business, whose community leadership is respected rather than feared, and whose business independence is matched by his political independence. No one can tell him how to run his business, and no one can tell him how to vote.

There is increasing evidence that today the small-business man is steadily being pushed to the wall. The competitive advantages of big business such as superior buying power, more capital available for expansion, and control of many market outlets are making it impossible for many small businesses to survive.

The letter to which I have referred was written by a small-business man who is now seeking to sell out the business which he has built up through the years and to invest his equity in the stocks of his larger competitors. The facts and figures he quotes speak far more eloquently than any words that I might utter. I am placing his letter in the RECORD so that the members of the House committees which formulate tax, banking, and small-business legislation may have the benefit of his experience. Something must be done to work out laws in these fields which will better enable small business to meet the crisis it is facing, if it is to continue to maintain the important position it has held in the past in our American way of life:

MARCH 23, 1956.

The Honorable J. VAUGHAN GARY,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR VAUGHAN: We are continuing to hear politicians talk about helping the small-business man; and since this wonderful help is forcing me and thousands like me to offer our businesses for sale daily to big business firms who can raise capital, I thought I would take the time to tell you of our plight, not that I expect anything to be done, but I will at least get it off my chest before I retire from business. It makes me sick to think that I have worked for 35 years to build from scratch to a nice business only to be forced to sell it because Government regulations do not allow enough profit to remain in business. The small corporations cannot hope to continue to survive unless they can get some tax relief where incomes are under $100,000 before dividends and taxes.

I will be more specific. I am being forced to sell my business for the lack of capital. We are being forced to compete against Ford, General Motors, Chrysler, Standard Oil, Goodyear Tire & Rubber, not to mention large co-ops who pay no taxes at all. Our resale prices are established by them, as they have a tremendous price advantage due to buying power, and there isn't anything we can do except to try to compete with them. These firms can float long-term loans or sell stocks and bonds when necessary to increase capital; but I ask you who is interested in stock in any small corporation. We are not large enough to get an insurance loan, and the bank is only interested in short-term loans. This leaves us without funds in order to compete with every other growing business.

Our company has paid from $30,000 to $50,000 in taxes annually for the past 4 or 5 years; and without paying dividends to stockholders, we are still going down at the rate of from $15,000 to $25,000. You might ask why our corporation shows a net income of $50,000 to $60,000 before taxes but cannot get enough cash to carry on our business. The answer is simple. No company can stand still, and after taxes we do not have enough cash left to handle an increase of 5 percent in sales. A 5 percent increase in sales would be $125,000 which would require a $31,000 increase in capital. This is $2,000 more than our net after taxes remembering that we are not even considering dividends; and when we have a normal increase, which is considered 10 percent, we go from $25,000 to $40,000 in the hole. During the past 2 years we have had a net income in excess of $125,000, and after paying between $60,000 and $70,000 in taxes, it has been necessary to borrow $60,000 from the bank. If we have a 10-percent increase this year, our indebtedness will go to at least $90,000. The only thing I can ask as a small-business man is why I should go broke in order to pay a lot of taxes and struggle with two strikes against me to start.

Each day we get letters of mergers among small manufacturers and wholesalers for the same reason. It is my guess that a few hundred large corporations will control all businesses within the very near future, and with this thought in mind I am placing our business on the market in the hopes that I can find a buyer; as I can take the money that I have invested and put it back in stock of any one of a number of good corporations and have a greater net return with no inventory, no headaches, and I won't even have to work.

If it is the desire of Government to have a few empires like General Motors and Standard Oil to run the country, I suggest that Congress leave the tax structure as it is today.

In closing let me say that it is quite amusing for the average small-business man to read about all the consideration he is receiving in Washington.

Very truly yours,
RICHMOND AUTO PARTS, INC.,
H. B. TRUSLOW, *President.*

Newark's Glory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, without in any way minimizing the beauty of the cherry blossoms that bloom in Washington, I wish to point with pardonable pride to the cherry blossoms which bloom in Branch Brook Park, which is part of my congressional district. The beauty of these cherry trees was at their fullest this past Sunday and many visitors from all parts of the State came to look upon this picture of nature in her finest dress.

The following editorial which appeared in the May 1, 1956 issue of the Newark Evening News entitles the story of the beautiful cherry blossoms well as "Newark's Glory":

NEWARK'S GLORY

Thousands are drawn to Washington from all parts of the country every spring to see the blossoming of the Japanese cherry trees around the Tidal Basin in Potomac Park. Few outside Essex County know that here in Newark is a cherry blossom display which many consider more dramatic than Washington's.

The lovely spectacle along Second River in Branch Brook Park was retarded more than 2 weeks by unseasonable weather. But

it has arrived at last. Of the 28 varieties, ranging from snow white through pink to dark red, the single-blossomed trees came to full flowering under the warm sun of the weekend. They will be succeeded in a few days by the magnificent double blossoms which last, barring heavy rain or windstorms, for 10 days.

The Essex County park commission last year began floodlighting the cherry grove from dusk to midnight to give more persons an opportunity to enjoy nature's glorious display. The experiment was so successful that this year the lights have been doubled. More will be installed next year. The effect is enchanting.

The people of the community have reason to be grateful to Mrs. Felix Fuld, the generous and public-spirited woman, sister of Louis Bamberger, who gave the trees to the county park system in 1928. Hers was a gift of rare and enduring beauty that each year gladdens the hearts of an ever-increasing number of visitors.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Congress the fact that May 3, the occasion of Poland's Constitution Day, is a particularly fitting time to recall Poland's historic struggle to regain her lost freedom through generations of oppression and rule by conquerors. Today the changing atmosphere behind the Iron Curtain quickens the hearts of Poles everywhere in the hope that their beloved homeland may once again see freedom.

From the time Poland reached full-grown statehood in the 14th century ideas of democracy, freedom, religion, toleration, intellectual culture have been of first importance in that nation. These ideas are the traditions of the people rather than of the state. During the 19th century, when no Polish state existed, the nation nonetheless endured tenaciously, and, indeed, the people, lacking a state, clung all the more closely to their traditions. Not what the Polish state has been and has done but what the Polish people have been and still are—these are the components of that great tradition. It has been carried on by men and women, not by governmental bodies or agencies. The achievements resulting from the tradition are personal, not official, and those persons who achieved much during former glorious centuries remain vivid in the memories of their descendants, state or no state. When Poland was restored in 1918 that tradition sprang at once into national and political effectiveness, as witness the turning back of the Bolshevik invasion.

During Poland's golden age, in the 16th century, much of the Polish tradition took shape. Time and again, far oftener than most of us today trouble to recall, the Poles were the eastern defenders of Christianity, order, and civilization itself. The eastern hordes of Tartars, Turks, and—in the 20th century—Bolsheviks were turned back by the valor and sacrifice of Poles whose bodies today lie in the soil fought over a hundred times.

Of few national traditions can Poles be more proud than that of tolerance—chiefly in the religious and political spheres, but also as a personal trait of the individual. In tolerant Poland of the middle ages the Jews found refuge from the persecutors who pursued them in other nations of Europe. In the 16th century, Poland was the only place that gave the Protestant revolution a just hearing. Jan Zamoyski, perhaps the greatest of all Poles, expressed this religious tolerance when he called together his friends who had left the Catholic Church; he would gladly give half his remaining life to see them return to the church, he said, but rather than see them return under compulsion he would lay down his life.

The Polish political tradition of nonaggression was clearly evidenced in the 15th and 16th centuries when Poland increased her territory threefold and her population twofold without intimidation, terror, or bloodshed. Her characteristic tolerance made other groups, the Lithuanians and Ruthenians, desire to join Poland.

The fate of Poland, the traditional friend of the United States, will always be of primary interest to Americans, if only in remembrance of the heroic work of Kosciuszko and Pulaski in helping the American colonies to win their independence.

Today, the Polish struggle for liberation is widespread. It is being waged on the national, social, cultural, and moral levels, where human mind and feeling often play a greater role than that of bayonet, prison, or concentration camp. The characteristics of national temperament of which I have spoken undoubtedly will help the Polish people endure the present Soviet occupation. The tradition of individualism constitutes an obstacle to the subordination of Poland to the Communist system which disregards the dignity and freedom of man.

We will never rest easily, never forget the Poles' justifiable and burning desire for freedom until the yoke of Soviet enslavement and brutality has been lifted. We look to the day when Poland will again emerge a strong, free, prosperous, and happy nation. We know the people will never give up their hope for the arrival of that day. With the help of courage, perseverance, and faith in freedom, that day will come, I know.

Rhode Island Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is independence day for the great State of Rhode Island. One hundred and eighty years ago tomorrow the State of Rhode Island dissolved all legal and moral ties with her mother country, Great Britain. By repealing an act entitled "An act for the more effectual securing to his Majesty the allegiance of his subjects in this His Colony and Dominion of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations."

On May 4, 1776 Rhode Island formally severed all social, political, and economic association with Great Britain. The events that led up to these acts of impunity are concisely and authoritatively recited in our history books.

In 1763 the English Government determined to institute a program to strengthen colonial administration, and to raise colonial revenue. Each of these measures was eminently unpopular in America, but the question of a colonial revenue proved to be the principal pivot of controversy. At the close of the French and Indian Wars the British public debt was overburdening and in England the taxpayers were clamoring for relief. To help defray the expenses of the new colonial policy parliament, in 1764, passed the sugar act, imposing a tax on imports of foreign molasses into America. This was the first instance of a parliamentary act designed for the express purpose of raising a colonial revenue.

The sugar act provoked a storm of protest. In spite of these protests, parliament proceeded, in 1765, to a still more objectionable revenue measure—the stamp act—whereby a tax was levied on all legal and commercial papers, pamphlets, newspapers, almanacs, cards, and dice. Immediately rioting broke out, because of these imposts, and British goods were boycotted.

In 1766 a new ministry in England repealed the stamp act and reduced the duties imposed by the sugar act. Within a few months however, still another ministry was in power and the attempt to raise a colonial revenue was renewed. By one of the Townshend acts of 1767 duties were imposed on imports of glass, lead, paint, paper, and tea. Again the colonies responded with a boycott of British merchandise.

Colonial resentment found expression in a series of incidents, many of which occurred in Rhode Island. As early as 1764 Newporters climaxed a riot with crewmen of the British schooner St. John by firing upon the vessel with cannons. The following year a Newport mob, angered by impressment of American seamen, seized and burned one of the boats of the British vessel Maidstone. Most famous in this series of incidents was the burning of the British revenue schooner Gaspee.

After the Gaspee affair tensions rose to a climax. In 1773 Rhode Island formed a committee of correspondence for cooperation with the other colonies. On December 16, 1773, the Boston Tea Party was staged to protest a British plan for stimulating the sale of taxed tea. This defiant action, which caused the British to retaliate with coercive legislation known as the Intolerable Acts, was vehemently discussed and approved by

town meetings in Rhode Island. The Bristol town meeting boldly asserted that the time might come when the people would be provoked to renounce their allegiance and assert an independency.

The colonial spirit of independency was the rock on which Britain's North American empire was finally wrecked. Accustomed for more than a generation to little or no taxation, and to nearly complete freedom in the management of their internal affairs, the Americans were disposed to resent every British attempt to strengthen colonial administration. Free from the menace of New France, strong and self-confident, the Thirteen Colonies prepared to resist.

In 1774, Rhode Island gave support to the calling of the Continental Congress, naming as delegates the former political rivals Stephen Hopkins and Samuel Ward. In 1775, upon receipt of the news of Concord and Lexington, the general assembly created an army of observation—most of the troops later joined Washington's Continental Army. The same year the assembly commissioned its own navy, consisting of two units, to protect the colony's trade. Before the year was out, this force had attacked and captured a vessel of the Royal Navy. On May 4, 1776, the Rhode Island General Assembly climaxed its program of resistance by formally declaring its freedom from Britain. This action, taken 2 months before the Declaration of Independence at Philadelphia, made Rhode Island the first sovereign state established by Europeans in the New World.

This formal declaration of freedom has been called the "shot heard around the world."

Our State's firmness lies in her record. Rhode Island still remains the land of "firsts." The circumstances have changed the times, but the character and determination still lies dormant only to be kindled by any sort of tyranny over the mind of man.

Rhode Island is a proud State. Her people are progressive and hard working. The products of her workmen can be found in every part of the world. It is the cradle of religious liberty in America.

We shall continue to be proud and independent. We shall continue to work for the good of all and oppose all things that are not in the public interest.

The Polish Constitution of 1791

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, there are certain landmarks in the history of mankind's efforts toward a society of liberty under law which Americans can never forget. Just because Americans are drawn from the peoples of every part of the world, in a special way they find their inspiration in the history of those peoples.

On May 3 we mark the 165th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791. It is a sobering thought that for most of those 165 years the Polish people have not been their own masters, least of all today, when they must bear their enslavement by the Communist tyrants. Yet, the spirit of freedom has always burned fiercely in Polish hearts, and the constitution which they adopted on May 3, 1791, is a shining example of the embodiment of democratic principles.

No celebrations will be allowed in Poland today, but we in America can commemorate this day by reaffirming our own dedication to the fundamental precepts of the Polish Constitution of 1791 and by restating our determination that the Polish people shall once again be free.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, May 3, 1956, is a day of reverence and remembrance for all the people of Poland, and their relatives and friends wherever they may be, in their native land of Poland, or in America, or throughout the world. It is a day they remember freedom.

May 3 is constitution day, celebrating the constitution of May 3, 1791, establishing democratic rights and religious freedom for all Poland's people.

We remember our good friends and relatives in Poland. In these difficult times, we urge them to continue their faith and good spirit. We people of America have not forgotten them, and we look forward to that great day of freedom, independent, and justice for all the people of Poland which is certainly on the way as evidenced by the rising spirits, success, and unity of the free peoples of the world.

We salute our friends, the people of Poland on constitution day.

I am glad to include in my remarks the following cheering statement of my good friend, Judge Blair F. Gunther of the Superior Court of Pennsylvania and supreme head of the Polish National Alliance in the United States:

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY, MAY 3, 1956
(By Blair F. Gunther)

These are unsettled times for the peoples of the free world but these are times of crisis for the people of Poland. While the Poles inside Poland are not now able to demonstrate openly their intense desire for the freedom they have been denied, free Poles all over the world and those of Polish origin will, with additional vigor, commemorate the 165th anniversary of the signing of the constitution of the 3d of May. They call upon others with similar feelings for freedom to join them in the commemoration of this significant event.

Poland has nurtured seeds of democratic thinking since its earliest days. The freedom of the individual to speak, worship, and carry out his own work as he chooses has been fought for throughout many generations. Poland was one of the first states in Europe to elect its rulers by vote of its citizens. It has ever been liberal in its attitude toward religion. It has always strived toward a high level of education, and its ideals of justice have made it an historic place of refuge for many racial groups persecuted elsewhere.

The Poles have long understood, and still appreciate, the feelings which motivated the struggle for independence in the United States. The sending of numerous sons to aid on the field of battle is but one outward example of the sympathy they felt for this young and free country. The same spirit which manifested itself here during the Revolution brought about in Poland, at the same time, the adoption of the Constitution of the 3d of May.

The Constitution of the 3d of May 1791, can validly claim to be one of the world's greatest documents of freedom. It was the first written democratic constitution in Europe establishing the rights of all classes and assuring the religious freedom of all groups.

Those unfortunate Poles locked in by the curtain of iron can only look back silently at the past greatness of their country, praying also in silence for a reestablishment of the principles embodied in the Constitution of the 3d of May. Those who can commemorate this event, by word or deed, must do so with increased spirit to compensate for and inspire those who cannot. We are all related to the fervent patriots of the constitution, either closely or more distantly, either by blood or spiritually, and our debt to them is a great one. Our actions today can be a sign of those bonds of kinship.

The Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I regret that it is necessary for me to be absent today on important official business, when the House has before it the agriculture bill of 1956. The measure was not previously programed for this week, and in the meantime I made certain commitments I am obliged to fulfill.

I have not missed a single vote in this session of Congress on the many measures that have come before us affecting our farmers. Nor would I miss this one today were it not absolutely necessary and were it not that I have assurances from the leadership of the Republican Party that my presence is not necessary, as most of the differences on the various features of the proposed legislation have been resolved.

Having been brought up on the farm, naturally I am inclined to favor any sound proposition that would be for the benefit of deserving farmers. For a number of years I have been a member of the grange and of the Farm Bureau, and I have been in close touch with the various programs that have been advanced for the benefit of the farmers. I have given considerable study and thought to the whole subject, and par-

ticularly to the bill now before the House.

The bill before the House is by no means perfect in every particular, but I do believe that on the whole it will make a constructive contribution for a solution to the farm problem. Were I present today and voting I would, accordingly, vote for the bill.

Agriculture is the leading industry of all of our industries. More people are employed in agriculture than any other business, and more money is invested in agriculture properties than any other business.

My votes in Congress have always been in favor of giving encouragement to this big industry and to the many people who engage in agricultural pursuits. My votes have always been for legislation which will give our worthy farmers a program that is economically sound and which will enable them to progress and prosper.

In Tribute to Poland, the First Ally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I consider it an honor to participate in the celebration of the anniversary of Polish independence and to pay tribute to a heroic people. Today all people of Polish extraction greet this eventful date with a song on their lips, the Third of May Mazurka, and I am sure that even though the Iron Curtain alters the tones and distorts the words, the echo repeats from all sides: "Poland is not dead yet, while we are alive."

On May 3, 1791, Poland guaranteed freedom to all her citizens by adopting a consttiution, and became the first nation in Europe to have a written democratic document proclaiming the principles of human liberty.

On September 1, 1939, Poland was the first nation to take up arms to resist Nazi aggression—the first who had the courage to say, "No" to Hitler. Poland in her international policy was faithful at all times, not only to the letter but also to the spirit of her treaties, and did not allow herself to be led astray by the Nazi proposal to take part in an attack on Soviet Russia, and refused to cooperate in any anti-Soviet plot, abiding by her neutrality and striving for peace. Yes; Poland was first to fight, and for this honor paid dearly with the blood of her soldiers, not only in Poland during the September campaign but on all Allied fronts—in Norway, France, in the Battle of Britain, Africa, Itlay, Belgium, Normandy, Holland, Germany—on the seas, and in the skies over Europe.

Poland was the first ally. While Poland was the "mother of the United Nations," she was excluded from the Conference of the United Nations, convened on April 25, 1945, at San Francisco. Yet the thought that was to guide the work of the San Francisco Conference was expressed by a Polish king in 1750—Stanislaw Leszczynski, one of the early protagonists of international cooperation, who wrote a memorandum on strengthening the general peace. The thought underlying his plan was that the community of nations should go to the assistance of any country attacked. Likewise, in 1833, Poland's greatest poet, Adam Mickiewicz, proclaimed in his works the ideal of the common brotherhood of man—a genuine international organization.

The Polish people have always been brave to the point of folly and they have always been believers in freedom. Time and again they have been found defending the rights of men and women to live their own lives in their own way. The Polish people fought against a German invader trying to steal other peoples' lands as far back as the year 963. In 1241 they saved Europe from the invading Tartar hordes. In 1685 it was Sobieski and the gallant Poles who protected and saved Christianity from the ravages of the Mohammedan sword and stopped the infidel hordes from overrunning Europe and destroying the Christian people. The liberty-loving Poles came to the aid of our American Colonies in the Revolutionary War. Wherever liberty and justice are at stake, the sons of Poland never fail to rally. Thousands of Polish boys from my State fought courageously on the battlefields of Korea.

Poland has always been devoted to the cause of humanity. Her contributions to human liberty and free institutions are glorious. She is a symbol of freedom and of peace.

In observing this anniversary of a great event in the history of Poland, let us recognize that the fate of this old, brave, great nation still disturbs the world and America. At Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam, we played a role not entirely compatible with our ideals. Let us all hope and pray that Poland, the first nation in Europe to adopt a democratic form of government, will be permitted to work out her own destiny under a government of her own, chosen by her own people.

The Lowest Summit Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the New Republic for April 9, 1956, is worthy of the attention of our colleagues:

PARLEY IN A SANDTRAP

We have talked to several reporters back from the Eisenhower-Canadian-Mexican conference at White Sulphur Springs. Their eyes are still popping. The chief executives from Ottawa and Mexico City couldn't seem to figure out what it was all about. Neither could the reporters. Eisenhower knew; he had come to play golf with professional Sammy Snead. The reporters couldn't kick—there was a free bar open all the time—but why, after all, were they there? Mexicans were happy; they were upgraded. Canadians were miffed; they were downgraded. Otherwise the two had little in common. There was no agenda. At the windup Eisenhower scheduled 2-hour individual conferences with each guest; these were cut down to 20 minutes when it turned out they had nothing to say. Ike got out on the links again.

Shrewd writers believe that this was smart politics. "The average American," one of them explained, "distrusts striped pants and diplomacy. He favors man-to-man talks at top level. It's what he thinks he would do if he were President. Ike went out personally and ended the Korean war, didn't he? How can you explain that the real United States-Canadian problems are so technical that Ike probably has never heard of them? This was good headline stuff and made votes." The conference has been dubbed the lowest summit conference.

Getting to the Top

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there was a time when a mother would tell her son that the way was open to the Presidency of the United States—that was then supposed to be the top.

However, Franklin Ford, in the Washington Evening Star of April 30 last, points out that at least there is another road to wealth and riches, even though it is not one traveled by the Horatio Alger boys. Here is what he wrote:

LIVE LIKE LORDS

(By Franklin Ford)

If you want to do right by your son, train him to be a labor leader. The Lords of Labor, with a capital L, are today's aristocracy, the modern princes of privilege, the well-fed, well-clothed, and well-housed.

Wouldn't it be dandy if your son and mine could be housed, for example, as well as Dave Beck, head of the Teamsters' Union. The Associated Press says his home in Seattle has a swimming pool, a movie theater, and a waterfall. About a year ago he permitted his union to buy the property from him for $163,000, a real bargain, providing he could live in it rent-free for life, and also that the union would pay all costs of service, taxes, and maintenance. And now he is going to allow his truck drivers to buy the furniture for $100,000, provided it stays in his house, presumably.

Besides, says the Associated Press, Mr. Beck gets $50,000 a year plus expenses, plus "furnished living quarters in the Teamsters' new $5-million marble and glass headquarters in Washington, plus an apartment in a Washington hotel."

Now, that's really living it up. And the "expenses" cover such things as Mr. Beck's trip to Hawaii with other executives of his union, for a business meeting. It wasn't, I'm sure, that these labor bosses merely wanted an expense-paid trip to the hula-hula land of romance and moonlight. It was because Hawaii is so much more convenient and centrally located for a business meeting than, say, Chicago. Besides, the AFL big brass meets in Miami, where there are lots

of night spots, race tracks, and swimming pools. So why not Honolulu for the king of the Teamsters' Union and his princes and barons?

Our President, Senators, governors, mayors, etc., hold office only for fixed terms, none more than 6 years but that's the silly American idea of rotation in office, with a secret ballot so the voters can pick the man of their choice. Of course, there's none of that stupid democratic nonsense in labor unions. The boss stays in for life, and the faceless zeros down in the ranks are subjects of an absolute monarch. Their only function, besides paying dues and assessments, is to obey.

Since today's kings like Beck, Reuther, Lewis, Hoffa, etc., hold in their grasp the economic livelihood of millions, and extract tribute from them in an unregulated system of private taxation, it seems right and just that these regal gentlemen also control the social and political lives of their subjects, and spend their dues money for mansions for themselves, or as campaign funds for politicians who will promise to do their bidding.

Yes, the smart thing to do is educate your boy to be a labor leader. Then he will really be sitting in the pullman diner of the gravy train, eating high on the hog.

The Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, permit me to direct to the attention of our colleagues Mr. Roscoe Drummond's column entitled "What Next in the Cold War?" The column appeared in the New York Herald Tribune for April 29, 1956. It follows:

WHAT NEXT IN THE COLD WAR?

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Part of the great debate in Washington today is over who's winning the cold war—the Soviet Union or the West? Mr. Dulles has been saying that we are winning the cold war because the Soviet Union has been forced to shift policies in midstream, and because the Kremlin has found it prudent to slough off some of the more ruthless coatings of the Stalin dictatorship. Adlai Stevenson has been saying that we are losing the cold war because the new Soviet tactics are more difficult to cope with, and because Soviet enticement and influence in Asia, North Africa, and the Middle East have made visible headway in recent months. President Eisenhower has been saying that we can't really know who is winning the cold war because it is impossible at this stage to cast up a firm balance sheet. My own instinct is to feel that, in this instance, Mr. Stevenson is nearer right than Mr. Dulles, and that Mr. Eisenhower is usefully candid in saying that dogmatic claims either way are misleading. What is needed, I think, is a fresh evaluation of what the United States can and must do—militarily, economically, and politically—to recapture the initiative. The purpose of this column is not to judge the cold war but to look at the criteria by which we can measure the adequacy of United States action as events take clearer shape.

THE BALANCE OF MILITARY POWER

This is absolutely critical, and this is why Senator STUART SYMINGTON's investigation into the scope and pace of United States defense production, whatever its political motivation, is timely and proper.

We hear it constantly repeated that we are today nearer peace, further from war, than 2 or 3 years ago. We hear it said that since each side can inflict massive destruction on the other, neither will find it profitable to embark upon war.

This is absolutely true and profoundly misleading. It leads to the suggestion that Soviet superiority in some major modern weapons is not crucial since we have sufficient nuclear arms to make their use by the Kremlin uninviting. This is a perilous premise. It is perilous because it is possible to avoid war and lose the peace. It is perilous because a significant shift in the balance of military power to the U. S. S. R. could incalculably strengthen Soviet influence all over the world and, though never used, overtly, could undetermine the will of the free world to stand together.

Moscow talks about reducing its armed force, but the United Nations Economic Survey of Europe for 1955 reveals that there was at least a 12 percent rise in Soviet military expenditures last year, and a continuing shift toward heavy industry and armaments. In England, Mr. Khrushchev discloses that the Soviets have dropped an H-bomb from an airplane (we haven't), and reports that Russia "will soon" have a guided missile with an H-bomb warhead capable of "hitting anywhere in the world." We haven't Moscow is producing submarines which can deliver atomic missiles at a rate far exceeding our own.

If this shift in the balance of power continues, it could undermine the Free World without firing a shot. To permit the balance of power to slip away from us is to invite disaster.

THE SOVIET POLITICAL CHALLENGE

The Soviet Union is today exerting diplomatic and political influence in parts of the world where its presence was not felt a few years ago—in the Middle East, where its arms sales are disturbing; in Asia where, for example, Ceylon has just voted a neutralist government into office; in the Western Hemisphere, where the Icelandic Parliament has called for the dismantlement of the NATO airbase.

THE SOVIET ECONOMIC CHALLENGE

By virtue of its ability to buy surplus foodstuffs, which are a drug on the American market, Moscow is making its trade-and-aid program increasingly felt.

These Soviet measures are counterable but only if the United States is ready to expend the resources to keep the balance of power from shifting to the Soviet Union; only if we are ready to help the newly independent, uncommitted nations to achieve political and economic progress which will cause them to identify their future with the Free World.

There is no present sign that American public opinion is yet prepared for this great exertion. It will require decisive and sustained leadership from the White House.

Giovanni da Verrazano, Discoverer of New York Harbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, April 17, 1956, at Oscar Tucci's Delmonico's Restaurant in New York City, the annual Verrazano Day was celebrated.

Giovanni da Verrazano is the great Italian navigator who first discovered the harbor of New York in 1524. Great credit for this public and well deserved recognition is due the Italian Historical Society of America, of which John N. La Corte is the director.

Oscar Tucci, the owner of Delmonico's, who was born in Florence, Italy, where the great navigator Verrazano was likewise born, spoke eloquently of his native countryman. Another speaker at the Verrazano Day celebration was Prof. Edward D. Re, of St. John's University School of Law in Brooklyn, whose eloquent address is of special interest at this time.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am happy to insert Professor Re's address, which is as follows:

REMARKS OF PROF. EDWARD D. RE, PROFESSOR OF LAW, ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW, ON THE OCCASION OF THE VERRAZANO DAY CEREMONY IN NEW YORK, TUESDAY, APRIL 17, 1956

Mr. Chairman, distinguished and honorable guests, my fellow Americans and friends, we Americans who share the noble traditions of freedom and liberty, the seeds of which were planted on the plains of Runnymede, in that fateful encounter between King John and the barons, often know more about dramatic historic events of other nations than we do about our own. Although one does not detract from the importance of knowing the history of Europe that is so closely linked with the very discovery, foundation and heritage of the Western Hemisphere and our own country, nevertheless it is felt that greater attention should be given to the many glorious chapters of American history. I say this because I believe that there are many chapters of American history that should be as well known to us as the signing of Magna Carta on the plains of Runnymede. Surely many events of American history are equally dramatic. It is therefore in an effort to instill justifiable pride in the American that we celebrate today the achievement and discovery of Giovanni da Verrazano, an achievement destined to become of the greatest significance.

Although Verrazano day is sponsored by the Italian Historical Society of America, since Verrazano was a Florentine navigator, the celebration is in no sense Italian. Likewise, if it were celebrated under the auspices of a French historical society, since Verrazano sailed a French vessel under the sponsorship of Francis I, King of France, the celebration would not commemorate a French event. The celebration, rather, is intended and must be understood as an American celebration commemorating an important and dramatic chapter of American history. From one standpoint it may be viewed as one of the most beautiful events of American history because it was Verrazano who first opened the great portals of New York Harbor to the peoples of the world. The millions of thankful immigrants who share with us the blessings of liberty and freedom may gratefully acknowledge Verrazano as the first immigrant who made possible their happy, fruitful life in this land of opportunity.

The Verrazano story, like the story of Amerigo Vespucci, commences in the beautiful city of Florence, Italy, for it was there that these two great navigators first saw the light of day. Although there is some doubt as to the year of birth of Giovanni da Verrazano, there is no doubt that he was born in Florence, Italy, the son of Pietro Andrea and Fianetta Capelli. James Carson Bre-

voort, the founding president of the Long Island Historical Society and a champion in the cause for the recognition of Verrazano, sets the date of birth of the intrepid Florentine navigator as 1480. Others believe the year of birth to be 1485. What is of interest to us, however, is the fact that Verrazano, a courageous sailor, became an experienced navigator who entered the service of France. In 1508, as a seaman, sailing out of the port of Dieppe, Normandy, he took part in the discovery and exploration of the Gulf of St. Lawrence.

The event that we celebrate today, however, commenced about 15 years later. Under the sponsorship of Francis I, King of France, Verrazano was commissioned the pilot of the 100-ton, three masted caravel or carrack, named *La Dauphine*. This vessel, named in honor of the eldest son of the king, under the command of one Antoine de Conflans, set sail in search for the "blessed land of Cathay." This trip, which led to the discovery of New York Harbor, is described in great detail in a letter, in the nature of a report, addressed by Verrazano to the king, who was referred to in the salutation as "the most serene crown of France." It is interesting to note that in this report Verrazano refers to *La Dauphine* as "*Dalfina*," being the Italian for Dauphine. According to the report, the first landfall on the American Continent was in South Carolina. He followed the coast northward until in mid-April 1524 the *Dauphine* sailed into New York Bay. The report states that, after cruising the shoreline about 300 miles, "we found a very agreeable site located within two small prominent hills, between which flowed to the sea a very great river, which was deep within the mouth." This is probably the very first recorded description of what is today the Bay Ridge hills of Brooklyn and Staten Island. Having entered the river in a small boat, Verrazano adds: "The people clothed with feathers of birds of various colors, came toward us joyfully, uttering very great exclamations of admiration, showing us where we could land with the boat more safely." After entering the river "within the land * * * in an instant, as is wont to happen in navigation, a gale of unfavorable wind flowing in from the sea" forced Verrazano "to return to the ship, leaving the said land with much regret because of its commodiousness and beauty."

Although unfortunately he was forced to leave quickly, he nevertheless had named the areas that he had described. He named the place Angouleme, since, prior to his succession to the throne, the king had been the Count of Angouleme. In the words of Verrazano's report: "We called it Angouleme, from the principality which thou attainest in lesser fortune, and the bay which that land makes, Santa Margarita, from the name of thy sister, who vanquishes the other matrons of modesty and art."

This story may very well be given the name selected by Monsieur Jacques Habert, "When New York was called Angouleme." Others may prefer Santa Margarita, but the story is nevertheless American. It is the story of an intrepid navigator who first set eyes upon the Narrows and New York Harbor 85 years before Henry Hudson's *Half Moon* sailed up the Hudson River to its navigable headwaters at the present site of Albany. It was therefore entirely befitting and proper, in October 1909, at the time of the Hudson-Fulton celebration in New York, that a statue to Verrazano was unveiled and erected here in Battery Park.

Although the Verrazano monument was temporarily removed during the operations connected with the digging of the Brooklyn Tunnel, happily, it was subsequently restored here in Battery Park—to a place of prominence and dignity. In this connection all Americans owe a debt of gratitude to those historians and civic-minded persons who have generously given of their time and effort to make known this Verrazano story not only to New Yorkers but to all Americans. This debt is owed to men such as Brevoort, Greene, Carli, de Costa, and Habert. Brooklynites may be especially proud of James A. Kelly, Brooklyn borough historian, who had dramatized the achievement of Verrazano with such enthusiasm that it was almost inevitable for the Italian Historical Society of America, founded by Mr. John N. LaCorte, to perpetuate the memory and discovery of Verrazano.

Due recognition has been given to this glorious event of American history by Mayor Robert F. Wagner who, in his proclamation proclaiming today Verrazano Day in the city of New York, urges "all citizens to do fitting honor to the memory of Giovanni da Verrazano for having been the first to enter this great harbor and gateway to the land of golden opportunity which has long shone as a beacon light to the oppressed peoples of a sad and troubled world."

Through the very gateway described by Verrazano, only 432 years ago, millions have passed to reap the rich harvest of freedom and liberty. Today that gateway assumes more than merely commercial and material importance. Rather, it represents the greatness that is America for in the center of that same gateway there stands the symbol of American democracy and the American way of life—the Statue of Liberty.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate adjourned out of respect to Senator Barkley.

House passed farm bill.

See Congressional Program Ahead.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 6627–6628

Bills Introduced: 1 resolution was submitted, as follows S. Res. 258. Page 6628

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

H. R. 6143, to amend the Internal Revenue Code with regard to income-tax treatment of transfer of patent rights, with amendments—reported May 1 under prior authorization (S. Rept. 1941);

S. 2582, 3472, H. R. 3964, 4051, 8187, 4536, 4633, 5495, 6395, and 4162, private bills—reported May 1 under prior authorization (S. Repts. 1942–1951, inclusive); and

H. R. 7471, providing for conveyance of certain U. S. lands to the St. John's County, Fla., Board of Commissioners, with amendments—reported May 2 under prior authorization (S. Rept. 1952). Pages 6627–6628

Bills Referred: Four House-passed bills were referred to appropriate committees. Page 6627

Condolence Resolution—Senator Barkley: Senate adopted S. Res. 258, expressing condolence on death of Senator and former Vice President Barkley. Page 6628

Program for Monday: Senate adjourned at 12:04 p. m. until noon Monday, May 7, when it will continue on S. 3073, D. C. transit system.

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

PROCESSED TOBACCO

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry: Subcommittee on Tobacco concluded its hearings with regard to the use of reconstituted or processed tobacco in the manufacturing of tobacco products. Witnesses heard were Dr. Robert N. DuPuis, of Philip Morris, New York; John C. Whitaker, R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Corp., Winston-Salem, N. C.; John A. Crowe, American Tobacco Co., New York; T. M. Wade, Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp., Louisville, Ky.; Irvin H. Peak, P. Lorillard Co., New York; Stanley S. Keyser, Consolidated Cigar Corp., New York; Charles H. Horn, Federal Cigar Corp., Red Lion, Pa.; Harry Wurman, Bayuk Cigars, Inc., Philadelphia; Victor C. Davidson, of John H. Swisher & Son, Inc., cigar manufacturers of Jacksonville, Fla.; Leon Singer, Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., New York; Dr. Ernest Ball, associate professor of botany, North Carolina State College; Dr. W. G. Frankenburg, General Cigar Co., Inc., New York; Dr. W. E. Colwell, North Carolina State College, Raleigh; and William A. Blount, Liggett & Myers Tobacco, New York.

APPROPRIATIONS—PUBLIC WORKS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee continued its hearings on proposed fiscal 1957 budget estimates for Army civil functions, hearing testimony on indicated projects from the following witnesses:

On various Montana projects—with testimony from Senator Mansfield;

On funds for New York-New Jersey channels—with testimony from Senator Smith (New Jersey) on behalf of himself and Senators Ives, Lehman, and Case (New Jersey);

On funds for the Port of New York Authority—with testimony from Representative Osmers, former Senator James Mead, and a local witness;

On funds for Ouachita River, Calion, Ark., and De Gray Dam—with testimony from Representative Harris and local witnesses;

On Middle Rio Grande Flood Control Association—with testimony from Senator Chavez, Arthur Perry, administrative assistant to Senator Johnson (Texas), and local witnesses;

On funds for various projects in the Pacific Northwest area—with testimony from Senator Neuberger; and

On various power projects throughout the country—with testimony from Clyde T. Ellis, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

Appendix

Astute Advice of Secretary Brucker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, everyone in this important legislative body knows of the outstanding ability of our great Secretary of the Army—the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker. Since assuming his tremendous responsibility, Secretary Brucker has worked unceasingly to improve the defense of our Nation. Having fought gallantly during World War I in the United States Army, our distinguished Secretary is well aware of the vital role that the Army plays in all wars.

On April 27 Secretary Brucker delivered an inspiring speech at Fort Knox, Ky., in which he offered the Nation sage advice. So important were his words that I wish to here insert his speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TEAMWORK: THE STRENGTH OF THE ARMY

(Remarks by the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army, United States Armor Association, Fort Knox, Ky., April 27, 1956)

It is inspiring to be here at Fort Knox, and to meet with leaders of our Army, and, in particular, of our armored striking force, which is so important an element of our great Army team. I emphasize the word "team" because consummate teamwork all along the line—as you have so often demonstrated in the fires of war—is the keystone of the Army's ability to discharge its tremendous responsibilities for the defense of our Nation.

I am reminded of a verse of the well-loved Caisson Song:

"Cavalry, boot to boot,
We will join in the pursuit,
While those caissons go rolling along."

The spirit expressed in those lines, with their nostalgic flavor of the old Army, must always be the ruling spirit of our new Army—the Army of tomorrow—firmly joined, man and man, arm and service, in the pursuit of a common purpose.

We must not make the disastrous mistake of underestimating the task that faces our Army today. Despite the ostensible "new look" of the Communist conspiracy—its freshly gilded promises and tawdry smiles, its artful retreading of belligerence into benevolence—there is not the slightest evidence to justify a belief that the Communists have modified in any degree their ruthless determination to subjugate the entire free world by whatever means they can. Backing that determination is the steel of the largest mobilized armed forces on earth, growing in size and power with each passing day.

"The vast Soviet military establishment has not been scrapped," President Eisenhower warned America only a short time ago. "On the contrary," he said, "the Soviets and their Communist allies are increasing the strength and effectiveness of their armed forces, and are providing them with equipment of the most modern design. The threat implicit in this vast aggregation of military power still casts an ominous shadow over the world."

The United States Army is a vital part of our defense against this massive threat. It is the hard core of our security. It is a central element of the greatest system of collective protection against a common foe that has ever been created—a system in which our country is now associated with 45 other nations.

Over 40 percent of our troops are deployed overseas in 73 countries in support of our global commitments. In Europe and Asia, standing guard with the troops of our allies, they form tangible barriers to any aggressive moves by the vast armies of Soviet imperialism. These men in the Army uniform constitute visible proof to the leaders of the Communist conspiracy that we mean exactly what we say—that we steadfastly intend to resist aggression in any form. Their mere presence stimulates the morale and stiffens the resolution of our friends by constantly reminding them that we are in this together, and that we intend to see it through together, come what may. In addition, our Army is helping to train more than 200 Allied divisions, a very substantial portion of the free world's collective strength.

The paramount purpose of our whole defense team is to deter aggression—to prevent war—but we know that in order to be an effective instrument of deterrence, it must be prepared to fight and to win under any circumstances. The evidence of its ability to do so must be so clear and so convincing that a potential enemy cannot fail to realize in advance that resort to armed attack would prove to be a most costly mistake.

If it should come to actual fighting—if our best efforts to prevent the outbreak of war should prove futile—the major combat burden would sooner or later fall, as always, upon our ground troops. No technological advance has diminished their importance. Weapons, equipment, and tactics have all been revolutionized more than once in the 40 years since I slogged through the mud of France in World War I with the Rainbow Division, but the fundamental role of the Army as we knew it then has never changed. It is the component of the defense team which has the means and capability needed to gain and to maintain control over an enemy's land, his resources, and his people; in other words, not merely to wreak destruction upon him but actually to conquer him, which is the ultimate wartime goal of all military action.

Since the days of the cave dwellers men have been devising new, more ingenious, and ever more lethal weapons of war with which to extend their capabilities, but nothing has yet been devised to replace man himself. As long as man lives on the land, and depends upon it for his sustenance, final victory in any military conflict will have to be gained on the ground. It will be gained by men who meet the enemy face to face and dig out the very roots of his resistance. The notion that wars can be won by remote control—with pushbuttons—is a dangerous myth. If encouraged, it can lead only to psychological, spiritual, and downright physical unpreparedness for the realities of military conflict.

In the event of war—no matter what kind of a war it might be, no matter what might transpire in its initial stages—our Army must be ready to play its full part as a dominant force. It must be prepared to fight successfully against any aggressor, any time, anyplace, and on any terms. It must be capable of fighting an all-out war. It must also be capable of coping with an urban riot, a remote brushfire war, an attempted seizure of power through military pressure, or any other device of military aggression contrived by the Communist mind. It must be equally as ready to fight a war in which atomic weapons are used, or are not used. In short, it must never allow itself to become irrevocably committed to any one concept of war, to any particular family or type of weapons, or to any inflexible tactical doctrine.

The ability of the Army to carry out its mission successfully is one of the most important measures of our national security. As members of the Army, we can be proud of what is being accomplished throughout our whole organization to make it ready for whatever tasks, or whatever magnitude, it may face in the critical years to come. We can see on every hand the results of dynamic thought, unremitting research, and positive, energetic action within every branch of the service, which will give the Army as a whole the means to be the fastest moving, hardest hitting Army in the world—a military force of incomparable power and versatility—a reliable and ready Army which is an indispensable part of the Nation's first line of defense.

Major emphasis is being laid at the present time upon the development of atomic weapons precisely tailored to the Army's needs. Weapons of this nature now in the hands of using units—the Corporal and the Honest John—give us a valuable interim capability, but they constitute only a beginning. In the not-too-distant future we will have whole families of guided missiles, ballistic missiles, and rockets to supplement the big guns with which our troops are armed. They will give our artillery the vastly increased range and effect necessitated by the requirements of the huge atomic battlefield. One example is the 1,500-mile IRBM Jupiter, which is now being developed jointly by the Army as a ground-launched weapon, and by the Navy for surface ship and submarine use. We are making such substantial progress with this high-priority project that the time necessary to develop the range we seek, coupled with the accuracy we have already attained, will be cut to a minimum. Units are being organized to utilize the shorter-range Redstone, the accurate experimental vehicle leading to Jupiter.

We believe that we should have in our arsenal an adequate supply of atomic weapons which can be used with discrimination against close-in as well as distant pinpoint targets, with complete accuracy under the most adverse conditions of weather and visibility. They will make it possible for us to support our troops adequately under any circumstances without unnecessary wholesale destruction, without the annihilation of large segments of the population—which might well be a friendly population—within an area of combat.

We are not overlooking the importance of intensified research and development in the field of nonatomic weapons as well, because they are urgently needed for a great many specific tasks, and will be for as long as we can foresee. We will never turn our backs upon any weapon or family of weapons until we have something definitely better in every important respect which performs the same function. We must always insure that the Army has the means at hand to apply the exact amount of force required to deal with every situation—from the silent thrust of a bayonet to the detonation of the most powerful guided missile.

The attainment of maximum mobility, both tactical and strategic, is one of our primary objectives. It would be a prime factor of success in any war we might have to fight. The traditional ground mobility and tremenodus shock power of armor take on new significance in the light of the requirements of the atomic battlefield. Armor will play a very important role in any war of the future. However, all elements of the combat commands of the atomic field army—infantry, engineers, and all forms of artillery, as well as armor—must be able to move swiftly to the attack from dispersed positions in order to exploit to the full the effects of our atomic firepower. Faster, lighter, more versatile ground vehicles are being provided to give them that capability. Air vehicles—including the "Flying Boxcars" which drop our paratroopers, the new assault transports which can land infantry on any reasonably level field, the Army's own organic helicopters which can put down men and supplies on the roughest and most inhospitable terrain—all these are literally giving wings to our ground troops.

In order to carry out its mission successfully, the Army must also be able to transport its major units by air over long distances, between continents and across oceans. We have made considerable progress in attaining that degree of mobility. We know, for example, that if the need arose and we were assigned the requisite transport aircraft, we could fly an entire airborne division, together with its essential automotive equipment and organic artillery, from the United States to any part of Europe or Asia. We could get it there in time to dominate a dangerous situation before it got out of hand. We look forward to the time when it will be practicable to move armored units with equal facility.

A high-priority undertaking to which it is imperative that the whole Army address its best efforts is the building of an adequate Reserve. The armored center has played an impressive part in the Reserve program. Due in large measure to the accomplishments of the officers and men here at the home of armor who participated in the training of the first experimental UMT unit in 1947, a ground swell of sentiment in favor of more widespread military training along the lines contemplated by the Congress when it originally passed the Universal Military Training and Service Act began to develop. Now we have the Reserve Forces Act of 1955, with its 6 months' training feature, which for the first time provides a definite and equitable means of building a strong, vitalized Reserve. Again the armored center is doing a splendid job in training many of the young Americans who have enlisted in the Reserve under this program.

Military Reserve Week, which is being observed throughout the country this week, is helping to focus the attention of the Nation upon the intensive efforts being made to build up our vital trained and ready Reserve forces, both the Army Reserve and our splendid National Guard, the backbone of our Reserve strength, which now numbers over 400,000 well-trained and well-equipped troops of high morale, and is growing rapidly. Already more than 28,000 young men have enlisted in the Army Reserve, and they are coming in at the present time at a rate of over 1,100 a week. It is proving to be something that appeals to young Americans, and those I have observed in training in various camps are making splendid soldiers, fully worthy of the honored uniform they wear. The program is rolling, and it is up to all of us to put forth every effort to keep it rolling and gathering momentum. The success of this program must be a prime concern of every member of the Army.

It is going to take teamwork of the finest kind to accomplish all the tough and tedious tasks that lie ahead of us today. I recall the story of a small attack group of the 25th Division which was working its way up a hill in Korea toward a platoon objective. A private who was leading the group used up his grenades on an enemy foxhole halfway up the ridge and yelled for others in the group to pitch him some more. Working together with the precision of an infield tossing the ball around, they kept him supplied through the air. The group advanced in short bounds with perfect coordination. The leader would catch a grenade, pull the pin, and throw it. The group dropped flat until it exploded and then tossed him another grenade, and the action was repeated. Eventually the group successfully fought its way to the top of the hill. The whole maneuver was perfectly executed because these were good soldiers who quickly grasped a situation and knew how to work together as a team to achieve their objective.

This epitomizes the team spirit which must permeate the Army at all levels of command. Teamwork does not mean merely cooperation. It involves a far closer welding of purpose and effort, a true yielding of the individual point of view to the success of the team as a whole.

During this critical era, the ability of the Army to do its job is of especially grave consequence to America. Every person connected with it owes no less than undivided allegiance to the team. Each of us must have a spirit of unqualified dedication, and singleness of devotion to this great Army that will stamp us as worthy in the tremendous days that lie ahead. Every job and every branch is of great importance. I served as an infantryman, and I am proud of the Infantry, but I am sure it would not accomplish very much without the rest of the team solidly behind it.

There is no room anywhere within the structure of our Army for any narrow self-interest which subtracts from the effectiveness of the Army as a team. I am by no means selling honest competition short. Competition is highly commendable when it impels a man or an organization to do the best possible job—to outstrip all others in excellence of performance.

The professional associations of the several arms and services—such as your Armor Association—have, through the years, zealously promoted this branch competence and contributed substantially to the effectiveness of the Army as a whole. There is a real and continuing need for them. There is also a challenging need—well expressed in an editorial in your magazine, Armor, which recently came to my attention—for a dynamic association, composed of members of all branches, which can and will speak with one powerful voice for the entire Army, and help to tell the Army's story to the Nation. All of us, both individually and collectively, have a solemn and inescapable obligation to the American people whom we serve to be as articulate as we possible can, to make crystal clear the cold facts about military security as we know them so well, to spell out the vital part the Army team is playing in the attainment of our national objectives. With a view to filling the need you have recognized for an all-inclusive organization, the Association of the United States Army was formed some months ago to provide a common meeting ground for the combat arms and technical and administrative services. It seems to me that if the Armor Association were to join with it—without, of course, losing its separate identify as a professional association—attainment of that one voice we all so earnestly desire would be brought one long step nearer.

The Army has a tremendously important job, a job it is fully capable of doing, but we must continue with unflagging zeal to seek improvement all along the line. This is the forward-looking and forward-thinking Army of tomorrow, and we must keep it so. We respect the past. We derive inspiration from countless examples of the courage and devotion which have made the Army great, but our watchword must always be: "Forward."

We must be ever ready and willing to cut a new pathway through any jungle growth of custom, of precedent, or of tradition that blocks the march of true progress. The Army team has a splendid example of forward-thinking of the person of armor's own George Patton. The foresight, strength, and determination which were so characteristic of the soldier whose creed was "In yourself demand the impossible" are doubly essential today. We must ever press on toward higher and seemingly impossible goals. We can never reach so lofty a plateau of accomplishment that there will not be looming above it another challenging mountain.

There is an old proverb that says: "An army is maintained for a thousand days so that it may be used on one particular morning." Each of us has a vital, personal responsibility to make certain that if the particular morning should dawn when the United States Army must fight again in defense of this Nation, it will be ready.

1956 Farm Bill

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10875) to enact the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think I can explain these amendments very briefly.

The first one strikes out the following language on page 26, line 19: "for immediate reference to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives." That is the language that comes out.

I understand that that will be done in ordinary routine fashion, therefore the language is not needed at all and should be deleted from this bill.

The same situation applies with reference to the language on page 38 which has the same purpose and provides substantially the same thing. The language that we are striking out is just this:

Any bill or joint resolution embodying the recommendations presented to the Congress under subsection (b) shall, upon introduction in the Senate or House of Representatives, be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate or the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, as the case may be. Such committee shall proceed as expeditiously as

possible to consider such bill or joint resolution.

(2) This subsection is enacted by the Congress (A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, and (B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as they relate to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

Now that, too, is exactly what will happen even if this language is deleted. The Committee on Agriculture certainly would proceed expeditiously and I am certain that the Speaker of this House would properly and promptly and appropriately exercise the powers of his office in making these references. It seems to me the language is objectionable and should be taken out.

Poland's Constitution Day

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, it was a warm and pleasant day in Warsaw on that May 3 of 1781, when the Sejm—Parliament—was called to meet. Quite a few of the deputies were still vacationing on their private estates, scattered all over the country. Some citizens and the gentry who had gathered around the tables in Fukier's wine cellar, knew that something was brewing at the Sejm—what exactly, they did not know.

An old politician from out of town remarked, "The King is going to talk on some very important matter." He elaborated further, "that they will give equal rights to the peasants, commoners, and Jews."

Someone yelled from the back, "That will be the day." And deep in the corner lying under the table a nobleman reached for his sword declaring: "That will never happen, never, as long as I live."

It was close to 11 a. m. on that memorable morning. The tension of the crowd assembled in the Sejm seemed to mount. In the galleries, spectators were chattering, men and their ladies dressed in their finest outfits were looking at one another, trying to read each others thoughts as to the big question: "Are you for, or against the new idea?"

What this great new and progressive idea was we will not repeat here. Year in and year out, we have hailed this great Polish Charter. It was equal to any other democratic legislature in existence in those days. We have mentioned its democratic character throughout, and I doubt that there is any need for repetition.

With the sound of the bell striking 11 o'clock at St. John's Church, King Stanislaw August Poniatowski, followed by a train of some 200 noblemen, officers of the guard, and royalty, entered the Sejm. Dressed in his favorite uniform of the cadet corps, he slowly proceeded toward the throne. Those opposed to the proposed program had threatened to take drastic measures in case a new order should be adopted. The chamberlain of the court and many a nobleman kept their hands ready on the hilt of their swords in case of disorder. The throne was protected by guards of the court and Ulan lancers. At the center door also, at the end of the assembly hall, stood the Sejm's marshal, and right behind him Prince Gen. Joseph Poniatowski and General Golgowski, guarding the exit against anyone who might try to get away after having caused the slightest disturbance. As the King ascended to the throne, the people in the galleries rose to their feet to get a glimpse of him. Some person yelled, "Long live the King," and the crowd in a spontaneous outburst began to hail their monarch. The opposition remained silent. Their facial expressions were hostile, as if judging a foe on the battelefield.

Malachowski, the president of the assembly, announced its opening by pounding his large cane three times against the floor, and the historical session began. To emphasize the gravity of the political situation, telegrams from Polish envoys abroad were first read. An outburst of the opposition was heard and some of them tried to leave the place but were forced back to their seats. When finally, after almost 7 hours of debating, someone rose to read the newly adopted constitution, a violent exchange of words began. At last they were interrupted by the King, who rose to his feet.

"The King behind his nation and the nation behind its King," could be heard from the galleries. Soon this phrase was picked up by the entire crowd, with the exception of a few hostile deputies. King Stanislaw August rose to his feet and solemnly swore to adhere to the constitution:

Juravi Domino, no me poenitebit—I swore to God and will not regret it—and now I call upon whose who dearly love their fatherland to follow me into the church and there take an oath with me praying that God will let us succeed and see to it that we will achieve our great task.

While a great crowd with its king assembled in the church of St. John, some deputies of the opposition remained in the Sejm, arguing over their defeat, and the merits and disadvantages of the new charter. But there were not more than about 50 altogether against the 350 deputies assembled there before, they calmly dispersed and went to their homes.

Mr. Speaker, today, 165 years after this great event, we once again bow our heads toward Poland, and its gallant nation. Although, in the last year alone some great political changes have taken place behind the Iron Curtain and the new anti-Stalin drive is in full swing, let us not be fooled by this treacherous new line. Many top-ranking Communists perished under Stalin's purges and others are now being rehabilitated and vindicated. Not one shadow of doubt remains in my mind, that this is a new trick and diversion directed at the western powers. It is a new policy of smokescreen, largely written up in our press. But who are the people leading this new policy? Are they newcomers? All of them were the closest collaborators of that tyrant, Stalin. Without them, one man could never have succeeded in wiping out entire populations, jailing others, humiliating and disgracing them. Bulganin, Khrushchev, Malenkov, Zukov, Rokossowski, and so forth, are not new names to us. They have come up ever since Stalin's became known here. And how about their protectors? General Serov, of the infamous MVD, the mass murderer of the Baltic Nations? I hope that this time we shall not repeat mistakes of the past, and will not be fooled by the "angels of Russia's new regime." The only way we will be able to save other thousands of human beings behind the Iron Curtain from further unwarranted cruelty and punishment, is to follow the spirit of the May 3 constitution, to preserve the liberty, and integrity of the Polish people.

The Imperative Need for a Flash-Flood Warning System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have had so many requests from Congressmen and others for copies of the letter I recently sent to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations in regard to the Department of Commerce Weather Bureau appropriations that I would like to insert in the RECORD at this time a copy of the letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 1, 1956.

The Honorable PRINCE H. PRESTON,
Chairman, Department of Commerce, Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESTON: I have just finished reading the recently issued hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, in regard to the appropriations for the Department of Commerce Weather Bureau for the year 1957.

In the accompanying subcommittee report and bill reported to the House of Representatives, I note with dismay that absolutely nothing is provided to meet one of the major weather problems now confronting our Nation, namely, the menace of flash floods.

It seems incredible—after the most costly flood disasters in the history of North America—that it nevertheless is intended that no provision whatsoever should be made by Congress to provide our citizens with any better protection against the deadly flash floods.

I do not believe that the elected Representatives of these States which have been stricken by the disastrous floods of the past few years will remain quiet and do nothing this year after they have been informed how most of the loss of life and how much of the loss in property can be eliminated by an up-to-date flash-flood protective system.

The total savings possible, on a nationwide basis, could be enormous. For example, in my own State of Connecticut last year, in a single flash flood, dozens of lives and millions of dollars worth of property could have been saved with a fully developed, modern high-water-warning service. Within a short period of months similar large losses could have been avoided in Pennsylvania, New York, California, and other States.

The size of the flood-loss problem is highlighted by the fact that the annual property loss from floods in major river basins of the United States averages more than $300 million a year. Engineers and flood experts have estimated that the amount of property loss which has been avoided through adequate flood-warning services averages about 10 percent of the total flood loss, which means about $30 million of prevented loss a year. Despite the huge flood losses mentioned above, and the large savings possible through adequate warning, there is not a single valley in America that is protected by a modern flood-warning system. Even in the Naugatuck Valley of Connecticut, which was flooded in a few hours by the heavy rains of Hurricane Diane, a pilot flash-flood-warning project is just now getting started and already suffers from lack of funds. And let us not forget that there are more than 2,500 valleys in the United States subject to flash floods.

My travels through flooded areas of New England have prompted me to ask Congress again to do something to protect our people from the disastrous flood menace that confronts almost every State of our country.

Recently I have talked with engineers, meteorologists, hydrologists, and river experts on the flood problem and they have assured me that for only $3 million (that is less than 1 percent of the real annual flood loss) it has now become possible to establish a modern flash-flood-warning service that will provide the protection needed along every river in the United States.

If it is acceptable to you and the other members of the Appropriations Committee, I would be pleased to offer a floor amendment to the Department of Commerce Weather Bureau appropirations for the fiscal year 1957 that would increase the expense item by an amount of $3 million for the establishment of an improved flood-warning service throughout our entire country; or perhaps you may deem it advisable to offer a committee amendment to accomplish this purpose.

If this added amount of $3 million was made available by the Congress, it would enable the Weather Bureau to take the following recommended action:

(1) Establish five additional district river forecasting centers.

This increase of 5 district river forecasting centers would make a total of 14 such centers, and would thereby provide adequate flood forecast coverage for the entire country.

The river valleys to be provided this new and additional flood-warning service, and the locations of the respective district river forecasting centers, are as follows:

1. Lower Mississippi Valley: Vicksburg, Miss.

2. West Gulf and Rio Grande Valley: Austin, Tex.

3. California: Sacramento.

4. Colorado and Great Basin: Salt Lake City.

5. Great Lakes: Lansing, Mich.

(2) Establish 5,000 cooperative river and rainfall observation stations in flash flood valleys, with necessary observation equipment and reporting facilities.

(3) Establish an adequate research and development program in regard to the forecasting of flood-producing rains and water supply, in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies and universities.

(4) Install 20 additional modified surplus radar stations in flash flood areas which are now more than 150 miles from established or planned radar storm detection locations.

(5) Strengthen professional river stage and flood study staffs at existing river forecast centers by two or more persons.

The river forecasting stations include Hartford, Conn.; Harrisburg, Pa.; Augusta, Ga.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Knoxville, Tenn.; St. Louis, Mo.; Kansas City, Mo.; Portland, Oreg.; and Tulsa, Okla.

Your support of this proposed measure will be greatly appreciated by the millions of Americans who live in the flood-hazard valleys of America and who should no longer be denied the flood-warning services that modern technology can not provide. I earnestly solicit your sympathetic consideration of this matter.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES T. PATTERSON,
Member of Congress.

Practice Versus Preachment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, there appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 1, 1956, a very interesting column written by the distinguished American journalist, Mr. Marquis Childs, entitled "Practice Versus Preachment." I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Childs be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRACTICE VERSUS PREACHMENT

(By Marquis Childs)

"The quick admission of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood will show the world that America practices what it preaches."—Dwight D. Eisenhower in a speech in Denver on September 16, 1950.

One of the conspicuous—and tragic—failures of the decade since the war's end is the failure to admit the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska as States of the Union. It amounts to a confession that the American system is incapable of further expansion.

There still might be a chance for the bill for statehood for the two Territories, pending from the last session of Congress, if the President wanted to get his administration behind it. In the campaign of 4 years ago and several times since he has preached the admission of Hawaii and Alaska. But practice has fallen far short of preachment.

In the elections recently held in Alaska, the voters, by a majority of 2 to 1, adopted a constitution anticipating approval of statehood.

By nearly as large a majority, they approved what is known as the Tennessee plan. Under this plan, which was used by Tennessee to force the issue of admission to the Union in 1796, Alaska will go through the motions of electing 2 Senators and 1 Representative as though it were a State.

When the 85th Congress convenes next January the two Alaskan Senators and the Alaskan Representative will be waiting on the doorstep demanding admission. They will not be seated, but their voices raised in a demand for statehood may at last be heard.

Michigan, Oregon, and California all used the Tennessee plan as a lever to overpower the forces that more than a century ago resisted the westward expansion of the Republic.

Something of the same division that tore the country apart over slavery works against the admission of both Hawaii and Alaska.

Hawaii is an outstanding example of the capacity of the races of West and East to live together in harmony. The courage and the stamina of the Nisei in World War II were legendary. These men of mixed inheritance proved in the heat of battle their loyalty to a country that had not yet granted them full citizenship.

Yet the suspicion of race lurks behind the conventional arguments against statehood, particularly among southern Democrats. The same suspicion works against the Eskimo in Alaska.

Among some members of the world's most exclusive club, namely, the Senate of the United States, there is implacable opposition to letting down the bars to foreigners.

Racial prejudice coincide with certain powerful economic interests to insure a roadblock big enough, regardless of the actual voting strength in Senate and House on statehood, to hold it back southern Democrats and conservative Republicans in this instance, as in so many others, form a working coalition exercising a veto power. Although it is not at all fashionable to speak about it, this is the focus of the stalemate that prevails in so many areas.

Although they have no proof for it, many Alaskans firmly believe that President Eisenhower has been influenced against statehood for Alaska by his good friend and close associate, Gen. Lucius Clay.

Clay is chairman of the board of the Continental Can Co., which has close ties to the Alaska canned salmon industry. If one can believe the story of resentful Alaskans, Clay persuaded the President that Alaska was not yet ready for statehood.

The fear of the salmon fishing industry is that if Alaska should become a State, the industry would be subject to restrictive regulations that would really be enforced.

In a fiery speech at Alaska's constitutional convention last November, Ernest Gruening, governor of Alaska from 1939 to 1953, charged that Alaska was America's colony and subject to the same kind of colonial exploitation this country denounces when practiced by European powers.

As a result of discriminatory legislation, according to Gruening, Alaskans pay higher freight charges, higher wharfage and longshoring charges, and higher maritime charges than anywhere else.

This increases the cost of living above the national average which, in turn, restricts the population and helps to keep Alaska in the status of a colony.

"If there is a clearer and louder example of colonialism anywhere," Gruening said of the Federal law covering Alaska shipping, "let it be produced. Here is a clear case where the Government of the United States—through its legislative branch which enacted the legislation, the executive branch through the President, who signed it, and the judicial branch which, through its courts, upheld it—imposed a heavy financial burden on Alaskans exclusively for the advantage of private business interests in the mother country."

In the case for statehood, a distinction has long been made between Alaska and Hawaii. The latter, it has been argued, is far more ready for statehood with a rapidly growing population, industry and agriculture in striking contrast to Alaska with its unpopulated areas of forest and mountain.

A bill granting statehood to the two territories has been bottled up in a subcommittee for many months. The chances for action at this session are virtually nil. But the hope that springs eternal is that in the new Congress next year, practice will finally catch up with preachment.

The Farm Bill

SPEECH
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10875) to enact the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I think every member of the Committee on Agriculture has done his very best to bring to the floor of the House a bill which they think is appropriate and acceptable not only to the House but to the other body and to the President. There are some of us who feel that the veto was unfortunate, and I am one of them. There are some who do not feel that way about it. Now that the committee has eliminated those features which were controversial, I hope that by this time tomorrow we can conclude our work by bringing to the farmers something which will be good and something which we hope the administration and the members of the other body will accept.

Without criticizing anyone, Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who is not too impressed with the idea of the soil bank.

I am going to vote for it. I voted for it before and I shall vote for it again tomorrow; but I am concerned with what is going to happen to the land which is taken out of the production of crops and put into the bank. And certainly the amount of money which will be paid to farmers in lieu of crops on allotted acreage put into the bank will not be sufficient to cover the cost of putting the banked acreage into soil-building or soil-preserving crops and at the same time leave farmers enough to live. The money being insufficient I am concerned about that land going to waste, growing up in weeds, and being subjected to the winds, the storms, and the elements, every day and every week.

Then, too, the soil bank idea has the effect of paying farmers for doing nothing. Good farmers do not want pay for doing nothing. They prefer activity and actual farming. They do not like the idea of seeing their land lie out, idle, and playing no part in agricultural productivity.

I am also concerned with the effect which it is going to have on the merchants in the little farm communities of our Nation. Almost all of the smaller communities of our country are surrounded and sustained by active farming operations. In these communities down my way you will find a little country bank, cotton warehouses, a few gins, and so forth. Up in the Corn and Wheat Belts you will find similar operations. They are very heavily dependent upon crops produced from nearby farms. On these crops they lend money; they handle, process, store, and transport them. When the lands go into the bank there will be just that much less wheat to be milled, there will be that much less cotton to be ginned, there will be less business at the bank, there will be less business at the country store. Not only will these people feel the effect of reduced production but all people of the community will feel the effect of it.

Maybe it will not work out that way, I hope not. On the other hand there are many who have some concern about this so-called soil bank and its general effect on the community life. They have expressed the identical fear of its effect.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I think the gentleman made a statement a minute ago he might want to qualify. He said he expected to vote for the soil bank tomorrow. I think he meant to leave the impression that he expected to vote for this bill.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Of course, the entire bill which embodies other provisions.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I do not think the gentleman would vote for the soil bank just as that.

Mr. ABERNETHY. No; I am for the entire bill. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], asked a question a moment ago. I think the answer ought to be developed further. In doing so we must assume that the soil bank is a fine thing; and it may be, I am not sure about it.

He asked the question if there was to be a dollar ceiling on the amount any farmer would receive from the bank. I imagine that which prompted the question was to be assured that any farmer who might own a very large farm would not be getting too many dollars from it. The gentleman's premise may be sound, but I doubt it. The No. 1 objective of the soil bank is to reduce the surplus. The theory is that acreage put into the bank will be taken out of crops and production reduced below demand. Then the crops that are now in storage will gradually be siphoned off to meet the demand. The advocates contend that sometime in the future, a year or two or more, the surplus would soon be exhausted. So, if a ceiling is placed upon any amount of acreage that a farmer puts in the bank then to that extent the very purposes for which the bank is created is defeated. The more acreage a farmer puts in the bank the less the production; and the less the production the sooner the surplus will disappear.

Down my way we have hundreds of small farmers. They cannot very well afford to participate. But the small farmer will benefit indirectly by way of a reduction in the surplus brought about through the large farmers' participation. The object is to remove the surplus. A ceiling on participation would defeat the objective.

There is another thing in this bill that I am concerned about. The bill permits the first year of operation to be financed with funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Personally, Mr. Chairman, I think an appropriation should be made for such. Why siphon off the capital assets of the Commodity Credit Corporation?

The Commodity Credit Corporation was established for the purpose of providing money for price-support operations and for that alone. Through other inappropriate authorizations, we are now gradually depleting the capital assets of the Commodity Credit Corporation. They are showing up in the balance sheets of the Corporation as a loss to the price-support program when as a matter of fact they are not such a loss.

Something has been said about the $1.25 to be paid for corn, that is, the unlimited production at $1.25 per bushel. I do not live in the commercial Corn Belt but I am tremendously concerned about the possible effect. The Department of Agriculture has told us that the trouble with corn today is that we have too much, so they have proposed the soil bank to get rid of it. Yet on the other hand just a few days ago, and it was not a part of the President's original recommendation, the Department announced that it is going to support the unlimited production of corn at $1.25 a bushel. I believe you heard the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] say, and I think I am quoting him correctly, that he had some concern about this inasmuch as he was afraid that the Corn Belt would really turn to corn. The Secretary also has told our committee, and I think he is right—this is one time I agree with him—that the reason we have had cheap cattle and cheap hogs is that we have had too much corn, cheap corn. If the Corn Belt should turn to corn at $1.25 a bushel, and I think it will, that means a tremendous surplus of corn. That means the warehouses will eventually be filled with it and that means a depressed price. It further means that eventually the surplus will be disposed of at heavy loss to the Government, with added troubles for corn farmers as long as the surplus exists.

From what I know about corn, and I do not know much, I have been told and I have read that the price of hogs follows the price of corn. If corn is cheap hogs will be cheap. If corn is cheap cattle will be cheap. I am concerned about it. I thought we were trying to get rid of the surplus. Surely this is not the way to do it. A high support price on unlimited production will undoubtedly increase the surplus.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. It is pretty well known that cheap corn always makes cheap hogs.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is what I have been told.

Mr. POAGE. And that cheap hogs never improve the likelihood of high-priced feed.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is exactly what I have been told.

Mr. POAGE. Are we not certain to have cheap corn if we deliberately go out and put a premium on overproduction?

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is also what I have been told.

Mr. POAGE. Does the gentleman remember any other time when we have been talking about wanting to cut down that we have gone out and tried to reduce our production by deliberately en-

couraging production by paying a pretty substantial support on unlimited production?

Mr. ABERNETHY. When you put a substantial support price on unlimited production it always makes for trouble. As I said a moment ago, I represent thousands of small farmers. The average cotton allotment in my district is only about 8 acres to the family. But you give them a comparable support price for cotton, with unlimited production, that which has now been given corn, and they will fill the warehouses of this country with cotton. It would wreck cotton farmers. It could, and may, wreck the Corn Belt.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield.

Mr. YATES. Will the gentleman tell us whether or not establishing this price of corn at $1.25 a bushel will be an incentive or a detriment to farmers to put their land in the soil bank?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I can only answer that on the basis of what some of them from the Corn Belt have said to me—that it would be an incentive to put their acreage in corn and not in the bank. In turn, the overall objective—reduction of surpluses—would be defeated.

Insurance Against Flood Damage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, in behalf of the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by him with reference to Senate bill 3732, a measure to provide insurance against flood damage, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF UNITED STATES SENATOR JOHN O. PASTORE, DEMOCRAT, RHODE ISLAND, WITH REFERENCE TO S. 3732, A BILL TO PROVIDE INSURANCE AGAINST FLOOD DAMAGE AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

On April 26, the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency reported S. 3732; a bill to provide insurance against flood damage and for other purposes.

As everyone knows, various sections of our country suffered tremendous damage and loss of life due to natural catastrophes within the past few years. In my own State of Rhode Island and in the New England area, floods and hurricanes wreaked damage almost beyond comprehension. Scenes were graphically portrayed in newspapers, magazines and on television showing the devastating havoc wrought by the floods. The hearts of the American people were moved to compassion at the misery which prevailed. And from all parts of the land and many parts of the world came messages of commiseration. These were heart-warming indeed. But little could be done by anyone to relieve the shocking plight of those whose loss of house and home, of factory, farm or shop, constituted a wholly uncompensated disaster against which there was and cannot be adequate insurance protection from private insurance companies. Many of these unfortunate people witnessed the loss of their entire life's work. Home upon home was swept away and, in many cases, nothing but an unpaid mortgage was left in its place.

The situation thus presented called for action—action on the part of all the people of the United States. To this end, therefore, the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency initiated a very thorough and exhaustive study of an insurance program which would attempt to alleviate the apprehension of those individuals who were unable to secure flood insurance.

The committee, under the acting chairman, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], visited various stricken areas of the country to view firsthand the grim results of these floods. Witnesses from all walks of life were heard. All proposed plans received study and attention.

The committee visited my own State of Rhode Island on November 10, 1955, and there as in so many other States and towns which were visited, they received the views of individuals qualified to speak on such an important, specialized problem as disaster insurance.

I personally joined in sponsoring S. 3137 and S. 2768. I understand that S. 3732, as reported by the Banking and Currency Committee, has taken features from both of these bills and from a bill introduced by the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. To me this is a concrete example of the bipartisanship nature of this legislation, which, in my judgment, merits the approval of the Senate.

Possibly there will be some who will disagree with some of the provisions of S. 3732, but there is a certain amount of trial and error which will be experienced in setting up an adequate flood-insurance program. This is to be expected.

This bill would create an agency called the Federal Flood Insurance Administration. This Administration would be under the Housing and Home Finance Agency and administered by a Commissioner appointed by the President and approved by the Senate. The detailed provisions of S. 3732 can be more comprehensively explained by the members of the committee who worked so diligently on S. 3732.

The need for such legislation is very apparent. For an individual to see his home and personal possessions which he earned by strenuous personal industry, washed away by a flood, is a scene which would tear at the heartstrings of any human. The tragedy at the present time lies in the fact that no individual can secure compensation for such loss. He may secure insurance against lightning, earthquakes, and other storms, but not against flood risks. Hence, this bill becomes more necessary as the days go by.

In connection with the need for this legislation, I include an editorial which appeared in the Providence Journal of Monday, October 31, 1955, entitled "Writing a Disaster Insurance Plan Fast":

"The Senate hearings on disaster insurance, opening today in Washington, come as a hopeful sign to flood-weary New Englanders who have been bearing the brunt of nature's costly extremes.

"As the hearings progress, it should become clear that the need for Federal participation in a disaster insurance plan is beyond question. There simply is no alternative—except impoverishment and suffering.

"Relatively few persons are vulnerable to flood damage, and because of this, commercial insurance companies have been unable to undertake their risks at reasonable rates. As a result, New Englanders will be able to recover only a tragically small percentage of the estimated $650 million losses suffered this year. One estimate, on the basis of earlier figures for the August floods, place insurance coverage at 10 percent or less of the total damages.

"Sadly, the uninsured losses are the important, everyday necessities—homes, furniture, shops, and factories. They must be swiftly restored without bankrupting their owners if our regional economy is to remain sound. This time, as in the past, the Red Cross and the various relief agencies gave invaluable aid to recovery. But still, all too many who suffered losses have found themselves unqualified for this aid. Many have to borrow to patch up their losses, but such loans are a continuing drag on the economy. Our residents and businessmen must be given solid assurances that they will have certain recourse when disaster strikes again.

"Federal participation in disaster insurance will, in fact, be a sort of premeditated relief. Because the population at large will be undertaking the risks of a few, such a program will be more in the nature of a subsidy than pure insurance, which is a voluntary spreading of risks. But there seems to be little room for disputing it on these grounds. One way or another, the entire Nation has always responded with relief to its stricken citizens, sharing in common the costs of misfortune—be it war, plague, or disaster.

"Nor does there seem to be adequate grounds for fearing that Federal disaster insurance will be another step in Government encroachment on private business, or that Government will ultimately be forced to underwrite less justifiable risks. Government in this case will be filling a glaring need that private business thus far has been unable to satisfy. This is not encroachment, nor could it ever be claimed as a precedent for encroachment.

"The Lehman commmittee should therefore act with decision in drawing up a sound disaster insurance plan to lay before the next Congress. And it should be enacted without delay, for more storms may strike before crucial flood-control devices can be built. New England will be impatient of political small talk, for the survival of many of her citizens is at stake."

The responsibility of the committee has just about been concluded. The members of it have worked endless hours, have traveled hundreds of miles and have had the benefit of one of the most efficient staffs of any committee on Capitol Hill. I wholeheartedly urge—yes—I even plead with the Senate to give favorable consideration to S. 3732 so that this measure may proceed on the legislative path to the other body.

There have been bills on this subject introduced in the House of Representatives. Possibly if the House receives a bill from the Senate, it might further expedite matters. Time is of the essence and as the expression goes, "Time and tide wait for no man."

The livelihood and welfare of literally millions of people rest upon this bill. While it is not a flood-preventive measure, at least it is a consolation for the people of this great country to know that the door will be open to them to make provision for insurance against the risk of flood. In the meantime, we can proceed with plans and preparations to control or avert the devastation of natural catastrophes.

The Red Cross knows what this problem is. The President of the United States knows what this problem is, as evidenced by the fact that he declared certain areas disaster areas during 1955 after these floods had left their marks of destruction.

This bill is not a handout by the Federal Government. The premium rate and the terms and conditions of any policies issued by private insurance companies on the basis of Government reinsurance are made subject

to the Commissioner's approval. Private companies alone cannot do the job. This is evident by a review of the testimony offered during the hearings on this legislation.

The Federal Government must lend a helping hand with the hope that the experience gained can eventually be of assistance to private insurance companies. The gap must be plugged until such time as private industry can cope with the problem.

When the Committee on Banking and Currency visited Providence, R. I., I submitted a statement setting forth my views. I said that the committee was faced with a tremendous task and I was certain that they wished to report legislation which would provide a ray of hope for those whose futures may be threatened by a repeat performance of the havoc which at that time had been wrought by Hurricane Diane and other natural catastrophes.

I congratulate the committee for the fine job it has done resulting in S. 3732.

I am very happy to note that this bill received the unanimous approval of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

This Congress has, through both the Senate Committee on Public Works and the Senate Appropriations Committee, considered the requests for preventive measures for flood control. Now, in order to properly weave the various threads of this problem into a complete cover, we must consider the insurance aspect of the flood problem. This has been done in S. 3732. If over a period of time it found that there are certain provisions of this bill which can be improved upon, this can be done in a future Congress.

We must get this program off the ground. We cannot do it by further study or prolonged debate and discussion. It is a matter of vital concern which requires our prompt and expeditious action on the floor of the Senate.

Personally, I can perceive no objections, nor have I heard of any objections by Members of Congress, to a flood-insurance program. As I previously pointed out, the President saw the need for such a program and so expressed himself. Former President Truman saw the need for such legislation in 1952. Here in this great body, the matter, in my opinion, has transcended party lines. It is a case of a national problem which must be dealt with on a national scale. It is not a problem to be left to the various States, because it affects the very economy of our entire Nation. If a plant in Woonsocket, R. I., is damaged by flood, thus causing production to stop, those people in the rest of the United States or in the world who depend upon that product must go without it or consume valuable time at great economic loss in securing a new source of supply.

The hearts of the American people have been touched on numerous occasions when a plea has been made by the Red Cross for funds to cope with the human suffering which resulted from these floods. Basically and simply, the problem is—we need flood insurance legislation. With this, no one quibbles. This is it.

Further, the problem must be solved on a national scale. This is where we in the Congress of the United States fit into the picture. S. 3732 enables us to carry out our obligation to all the people of the United States.

The instrument for relief is at our disposal. The Committee on Banking and Currency of the United States Senate has put this instrument before us. I urge with all the fervor at my command for favorable consideration of S. 3732. It will give a lift to those who need it. It will bring consolation to those who are moved with compassion for their fellow man. It will show that no problem is too big for the United States to overcome once it puts its machinery of democracy into operation.

Address by Hon. Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire, Before Annual Meeting of American Cotton Manufacturers Institute

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered before the annual meeting of the American Cotton Manufacturers' Institute, at Hollywood Beach, Fla., on Saturday, April 7, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTION

I am delighted to come to Hollywood Beach this morning and join in your annual meeting.

The American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, as the central organization of one of America's largest and most important industries, is doing an outstanding job for its members. I have known this for a long time, of course, but the size of the audience here today makes me all the more certain of it.

I have come here today from our Nation's Capital—one of the two great nerve centers of the world. The other, of course, is Moscow. Decisions are being made—and will be made in the next few months and years—in these two world capitals, which may well decide the destiny of the civilized world. In my judgment, it is imperative that the citizens of this country understand some of the basic issues which confront us. It is only by understanding them that we can meet the challenges—courageously and intelligently.

I happen to be the ranking Republican in the United States Senate and chairman of the Senate Republican policy committee. As such, I represent 1 of the 2 great political parties of our country. We now have a Republican administration after 20 years of control by the New Deal and Fair Deal leadership of the other party.

A little more than 3 years have passed since this change in government took place. They have been short years. They have gone quickly. But a great deal has taken place in that brief period of time. It is right that we stop and evaluate our progress.

In the first place, we must know what this administration in Washington is doing. Secondly, we must identify the major problems which confront us today, and determine how those problems shall be solved.

I think it is fair to say that this administration probably satisfies neither extreme in our country—neither the extreme left wing nor the extreme right. I am sure that the New Dealers are not pleased with it, and I imagine that the ultraconservatives are not happy either. In my judgment, the administration is following a constructive middle course—a course dedicated to the best interests of the great majority of Americans. My definition of it is: "A wise application of traditional American principles to today's problems."

THREE OF THE FUNDAMENTAL ISSUES

This administration has had to cope with a multitude of problems. If time and your patience permitted, I could discuss them for hours. However, we can reach some understanding of the complexities of Government, if we discuss three of the fundamental and basic issues that confront us today. The first and most important is that of fiscal stability. Our fiscal health determines in great part how successful we will be in our approach to the remaining two problems—foreign trade and national defense.

PROGRESS IN ECONOMIC STABILITY

For the last 10 years, the American people have fought a constant battle with fluctuating prices, fluctuating wages, and inflationary trends.

One of the most important developments which has occurred in the last 3 years has been the economic stability which accompanied the economic progress this administration brought to the Nation.

A striking example of the byproducts which come from sound fiscal policy is found in the termination of controls. The calamity howlers said that the removal of controls would ruin our economy. They insisted that without controls we would experience a further inflationary spiral.

The New Deal planners maintained that controls were essential and that the free-enterprise system was out of date. They told us that if the President dared to remove controls on prices, wages, and rents, the American wage earner would be the loser by $3 billion a year in increased cost of living. Fortunately, President Eisenhower and the leaders in Congress were courageous enough to do what they knew was right.

WHOLESALE PRICES AND COST-OF-LIVING INDEXES

The results of their courage are apparent. In January 1953, the wholesale price index was 109.9. In January 1956, this same yardstick was 111.9. The wholesale price level of commodities has risen only 2 points in the last 3 years, whereas, in the last 3 years of the Truman administration, the wholesale price index jumped 12½ points.

The cost-of-living index in January 1953 was 113.9. In January 1956, 3 years later, it was 114.6—an increase of only seven-tenths of 1 percent.

I can offer no better proof that this administration's doctrine of economic commonsense has been effective. In my judgment, these figures bear plain witness to the fact that free enterprise is the true American system.

STRENGTHENING THE DOLLAR

Another clear indication of improvement in our economic health has been the ability to stop inflation of our currency and the cheapening of our dollar.

In 1939, the purchasing power of the dollar was 100 cents. By January 1953, the deficit financing and inflationary programs of that period had decreased its value to 52 cents.

This depreciation of our currency has had devastating effects on wage earners, investors, and on the aged who depend on fixed retirement income for their security. It is a brutal but accurate fact that an annual income of $5,000 in 1940 would provide little more than $2,500 worth of commodities in 1952. I hardly need to dwell on this. You know as well as I do what cheap money can do to the Nation's economy.

It is tremendously significant that, since January of 1953, the purchasing power of the dollar has varied within a range of only one-half of 1 cent. That is a record of fiscal responsibility. It is this same sense of responsibility which makes us continue to strive to balance our national budget and spend within our means.

REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS AND SPENDING

When this administration came into power on January 20, 1953, and President Eisenhower assumed the responsibility of leadership, we were faced with an almost impossible fiscal situation. We had, carried over from the previous administration, contract authorizations amounting to over $83 billion.

These were actually I O U's incurred by our predecessors and left for us to pick up and pay.

Imagine taking over a business and finding $83 billion in bills facing you—and finding $83 billion to be $20 billion more than the entire income of the business. In addition, Mr. Truman had made excessive recommendations for appropriations and spending to the new Congress. The 1st session of the 83d Congress cut appropriations by $14,100,000,000 under the Truman estimates. In the 2d session of the 83d Congress, we again made substantial cuts and the final appropriations by that Congress were $27,800,000,000 under the appropriations of the 82d Congress.

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, a balanced budget is in prospect.

Latest Treasury estimates indicate a $200 million surplus, although this figure may change in the spring after the Treasury receives heavy corporate and individual Federal income-tax payments.

Furthermore, President Eisenhower has submitted a balanced budget for fiscal year 1957, with an estimated surplus of some $400 million.

The struggle to balance the budget has been a tough one. It will require continued vigilance to keep the Government from going into the red again.

Later in my talk, I will make reference to the Bridges-Byrd amendment, which I believe would contribute materially to this goal.

TAX CUTS

The Republican Party has taken the lead historically, in reducing income taxes. In fact, it has voted 7 out of 10 income tax cuts that have been made since 1913. We will cut taxes again whenever it is reasonable and proper that we do so. But first things must come first. We would be irresponsible and negligent in our duties—if we went before the American people and advocated a tax cut at this time. It is our conviction that fiscal stability is essential to the welfare of the country, but we will never have that stability so long as we spend more than we take in.

The national debt of this country is almost beyond human understanding. It presently rests at $277,700,000,000. Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey has stated that this debt is so tremendous that we owe more money than all the people in the world have ever owed.

SIGNS OF A HEALTHY ECONOMY

The constant efforts of this administration to achieve economic stability are good signs in government. In my judgment, these measures are applauded by all thinking Americans.

There are other signposts, however, of improvements in our economic condition, which I invite you to consider.

More than 64 million Americans are now employed, out of a record civilian work force of 66½ million.

More than half of the 47 million American householders own their own homes.

Americans have put aside $85 billion of savings in life insurance and own more than $50 billion worth of United States savings bonds.

Government and private retirement funds for American workers now total almost $60 billion.

Total output of goods and services hit a new high in 1955—more than $387 billion, and the rate in 1956 may run over $400 billion a year.

Personal income in 1955 broke all records: $303 billion, an increase of $15.5 billion over 1954.

Disposable personal income—which is total personal income less personal taxes—reached an all-time peak of $269.2 billion in 1955—rising $14.4 billion over 1954.

What's more, the Nation's expanding income was widely shared. Income received by labor in the form of wages, salaries, social-security benefits, and related payments, rose to 75.4 percent of total personal income plus personal contributions for social insurance. The share of proprietors fell about one-half percent; the share of investors remained unchanged.

Meanwhile, the consumer price index fluctuated within a range of less than one percentage point during 1955.

In other words, while personal income was rising, the cost of living was steady, meaning a net increase to our people.

Unincorporated firms showed gains, as seen by the rise in business and professional income from $25.9 billion in 1954 to $27.3 billion in 1955—an all-time high.

Corporate profits in 1955 rose above 1954 by $9 billion before taxes and by $4.5 billion after taxes.

New production records were set in industry and related activities, and construction expenditures reached a new high of $42.2 billion.

This country has never known such prosperity—either in peace or in war.

Farm prices and incomes alone are depressed amid the Nation's greatest prosperity.

Average prices received by farmers for all products remained fairly stable in the first half of 1955. Near-record harvests, however, sent the index of prices received by farmers downward from June through December.

Another measure of the farm situation—the parity index which includes the index of prices paid by farmers, interest rates, taxes, and wage rates—held steady and was at the same level at the end of 1955 as in 1954.

Although farm prices and incomes generally declines during the year 1955 and both farm mortgage and non-mortgage debt rose, total farm asset values and owners' equities in these assets increased, chiefly because the value of farm real estate continued to rise. Average values of farm real estate on November 1, 1955, were 6 percent higher than a year earlier and above the previous peak reached in 1952.

I believe the farmer is entitled to his fair share of the general prosperity. This administration has proposed a far-reaching program attacking the principal causes of the present farm dilemma.

These causes are: 1, production and market distortions as a result of wartime production incentives too long continued by the previous administration; 2, current record livestock production and near-record crop harvests piled on top of previously accumulated carryovers; and 3, rising costs and high capital requirements.

Congress is currently trying to write a farm bill that will help the farmer share in prosperity, and, in so doing, to help assure continued prosperity for the Nation as a whole.

There is a further important policy of this administration that is a factor in fostering a healthy economy; the Federal Government is getting out of business activities in which it never should have engaged in the first place. Barge lines, rubber plants, ice cream factories, clothing factories, paper mills, formerly operated by the Government in competition with private enterprise, are being liquidated and disposed of at a fair market price.

All of these things are signs of a healthy economy. Furthermore, they have been accomplished without endangering our national defense.

I want to say just a word about reductions in Federal personnel. A little over 3 years ago, we inherited a great sprawling bureaucracy. We found tremendous amounts of duplication. We found functions which were unnecessary or obsolete. Since that time nearly 300,000 Federal employees have been eliminated from the public payroll.

When one reviews the progress which has been made in a brief period of time in restoring fiscal stability to our country and removing the uncertainty of inflation and recession, the program has indeed been effective.

FOREIGN TRADE

I come now to the second of the three important issues—foreign trade.

First of all, I know that we are gathered here as people who have common feelings on the need for protecting American industry from low-cost imports. When the textile industry of this country has over two million people working for it, our import problems demand not only your attention as industry representatives but the attention of Americans in all walks of life.

As Spencer Love of the Burlington Industries, one of your spokesmen, recently said, "The strength of the American textile industry is a part of the strength of America. It is a part of this Nation's essential system of defense." No clearer statement of necessity can be made when we consider the effect of foreign economic policy on industry and employment in this country.

Now, the last session of Congress saw our Trade Agreements Act extended for another 3 years. As you all know, it was the subject of bitter debate in both the House and Senate, even to the point where President Eisenhower felt it necessary to publicly state that "No American industry will be placed in jeopardy by the administration of this act."

When it was referred to the Senate, there were many of us who felt that our domestic industries needed a greater measure of protection than was spelled out in the bill, that certain changes would be necessary to preserve the reciprocal and selective principles of the Trade Agreements Program. There were a great many amendments offered and considered. Perhaps the most constructive of these were the nine amendments that I introduced with Senator Pastore of Rhode Island.

Of these 9, 8 were accepted by the Senate Finance Committee and passed on the floor of the Senate. I will not list them in detail for you this morning. However, I do want to point out that their adoption certainly made the bill more responsive to a sound and realistic continuation of the Trade Agreements Program.

The present session of Congress has before it other legislation which is important to all of you, and the textile industry generally. I should like to mention just three of these bills. I am sure that most of you are familiar with them.

The first of these is known as the Customs Simplification Act. It passed the House of Representatives late in the last session. You should watch it closely for, as it is written, there exists the threat of tariff reduction through indirection. It could result in our present congressional safeguards being circumvented.

I shall not dwell on it at length, but I will make the prediction that if Senate floor action takes place on it before adjournment and there is a possibility that it will not—the bill will be modified from its present form in several respects.

Now, the second of these bills is one which the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute and I view with deep concern. It calls for United States participation in the Organization for Trade Cooperation.

OTC, as it is known, would administer the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade. Now, it must be remembered that GATT is

an international trade agreement entered into by some 35 countries, including our own. It has never been approved by the Congress despite many efforts. Few people—and not too many Members of Congress—fully realize the implication of this bill.

Twenty-two years ago, Congress virtually surrendered control of trade policy to the State Department. The results have not been happy. Now, by approving OTC, we are asked to take the final step and transfer that power to an organization subject to the control of foreign governments.

As Roger Milliken, president of Deering-Milliken & Co. and a leader in your organization, recently testified before the House Ways and Means Committee, "We regard OTC and GATT, viewed separately or in combination, as instruments designed to suppress our national freedom in international trade and our freedom as a Nation to govern the internal economy of the United States in accordance with the Constitution and the laws of Congress." He could not have described this situation more accurately.

Let me give you just one illustration of what I mean. The United States, as a participating member of GATT, would have only 1 vote out of 35 in any dispute arising over, for example, the revision of tariff levels—and not even that if we happened to be a party to the dispute. Other countries who would participate in such decisions with a vote equal in every respect to our own would be, to name a few, the Duchy of Luxembourg, Rhodesia, India, and, believe it or not, Communist Czechoslovakia.

The President has called for the passage of this bill, and as much as I should like to, I cannot share his views. I cannot avoid the feeling that he has not been fully advised as to its breadth and implications. I have no choice but to oppose it in the Senate of the United States.

Now the third and last bill I shall mention is the one that Senator JAMES EASTLAND introduced. It has the bipartisan support of 62 other Senators, of which I am one. It seeks to do two things:

1. Have our Government maintain a fair share of the world market for United States cotton, and

2. Limit the importation of cotton into this country by the establishment of quotas.

The second of these two proposals is a relatively new approach to the problem of low-cost foreign competition. As a measure of its importance, I think you all know that the Japanese textile industry has already suggested establishing its own voluntary quotas. You can be sure that this proposal has them worried.

I am not going to hazard a guess, this morning, as to what its chances may be, for House action must take place first through a companion bill. However, there is increasing sentiment for Congress to look long and seriously at its potential.

Before closing this subject, I want to leave with all of you this one word of warning. It is this: Those of you who favor the establishment of quotas should not be misled into making any concession on OTC and GATT legislation for your own near-term purposes. It would be a serious, and possibly later, a fatal mistake.

In any session of Congress, and particularly in this one, we in the House and Senate count on you people to keep us advised. We seek your counsel and guidance. It is virtually impossible to predict accurately the trend of events this year. This is a presidential election year, and much of the time, thought, and effort of Congress will revolve around that fact.

We will not have time to do all we should. We need advice, facts, and recommendations on a broad policy basis. You can help us in many ways. Your knowledge of these situations can be invaluable to us. The more that you can do as a group, the greater help you will be to us in the Congress—and the more certain you can be of attaining the results that you seek.

NATIONAL DEFENSE POLICY

Regardless of the fact that our foreign relations have improved, I would be unrealistic if I did not tell you that we are living in a world of crisis.

We might as well face the fact that the American system cannot coexist with communism. The basic doctrine of communism is class struggle. Their eventual plan calls for revolution throughout the world.

We might as well recognize communism for what it is—a conspiracy. It is a conspiracy that has been growing for nearly a hundred years and there is no reason to assume that it will end tomorrow.

I believe we have made some terrible mistakes in dealing with this conspiracy. In 1945, we emerged from the bloodiest and most costly war the world has ever known. We emerged as the acknowledged leader of the free nations. We had the best-equipped and strongest Army, the greatest Air Force and the most powerful Navy on earth. In addition, we had sole control of the atomic bomb—the new weapon which could be used to control the world.

In 11 short years we squandered away most of these advantages. We appeased, we compromised, and we condoned and sheltered traitors in our midst.

We are now faced with the fact that Soviet Russia has the capability to manufacture atomic and hydrogen weapons, and there is every indication that they will use those weapons, if and when they consider it profitable to do so. It may not happen tomorrow—it may not happen for 10 years—it may never happen. However, the potential is such that we can never again afford to go to war without adequate preparation or the ability to wage war.

In view of these basic facts, it has been necessary to revise our planning for national defense. It now is apparent that we must plan for an indefinite date in the future.

There are those who advocate an all-out crash defense program—more planes, more guns, more ships, more men in service, and more expenditures. They would have us spend 100 billion dollars a year for several years. True, we could make this Nation invulnerable if we turned it into an armed camp, but we could lose the struggle against communism without a shot being fired if we burden our economy to the point of breakdown.

I think the Communists have made it entirely clear that they hope to participate our economic destruction, as an easy and cheap means of overthrowing our Government. It follows then that we must be realistic in planning for an adequate, yet economical, defense program. The course we are following now is both logical and intelligent. We have abandoned—I hope for once and for all—the old theory of national defense which was based on feast and famine.

As I have indicated, we never again will have a year or two in which to prepare our defenses. In the same breath, we cannot afford to spend ourselves bankrupt.

BASIC AIMS OF DEFENSE PROGRAM

This is a period of extended tension. We may reasonably expect that this tension will continue indefinitely. For this reason, we have devoted ourselves to a program which:

1. Provides us with armed forces capable of deterring an aggressor.

2. Providing a well-trained and professional defense force, immediately available to handle whatever situation develops and to repel any national attack.

3. Establishes an increasingly stronger continental defense program.

4. Establishes and develops a powerful military manpower reserve.

5. Provides a strong industrial economy working for peace, but ready for conversion to war.

6. Increases our superiority in weapons and techniques.

It has become increasingly apparent that our superiority must depend upon our technological ability. We cannot hope to compete, on a man-to-man basis, with countless numbers of Russians and Chinese. Our greatest hope is our continued superiority in the fields of nuclear weapons, guided missiles, and all the other modern devices of war.

I can summarize the national defense picture by saying that we are fundamentally strong, and are growing stronger every day. Yet, this has been accomplished at tremendous savings to the taxpayer by cutting waste and extravagance.

These three general areas—fiscal stability, foreign relations, national defense—are all interrelated. Each is tremendous in scope and complex in nature by itself. I have personal knowledge of the time, energy, and thought which must be devoted to these problems, and I can give you my personal assurance that their solution is a matter of the gravest concern to the administration and the Congress.

BRIDGES-BYRD AMENDMENT

In company with the distinguished Senator from Virginia, Senator BYRD, I have introduced a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Without going into the technicalities of my proposal, it may be simply explained as follows: This legislation, if adopted, will require the imposition of Federal taxes sufficient to provide for revenues which will be equal to appropriations. By this simple constitutional amendment, we will require that the President submit to the Congress a budget which shall not exceed the total of the estimates of the receipts of the Government during the coming fiscal year.

In the event that the Congress makes appropriations which exceed the estimates of the receipts of the Government, it shall be mandatory upon the Congress to enact measures to raise an amount of additional revenue at least equal to the excess of appropriations over receipts.

This proposal further provides that the Congress shall not recess or adjourn for a period of longer than 3 days, until such action has been taken.

This Nation is prosperous. Our people are well clothed, well fed, well housed. We are in a period of abundant employment. There is just no reason why we cannot pay our operating expenses. I should think that every American would wholeheartedly support this constructive suggestion which merely states that the Government is obliged from now on to collect at least as much as it spends.

SENATE BILL 1343

I have also introduced another bill to require that whenever a committee of Congress reports favorably on a measure authorizing the appropriation of money from the Treasury, that the Department or agency of Government concerned submit a printed report to include an estimate of the probable cost of carrying out the legislation.

The purpose of this bill is sound in principle and easily understood. Only too often Congress has enacted legislation without the faintest idea of how much money would be required to carry out the intent of the legislation.

There is not one of us who would sign a contract with an automobile salesman until we knew the price of the car. Why in the world should the Government pass laws without knowing how much it is going to cost to implement those laws?

SENATE BILL 1341

Another of my bills is one requiring that every year the Federal budget shall include a

special analysis of all long-term construction and development projects authorized by Congress. This analysis would show the total estimated cost, the actual or estimated amount expended during previous fiscal years, the amount needed during the current fiscal year and the amount needed in subsequent years.

With these figures available the Congress will have the kind of information which any individual needs when he undertakes to build a house. Any intelligent person would want an estimate of the total cost, how much had already been spent, and how much he would have to spend in the future. I can see no possible objection to giving the Congress of the United States this very same information.

I agree that these measures are not the kind which call for headlines in the sensational press. They are, in my opinion, much more important to our future security than so many items of sensational but temporary interest.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion let me say this: I cannot avoid the conviction that the stability and national security of this Nation is dependent upon a sound economy.

We must never forget that the Communist manifesto, known as the Bible of Communism, written in 1848 by Frederick Engels and Karl Marx, predicted that economic factors would determine the course of history. It states that capitalism is doomed to destruction because of its inability to maintain a stable and productive economy.

The comrades in the Kremlin hope and pray that we will waste our resources and spend our way into financial collapse. I am convinced that such a result need never take place.

As a representative of a thrifty New England State, with considerable experience on the national scene, I am convinced that the last 3 years have put us back on the track. I feel justified, therefore, in leaving you on this hopeful note.

This country of ours is the greatest and strongest on earth. It was made that way through the qualities of courage, intelligence, morality, and plain commonsense of individual Americans. We are sometimes slow to act, and too often leave the impression that we are soft. The world is beginning to understand that our humanity is not softness—that the fiber of America is no less strong than it was in 1776.

Foreign Aid and the Governor of Utah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I have long felt that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD could do with a good column. It is one of the few daily publications in the United States without the benefit of a good column.

As an example of what might be used for the purpose, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a column entitled "The Great American Novel," written by Dan Valentine and published in a recent issue of the Salt Lake Tribune. As many of my colleagues probably know, the Governor of my State has declined to pay a part of his income tax on the ground that the funds were being used for foreign aid, to which he objects.

My friend, Dan Valentine, in his column has worked out a fictional solution to the problem, which may be more romantically interesting than the actual solution, which came last week, when the Internal Revenue Service exercised its lien on the Governor's bank account and collected the unpaid portion of the taxes.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Like most men in the newspaper business, I have always had it in the back of my mind to write a novel. (I have read some of the novels written by newspapermen. It would have been better if the stuff had stayed in the back of the mind.)

However, I have never written a novel because I have never been able to come up with a plot strong enough to go 350 printed pages and sell for $3.95.

But I think I will get at it now. Because I have finally come up with a plot that will knock the bindings off the publishing industry.

It came to me just like that.

The main character is the governor of a State, see? He's a good governor, honest and fearless, and he's the hero.

Well, after a couple of chapters about the background of this governor, the novel gets going.

This governor decides not to pay his income tax because he doesn't want the money going to India and points east. So he decides to put his income tax in the bank instead of giving it to the Government. At the same time, he decides to run for governor again.

Well, the Government asks for the money. But the governor says no, so they send out a handsome young income-tax collector to get it.

This handsome young income-tax collector knocks on the door of the governor's mansion, but the governor isn't home. His beautiful young daughter answers the door.

"No, no, a thousand times no," the governor's pretty young daughter says when the handsome young income-tax collector asks for the income-tax money.

Well, meanwhile back at the State capitol, the Governor is crating all his valuables into boxes to be sent to Alaska. He doesn't think the Government can take 'em, but he's not sure.

But back at the Governor's mansion, the Governor's beautiful young daughter is falling in love with the handsome young income-tax collector, but they can't do anything about it because the Governor will not let his beautiful young daughter marry an income-tax collector.

This goes on for 5 or 6 chapters, young love fighting against tremendous odds.

The Governor can't get in the capitol because the Federal Government has put a cavalry outfit on the front lawn. So at midnight the attorney general sneaks in the capitol and takes the official State seal, and the Governor goes back to his hometown and hides in a coal mine. This coal mine is made into a provisional State capitol, and he does all his paperwork wearing a hat with a candle on it.

Well, meanwhile, the Governor's son is recalled into the Army and given command of a brigade, and this brigade is told to capture the Governor.

See the suspense, get the conflict? Father against son, son against father.

Well, the brigade is bivouacked in front of the coal mine, but the Governor doesn't care, because his beautiful daughter is sneaking in sandwiches at night.

Meanwhile, the country is up in arms. There is a threat of civil war. Finally, the President of the United States flies to the coal mine.

He talks down the shaft, and the Governor talks back.

They discover they are old World War I buddies, and that the Governor had saved the President's life once. So, the President tells the Governor that if he will write a check for the income tax due, he, the President, will see that it is never cashed.

Then, the Governor comes up and consents to the marriage of his daughter and the income-tax collector, and the son sends his brigade back to Fork Knox, and the book ends as the President and the Governor walk arm in arm up the rolling green lawns toward the capitol building in the sunset.

Now, I ask you, is this going to be a book, or is this going to be a book?

Cast-Stone Panel Industry at Bend, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most informative news story from the Bend (Oreg.) Bulletin of April 20, 1956. Written by Don Higgins, a staff writer, this article tells of a new industry recently developed in this central Oregon town.

Without fanfare or flurry, the inventor and manufacturer, Ike Whitely, is producing a new article for the building trade and it is described very adequately by writer Higgins.

Significant, Mr. President, is the resourceful and enterprising use being made of pumice, a material found in abundance in the vicinity of Newberry Crater, just east of the Cascades in central Oregon. In fact, from the south shore of the lake there rises a whole mountain of this light gray variety of volcanic glass generally referred to as pumice. Newcomers to this lake are amazed to see walnut-sized pumice pebbles floating at the water's edge. This is possible because the material is full of many cavities.

At national Scout jamborees, Oregon Boy Scouts swap chunks of pumice for the oddities and wonders offered for barter by Scouts from other areas. Long known for its polishing and cleansing qualities, as implied in its name, this material has become widely known as a building material in recent years.

This article, Mr. President, attests to the ingenuity, resourcefulness, and enterprise of our people who are seeking always for new resources, as well as for new uses for old resources.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW PLANT MANUFACTURING CAST-STONE PANELS AT SITE JUST NORTH OF DESCHUTES JUNCTION

(By Don Higgins)

A new industry has appeared in the Bend area and has begun manufacturing with nary a trumpet tooted in advance.

Few people have noticed it although the building was constructed in plain sight of hundreds every day. The passing throng was looking straight ahead, as it should.

The new plant is the Hy-Bloc Manufacturing Co. a mile north of Deschutes Junction on Highway 97 between Bend and Redmond.

WHITELY IS OWNER

Ike Whitely, a sturdy stonemason of 50, is the owner and working boss. He is manufacturing lightweight cast-stone panels 6 inches by 12 inches by any lengths but the standard is 7 feet 9 inches. They are for use as sidewalls or partitions for houses and buildings of any kind.

"I haven't said anything about it before," said Ike.

The plant is a dream realized for Ike. He says it is the only one of its kind in the world. His product is made by a process he invented and he has applied for a patent.

Ike had the do-it-yourself man in mind when he invented his panels. They are hollow, crammed with zonolite insulation, reinforced by a three-eighth inch steel rod at each corner. They are so light that 1 strong man, or 2 of medium strength, can wall a building with them without the use of lifting machinery. Each weighs about 160 pounds.

SET VERTICALLY

The panels are set vertically like modern ranch style homes. They are bolted together top and bottom and sealed with mastic instead of mortar.

Whitely's factory is a long, narrow, low building of pumice block—80 by 20 by 8 feet—with an odd looking superstructure at the front end that resembles a sawed-off grain elevator. He has built it since January 1 with the help of his son-in-law, L. R. Blume, and a workman.

The superstructure is called a bunker and holds a hopper into which the pumice is dumped from trucks that reach it over a ramp. Step by step the especially ground pumice goes down the gravity feed from the hopper into a mixer below which contains a plastic material and cement.

STEAM MOLD

There is a rumble and the mixer vibrates and compresses the mixture and delivers it to a steam mold which sets it into long panels with hollow cores that are filled with insulation by a special process.

The panels are wheeled 1 by 1 to the curing room in the rear of the building by a traveling hand crane suspended from an overhead track. Paper is placed between the blocks during 3 weeks of curing. They are sprayed lated by a zonotone plastic process, that anneals into a permanent waterproof skin.

The panels are finished usually in any of 20 colors ordered and have the appearance of granite; or they are delivered unfinished for later spray painting by the purchaser.

Whitely says his panels are light, compare favorably in strength with the heavier cast stone that is a familiar building material, especially in the East and Middle West. The latter is made of sand, gravel, and cement.

The new manufacturer says his present aim is 100 panels a day. They sell between $7 and $9 each on the retail market and it takes 100 of them to build an average 5-room house.

The other day when this information was obtained, Whitely was molding his first lintel and processing his first order. He said he wasn't worried about sales. Milo Harris and his Pamelia Lumber Co. will market the panels in this area and on the coast the selling will be done by the Hy-Bloc Sales Co., of Portland.

Whitely is a native of Payette, Idaho. He has been a stonemason during his working life and was a contractor for 3 years in Madras. During that time, his idea was born for his factory and he has been developing it into the unique plant of today at Deschutes Junction.

With his wife Whitely lives in Redmond. Their two children, a son and a daughter, are grown and married.

"Our new baby is his plant," said Ike proudly. "We are making the only hollow core, insulation filled cast stone on the market."

Address by Hon. Barry Goldwater, of Arizona, at Taft Memorial Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] at the Robert A. Taft memorial dinner, held in Boston, Mass., on May 3, 1956. The address is entitled "The Fallacy of the Common Man." It is a fine address.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Any American would be honored, as I am, by the opportunity of participating in this occasion, so appropriately dedicated to the late Senator Robert A. Taft.

Because I was privileged to serve with him for a brief period in the Senate; because he was a Republican and contributed of his time and talents to my campaign in Arizona in 1952; and because we have always appeared to share the same philosophy of Government and ideals of freedom, I feel a particular sense of personal pride in being asked to recall with you the enormous and enduring contributions which Bob Taft made to his country.

The ledgers of our Nation's history are abundant in their memorializations of the great leaders of the past who played such vital roles in the building of our liberty. Few men, however, for all the reverence and esteem in which they have been held by succeeding generations of their countrymen, have lived to realize the greater compensations of their job well done.

Bob Taft not only enjoyed the rare experience of being a prophet who had honor in his own country, but he also received in the course of his public service the satisfactions that come from the selflessness and sacrifice that is the mark of true statesmanship.

He was a genuinely brilliant man; but, somehow, to those who remember him, his brilliance is actually overshadowed by his character, his convictions, and the courage which fortified him against the assaults which are inevitably made upon men to whom principle is more sacred than profit.

He was the soul of integrity. His unswerving dedication to the right set an example of strength and greatness which has been permanently fused upon the spirit of the American Congress.

The quality of Bob Taft's service cannot be measured entirely by surface achievements. It is true that he built a record of accomplihment seldom equaled in legislative annals; but the principal substance of his towering stature was the way he lived, the ideals he cherished, and the faith which guided him.

He was never ambitious for himself, yet he was always striving to inspire others in the way of his own governmental convictions. To be President of the United States meant, for him, the ultimate opportunity to render service to the Nation he loved. I am sure that he never considered this aspiration in terms of self-glorification or personal reward.

Indeed, all of us know—as I am sure Bob Taft, but for his humility, would have realized—that he did not need to be President to be forever beloved and revered by his fellow citizens.

When, God, in His greater wisdom, denied Senator Taft the fulfillment of this highest official goal, He also lighted the way to the greatest single triumph of his career; and Bob Taft followed this beacon to become the most trusted and faithful confidant of the man whom he had opposed for the presidential nomination.

Bob Taft was, truly, an American first; a Republican, second; and a "Taft man" last. How appropriate, indeed, was Senator KNOWLAND's reference to him at this meeting last year as "Mr. American."

No one will say, of course, that Bob Taft was an ordinary, a common man. He dwelt among us in the days and years which called for an uncommon man, a leader, a statesman. Senator Taft was that man.

He was outraged by the attempt of self-styled, pseudo-liberals to penetrate the foundations of our constitutional, free enterprise system with their socialistic theories. In this respect, then, he was a conservative; but, as a believer in the rights of individuals to live their own lives, to follow their own pursuits, to exercise their own wills, and to retain the products of their own labors, he was a liberal in the true, historic sense of that word.

Bob Taft believed in liberty. He believed in preserving the creeds and institutions which created our liberty.

He knew that he was not a common man. He knew that there is no such thing as a common man in America.

He recognized the wide diversities we have in races, nationalities, religions, occupations, and income levels in the United States.

He believed in treating our citizens as individuals, with sacred rights and freedoms, and opportunities greater than anywhere else in the world.

He did not subscribe to the collectivist theory that Americans are cast from a common mold.

The preachers and prophets of gloom in our country—those despairing individuals who believe that we have reached the zenith of freedom's opportunities and must now revert to an antiquated system of slavery and regimentation—have long leaned heavily, in the name of liberalism, upon the theme of the common man.

They have employed the tyrant's tactic of division and disunity by appealing to the lingering prejudices of a system of ranks and class which pure freedom does not recognize. When they speak, they speak not to all Americans as Americans, but rather they set labor against management, farmer against worker, black against white, Jew against gentile, Catholic against Protestant, rich against poor.

In other words, they classify Americans according to race, color, religion, and occupation, and they say to each group that they are the common men who are being oppressed by the privileged few.

This privileged few, of course, in the eyes of the socialist-minded speudo-liberal, is anyone who has enjoyed a measure of success and prosperity that is greater than that of the particular group to whom he is speaking.

For many years, the Democrat Party has applied this strategy. It has portrayed itself as "the people's party," while Republicans have been described as "the party of the

special interests"—in other words, the "common man" in opposition to the "privileged few."

This claim is utterly false, but the self-styled liberals who have, unfortunately, gained control of the mechanism of the Democrat Party, have pressed it so boldly, for so long, and in so many forms that they have achieved for it a substantial measure of popular acceptance.

It is a flagrant example of the "big lie" in politics.

No major party could function successfully in a country of the size and diversity of the United States if it served only the common man or the privileged few.

It is one of the virtues of our nationwide two-party system that the voters may switch from one major party to the other and find each one an adequate instrument to serve the Nation as a whole.

If this were not true, our political system would soon degenerate into a multiplicity of small special-interest parties not capable of governing.

The very health and vigor of our two-party system—each one drawing strength from all four corners of the Republic—belies the Democrat Party claim.

These statements by so-called liberals who have corrupted the traditional Democrat Party philosophy are so absurd that I often wonder just how stupid they think the American people are.

In his acceptance speech before the Democrat National Convention on July 15, 1948, Harry Truman said, for an example:

"The people know that the Democratic Party is the people's party and the Republican Party is the party if special privilege."

He said further, at that same time, "The Republican Party favors the privileged few and not the common, everyday man."

Adlai Stevenson, in a speech at Chicago on November 19, 1955, said:

"In whatever direction we look—tax policy, resources policy, credit policy or what not—we see the sharp outlines of what can only be described as special interest Government in Washington, something we haven't seen since Republicans were there last."

Another instance of this pseudo-liberal, "common man" approach to Democrat partisanship may be found in the report on Congress issued by the CIO in September 1954. This report says, on page 20:

"The question is not whether there will be any tax relief, but who will get it. The Democrats wanted it for the people. The Republicans wanted it for the upper brackets and the corporations."

As recently as April of this year, according to a story which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on the 13th of last month, Democrat Senator SAM ERVIN, of North Carolina, said:

"The Republicans believe in government for a few elite; the Democrats believe in a government serving all the people."

The big lie marches on.

One reason behind the Democrat Party claim that it is the party of the common man is the fact that for years it has labored hard to mold the American people into common men.

Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell called attention to this tendency of the Democrats to turn our people into common men in an address at Flint, Mich., on January 20, 1956, when he said:

"The keepers of this doctrine were interested not in individual men but in collective man, massed man. For them social problems were quite simple. One merely had to determine what was good for collective men and then shove it down his throat like castor oil. The Government was of the people, for the people, but by the social planners."

Dr. James B. Conant, former president of Harvard University, put his finger on the sources of the doctrine of massed man when he wrote:

"The Soviets seek uniformity and strict adherence to the creed of Marxism-Leninism."

In that creed man is nothing as an individual. He exists only as an unidentifiable atom in a collective mass; and men and mass exist only for the state.

Recent history shows the many steps through which the Democrats, who were in control of Government, deprived our people of their individuality.

Democrats centralized the government of everyday affairs in Washington, leaving less and less for people to do in their home States and localities. They handed out billions in relief, grants, and aids from Washington, making people dependent upon the Great White Father at the Nation's Capital.

Through social security they reduced the individuality of persons to numbers in electronic computing machines. They forced men into unions to bargain collectively.

By raising great citizen armies to fight in foreign wars they put the GI stamp of uniformity on every mother's son. By spawning Government housing developments they scattered clusters of identical brick and frame boxes from one end of the country to the other.

The list of laws, acts, and regulations which systematically robbed people of their individuality and piled them up in collective masses could be extended a mile long.

No one can deny that the Democrats intended to do good by these operations. No criticism need be leveled against relief programs, social security, collective bargaining, and public housing. Yet, it cannot be denied that an inescapable and most harmful by-product of such operations has been the weakening of individual personality and self-reliance.

The Democratic Party has done its utmost to pour our people into the mold of common men and to deal with them in the mass. This is the basis of their political philosophy and voting appeals.

While they have had some measure of success, especially where our technical progress has emphasized collective or mass action, this success has been superficial because deep down our people are proud and jealous of their individuality. They resent being compressed into the mold of the common man.

Behind the mass production and the collective this and that, our people still have wide diversities and at heart remain individualists. This is clear when we examine some of the deep-seated diversities in American life.

Where Democrats are sincere in making the claim to be the party of the common man, as some of them undoubtedly are, they see the forest and not the trees. They look at the material uniformities in American life—the same trains, hotels, restaurants, cooking, and newspapers—and quickly come to the conclusion that all our people, too, are of a common mold.

What they fail to see is that this conformity is merely an expression of our technical, material progress. They fail to understand, or deliberately close their eyes to the fact that beneath the common material veneer is a people still highly individual in talents, aspirations, and with the intense desire to fulfill their individual personalities.

Again, in his address at Flint, Mich., in January of this year, Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell declared:

"We were told for some years that government was supposed to minister to the common man. This doctrine of the common man was as singularly unfree a doctrine as we have ever witnessed in this country. The idea that we are all alike, a common mass, the products of some sort of biological punch press, seeking the same end, through the same means, with the same ideas, desires, and needs, is indeed a devastating one."

A similar view is expressed by James B. Conant in his latest book, the Citadel of Learning, where he says "We in the free world, through our schools, colleges, and universities, seek to perpetuate that tradition of western culture which emphasizes diversity, controversy, and tolerance."

So where are we to find the "common man" the Democrats are always talking about?

Is he of the Anglo-Saxon, Scandinavian, Germanic, Latin, Slavic, Celtic, or the score of other races which make up our population?

Is he English, Irish, Scotch, German, French, Italian, Norwegian, Swedish, Czech, Polish, or among any of the other three score and more nationalities which people the United States?

Do we find that our "common man" is a Catholic, Methodist, Unitarian, Presbyterian, Baptist, Jew, or any of the other hundreds of religious sects which flourish among our people?

Is he the business executive, the local banker, the city or rural lawyer, the office clerk, the shop manager or foreman, the factory worker, the school principal, the teacher, the corner grocer and his wife, the chainstore manager, the garage owner or mechanic, the department store clerk, the Army officer or private, the housewife, or in any of the other thousands of occupations which make up our working population?

We have over 65 million employed persons in all occupations today. Where is the "common man" in this total?

Is he the worker in manufacturing who numbers only 15 million of our nonagricultural employed; or the 1 million engaged in mining; or the 2 million doing construction work; or the 4 million engaged in transportation; or the 9½ million who work in wholesale and retail trade; or the million and three-quarters who handle finance, insurance and real estate; or the 5 million engaged in service industries; or the 5½ million people who work in Federal, State, and local government?

Is the "common man" to be found among our 8 million farmers? Is he the soft or hard winter wheat farmer, the cotton farmer, the rice farmer, the truck gardener, the cattle rancher, the cattle feeder, the peanut grower, the dairy farmer, the sheep raiser, the poultry and egg producer, or among the hundreds of other farm producers in our vast lands?

Does he come from the 7.6 percent of consumer units who have a family personal income of $1,000 per year or under; or the 15.1 percent whose income ranges from $1,000 to $2,000; or the 18.9 percent with income from $2,000 to $3,000; or the 19.3 percent with income from $3,000 to $4,000; or the 12.8 percent with income from $4,000 to $5,000; or the 14.8 percent whose income is from $5,000 to $7,500; or the 4.8 with incomes between $7,500 and $10,000; or the final 4.5 percent who have incomes of $10,000 and over?

What do these facts show?

They show one thing above all else: That there is no such thing as a "common man" in the United States.

Every man and woman is an individual, with talents, interests, needs, hopes and dreams of his or her own. Each person seeks freedom to live his own life, to develop his own personality, and a fair opportunity to get ahead in the game of life on his own merits.

When young we dream of making a professional career, starting a small business, operating a farm, owning our own home, establishing a family, and building a competence for old age.

America is the land which urges us to "hitch our wagon to a star," to plan and to build on the rich foundations of our freedom and the heritage of those who came before us and provided for us, and for the generations of Americans yet to come, the opportunities we have had, as well as inspiration to move ahead to yet undiscovered frontiers in this sanctuary of freedom.

Democrat Party leaders who make the claim that theirs is the party of the "common man" are well aware that ours is a Nation of great diversities, and that there are no "commen men" in our midst.

Still, they do not hesitate to develop and inflame class distinctions in their aim to separate a few of our people from all the others.

One doesn't have to think hard to find the reasons for such Democrat trickery. One reason is that the Democrats have been running the Government on the doctrine of the collective man, massed man.

A second reason lies in the field of raw politics.

Political history shows that Democrat Party leaders will make any claim and follow any line which promises them the votes to gain control of the country and remain in power.

They have shrewdly calculated where the bulk of votes lie and they make their appeals accordingly. That is why they label Republicans as the party of the rich, the bankers, big business, and the privileged few. They know that such labels carry an unpleasant, even sinster implication; and that few votes can be had from those sources.

They label their own party the party of the comman man, the average man, and include among these the farmer, the laboring man, the white-collar worker, and the small-business man because such labels sound wholesome and the bulk of votes can be drawn from those sources.

It apparently does not trouble Democrats in the least that this deliberate inflaming of class distinctions can do great harm to the peace and unity of the Nation.

It apparently does not bother them to malign good men and women among our people.

Their consciences seem not to trouble them when it is pointed out that their party, too, has its share of millionaires, its quota of advisers from banks and big business, and a very sorry record of favors to the privileged few. It doesn't seem to bother them, either, that a great many of the things they have done with professed intentions to help the so-called little man have resulted in great harm to the bulk of our people.

In using the inflammatory phrases of class distinction, they have had but one thought in mind—to get in power and stay there.

We are reminded in the third chapter of the First Epistle General of John that "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer."

Isn't this, after all, the end result of these pseudo-liberal, common-man appeals?

They are attempts to instill fear in the minds of our citizens—fear of one another, fear of those who are different, fear of the self-reliance which is the keystone of liberty.

What has happened to the faith of our fathers?

America was not made free by hate. Humanity does not move forward in a climate of fear.

America has grown great because its citizens have trusted wholeheartedly in God, in our country, and in each other.

If the deceit of this new New Deal-Liberal dogma of the common man is perpetuated, freedom's call will go unanswered, opportunities will go unfulfilled, and competence for the future will be destroyed.

We cannot continue to reap the blessings of liberty by incubating cowards. We cannot carry on America's tradition of strength and leadership by stifling ambition, curbing incentive, and abandoning faith.

We need—desperately need—the uncommon men our our Nation. We need the courage and unquenched spirit of adventure which inspired the freedom of these United States.

We need to encourage in all Americans the qualities which guided Bob Taft—Senator, statesman, and uncommon American.

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the address delivered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] before the faculty and student body of Vassar College at Poughkeepsie, N. Y., on Wednesday afternoon, April 26, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I believe it is correct to say that we have been undergoing a review and reappraisal of our foreign policy during recent weeks.

The Secretary of State himself set this stocktaking into motion, either intentionally or unintentionally when he submitted to an interview in Life magazine—the famous "brink of war" interview.

This interview produced violent reactions both at home and abroad. If it was indeed the Secretary's intention to launch a great debate, then we need not comment here upon the propriety of his choice of a forum. No matter how eminent the publication, he does have access to the regularly established committees of Congress which share with him and the President a certain responsibility for the foreign policy of this Nation.

If, on the other hand, as I suspect is more accurate, this interview only accidentally launched the curren stock-taking, then insofar as it contributes to the present sober discussions it has served a good purpose.

I was glad to note that here in New York Mr. Dulles this week turned the debate into a phase of our foreign relations which has given me considerable concern. This is our relations with bur fellow Western democracies of the North Atlantic. He did so in his address to the annual meeting of the Associated Press in New York City Monday.

Not long ago I was rereading some of the files that I have accumulated through the years in the Senate, and ran across a report which I felt was quite incisive. It was dated April 2, 1952, and outlined some of the developments within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization during its first year of existence. It included this statement which I shall read in full:

"As we look back over these developments, it seems almost as if the nations of the West have been, for decades, blindly enacting parts in a drama that could have been written by Lenin, prophet of militant communistic expansion. This pattern of events, which points so surely to ultimate disaster, can be changed if only the peoples of the West have the wisdom to make a complete break with many things of the past and show a willingness to do something new and challenging. NATO itself is a significant step to meet both the present danger of aggression and the tragic struggles and dissensions that have divided our peoples in the past. But NATO's development is not automatic: action is the test."

The report went on to say that if "the free nations are to remain secure, our peoples must march together, agreed on common goals, and win that cooperative unity possible only in a free society."

Now personally I found myself in agreement with the sentiments expressed in that report at the time I originally read it in April of 1952. I find myself in agreement with them now. The report was signed by Dwight D. Eisenhower, then Supreme Commander of NATO.

This week I was interested in reading in Mr. Dulles' remarks this statement:

"The North Atlantic Treaty Organization is another organization which, in its own distinctive way, contains the possibilities of great development. It was, to be sure, conceived primarily as a military alliance, and that aspect of the organization remains vitally important. But the organization can and should be more."

Mr. Dulles continued:

"The historic weakness of the West has been its disunity. Out of this disunity came wars which have taken the lifeblood of its finest youth and weakened its economies. A major task of postwar statesmanship was to find the ways whereby the West can maintain its solidarity * * *"

I find myself also in agreement with these remarks of the Secretary of State concerning NATO. But I am wondering what has happened in between April 2, 1952, when Eisenhower spoke from his post of Supreme Commander, and April 23, 1956, when Dulles spoke as Secretary of State in an Eisenhower Cabinet.

Just a little over a year after his report, General Eisenhower became President Eisenhower. He then had the office and the authority to seek to bring about the conditions that he believed beneficial. But where is the action that he spoke about as the test?

There has been none.

In 1952 General Eisenhower wrote that "the enormity of the present threat will never be met by half-hearted measures." And he continued: "Required is the full awakening of the free world and the pursuit of energetic, far-reaching measures to insure our form of life—even our survival."

But what has President Eisenhower done since he entered the White House to awaken the free world to the enormity of the threat to which he called attention so ringingly in April 1952. I leave it to you and to him to decide.

Do I need to prove to any of you that the threat remains enormous still? Would you say that the free world needs to be awakened to it any less now than in April 1952. The one thing that President Eisenhower has done which gained the most attention in the world was to go to the Summit Conference in Geneva. But no one would say that its purpose or result was to awaken the free world to the enormity of the threat it faces.

Where are the "energetic, far-reaching measures"? I search my memory and can recall the Marshall plan, NATO, point 4—all adopted under the administration of Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman. But what has the Eisenhower administration proposed?

During the past 4 years, rather than improving, our relations have deteriorated badly. The fact is that the Atlantic Community's continued disunion has left the West far weaker in April 1956 than it was in April 1952. With the Mediterranean—the whole southern flank of the Atlantic alliance—seething from one end to the other, I am sure that I need not convince you that there is serious need for improvement in the alliance. We are today weaker in important areas of Africa and Asia. Need I do more than mention Indochina, India, the Middle East, Cyprus, Tunis, Algeria, Morocco?

Our relationships will continue to deteriorate, in my judgment, unless we take some of the bold and imaginative steps that President Eisenhower called for but then failed to carry out. I note in Secretary Dulles' present speech the flimmer of hope that something may now be done. He says that the Canadian Government "has notably espoused this point (that NATO can be more than a military alliance)."

What has the Canadian Government done?

It has done only what I have long proposed that our own Government do, and

which only our Government can do successfully, because only it has the geographic location, prestige, and strength to provide the necessary leadership.

On February 9, 1955, I introduced in the Senate a resolution which I have had pending from time to time for a much longer period. This resolution, simply provides that the President call a convention of the other sponsors of the NATO agreements to meet and determine what steps they might take to forge unity in their military, economic, and political policies. It is known as the Atlantic Union Resolution.

I have no partisan interest in this resolution. The Marshall plan, NATO, point 4, all were adopted with Republican support. Some of us remember that the proposal for a League of Nations was put forth first by a Republican, former President William Howard Taft whom Woodrow Wilson defeated in the 1912 election. But in May 1916, Wilson announced his support of a League of Nations, at a dinner presided over by former President Taft.

Many people have forgotten that Wilson took over the proposal of the league from Taft. Once he adopted the idea, it was his. And so it can be with Eisenhower. If I sought personal political advantage, I would wait until after Congress adjourns to make this speech, but now there is time for Eisenhower to provide the leadership within his party necessary to fulfill the desires that both he and his Secretary of State have expressed.

The convention, let me emphasize, would be one at which free peoples would meet together to discuss the desires and hopes and dreams of the entire free world searching for a common policy, the purpose of which would be to make freedom itself more secure.

Whatever proposals they in their wisdom adopted would have to be ratified by the respective nations according to their own constitutional prerogatives. To fear such a meeting is to fear democracy itself.

And democracy cannot be strong, nor can it be democracy, if it is afraid.

What we seek is unity of purpose.

Only good can come from intensifying that search.

One Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Robert E. Peary, Discoverer of the North Pole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, yesterday, May 6, marked the 100th anniversary of the birth of Robert E. Peary, discoverer of the North Pole. Admiral Peary was a truly great American explorer, and has always been one of the State of Maine's best-loved sons. His courage, steadfastness, and patriotism have been an inspiration to those who knew him personally, as well as to those who have read of his activities in Arctic exploration.

In 1910 the United States Senate thanked Admiral Peary on behalf of the American people for the work he did for his country, by passing a bill, introduced by the late Senator Eugene Hale, of Maine, promoting him to the rank of rear admiral in the United States Navy.

Time passes quickly, and lest we forget men like Admiral Peary I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a statement which I have prepared for this occasion.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR PAYNE

I believe that the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the birth of the Arctic explorer, Robert E. Peary, is a fitting time to recount the life of a man who exemplified the true pioneer spirit which has inspired this Nation down through the years.

Robert Peary was born at Cresson, Pa., but the State of Maine has always claimed him, and rightly so, as one of her noted sons. At the age of 3 he came to live at Cape Elizabeth with his widowed mother and spent his boyhood there. Peary grew up in a rugged Maine environment and attended one of the State's proudest educational institutions, Bowdoin College.

Upon his graduation from Bowdoin in 1877, where he studied engineering and was a prominent athlete, he became a county surveyor in Fryeburg, Maine. In 1879 he entered the Coast and Geodetic Survey in Washington as a cartographic draftsman and later joined the Naval Corps of Engineers. He was sent to Nicaragua as assistant engineer to survey a route for the proposed Nicaraguan ship canal. He distinguished himself on the Latin American project by inventing a new type of lock gate for the proposed canal.

Up to this point in his life, it would appear that Robert Peary was destined to be a successful engineer, one who could make astute decisions, who had a forceful personality, and that was all.

In the summer of 1885 all this was changed. Quite by accident Peary came upon some papers in his reading which described the inland ice of Greenland. Instantly he was fired with the desire to explore one of the world's last remaining geographical secrets, the Far North.

From this point on, through the next 35 years of his life, Robert Peary underwent the severest physical and mental rigors. Suffering defeat on nearly all of his Arctic trips, he persisted until he succeeded in conquering the vast desert of wastless snow, only to have the public initially reject his claims to the discovery of the North Pole.

Securing a leave from the Navy in 1886 Peary was determined to cross the inland ice of Greenland. He sailed on a steam whaler to Godhaven, a small Danish station on the west coast of Greenland. Here, with few supplies, almost no equipment, and among strange people, Peary organized his first expedition. Many had gone before him. Franklin, de Long, and Greely all had met with defeat, and so did Peary on his first trip. Winds, sleet, and lack of supplies forced his return.

For the next several years Peary was in Nicaragua again, this time as chief engineer on the canal survey project. He spent his spare time in Arctic research. Efforts to secure interest and financial backing for a second expedition received a serious blow when, early in 1889, news came of the crossing of Greenland by the Norwegian explorer Fridtjof Nansen. But Peary was determined to return. In 1891 he had solicited enough aid from scientific and geographical societies to finance another trip north. He, Mrs. Peary, and a party of six left New York aboard *The Kite*, a chartered Newfoundland sealing vessel.

During the voyage Peary suffered a broken leg and had to be carried ashore at the destination. While he lay on his bunk in a crude wooden shack, the decision was made to remain. Under Peary's leadership the party, which had been joined by a number of Eskimos, passed the winter in relative comfort. It was during this winter that Peary learned the Eskimos' way of life, their language, and their culture.

That spring he pushed northeastward to the Greenland shore of the Arctic Ocean. The insularity of Greenland was proven. Upon his return to camp he found *The Kite* waiting, and the party returned to New York in September. Peary was immediately hailed as an outstanding explorer. The 1,300-mile sledge trip, the studies of Eskimo life, and the various meteorological data which he brought back furnished him with material for an extensive lecture tour. Public interest and sufficient funds insured a trip the following year.

The sailing from Philadelphia in the summer of 1893 was a jubilant occasion, ironical for an expedition which was to end in utter failure. Mrs. Peary went along, and their daughter, Marie Ahneghito Peary Stafford, was born that fall. She was the farthest northern born white child known.

The object of the 1893–94 trip was to push on as far to the Pole as possible. The winter proved extremely bitter. A fatal disease struck down Peary's dogs, and one by one his men broke under the strain. An expedition in March 1894, on which all of the food gave out, sent most of Peary's men home more dead than alive.

With three remaining men he pushed on almost to the point of death. Facing death as a certain eventuality if he continued, Peary returned to his base of operations, walking the last 50 miles. Exhausted and half starved he later wrote:

"Never shall I forget that time and scene, 3 exhausted men and 9 starved dogs standing in the gaunt frozen desert. These and the glistening snow, the steel blue sky, and the cold white sun. Five hundred miles in an air line across a waste of snow to the nearest human being, with insufficient rations for even that return journey, yet we were still facing the other way * * * I felt then, as I feel now, that in that cool, deliberate moment we took the golden bowl of life in our hands, and that the bowl had suddenly grown very fragile, and I now feel, as I felt then, that we were neither rash nor foolhardy in so doing, but simply followed the dictates of temperaments which could not act otherwise, and which would do the same thing again under the same circumstances."

Again Peary had failed, but out of this expedition came the Cape York Meteorites, which he found in 1894. He made two successive trips to bring them back to New York. In 1897 he secured another leave from the Navy. This leave and successive ones, together with the attempts of his friends to secure promotions for him, perpetrated a controversy which rose to plague him in later years.

The 1897 trip also ended in failure. In fact, the next few years seemed to lead Peary almost nowhere. In 1899 a group of his close supporters organized the Peary Arctic Club, which performed invaluable service for him in managing his ships and personnel, and in dealing with public opinion, which, by this time, was becoming crystallized against further Arctic exploration, especially by a man who seemed destined to failure.

By 1900 the tide was turning. The past decade of failure had convinced a number of people that Peary was a man who would never give in to it. In 1904 the Perry Arctic Club and its benefactors made possible the construction of the ship *Roosevelt*, designed by Peary himself and built at Bucksport, Maine.

Once again Peary pushed northward through the ice. The *Roosevelt* proved herself in combating the icepacks. April 21

1906, found his party turning back again, this time within 174 miles of its goal.

In 1908 Peary was 52 years old. He had spent 25 years of his life in what appeared to be futility. But he had learned much. These years of failure had imparted to him all that he needed to know. Various routes had been attempted, different equipment had been tested, and the Eskimos were now his trusted allies.

The *Roosevelt* sailed from New York on the last trip north in July 1908. President Theodore Roosevelt came aboard at Oyster Bay and wished Peary well. "I believe in you, Peary, and I believe in your success," were his words.

The trip was carefully planned, and on September 28 the *Roosevelt* reached 82°30' North, a world's record for a ship under its own power. Here the party moved west to Cape Columbia where a winter camp was erected. Peary had also carefully planned the activities of his men. His staff was small. Capt. Bob Bartlett commanded the *Roosevelt*. Matt Henson, Ross Marvin, Donald MacMillan, George Borup, and Dr. Goodsell made up the official party. Mrs. Peary remained behind this time. These men, together with the Eskimos who had been selected for the final dash across the ice, were welded together as a unit by Peary in a military manner. Every facet of the 25 years experience was put into use.

On February 22, 1909, Peary left for the Pole. Compared with his other attempts this final one was comparatively easy. Much of his success can be attributed to experience and organization. When men and dogs faltered and fell behind there were others to take their places. This time there was an abundant supply of food.

On March 26 Peary sent the last of his assistants back to the *Roosevelt* except Henson. He now traveled with Henson and 7 Eskimos and 60 dogs. The days' marches lengthened. On April 5 they were 35 miles from the Pole. The going became easier and on the morning of April 6 the Pole was reached at last. Peary had won. The United States flag flew from the top of the world. The exhausted party took a few readings and turned back.

"One backward glance I gave," Peary said, "then turned my face toward the south and toward the future."

The future was in many ways a bitter experience for the explorer. The party returned to Cape Columbia on April 23. When the *Roosevelt* reached Labrador the message was sent of the discovery—"Stars and Stripes nailed to the North Pole, Peary."

Another explorer, a Dr. Cook, was in the Arctic a year before. Shortly before Peary's message was received he announced to the world that he had reached the Pole in the spring of 1908. Many sided with Cook in the ensuing controversy.

The National Geographic Society recognized Peary's claim, and in 1910 Senator Eugene Hale, of Maine, introduced a bill in the Senate for Peary's promotion and thanking him in behalf of the American people. For this, Peary underwent a congressional investigation, which sought proof of actual discovery. It was, in many ways, a painful method of receiving the tribute which was due the man. Throughout the whole proceedings Robert Peary maintained his characteristic dignity. In the end the investigating committee found in his favor.

In the years that followed Admiral Peary gave many lectures in this country and in Europe. Geographic and scientific societies awarded him well-deserved honors. He retired to his home at Eagle Island, Maine, and during World War I he served his country as one of the great air-flight pioneers. He recognized the significance of the strength of air power, both commercially and for national defense. Not only did he write and lecture for its promotion, but he made many flights himself as an aviator.

The physical torture to which he had submitted his body for the greater part of his life finally took its toll. Peary contracted pernicious anemia from which he never recovered. Even while he was dying his spirit never faltered. When, at last the end came, in 1920, the admiral died as he had lived, with a never-ending faith in the future.

Dr. John Milburn Price

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRICE DANIEL
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, on Thursday night in Fort Worth, Tex., the people are honoring Dr. John Milburn Price, founder and director of the School of Religious Education at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. On behalf of my colleague Senator LYNDON JOHNSON and myself, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD a statement calling attention to the career of this distinguished American.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. JOHN MILBURN PRICE

On Thursday night in Fort Worth, Tex., a singularly moving and gratifying event is planned for a particularly distinguished and deserving American. The people of that city are to honor Dr. John Milburn Price, founder and director of the School of Religious Education at the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary.

We would like to call the Senate's attention to Dr. Price's splendid record and his contribution to Texas, to the lives of countless of his students, and to the Christian ideals.

The Southwestern Seminary at Fort Worth trains young men and women of all faiths. Its school of religious education is the first in the South and the largest in the world. Dr. Price founded the school 41 years ago, and he has been in the teaching profession for 53 years.

As a preacher, teacher, writer, educator, and administrator, Dr. Price's record is unparalleled. Some notable achievements of his school of religious education include: The first school among Baptists to offer vocational training in religious education (1915); first school in America to offer a religious education diploma (1917); first conference in religious education (1921); first and oldest Vacation Bible School among Baptists (1922); first building in America designed exclusively for teaching religious education (1950).

Dr. Price has been past president of the American Association of Schools of Religious Education. He will retire on August 1 of this year after 41 years of service to the school which he founded.

Dr. Price, a Kentucky mountaineer with a pioneering spirit, began teaching in Cleveland, Ky., in 1903. He has been preaching for 50 years—in Kentucky, Rhode Island, and Texas. He was pastor of the Webb Baptist Church in Tarrant County, Tex., for 21 years. He has written for magazines, newspapers, periodicals, and over one-quarter million copies of his books in religious pedagogy are either translated or being translated in four languages around the world.

While a collect student—a Marston scholar at Brown University—Dr. Price was inspired by the thought of training laymen and women to become Sunday school teachers. While completing his theological training at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Ky., the opportunity presented itself. Dr. L. R. Scarborough, then president of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Fort Worth asked him if he would like to "break new ground" in helping establish a School of Christian Pedagogy in Texas.

He had been elected Sunday school secretary for Kentucky, and he yearned to remain in his home State. At the same time, friends in Canton, China, urged him to join a seminary faculty there. He decided that in the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, he could—through his students sent out into the world—be in Texas, Kentucky, and China at the same time.

The first year at his new School of Religious Education, only five courses were taught. Today, 129 courses for vocational training in religious education are available. Six thousand students have enrolled in the school since 1915; there are 800 enrolled today. These trainees have revolutionized Sunday school and training union work in the Southern Baptist Convention. Since 1920, the Southern Baptist denomination has increased from 3 million to 8 million members. The phenomenal growth is due in many ways to the teaching ministry of the church.

The largest school of religious education in the world stands today as a permanent memorial, vibrantly alive, to the man who dared to establish his life "by way of the throne of God."

Problems Faced by America's Reserve Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Saturday evening, May 5, I addressed the convention of the Reserve Officers' Association of Wisconsin, pointing up the problems faced by America's Reserve forces.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I'm happy to be with you tonight.

I salute you, as alert members of the Reserve, vigilant night and day in fulfilling a citizen-soldier's responsibilities of national defense.

As you so well know, the safeguarding of the future of our Nation can no longer be left in the hands of the Armed Forces Regulars alone.

Defense has become everybody's business, everybody's responsibility—yours and mine and everyone else's.

AMERICA—A PEACE-LOVING NATION

America remains, of course, a peace-loving Nation. We Americans are, by tradition, a peaceful, nonaggressive, easygoing people.

Cherishing our freedom, however, we have always been solicitous of the rights of others to freedom. We remember how other peoples have lost their freedom—with 900 million people now behind the Iron Curtain.

Moreover, we remember how, in the past, war has come to our people by surprise attack—by a blitz against our unsuspecting Nation—in April 1917, in December 1941, then again in June 1950.

DANGER OF A NUCLEAR PEARL HARBOR

We are determined that never again shall we be unalert, unprepared, undefended. Never again will we risk another Pearl Harbor.

We shall not be lulled to sleep by Comrades Khrushchev's and Bulganin's sirupy words. We will not be deceived by the phony dissolution of the Red International Cominform.

Aware of what war could mean, we will, of course, do our utmost to explore avenues of peace. But we will never again be asleep at the switch—unprepared for modern, high-speed war in the atomic age.

Today, already, our best jet plane can fly at 1,500 miles per hour. Development of guided missiles of 10,000 miles per hour is reportedly on their way. We dare not therefore, coast on our laurels, as the race for technical supremacy intensifies, for the Reds are rapidly moving ahead on their own.

COLD WAR CONTINUES

Meanwhile, on every continent, the cold war rages: In Asia, Africa, South America, Europe and elsewhere; the war of propaganda by radio, press, TV, motion pictures, newspapers, pamphlets; of Soviet trade offensive, cultural offensive, yes, even athletic offensive (in the coming Olympics games in Australia).

The cold war is a war which we must and can win, so as to avoid a "hot war."

ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM IS SOUND

On the home front, the challenge today is to develop a comprehensive peacetime program to protect our Nation at all times.

I believe the philosophy of the program of our national administration in Washington is sound.

The major tenets of this philosophy are—that military strength should be maintained at a level of development necessary for the changing needs of national defense; that the defense effort should be a well-balanced program between the three services, but with particular stress on aviation; that the program should be geared to the long haul, and to the ecenomy of the country.

MEASURES OF DEFENSE

To create a program that will fulfill this philosophy of defense, we must—maintain armed forces equipped with even more modern, long-range weapons, with the greatest retaliatory striking force in the world; maintain a flexibility of operation, to adapt to rapid technological changes and developments; improve our continental defense—our Distant Early Warning Radar system, our Nike program; maintain a front-line perimeter of defense in bases around the world, ready to respond at the first siren of emergency; fulfill the needs of our Reserve and our National Guard so that they are ready and able to charge into the battle-line in the event of attack.

COMMUNIST MILITARY GROWTH SERIOUS

As you and I know, our great concern for an adequate defense effort is not based on illusion or miscalculation.

The hard facts of the military strength of aggressive communism will dissolve any doubt that we need a strong defense.

The Soviets have modernized their air power; most of their 20,000 operational planes are now modern jet fighters and bombers. New and improved planes—with super-thrust engines are coming off production lines throughout Russia and the other Communist countries.

They have modernized their mobile army of 175 divisions, and have increased the capability of the European satellite armies which comprise some 80 tough divisions.

The Russians have built a strong undersea fighting force, including more than 400 modern submarines. (That is five times as many as Hitler had at the start of World War II.)

The capability of the vast military forces of Red China are greatly increased. The Red Chinese air force, jet equipped, is now the fourth largest in the world.

These are but a few of the unhappy facts we must face, in girding ourselves for the long-haul, defensive effort.

And, of course, I need hardly remind you that Soviet development of A-bombs and H-bombs, as well as progress in guided-missile research—looms as one of the topmost acute problems on the world stage.

MILITARY, ECONOMIC, AND IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE

Presently, in all the continents, there are two principal phases to the struggle between communism and the free world: the military and the economic.

We should be aware, however, that accompanying the military and the economic struggle, there is always the ideological factor.

The basic tenets of the contest are: Our way of life against the communistic; freedom against slavery; truth against falsehood; recognition of the dignity of the individual, against complete subjugation of the individual to the dictatorial state.

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST DICTATORSHIP

The U. S. S. R. is, of course, solely responsible for the state of continual crisis in which the world is now living.

The demotion of Joseph Stalin has not basically changed Red strategy. Conquest of the world remains communism's dominant aim.

UNITED STATES MODERNIZING DEFENSES

To meet the Soviet threat, we are now re-evaluating our military defense. A Senate Armed Services subcommittee is reviewing our long-range bomber and guided missile programs. President Eisenhower has requested one-half billion dollars more from the Congress for Air Force production of B–52's.

Obviously, we cannot be smug over our existent defenses. Nor need we however be overly critical of our own progress.

We have made dynamic advancement in modernizing and bringing up to date our fighting standards. Here are a few examples:

Our jet-equipped Air Defense squadrons are being strengthened with increasing numbers of supersonic aircraft;

Our interceptor planes will be increasingly equipped with Falcon air-to-air guided missiles;

On the ground, an increasing number of Army antiaircraft battalions are being converted to Nike guided missiles—such as those already encircling the city of Milwaukee;

The guided missile, Corporal, is in the hands of our troops and ready for action, capable of delivering an atomic warhead on targets at long ranges;

The mighty atomic artillery rocket, the Honest John, an outstanding weapon for close-in support, is also in the hands of our troops.

The Army and Navy have joined together as a team in developing the ballistic missile with the intermediate range of 1,500 miles, to be launched from land, ship, or submarine.

The development of these mighty missiles will give our fighting forces the power to demolish pinpoint targets deep within enemy-held territory—despite fog, rain, snow, or any other adverse conditions.

As you know, the destructive firepower of today's division is estimated to be 80 percent greater than it was in World War II. We must exert all-out effort to maintain and improve this completely modernized fighting force.

ROLE OF THE RESERVES MORE AND MORE IMPORTANT

Meanwhile, the role of the Reserves is becoming increasingly important in our national-defense picture.

The ultimate objective of the reserve program, of course, is its integration into the fighting force of the United States as effectively as possible, so as to best support the overall-defense program.

We need all 5,000 reserve units throughout the country at top strength, trained and ready to meet the needs of emergency. We need complete units: manned, equipped, trained, and ready for mobilization.

GOALS OF RESERVE PROGRAM

The reserve program too, is a most valuable way of educating our national citizenry to its defense obligation. This can be done: (1) Without too greatly disturbing the pursuits of the individual in life; and (2) without impeding our technological advancement, in fact, we are strengthening it, by having a maximum of our citizens, as reservists, possess current technical knowledge.

The reserve program, also, is designed to operate without upsetting our economy pattern, and without impeding our intellectual, cultural, and spiritual development as a nation.

The men who are in the Reserve, of course, are the best judges of its effectiveness, and of its ultimate degree of contribution to our national defense.

RESERVE PROGRAM BROADENED

Fortunately, in recent times the reserve program, because of its increasing significance in the national defense effort, has been made more just, has been broadened and made more flexible.

The basic aim of the enactment of the historic Reserve Forces Act was to make more just and equitable our reserve policy and to improve the structure and size of the Reserve Forces. Under the current program, the Reserves essential elements are, as you so well know, composed of the Ready Reserve and the Stand-by Reserve.

SCREENING OF READY RESERVES

The statutory size of the Ready Reserve has been increased, as you are aware, from 1.5 million to 2.9 million.

The screening process for the Ready Reserves is extremely important to make certain that this highly important segment of the reserve program is genuinely ready. The objectives of the program are to ascertain that we have in the reserves only those who are actually available for immediate mobilization; that we do not have in the Ready Reserve, persons with critical civilian skills who can make a better contribution in a defense-supporting economy.

In addition, we need careful screening procedures on such categories as: those failing to meet service standards; hardship cases; persons with skills in excess of service needs for the Ready Reserve; students and apprentices in training for critical professions and occupations, and others not available for mobilization.

This screening is essential to keep the units at the highest level of efficiency—ready to plunge into the front line of the Nation's defense.

STANDBY RESERVE

The Standby Reserve, composed of 2 million men, is greatly needed to provide for additional units and individuals. Although essentially a nonorganized pool of experienced personnel, this group of the Reserve program will be invaluable in time of national crisis.

SIX-MONTH ACTIVE-DUTY FOR YOUNG RESERVISTS

Unfortunately, the program for 6-month active-duty training for young men who will then go into the Reserves, has not yet had as great an effect upon Reserve enlistment as anticipated.

However, it is hoped that with time the program will take hold. We need to educate our people, and especially our young men, to the requirements and benefits of this program, so that as many as possible of our youth may avail themselves of its opportunities in discharging their service obligations.

INCREASE IN RESERVE WAGES

Last week, as you know, the Reservists received a raise in pay from $50 to $78 monthly for voluntary active duty. This corrects a disparity between the reservists and other active-duty personnel.

This raise may help, also, to provide the needed manpower for the Reserve program. We dare not have "too few and too late" if war again comes.

TWENTY-TWO MILLION VETERANS IN AMERICA

We have all heard it said many times: "We no longer have a class of veterans among us; instead, we are becoming a nation of veterans."

America today has more than 22 million veterans, in all walks of life. However, the veteran still assumes a unique role in our society.

We are requiring our veterans to give more of their time and their service, yes (in the tragedy of war) of their lives, if need be.

With this great sacrifice, we must also help to provide them with the genuinely deserved benefits of our way of life. That is why, for example, I have personally introduced legislation to extend for 3 years the GI home loan benefit program. Otherwise, that program will expire by mid-1957.

OTHER LEGISLATION FOR VETERANS

As you know, there are hundreds of other veterans' bills pending before the Congress. These cover such problems as increase of pensions, employment, hospitalization, educational benefits, loans, rehabilitation, and many other answers to the real problems of today.

On April 24, the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, before which this legislation is being largely considered, passed over, without prejudice, all compensation and pension legislation, pending study and analysis of the findings of the Bradley Commission. As you are aware, parts 1 and 2 of this report were issued last week.

A meeting of the committee is expected in early May. After consideration of the Bradley recommendations, a report on overall veterans' legislation will be forthcoming.

CONCERN OVER BRADLEY COMMISSION REPORT

I personally have not as yet had an opportunity to study in full the Bradley report. I am inclined, speaking generally, to agree with what it states about the need for more aid for the severely disabled combat-connected vet.

But I certainly do not agree with what the report seems to state about depriving noncombat disabled veterans of their just due.

The findings of the Commission seem unfortunately, to point toward an undermining of programs of benefits for most veterans—programs which all of us have worked hard to provide over the years.

Be assured that I will strongly oppose any kind of recommendations that would undo our well-deserved efforts. And I am confident that the present 84th Congress would not act in the slightest to impair statutory rights and privileges of our ex-servicemen.

LIBERALIZATION OF SURVIVOR'S BENEFITS

Meanwhile, there is, as you know, important House-approved legislation before the Senate to liberalize benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans. This legislation is now before the Senate Finance Committee.

Until now, there has been an unfortunate disparity in the treatment of survivors. This current legislation will help to correct this disparity. This is not, of course, a perfect piece of legislation; but it is a step in the right direction.

Along with our national administration, I believe that the enactment of this legislation would provide fairer treatment of all categories of survivors.

You may be assured that I shall urge prompt action by the Finance Committee, to expedite this legislation, for the benefit of deserving families of veterans and servicemen throughout the country.

OTHER VETERANS' AND SERVICEMEN'S PROBLEMS

There are, as you are well aware, many, many other problems yet to be worked out for veterans and servicemen. We must continue our efforts to analyze the problems, and propose solutions, to correct any inequities in existing programs.

For myself, I believe this is one of the foremost responsibilities of the Congress.

As Calvin Coolidge wisely said, "A nation which forgets its defenders will itself be forgotten."

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN TOTAL DEFENSE

There is a great need on the part of the public for understanding the new "kind of overall defense" which we must undertake to meet the current world crisis. It is a total defense pattern—defense from without and from within—in which every citizen must participate.

The American people must cooperate to build a formidable wall of protection for ourselves and the free world.

At the same time, we must all contribute to the progress and development of our own Nation, itself—keeping it healthy and clean and prosperous.

FREEDOM IS ALIVE EVERYWHERE

Our land is the symbol of hope, of freedom which flames in the breast of every human being.

Among the Communists, only "higher-ups" enjoy even a limited freedom. The Kremlin's ruling class, however, is never quite sure when the party line will change, and its members will be purged, possibly killed, or sent to prison in Siberia.

WE CAN BE DEFEATED ONLY BY APATHY

We have no such fear. The only things that can cause our defeat by communism would be a lack of patriotism, or a lack of initiative to rise up and meet the dynamic challenge of our times.

We have—potentially all that we need to have—materially, economically, militarily, and spiritually to win the peace. I believe in my heart that we, individually and as a Nation, will do so.

DESIRE FOR FREEDOM IS UNIVERSAL

We must always remember that we are not alone in our desire for, and need of, freedom. The love of liberty is aflame in the breasts of millions of souls behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, and throughout the rest of the world. Despite all the efforts of communism to extinguish that flame, it burns even brighter.

Every now and then, however, we might each adjourn to our "inner rooms," and consult with our souls, and our God. For a strong, spiritual faith is "basic equipment" for every American.

CONCLUSION

I firmly believe that, if we unite now, as we have in other times of crisis, we will assuredly triumph over communism, and without a mortal conflict.

More than that, we will bring to the world the rich kind of life that results only from free people—working and praying together—to attain their goals.

These goals, based on God-given freedom, are defined in the Bill of Rights, and embedded deep in the heart of all humanity.

It is your minutemen—your reservists—who will help us—help all mankind to maintain or attain our birthright.

Enlightened Self-Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Enlightened Self-Interest," which was published in the Wall Street Journal of May 2, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENLIGHTENED SELF-INTEREST

Foreign aid was supposed to end a number of times in the past, but now there is no longer any attempt to present it as a temporary phenomenon. Increasingly the administration stresses its permanence.

Secretary of State Dulles this week said he thinks military aid will have to go on as long as the security of this country is threatened. The administration seeks authority to make 10-year economic-aid commitments. No one suggests that even another decade will see the end of this type of assistance.

What is proposed, then, is a drastic change in United States foreign policy. On what grounds is it proposed?

In his statement the other day Mr. Dulles made the superficial case for continued military aid. Some strategically important countries cannot afford to maintain the kind of military establishment considered necessary to deter or rebuff Communist attack. So, it is argued, it is in our interest to maintain their defenses for them.

Perhaps so. But the argument glosses over a couple of points. When the anti-Communists build-up began, the idea was for us to help other nations get their rearmament going to the point where they could carry it themselves. The idea was not for the United States to subsidize their armed forces in perpetuity.

If, after all the billions of military aid, these nations are still unable to afford their present defense establishments, they probably never will. The question arises whether it is sensible, in the long run even feasible, to base anti-Communist defense on so shaky an economic foundation. Already the United States is finding it has to provide some economic aid just to enable certain countries to absorb the military aid. That is a situation which borders on the absurd.

The case for perpetual economic aid to the so-called underdeveloped nations is even more questionable. The aid is supposed to help keep these nations from going Communist. But where has economic aid to underdeveloped nations won the friendship of their governments for the United States or cooled their flirtations with the Communists?

That is by no means the only question about this type of economic aid. To what extent has it deterred underdeveloped nations toward economic improvement? How much has been wasted, grafted, or used for foolish undertakings? And anyway, by what moral or historical precedent should the American people be expected to give up billions of their annual income for these purposes year after year?

Mr. Dulles invited Congress to probe deeply into the premises of foreign aid, and President Eisenhower recently proposed that a special citizens' council be formed for that purpose. Such an intensive review is long overdue. And the fundamental issue it should study is just what we are letting our-

selves in for if we change foreign aid from a temporary to a permanent arrangement.

It is one thing to help a country get a rearmament program going or give it military aid if it is attacked, or to provide dollars or goods to a nation devastated by war or temporarily impoverished by natural disaster. National interest or simply charity may dictate such assistance on occasion.

But it is the opposite of enlightened self-interest to establish an American policy of subsidizing half the world from here to eternity.

What the Hoover Commission Program Can Mean to Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very important address delivered by the Honorable James A. Farley at the annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, on April 30.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT THE HOOVER COMMISSION PROGRAM CAN MEAN TO BUSINESS

The admirable program which the United States Chamber of Commerce has undertaken to build public understanding of the Hoover report is enough to assure me that I need not dwell in detail on the better-known aspects of my topic. Permit me to say, as a member of the bipartisan second Hoover Commission and as a director of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, that the chamber has never given a better demonstration of its civic spirit; your Hoover Commission program is splendidly conceived for maximum effectiveness.

You know, of course, that the first Hoover Commission was unanimously created by Congress on a bipartisan basis in 1947; that it completed its report to Congress in 1949; that some 72 percent of its recommendations were eventually adopted which resulted in savings that now total, I am informed, over $7 billion. The success of the first report was due primarily to the great leadership of its chairman, to the quality and objectivity of its research, and to strong, bipartisan citizen support of its recommendations.

The first Commission paved the way for the second, on which I had the honor to serve from 1953 to 1955. Under the same leadership and with experience to build on, the second Commission's report was even more comprehensive, even more searching, and potentially even more rewarding to the Nation than the first. Taken solely as a matter of dollars and cents, full adoption of the report would yield savings of over $5 billion a year. That would be a return of $1,500 for every one of the 3,300,000 words in the reports of the Commission and its task forces. And that, I submit, is a royalty beond the dreams of any author in or out of Hollywood.

But here, for the sake of perspective, let me remind you that, prior to 1947, innumerable boards, commitees, and commissions had made studies of the Government and issued reports all of which perished in the dusty pigeonholes of Washington. We cannot assume, on the basis of one precedent-shattering experience, that the acceptance of the first Hoover report is in any sense a guaranty of the success of the second. Quite the contrary. The current report digs more deeply into the root problems of modern "Big Government." It bites more sharply into areas of vested interest. It calls for fundamental policy decisions of the sort which both officials and legislators traditionally prefer to avoid. We may be due for disillusionment unless we bend all our energies to the mobilization of public support.

The educational task ahead of us, it seems to me, falls into two main parts. First, of course, there is the job of seeing to it that the factual findings of the Commission and its task forces are not forgotten. This means that, by every possible medium, we must continue to make those facts known far and wide. Second, and just as important, is the task of interpreting the Commission's findings in terms of their true meaning and deep significance to all of us as citizens.

In this way, I believe, we may yet succeed in awakening the Nation to the grave realities which the Hoover report so clearly underscores. It sometimes seems to me that in these recent, hectic decades of depression, war, cold war, emergency, and more war, we have almost lost our appreciation of the principles on which this free Nation was founded. Something has happened to numb our sense of history and even our understanding of simple arithmetic. In a very real sense, I fear, we have been hiding our heads in the sands of careless governmental expansion, inflation, and runaway public debt.

If you will pardon a personal reference, let me say that my service with the Hoover Commission was not only a great privilege and a great honor but a striking revelation to me. Quite frankly I had not realized that I, like so many of us, had accepted without much question the mushroom growth of modern government. You may recall that I entered the Federal service as Postmaster General in 1933. It seemed then that we had a large and complex executive branch with 572,000 employees, 450 different departments and agencies, and a budget of $4 billion.

Here, 20 years later, we found the results (and I consider them inevitable) of the vast international pressures which have forced us to expand our governmental functions in every direction. With 2,300,000 civilian employees and nearly 3 million more in uniform, we have built a vast structure of more than 2,100 departments, agencies, boards, bureaus, and commissions. For every dollar we spent in 1933 we were spending more than 15. To put it another way, the cost of Federal paperwork alone today is equal to the whole Federal budget a mere 20 years ago.

I was, I still am, appalled.

Perhaps we need to give more attention to our self-education in fundamentals. At any rate, we cannot at the moment say with any assurance that the second Hoover report is well on its way to successful implementation. Ten months have passed since the Commission sent the last of its report to Congress. Where, in terms of its acceptance, does this report stand today? As you know, some 45 percent of the Commission's recommendations can be implemented by executive branch action; most of the remainder require legislation. As far as I know there has been no official announcement of governmentwide results as yet, although we have had good news of Executive action on several fronts.

Every citizen, I am sure, applauded President Eisenhower's recent exchange of letters with Civil Service Commission Chairman Philip Young in which the administrative application of the Commission's Report on Personnel and Civil Service was so strongly urged. It was equally gratifying to read the announcement that such a high percentage of the Commission's total report had found acceptance in the Defense Department that annual savings approximately $450 million a year will result. I certainly concur with my good friend Clarence Francis of the Citizens Committee that this represents a "giant stride" to wider implementation of the report as a whole.

We citizens need news of this sort. It reassures us in our determination to see that the report and its issues are fully understood. It encourages us to go on working in support of the administration and Congress in their every effort to make a lasting reality of the Commission's concepts.

Americans always like to see results and, in this connection, permit me to cite one little-known illustration of the fact that something can be done to reduce governmental delay, confusion, and waste. Among the recommendations of the first Hoover Commission's report on budgeting and accounting was the spot-checking, rather than the double-checking, of governmental vouchers. In the past, huge truckloads of vouchers would be driven into Washington from such places, as let us say, the Rock Island Arsenal. These had already been checked once at Rock Island but they had to be checked all over again, one by one, at the General Accounting Office.

Almost at the very time that the Commission was making its recommendation, the General Accounting Office was building a large new building here in Washington. The recommendation on spot-checking was meanwhile accepted and the parade of trucks was brought to a halt. As a result, there was plenty of room in the Government Accounting Building when the second Hoover Commission came to town in 1953 and there, if you please, was where the Commission was comfortably housed. Thus, you might say, the first Commission literally made room for the second.

To return to current results we see, as I say, much that is encouraging. The citizens committee recently estimated that approximately 22 percent of the second commission's recommendations have so far been adopted with savings reckoned at $470 million a year. But here's the rub: 18 percent of these gains were made by executive action and only 4 percent by legislation. By contrast with the 1949 record for a comparable period, this is deeply dismaying. For, 10 months after the first commission completed its report in 1949, Congress had enacted 5 major public laws, a number of lesser ones, and 6 Presidential reorganization plans.

Now to be fair we must recognize certain important differences. This is not only a bigger report than the first, it is much tougher, so to speak. It deals with functions, not departments, and it cuts into policy lines. Its full adoption may well be the work of years. Yet, to assure real success in 1957, we need a 1956 record of congressional action as a precedent. And the great majority of the recommendations, 80 to 85 percent in fact, are not controversial. Surely we can deal with a substantial portion of them now, even in a so-called Presidential year.

I, for one, do not believe that this Congress is by and large hostile to, or unwilling to act upon, the Hoover report. Quite to the contrary my friends on Capitol Hill tell me that they are much impressed with the report as a whole even though they may, as individuals, differ with certain provisions. But when I ask them why Hoover report legislation isn't moving faster they tell me in effect that they just simply aren't being asked enough.

Congress, traditionally, responds to requests for action from two main sources, the executive branch and the public. The enactment of bipartisan legislation, such as the Hoover Commission's recommendations, depends on teamwork. There must be teamwork between the leaders of both parties and between the administration and the Con-

gress, any administration and any Congress. Evidence of such teamwork thereupon stimulates interest and support on the part of citizens of both parties.

At this point, let me repeat what I have so often said before: By its very nature, the Hoover report is not, cannot be, a matter of partisan politics. Every single Member of Congress voted for the Commission's creation. The Commission itself was scrupulous in its avoidance of political considerations. As I said when we completed the report in June 1955:

"At no time did politics enter into the deliberations of the Commission. Where we differed, they were honest differences of opinion, and Mr. Hoover recognized the right of each member to give free expression to his views."

Neither party can be for or against something which both created. This is attested by the large number of leading citizens of both parties throughout the country who are actively working today for public understanding of the report. Truly, this is one issue on which the two parties can either cooperate and share the credit or fail to act and share the blame.

It is solely as a citizen who happens to have served on a bipartisan commission, therefore, that I feel bound to point out one current gap in the pattern of teamwork so greatly needed to assure full consideration and action on the Hoover Commission's recommendations. In 1949 frequent Presidential messages were sent to Congress requesting the enactment of Presidential reorganization plans and other pieces of specific legislation on such major issues as military unification, General Services, and State Department reorganization. To date no Presidential requests have been directly addressed to the Congress for action on specific legislation based on the report of the second Hoover Commission. This is said with full appreciation of the fact that the Commission is mentioned favorably in the 1957 budget message and again in the state of the Union report. But my friends in Congress of both parties can still say with justification that they haven't been directly asked.

Withal there has been some congressional activity on the Hoover report and hearings have been held on some important measures. There is still time, I believe, for Congress to move substantially on measures based on the Commission's reports on budget and accounting, personnel and civil service, paperwork management, business enterprises of the Government, and surplus property. Considerable progress has been made on a bill to create a National Library of Medicine and thus provide safe housing for thousands of priceless books now stored in inadequate buildings where they may be damaged by fire or rain. Where expenditures were needed, the Commission did not hesitate to recommend them.

Both budgeting and accounting and personnel procedure, while they may seem dull subjects, are absolutely vital to the efficient and economical operation of any human organization, including government. Frankly, I differed with my fellow Commissioners on some of the specific remedies but not for a moment did I question the importance of the problems or the need for thorough and vigorous congressional consideration of them.

We simply must plug the leaks in our fiscal system and strengthen congressional control of expenditures. And what can be more vital to the Nation's progress, and indeed its very safety, than the wise use of the minds, hearts, and hands of the 2,300,000 people in civilian service and the 3 million who wear the uniforms of our armed services? Manpower is increasingly a critical national resource. Let us not be deceived by the crocodile smiles of Moscow's emissaries to London. They mean to go right on driving for world domination and they have one important edge—manpower.

This is just one way of stating the big message of the Hoover Report in its meaning to the citizen and the message is simply this: We have been deceiving ourselves; we have grown extravagant in our use of our resources, both human and material; we have become dangerously indifferent to the conduct of the affairs of our free Government.

Spelled out in a score of ways, that is the message. We believe we have a national debt of $274 billion. The Commission shows us that indirect obligations in the form of loans, guaranties, and insurance activities, plus the retirement program, have brought the Nation's total indebtedness to something much more like $700 billion. We budget annually, then lose control of expenditures. So we find that, as of June 30, 1955, the executive departments had $52 billion on their hands, appropriated but not spent, over which Congress had no further power of review. We seek to maintain a dynamic system of private enterprise, then let Government competition undermine it in one area after another.

The Hoover report confronts us with a challenge which we can ignore only at peril to our progress, our freedom, and our very lives. Thomas Jefferson said long ago: "The nation which expects to be ignorant and free expects what never was and never will be." In the spirit of the scrap drive and the blood bank, let us redouble our efforts at self-education. Truly the text from which we wage our "war on waste" is today's real "battle cry of freedom."

Jim Farley and Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, immediately following the insertion of Mr. Farley's address in the Appendix of the RECORD, I should like to have printed an editorial entitled "Jim Farley and Waste," published in the New York Herald Tribune of May 3, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JIM FARLEY AND WASTE

When James A. Farley became Postmaster General some 23 years ago, the total cost of running the Government was only a little more than $4.5 billion.

When Jim Farley, as a member of the Hoover Commission, helped make the survey which led to the Commission's notable reports last year, he found among other things that the cost of the Government's paperwork alone was nearly this much.

Mr. Farley made a speech about it the other day to the United States Chamber of Commerce.

"I was—I still am—appalled," Mr. Farley said.

For every dollar the Government spent when he took over the Post Office Department, Mr. Farley said, it now is spending $15.

"Quite frankly," he added, "I had not realized that I, like so many of us, had accepted without much question the mushroom growth of modern government."

The Hoover Commission has recommended changes which would save an estimated $5 billion—more than the whole Government used to cost. Mostly this $5 billion now is just being wasted. It is unnecessary spending. But the money comes out of the pockets of taxpayers, who otherwise could use it for their own purposes.

Some of the Hoover suggestions have been put into effect—but not many. Some need action by Congress; others the President can manage by ordering them.

After all, delay accomplishes nothing. But it costs the taxpayers money. They have a right to squawk. And it would be a good idea if they did.

Government by Crisis a Thing of the Past

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Government by Crisis Thing of Past," written by George Minot, and published in the Boston Sunday Herald of April 22, 1956. I think it is worthy of the attention of the Senate as well as the general public.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT BY CRISIS THING OF PAST—FEAR-PEDDLERS PLAY RED TUNE

(By George Minot)

It would be a relief to wake up some morning and find there wasn't some new country in a mess and expected the United States to rescue it. Better still would be to read that somebody, somewhere, had said a good word about us. Instead, day after day, come blasts from the Indians, the Israelis, the Arabs, the British, the French, the Italians, the farmers—all crying that we haven't shelled out generously enough.

The more we do, the more unpopular we become. From July, 1945, through the fiscal year 1956 this country will have spent $55.6 billion on various forms of foreign aid. Of this, $4.7 billion will be disbursed this year. Of the total amount $35.8 billion went as grants, not repayable to the United States. The rest is to be returned in theory only.

WE SHOULD CHEER REDS

If we were trying to buy allies by all this spending, it should be obvious that we have failed. Nehru, for instance, and despite all the hundreds of millions India has received, delights in ridiculing and criticizing this country and praising Russia and its aims. The Israelis blast us for one thing, the Arabs for another. So do the Greeks and Turks.

We have poured millions on end into financing communistic and socialistic regimes, building up a monster that may destroy us in the end. Now that Russia is getting into the act of offering economic aid in some of those places, we ought to cheer instead of acting afraid. Let the Reds try to buy up good will.

The Chicago Daily News put is pretty well the other day:

"There is something craven in the spectacle of a rich and powerful nation which thinks it must scatter candy around the world lest it find itself alone and friendless. The facts seem to be that our largess brought no friends, and earned us more resentment than good will. But we still fear to change the formula."

Today we act as if we wanted everybody to love us. That's impossible. If we are going to be strong and independent, live up

to our great heritage and not waver in our steadfastness—then we are bound to make enemies.

PART OF OUR POLICY

We have got to stop following the old line mapped out by the Truman-Acheson crowd. That was based on the fact that if we sent money enough Europe wouldn't succumb to communism and would do something to help itself. Today we find this matter of contributing a few billions every year has become a part of our foreign policy.

Now there are internationalists who want us to go further and engage in a spending contest with the Russians, lest they lure away some of those countries we have been helping. Look at them. France and Italy are riddled with communism. The Germans are flirting with Moscow. In Greece, the Popular Front opposition is overcoming government candidates supported by us.

IF YOU LOOK YOU FIND

The United Kingdom which has received almost $7 billion from us has practically given up the ship in the Middle East and wants us to help restore the old order. Yet, when we criticize their actions in Cyprus, or their trade with Red China, then they are bitterly resentful.

In this country there are still hang-overs from the New Deal monstrosity who are world government zealots at heart and who want to see how much we can give away in order that everybody eventually will arrive at the same level. "Nowadays," says John S. Knight, one of the great editors of these times, "we don't wait for aid requests. Our Secretary of State goes gadding all over the globe to see if we have missed anyone who has communism or socialism for sale. He looks for trouble and usually finds it."

The funny part about the whole business is that we land up with the dirty end of the stick. Within the last few weeks the French Premier, the Italian President, the Icelandic Parliament, the Egyptian Premier, and the Israeli, British, and Dutch Governments all have lodged complaints against us. All of them openly resent the fact that we enjoy peace and prosperity over here while they have neither.

That's what the Soviets have been yelling about for years. It's amazing how many in this country fall for the same state of mind. Egged on by a group of columnists and commentators who worshipped at the feet of Roosevelt and Truman, the internationalists in both parties openly sneer at the optimism Eisenhower and Dulles express.

They are not satisfied unless we have a war scare every few weeks and a new crisis every day. They resent expressions of confidence that the free world is doing all right. They want to insist on emergencies, the necessity for military action and the fact the Russians are outstripping us in almost everything.

THIS IS NOT SENSIBLE

It hardly seems sensible to preach that everything the Russians do is brilliant and subtle while everything we do is confused, stumbling, and too late. Yet that is what the kiss-me-mother-I'm-dying boys would have you believe. They seem to prefer the government by crisis that Roosevelt and Truman operated for years. Those were the days when the administration was complacent and easygoing while Communists were boring inside many key agencies, but always was alert when it came to calling out the troops.

Our latest appeals come from Europe. There the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is on the rocks. France has pulled out her best troops. It's obvious Germany is in no hurry to contribute any. The development of atomic weapons and guided missiles has rendered useless many of the bases on which we have spent billions.

There's a lot to be done. It's unthinkable anything should break the Anglo-American alliance. Yet hysteria never will solve any problem. The New Dealers proved that. So far at least, the record of Eisenhower and Dulles can't be improved upon. It's the height of silliness to listen to the fear peddlers every time the Reds dream up a new scheme to plague us.

America's Siberia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I have here an editorial written by the Rev. Dr. Robert Shuler, editor of the Methodist Challenge, of May 1956 issue of that publication, which I have been requested to insert in the RECORD in an effort to bring before the people further facts regarding the so-called mental health bill. I commend it to your attention and thoughtful consideration:

AMERICA'S SIBERIA

Russia's Siberia is infamous in that it is the forcible retreat of political and social misfits and undesirables, not only of Russia itself but of the whole world. Americans have been imprisoned there. It is a land of living death. Any one who gets in the way of the men in power in the Kremlin is banished to Siberia.

In They Wrote to Us, the editor's attention has been called to a well planned bill now before the Senate, having already passed the House, which provides for a domain of a million acres to be set aside in Alaska, supposedly for the mentally ill of that far North. There are fewer than 500 mentally ill people in Alaska, now being cared for under contract by the State of Oregon.

This would appear to be a most worthy enterprise. But an examination of the bill jolts a studious reader. For instance, it provided that any State, desiring to send mentally ill people to this million acre retreat may do so by meeting certain conditions, not difficult of fulfillment. Contemplate this provision of the bill:

"The Governor (of Alaska) is hereby further authorized to enter into a reciprocal agreement with any State providing for the care and treatment of mentally ill residents of Alaska by such State, and for the care and treatment of mentally ill residents of such State by Alaska, each on a reimbursable basis."

Surely the medical fraternity in the United States and our leaders in Washington have not sensed the fearful potentialities of this bill if it should be signed into law by the President. Frankly and practically, it means that objectionable persons could be railroaded into perpetual exile in the icy North, far from loved ones and friends, there to spend their remaining days hopelessly and helplessly. It is unthinkable, and yet Russia is doing that very thing, as are other nations.

The monstrous political implications of this provision of the bill are so un-American and inhuman that we certainly would not accuse the President or any President of intentionally building such a deadfall for our citizens. But that alone is not the only deadly feature of this provision. Perfectly sane people might be thus disposed of. Take Governor Lee of Utah or Senator McCARTHY. The railroading of such objectionable public men, who are objectionable to the status quo, would be easy. Gerald L. K. Smith would have been landed there long ago. I could name scores.

In fact, I shudder at what might have happened to me if a million acres of ice in Alaska should have been set aside for the mentally ill. I recall that several years ago three judges tried me for contempt of court. Those were days when millions of dollars were at the disposal of men who were determined to get rid of me. Of the three judges presiding at that trial, the judge of the psychopathic ward, who handled the crazy people, was one who sat and considered my fate. This judge was a splendid man, but it was freely stated by the reporters from the newspapers that he was there to observe me and decide whether or not I was sane.

Suppose an icy waste had been prepared for the poor victims and my fate had rested with a judge whose political affiliations or love for money should have been a constraining influence, what chance would I have had?

There are thousands of people who would go to almost any limits to rid themselves of obnoxious kinfolks, people who stand between them and fortunes, enemies that they are not quite prepared to have murdered, but certainly would go to extreme lengths to get out of the way. Think of what a handy million acres of ice that Alaska preserve might become! Russia may have caught up with us on secret weapons but we would certainly overtake her on our American Siberia, if President Eisenhower should sign such a law.

There is another question to seriously face. Just how many of us might with sufficient excuse if not with justification be sent to Alaska's ice domain, if such a law as is proposed were passed and signed? The psychiatrists tell us that at least 50 percent of American adults have at some time been "mentally ill." Anger, excitement, disaster, indeed quite a number of common happenings may produce such mental abnormality. There are enough miscarriages of actual justice together with the tragedy of false diagnoses or mistaken professional opinions to stir many of us to great pity and sometimes indignation, when the victim is only a few miles away. What chance at rectifying an injustice when they are thousands of miles from help, with a sea of ice intervening?

We do not want a police state prison system operating near the North Pole. There may be no salt mines there, but the effectiveness of such a St. Helena could be atrocious.

Our lawmakers claim that certain doctors recommended this new law for the care of the "mentally ill." Who were these doctors? Those who have watched certain doctors, alienists and psychiatrists in courts where large sums of money are often used to influence the processes of justice are justifiably alarmed.

Needs of the Mentally Retarded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last Friday night it was my privilege to deliver an address before the Phi Mu Sigma Fraternity Chapter of the Wisconsin State College, of Milwaukee. Phi Mu Sigma is an organization dedicated to increasing the number of specialists looking after the educational and other needs of America's mentally retarded.

At the dinner, awards for distinguished service for the mentally retarded

were given to President Eisenhower; Roy Rogers and his wife, Dale Evans; Dr. Samuel A. Kirk, of the University of Illinois; and Dr. Salvatore Di Michael, executive director of the National Association for Retarded Children.

I was personally pleased to receive an honorary life membership in the fraternity.

Special citations were also given to the Manitowoc County Association of Retarded Children and the Milwaukee County Association, as well as the Wisconsin Council for Mentally Retarded Children.

I was happy to circulate some advance texts of my remarks of that evening and received many kind comments in response. One such came from the superintendent of Southern Wisconsin Colony and Training School at Union Grove in my State, Mr. John M. Garstecki. I am pleased to quote this distinguished leader:

The address has been read with considerable interest, and it is encouraging to note that the feeling prevalent among those who work daily with the retarded child is also a feeling exhibited throughout the address. It is our sincere hope that public awakening to the needs of the mentally retarded will continue to show the benefits that have been accrued during recent years. We look forward also to the day when mental retardation will join with all the other plagues of mankind eradicated by medical science through research and discovery into causes and prevention.

We deeply appreciate receiving the address and the many fine comments regarding the group of children who require such a full measure of consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that the prepared text of my address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I can think of few more memorable or more satisfying evenings than those like this, in which I have been able to join with folks, such as you, who are dedicating yourselves to serve your fellow man.

I cannot too strongly endorse the work of this fraternity, designed as it is, to advance the professional service of teaching and otherwise aiding the mentally retarded.

The awards you are conferring tonight are amply merited for deeds well done. May they serve as an inspiration for still more deeds—in Washington, in Madison, in Milwaukee, and everywhere else—for the retarded.

THE CHILDREN WHO NEVER GROW UP

Yes, if I may say, may they particularly spur our aid to the little ones, to the children who never grow up, to those whose brains unfortunately cannot mature to full adult levels of intelligence.

As you know, they may be among your children or grandchildren or mine, for retardation is democratic—in striking almost anywhere, any family. Retarded children lack brainpower, but they are God's children, with Godlike qualities—with human feelings and human wants and frailties. They need love and affection and understanding and help.

I will not attempt to spell out in detail the problems of the mentally retarded, with which, after all, you, more than I, are very familiar.

WE ALL HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY

I would, however, like to make a few observations on this field:

The first is that every single group in our society has a responsibility in this area. We in the Congress certainly do. (I shall amplify this point a bit later on.) You of the college and university world, the professional field do, and every community, every parent, every PTA, has an obligation, as well.

If we are genuinely to be adequate to our over-all goal, we need not a partial effort, but a speeded-up comprehensive program. I refer to a program which will advance greatly the frontiers of our understanding, diagnosis, prevention and treatment of the mentally retarded.

TWOFOLD GOAL: MORE RESEARCH, SERVICES

Basically, this means: (1) expanded research, (2) expanded services.

Research for example, into the 70 known causes of retardation, ranging from damage to the nervous system before, during and after birth, to genetic factors, infections, toxic agents, endocrine disorders, etc.

And, yes, services—all types of modern services; community diagnostic—treatment clinics; home counsellors; nursery classes; special education (that's where you fine folks come in, or course) with improved vocational training and social training; sheltered workshops; community centers with recreational, social and counselling facilities for the adolescent and adult retarded, etc.

All this takes time. It takes energy. It takes money. But somehow we must and will find all three ingredients.

THE ALTERNATE OF NEGLECT

The alternative is dismal. The alternative, neglect of the problem means hardship. It means suffering. It means utterly wasted years. It means a lapse in fulfilling our moral obligations.

It means an avoidable national loss of potential human resources. America, despite all its wealth, all its prosperity, all its 165 million strong—can ill afford such staggering loss as we are now experiencing because of our neglect of the deficient, the feebleminded.

All God's children are precious. Each is entitled to his or her birthright. In the eyes of God, no child, no adult is unworthy of fulfillment.

TEAMWORK BY FEDERAL AGENCIES

It seems surprising, but it is a fact that the overall challenge of mental retardation, so far as Uncle Sam is concerned, has only just begun to be acutely felt in all its proportions.

Fortunately, the national administration is now well alert to the wide dimensions of the challenge. The administration has surveyed the field and it is now going into action—in cooperation with the Congress on a well-coordinated basis.

That means, of course, the full teamwork of the invaluable United States Children's Bureau. It means the United States Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, the Bureau of Public Assistance of the Social Security Administration, the National Institutes of Health, the United States Public Health Service, itself, the United States Employment Service, the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, the United States Office of Education, and still other sources as well, working for a common goal.

The problem is not limited to our own land of course, as the World Health Organization has noted in its important statements in this field.

UNDERSTANDING NEEDS OF GIFTED CHILDREN, DISTURBED CHILDREN

In other words, we are really just about opening up a whole new frontier of effectively looking after these folks in our society.

I might point out, incidentally, as a side note, that there are other frontiers which we are fortunately opening up.

America has been "discovering" slow learners. It has been "discovering" the unique problems at the other end of the scale—problems of those exceptional children who are especially gifted in intelligence. We have found that this type of youngster, too, needs our understanding and our attention, so as to realize his or her full potentialities.

We are also "discovering," so to speak, the problems of emotionally disturbed children of all levels of I. Q. We are realizing—a great many Americans almost for the first time—that the emotional problems of later years have their deep roots in childhood. We are realizing that emotional disturbance in a preschool child, has best be caught in its inception, lest it grow more and more serious as time goes on.

One cannot, of course, draw artificial dividing lines in a human being. A mentally retarded child may, as you know, simultaneously be emotionally disturbed.

A brilliant, gifted child may be emotionally disturbed; and so may the so-called average child.

A child may be physically well, but emotionally ill; or emotionally well, but physically ill.

There are, as you well know, all sorts of combinations of circumstances in the miraculous human creature. So what we need to do is to look at the whole child and at all children—not in theory, but in life, and concentrate our attention on those who need our services most.

Certainly, the retarded child needs our services, and that is why I am so thankful to be in your personal presence this evening.

HUGE MAGNITUDE OF PROBLEM

An indication of the magnitude of the problem we face is borne out by this statistic: Three percent of our population is affected by mental retardation.

Other illness or inadequacy problems have tended to be more publicized, but mental retardation affects infinitely more than the more publicized problems.

Thus, out of every 100,000 children, it is estimated that 15 are likely to be blind, 7 are cerebral palsied; 7.2 are polio victims; 200 are rheumatic heart patients—and here is the figure for all of us to remember—there is a staggering 3,000 who are mentally retarded.

Three-hundred of the children born every day are estimated will be in the mentally retarded category.

In round figures, total numbers are, as you know, estimated at 4.8 million, of whom 1½ million are children; 153,000 adults and youngsters are, confined in institutions for the mentally retarded and epileptic.

Around $150 million a year is spent on public and private institutions of this nature.

The length of stay in institutions is longer than for any category of handicapped person.

Inevitably, the cry rightly goes up. "We need specialists to handle this problem—specialists and more specialists! We need 55,000 more teachers for the mentally retarded—the very need you are seeking to fulfill."

And we need more of almost every category of specialist—social workers, physical and occupational therapists, psychologists, psychiatrists, and myriads of other personnel. This is what Senator LISTER HILL'S fine bill is all about—as I shall shortly mention.

CONGRESS SHOULD ACT ON SENATOR HILL'S BILL

Naturally, all eyes turn to the United States Congress for its realization of and action on this problem.

Toward that end, I personally have been in contact with the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, with the House Education and Labor Committee, with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and with Senate and House Appropriations Committees.

I was pleased indeed when the House Appropriations Committee took the first indispensable step and increased the budget requests of $11.9 million for maternal and child-health services in the very modest Children's Bureau Budget to $16 million.

The committee made a formal recommendation, as you know, that half of the increase provided, be spent on the problem of mentally retarded children. The committee likewise approved an increase over the $750,000 appropriated last year for medical research on the mentally retarded.

Then, as you no doubt know, last month, Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama,, on behalf of himself and other Senators, introduced a landmark bill for the purpose of providing funds for research and training in the field of mentally retardation. I am happy now to serve as a cosponsor of this vital legislation.

S. 3020, now pending before the Senate Labor Committee must be enacted into law. It will help provide funds to aid in training more undergraduates and graduates, more teachers, more supervisors, researchers, and administrators to provide ever improved programs—the type of programs which, as I have indicated, are so sorely needed by so many.

Time must not be lost.

We have a great deal of time to make up. For too long, the mentally retarded have lived in the shadows—neglected, often rejected, unwanted. The Federal Government has a clear responsibility to fulfill its role in conjunction with the States and the cities to improve overall services to the mentally retarded.

CONTINUE CHILDREN'S BENEFITS BEYOND 18; LIBERALIZE TAX TREATMENT

Meanwhile, in Washington, as you know, we are approaching the final stages of enacting liberalizing changes in the social security laws.

One of those necessary changes (to which I personally have given my complete support), provides for the payment of social-security benefits to widows caring for those children beyond the age of 18, who are still unable to look after themselves.

After all, if a widow has been tending a retarded youngster, let us say, all by herself, from the age of 11 on, that child still needs help, even after he passes the chronological age of 18. The widow's social-security benefit—to look after him—should not, therefore, cease simply because he has passed that chronological age. His mental age would still prevent him from looking after himself.

In accordance with this same principle of fairness and easing financial burdens, I have long been in favor of taking a new look at our tax laws. On the Senate floor, I have urged liberalizing of tax deductions for the care of mentally retarded dependents.

Tax liberalization results in a loss of some revenue. But surely with Uncle Sam taking in $65 billion, he can spare taxpayers a few more dollars to look after their own loved ones who are retarded.

LOOKING AFTER PARENTS

But legislation—and even legislatively provided funds or tax deductions will not—in and of themselves—provide all the answers.

I have spoken of frontiers. There is a whole new frontier in looking after the needs of parents of the mentally retarded.

I am pleased that organizations and individuals who have concerned themselves with the children's problems now are giving their serious attention to the needs of parents, as well. I refer to such splendid groups as the National Association for Retarded Children. Thanks to NARC and others, more and more people realize the deep emotional prolems which are caused to a parent of a mentally deficient child.

The parent may utterly lose confidence, may seek to live in isolation from the community, may have a feeling of guilt, even though there is no traceable reason for the child's problem (no accident, for example which caused injury to the brain due to any parent's fault.)

In order to meet the needs of the child, therefore, more and more of you experts are trying to meet the need of parents, as well—for improved understanding. After all, a parent can come to feel just as much if not far more pride in what a retarded child can with aid, accomplish, as in the achievement of a so-called average child.

WISCONSIN'S TRAILBLAZING

In the overall field, I am particularly proud at the outstanding progress which has been made in our State—by yourselves and others.

I was delighted, for example, to note the council work adjustment center here in Milwaukee. It never would have come about, had it not been for the wonderful cooperation, the magnificent teamwork of women's organizations, the local office of the State board of vocational education, the division of vocational rehabilitation, Southern Colony and Training School, Milwaukee Vocational School, the Wisconsin State Employment Service, and the Community Welfare Council.

A complete range of services is being provided. There is medical service, educational service, family case work, psychological service, etc.

This is a heartwarming sign of better days ahead. And there are other welcome signs of progress in many other parts of our State. I have been pleased to hear from many professional workers, parents, and others in all parts of the Badger State reporting progress.

CONCLUSION

We all have a role to play in continually looking after this problem. I know you will not pass the buck to Uncle Sam. Let the Federal Government do its role; let it not shirk its responsibility. (I pledge my own efforts to see that Uncle Sam doesn't let you down.) But let every American continue to do as you are doing—to do whatever he or she can—for these youngsters, and for adults as well, in need. Certainly, you, in this audience tonight, who are dedicating yourselves, should serve as an inspiration to all of us.

Those of us who are not privileged to serve in this cause 365 days a year, so to speak, can at least do our modest share to be worthy of the fine tradition which you are establishing for us.

Good luck. To the award winners, my heartfelt congratulations—and best wishes to you all.

East-West Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Public Affairs Luncheon Club of Dallas, Tex., on April 24, 1956. It relates to the East-West trade in strategic goods.

I quote one paragraph from the resolution:

Resolved by the Public Affairs Luncheon Club, assembled this 24th day of April 1956, That so long as the United States Army divisions are needed in Europe to bolster Western defenses, trade in strategic materials of war by our allies with the Soviet bloc is indefensible.

I ask that the full text of the resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Congress passed the Battle Act to prevent our allies from sending strategic materials to the Soviet bloc; and

Whereas the Coordinating Committee Conference on East-West Trade held in Paris, July 1954, changed, amended, and modified our Battle Act list, thereby perverting the intent of Congress; and henceforth permitted our allies to sell and ship the most strategic materials and equipment such as copper wire, aluminum, machine tools, electric and electronic equipment, etc., to Communist countries. Said action being taken with the advice and consent of Mr. Harold Stassen, United States Government conference representative; and

Whereas the shipment of scrap metal to Japan which became the scandal of the 1930's and 1940's, can well be considered a minor blunder when compared with this—the building up, accelerating, and strengthening of the Communist war potential: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Public Affairs Luncheon Club, assembled this 24th day of April 1956, That so long as United States Army divisions are needed in Europe to bolster Western defenses, trade in strategic materials of war by our allies with the Soviet bloc is indefensible; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress be urged to withhold all monetary aid to these countries so long as such trade continues; that a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this club; and that copies be sent to Senators LYNDON JOHNSON and PRICE DANIEL, and to Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, chairman of the Senate Investigations Subcommittee.

The Proof of the Pudding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks, I include an editorial appearing in the Missouri Farmer, the most widely read farm paper in Missouri, and written by Fred V. Heinkel, one of the most authoritative writers on farm topics in America today.

Mr. Heinkel says:

President Eisenhower, in his message to the American people following his veto of the comprehensive farm bill, indicated that farm prices will be supported at 82½ percent of parity. The bill provided for 90 percent supports and many other features designed to restore farm income. The question that might be asked by farm people is, "At what percentage point of parity would they have us believe that farm price supports cease to be good and become bad?" Would this point be at 83, 87, or 89 percent of parity?

According to farmers with whom I have talked and visited, farmers generally believe that price supoprts at 90 percent are good and, in fact, they are inclined to believe they are entitled to 100 percent of parity.

On March 15 the parity index was 82 percent, and farmers were not doing well. How much help can farmers expect from this

promise of a meager 82½ percent of parity on wheat, corn, cotton, rice, and peanuts? And why the delay in even this scant help?

What President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson have never realized is that flexible supports are a cause of—not a cure for our farm problem.

Testifying before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry back in 1954, on March 24, I warned that flexible supports would be a failure. On that occasion I told the committee:

"A flexible price-support program is based on two premises: First, that production will be controlled voluntarily by farmers when the prices farmers receive for their products are lower, and second, that lower farm prices will mean increased consumption of the products of agriculture. We contend that both of these premises are false. If these premises are not true, then the whole case for a flexible price-support program falls."

Now let us review what has happened.

Flexible supports have failed to control production. President Eisenhower should know this. If he thinks flexible supports can control production why is he asking for a soil bank? He is asking for a soil bank because he knows good and well that cutting prices is not the answer to cutting production.

The administration cut price supports on oats 22 percent since 1952. Production has gone up 25 percent. Soybean supports were cut 20 percent during the same period, and production has gone up 30 percent. Barley supports were cut 23 percent. Production went up 73 percent. Rye supports were cut 17 percent. Production climbed 81 percent. Supports on grain sorghums were cut 25 percent. Production has gone up an amazing 180 percent.

While part of these increases in production resulted from decreased acreage allotments on the basic crops, it is quite clear that where the return per bushel dropped, the farmer produced more in order to recoup his lost income.

The last time the parity index was 100 was late in 1952. Since then the parity index has dropped as low as 80, and on March 15 of this year, it stood at 82. While farmers have been taking a cut in income of up to 20 percent, prices to consumers have dropped only 3 percent. It is obvious that this lowering of farm prices has not brought on a rush by consumers to purchase farm products.

The Missouri Farmers Association was not alone in advising against flexible supports. Other organizations, and many distinguished economists, foretold the disaster that could be expected to accompany the flexible supports foolishness.

Back in September 1952 Rainer Schickele, head of the Department of Agricultural Economics at North Dakota State College, warned, "Lower support prices are not likely to bring about a reduction in output any more than low free-market prices did in the early 1930's."

President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson said the farm bill as passed by Congress was a bad bill. In our opinion it was a good bill. As evidence, it had the bipartisan support of the overwhelming majority of Senators and Congressmen in the principal Farm Belt States. This included the support of both of our Missouri Senators and all of our Missouri Congressmen but two.

The bill was supported by the entire Kansas delegation—with the exception of one Congressman—all of whom are Republicans, including the dean of the delegation, CLIFFORD R. HOPE, who is himself an authority on farm legislation.

Just prior to President Eisenhower's veto of the farm bill, a news article in the April 11 issue of the New York Times stated, in part as follows:

"Food industry interests opened a campaign yesterday to mobilize consumer sentiment against certain features of the farm bill.

"They acted as a result of a telephone conversation between John Q. Adams, chairman of the board of directors of the Coordinating Committee of the Food Industries, and Secretary Benson. The committee was set up by 52 trade associations in various levels of food production, processing and distribution."

It is common knowledge that as farm prices drop the spread widens between what the farmer gets and what the consumer pays. Farm legislation should be for the benefit of farmers and thus promote the well-being of all our people—not just food processors alone.

The agricultural economy is sick—very sick. And what it has is contagious—as contagious as any plague that ever threatened the people of this world. Our national economy cannot remain healthy, with part of our economy booming and prosperous, while at the same time the farmers and businessmen in our small towns are suffering from economic distress.

What is needed most of all to improve the economic position of farmers, aside from some good rains, is more income.

This could be accomplished if Congress would pass a law providing for the use of production payments such as are in use on wool and sugar.

Since production payments do work satisfactorily, and the President and Congress have both approved their use for wool and sugar, why not give them a trial run on hogs, cattle, poultry and eggs, which do not have the benefit of mandatory price supports.

And if we have surpluses that need moving, these could be channeled into a better diet and better living for the 6 million people who have incomes of less than $55 per month, by use of a food-stamp plan.

Demonstrations at National Conventions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received from Mrs. Clara Shirpser, the Democratic national committeewoman for California, a most interesting resolution which she proposes to place before the 1956 Democratic National Convention. I quote it:

To the Rules Committee, 1956 Democratic National Convention:

Resolved, That—

(a) All demonstrations at the 1956 Democratic National Convention be restricted to a period of 15 minutes;

(b) That all parades in the aisles be eliminated;

(c) That an invitation be extended to each Democratic candidate whose name is placed in nomination for President of the United States who receives at least 15 percent of the votes on the first ballot, to address the 1956 Democratic Convention for a period of 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this suggestion has a great many advantages and few, if any, disadvantages. Perhaps it will be considered by both political parties and certainly it would be a fine thing for all those who will undoubtedly be watching the proceedings of the conventions on television to have the opportunity to directly see and judge the candidates who remain in the running under the proposed formula. There seems to me to be one of the improvements in the convention system which has long needed to be made more democratic. I hope it will be widely discussed and supported by the delegates to the 1956 Democratic National Convention.

Competition for Manpower Between the National Guard and Organized Reserves in the State of Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL C. JONES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I believe I am expressing the views of a majority of the Members of Congress when I say that I am interested in maintaining a strong Reserve defense force. I am equally certain that most of us are conscious of the competition existing in certain areas, between the Organized Reserves and the National Guard which, at least partially, defeats the purposes for which the Reserve Forces Act was enacted.

Prefacing my remarks, it should not be necessary to remind my colleagues that the intent of Congress as enunciated in the Reserve Forces Act of 1952, remains unchanged in the Reserve Forces Act of 1955, in that:

The Congress further declares in accordance with our traditional military policy as expressed in the National Defense Act of 1916 as amended that it is essential that the strength and organization of the National Guard and the Air National Guard as an integral part of the first line of defense of this Nation be at all times maintained and assured.

In some areas the strength and effectiveness of the National Guard is being jeopardized by policies adopted by the Organized Reserves, which are proving detrimental to the overall Reserve defense program.

In a recent address before a conference of the Adjutants General Association at Augusta, Ga., Maj. Gen. A. D. Sheppard, the adjutant general of Missouri, presented the problem, cited instances of how the policy was operating contrary to the implied intent of Congress, and made suggestions as to how the program could be improved, as is being presently done in Missouri.

Those who are anxious for a strong Reserve, particularly those in whose districts are located traditionally strong and active National Guard units, will, I am certain, be interested in reading the timely remarks of General Sheppard, which are presented herewith:

COMPETITION FOR MANPOWER BETWEEN THE NATIONAL GUARD AND ORGANIZED RESERVES IN THE STATE OF MISSOURI

The Reserve Forces Act of 1955 amends the Armed Forces Act of 1952 (Public Law 476, 83d Cong.) and the Universal Military Training and Service Act (Public Law, 82d Cong.).

Contrary to some current publicity, the Reserve Forces Act of 1955 in no way changes the status of the National Guard, which is

set up in section 201 (b) of the Armed Forces Act of 1952 and remains unchanged, as follows:

"The Congress further declares in accordance with our traditional military policy as expressed in the National Defense Act of 1916 as amended that it is essential that the strength and organization of the National Guard and the Air National Guard as an integral part of the first-line defenses of this Nation be at all times maintained and assured. It is the intent of the Congress that whenever Congress shall determine that units and organizations are needed for the national security in excess of those of the Regular components of the ground forces and the air forces, the National Guard of the United States and the Air National Guard of the United States or such part thereof as may be necessary together with such units of the other Reserve components as are necessary for a balanced force, shall be ordered into the active military service of the United States and continue therein so long as such necessity exists."

The position of the National Guard in the defense structure of the Nation is thus clearly established by the Congress of the United States. Nevertheless, Organized Reserve units have been and are being located in communities where National Guard units have already been established, causing competition for manpower to the detriment of both components, particularly the National Guard.

This is done in violation of the implied intent of Congress, and in violation of the Army regulations governing the location of Organized Reserve units as contained in paragraph 30, Army Regulations 140–305, Department of the Army, December 5, 1952, which reads, in part, as follows:

"30. Location of units: (a) The location of the home station * * * will be designated by the area commands and will be based on the following considerations:

"(1) Home stations for units should be selected so as to insure, so far as possible, continued maintenance of personnel strength in the units. Competition for personnel between services or Reserve components of the Army should be avoided where possible, and projected plans for home stations should be coordinated at the appropriate levels prior to implementation.

"(2) Density of male population of military age, coupled with proper geographic distribution to and within military areas.

"(3) Availability of personnel for units requiring technically trained personnel."

National Guard units have generally been located and fitted into their communities for many years and are identified with them by strong ties, and hundreds of thousands of dollars have been invested by the State in real estate and armory facilities. We cannot abandon this property; therefore we must fight for it. It is the superimposing of Reserve units upon these communities, in violation of the act of Congress and the Army regulations cited above, to which I object.

In the following paragraphs I will give illustrations of the disregard of the above instructions in placing Reserve units to the detriment of both the National Guard and Reserves. It will also be pointed out that the manner of determining the density of male population, called the manpower potential by the Department of the Army, is not a satisfactory guide in placing units.

The data relating to the locations and strengths of Organized Reserve units used below was furnished by the Chief, Missouri Military District, for this purpose. A report similar to that below has been furnished each Senator and Representative of Missouri in Congress, outlining the situation as it pertains to his or her particular district.

The Missouri National Guard is organized into 112 Army and 22 Air units, the total strengths of which, as of February 29, 1956, were as follows:

	Officers	Warrant officers	Enlisted men	Aggregate
Army	590	112	7,127	7,829
Air	220	8	1,669	1,897
Total	810	120	8,796	9,726

Army units are located in 48 counties and the city of St. Louis. Eleven of them are detachments, the 101 remaining being company-size units with an aggregate enlisted strength of 6,839, an average of 68 men per company.

The Air National Guard units are located at Lambert Field, St. Louis, and Rosecrans Field, St. Joseph. Its units are at 74 percent strength, which is good. It is not as concerned with the placement of Organized Reserve units as is the Army Guard.

The Army Guard is more successful with units located in the smaller towns of the States than is St. Louis and Kansas City. For instance, the 140th Infantry Regiment in southeast Missouri averages 94 officers and men per company in comparison to an average of 62 officers and men of the 138th Infantry Regiment located in St. Louis. The only company of the 138th outside St. Louis is the Heavy Mortar Company, at St. Clair, which has as a strength of 110.

It has been my policy not to object to the location of Organized Reserve units in either St. Louis or Kansas City on the theory that there should be sufficient manpower in them to support any reasonable number of units. A look at the results obtained in these cities will show that this supposition may be false.

St. Louis

	Authorized strength			Actual strength		
	Officers	Warrant officers	Enlisted men	Officers	Warrant officers	Enlisted men
National Guard:						
Army	230	28	4,230	138	16	1,662
Air	215	18	1,392	163	5	1,114
Organized Reserve	839	90	6,037	664	62	1,442

The Air National Guard units are at 80 percent of their authorized enlisted strength. The Army National Guard units are at 39 percent of their authorized enlisted strength. Two National Guard antiaircraft artillery battalions, earmarked for the on-site defense of St. Louis, are seriously under strength. It is hoped that when moved to their tactical duty stations this can be corrected. The Organized Reserve units are at 24 percent of authorized enlisted strength. Thirty-four units of the 102d Infantry Reserve Division have 891 enlisted men, or an average of 26 men per company, approximately cadre strength.

Kansas City

	Authorized strength			Actual strength		
	Officers	Warrant officers	Enlisted men	Officers	Warrant officers	Enlisted men
National Guard	123	11	1,019	82	14	714
Organized Reserve	458	46	3,021	423	34	611

The National Guard units are 70 percent of authorized enlisted strength, the Reserve units at 20 percent of authorized enlisted strength. Fifteen units of the 102d Infantry Reserve Division have 288 enlisted men, or an average of 19 men per company, less than cadre strength.

In cities other than St. Louis and Kansas City, the placing of Organized Reserve units where there is already an established National Guard unit is strongly opposed. The average size town cannot support both the National Guard and Organized Reserve without detriment to both.

St. Joseph is an illustration. The following summary is given:

	Authorized strength			Actual strength		
	Officers	Warrant officers	Enlisted men	Officers	Warrant officers	Enlisted men
National Guard:						
Army	10	3	177	6	3	61
Air	70	5	680	57	4	555
Organized Reserve:						
Army	29	2	347	25	4	183
Marine and naval	41	0	586	23	0	334

Again the Air National Guard is in good shape, but the Army National Guard and Reserves are well under their authorized enlistments. The only reasonable conclusion is that more organizations have been allotted St. Joseph than can be reasonably supported. The State of Missouri has an investment of $135,000 in an armory in St. Joseph for the 35th Signal Company, a key organization of the 35th Division. It is highly desirable that this company strength be increased. The Army Reserve units were located in St. Joseph over my objection, the military district calculating that the area had a manpower potential of 10,068. This has not proved out.

Recently a group of Reserve officers put pressure on the Chief, Missouri Military District, to locate an additional Reserve unit in Springfield to which I objected. The situation in Springfield was as follows, given in detail to show the extent to which Reserve units fill their vacancies:

Springfield

	Authorized strength			Actual strength		
	Officers	Warrant officers	Enlisted men	Officers	Warrant officers	Enlisted men
National Guard:						
35th Infantry Division Band	0	1	42	0	1	34
Company A, 735th Ordnance Battalion	4	1	146	1	1	73
Headquarters and Headquarters Detachment, 229th Medical Battalion	6	1	22	6	1	22
106th Ordnance Company (heavy maintenance)	5	2	145	5	2	69
Total	15	5	355	12	5	198
Organized Reserve:						
Company I, 409th Infantry	6	0	165	0	0	0
Company K, 409th Infantry	6	0	165	6	0	27
Headquarters and Headquarters Battery, 283d Field Artillery Battalion	14	1	91	11	1	29
Service Battery, 283d Field Artillery Battalion	3	2	54	3	2	19
Battery A, 283d Field Artillery Battalion	4	0	85	4	0	25
Battery B, 283d Field Artillery Battalion	4	0	85	2	0	22
Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 320th Engineer Group	16	1	51	13	0	38
Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 750th Transportation Battalion	11	2	95	8	2	22
Company A, 750th Transportation Battalion	6	0	180	5	0	27
Company B, 750th Transportation Battalion	6	0	102	2	0	25
Company C, 750th Transportation Battalion	7	0	228	2	0	26
Headquarters, 3d EBTG ERTC	8	0	10	8	0	12
Headquarters, 2d Battalion, 3d EBTG ERTC	2	0	4	2	0	3
Headquarters, 3d Battalion, 3d EBTG ERTC	2	0	4	2	0	2
Total	95	6	1,319	68	5	277

There were vacancies in the existing Reserve units for 27 officers, 1 warrant officer, and 1,042 enlisted men, in addition to vacancies in the National Guard for 3 officers and 157 enlisted men, the total vacancies being for 30 officers, 1 warrant officer, and 1,199 enlisted men. The unit proposed to be added to Springfield was a company of an Engineer Basic Training Group creating vacancies for 6 officers and 26 enlisted men. The officers were of no consequence, but the enlisted men were. They included the following high-ranking grades:

Master sergeants (E–7)	5
Sergeants first class (E–6)	6
Sergeants (E–5)	8
Corporals (E–4)	4
Privates (E–3)	3
Total	26

As shown in the Reserve tabulation, there appears to be little effort made by the Reserves to fill up their units after the plush jobs and high enlisted ratings are filled. To add 19 more of the three top grades to the large number already in existence in Springfield is in direct conflict with the interests of the National Guard which must also have a proper percentage of the lowest ranks in order to have balanced combat units. The Guard units in Springfield are at only 56 percent of authorized enlisted strength as a result of this unhealthy situation.

Columbia and Jefferson City also offer pertinent examples. Columbia has the following status:

	Authorized strength			Actual strength		
	Officers	Warrant officers	Enlisted men	Officers	Warrant officers	Enlisted men
National Guard	12	0	247	10	1	126
Organized Reserve	60	4	412	59	2	161

A breakdown of the enlisted grades authorized in the above is as follows:

	Master sergeant, E–7	Sergeant, 1st class, E–6	Sergeant, E–5	Corporal, E–4	Private, 1st class, E–3	Private, E–2	Total
National Guard:							
Battery B, 128th Field Artillery Battalion	3	7	14	24	45	4	97
Company A, 175th Military Police Battalion	1	5	13	71	59	1	150
Total	4	12	27	95	104	5	247
Organized Reserve:							
Company A, 327th Engineer Battalion	4	11	23	36	27	9	110
Headquarters and Headquarters Battery, 816th Field Artillery Battalion	5	6	18	26	32	4	91
Battery B, 816th Field Artillery Battalion	3	7	8	29	59	----------	106
Service Battery, 816th Field Artillery Battalion	1	5	7	23	11	7	54
Medical Detachment, 816th Field Artillery Battalion	----------	1	2	6	----------	----------	9
Headquarters leaders course, ERTC	1	11	21	9	----------	----------	42
Total	14	41	79	129	129	20	412

By comparing these authorizations with the actual enlistments, it is found that the National Guard has only 126 enlisted men out of an authorization of 247, or 51 percent. This is below normal. Forty-three of the 247 enlisted spaces authorized are allotted to the 3 highest grades (E–7, E–6, and E–5). This leaves 83 men or 66 percent of the 126 enlistments who must be serving in the 3 lowest grades, that of corporal (E–4), private, first class (E–3), and private (E–2).

The Organized Reserves have only 159 enlisted men out of an authorization of 412, or 38.5 percent. This is above normal for Reserve units. One hundred and thirty-four of the 412 authorized enlisted spaces are allotted to the 3 highest grades. This leaves only 25 men or 16 percent of the 159 actual enlistments who must be serving in the 3 lowest grades. As an example, Battery B, 816th Field Artillery Battalion, with an authorized enlisted strength of 106 actually has only 22, and is authorized 18 of the top 3 grades.

Just the opposite exists in Jefferson City, where the National Guard has the advantage in a high proportion of top grades and where many members are employed in the office of the USP&FO and in the State maintenance shops. Their enlisted strength is 94 percent of that authorized. The Reserve units are at only 27 percent enlisted strength, this being possible only because the 420th Military Government Company is above its authorized enlisted strength. The combat unit, Battery A, 816th Field Artillery Battalion, is at 8 percent of enlisted strength, having 9 men against an authorized 106.

The situation in Columbia and Jefferson City are ample proof that the so-called manpower potential as calculated by the Department of the Army to justify the establishment of additional units in a given locality is not sound. In neither of the above compared localities are the units of both the National Guard and the Organized Reserve at a satisfactory or effective strength. In letter, Missouri Military District, May 13, 1955, subject: Relocation of Army Reserve Unit, in which approval or objection of the adjutant general of Missouri to locating Battery A, 816th Field Artillery Battalion in Jefferson City was requested, a total manpower potential of 1,937 men for Jefferson City was computed. I objected to putting the battery in Jefferson City, and further stated that I did not agree to such a manpower potential for recruitment. Nevertheless, the battery was established, and where military district stated at that time there were 4 officers and 10 enlisted men pledged to join the unit, it is significant to note that now, 11 months later, the unit has a strength of only 5 officers and 9 enlisted men.

An Organized Reserve unit may be maintained with cadre strength, or 25 percent or enlisted strength when cadre strength is not shown in T/O&E or T/D (table I, Army Regulations 140–305). The National Guard cannot function on a similar basis. It must have an effective strength to carry out its State and Federal missions. The more Organized Reserve units placed in any locality and allowed to subsist by filling only high-ranking vacancies, the more difficult it is for the National Guard to obtain an effective strength in that locality, as illustrated above. Men who should be privates in the National Guard are attracted to positions in the Organized Reserve they are not qualified to hold, in order that Reserve maintenance strength may be reached and the Reserve officers be paid for drill attendance. Even though the enlisted man may not be promoted at once to the rank commensurate with the vacancy occupied, the fact that the vacancy exists and the knowledge that promotion will surely be much faster than in the National Guard is sufficient without being told that Reserves are not subject to

being called out by the governor for riot or other State emergency. What would have happened if the Missouri National Guard had not answered the call promptly for the penitentiary riot in Jefferson City in 1954?

Many of our National Guard units have been an integral part of their communities for 50 or 60 years, and we do not wish them to be crowded and made ineffective by Reserve units with high-ranking vacancies but of secondary importance in the overall defense structure. It is highly desirable that they be up to strength and able to function efficiently and effectively. To allocate too many units to any area defeats the purpose of both the National Guard and the Reserve. To lose a unit in a town having a State-owned armory would result in a serious economic loss. On the other hand, the Reserve has few armories, and a change of location is of little consequence. In fact, they appear to be in continual movement, whereas National Guard units are a fixed part of the community.

One last point. In the Guard-Reserve edition of Army Times, volume XVI, No. 24, January 21, 1956, the following résumé of the recent and future planned strengths of the Army Guard in comparison to the Army Reserve was set forth:

	Officers	Enlisted men	Total
Army National Guard:			
Nov. 30, 1955	34,375	336,508	[1]370,883
June 30, 1956	36,790	370,310	407,100
June 30, 1957	36,850	371,250	408,100
Army Reserve:			
Nov. 30, 1955	67,368	102,878	169,946
June 30, 1956	73,900	141,155	215,055
June 30, 1957	84,600	214,000	298,600

[1] From National Guard Bureau Report.

This shows that the National Guard is planned on a combat basis with a proportion of officers to enlisted men of approximately 1 to 10. The Army Reserve is planned to be raised from a proportion of officers to enlisted men of approximately 1 to 1.5 in November 1955 to 1 to 2.5 in June 1957. And this is under the new Reserve Forces Act of 1955 plan. This cannot be considered an effective force, but only high ranking, cadre strength.

We are most anxious for a strong Reserve. We have many towns in Missouri requesting military organizations. We have suggested the organization of Reserve units in these towns and have pledged the Missouri National Guard to help the Reserve recruit their units and help them in every way possible.

With all of these communities available for the Organized Reserve, we think it anything but commonsense for the Reserve to pass up this virgin territory and insist on coming into towns where the Guard has good units and deliberately forcing us to fight them to protect our investments and old units.

We can never have a strong Guard and Reserve under this method, and there are plenty of communities available for both Reserve components where there would be no competition whatever, and would assure both components being strong, which is what we all desire.

Oust the Top Soviet U. N. Spy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Now Oust That Top Soviet U. N. Spy," and published in the Philadelphia Inquirer on Friday, April 27, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOW OUST THAT TOP SOVIET U. N. SPY

United States ousting of 2 minor Soviet officials at the United Nations, for their part in kidnaping 5 Russian seamen who sought asylum in America, is a welcome move. But it is only a beginning.

Last Sunday the Inquirer urged expulsion of Arkady Sobolev, Soviet delegate to the United Nations, if evidence implicated him in that kidnaping. The evidence apparently does, for the note of our State Department to the U. S. S. R. states:

"Ambassador Arkady Sobolev himself insisted on intervening, despite the presence of an accredited representative from the Soviet Embassy in Washington."

It was to Sobolev's Park Avenue headquarters that the five seamen were lured the day before the kidnaping. Sobolev was charged with engineering the spiriting away of the five in testimony given Senate investigators last week by a sixth Soviet seaman, who managed to escape the Red gang.

Three highly important issues are involved:

First is whether those who seek sanctuary in this country from the Soviet terrorism can, and will, be protected from the operations of Soviet agents.

Second, scarcely less important, is whether the new-look leadership shall be permitted to continue the Stalinist system of using Soviet diplomatic agencies here as espionage centers.

Third, and vital, too, is whether the Soviet Union shall continue to abuse the hospitality of both the United Nations and the United States, as it has in this case. The United States note properly protests that the ousted Red officials abused the privilege of residence.

Soviet officials now blandly insist that the five seamen left of their own free will. They say Sobolev was present at the airport only as a friend and compatriot to bid them goodby. (If so, why were the seamen surrounded by an estimated 20 Red agents?) Word also comes from Moscow telling how happy the five are to be back.

Such flimsy yarns do not jibe with the fact that one of the abducted men was about to be married, in New York, to a pretty 24-year-old Russian girl who came here 5 years ago. Nor do those explanations stand up before testimony of the landlady of two of the men—testimony which tells how, on the night of April 5, the seamen were visited by two men who looked like Soviet agents and how, next day, the Soviet seamen were gone, leaving behind them a wrecked room, a blood-stained shirt, and other signs of a struggle.

Soviet lying in matters of this kind is historic.

Red thugs tried to say Mrs. Oksana Kosenkina wanted to go back to Russia—until the truth came out after her famous leap to freedom from a third floor window of the Russian consulate in New York.

In Australia, Red thugs tried to say that Mrs. Vladimir Petrov was eager to go back to Russia, although they had to push her, apparently in a drugged state, into a plane bound for Russia. She lost her shoes in the process. The truth came out when, later, that plane landed at Darwin and Mrs. Petrov succeeded in escaping when Australian police took away the guns of the Soviet thugs.

These are only two of the most notorious kidnapings which the Reds have engineered on the soil of other nations.

One other aspect of this latest outrage remains unexplained by the State Department. That is why United States authorities who were on hand at the airport made no effort to halt the kidnaping and apparently no real attempt to determine what actually was going on. An Immigration Service inspector is quoted as fearing that if he detained the seamen it might provoke an international fracas.

Well, his failure to do so has provoked just such a fracas. And the issues involved—especially the right of sanctuary for those who seek asylum here—call for firm and effective measures.

Send Sobolev home.

For a Better World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks including an address For a Better World, made on February 12, 1956, before the New York Province of the Newman Clubs at New York City by Hon. Robert Murphy, Deputy Under Secretary of State.

The address is as follows:

The New York Province of the Newman Clubs has greatly honored me by inviting me to take part in your convention dedicated to the theme For a Better World. This is a goal to which we all aspire. We can find guidance in our search for a better world in the life of Cardinal Newman himself and from the principles to which your clubs are devoted. Newman's Apologia and the Idea of a University remain classics today and were fitting inspiration for Timothy Harrington when he called his fellow students together to found a Newman Club at the University of Pennsylvania.

John Henry Newman is a symbol of those who struggled for and attained happiness based on faith and spiritual understanding. His life was devoted to service of our faith and to increasing human understanding. We of the 20th century would do well to approach the difficult problems of our world in the spirit of calm and detached contemplation Cardinal Newman achieved.

Although he lived in what now seems a simple age, Newman's life-span covered a period of great ferment and change. In the 19th century, industrialization was gathering momentum in Western Europe and the United States. New economic and social theories were challenging and testing the existing order. The concerns of the times were concerns about material things. It was said that men should have more goods; that goods should be more equitably distributed; that society should be reorganized to provide the maximum material benefits, to provide the greatest good for the greatest number.

Most of the economic and social ideas of the 19th century were idealistically conceived. They were intended to solve the problems created by new political institutions, by growing populations, and by the industrial revolution. The 20th century, however, has seen some of these schemes and theories used in practical life, and used in such a way as to destroy whatever may have been good and to bring to dominance the error and evil they contain.

The materialist creed of Karl Marx, with its negation of faith and spirituality, its worship of the state alone, has become the enforced gospel of nearly a billion people, almost half the population of the world. Its economic dogmas have been adapted by Lenin, Stalin, and their successors to politi-

cal and imperialist programs designed to promote Soviet communism into every part of the world. While this is an ideological purpose of vast significance, it serves handily as a cover, and an effective cover, for Russian expansionism.

These doctrines have strong appeal for many peoples who are striving to improve their conditions and their standards of living. These peoples are often reluctant to believe that Communist intentions are predatory, that economic gain under the Marxist system will inevitably be at the expense of political liberty and spiritual freedom.

INTERNATIONAL COMMUNISM WELL ARMED

International communism is well armed for the struggle to which it is so fully committed. Its military forces include the two largest land armies in the world. It possesses substantial airpower and a growing stock of nuclear weapons. A huge percentage of the budgets and the resources of the U. S. S. R., of Red China, and of course the Eastern European satellites is devoted to national defense, armament, and internal security. Vast quantities of manpower are allocated to these purposes. As you know, these millions of men and women have little or no choice when it comes to military service or, in fact, any labor for the state. Political and economic control is maintained by power in the hands of a few at the top and by tight organization in the ranks.

By denying the needs of its own and subject peoples, the Soviet Union can set aside goods and equipment for export where it foresees political gain. Thus it can focus its resources on a given world area if it sees in that region a possibility of political gain. In the same way it can export technical assistance. And to the war of ideas it devotes vast resources which it can mobilize without much regard for public opinion. It has mastered the art of making the worse appear the better cause, of making the undemocratic sound democratic, of cloaking aggressive aims with peaceful words.

To meet this threat, a threat to the security of nations in addition to our own, the United States ocoperates in an immense effort by the free nations to build their common strength. As a great power we have special responsibilities whether we welcome them or not. We have formed a system of alliances not only for mutual defense but for economic and social cooperation. We are doing much to drive home the story of what the free nations stand for and what international communism means. Our strength is great, and we intend to remain strong. We intend to remain economically strong, militarily strong, and in particular morally strong. We must maintain faith and confidence in the values for which the United States stands. As Secretary Dulles has said:

"The Government of the United States has, I like to believe, a rather unique tradition in this respect. Our Nation was founded on an experiment in human liberty. Our institutions reflect the belief of our founders that all men were endowed by their creator with inalienable rights and had duties prescribed by moral law. They believe that human institutions ought primarily to help men develop their God-given possibilities, and that our Nation, by its conduct and example, could help men everywhere to find the way to a better and more abundant life."

We share the tradition of a respect for human liberty and moral law with a number of the nations with which we are now in close alltiance. We must build upon these traditions and concepts if we are to build a better world. We must teach the new nations emerging in Asia and Africa the importance of these ideals. We must show them they can and must be adapted to their own conditions. We must teach by example that a society without moral value and without principles is doomed to fail, no matter how hard it struggles to build up economic and military power.

BATTLE FOR MEN'S MINDS

Not long ago Archbishop O'Boyle, of Washington, delivered a thoughtful and stimulating sermon on the conflict we face. "When mercy is considered treason," he said, "when truth is classed as a lie, and good is called evil, we are indeed faced with a monstrous perversion of human nature, a denial of every ideal that civilized man has cherished."

The archbishop accurately noted that communism appeals not only to the disgruntled, the bitter, and the neurotic members of a community, but also to men of sensitive nature and high ideals. He declared that there is danger we may look at the world struggle too narrowly, that we may concentrate too much on the economic, military, and political menace of communism, and so neglect the battle for men's minds. "The American people should speak out," he concluded, "through their proper organizations and representatives, on the real nature of communism. We should realize that the struggle is total, and not merely a matter for Government action only."

This is where I think you members of the national Newman Clubs have a major role to play. Why not mobilize your talents and your great abilities to spread an affirmative doctrine of the things for which your Government stands?

The United States is today making a tremendous effort to win the battle for men's minds. Our Government has a worldwide information program which is doing an effective job in many areas. Many nongovernmental groups are also doing excellent work in meeting foreign peoples and explaining our way of life. Missionaries, labor leaders, businessmen, and thousands of other Americans are a vital part of our effort here and abroad to increase international understanding.

In the battle for men's minds, we should make a particular effort to reach those men whose thoughts and ideas will be decisive in guiding the policies of the new nations in Asia and Africa. As Archbishop O'Boyle said: "In wide areas of the world, men of learning are the real leaders of their nations. This is particularly true in the nations newly freed from colonial status. It is in these very areas that the power of communism is growing with sobering speed."

Sometimes Americans have trouble understanding the attitude of the people of new new nations. Usually these young nations want to solve their own problems their own way. They distrust foreign help and advice. They have an intense desire for rapid economic development. They know little about the Soviet Union, but they are told its achievements are vast. Efforts are being made to persuade them that the pattern of Soviet industrial development has more meaning for them than the freer, more humane process by which the institutions of the United States and Western Europe were developed.

The tours of Bulganin and Khrushchev to India, Burma, and Afghanistan are efforts by the Soviet Union in the new direction. We would be foolish to deny that the new Soviet policy presents us with dangers and a challenge. Where formerly the Iron Curtain implacably shut off the the Soviet Union and its satellites from the rest of the world, we now see traveling salesmen, with broad smiles and back-lapping, offering tempting bargains to the uncommitted nations. There are offers of economic and military aid, proposals for treaties of friendship, requests to set up diplomatic posts, and plans for interchange of experts in many fields.

It is ironic and typical, however, that at the same moment they speak of peace and friendship in India, Burma, and Afghanistan, the Soviets and their Communist allies continue their nuclear tests, their threats of war to take Taiwan, and their warnings of reprisal upon Iran and Pakistan for participation in the Western defense system. In a sense, the Soviets have put a new wrinkle in their traditional policy of zigzag. They have found it possible to zig and zag at the same time. They continue to show plainly, for anyone who cares to look, that aggression is still their end, to be pursued by peaceful talk or warlike threats, or both—whatever suits the need of the moment.

By their own deeds they warn us again that we cannot relax our vigilance, we cannot lower our guard.

I have spoken to you already of the means—military, political, and economic—by which we must keep ourselves and our allies prepared to defend themselves. But the willingness and the ability to undertake our defense, while essential for avoiding war, is neither the only means nor the best means, in the long run, for preserving peace. We believe in a forward strategy not only in the military sense but in the political and social sense. As President Eisenhower put it earlier this year:

"The sum of our international effort should be this: the waging of peace, with as much resourcefulness, with as great a sense of dedication and urgency as we have ever mustered in defense of our country in time of war."

One of the highest tests, I think, of the greatness of a Nation is the test, in times like these, whether we can be strong enough to win a war, yet gentle enough to help the weak; resourceful enough to gain great wealth, but wise enough to use it well.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR MORAL LEADERSHIP

Moral leadership is a great asset in any struggle. It is especially important in the present world battle for the minds of men and women everywhere. The responsibility for moral leadership in our country certainly rests upon our Government, but not upon Government alone. It is also the direct responsibility of our churches and schools, of youth organizations such as the Boy Scouts and the 4–H Clubs, and especially of all these Newman Clubs of which we are justly proud. These agencies, civic and religious, must maintain the spiritual vigor and moral strength of the people who run our Government, who man our fighting forces, who carry on our dealings with other lands, who cast the votes that decide the course our Nation follows.

I am certain that your organization is doing a great deal, but you can do more. I have had close contact over the years with many young men and women who have been trained by our Catholic colleges and universities and shaped under the guidance of the Newman Clubs and other groups. Most of them measure up admirably to the challenges they face.

But none of us must forget that the evil forces that oppose are tireless in their self-criticism, in their manipulation of Government programs, educational institutions, and youth programs. Their brutal efficiency is high, and, in all realism, we can expect it to go higher.

The moral superiority that our values, our system, have over those of the Soviets can and should be decisive in this contest between us. But it is not inevitable. Our values must be applied. Our system must be made to work. We must match their tirelessness with our own, their efficiency with ours, if our moral superiority is to be decisive. As we seek to win the allegiance of the uncommitted nations to our standards and our values, we must do it by our deeds as much as by our words.

These nations will watch us, first, to see how we apply our values among our own

people. Our record in this respect is good, though certainly not perfect. The opening of the channels of opportunity, the emphasis on free choice and private initiative in the past few years, has brought prosperity for nearly all Americans. In addition, progress has been made through legislative and judicial efforts to bring about greater social justice among our people.

Not only are we being watched in applying our values to our own people, we are being watched in applying them to other peoples. Here, again, we do not need to apologize for our efforts. In the past 10 years a number of nations have won their freedom from colonial control. It has been our policy to respect this new freedom. By our economic strength and in many ways we have helped it to survive and to grow.

It has also been our policy to support the further attainment of freedom by subject peoples who desire it. In particular we support the liberation by peaceful means of the peoples of Eastern Europe, who have been unwillingly made subjects of the new colonialism of the Communists.

Another means by which we have given moral leadership is through our efforts to bring about disarmament. The whole world was thrilled by President Eisenhower's proposal of "atoms for peace" in 1953, and again by his proposal for aerial inspection to insure disarmament in 1955.

The final means by which the United States has rendered moral leadership in the world is the courage, the determination, the high principle, the good faith with which President Eisenhower, Secretary Dulles, and the leaders of our Government, with the full backing and support of the American people, have faced the perils and the opportunities of this age in which we live.

Your convention is dedicated to the theme For a Better World. In these remarks I have tried to outline for you, perhaps inadequately, some of the obstacles that lie in the road to a better world and, more important, some of the means by which we will surmount these obstacles. You who are on the threshold of your careers will play, I know, a major role in achieving our national objectives.

To all of you I wish Godspeed and good luck as you go forward with your own efforts to bring this better world into being.

World Vision—Mission to the Motherless

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, there can be no nobler act than to aid the unfortunate children and orphans, and World Vision, Inc., with its international headquarters in Portland, Oreg., has spearheaded much of this great work.

World Vision, an interdenominational religious organization, is supporting 6,500 children in 94 orphanages in South Korea, and last year contributed more than $700,000 for work in 10 countries.

World Vision has done a great job in helping mixed-blood war orphans in Korea, orphans fathered by American and other United Nations military personnel. These orphans are not accepted by the people of Korea; they are mistreated and many are abandoned and killed.

Mr. President, last year I had the honor to sponsor legislation in the Senate which allowed Mr. and Mrs. Harry Holt of Creswell, Oreg., to bring to the United States their eight adopted Korean war orphans, and I know of the fine job being done by Mr. Holt and World Vision in facilitating adoptions of these mixed-blood war orphans in our country. I have recently introduced legislation to continue the orphan provisions of the Refugee Relief Act which expire, unless extended, at the end of this year.

I have had an opportunity of working with Dr. Bob Pierce and Dr. Frank Phillips, World Vision president and executive secretary, respectively, and I know of the fine job they and their coworkers are doing. Portland is proud that World Vision has made its international headquarters in our city and of their fine work to help the unfortunate of the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a fine article by Mervin Shoemaker which tells of the oustanding work being done by World Vision which appeared in the Northwest rotogravure magazine of the Sunday Oregonian of April 29, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSION TO THE MOTHERLESS

(By Mervin Shoemaker)

There were few dry eyes in the happy crowd at Portland International Airport one day last October when 12 Korean children debarked from a big Pan American plane to enter on a new life.

Eight of these were the well-publicized children brought to this country by Harry Holt, of Creswell, who recently took another Korea trip to arrange more adoptions. For the remaining four, other foster parents were waiting at the airport.

They could not possibly have first touched the continental United States at a more appropriate place.

Adoption of all the children was arranged by World Vision, Inc., a relatively new and highly unusual missionary organization. Holt was accompanied on the Pan Am "stork ship" by Dr. Bob Pierce, president of World Vision. And the home office for this fast-growing, world-service organization—which has one particularly distinguishing feature—is in Portland.

The distinguishing feature is "personalizing" of foreign mission, which is something unusual, if not new, in alleviating the woes of the world, and World Vision is vividly demonstrating its merit.

A staff of 35 persons works in the organization's second floor quarters at 258 Southwest Alder Street. An important part of the staff's job is to encourage a personal relationship between contributor and benefactor. This may seem not to engender the purest kind of altruism, but it gets money, saves souls and feeds hungry youngsters.

World Vision is only a little more than 5 years old. But through this office last year went more than $700,000 for support of missionary work in ten countries. The year before the figure was more than $500,000. These totals do not come up to point 4 appropriations, but they do indicate a significant contribution to building good will for the United States in other countries.

"The purpose of World Vision," said Dr. Frank C. Phillips, executive secretary, "is to meet emergency needs in crisis areas of the world. We do this principally by working through native churches and existing missions in the various countries to make our funds do the most possible good. We play no favorites among denominations in giving financial aid to missions where we think the need is greatest."

Financing the care of Korean war orphans, and arranging for adoption of some of them, is World Vision's biggest job. The magnitude of the task was not appreciably diminished by departure of the dozen who came to this country with Holt and Dr. Pierce. The organization now is supporting more than 6,500 children in 94 orphanages over South Korea.

"There are many more who need care," said Dr. Phillips, "and we are expanding as rapidly as possible."

World Vision's care of orphans is financed by some 4,800 persons, mostly in the United States, who contribute $10 a month for each child. There are 125 orphan-sponsors in Portland. Seventeen of them are members of the World Vision headquarters staff.

Some support more than one orphan. Roy Rogers and Dale Evans (Mrs. Rogers), the ridin', shootin' couple who daily battle TV outlaws, have taken responsibility for 25 Korean orphans, and are planning legally to adopt one and take him into their home. The Holt family of Creswell is supporting 33 orphans in Korea in addition to the 8 they have adopted.

"Every State in the Union, the District of Columbia and Alaska are represented on World Vision's list of sponsors," said Dr. Phillips. "Money is collected elsewhere over the world, and we recently opened offices in London and Belfast, where contributions are accepted."

Approximately 800 of the Korean orphans pose a special problem. The others are ordinary Korean children who will be educated and generally prepared to live a normal life in their homeland. These 800, however, are the children of United Nations military personnel. Many have American fathers.

The Koreans do not accept the mixed-blood children. These unfortunates are mistreated under the best of circumstances, and sometimes are killed. It doesn't speak too well for the Koreans, but a lot of United States citizens are in no position to throw rocks. Mothers often hide these children as long as they can, but a great majority of them wind up at an orphanage.

"As far as most orphans are concerned," said Dr. Phillips. "We think they will be happier living useful lives in their home country. But we would like to find homes out of Korea for the 800."

It was from this group that the Holts took their eight children. The Roy Rogers child also will come from this group.

The $10 a month paid by a sponsor takes care of food, lodging, clothing and education of a child. Sponsors are asked to pledge support of a child (or more than one) for a period of a year.

Such a sponsor receives a picture of the child he is supporting, his name and the English meaning of the name, along with such history of the child as is available. Then he is encouraged to correspond with the child. Letters are translated—Korean to English and English to Korean—in World Vision's Seoul headquarters.

One of Portland's sponsors is Miss Dorothy Strivenga, 2017 SW. Broadway. The child assigned to her is Choung Choon Young, a girl born in 1949—the year before the Korean war began. Her parents died when she was tiny. A brother tried to care for her, but he had to give up. She is at the Song Jook orphanage in Seoul. Her name means "spring and song."

Another Portland sponsor is Roy Wolfe, director of publications and artist for World

Vision. Wolfe, who went to World Vision from the art department of the Oregonian, is 1 of the 17 staff members who are supporting 19 orphans and 1 returned prisoner of war studying to be a minister. Wolfe's orphan is Lee Uoo Kee, meaning "rainy season." This child, almost 10 years old, is at the Long Life Orphanage, Seoul.

TITLES TRANSFERRED TO CHURCHES

World Vision does not own, or direct the staff of, any of the orphanages to which it contributes funds. When it constructs a building or purchases equipment it transfers title to a church or mission organization. In its 5 years' existence it has spent a total of $309,912.94 in this manner.

Many civilians were killed in the Korean war, and care of orphans became a desperate necessity early in the conflict. Some of the orphanages were established by missionary organizations, some by Korean individuals, and some by United Nations military personnel touched by the spectacle of thousands of homeless children.

One Seoul woman took 10 children with her on the retreat toward Pusan, seaport of the small beachhead that marked the low ebb of United Nations fighting. When the government went back to Seoul she returned with the children and established an orphanage. This is the Faith-Hope baby home, with 62 children.

The Sun Rin Orphanage, operated by a Presbyterian mission at Pohang City, is one where American servicemen are well remembered. This is clear in the report of John Sohn, Seoul, overseas secretary for World Vision, on the application of the orphanage for funds from the Portland-headquartered organization.

"This orphanage was established by Chaplain Cleaves and Pastor Ok Ken Mock," wrote Sohn, "to take care of fatherless and motherless children in February 1952, and Kyung Dong Presbytery became a founder by the law. The orphanage was able to keep 7 children when it first opened, but now it has 103 children."

Many of the orphanages, said Dr. Phillips, were established by American military men, who contributed money, did construction work, scrounged supplies from their own bases, and then aided in management of homes for homeless children.

One of the orphanages—located at Songjong Ri, near Kwangju—was established by Gen. Sun Yup Paik, commander of the Republic of Korea 1st Army. It now has 240 children, but it was originally established to house the sons and daughters of Red guerrillas who were executed or imprisoned by a task force operating in the mountainous Chiee-San region of southwest Korea. Commander of the task force was General Paik.

Other Korean and American members of the task force contributed to initial financing of the orphanage. World Vision is supporting 188 of the 240 children.

WARTIME VISIT INSPIRED HELP

It was Dr. Pierce's compassion for orphans when he visited Korea during the first few months of the war, in 1950, that resulted ultimately in forming of World Vision, Inc. The president is an inspirational evangelist, and—in the lodge—an acknowledged master at getting money from a crowd.

He is a close friend and coworker of Billy Graham, and left the United States in January to accompany the famous evangelist for a series of meetings in India. Dr. Pierce is 42 years old.

World Vision's business manager is Dr. Phillips, 44, a Baptist minister and a bacteriology graduate of the University of Toronto. He holds an honorary doctor of laws degree from the Bible Institute of Los Angeles, and practiced veterinary medicine in Portland from 1938 to 1945.

The executive secretary is an old China hand. For several years in the early 1930s he lived in Shanghai, where he was employed by the Chinese Government to change the city's milk grade from B to A.

"I came to love the Chinese people," said Dr. Phillips, "and to understand the social and economic problems of the densely populated Orient."

Dr. Pierce was fired with zeal for helping Korean orphans when he returned to the United States in 1950. Contributions came quickly when he began to tell the story. He showed motion pictures that he had made, and this is still an important part of World Vision technique in collecting funds. But at that time Dr. Pierce did not know where to send the money. Then he remembered Dr. Phillips' China background, and sought his help.

"I sent that money to the proper places," said Dr. Phillips, "but pretty soon there was just more money than we could handle that way. So we incorporated."

While World Vision is nondenominational, it is thoroughly a religious organization. The Portland headquarters staff begins each day with a prayer service. Money is sought in the name of souls saved for Christ; as well as by appeals to sympathy for the physically deprived. World Vision is fundamentalist, evangelical—but it is as modern as television.

It is not unusual among missions in holding out a hand for a physical lift as it delivers its gospel message. Not many mission organizations, however, are so efficiently streamlined for flexible, effective action on short notice. Dr. Phillips needs only arrange a telephone conference to get approval of an important grant.

Other members of the board of directors, besides Dr. Pierce and Dr. Phillips, are: Paul Myers, Los Angeles, vice president; Cliff Barrows, Greenville, S. C.; Don DeVos, Grand Rapids, Mich.; Evon Hedley, Brantford, Ontario, Canada, and Dr. Jack Shuler, Arcadia, Calif. Myers is a Los Angeles radio evangelist, known as "First Mate Bob."

Caring for orphans is World Vision's biggest single project, but to list the other important jobs it does is difficult in limited space. In Korea alone the list is impressive.

Korean schools are on a tuition basis. Orphanage children go to school, but many thousands of children cannot pay the tuition. To meet part of this deficiency, 72,000 children are being taught in Presbyterian, Methodist and Holiness churches. They are divided into groups of 800, with five teachers to a group. World Vision is paying the teachers in the Presbyterian part of the project, and has expressed willingness to give similar aid to the other denominations.

"To us," said Dr. Phillips, "the education program represents the future of Korea. Those in the orphanages will be among the leaders. In the top 30 pupils, scholastically, in one school, 28 were from the orphanages."

The Presbyterians operate a 1,000-bed hospital at Taegu, Korea. World Vision built a 50-bed children's hospital as a wing to the main structure. All patients in this wing are nonpaying, and here World Vision furnishes doctors, nurses, and medicine.

World Vision established its first "amputee center" at Seoul, then another at Taejon, and soon will have them also at Taegu and Pusan. There are many amputees in Korea.

This project was started and is directed by Dr. Reuben A. Torrey, 70-year-old retired Presbyterian minister, who himself has an artificial arm.

Amputees here are given the materials, taught to make their own prosthetic devices, and then are trained to use them. Last November the 500th amputee mastered use of an artificial limb, and was read to start on a new job.

Seventy-five widows and 100 children of war-killed Korean ministers are supported by World Vision in Seoul, Taegu, Pusan, and Taejon.

"When the Communists came into South Korea," said Dr. Phillips, "they went after the church leaders first. An estimated 600 pastors were killed."

World Vision operates a seminary for 80 returned prisoners of war who are studying to be ministers.

It finances students and other nationals carrying on missionary work in mountain communities.

A home for unwed mothers in Seoul, which is sponsored by the Salvation Army, is operated—financed completely—by World Vision.

World Vision is active in Formosa. At Taipeh it finances two homes for ex-beggar boys who were taken off the streets. They are being educated and taught trades. This project is under direction of Mrs. Lillian Dickson, wife of a Presbyterian missionary. World Vision is planning to build a new church here this year.

At Taipeh, World Vision also operates a home for the children of lepers, who are taken from their mothers immediately after birth to prevent their contracting the disease. Twice a year the children are shown to their parents at the leper colony.

Madame Chiang Kai-shek, wife of the generalissimo, is conducting a project that will see a couple of her prayer groups outfitting a mobile medical unit which will be accompanied by a doctor, two nurses, and a minister. World Vision is furnishing the medicine.

Twenty-four native workers are supported in a village evangelism program in Formosa.

World Vision is stepping up its program in India, where Dr. Pierce and Billy Graham were working together in January.

The organization operates 3 milk and medical clinics in Calcutta. It supports 30 Indian nationals in village evangelism work, and is planning to begin an orphanage program in Calcutta.

World Vision built a large dormitory for students in the Union Biblical seminary of India at Yeotmal, and has sent money to build a second one.

World Vision's work in Africa dramatizes its interest in purely spiritual activity. Many thousands of the Mau Mau people have been herded into compounds because of the difficulty of identifying the terrorists among them. World Vision gave the Pocket Testament league $2,000 to supply gospels of John in the Gujarati and Urdu languages for use of people in the compounds.

Another $1,000 went for Bible tracts for the Vietnam territory, and here World Vision also supplied seven motorcycles and a jeep to aid in their distribution.

Smaller missionary projects are carried on in Greece, Ecuador, New Guinea, the Philippine Islands, and Portugal.

A great many people find it hard to understand how mountain climbers and missionaries get that way, and no mission project is above suspicion in the minds of the more materialistic. This is perfectly well understood by Dr. Philips, top businessman of the organization.

A public accounting firm regularly examines the books of World Vision. Administrative costs in the 1953–54 fiscal year, said Dr. Phillips, were slightly over 10 percent, but in the year ending last September, they had dropped to about 8 percent. Incidentally, according to the executive secretary, a sponsor's $10-a-month goes entirely to the orphan. Administrative expense is paid from other funds.

A monthly financial statement is given each of the 29 members of the board of trustees. The trustees are mostly churchmen over the Nation. Billy Graham is chairman of the board.

But there are laymen, also, in the group. And some of these could be expected to be particularly hardboiled in demanding assurance that a missionary organization was

on the level before allowing use of their names in solicitation of funds.

Gov. Arthur B. Langlie, of Washington, is one of these. Another is United States Senator FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas. Also Roy Rogers and Dale Evans. Then, too, there Lt. Gen. William K. Harrison, commander in chief of the Caribbean Command, Canal Zone, who was chief of the U. N. armistice delegation in Korea at the signing of the truce.

"I believe in World Vision, Inc., because it is dedicated to bringing lost sheep to His fold," wrote General Harrison in a letter used as introduction to one of the organization's brochures.

One of World Vision's most valuable endorsements comes from a neighbor—Dr. Paul S. Wright, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Portland and moderator of the Presbyterian Church in the United States.

"I wish to express my personal gratitude to World Vision, Inc., and to Dr. Pierce for the extremely valued help which you have given," wrote Dr. Wright to Dr. Phillips shortly after the Presbyterian Church leader returned from a visit to Korea last December. "I saw signs of your generosity everywhere, and I had the privilege on occasion of riding in a station wagon purchased by your funds.'

Dr. Wright's expression is a good illustration of the principle implicit in World Vision's "personalized" missionary work—the common, courteous "thank you" for a favor.

A man may be ever so selfless in his giving—of money, of time, of service to the community. Still he appreciates a pat on the head. It is an incentive to continue. And the pat of a child who needs him means something special.

It is not far-fetched to consider that World Vision's program may also construe important missionary work in this country. How else would so many new people learn that foreign mission giving can be gratifying and exciting?

Important if True

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, our old friend Josh Billings made a remark on one occasion about "knowing so much that ain't so."

Whenever I hear one of these fellows who live at the farmer's expense—who demand a high price for everything they sell the farmer and then refuse to pay him a fair price for his labor and investment—talk about farm legislation I am reminded of Uncle Josh's oft-quoted remark. They know so much that ain't so.

This week's issue of the Missouri Farmer tabulates some of the often reiterated fallacies with which these economic parasites attempt to bolster up their imposition on the farmer in taking away from him the products of his labor and investment without paying him as fair a price as they demand for their own labor and capital.

The list is as follows:

FALSEHOODS ABOUT FARM LEGISLATION

Falsehood No. 1: High price supports are a carryover from the war.

The truth: During the war farm prices were controlled. Farmers operated under price ceilings and were not concerned with supports.

Falsehood No. 2: Government-owned surpluses are depressing the market.

The truth: There are no Government-owned surpluses of beef or pork, yet the depressed market for cattle and hogs has flattened a lot of farm pocketbooks.

Falsehood No. 3: That flexible supports, by reducing prices, will cause farmers to voluntarily control production.

The truth: When prices are cut farmers produce more in an effort to maintain income by selling more at reduced prices.

Falsehood No. 4: Lower farm prices will increase consumption.

The truth: In the last 3 years farm prices have dropped approximately 20 percent and consumer prices have dropped only about 3 percent. This has not created a rush to buy farm-produced commodities.

Falsehood No. 5: Once we get rid of our high price supports and return to the free market our surpluses will disappear and farmers will have no worries.

The truth: During the 1920's and early thirties farmers did not have price supports yet low market prices were blamed on surpluses.

Falsehood No. 6: High support prices built up our huge surpluses.

The truth: Technical know-how has been a far greater factor in building up surpluses than has price supports. Flexible supports or a threat of flexible supports has encouraged farmers to get rid of crops ahead of further price decline. Another factor, when prices are reduced farmers produce more in an effort to maintain income at reduced prices.

Falsehood No. 7: All agricultural commodities held by Government are surplus.

The truth: The Government carries the current inventory for many industries. For example, in the old days the mills waited at the gins to buy cotton at bargain prices from planters that were hard up and in need of cash. Today these planters place their cotton under loan and put their cotton in storage. The mills buy the cotton as they need it and the Government carries the inventory. Creameries place butter and cheese under loan during flush milk seasons and redeem butter and cheese during months when the cows are not giving as much milk. The Government also carries inventory on rubber, metals, and other raw materials.

The Arab Campaign Against American Jews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the American Jewish Congress at its recent national biennial convention adopted a most important report. It is entitled "The Arab Campaign Against American Jews." I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to this report as follows:

THE ARAB CAMPAIGN AGAINST AMERICAN JEWS—A STATEMENT OF THE FACTS AND A CONSIDERATION OF AMERICA'S MORAL AND DIPLOMATIC RESPONSIBILITY

FOREWORD

One of the least known byproducts of current Arab-Israel hostility is the widespread campaign by Arab League countries against Jews in the United States. Internal anti-Jewish campaigns indulged in by Arab States at the expense of their own subjects may be a matter for their sovereign discretion and even then may contravene commitments undertaken pursuant to the United Nations Charter. But efforts to package and export anti-Semitism to this country, especially when that anti-Jewish sentiment is directed at American citizens, becomes a matter demanding immediate remedial action by our own Government.

The principal forms of discrimination currently employed by the Arab States against American Jews may be classified into three categories: (1) Arab denial of entry or transit visas to American Jews; (2) Arab boycott of American Jewish businesses; (3) the establishment and subvention of large-scale Arab propaganda centers to disseminate anti-Semitic literature in the United States. Each of these is discussed in detail at a later point in this paper.

Some of these anti-Jewish discriminatory practices have been continued over a period of years without occasioning more than gentle rebuke from any agency of the United States. Whatever expressions of disapproval have recently been made by our State Department have tended to be perfunctory and shortlived, limited to the writing of notes and the routine exchange of correspondence. Not once in recent years has this country ventured beyond mild protest into any form of action.

Encouraged by this seeming official casualness, if not indifference, the Arab States continue to act virtually as they please in the mistreatment of American Jews, perfectly confident that our Government will not uphold the rights of its Jewish citizens. The apathy and apparent indifference of our Government has served not only to intensify Arab hostility to Jews within our own territories but to increase and introduce anti-Semitism in new and unexpected quarters here.

The most recent illustration of State Department thinking on these issues may be found in the testimony of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on February 24, 1956. Those portions of Mr. Dulles' statement that are relevant to matters discussed in this memorandum are contained in the following colloquy with Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota:

"Senator HUMPHREY. Speaking of Americans who are in Saudi Arabia, is it true what I read in the paper here, and which I spoke about in the Senate, and which today the Pentagon apparently seems to feel is true, but I want to get all departments in on it, to the effect that arrangements have been arrived at between our Government and Saudi Arabia under the terms of the Mutual Security Agreement and our air base at Dhahran, that certain American personnel are not permitted to be stationed in Saudi Arabia, American personnel of the Jewish faith?

"Secretary DULLES. It may be. I think that for many years, not just in recent years, but that running over a long period of years, there has been a prohibition on Jews in Saudi Arabia.

"Senator HUMPHREY. I mean Americans; I am talking about citizens of the United States of America.

"Secretary DULLES. I am talking about persons of Jewish faith.

"Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, but Americans.

"Secretary DULLES. Yes, of any nationality.

"Senator HUMPHREY. Is it true that American businessmen who may be of the Jewish faith are not permitted to engage in commercial enterprise in Saudi Arabia with our agreement and our recognition of that discrimination?

"Secretary DULLES. No, not with our agreement or recognition of it. The King of Saudi Arabia regards himself as the primary cus-

todian of the sacred places of the Moslem faith, and they have a long time been extremely rigorous in the practice of the Moslem law.

"I was there—when I was there visiting King Ibn Saud, it was during the period of the Ramadan, where from the very time the sun rises in the morning—and at that time of the year it rises very early—until it sets at night, no one can take a drop of liquid or a bite of food, and the former King Ibn Saud was an aging feeble man, but he nevertheless stuck rigorously to that, and there is another prohibition that applies there also. There is not a drop of liquor that is allowed to be sold or used in the whole area.

"Now, they have got some practices which we may think curious.

* * * * *

"Now, we do not like or approve of or acquiesce, except perforce in any such practices, such as that, but we do have to recognize the fact that Saudi Arabia is an ally, became an ally in the first instance, through the conversations and subsequent communications with President Roosevelt, and then it was confirmed by President Truman, and we have a very special relationship there with that government.

"That does not mean we approve of all of its practices at all. It does mean we get along together in a way which is of mutual advantage.

"We, perforce, accommodate ourselves to certain practices they have which we do not like; they, perhaps, accommodate themselves to certain of our idiosyncrasies which they do not like, but on the whole, they have a pretty arbitrary rule, largely dictated by the strict tenets of the Moslem faith."

The American Jewish Congress is an organiziation of American Jews whose membership is generally sympathetic to Israel. But our concern over the serious errors in national policy and diplomatic judgment discussed in this paper does not derive from either of these factors. The injury and affront we discuss here is sustained by all Americans who are currently made witness to arrogant Arab violation and disregard of the rights of American citizenship. We respectfully submit that the time is past due for our diplomatic representatives to resist such encroachments upon American rights with firmness and dignity.

We are not unmindful that much is at stake. American officials in high places have made it their business to emphasize frequently that the present unusual solicitude in dealing with Arab governments is designed to protect military and economic relations presumed to be vital to our material interests. We are told repeatedly that important commercial and industrial undertakings remain possible only because of American willingness to compromise and to accommodate Arab prejudice. We are warned that substantial American interests will be put in jeopardy if Arab-American relations are, in any way, strained or impaired. It is even intimated that we must concede something, even at the expense of a certain number of our citizens, in order not to risk this economic stake.

We submit that this view is a perversion of traditional and basic American doctrine. It reflects a way of thinking that accepts the subordination of the rights of citizenship to the expediencies of international bargaining and that regards the legal incidents of citizenship as expendable items to be traded away. We cannot refrain from adding, though we do not believe this paper to be the appropriate occasion to argue this point at length, that it is doubly deplorable that this position should be urged to support a course of conduct that is not only morally wrong but badly calculated in terms of national advantage. We are convinced that a realistic appraisal of the economic potential of the Middle East will disclose that no legitimate American interest is in real danger from Arab rulers who, however fanatic their religious hatreds, nevertheless remain hardheaded businessmen whose economic advancement is wholly dependent upon American investment dollars.

Issues of precisely this character are not without precedent for the United States. The diplomatic history of any great nation is the record of its capacity to sustain, or its willingness to abandon, those ideals that embody its national creed. When confronted with a threat to the liberties of its citizens, indeed, when forced to choose between condoning exactly the kind of anti-Semitism now practiced by the Arab states and risking the possibility of economic loss, this country did not in the past waver or equivocate. For us the claim of freedom has always been of greater force and dignity than the claim of profit.

When Woodrow Wilson was advised in 1911 (as we are now advised respecting the Arab states), that there must not be American diplomatic intercession against foreign anti-Semitism because of possible danger to American investment opportunities, he stated:

"There lies a principle back of our life. America is not a mere body of traders; it is a body of free men. Our greatness is built upon our freedom—is moral, not material. We have a great ardour for gain; but we have a deep passion for the rights of man. Principles lie back of our action. America would be inconceivable without them. These principles are not incompatible with great material prosperity. On the contrary, unless we are deeply mistaken, they are indispensable to it. We are not willing to have prosperity, however, if our fellow-citizens must suffer contempt for it, or lose the rights that belong to every American in order that we may enjoy it. The price is too great" (48 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 497–498 (62d Cong., 2d sess., Dec. 6, 1911)).

Before turning to a detailed examination of Arab anti-Semitism in the United States, we believe it pertinent, therefore, to consider briefly past actions taken by this country in protest of foreign anti-Semitic excesses.

I. AMERICAN DIPLOMATIC PRECEDENTS

American diplomats have never been diffident in denouncing religious discrimination against any American nationals who travel abroad. Under the act of July 27, 1868 (15 Stat. 244) the President of the United States and the Department of State are required to take immediate action whenever the rights of any American citizen are violated or threatened by a foreign state. This right of protection admits of no religious limitation. As stated by Secretary of State Lewis Cass, the object of our foreign policy is "not merely to protect a Catholic in a Protestant country, a Protestant in a Catholic country, a Jew in a Christian country, but an American in all countries." (Quoted in J. B. Moore, American Diplomacy (1905), at p. 135.)

This diplomatic principle derives from the recognition by those charged with determining and administering our foreign policy that the defense of religious liberty is an inseparable aspect of all American undertakings. In a diplomatic note protesting Austro-Hungarian anti-Semitism directed at the family of an American minister-designate, Secretary of State Thomas F. Bayard declared in 1885:

"Religious liberty is the chief cornerstone of the American system of government, and provisions for its security are imbedded in the written charter and interwoven in the moral fabric of its laws.

"Anything that tends to invade a right so essential and sacred must be carefully guarded against, and I am satisfied that my countrymen, ever mindful of the sufferings and sacrifices necessary to obtain it, will never consent to its impairment for any reason or under any pretext whatsoever.

"It is not believed by the President that a doctrine and practice so destructive of religious liberty and freedom of conscience, so devoid of catholicity, and so opposed to the spirit of the age in which we live, can for a moment be accepted by the great family of civilized nations or be allowed to control their diplomatic intercourse.

"Certain it is, it will never, in my belief, be accepted by the people of the United States nor by any administration which represents their sentiments." (Foreign Relations (1885), p. 50.)

A. Czarist Russia

Perhaps the most noteworthy of all of the interpositions by our Government to protect the rights of Jewish communities from the force and effect of foreign anti-Semitic decrees—if only because it is virtually on all fours, both in the character of the anti-Semitic discrimination and in its attempted rationale, with the discrimination currently practiced by the Arab governments—was that made over a period of years in protest against Czarist Russia's expulsion and exclusion of American citizens of Jewish faith. This intercession with Russia is significant not only because it unequivocally fixed and defined American policy on this issue but also because it reflected the ardor with which American spokesmen insisted upon adherence to principle, even at the risk of commercial disadvantage, and in the enthusiasm and unanimity with which the people of this country endorsed that stand. We submit that neither the State Department nor the general community now should be content with any less zealous protection of fundamental rights.

In the 19th century Russian anti-Semitism, like Arab anti-Semitism today, was intense and deeply rooted. The history of the Jews in Russia was a catalog of savage and bloody assaults upon them, attacks that were endorsed, either openly or tacitly, by the Russian Government itself. In addition, the Czar had promulgated a network of anti-Jewish legislation directed nominally at his own Jewish subjects but applied without distinction to Jews of any nationality who found themselves within Russian borders. Among these restrictions were rules forbidding the free entry, travel or residence of Jews in certain parts of the country outside the Pale of Settlement. As a result American Jews who dared to enter the proscribed areas were forcibly expelled by order of the Russian authorities, while other Americans, non-Jews, but otherwise of identical status, were permitted freely to reside, travel, and transact business throughout Russia.

The State Department was thus forced to decide, exactly as it is forced to decide now, whether it would submit passively to the demands of religious prejudice or instead would endeavor to enforce throughout the world, even in those areas where it might be difficult or embarrassing to do so, the rights of American citizens of every religious persuasion, without distinction or difference. The State Department did not a hundred years ago hesitate to assume responsibility for all Americans, including American Jews, and it would be unconscionable and delinquent for any agency of our Government now to do less.

When protests were made during the 1880's that American Jews were systematically expelled from certain parts of Russia, repeated attempts were made by American diplomats, first by exhortation and moral argument, to persuade the Russian Government to adopt a more humane attitude toward its own Jewish population and to extend to American Jews treatment equal in all respects to that accorded all other Americans. When these moral entreaties failed, this Government moved firmly and decisively and abrogated the long-standing and profitable commercial treaty of 1832 between this country and Russia. Because of the failure of the czarist regime to refrain from further anti-

Semitic discrimination against American Jews, these treaty relations were never resumed.

The mere recital of the facts cannot fully disclose the high quality and courage of statesmanship, fully cognizant of all its responsibilities, that culminated in this action. Some of the notes on the question prepared and dispatched by our highest diplomatic officers remain instructive in reminding us of the manner and context in which decisions affecting international behavior of this kind must be formulated.

Among those who were most forthright and uncompromising in demanding that the Russian Government deal with all Americans equally and fairly was John W. Foster, the American Minister to St. Petersburg and the grandfather of the present Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles. It is an unusual family and an unusual historical era that permits grandfather and grandson during successive periods to pass directly upon the same urgent problem. It is to be hoped that Secretary Dulles will reconsider and examine the precepts and policies laid down on behalf of the United States by his grandfather, himself later to become an eminent Secretary of State, and that he will find implicit in those policies a moral view and a national commitment of lasting and enduring force.

In the late summer of 1880, Henry Pinkos, an American Jew who had assumed residence in St. Petersburg for several months with is wife and family and had established a small business there, was expelled from the city and the country as soon as his Jewish identity became known. Despite efforts by American officials to delay execution of his expulsion, Mr. Pinkos left Russia without awaiting further steps in his behalf. The Chargé d'Affaires of the American Legation thereupon was disposed to drop the whole matter, stating that "there now appears to be no necessity for my communicating with the Russian Government."

Mr. Foster who was then newly appointed United States Minister to St. Petersburg and the then Secretary of State William N. Evarts, were agreed however that there was a principle in issue that transcended Mr. Pinkos and whose significance in no way depended upon his physical presence in Russia. Rejecting an easy opportunity to evade a difficult and troubling issue and disregarding staff suggestions that we silently absorb the affront to our Jewish citizens because the issue had become moot, Mr. Foster wrote in clear and unmistakable terms to Baron Jomini, acting Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs:

"The Secretary of State instructs me to state to your excellency that in the presence of the fact that an American citizen has been ordered to leave Russia on no other ground than that he is the professor of a particular creed or the holder of certain religious views, it becomes the duty of the Government of the United States, which impartially seeks to protect all of its citizens of whatever origin or, faith, solemnly, but with all respect to the Government of His Imperial Majesty, to protest. As this order of expulsion is understood to apply to all foreign Jews, in certain cities or localities, at least, of Russia, it is, of course, apparent that the same is not directed specially against the government of which Mr. Pinkos is a citizen, and, indeed, the long-standing amity which has united the interests of Russia with those of the Government of the United States would of itself forbid a remote supposition that such might be the case. Notwithstanding this aspect of the matter the United States could not fail to look upon the expulsion of one of its citizens from Russia, on the simple ground of his religious ideas or convictions, except as aggrievance, akin to that which Russia would doubtless find in the expulsion of one of her own subjects from the United States, on the ground of his attachment to the faith of his fathers" (Foreign Relations, 1880, p. 881, et seq.).

It is significant that Mr. Foster's intercession was not inhibited or deterred by the fact that the anti-Semitism practiced by the Russian Government was universal and "not directed specially against the government of which Mr. Pinkos is a citizen." Mr. Foster was aware that the larger interests of the United States dictate forthright opposition to all religious prejudice aimed at or affecting Americans whether our citizens are made to suffer indignity and insult as part of a general campaign of hatred and bigotry or directly in their capacity as American nationals. In either case our citizens are deprived of rights this country is committed to protect, and in either case this foreign conduct constitutes an encroachment upon American freedoms that must be requited and corrected.

Exactly as Arab extremists seek to manufacture an apology for their terrorism and to justify current anti-Jewish excesses as a security measure designed to protect them from supposed Zionist violence, so did the Czarist regime strive to rationalize its anti-Semitic decrees as a protection against a supposed Jewish insurrection. To this Mr. Foster replied:

"It having been intimated to the Secretary of State by this legation that the reason of this order may be found in the supposed implication of Jews in the plots formed against the life of His Imperial Majesty, the Emperor, the Secretary directs me to say that insofar as this may be true, the Government of Russia has the entire sympathy of the Government of the United States, in all just preventive efforts, and if there existed any good evidence that Mr. Pinkos has been connected with any of these attempts, the Government of the United States could not object to this expulsion on that ground. But neither the police authorities, in the several communications which the members of the consulate general and this legation have had with them, in their efforts to obtain relief for Mr. Pinkos, nor Your Excellency's department, in the notes addressed to this legation on the subject, have ever intimated the existence of such a charge. Nor does the character of citizens of the United States of Jewish faith afford ground for the supposition that they would be likely to engage in conspiracies or plots against the established government of the country. From the foundation of the United States as a Nation, they have been entitled to full and unrestricted privileges of citizens, and have shown themselves to be peaceable and law observing in their conduct, quiet and industrious in their habits and are esteemed a valuable portion of the community, so that insofar as the regulation for the expulsion of foreign Jews from Russia affects American citizens, whatever may be the conduct of their coreligionists of this or other countries, it is an unjust reflection upon American Jews as a class and a discrimination which cannot be acquiesced in by my Government" (ibid.).

When these notes were insufficient, Mr. Foster continued to press his demands with untiring vigor. In a letter to the Secretary of State on March 25, 1881, he was the first to suggest that this country base its demands for equal treatment for American Jews upon the treaty of 1832 and employ the influence and status we enjoyed as a signatory to that treaty as a means of enforcing our claim. (Foreign Relations 1881, at p. 1012.) This device, in fact, became the solution finally adopted.

Mr. Foster enjoyed the support and encouragement of his superiors in the State Department. As has already been noted, Secretary Evarts first directed Mr. Foster's intervention with the Russian Government. Upon Secretary Evarts' death, his successor James G. Blaine, shortly after his appointment, unreservedly ratified Foster's strong position. He wrote Foster as follows:

"Your course appears to have been discreet, and it is hoped that you will press your representations to the successful establishment of the principle of religious toleration for our citizens peacefully residing or traveling abroad, which we as a Nation have such a deep interest in maintaining. * * *

"It would be, in the judgment of this government, absolutely inadmissible that a domestic law restraining native Hebrews from residence in certain parts of the empire might operate to hinder any American citizen. * * *

"I need hardly enlarge on the point that the Government of the United States concludes its treaties with foreign states for the equal protection of all classes of American citizens. It can make absolutely no discrimination between them, whatever be their origin or creed. So that they abide by the laws, at home or abroad, it must give them due protection and expect like protection for them. Any unfriendly or discriminatory act against them on the part of a foreign power with which we are at peace would call for our earnest remonstrance, whether a treaty existed or not" (Foreign Relations, 1881, P. 1030).

The American people were no less sensitive to these deprivations based upon religious affiliation. When diplomatic intercession alone failed to correct this anti-Semitic discrimination, the issue became one for general public notice and for more direct executive and legislative action. Indeed, it became a matter of such moment that in his speech of acceptance of the Republican nomination for the Presidency in 1908, William H. Taft noted that "in some countries * * * distinctions are made in respect to the treatment of our citizens traveling abroad and having passports of our executive, based on considerations which are repugnant to the principles of our Government and civilization." He committed his party and administration "to make every endeavor to secure the solution of such distinctions which in our eyes are both needless and opprobrious." (Adler and Margalith, With Firmness in the Right (1946), at pp. 281-282.)

On December 4, 1911, conclusively to dispose of this issue, Joint Resolution No. 166 was introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative, later Governor, William Sulzer of New York. The text of the resolution declared:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the people of the United States assert as a fundamental principle that the rights of its citizens shall not be impaired at home or abroad because of race or religion; that the Government of the United States concluded its treaties for the equal protection of all classes of its citizens, without regard to race or religion; that the Government of the United States will not be a party to any treaty which discriminates, or which by one of the parties thereto is so construed as to discriminate between American citizens on the ground of race or religion; that the Government of Russia has violated the treaty between the United States and Russia, concluded at St. Petersburg, December eighteenth, 1832, refusing to honor American passports duly issued to American citizens, on account of race and religion; that in the judgment of the Congress the said treaty, for the reasons aforesaid, ought to be terminated at the earliest possible time; that for the aforesaid reasons the said treaty is hereby declared to be terminated and of no further force and effect from the expiration of one year after date of notification to the Government of Russia of the terms of this resolution, and that to this end the President is hereby charged with the duty of communicating such notice to the Government of Russia."

This resolution was adopted by a vote of 300 to 1 on December 13, 1911. On December 15, 1911, Mr. Sazanoff, then Russian Foreign Minister, was notified by Secretary of State Philander C. Knox that the United

States had decided to abrogate the treaty of 1832.

Although this was perhaps the most extensive action yet undertaken to protect the rights of American Jews from foreign anti-Semitism it met with immediate and widespread popular approval. Thus, the Republican National Convention of 1912 adopted a plank declaring:

"We approve the action taken by the President and Congress to secure with Russia, as with other countries, a treaty that will recognize the absolute right of expatriation, and that will prevent all discrimination of whatever kind between American citizens, whether native born or alien, and regardless of race, religion, or previous political allegiance. The right of asylum is a precious possession of the people of the United States, and it is to be neither surrendered nor restricted." (American Jewish Year Book, 1913–1914, p. 442).

Almost identical planks were adopted the same year by the Democratic and Progressive Party Conventions. The American people have consistently abjured any suggestion, whether by internal decree or foreign treaty, that there can be class distinctions among American citizens or that there are varying degrees of protection to which our citizens are entitled.

B. Switzerland

One of the earlier intercessions of this Government on behalf of American Jews abroad perhaps illustrates better than any other the personal zeal with which American statesmen have endeavored to combat foreign anti-Semitism.

In 1853, Theodore S. Fay, then United States Minister to Switzerland, was advised that Swiss cantons were denying visiting rights to American Jews. The Swiss Federal Council was willing to interpret liberally the treaty of 1850 between the United States and Switzerland and to extend to American Jews the same rights and privileges granted American Christians. Some of the cantons, however, persisted in their discrimination and refused to permit American Jews to establish themselves within their jurisdiction.

Mr. Fay became absorbed in the whole problem of anti-Jewish prejudices and made a detailed study of the condition of the Jews in Switzerland and neighboring countries, inquiring even into matters ranging far beyond those affecting Amercan Jews. The Secretary of State encouraged Mr. Fay in this inquiry and notified him that the removal of oppressive restrictions upon the Jewish community was "a matter which the President (Buchanan) has much at heart." (See Executive Document No. 76, House of Represeentatives, 36th Congress, 1st Session, page 22.)

As a result of his extensive inquiry and investigation, Fay wrote the famous "Israelite Note," which he circulated among the respective cantons. The then president of the Swiss Confederation, Dr. Furrer, wrote that as a result of Fay's note "an immense majority of the Council of Zurich is disposed to change the legislation respecting the Israelites in the interest of amity and progress." (Ibid., p. 77.) Many other cantons followed and gradually, one after another, removed all restrictions against the Jews. Thus, because of his personal concern over the oppression of religious minorities, an American minister in Switzerland was able to play a decisive and crucial role in amending the Swiss constitutional system to eliminate all Swiss discrimination because of race and religion and, almost singlehandedly, was instrumental in restoring to American Jews the right to travel throughout that part of Europe without restraint or inhibition.

C. Other countries

Our deep attachment to the concept of religious freedom has motivated our Government to urge intercession even in instances of religious suppression and persecution that did not directly affect citizens of the protesting states and even if such protest entailed direct criticism of the internal legislation of other states, a matter not ordinarily within the purview of any foreign power. Thus in the very first representation relating to Jews made by the United States to any foreign state, Secretary of State John Forsyth at the direction of President Van Buren, in 1840 in a dispatch to the American consul at Alexandria, Egypt, urged intervention in behalf of Damascus Jews who had been accused of murder.

Since that time the diplomatic record is studded with instances of genuinely altruistic intervention by American officials on behalf of persecuted Jewish populations abroad. See the account of protests made by the United States Government because of local anti-Jewish persecution in Morocco in 1863 (Adler and Margalith, With Firmness in the Right (1946), at 11); in Persia in 1897 (ibid., at 16); in Syria and Palestine in 1915 (ibid., at 65); in Italy in 1938 (ibid., at 386); in North Africa in 1942 (ibid., at 410); and in Argentina in 1943 (ibid., at 430). This is not even to mention the strenuous protest made through every available diplomatic medium against the atrocities of Nazi Germany. Indeed, the sense of revulsion against the barbarities of the Nazis and their attempt to import racial doctrines into the United States was one of America's moral armaments in the days of President Franklin D. Roosevelt (ibid., at p. 348 et seq.).

This brief review of American diplomatic practice indicates a continuing course of conduct by American foreign officers extending over 100 years to protest religious persecution by foreign states adversely affecting American citizens.

It is, therefore, both disappointing and disturbing that Secretary Dulles' recent testimony intimates that the United States in effect has acquiesced and yielded to the demands of current Arab anti-Jewish aggression, even to the point of sacrificing some of the protection legally due its citizens. We do not believe it an adequate justification that this retreat has been undertaken in the hope of finding a way in which the Arab countries and the United States may live together in a manner which presumably is to their mutual advantage. We do not believe that the American people will concur in this bargain or will endorse or accept any diplomatic approach that requires the United States to hold the rights of its citizens less dear than did our predecessors. We are convinced that the only reason this position could ever have been suggested is that the full measure of American concessions required to meet the demands of Arab bigotry has not been completely understood. It is in the hope of correcting this general lack of information that this paper has been compiled. We are convinced that once the facts are fully and publicly stated, the people of this country and those who have been appointed to guide its foreign relations will be in a better position to assess and evaluate those factors that must dictate our future conduct if the freedoms of all our citizens are to be assured.

II. CURRENT ARAB ANTI-JEWISH PRACTICES

The discriminatory actions practiced by the Arab countries under the direction of the Arab League fall into three categories: A. The denial of entry or transit visas to American Jews; B. The commercial boycott of American Jewish businesses; C. The establishment and subvention of large-scale Arab propaganda centers to disseminate anti-Semitic literature in the United States. Each of these three practices is discussed below.

A. Denial of entry or transit visas to American Jews

In recent years various Arab countries, including Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia have sought to extend and promote their programs of domestic anti-Semitism by promulgating a rule flatly prohibiting the issuance of entry permits and travel visas to American citizens who are Jews. This discrimination extends to government officials and to members of the United States Armed Forces. A number of invidious consequences have flowed from this Arab policy; American State laws against discrimination in employment have been openly and repeatedly flouted, and recruiting for employment, even on defense contracts paid for by American taxpayers, has been conducted on a discriminatory basis because of Arab refusal to admit American Jewish workers. Thus, Arab bigotry has already forced its way across our own borders and infected our own domestic practices.

(1) Restrictions Against Military Personnel

On May 20, 1955 a chaplain serving in the United States Air Force wrote Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN:

"United States Air Forces Europe (USAFE) Manual 30–1, dated June 1953, deals with 'Clearance and Documentations for Leave and Duty Travel' for members of the United States Air Force. In section 26, paragraph 3, we read: 'Individuals of Jewish faith or descent are strictly barred entrance to or transit of Saudi Arabia. Further, any passport containing an Irsaeli visa will not be honored.'

"In section 13, paragraph 3c, we read: Individuals of the Hebrew Race will not be issued visas or admitted to Jordan.

"By restricting the travels of a Jewish serviceman on military aircraft, the Military Air Transport Service (MATS), a lawful agency of the Government of the United States of America, subjects itself to the bigoted religious doctrines of a foreign power."

This letter elicited the following reply on June 20, 1955, from Harold E. Talbott, then Secretary of the Air Force, to whom it was forwarded by Senator LEHMAN:

"The countries of Saudi Arabia and Jordan for purposes of internal security will not issue a visa for persons of the Hebrew race. This restriction is not only applicable to American citizens, but applies to Jewish people of all nations. Further, Arabic countries, specifically Saudi Arabia and Jordan, will not issue a visa to any person regardless of race, if the passport of the individual is stamped with any margins which would indicate that the traveler had visited Israel prior to the application for entrance into Saudi Arabia and Jordan.

"These restrictions are promulgated and enforced by the Arabic countries and are not within the prerogative of the State Department or the military to change.

"The only exception to the above procedures is when the traveler receives special permission from the Arabic Government concerned to enter that country."

Senator LEHMAN wrote to Mr. Talbott on July 12, 1955:

"I have your letter of June 20. I am aware of the practice of the Governments of Saudi Arabia and Jordan in barring entrance to persons of Jewish faith. I had hoped, however, that the appropriate departments of the United States Government would work ceaselessly against any such regulation insofar as it affects American citizens. I was especially shocked to know that American GI's who happen to be of the Jewish faith are likewise discriminated against. I hoped that far from simply taking cognizance of the matter, the Air Force would use its influence to the extent possible to see that this discrimination was not practiced against Americans who were serving their country in the Air Force."

Secretary Talbott's answer, dated July 20, 1955, exhibits an odd lack of concern:

"The Air Force is cognizant of the situation concerning restriction of travel to mem-

bers of the Jewish faith to Saudi Arabia and Jordan. However, it must be recognized that we are dealing with a tradition of long standing, and in all probabilities, will take much effort and time on the part of all Governmental agencies, including the Air Force, to try and work out a satisfactory solution with the countries concerned. The Air Force together wtih governmental agencies, has worked ceaselessly to abrogate regulations of this nature put into effect by foreign governments which affect American citizens. Unfortunately, as indicated in my previous letter, these restrictions or regulations are promulgated and enforced by foreign countries and are not within the prerogative of the Air Force to change."

When, on February 24 of this year Secretary Dulles was specifically asked by members of the Foreign Relations Committee whether, pursuant to the trems of the mutual security agreement between this country and Saudi Arabia, American Army personnel of the Jewish faith were not permitted to be stationed at the Dhahran Air Base, the Secretary replied, "It may be." We question Mr. Dulles' apparent belief that his further statement "over a long period of years there has been a prohibition on Jews in Saudi Arabia" can be a sufficient explanation for this Government's tolerance of foreign disqualification of American military personnel because of their religious beliefs.

We submit that continued collaboration in the exclusion of Jewish servicemen invites manifold invasion of the rights of American citizenship. If we accept the principle that foreign states are to be permitted to pass upon the religious qualification of any American in military service stationed abroad, reaching down even to the level of private soldier, then we necessarily become party to the negation of the constitutional concept of religious freedom and religious privacy. We should then be required to screen and survey the religious convictions of prospective public officials who may otherwise be fully competent and qualified. We would then be able to employ as our representatives abroad, whether as ambassador, technician, soldier, or clerk, only those whose religious beliefs correspond favorably to those of some foreign ruler. In contravention of express constitutional prohibitions, we should inevitably be obliged to impose a religious test for public office. The logical extension of this approach would require, obviously, that any emissary of this country sent, for example, to Communist countries should be required to pass Communist tests of nonreligious fitness. The absurdity and inequity of this practice seems patent.

That the first amendment to the United States Constitution obligates this country to refrain from entering into any treaty or agreement that might serve as an instrument for discriminating against any group of American citizens by limiting their right freely to travel abroad because of their religious convictions, was plainly stated by Clifton R. Brickinridge, American Minister to St. Petersburg in 1895 in a note to the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs. Replying to a Russian contention that the American Constitution could not apply to Russian domestic legislation and therefore could not be invoked to interfere with treaty arrangements between the two states, the American Minister declared:

"Our Constitution does not say that Congress shall not make a law simply prohibiting or authorizing a religious exercise or belief, as your excellency seems to understand.

"It says that 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, nor prohibiting the free exercise thereof.' Certainly if a law deprives any people or persons of a certain faith, because of that faith, of all or of any part of the rights, privileges, and immunities enjoyed by any other citizen, or class of citizens, it is made respecting that religion, and it militates against the free exercise thereof as much so as if the sect had been mentioned in the title of the act and the consequences had been named as pains and penalties for the conscientious belief and observances entertained and practiced" (Foreign Relations, 1895, p. 1066).

We suggest that a proper attitude, one consonant with the requirements of our Constitution and with our own national temper, is reflected in the action of the United States in the one prior time in its history when one of its representatives was found unacceptable by a foreign country because of admittedly religious factors.

(a) The Keiley precedent

In May 1885, President Grover Cleveland appointed Mr. Anthony M. Keiley, of Virginia, envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States at Vienna. The United States was informed, however, that Mr. Keiley would be unacceptable to the Austrian Government because "the position of a foreign envoy wedded to a Jewess by civil marriage would be untenable and even impossible in Vienna" (Foreign Relations, 1885, p. 48).

Secretary of State Bayard replied in unmistakably language:

"The supreme law of this land expressly declares that no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States and by the same authority it is declared that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

* * * * *

"It is not within the power of the President nor of the Congress, nor of any judicial tribunal in the United States to take or even hear testimony, or in any mode to inquire into or decide upon the religious belief of any official, and the proposition to allow this to be done by any foreign government is necessarily and a fortiori inadmissible."

"To suffer an infraction of this essential principle would lead to a disfranchisement of our citizens because of their religious belief, and thus impair or destroy the most important end which our Constitution of Government was intended to secure.

* * * * *

"The case we are now considering is that of an envoy of the United States, unquestionably fitted, morally and intellectually, and who has been duly accredited to a friendly Government, toward which he is thoroughly well affected; who in accordance with the laws of this country, has long since contracted and has maintained an honorable marriage, and whose presence near the foreign government in question is objected to by its agents on the sole ground that his wedded wife is alleged to entertain a religious faith which is held by very many of the most honored and valued citizens of the United States.

"It is not believed by the President that a doctrine and practice so destructive of religious liberty and freedom of conscience, so devoid of catholicity, and so opposed to the spirit of the age in which we live can for a moment be accepted by the great family of civilized nations or be allowed to control their diplomatic intercourse.

"Certain it is, it will never, in my belief, be accepted by the people of the United States, nor by any administration which represents their sentiments" (Foreign Relations, 1885, p. 48).

The Austrian Government thereupon changed the ground of its opposition to a supposed "want of political tact evinced on his (Mr. Keiley's) part on a former occasion, in consequence of which a friendly power declined to receive him; and upon the certainty that his domestic relations preclude that reception of him by Vienna society, which we judge desirable for the representatives of the United States with which power we wish to contine the friendly relations existing between the two governments" (Foreign Relations, 1885, p. 55).

This country, however, was not deceived by these representations and refused to appoint an envoy in Mr. Keiley's stead. The position of this Government was that the acts of Austria and her ministers in this case would require this country to agree to permit Austria to reserve for herself the right to prescribe a religious test for office in the United States and that this could never be found acceptable by the people of this country. In his annual message to Congress, December 8, 1885, President Cleveland reviewed the entire case:

"Question has arisen with the Government of Austria-Hungary touching the representation of the United States at Vienna. Having, under my constitutional prerogative, appointed an estimable citizen of unimpeachable probity and competence as minister at that court, the Government of Austria-Hungary invited this Government to take cognizance of certain exceptions, based upon allegations against the personal acceptability of Mr. Keiley, the appointed envoy, asking that in view thereof, the appointment should be withdrawn. The reasons advanced were such as could not be acquiesced in, without violation of my oath of office and the precepts of the Constitution, since they necessarily involved a limitation in favor of a foreign government upon the right of selection by the Executive, and required such an application of a religious test as a qualification for office under the United States as would have resulted in the practical disfranchisement of a large class of our citizens and the abandonment of a vital principle in our Government. The Austro-Hungarian Government finally decided not to receive Mr. Keiley as the envoy of the United States, and that gentleman has since resigned his commission, leaving the post vacant. I have made no new nomination, and the interests of this Government in Vienna are now in the care of the secretary of legation, acting as charge d'affaires ad interim" (Foreign Relations, 1885, p. iv).

(b) The Government plea of noninterference

Unquestionably the qualification of an ambassalorial appointee depends in considerable measure upon his standing in the country in which he is designated to serve. It is not diplomatic custom for any state to impose an unwelcome envoy upon another. The grant of diplomatic standing normally is regarded as the exclusive prerogative of the host state. This country nevertheless felt that the exercise of religious prejudice in the Keiley case was a matter of sufficient importance to override all considerations of diplomatic practice. How much greater an effront is it, therefore, for the Arab States to dictate to our Armed Forces with respect to the religious affiliations of our military personnel ordered to serve in our defense installations in Arab lands. The religious beliefs of members of the Armed Forces of the United States can be no business of the Arab countries and it is a gross invasion of the constitutional guaranties of religious freedom for any agency of this Government to agree to the exclusion of Jewish servicemen, or indeed Jewish public officials of any rank, from acting on behalf of their country anywhere in the world.

It is plainly no argument to allege, as Secretary Talbott alleges, that since these restrictions on the entry of Jewish military personnel are enforced by the Arab countries they are "not within the prerogative of the State Department or the military to change." Matters that impinge so directly upon the welfare and liberty of American citizens cannot thus be so immunized from American intervention. It should be remembered that

upon proper occasion the United States has not been unwilling to instruct its diplomatic emissaries abroad to take action with respect to matters that entail criticism of the internal activities of another state, something that is not within the ordinary purview of normal diplomatic conduct. Thus, on November 22, 1881, in seeking to persuade Great Britain to join in protest against Russian anti-Semitic discrimination, Secretary of State Blaine wrote James Russell, then United States Minister at London:

"I am well aware that the domestic enactments of a state toward its own subjects is not generally regarded as a fit matter for the intervention of another independent power. But when such enactments directly affect the liberty and property of foreigners who resort to a country under the supposed guarantee of treaties framed for the most liberal ends, when the conscience of an alien owing no allegiance whatever to the local sovereignty, is brought under the harsh yoke of bigotry or prejudice which bows the necks of the natives, and when enlightened appeals made to humanity, to the principles of just reciprocity and to the advancing spirit of the age, in behalf of tolerance, are met with intimations of a purpose to still further burden the unhappy sufferers and so to necessarily increase the disability of foreigners of like creed * * * it becomes in a high sense a moral duty to our citizens and to the doctrines of religious freedom we so strongly uphold, to seek proper protection for those citizens and tolerance for their creed, in foreign lands, even at the risk of criticism of the municipal laws of other states" (Kohler, The United States and German Jewish Prosecutions, pp. 40–41).

It always will remain possible to search out reasons for not acting but the present prim and circumspect regard for every legalism that might justify American indifference must be contrasted with the attitude of former Secretary of State William N. Evarts. He did not hestitate to employ the power of his high office to instruct an American consul in Morocco that while intervention by this country in behalf of Jews who are Moorish subjects ordinarily might be considered improper, "Still, there might be cases in which humanity would dictate a disregard of technicalities, if your influence would shield Hebrews from oppression." Letters of Secretary Evarts, March 20, 1878, quoted in J. B. Moore, American Diplomacy (1905), page 349. We are forced to conclude that American diplomatic intervention against the Arab States is more likely deterred by lack of will than by lack of legal warrant.

(2) Restrictions Upon Private Travel

In the face of this official indifference toward limitations imposed upon the right to travel of military and Government personnel, it is hardly surprising that travel restrictions against American Jews who are merely private citizens should continue with almost no comment. The Passport Division of the Department of State expressly informs applicants for passports that persons of Jewish faith will be denied the right to visit Arab lands. Information supplied to passengers departing America aboard ships of the American Export Lines, which during cruises touch ports in Arab countries, declares that persons of Jewish faith or Jewish name (sic) will be denied certain cruise travel privileges in Arab countries freely available to other passengers. Airlines regularly traveling to Arab countries contain notations in their schedules indicating that Jewish passengers will not be allowed to disembark at Arab ports of entry.

This regular withholding of travel privileges by Arab officials in this country from American citizens of Jewish faith is demeaning and introduces a discordant and dissonant note in a free community. Thus, in 1895 Acting Secretary of State Alvey A. Adee reminded the American Minister at St. Petersburg that the refusal of Russian consuls to grant visas to American Jews was of continuing concern to this country if only because of the impact and effect of this practice within our own borders, Mr. Adee wrote:

"Apart from the constitutional objections to the discrimination made by Russian consular officers against American Jews, this Government can never consent that a class embracing many of its most honored and valuable citizens shall within its territory be subjected to invidious and disparaging distinctions of the character implied in refusing to visa their passports. For, notwithstanding Prince Lobanow's suggestion that his Goverenment's consular regulation upon the subject under consideration does not apply to all Israelites and therefore cannot be regarded as a discrimination against them on religious grounds, the fact remains that the interrogatories propounded to applicants for the consular visa relate to religious faith, and upon the response depends the consul's actions.

"Viewed in the light of an invidious discrimination tending to discredit and humiliate American Jews in the eyes of their fellow citizens, it is plain that the action of Russian consular officers does produce its effects within American territory, and not exclusively in Russian jurisdiction." (Foreign Relations, 1895, p. 1067.)

The denial of visas to Jews by Arab countries, moreover, frequently has a more serious consequence than the mere withholding of travel for pleasure. Arab anti-Semitism has been made the occasion and excuse for anti-Jewish discrimination in hiring practices in this country, in direct contravention of the purpose and policy of State fair employment practices legislation.

(a) SCAD and private employment

In 1950 a help-wanted advertisement inserted by a private employment agency in New York City newspapers sought welders for foreign service. When applicants for these positions were interrogated about their religious beliefs, a complaint was filed with the New York State Commission Against Discrimination charging that these inquiries constituted an unlawful employment practice.

The State Commission reported:

"Investigation disclosed that the welders were being recruited by a subcontractor of the Arabian American Oil Co. for work on a pipeline in one of the Arabian countries, and that a visa from the Arabian Government was a prerequisite to employment.

"The investigating commissioner was informed by the Arabian American Oil Co. that the Arabian Government does not issue visas to persons of the Jewish faith. The company advised that it had an understanding with the Arabian Government to screen all prospective employees for work in Arabia before they applied for Arabian visas, for the purpose of excluding persons of the Jewish faith to whom visas will not be granted. The respondent urged the commission not to take any action which would jeopardize this agreement in view of considerations important to the international interests and security of the United States.

"Pursuant to Commission policy to seek confirmation of the facts upon which the existence of a bona fide occupational qualification is predicated, the investigating commissioner communicated with the United States Department of State. He was advised by the Political Adviser for the Office of African and Near East Affairs that as a result of the recent conflict between the Arabian countries and Israel, the Arabian governments refused to grant visas to persons of the Jewish faith for work in any of the Arabian countries. This representative of the Department of States stressed the importance of not having anything interfere with the existing relationship between the Arabian Government and the Arabian American Oil Co., explaining that this relationship was the basis for the harmony between this Government and the Arabian Government and should it be disturbed in any way the international interests of the United States would be seriously affected" (Report of Progress, 1950, New York State Commission Against Discrimination, pp. 47–48).

As a result of State Department intervention, the New York State Commission Against Discrimination found these employment practices not violative of State law. Two factors are worthy of note in this report. First, it is indicative of the contagious effect of religious bigotry that an American employer in New York should enter into an understanding with Arabian governments to screen American citizens who are candidates for employment "for the purpose of excluding persons of the Jewish faith." Thus, in direct contradiction of the intention and purpose of existing State fair employment practices legislation American employers are induced and even compelled to undertake religious inquiries and to fix religious standards as a qualification in hiring practices.

Secondly, it is shocking that a "representative of the Department of State (should have) stressed the importance of not having anything interfere with the existing relationship between the Arab Government and the Arabian American Oil Co." It should be remembered that the "anything" that might in this case have disturbed this relationship would have been a demand for the full and equal protection of the rights of American citizens. It is bad statesmanship as well as bad principle that our traditional concept of equal protection should be abandoned for the purpose of furthering certain commercial transactions, whether they be with the Arabian American Oil Co. or with anyone else. It is not true that the American people are willing to maintain contractual arrangements for international exchange of commodities, whatever they may be, when such arrangements are made contingent upon implementing in our own community the religious or racial hatreds and prejudices of foreign governments. Private deals cannot be sanctioned when they are made at the cost of national ideals.

(b) Defense contracts abroad

It is even more disturbing that Arab antisemitism has been made the occasion for the practice of religious discrimination by United States Army contractors engaged in defense projects, projects paid for by all the American people. The New York Times of February 2, 1952, reported that Maj. Gen. G. J. Nold, Deputy Chief of Engineers, United States Army, testified before a Senate subcommittee that New York workers were not recruited by Army contractors for building military bases in Arab countries because the contractors believed a large number of New York applicants would be of Jewish origin and, if hired, would be resented by the Arabs and possibly be in personal danger. It is not surprising that this is precisely the argument advanced by Russian Foreign Minister Prince Lobanow in 1895 to justify his Government's refusal to visé the passports of American Jews, explaining that his country's attitude was essentially philanthropic, serving to warn American Jews while they were still in the United States and thus save them from "difficulties and dangers which they would encounter later if they had not been advised." Adler and Margalith, *op. cit. supra*, at 250. In any event, either forgetful of SCAD's prior ruling or uncertain whether the Army would be granted the same special license to discriminate previously accorded the Arabian American Oil Co., the New York State Employment Service had informed the air base contractors that they must operate in conformity with the State law against discrimination in employment and could not screen out Jewish applicants for the jobs. General Nold tes-

tified that the contractors thereafter simply avoided the New York labor market and recruited their entire work force in the Middle West.

In response to an inquiry by the Chairman of the New York State Commission Against Discrimination, the then Secretary of the Army, Frank Pace, Jr., on March 3, 1952, wrote:

"The charge that the Army has refused to recruit workers from New York for construction work in Arab countries because New York law prohibits discrimination in the hiring of workers has resulted from the recent testimony of the Deputy Chief of Engineers before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee. The Deputy Chief of Engineers there testified that a problem existed in recruiting people of the Jewish faith for work in Arab countries. Insofar as this testimony indicated that there were problems in recruiting Jewish workers for every country having an Arab population, the statements of the Deputy Chief of Engineers were broader than the facts justified. Although his testimony was not so limited, actually the Deputy Chief of Engineers was cognizant of the recruitment problem with respect to the country of Saudi Arabia. The situation there, however, is not one caused by Corps of Engineers contractors. These contractors have not discriminated against qualified Jewish workers for Saudi Arabian projects. They are willing to recruit workers of this faith; however, these workers are unable to obtain the required visas from Saudi Arabia."

This comment by Secretary Pace is characteristic of official nonchalance and indifference to this problem. It reflects the too frequently held view that mere reference to Arab anti-Semitism is all that is necessary to condone American collaboration in discriminatory acts. During the course of his letter to the chairman of the State commission, the Secretary claimed that contractors recruiting workers in the United States for military construction in North Africa by and large conform to the policies laid down by President Truman barring discrimination based on race, creed, color, and national origin; but he also admitted, somewhat coolly, that contractors do, in fact, discriminate against workers of Jewish faith in recruiting for military construction in Saudi Arabia. Government agencies as well as individual contractors usually disclaim any discriminatory intent, even loudly assert that exclusion of Jewish employees is contrary to their own wishes and forced upon them because Jews are refused visas for entry into Saudi Arabia. But the net result is no less an instance of discrimination in Government contracts, in clear, open, and undeniable violation of standing Executive orders.

(c) State Department passivity

More is required of the State and Defense Departments than mere passive recognition of existing facts. Regrettably, Secretary of State Dulles, like his associates, appears largely undisturbed by the Arab policy of discrimination against American Jews. During his testimony on February 24, 1956, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in response to a question relating to our endorsement of discrimination against American Jewish businessmen, Secretary Dulles found it appropriate to refer to the religious requirements of Moslem law and to indulge in analogies concerning Moslem dietary customs. The general temper of Secretary Dulles' reply may perhaps be evident in his concluding comments that the Arabs "have some practices which we may think curious. * * * We, perforce, accommodate ourselves to certain practices they have which we do not like; they, perhaps, accommodate themselves to certain of our idiosyncrasies which they do not like, but on the whole, they have a pretty arbitrary rule largely dictated by the strict tenets of the Moslem faith."

It ordinarily might be supposed that the practice of religious discrimination against American nationals is not a mere curious practice to be likened to exotic dietary habits, nor would it ordinarily be thought properly comparable by an American Secretary of State to folk idiosyncrasies of our own to which the Arabs might conceivably object. At issue are national policies that impose serious penalties upon many American citizens and these cannot lightly be dismissed as quaint, almost charming, eccentricities which we need not trouble to regard seriously.

The occasional objections made by the State Department to this practice of religious discrimination thus far have been palpably inadequate. For all of its perfrunctory assurances, the State Department has never indicated the precise nature of its protests of whether those protests when conveyed were pursued with vigor and persistence. Nor has Secretary Dulles, or any other Department spokesman, ever suggested any further course of conduct should our protests, as seems inevitable at present, continue to go unheeded.

The right to travel and go abroad is a right much treasured and desired, and if the Arab states were suddenly to close their doors to all Americans we should unquestionably deem it to be an affront and unfriendly act. We can properly be no less affronted when the Arab countries single out one group of Americans to whom they bar their borders solely because of religious affiliation. And it becomes doubly unconscionable when this practice, abetted by American participation, becomes the prelude and apology for imposing economic penalties against American Jewish citizens.

It would seem, at the very least, that if any American citizens are barred from entry to any Arab states for religious reasons, this Government, with the exception of necessary and authorized diplomatic personnel, should prohibit all citizens from Arab countries from entry here. There is ample precedent for such a move. Section 243 (g) (7) of the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 authorizes this country to refuse any further immigration from those states who are unwilling to accept return of their nationals who are deported from the United States. Surely the crude religious discrimination practiced by the Arab countries is at least as significant a cause for invoking this reciprocal prohibition. There is no tenable reason for the United States to continue to receive immigration from countries who capriciously and arbitrarily deny an equivalent right to a considerable section of our own citizens. It is a well-established principle that no foreign government can with impunity discriminate between one American passport and another. That principle needs now to be implemented.

III. BOYCOTT OF AMERICAN JEWISH BUSINESS

It is generally conceded that pursuant to a directive of the Arab League there is at present an Arab boycott of business throughout the world that have representatives or branches in Israel or that maintain commercial relations with Israeli firms, however small these transactions may be. This is evidenced by a recent statement by the Iraqi Consul in New York, Gen. A. K. Gailani asserting that:

"Our policy is that all firms, be they Christian, Jew, or Moslem, are not allowed to do business with the Arab countries if they have a subsidiary or branch in Israel. This was a decision of the Arab League, not of Iraq alone, and the reason is that Israel is at war with the Arab countries." (New York Post, February 3, 1956.)

An article recently appearing in the Foreign Commerce Weekly, published by the United States Department of Commerce, further confirms this fact:

"Member states of the Arab League have agreed to take the following actions in implementation of their boycott against countries having relations with both Israel and the Arab countries, the Iraq Government has informed diplomatic missions in Baghdad.

"Imports of products from foreign countries will be banned if the companies have branches or assembly plants in Israel; if their general agents or regional offices in the Mideast are located in Israel; or if Israeli companies are granted the privilege of using trade names.

"Foreign companies, bodies, and establishments, both public and private, having shares in Israeli firms or plants will be prohibited from carrying out business in the Arab countries.

"Regularly scheduled foreign steamships passing through Arab ports on both-way trips will not be allowed to anchor in an Israeli port on either journey. Exceptions are world tourist steamships, provided the Arab states through which they are to pass are notified in advance of their names and the dates of departure—Embassy Baghdad" (Foreign Commerce Weekly, vol. 51, No. 1, January 4, 1956).

There is irrefutable evidence, moreover, that this anti-Israel boycott has now been expanded into a blacklisting of all businesses throughout the world, whether or not they have branches in Israel, that are owned by Jews, employ Jews or even subscribe to Jewish philanthropic activities. According to the Economic Bulletin of the Arab League (Cairo), there are now 162 Jewish firms on the blacklist; 45 or British, 44 American, 23 French, 14 Swiss; 11 are in Argentina; 10 in Canada, 8 in Belguim, 6 in Holland and 1 in Australian. Despite the occasional camouflages that have been attempted, the character of this economic reprisal is now sufficiently clear as to leave no doubt whatever as to its anti-Semitic purposes.

The boycott is conducted by cooperation of a number of the member states of the Arab League. The Saudi Arabian Government has been the most active and consistent in this connection in the United States although other Arab states have also participated with increasing frequency.

A. Saudi Arabian boycott

The American Jewish Congress has in its possession correspondence from Arab firms located in Saudi Arabia, canceling contracts with American Jewish businesses because of a directive promulgated by the Saudi Arabian Chamber of Commerce, but unquestionably inspired by the Saudi Arabian Government, instructing Saudi Arabian firms to discontinue all relations with businesses abroad owned or controlled by Jews or that employ Jews. These letters state that any contract negotiated in violation of this directive will be subject to summary cancellation and that any merchandise imported into Saudi Arabia from firms employing Jews abroad will run the risk of confiscation. The Saudi Arabian Government evidently requires its domestic import companies to obtain affirmative and positive assurances that their business associates abroad are free of all Jewish connections.

The claim has been adduced by representatives of the State Department among others that this boycott is not by any official agency in Saudi Arabia but only by private individuals. This contention must be weighed against the undisputed fact that Saudi Arabia is an absolute despotism without any semblance of representative government. It is unthinkable that any influential agency in that country could issue policy directives without the prior knowledge and approval of responsible officials. Moreover, no body other than the Government itself would possess authority to confiscate incoming shipments. The Government of Saudi Arabia has plenary authority to impose conditions on international transactions and it must be concluded that, despite the nominal denials

glibly issued by their spokesmen and consular representatives in the United States, Saudi Arabian Government officials themselves have stipulated and directed the anti-Jewish restrictions now invoked.

The nature of the discrimination is clearly reflected in the following excerpts from letters in our files received by American firms owned by Jews from their Saudi Arabian customers. The names of the recipients and senders of these letters are not here disclosed in order not to disturb other commercial relations these firms may have. Photostatic copies of the letters, however, are in American Jewish Congress' possession.

January 3, 1952: "We very much regret to inform you that our Government has duly published a notice announcing that any importers of Saudi Arabia must not be permitted to import the goods, any kind of goods, from any Jewish firms of the world.

"Further, they have listed your name as being your firm is Jewish firm, as these steps are taken suddenly against you, we are obliged to cable you to stop the shipments of our orders, until we write you.

"However, we are obliged to ask you to let us have full particulars as to what faith your firm belong, to Jewish or Christian? And until we have full particulars from you we are obliged to stop our business with you."

October 1, 1953: "In connection with our request for not effecting the shipment of our order by any steamer which belongs to any Jewish steamship company. This is in compliance of our Government's regulation announced recently, further this ordinance warns that any shipment by such steamers will not be allowed to enter Saudi Arabia."

September 17, 1953: "We have also to inform you that you are well aware we are quite prohibited to import any goods manufactured in any Jew factories. Now our Government has issued a new regulation warning all the importers that no goods may be brought by the steamers belonging to Jew steamship company. You are kindly requested to take this matter into consideration in order to avoid any sort of trouble arising by doing so."

September 22, 1953: "We hope that you have not shipped our order by now. We append the text of notification from our local government, for your kind information and perusal. Merchant or merchants established in Saudi Arabia intended to import goods from foreign countries should know that it is forbidden to deal with a Jewish company or with a company whose any of its workmen is Jewish or has branch in Israel, and if a merchant intended to deal with a company and knows that the same company is not Jewish, should also be asked to submit a letter of certificate issued by the chamber of commerce certifying that neither of its workman is Jewish nor has branch in Israel. Therefore, we will request you to furnish us with a certificate issued by your local chamber of commerce to that effect."

November 27, 1955: "We refer to your letter dated March 8, 1955, addressed to our associates —— from which we gather that you are desirous to establish business relations in Saudi Arabia.

"It may also be noted that according to Saudi Arabian Government's regulation all invoices for the goods supplied, must be legalized by Saudi legation of your side. We are strictly prohibited to deal with Jew firms and therefore it will be appreciated if you can furnish us with a certificate duly legalized by the Saudi legation stating that your firm is not Jews firm, otherwise we regret we shall not be able to enter into business with you."

January 7, 1956: "With reference to your letter No. IW:ek of the November 21, 1955, we have to inform you that you will have to get the original certificate attested and certified by the Saudi Arabian Consulate in your country to the effect that firm which exports the machine is not a Jewish firm, without which we can not have dealings with your firm."

One of the recipients of the letters quoted above regularly exports wheat, flour, rice and textiles to Saudi Arabia and prior to the boycott his business in that country amounted to about $2 million a year. No United States export license is required for shipment of these materials but under the terms of the International Wheat Agreement to which both the United States and Saudi Arabia are subject, the United States pays 70 cents for each bushel of wheat shipped as a subsidy to American exporters. The effect of this boycott therefore is that the United States Government may make grants to non-Jewish firms shipping wheat to Saudi Arabia, but because of American submission to Arab demands Jewish firms are excluded from comparable benefits.

The discontinuance of contracts by Saudi Arabia importers reflects not only an effort on the part of the Saudia Arabian Government to regulate the conditions of its internal economy, but to reach out far beyond its own borders to boycott what it regards as Jewish enterprise. American Jewish businessmen are flatly excluded from competition for a large segment of international trade. Certainly to the extent that funds used to subsidize this trade derive from tax payments and other contributions on the part of all the people of this country, it would appear intolerable for any American national to be barred from participation because of religious considerations.

B. Boycotts by other Arab countries

Although the boycott carried out by Saudi Arabia has received the greatest attention in this country there are clear indications that other members of the Arab League have carried on an identical policy of barring Jews from international trade. The following excerpts from a letter to the Chairman of the Board of Directors of Verkoopkantoor Van der Heem N. V., The Hague, Holland, on November 13, 1955, indicates the firm intention of all members of the Arab League to make the boycott of Jews universal:

"As you are aware the Arab countries are in a state of war with Israel and for this reason we are making an economical siege around that Israel. This siege is administered by a special control and investigation office with members of all the Arab States.

"An officer in said office visited us today and requested that following information be supplied about your company:

* * * * *

"5. Do you have any Jewish employees in your company, if yes how many and what are the positions held by them.

"6. Are there any Jews in your board of directors as members?

"7. Is any of your managers or branch managers a Jew, if yes please give name of the department headed by such a man.

"8. Is any of the persons authorized to sign on behalf of your company a Jew?

"9. What is the number of Jewish laborers in your factories and offices?"

In a letter quoted below from Assistant Secretary of the State in 1953, the State Department acknowledged that there has been from time to time a blacklisting of American Jewish firms by the Lebanese Government. American newspapers report similar experiences by American Jewish businesses throughout the world in dealing with member states of the Arab League (New York Herald Tribune, Feb. 12, 1956). The boycott now suffered by American Jewish firms is a vital part of the international plan of the Arab League to deny Jewish businesses access to principal markets.

C. The reluctant State Department

This matter was first brought to the attention of the State Department in 1952 when reports of this practice were first received by the American Jewish Congress. The issue presumably was satisfactorily concluded, in May 1952, when in a letter to Senator LEHMAN, Jack K. McFall, Assistant Secretary of the Department of State, declared that the racial and religious restrictions imposed on international dealings by the Saudi Arabian Government had been discontinued effective April of that year:

"I refer again to your note of January 30, 1952, and my reply of February 6 regarding Saudi Arabian trade discrimination against Jewish firms in the United States. As you know, this action and its possible repercussions in this country were matters of real concern to this Department. The delicacy of the problem in Saudi Arabia recommended an informal approach rather than official representations to that Government as best designed to meet with success in causing the discontinuance of that discriminatory practice.

"Several frank but friendly discussions were held with the Saudi Arabian Embassy in Washington and by our Ambassador in Saudi Arabia with appropriate high authorities there. I am now happy to be able to report to you that these efforts have been successful and the broad restrictive Saudi Arabian decree has been superseded as of April 4, 1952.

Regrettably, however, as is evident from the letters quoted earlier, the boycott of Jewish firms has not, in fact, been stopped and continues even to the present month without any lessening of its force.

(1) The Claim of Private Boycott

Repeated efforts have been made to persuade the State Department to assert its influence to cause an effective discontinuance of this economic boycott by American Jews. In a letter to Senator LEHMAN on December 15, 1953, the then Assistant Secretary of State, Thruston B. Morton, declared:

"As I informed you in my letter of May 15 last, the Department at that time sought an appropriate occasion to reassert the United States feeling toward the boycott. This presented itself in July, when a report was received from our Embassy in Beirut that there were indications that the Lebanese Government contemplated blacklisting American firms dealing with Israel. The Department promptly took this occasion to instruct the Embassy, and to inform our other Embassies in the area, that if such action were taken it should state in positive terms to the Government of Lebanon that the United States Government was seriously concerned, and that the blacklisting action was unwarranted. Specific points upon which the Department based this position were transmitted to the Embassy for use if the occasion arose, and these points were also relayed to the other Embassies for guidance if they were confronted with a similar situation.

"Insofar as the Department has been informed up to this time, the action reportedly contemplated by the Lebanese Government has not been taken. In fact, the Embassy recently took steps to obtain an import permit for an American consignment in transit to Jordan, which had been refused some time ago by the Lebanese Government, and was successful in obtaining it. We are currently taking steps to remove from a blacklist three American tankers refused permission to enter a Saudi Arabian port.

"One of the cases cited in your letter had been previously brought to our attention and sent to our Embassy in Saudi Arabia for its report. The other case which you cite has now also been referred to the Embassy. The type of discrimination implicit in these cases is indeed serious. The Department hopes that these instances are in the nature of sporadic, out-of-bounds actions based on excessive zeal or misunderstanding on the part of certain individuals rather than an indication of fundamental intensification of boycott practice by the Saudi Arabian Govern-

ment. This hope is supported by the report which we have just received from the Embassy on the first of the two cases reported to it. The Embassy states that is can find no decree of the Saudi Arabian Government barring imports from Jewish firms but is investigating the possibility that a local sheikh or other official may have issued an order effective only in his area. A leading figure of the Arab League has also recently indicated to an officer of the Department that discrimination of the type exemplified in the cases under reference is not to his knowledge contemplated nor supported by the league."

A letter similar in import was sent to Dr. Nehemiah Robinson, director of the Institute of Jewish Affairs of the World Jewish Congress, on December 30, 1953, by Merrill C. Fay, officer in charge, Economic Affairs, office of Near Eastern Affairs of the Department of State. Mr. Fay's letter declared:

"A report has now been received from the American Embassy in Jidda, Saudi Arabia, in response to the Department's inquiry whether a decree has been issued by that government prohibiting merchants from trading with Jewish-owned firms in the United States.

"The Embassy reports that decree No. 3/4/2179 of April 4, 1952, forbids the importation of 'Israeli products of the products of foreign companies with branches in Israel.' Order No. 11299 of August 26, 1953 (16/12/1372), prohibits this importation of goods on 'Israeli ships or through Israeli navigation companies or on foreign ships which may anchor, during the trips to Arab countries, in Israeli ports.'

"The Embassy reports further that no official action has been taken by the Saudi Arabian Government against trade with Jewish firms who do not have branches in Israel or engage in trade with Israel through Israeli shipping companies. It would therefore appear that the documentation requirement mentioned in your letter has no official status.

"The Embassy speculates that some Saudi Arabian importers entertain apparently groundless fears that their goods might be confiscated, under one of the foregoing regulations, if the supplying firm bore a Jewish name, may have written to their American connections that a certificate by the local chamber of commerce should accompany their shipments. There is nothing that the Department can do, unfortunately, to cause them to desist from such a practice which does not appear to accord with their government's regulations.

"You may rest assured, however, that this situation is being kept under constant study by the Department, and that all appropriate steps will be taken to protect the interests of American exporters."

It has already been suggested that the use of private fronts to conceal official governmental boycott of American Jewish firms is an obvious dodge, one designed to permit Arab countries to engage in anti-Semitic discrimination against American citizens while pleading innocent of any implications in these acts. The insistence by Arab exporters upon a certificate of non-Jewish ownership is too regular and consistent to be attributable only to excessive zeal on the part of some local sheikh. It would be naive to suppose that such a widespread pattern of conduct could be sustained without the approval and participation of government agencies.

Occasionally, the mask has slipped. Recent newspaper accounts indicate that Arab diplomatic officers in this country have admitted government sponsorship of the discriminatory boycott. The New York Mirror, December 29, 1955, reported the existence of a Saudi Arabian blacklist of Jewish firms and declared:

"At the Saudi Arabian Consulate in the Chrysler Building, a trade attaché admitted that American firms either owned or headed by Americans of the Jewish faith cannot do business with the Arab country."

Similarly, a report in the same newspaper on December 30, 1955, announced State Department disapproval of the exclusion of Jewish firms from this area of international trade and observed:

"An official of the Saudi Arabian consulate in New York declined to confirm the report, but said that Saudi Arabian firms would 'naturally be reluctant to deal' with American businesses owned by Jews."

(2) The Boycott Becomes Official

Moreover, evidence has come into the possession of the American Jewish Congress unmistakably establishing overt conduct, not on the part of private individuals, but by authorized representatives of the Saudi Arabian Government to promote, create, and maintain a boycott of American Jewish business firms. American Jewish exporters have separately filed affidavits with the American Jewish Congress declaring that the Saudi Arabian consulate in New York City has refused to legalize commercial invoices they have submitted for approval on the grounds that they are "undesirable" concerns. And each of them has attested that he cannot account for this classification except for the intensive questioning that he or his representatives have recently undergone by members of the consulate staff as to the fact of their Jewish ownership or as to their employment of Jewish personnel. Even the messengers employed by these firms merely to deliver and hand over papers have been interrogated about their religious affiliation. Under the existing custom of international trade the legalization of commercial invoices frequently is a prerequisite to the fulfillment of contractural obligations between American shippers and Arab purchasers. It will be noticed that in the letters quoted above demanding a certification of non-Jewish ownership, several Arab firms have referred to the fact that "according to Saudi Arabian Government regulations all invoices for the goods supplied must be legalized by the Saudi delegation of your side." A refusal by the Saudi Arabian Government, therefore, to validate these instruments precludes any possibility of maintaining commercial dealings by American Jewish exporters with their Arab customers.

None of the exporters affected by this ruling until this time had had any difficulty or disagreement with the Arab consulate in New York or with their Arab customers. Despite the generally understood disapproval by the Saudi Arabian Government of commercial transactions carried on by its nationals and foreign Jewish businesses, many of these exporters with the cooperation and help of Arab purchasers had been able to work out devices to avoid official intervention in their transactions. However, the boycott now imposed by Arab Government officials flatly precludes any possibility of negotiation or cooperation on the part of private individuals of either country to carry out contracts for trade. It is precisely because this ban is conducted under the auspices of the Arabian Governments themselves and not as a result of private individual decision that these American citizens are barred. It is no longer possible to attempt to evade this problem by lightly passing it off as a result of individual misreading of official regulations. This anti-Jewish discrimination stands clearly disclosed as the direct result of official governmental decision and decree.

Moreover, it is indisputable that our own Government by now must be aware that the current Saudi Arabian boycott of Jewish firms is, in fact, an official undertaking and an expression of anti-Semitic prejudice by the Saudi Arabian Government itself, and not merely a succession of sporadic, private acts. The following item appearing on page 7 of the Foreign Commerce Weekly of March 5, 1956, published in Washington by the United States Department of Commerce establishes that the Department of Commerce, if not the State Department, is fully apprised of the facts:

"Saudi Arabia intends to boycott all Jewish or Jewish-directed firms from trading with that country, according to information received by the Bureau of Foreign Commerce.

"This new policy greatly extends the provisions of the existing boycott against firms having branches, assembly plants, or general agents in Israel, as well as firms having shares in Israeli companies.

"Implementation of the new policy normally will be accomplished by Saudi Arabian Consulates, who are responsible for legalization of commercial invoices and certificates of origin."

Similarly, the Minutes of the Monthly Round Table Conference of the Foreign Credit Interchange Bureau of March 7, 1956, discloses that Mr. Milton Blecher, business analyst of the New York field office of the United States Department of Commerce was among the discussants at the conference and that the following comments on the Saudi Arabian boycott were made:

Chairman: Question. "Customers in Saudi Arabia have advised that a certificate is required by the Saudi Arabian authorities as to the Jewish or Christian status of the firm for which a letter of credit is to be opened. Such a certificate is to be verified or visaed by the Saudi Arabian Consul in New York. Lack of this certificate, or a certificate indicating that the supplier firm is Jewish would make it impossible to conclude the sale. It is not clear just what is meant by a Jewish firm nor can we comply with such a request without protesting the implication. Has there been any action by the Department of Commerce or by the FCIB to make the impertinence of this requirement known to the Saudi-Arabian authorities?"

Mr. Milton Blecher (U. S. Department of Commerce): "Saudi Arabia intends to boycott all Jewish or Jewish-directed firms from trading with that country, according to information received by the Bureau of Foreign Commerce, United States Department of Commerce.

"This new policy greatly extends the provisions of the existing boycott against firms having branches, assembly plants, or general agents in Israel, as well as firms having shares in Israeli companies.

"Implementation of the new policy normally will be accomplished by Saudi Arabian consulates, who are responsible for legalization of commercial invoices and certificates of origin."

Chairman: "I think Mr. Blecher in his comments also answered question No. 2."

Question: "Several stories have appeared recently in the press regarding a trading boycott by Saudi Arabia against certain American firms. Can you develop this further at the round table?"

Member: "One part of the discussion has not been clarified. Is this something being considered or are their firms now shipping to Saudi Arabia and having any difficulty?"

Panel Member: "I just heard of one case where the consulate in Beirut refused to clear the transshipment documents."

Member: "Within the last month we received a letter of credit from Saudi Arabia and there was absolutely no question."

Panel Member: "I thing there is a private clearance going on here by the consulate and they have certain information on certain firms on the strength of which they act."

Member: "We have made several shipments and all that has been required of us has been certificate of origin and that would be legalized by the Saudi Arabian consulate."

Member: "What would be considered a Jewish corporation?"

Chairman: "Can anybody answer that?"

Panel Member: "As far as I know if any member of the firm or part-owner of the firm is of the Jewish faith they will not allow the goods in."

The Department of Commerce is thus aware of the facts. Foreign credit men working in this country are aware of the facts. Virtually the only interested party not aware of the facts is our State Department.

In the one precedent in our history for this withholding of consular approval of commercial documents submitted by American Jewish firms, the then Acting Secretary of State, Alvey A. Adee, in 1895 found this practice to be an "unjust and invidious discrimination against American Jews":

"But the Russian discrimination against American Jews is not confined simply to the matter of visaing passports. This department was informed a few years since by the Russian Minister here that Russian consuls in this country would refuse authentication to legal documents for use in Russia when Jews are ascertained to be interested. This is an unjust and invidious discrimination against American Jews." (Foreign Relations, 1895, p. 1067.)

Acting Secretary Adee called for immediate cessation of these practices and the adoption of preventive measures by this country. It is to be expected that now that all pretense has been dropped and the actual involvement of government officials in the current anti-Jewish boycott is a matter of full public disclosure and information, our State Department officials will similarly be disposed to demand an immediate stop to this intolerable behavior by Arab diplomats in this country.

It is also significant that none of these exporters maintains any branches or transacts any business with the government of Israel or with any Israeli firms. The allegation that only firms with Israeli branches or connections are excluded from Arab trade is a transparent artifice employed by the Arab League to conceal its intention to boycott Jewish firms wherever situated, as is indicated in the remarks of Mr. Blecher of the United States Department of Commerce quoted earlier. It cannot be mere accident that so many individual Arab exporters should have felt constrained to interpret nominally anti-Israel regulations as, in fact, directed against any foreign Jewish enterprise. The merits of Arab hostility to Israel may be debated by other disinterested nations but this hostility cannot in any way be made to justify the current campaign of universal anti-Semitism.

It is worth noting that in some countries, notably Italy and Holland, commercial organizations and government authorities have denounced this Arab policy and have refused to cooperate with it. The Central Organization for Foreign Economic Relations at The Hague has recently advised the Netherlands branch of the International Chamber of Commerce that Dutch members should not supply information relating to the number of Jewish executives and employees employed in Dutch export houses as demanded by various Arab importers. It is also disclosed that: "The Belgian Foreign Ministry is reported to have told the Antwerp association that it is giving sympathetic consideration to the request for international action on the issue." (New York Herald Tribune, February 12, 1956.)

(3) The "Informal Approach" of the State Department

No less should be expected of our own Government. Previous State Department demurrers on the ground that the Arab States have the sovereign right to regulate their commerce and their mode of international dealing are not a sufficient reply to the deprivation of rights suffered by American citizens. The operative facts here do not run to any country's sovereignty but rather to our own country's policy of permitting an affront to a section of American citizenry to go unanswered.

Moreover, the State Department surely has a responsibility to reaffirm and continually press, through every possible international forum, its wholehearted opposition to this practice. As Senator LEHMAN wrote Secretary Dulles on January 25:

"Would you not agree that our Government has an obligation to its citizens, and its own ideals, to the let the government of Saudi Arabia know not only on one occasion but on repeated occasions that we view with utmost distaste this policy of anti-Semitic discrimination?"

It has been already noted that the State Department at one time felt that its intercession had successfully resulted in ending the then concededly official Arab boycott against American Jewish citizens. Recent events obviously disprove this claim. Part of the reason for our Government's notable lack of ability to bring this practice to a decisive end may be found in the hesitant and uncertain attitude of the State Department itself. It will be remembered from Mr. McFall's letter quoted earlier that the State Department was apprehensive about possible repercussions at least as much as it was agitated about the admitted fact of discrimination. Mr. McFall's language is suggestive of the State Department's thinking: "The delicacy of the problem in Saudi Arabia recommended an informal approach rather than official representations to that Government." And the State Department's notion of what needed to be done culminated in holding "frank but friendly discussions."

It is high time the State Department steeled itself to the realization that informal approaches and friendly discussions, however frank, are not enough to drive home the proposition that this Government will not stand for further religious discrimination against its citizens. The fact that the agreement not to boycott did not stick must be attributed to the willingness of our representatives to pussyfoot and equivocate and to act out of fear of loss of advantage rather than out of strength deriving from conviction. Further representations can and ought to be made, but they must be made in firm language and in a formal context that makes it plain that we do not intend to be bought off; that, in short, we are determined with all the vigor and influence we can bring to bear to protect all our citizens alike. It should be made plain that no treaty or trade agreement will be negotiated or maintained between the Arab countries and the United States unless it is expressly understood that all American citizens shall have full and equal right to participate in the trade thus made possible, without regard to religious affiliation. The prestige and influence of the United States is not so inconsiderable that the Arab countries could easily remain recalcitrant and unyielding in the face of a clear and determined expression of policy by this country.

IV. ARAB ANTI-JEWISH PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

Perhaps the most vicious offense committed by Arab Governments against Jewish citizens in the United States is their deliberate formenting of domestic anti-Semitism in this country and their collaboration with and sponsorship of elements in the American hate movement.

A. The Arab information center

Prior to the end of World War II, there were virtually no Arab propaganda activities at all in the United States. In November 1944, for the first time an office was established in New York under the name of the Institute of Arab-American Affairs to disseminate material about each of the Arab countries separately as well as about the group of Arab countries united in the Arab League. Though its declared purpose was to "seek to implement its policy as a medium of good will between the United States and Arab countries," most of its activities were concerned with the fight against the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine and by 1947 the Institute of Arab-American Affairs was dealing exclusively with the Palestine question.

The main organ of propaganda for the Arabs in the United States is the Arab Information Center recently reactivated in New York City at 445 Park Ave., where it shares quarters with the U. N. delegation of the Kingdom of Yemen. The Information Center is currently headed by Kamil Abdul Rahim, a veteran diplomat who served from 1948 to 1953 as Egyptian ambassador to Washington and is now an accrediated member with the rank of Ambassador, of the Yemen delegation to the U. N. As U. N. ambassador, Rahim enjoys diplomatic immunity not only for his own person but also for the premises he occupies, which just happen to be coterminous with those of the Arab Information Center. The Center itself, however, is registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act. The Center has recently been granted a special fund of $300,000 to expand its activities against Israel and Zionism. Egypt underwrote the major portion of this expenditure with an allocation of $140,000; the Arab League allotted $90,000 and Saudi Arabia $70,000. Besides this, the Center has been given a regular budget of $400,000. Thus, it has a total of $700,000 to spend in the coming year's operations.

B. Collaboration with American hatemongers

In carrying out its anti-Jewish campaign, the Arab Information Center has determined upon a course of intimate cooperation with professional anti-Semites in this country.

A policy statement sent by Rahim on October 25, 1954, from Cairo before his departure for the United States to head the Center, to Dr. Omar Haliq, Arab League representative in New York (Jewish Telegraphic Agency dispatch of March 17, 1955) declared that the Center henceforth would welcome the cooperation and assistance of professional anti-Semites "in all fields and ways." Rahim emphasized that such activities were to be handled discreetly so as not to exposed the Center to charges of anti-Semitism or compromise its character as "a cultural exchange." Rahim indicated that he intended to deal with this facet of the Center's activities personally.

It is further reported that at about this same time Dr. Haliq sounded out for possible Arab collaboration such figures as Gerald L. K. Smith, who runs the Christian Nationalist Party; Joseph P. Kamp, head of the Constitutional Educational League; Allen Zoll, whose American Patriots, Inc., was listed as "fascist" by the Justice Department; and Benjamin H. Freedman, confessed financier of anti-Jewish publications.

More recently open cooperation between Arab diplomats and American hate groups has become even more bold and unabashed. At a meeting last June of the American Nationalist Coalition, a front group for James H. Madole's National Renaissance Party, cited by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as an avowedly Hitlerite group, Abdul M. Hassan, a member of the Egyptian delegation to the United Nations was a featured and inflammatory speaker. A table at the rear of the meeting room, attended by a uniformed American Nationalist Coalition youth member, offered for free distribution such pamphlets as Egypt's Agrarian Policy Under the New Regime by Dr. Abd-El-Razzok Sidky and the Story of Zionist Espionage in Egypt. According to Madole, the pamphlets were provided free by the Egyptian Embassy and proved the anti-Israel and anti-Jewish charges made in Has-

san's remarks. Hassan inevitably later declared that his appearance at the meeting did not necessarily constitute endorsement of the coalition's entire program. (National Jewish Post, June 10, 1955.)

C. Distribution of anti-Semitic literature

The increasingly voluminous literature published directly by Arab official propaganda agencies bears a comparable stamp of anti-Jewishness although, significantly, it does not usually bear any imprint identifying its source. Most of the anti-Jewish items now being freely distributed across the country, often elaborately and handsomely printed, are published by the embassies of the Arab States and distributed by the Arab Information Center.

Generally, Arab officials obey the advice given them by American consultants to avoid heavy-handed anti-Jewish themes in their propaganda. On the other hand, the Arabs understand that the terms "Zionist" and "Jew" are so closely identified in the United States by the general public that the theme of anti-Zionism can be handled adroitly to produce anti-Jewish implications, thus the continually repeated refrain concerning "the influence of the American Zionists in Washington."

Occasionally, however, the Arab line is directed into an unmistakable excursion into overt anti-Jewish incitement. This is especially true in two pamphlets now widely in circulation, "Story of Zionist Espionage in Egypt" and "Jewish Atrocities in the Holy Land." Both documents originally were issued by the Egyptian Embassy and were sent without any indication of their source or sponsorship to a large mailing list. They are also distributed by the Arab Information Center. These pamphlets clearly seek not only to inspire antipathy toward Israel but, in addition, to invoke a feeling of anti-Jewish prejudice and bias generally. And as a matter of fact, domestic anti-Semites in the United States already have distributed and exploited these documents for their own purposes. Thus, "The Story of Zionist Espionage in Egypt" is now being circulated by Madole's National Renaissance Party, an openly Hitlerite group, and "Jewish Atrocities in the Holy Land," published 6 years ago, has been circulated and distributed, and its contents otherwise exploited, by such worthies as Conde McGinley, Gerald L. K. Smith, and Frank L. Britton.

The "Story of Zionist Espionage in Egypt" is openly anti-Jewish as well as anti-Israel. A detailed narration of an alleged spy plot is prefaced with the statement that the Israelis * * * "recruit hundreds of agents, financed through the international system of begging which Israel has invented and brought to an art, and disperse them throughout the Arab world to commit acts of sabotage, destroying the lives of the innocent."

After 40 pages on this subject, the pamphlet then devotes about 15 pages to alleged desecration of Moslem and Christian holy places by "the Zionists" and "the Jewish forces," narrations of the assassinations of Lord Moyne and Count Bernadotte, and finally—after this lengthy warmup of spying, bombing, atrocity, desecration, and assassination—a 1-page dissertation on "Zionism and communism," which begins:

"Zionism and communism are 2 distinctive forces with 1 political objective—world domination. Both powers cooperate secretly and in public without friction since the power in the end will eventually go to Zionism.

"They will not achieve supremacy until they destroy the Islamic and Christian countries all over the world. Therefore communism helps Zionism and each in its own way completes the other; only thus will they reach their aim—Zionist world supremacy."

"Jewish Atrocities in the Holy Land" exploits the excesses committed by unauthorized terrorists at the height of the Arab-Israeli conflict; the excesses are attributed to the Jews as Jews. Scattered throughout the pamphlet are photographs of the more revolting kind, including some which show dead victims in various states of decomposition.

The following excerpts are illustrative of the themes in the text of this pamphlet:

"Now we have once more to hear the horrible tale of sadistic cruelties and wanton brutalities perpetrated against an innocent population, mainly composed of women, children and old men. But this time the aggressors are those very Jews who were lately so loud in their outcry against the Nazis. * * *

"When reading of these atrocious acts, one unconsciously thinks of their perpetrators as being untaught savages, or barbarians of the remote past. Yet these same Jews have for centuries, by virtue of their money-amassing activities, gathered to themselves the cream of culture and refinement of whatever country they have settled in. The wealthy, educated Jew, surrounded by all the culture and art that his riches can command has been a long familiar figure in civilized society."

An even more outrageous document, published by the World Truth League of P. O. B. 44, Jerusalem, Jordan-Arab side, is distributed widely in the United States through embassy offices of the Arab delegations to the U. N. as well as by the Arab Information Center. The sheet, composed in a sensational format, contains touched-up photographs of alleged Israeli massacres of Arab children, old men, and women. It quotes liberally from the "Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion" to the effect that the Jews believe "the Gentiles are a flock of sheep and we are the wolves and you know what happens when the wolves get hold of the flock." This Jordanian leaflet maintains that Jews, not Israelis, are the unconscionable exploiters of the Gentile world and "they have very well proved it once again by their recent Judaic barbarities against innocent Arab shepherds." It declares that "the basic material in all Jewish propaganda is composed of lies and distortion of facts as is known by now all over the world."

Another column contains citations from books and documents written by Jews of various nationalities around the world, purporting to illustrate the Jewish incendiary revolutionary spirit. Among the persons slandered are Theodore Herzl, Louis Dembitz Brandeis, Harold Laski, and Bernard Baruch. The paper also discloses that: "Benjamin Cohen, a Jew from Chile, is just under Trygve Lie, the U. N. Secretary General and his job is to see that Lie follows the Jew plan." * * * "The United States representative at the U. N. is the Jew, Ernest A. Gross." "Dr. Leo Paslovsky 'Special U. S. Assistant Secretary of State,' a Russian born Jew, naturalized American citizen, is the man who drew the United Nations Charter, with the assistance of Alger Hiss, the traitor, who was then in the State Department." "The United States is hopelessly run by Jews and the U. N. is the den of Jewish spies."

It is apparent that crude and vicious canards of this kind are not intended to be limited merely to incitement of hostility against Israel. They are designed for the larger purpose of promoting hatred toward Jews of every national allegiance throughout the world.

D. Defamation by Arab diplomats

The most astounding and arrogant conduct of all, however, is the persistent abuse by Arab diplomats of the hospitality granted them by the United States. In addition to the spurious political arguments used by Arab diplomatic representatives to press their cause, they have now added an almost open appeal to prejudice, suspicion and race hate. Recourse to anti-Semitism is nothing new in the history of calumny of the Jewish people but it never before has been attempted in America by foreign diplomats as part of a calculated design.

One of the first reported cases of an attack by Arab spokesmen on American Jews before their fellow citizens occurred in February 1953 during a conference on Middle Eastern affairs sponsored by the Foreign Service Educational Foundation in Washington, for the benefit of corporations from all over the country. During the conference, a State Department official read an address by Mr. Bakr, then Iraqui chargé d'affaires in Washington and now his country's foreign secretary, in which Bakr used the then recent "doctor's plot" of Moscow to show that Jews could really not be trusted anywhere and that they are part of an international conspiracy, whether they are Russian citizens, Americans or citizens of any other country.

(1) Ambassador Zeineddin's Anti-Jewish Campaign

Dr. Zeineddin, Bakr's Syrian colleague, tried out this theme a month later in an address at the University of Vermont and then later in a full-fledged attack on April 15, 1953, at the Seventh Session of the United Nations in New York.

In his address, the Syrian ambassador stated:

"The steps taken by the Soviet Union were met with deep satisfaction and appreciation in my country and the public opinion of other Middle Eastern countries * * * Zionism uses the Jewish religion for its political purposes * * * Jews who become Zionists act as a separate closely knit group within their nation. They serve their own Zionist interest. Their allegiance is therefore not to their legal country. Their allegiance to their legal country is formal and not real. Their real allegiance would be to Zionism and Israel, i. e., to a foreign authority. An American, an Argentinian, a Russian or a Syrian Zionist are all one in furthering the aims of Zionism in Israel, be it to the detriment of the interests of their legal country. This, naturally, creates mistrust, suspicion and apprehension between Zionist Jews and non-Jews. Thus Zionism breeds and enhances the growth of anti-Semitism. In fact everywhere that Zionism grew, it brought anti-Semitism in its wake."

After piously insisting that he is not anti-Semitic ("How can we Arabs be anti-Semitic? Are we not Semites ourselves?"), Dr. Zeineddin repeated the familiar calumny of the "internationalist Zionist conspiracy" in the following remarks:

"Zionists today are organized all over the world * * * they join political parties ranging from diehard conservatism to communism, but as Zionists they work toward one end * * * Zionism works in a way which constantly adversely affects world peace and the security of other states by inciting the Jews to feel that they are exiles in their various homelands and by developing in them a conviction that they are an entity of their own in any country. It breaches, with one stroke, the national unity in their country on the basis of religion, thus diminishing national harmony."

These remarks have formed a consistent pattern. Thus, Zeineddin has declared over a radio program broadcast over the NBC network:

"As you may know, Zionism is based upon a distinction as to race and religion between the Jew and the Gentile. They (Zionists) attempt to have the Jews consider themselves as exiles in other countries * * * and there you have the idea of the diaspora * * * and that they should be assembled in Palestine. A Zionist, therefore, gets to be loyal to Israel and gets to be loyal to the Zionist movement if he is really a Zionist. His loyalty to Zionism undoubtedly may diminish

his loyalty to the country in which he lives, and therefore Zionism brings some shade of doubt as to the loyalty of Jews in other countries of whom many might be loyal."

Similarly in a television broadcast some time later, carried over the Dumont network on November 2, 1953, he stated further:

"When an individual becomes a Zionist he acquires a double loyalty, his allegiance is divided. If he is a strong Zionist, his allegiance will certainly go to Israel, even against his very own country, be it the United State, or Syria, or any other country. He is then legally an American, but in fact his allegiance is due to some other principle, that of Zionism, or to some other country such as Israel."

Far from abating, Dr. Zeineddin's incitement of domestic anti-Semitism has became an increasingly intense preoccupation. In a speech delivered before the Women's National Democratic Club in Washington in November 1955 he brazenly impugned the loyalty of American Jews to their own country. Zeineddin charged that "Zionist pressures" on the United States Government and Zionist propaganda had distorted and perverted Arab and American relations. He characterized Jews throughout the world as "mongrellized Russians" who cannot ever claim to be an integral part of a country in which they reside, that they consider themselves different, that they refuse to assimilate and owe their allegiance solely to international Zionism. He wound up his speech by declaring that if there is such a large and urgent sentiment in this country for a creation of a Jewish state "then the only fit place for them is New York City" (New York Post, November 16, 1955).

On November 17, 1955, in a lengthy meeting with George V. Allen, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs, Zeineddin boasts of having said that: "Zionism seeks with some success to make of the United States and in the United States a center for its worldwide activity which is inimical to other states and which is morally unfounded." Zeineddin reportedly urged that the United States "find it fit to look into this matter in view of its international implications." He stressed that the Arabs were especially anxious to see the United States Government look into tax exemptions by Jewish charity contributors. He claimed such deductions really supported "a foreign political movement." (Jewish Telegraph Agency, November 18, 1955.)

A similar refrain has recently been picked up by the diplomatic representatives of other Arab countries. In an address to the Economic Club of Detroit on October 31, 1955, Dr. Mohammed Fadhil Al-Jamali, Foreign Minister of Iraq and head of its U. N. delegation, described the situation "created by a United States policy which has been inspired mainly by Zionist propaganda and pressure."

"They (the Arabs) feel that American policy cannot easily relieve itself from Zionist pressure and Zionist manipulation of the Jewish vote. Next year is an election year. Could the peoples of the United States who have peace and American interests at heart see to it that Zionist propaganda becomes ineffective in the election campaign? It is most important for United States interests in the Middle East that United States policy should not be influenced by Zionist pressure."

The canards currently being circulated by Arab diplomats have not gone unnoticed and they have not been condemned only within the Jewish community. The leaders of five prominent non-Jewish nationality groups in America, including the president of the Czechoslovak National Council of America, the director of the American Hungarian Federation, the chairman of the National Antidefamation Committee of the Order of the Sons of Italy in the United States, the director of the American Lithuanian Information Center, the executive secretary of the Ukrainian Congress Committee, and the editor of the leading Polish language newspaper in the United States, recently protested to Secretary of State Dulles against Zeineddin's libels. They wrote, "To us, the substance of the Ambassador's remarks in many ways was virtually indistinguishable from Nazi racial theories which, within all our memories have brought about such ruin and loss to the world." (J. T. A. November 22, 1955.)

(2) Recruiting Arab Student Propagandists

The anti-Semitic activities of the Arab diplomats have been supplemented by the more informal if no less intense propaganda efforts of Arab students now studying in the United States. Cairo radio broadcasts monitored in the United States report that the more than 2,000 Arab students in this country have been directed by the Arab League to assume an active role in the promotion of anti-Israel and anti-Jewish propaganda in this country. According to these broadcosts, Arab students have been supplied with anti-Zionist literature and have been instructed to deliver anti-Zionist lectures not only on campus but in the general communities outside the universities in which they study, and they have been directed to exert themselves to stimulate pro-Arab and anti-Jewish articles in the American press. The indefatigable efforts of the Arab League to exploit every possible resource to incite anti-Jewish feeling in this country is evidenced in the following item in the January 1956 Newsletter of the Arab Students Association at Columbia University:

"Arab students abroad to defend Arabism. The secretariat-general of the Arab League requested member states to furnish the League with the names of its nationals studying abroad. The secretariat intends to provide these students, wherever they may be, with information which will help them defend Arab interests."

The same Columbia University Newsletter includes samples of the materials to be used as "factual information" by Arab students invited to college forums and other public meetings. A characteristic example is the following "item" attributed by the Newsletter to the Egyptian weekly Al Musawwar:

"We Egyptians do not face a small country called Israel, but a well organized international movement called Zionism. This movement exerts tremendous pressure on the Governments of the United States, France, England and other western countries.

"Some western and eastern bloc countries supplied Israel with arms during the 1947 conflict. Certain army generals, fliers and soldiers who fought for Israel were not Jews; identification cards of prisoners taken during that war testify to that.

"Israel was established upon the bodies of Palestine's rightful inhabitants, through funds obtained from the pockets of American, British and French Zionists."

The Arab League is careful not to miss a trick. It does not scruple at abusing the special status enjoyed in this country by diplomats and visiting students, and its does not hesitate to attempt to convert each of its nationals in the United Sates into an instrument for the promotion of anti-Israel and anti-Jewish doctrine in this country. That such conduct is improper, that it violates the hospitality extended by the host state, that it is offensive to the beliefs and traditions of the people of the United States is apparently a matter of no concern.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

While we recognize that the Government of the United States from time to time has expressed its passing disapproval of Arab anti-Jewish discrimination against American citizens, we submit that far more vigorous action is called for than until now has been forthcoming. American Jews have the right to expect their Government to protect their dignity and good name and their right to travel or engage in commerce abroad on an equal footing with their fellow citizens of other faiths. The effect of present Arab policy is not only to deny equal treatment to American citizens in Arab territories but to extend antisemitism into new and unexpected places here. The time is overdue for official American spokesmen to meet infringements by foreign states upon the rights of American citizens with decisions, firmness, and a determination to protect American rights.

The argument that a firm protection of the rights of our Jewish citizens must be damaging to our economic interests is false and misleading. Arab leaders are, if anything, practical men. And Arab economic relations are based not upon sentiment but upon interest. Any concessions that may now be enjoyed by the United States in Arab lands do not derive from any innate liking that Arab leaders have for this country or from their natural sympathy for our democratic objectives. These benefits result more simply from the enormous consideration that the United States is able to pay in return. It is incredible that this immense American revenue, absolutely vital to the support of the Arab economy, will be refused because of our insistence upon equal treatment for all our citizens. Sovereign decisions on economic and political matters are not made to turn solely upon such factors.

American spokesmen appear sometimes to misunderstand our role. Our relations with the Arab States are not those in which we entreat their favor. We come with gifts in our hands amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars a year, and Arab statesmen perceive this truth, perhaps more clearly and accurately than our own. If the Arab Governments have felt during the past decade that they could ignore the protests of American Ministers and Secretaries of State, it is because, and only because, they felt American protests were half-hearted and unwilling and because they were convinced that this Government spoke only for some special interests or for some special point of view. The intolerable abuse of American citizens by Arab States will be corrected just as quickly as they become convinced that for this country it is indeed intolerable.

The action necessary by the United States to convince the Arab Governments of our determination and resolve to protect the rights of all our citizens equally can readily be prescribed. It would quickly be achieved by adoption of the following measures:

1. No treaty or trade agreement should be negotiated between the Arab countries and the United States unless it is stipulated that all American citizens shall have full and equal right to participate in the trade thus made possible, without regard to religious affiliation.

2. No contract should be negotiated with the Arab states by any agency of the United States whether it be for defense, security, or for any other reason, that allows or requires American Jews to be excluded from employment pursuant to its terms. It shall be made a part of each American-Arab agreement that there shall be no religious discrimination as a result of these joint undertakings against any American citizens.

3. Existing American subsidies including those granted under the International Wheat Trade Agreement should be discontinued for trade in Arab countries unless it is explicitly understood that American Jews shall be permitted full participation without prejudice because of their religious beliefs.

4. No agency of this Government, military or diplomatic, should be permitted to consider religious affiliation in selecting personnel for assignment to Arab countries.

5. No discriminatory hiring practices should be condoned or excused because of the possible exclusion of Jews from Arab

lands by Arab refusal to issue necessary visas.

6. The United States should prohibit immigration whether temporary or permanent, whether for turists or for permanent residents, from any Arab state which bars entry to any American citizen because of his religious beliefs.

7. Any member of a diplomatic mission to this country who indulges in public anti-Jewish activities aimed directly or indirectly against American Jewish citizens or the American Jewish community generally should be declared persona non grata by our Government.

8. Any member of a diplomatic mission to this country who refuses to process commercial or legal documents because they are offered by Jewish business firms or who make inquiries into the religious affiliation of persons who come before him in his official capacity should be declared persona non grata.

9. Any person present in the United States on a student visa who engages in public anti-Jewish activities aimed at American citizens should have his student visa terminated, since even the most permissive view of academic freedom cannot justify the promotion of race hatred.

10. The United States delegation to the United Nations should assume the initiative in demanding U. N. inquiry into practices of Arab States that are violative of the common pledge of all U. N. member states to promote universal respect for human rights.

Each of the nine other measures may be initiated by unilateral action of the United States. The anti-Jewish efforts of Arab countries, however, have spilled over every national border and while the general refusal of the civilized world to give way to Arab prejudice is gratifying the fact that no concerted effort has been made to meet it decisively must be regarded as a serious shortcoming. The time has come for an international effort to put an end to a policy which is damaging to international trade and causes loss and grave inconveniences to people of many nationalities. Under article 55 of the charter, the United Nations undertakes to promote "universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion" and under article 56, "all members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the organization for the achievement of the purposes set forth in article 55." These texts are susceptible to many and varying interpretations but to seek to reconcile them with a new and deliberate policy of discrimination on an international scale is to denude words of their meaning. The action of Saudi Arabia in instituting discriminatory commercial practices against groups of citizens distinguishable only by their religion in countries with which it enjoys normal diplomatic relations is manifestly irreconcilable with the principles and purposes of the United Nations as embodied in the preamble to the charter and in articles 55 and 56.

Whatever may be thought about the right of a government to practice or tolerate discrimination against its own nationals, the practice of discrimination against the citizens of other states is clearly not compatible with an undertaking to promote "universal respect" for human rights, to say nothing of the comity of nations. If this precedent is allowed to stand without challenge, and is imitated elsewhere, the international community would be exposed to a new and serious menace. The national economy of every country would be opened to the operation of officially sponsored influences dangerous to its welfare and hostile to its traditions.

CONCLUSION

Decisive action by the United States will clear the air. We may confidently expect that Arab governments will desist in their discriminatory practices once our position is indicated by unequivocal action. The arithmetic of advantage is plain. Arab leaders could not repudiate American support without the prospect of certain financial loss. Our serious insistence upon an end to discrimination would doubtless persuade Arab spokesmen acting out of an enlightened self-interest to discontinue their anti-Semitic conduct. In any event, this is a risk we are fated to run. No honorable alternative exists. We respectfully disagree with Secretary Dulles that Arab affronts to American citizens must be suffered peaceably so that our nations may get along together in a way that is to our mutual advantage. There can be no mutual advantage when one of the terms of the bargain requires that we condone and ratify religious bigotry. We believe, as President Wilson believed, in a comparable situation, there comes a time—and that time is now—when we must finally say the price is too great.

Survey by New England Leaders on Major Congressional Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the result of a survey made of New England leaders on major congressional issues. This report was made to the members of the New England congressional delegation dinner on May 1, 1956, in Washington, D. C., given by the New England Council.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW NEW ENGLANDERS STAND ON SELECTED MAJOR ISSUES BEFORE CONGRESS IN 1956—A REPORT TO THE NEW ENGLAND CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION BY THE NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND THE NEW ENGLAND ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCIAL EXECUTIVES

The tabulation below shows how New England business leaders stand on some of the major congressional issues of 1956.

The questions asked in the quiz were submitted by New England Members of Congress and relayed by the New England Council and the New England Association of Commercial Executives to the region's business community.

We believe you will find this record both interesting and helpful.

THE ISSUE AND THE VOTE

1. Disaster insurance: Do you favor the enactment of a Federal program offering insurance against the risk of natural disaster? Yes, 963; no, 656; yes, with reservations, 739.

2. Debt: Do you favor Federal debt reduction prior to Federal tax reduction? Yes, 1,734; no, 360; yes, with reservations, 201.

3. Foreign aid: Do you favor greater expenditures to step up foreign aid in the face of recently increased economic competition from the Soviet Union? Yes, 626; no, 1,023; yes, with reservations, 674.

4. Highways: Do you favor a Federal pay-as-you-go highway program? Yes, 1,788; no, 310; yes, with reservations, 262.

5. Education: Do you favor Federal aid for school construction? Yes, 853; no, 1,017; yes, with reservations, 437.

6. Import quotas: Do you favor protecting investment and employment in New England textiles from low-wage foreign competition, principally from Japan, through the establishment of import quotas? Yes, 1,343; no, 511; yes, with reservations, 485.

Distribution of replies by States

Maine	111
New Hampshire	311
Vermont	202
Massachusetts	1,113
Rhode Island	102
Connecticut	526
Unidentified	56
Total	2,421

THE NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

President: Raymond H. Trott, president, Rhode Island Hospital Trust Co., Providence. Executive vice president: Walter Raleigh, the New England Council, Boston. Vice presidents: Frederic W. Howe, Jr., president, Crompton & Knowles Corp., Worcester, Mass.; L. Douglas Meredith, executive vice president and chairman, Committee on Finance, National Life Insurance Co., Montpelier, Vt.; Herman W. Steinkraus, president and chairman of the board, Bridgeport Brass Co., Bridgeport, Conn. Treasurer: B. Morton Jennings, Jr., vice president, First National Bank of Boston, Boston. Secretary: Harry E. Umphrey, president, Aroostook Potato Growers, Inc., Presque Isle, Maine. Chairman of the Board: Hon. Hugh Gregg, president, Gregg & Son, Inc., Nashua, N. H. Chairman of the Senior Council: Curtis M. Hutchins, chairman of the board and president, Bangor & Aroostook Railroad Co., Bangor, Maine.

THE NEW ENGLAND ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCIAL EXECUTIVES

President: George E. Underwood, executive secretary, Bristol Chamber of Commerce, Bristol, Conn. Vice President: Harry L. Gustafson, executive vice president, Worcester Chamber of Commerce, Worcester, Mass. Secretary-Treasury: Sherwood H. Prothero, executive secretary, Chamber of Commerce of Norwalk, Inc., Norwalk, Conn.

Adolph and Joseph Sabath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Judge Joseph Sabath, brother of our own late beloved Adolph Sabath, is dead in the city of Chicago. He served with distinction on the bench for many years. He was honest and just in all his relations in his personal life and in the performance of his judicial duties. In everything he was gentle and kindly. With other attorneys practicing in his court I shared a feeling for him of respect and of affection.

Just as Adolph served in the House a longer period than any other Member in the history of the Congress so did Joseph, his brother, serve longer continuously as a judge in the courts than any other jurist in the history of Chicago.

Adolph and Joseph Sabath for more than half a century were the close dear friends of my colleagues from Illinois, Congressmen THOMAS J. O'BRIEN and

JAMES BOWLER, and of me. We shall miss Joseph as since his passing 4 years ago we have missed Adolph.

Judge Sabath's son Al was the owner of Alsab, who won the Preakness and narrowly missed in the Kentucky Derby. Al's untimely death some years ago was a heavy blow to the father.

Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include an editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times of May 7, 1956, that I am sure my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will wish to read:

JUDGE JOSEPH SABATH

Joseph Sabath was one of two immigrant brothers who were destined to achieve unique honors and distinction in America, their adopted homeland.

Joseph and his older brother Adolph were born into one of the poorest families in Zabori, one of the poorest villages in poverty-striken Bohemia. Adolph was 15 when he came to America in 1881 and Joseph was the same age when he joined his brother in Chicago 4 years later.

By dint of hard work and even harder study, the two young men acquired law degrees, took a strong interest in Democratic politics and soon became political figures to be reckoned with.

Though Adolph was the first to serve in a judicial capacity—as a justice of the peace and police magistrate—it was Joseph who made a career of the judiciary.

When Joseph died last week, at the age of 86, he had been retired for 4 years. But he still retained an unbroken record of having served uninterruptedly on the municipal and superior court benches longer than any other man—42 years. Moreover, his long service as a divorce judge had won him national as well as local distinction for having reconciled some 10,000 of the 100,000 couples who had appeared in his court.

Adolph's death nearly 4 years ago, also at the age of 86, terminated the longest uninterrupted service of any Member of the United States House of Representatives. His record of 46 years, during which he became dean of the House and one of its most powerful figures, is still unbroken.

While Judge Sabath's death is widely mourned, as was his brother's, Chicago may well be proud that it opened its heart to these two young immigrants who were to contribute much, in return, to the well-being of the community and the Nation.

For Human Betterment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Honorable Boyd Campbell, of Jackson, Miss., retiring president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, delivered a splendid keynote address entitled "For Human Betterment," at the 44th annual meeting in Washington, D. C., on April 30, 1956.

Boyd Campbell is to be congratulated for the fine service he has rendered to the Nation and the lifelong credit that he has brought to our State of Mississippi. His every action has brought credit to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States; his very constructive outlook for progress goes far beyond our times. To know him as I have is to appreciate him for the fine upstanding citizenz that he is, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD his keynote address.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR HUMAN BETTERMENT

(Keynote address by Boyd Campbell, president, Chamber of Commerce of the United States)

Three hundred and sixty-six days and 120,000 miles ago we were in this room together.

Since then, I have been across the length and breadth of our national landscape.

From Albany to Austin, from Poland Springs to Pasadena, and from Wichita to Williamsburg, I have met wonderful people, so many thousands of wonderful people.

It has been thrilling experience. No American could emerge from it without becoming a better American, or without acquiring a more perceptive knowledge of the real strength of our country and of the character, the spirit, and the purpose of our people.

As never before, I have realized the deep reservoir of good will which attaches to the chamber of commerce of the United States—this great federation of chambers of commerce and trade associations, with its underlying membership of more than 1,700,000 businessmen and women.

If you had shared the salt—as I have shared the salt—with those who implement the national chamber's purposes and vitalize its policies—you would have gained—as I have gained—a new respect for the validity of our purposes and the integrity of our policies.

To you and to a great host of others like you, I express the sincere thanks and the most cordial appreciation of the board of directors, the officers, and the staff—and for myself—the gratitude of my heart for your beautiful courtesies and your boundless cooperation.

In 124 communities, I have visited with you and talked to you—singly and in groups.

More importantly, you have talked to me. You have talked about the current issues and public questions that affect the well-being of our beloved country.

By you, I mean Mr. and Mrs. Average American—Godfearing, homeloving, taxpaying, community builders.

Wherever I have met you, north or south, east or west, there was a striking similarity in your thinking.

You spoke the same language. The accents may have varied, but the meaning did not.

Because your words were far more eloquent, and because your thoughts were far more significant than any that I could possibly assemble, I shall tell you what you said.

And so, I appear today as a reporter.

First of all, you talked about business—as it was, and as you thought, or hoped, it would be.

Last summer and fall, you looked forward to the turn of the year in anticipation that 1955 by—national standards—would prove to be our finest business year—and it was.

In planning for 1956, you were hopeful and confident. Now, here we are, with one-third of the year behind us, and most of our economic forecasters believe that 1956—on balance—will be a better year than 1955.

You frequently raised the question about the continuance of good business.

You recognized your own responsibilities for a stable and expanding economy, and you were making plans accordingly. You also recognized that higher levels of business would depend, in large degree, on wise tax policies and sound fiscal policies of government.

While you did not spell it out in so many words, I am convinced that you share my opinion that our high level of prosperity is an almost perfect tribute to the workings of a free economy.

Furthermore, I think you will agree that there was never a more appropriate time to appraise the quality and scope of our economic stewardship.

This appraisal should be a continuing process, and I firmly believe it is becoming so—not only to the advancement of our dynamic system of enterprise, but also to the betterment of all mankind.

You were concerned—and very genuinely so—about the plight of your friends, the farmers, your fellow business men in agriculture. You were troubled because agriculture was not sharing in the prevailing prosperity.

You felt that the farm problem had been vastly complicated because politics had become so interwoven with it.

If I am reporting your opinions correctly, you are convinced that the problem may get worse before it gets better.

You know, however, that the economic softness of agriculture cannot continue indefinitely without becoming a hazard to our national welfare.

You have not claimed to know all the answers, but this you do know: Any real answer to the farm problem must be based upon economic principles rather than political considerations.

There exists among the men of agriculture a tremendous fund of good sense, good judgment, good will, patriotism, and economic understanding.

When we add these priceless qualities to a high faith in the long-range future of farming, there will emerge a real solution to the farm problem—if—and this is a big if—political eager beavers will take a vacation.

Then—taxes. Everywhere I went, you talked about taxes.

What did you say about taxes?

Surely you would not expect me to quote your exact language in this company.

In essence, however, you said: "Taxes are too high."

Maybe you've always said taxes were too high. I've never heard you say taxes were too low—or even just right.

A system of taxation that puts a premium on tax angles rather than upon good management, undermines your confidence in its equity, and without equity, no system of taxation is tolerable or enforceable.

I could drop the subject of taxes right there, but I would be closing on a negative note. The fact is that your thinking leaned very definitely toward the positive.

You were worried not only about the tax burden itself, but about what our tax structure does to initiative, to venture capital, and to opportunity.

And that means that you are for a system of taxation that inspires initiative, magnetizes venture capital and broadens opportunity.

You are thinking about tomorrow, and what it holds for young people. There is nothing negative about that.

You expressed strong opinions about Government in business. First, last, and always, you are against the competition of Government in economic areas where private capital is able and anxious to do the job.

Instead of amplifying your opinions, however, I shall condense them into one emphatic, unequivocal statement.

You said: "Let the Government get out of business."

Repeatedly, you brought up the topic of social security. You approved the principle,

but you were amazed at its complexity and alarmed at its implications.

Because the social-security program is full of heart appeal, it is also full of political allure. You recognized its attractions for the articulate and plausible—sometimes uninformed—and sometimes unprincipled office seekers who attempt to buy votes with your money by constantly raising the social-security ante.

Your deep concern was indicated by the number of times you posed the question: "How far can we go?"

Can we contain the program at its present levels and supplement it by private plans, or will we be led—insidiously but pleasantly—along a primrose path toward a security mirage until we reach the point of no return?

Is it conceivable that the great humanitarian concept of providing basic security for our senior citizens and for widows and orphans could become an economic albatross about the neck of our body politic?

Now this leads us directly to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. What did you say about those recommendations?

Not enough. Not nearly enough.

True, ninety-nine and fourty-four one hundreths percent of you were for the recommendations of the Hoover Commission—which we usually call the Hoover report—just to simplify the reference.

While you were emphatic and hightly articulate on the subject of taxes, the same emphasis did not carry through on the Hoover report.

This is paradoxical because the adoption of the report would provide the tax relief which you so earnestly seek.

Likewise, it would accomplish your vigorous demand that the Federal Government remove itself from competition with private business.

Not only does the Hoover report provide the means of bringing these long-sought objectives into reality, it proposes the modernization of our National Government, which is a consummation devoutly to be wished.

This magnificent audit of government, produced by the best talent in America, after a prodigious amount of study, however highly respected, is not self-enacting.

To get its recommendtions translated into law will require the full force of your informed, united, and sustained effort. It will take leg work, head work, and heart work.

I do not share the opinion of those who feel that this is not the time to press this matter. It is too important to delay—under any consideration.

An now—the labor merger.

We are confronted with the accomplished fact of a union between the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations, comprising a membership of about 15 million.

In many groups, in many States, I have sat in on conversations in which you attempted to appraise the impact of the merger on industry—on politics—and on the publice weal.

If I have correctly gaged your thinking, you look upon the labor merger as a possible menace—and as a possible promise.

Labor's objectives, in many respects, run counter to our own. Labor tends to the idea of more government in our economic system—more concentration of power in Washington.

We have been working in exactly the opposite direction. We believe that one of freedom's greatest safeguards lies in the dispersal of authority, and we will never surrender that conviction.

Labor's vast power has been concentrated—and if I may interpolate a suggestion in at this point, I would recommend that while you are in your capital city, you have a look at the magnificent new buildings the unions have recently constructed—and those they are now constructing. There are some 15 in all.

Those buildings are solid evidence of labor's growing strength and of its entrenchment in Washington to present its views to Government under the constitutional right of petition.

You have expressed no quarrel with that. You only hope that as labor comes into a realization of its great size and strength, it will be as zealous in policing itself for the general well-being as it has been zealous in pressing its economic demands.

You believe that the American public's awareness of the potential danger in bigness—big government, big business or big labor—is a safeguard to the abuse of such power.

You have hailed the high-principled statements of Mr. George Meany—president of the AFL-CIO. He has said, with emphasis, that as labor grows bigger and bigger, that it must discharge its reponsibility to the community as a whole in a manner that will bring credit to the union movement.

Mr. Meany will have your great good wishes if he moves against the intolerable evils in the secondary boycott—that malignancy in the body of our economic-social system.

If Mr. Meany mobilizes his power and influence to clean up terrorism and racketeering in unprincipled unions, he will not only enhance the stature of American labor, he will perform a service of incalculable value to our country.

And then, you spun the globe.

You have been intrigued, amazed—and if I am not mistaken—somewhat amused at the fantastic Russian spectacle—the so-called New Look.

The ghost of Stalin has been haled before the court of his successors and charged with every crime in the book.

No one is easier to convict than a ghost, and so the present masters of the Kremlin, serving in the triple capacity of prosecutor, judge, and jury, have convicted "good old Joe." He is solely responsible, so they say, for the lies, deceit, duplicity, and murder, and all the other sins against society, upon which the Soviet regime was built.

Among the many grotesque contradictions in this situation is that the same old gang is ruling Russia, minus Stalin. It is the same old gang with a brand new look.

They are playing that new look for everything it is worth—and let's face it—they are getting away with it in too many corners of the world.

Day after day we are deluged with stories of the backslapping and baby-kissing tours of Russia's ruling clique. Synthetic good will is simply oozing from their pores.

But, as its present masters parade across the world behind their macks of benignity, you have not forgotten the real character of the Russian apparatus.

No, you have not been fooled. You have not been enticed by the song of the Russian Lorelei, because in that direction lies disaster.

There is nothing you would welcome more than a true change of heart in the rulers of the Kremlin, because deep down inside each of you is a love of peace, and the hope that it may eventually prevail throughout the world.

You cannot envision, however, such a change among the men who were part and parcel of the great Russian blood-lettings.

You are committed to the principle of St. John the Divine, that men should be judged by their works, and so you are in favor of keeping America's defense impregnable while we watch and wait for more convincing evidence of the Soviet's regeneration.

When Russia has reversed all the entries of double dealing:

When she has released the thousands of slave laborers and war prisoners who are being held in captivity in violation of law and human decency;

When she has freed her satellite nations and done everything possible to expiate her crimes against civilization;

When she has repudiated her diabolical purpose to rule the world;

Then perhaps it will be time to take her new look seriously.

How about your views on education?

There was never a time in our history when education was so important to our national vigor—to our very survival—as it is today. The ideological and physical conflicts which embroil the world will be resolved in the realm of the mind and spirit.

You know this. You have come into a new realization of the value of education, and you have a sense of compulsion to do something about it—just what, you are not too sure.

The towering problems of teacher shortages, of tremendous manpower demands, particularly in the fields of science and engineering, and always the problems of finance, do not lend themselves to easy solutions.

Always, in talking about education there arose the subject of Federal aid.

And what is your attitude about Federal aid?

You want no part of it, and you understand clearly why.

You understand that just as livestock lose weight on a long trip to market, so does your tax dollar lose weight on a round trip to Washington.

But that is not your main objection to Federal aid for education. Your objection goes much deeper than that.

You believe in the dispersal of power, particularly with respect to education. You know that if and when local and State authorities surrender their responsibilities for the support and control of our schools, freedom will have lost one of its mightiest citadels.

The Founding Fathers allocated only 17 powers to the Federal Government. The responsibility for education was not one of them. That responsibility was left to the individual States and the people. The architects of our Constitution believed in a government close to the people and in the philosophy of maximum self-determination.

You are familiar with the recent exhaustive studies of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in which it was found that not a single State in this Union was unable to finance its educational responsibilities.

The White House Conference confirmed this finding, although in the much-discussed report of the conference, this significant fact has not had the emphasis that it deserves.

If I might be permitted to add a footnote to my interpretation of your attitude toward Federal aid to education, it would be this:

The increasing demand for Federal aid has its genesis in the failure of the States to meet educational needs. It can well be that there has been too much emphasis on States' rights and not enough on States' responsibilities.

If the States do not proceed at once—now—to close the gap between what is and what ought to be in education, we will have Federal aid. Children cannot wait and the national welfare is involved.

Finally, the election year—the year in which a legion of candidates are advancing their personal and party claims to public office.

Among them, are those who seek election to the most powerful position in the world—the Presidency of the United States.

This leap year could be a stimulating and inspiring proposition, a reexamination of governmental practices, a reappraisal of political and economic policies and a reassessment of social accountability. In short—it could be a workshop on citizenship.

But, you say, that such is not the case. You seem to feel that our political campaigns

all to frequently take the form of a promising match.

You believe our democratic concepts would be reinforced if we had more leadership and less followship.

You want the kind of leadership that makes us think—instead of followship that tells us what it thinks we want to hear.

We have often wondered—you and I—just what would happen if a political Daniel should come to judgment. What would happen if this man, possessed of the God-given power to "make interpretations and dissolve doubts," should announce for public office?

Suppose that he should promise nothing but the equivalent of the Churchillian promise of blood, sweat and tears.

Would he be heeded—or hung in effegy?

Suppose he should be elected, and suppose that upon some momentous issue with tremendous public appeal, he should say—as did Senator Lamar of my own State—many years ago—"Today I must be true or false."

And then suppose that he took a position for integrity instead of expendiency.

Would he be returned—or retired?

You are looking for men like that in public office because—here in America—is the desire of the people to do justice, to love mercy and to walk humbly with God.

And now—I close the book on my report.

I conclude, as I began, by saying that no one could emerge from my experience of the past 12 months without becoming a better American.

Whenever I have been abroad, and the hour for returning finally arrives, my thoughts turn to these magnificant lines of Henry Van Dyke:

"Oh it's home again, and home again, America for me.
"I want a ship that's westward bound to plough the rolling sea
"To the blessed land of room enough beyound the ocean bars
"Where the air is full of sunlight and the flag is full of stars."

Here in America—the air is full of sunlight—and the flag is full of stars.

I have never been so proud to be an American.

The Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio and TV broadcast by Glenn J. Tarbott, president of the North Dakota Farmers Union, in connection with the farm bill.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL BROADCAST OVER ENTIRE NORTH DAKOTA RADIO NETWORK BY GLENN J. TALBOTT, PRESIDENT, NORTH DAKOTA FARMERS UNION, MONDAY, APRIL 23, 1956

Good evening. Tonight I should like to direct my remarks to all the people of this State—not merely to farmers, but to the housewives, to the businessmen on Main Street and to the laboring people in our cities and towns.

The subject I want to discuss is the farm in general—and the President's veto of the farm bill in particular.

The farm problem is, I believe, greatly misunderstood by many people. Because it is misunderstood, it is ignored by too many people who apparently feel more comfortable, when they pretend it doesn't exist.

I suppose this is only natural because the farm problem is a tough and complicated problem.

Its solution lies, of necessity, in the field of legislation, and legislation is a political process. Hence, farm legislation is subjected to all the varying degrees of competenee and incompetence of our legislators, to the varying degrees of understanding or misunderstanding of our Congressmen. And should a good solution be found by Congress, the administration of it, is subjected to the varying degrees of competence and understanding of our national admiinstration. Therefore, since a sound solution of the farm problem rests finally with the people, a greater interest and a more real knowledge on the part of all citizens is imperative.

The problem has been ignored by many people because the very term "farm problem" implies that it is an isolated economic problem—of interest and concern only to farmers—and while many people sympathize with farmers when they are in distress, it is natural for nonfarm people to shrug their shoulders and say "Well, it is too bad—but what can we do about it? We have problems of our own."

And that is only too true. Surely the independent businessman on Main Street has his share of problems. And the laboring man does. And so does the housewife who faces the almost impossible task of stretching the paycheck to meet the rising cost of living.

But it is equally true—particularly in a State like ours—that the farm problem and what is or is not done about it—directly affects the economic welfare of everyone else.

Unless the decline in farm income is quickly reversed the current economic distress in agriculture will spread throughout our entire economy. Many businessmen have long since felt the pinch of steadily falling farm prices in terms of cancelled machinery orders, reduced business volume and a dangerously high volume of accounts receivable.

A lot of people ask me: "Why-is it that farmers always seem to be in trouble—particularly now when the rest of the economy seems so prosperous."

Well, the reason for farmers' persistent trouble is not too difficult to understand. Principally, the farm problem stems from the fact that in this highly complex and very delicately balanced economy, the farmer is the only businessman who is forced to buy everything at retail and sell everything he produces at wholesale. According to all normal commercial rules and practices he is forced to operate in reverse.

The farmer is the only businessman in the entire economy who is unable to determine his own price. He cannot—like the manufacturer—or the storekeeper—or the machinery dealer—figure up his operating costs, like taxes, depreciation, interest and a modest profit and then say—on the basis of these costs—"I must get so much for a bushel of wheat, so much for a pound of beef, or so much for a gallon of milk or cream."

The farmer—left to the mercy of the free market—has no idea what his prices will be in the fall, when he plants his crop in the spring. Yet his operating costs are determined by someone else and they remain the same whether he gets $3 a bushel for his wheat or only $1.50 a bushel.

No intelligent businessman in the world could successfully conduct his business on such a basis. Yet a farmer is very much a businessman. His capital investment is high—and his operating costs—like any other businessman's—must be paid out of income. So, because the farmer is forced to calculate his costs of operation at retail prices and at the same time accept prices for his commodities determined by a so-called "free market" process, which is wholly unrelated to his costs, he is constantly in economic trouble.

Yet, because the production of food and fiber is the most vital public-interest business in the Nation, it is necessary that the public first understand the farm problem; and, secondly, helps to provide the legislative and administrative devices which, in some measures, at least, will fill the economic vacuum in which farmers by the very nature of their business must operate. Many economists call this problem: "Agriculture's adverse terms of trade with the rest of the business community."

Before 1930, no real attempt had ever been made to provide the corrective measures necessary to maintain agriculture on an equal level with the rest of the economy. As a result, we had a very deep and disastrous farm depression which ultimately resulted in a nationwide depression during which there were 15 million unemployed—hundreds of banks went busted—thousands of businessmen went bankrupt and hundreds of thousands of farm families were bankrupt and forced out of agriculture. We ought not permit that to happen again. Yet it can happen again unless we establish a Federal farm program that will specifically provide real parity income for farm families.

So actually, farm programs are not, in any sense, class legislation designed to favor farmers at the expense of the rest of the people. When you urge Congress and the President to provide real farm parity, you are saying that you are willing to give the farmers the same economic break as the rest of the country—in order to insure all of you an abundance of food at all times—so that the businessmen who are dependent on farm purchasing power may be successful and so that the jobs of those who work in the trades supplying farmers' needs and in transportation, processing, and distribution of farm commodities, may be secure.

Businessmen are shortchanging their best customers when they fail to understand this, and when they fight against parity farm legislation. The laboring man invites loss of jobs and pay cuts when he fails to support the farmers. The housewife risks a food shortage and invites higher food prices and perhaps even a nationwide food monopoly when she ignores the farm problem.

We think this all-too-prevailing attitude among people is unfortunate and unwise. But it seems nothing less than tragic when the President, presumably upon the advice of his Secretary of Agriculture and his political party, vetoed a farm law which would have partially repaired the income losses farmers have suffered the past 3 years.

We hate to think that the President vetoed the farm bill last week out of ignorance. We cannot believe that the President has no feeling for farmers—no sympathy for their problems. We do not like to think he vetoed the farm bill for purely political motives.

Yet it is a little difficult to believe he is not aware that farmers are in distress—that farm prices have fallen nearly 30 percent since 1952—that farm net income has fallen 37 percent—that the parity ratio has dropped from 101 to slightly over 80 percent.

His avowed farm policies for more than 3 years and by his veto last Monday he said, in effect, that the answer to falling farm income—the answer to the farm depression—is not more but less farm income.

The farm bill—though far from perfect—would have raised farm income nearly $3 billion over the level of 1953.

But the President vetoed it.

It would be pointless to get into a long technical discussion of the bill itself. We would like, however, to point out what the veto means in terms of dollars and cents

to farmers directly and to businessmen indirectly.

On major North Dakota crops affected by the veto, wheat, for instance, will be 26 cents a bushel less this year; rye will be 25 cents a bushel less; oats, 13 cents less; barley, 20 cents a bushel less; corn, in the commercial corn area, 14 cents less; and in the noncommercial corn area, 50 cents a bushel less.

For the average North Dakota farmer—when you multiply the per-bushel price difference by his production of these crops—the veto bill cost him from $1,200 to $2,000 this year.

There are those who say—and this includes the President himself as well as his Secretary of Agriculture—that "yes, falling farm prices are a problem but the important problem in agriculture is farm surpluses and—they say—you can't solve the farm-price situation until you solve the surplus problem." And their answer to solving the alleged surplus problem is to cut prices so low that it drives farmers out of production of these so-called surplus crops.

Aside from the fact that this method is cruel and immoral—actual experience of the past 3 years shows that instead of production falling off and surpluses disappearing—production increases for the simple reason, that farmers, out of the economic necessity to meet high, rigid operating costs, must make up the difference with more production.

For instance, in 3 years to the end of 1955, the price of grain sorghums has gone down 24 percent but production of grain sorghums went up 173 percent.

The price of rye went down 17 percent but production is up 75 percent.

The price of oats went down 23 percent but production is up 42 percent.

The farm price of milk went down 17 percent but production of milk is up 9 percent.

And so it goes all through the list of farm commodities.

Another thing which this administration either fails to understand or refuses to recognize, is, that the present formula for calculating price parity—which they say is high—is, on the contrary, far too low to give farmers any semblance of real parity income, even should price parity be at 100 percent.

Here are most recent figures from the Department of Agriculture and the President's Council of Economic Advisors:

In 1947 when the farm parity ratio stood at 115 percent—or 15 points above the so-called full parity level—per capita farm income was only 55 percent of the per capita income of all nonfarm people.

In 1952 average farm prices were 100 percent of parity but per capita income for farmers was 52 percent of nonfarm per capita income.

And last year, 1955, when farm prices were 84 percent of parity, per capita farm income was only 44 percent of the per capita income of nonfarmers.

Even the most partisan individual would surely admit that this per capita income difference is badly out of balance, and that the answer doesn't lie in the realm of still less farm income. Yet, what other conclusion can you draw from the President's veto, and his message last Monday night.

Obviously, you can't raise farm income by deliberately lowering farm prices. The answer doesn't lie in a return to the free market. It is a proven fact that lower prices will not reduce farm production, unless such a policy is continued until the productive capacity of our farm plant is so impaired that it constitutes a tragic threat to the food needs of our Nation.

We think the veto was a tragic mistake—a staggering blow not only to farmers but to our whole economy.

We think that anyone—regardless who he is—or the position he holds—does the Nation a great disservice by misrepresenting the facts about the farm problem and farm programs.

Whoever does this is gambling with our economy—risking the welfare of 22 million farm people—and gambling with the health and the security of the whole Nation.

Any responsible political party—any man in, or who seeks high office—should understand the simple fact that our economy is not and cannot be truly prosperous while agriculture is being driven deeper into debt and at a headlong pace toward bankruptcy.

It will take broad public understanding—and it will take knowledge and integrity on the part of the press, the politicians and public officials to write a workable farm program that gives farm families real parity of income and thus securing—for all time—an economy of abundance.

That's all we ask—that you recognize the problem for what it is. Try sincerely to understand it. And be willing to give farmers the same economic break that you expect for yourself.

We are sorely disappointed that the President vetoed the farm bill. The Farmers Union, alone of all the farm organizations, supported it—not because we thought it was the best and final answer—but because it provided immediate and substantial help for a rapidly crumbling farm economy.

The Farmers Union will continue to work for legislation that will assure farmers real parity income. We believe this is wholly in the broad public interest. This goal will be realized sooner if all of you—in your own self-interest—will give us your understanding and your support.

Thank you for listening, and good night.

The Bricker-Dirksen Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, one of these days the Senate will be faced with the new Bricker-Dirksen amendment. I have recently received a copy of a communication addressed to deans of accredited law schools and teachers of constitutional and international law throughout the country. This letter is signed by five of the most eminent law-school deans in America, Dean Jefferson B. Fordham, of the University of Pennsylvania Law School; Dean Erwin Griswold, of the Harvard Law School; Dean William C. Warren, of Columbia University Law School; Dean Eugene V. Rostow, of the Yale Law School; and Dean E. Blythe Stason, of the University of Michigan Law School. The letter which these five great legal authorities are sending out is in itself a persuasive and convincing argument against the Bricker-Dirksen amendment. The five deans are also attaching to their circular letter a copy of a statement issued by the Committee for Defense of the Constitution by Preserving the Treaty Power.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter being circulated by the five law-school deans, and also the statement of position of the Committee for Defense of the Constitution, together with the names of the officers and sponsors of that committee, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCERNING THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

DEAR COLLEAGUE: As you know, a majority of the Senate Judiciary Committee recently recommended the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in the following language:

"SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with any provision of this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

"SEC. 2. On the question of advising and consenting to the ratification of a treaty, the vote shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against shall be entered on the Journal of the Senate."

You will remember that in 1953, Senator WILEY solicited the views of law school deans and professors of constitutional and international law with respect to the Bricker amendment and that the Judiciary Committee published the replies in a pamphlet which some believe to have been the most effective single document in the fight against the amendment. Twenty-six out of twenty-seven replies were against the proposed amendment.

The wording of section 1 of the then-proposed Bricker amendment, upon which Senator WILEY invited your views, was as follows:

"SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect."

Section 1 of the 1953 version is identical with section 1 of the new Dirksen version, except that the latter adds the words "any provision of" before the words "this Constitution" and also adds the words "other international agreement." The Judiciary Committee report states that the word "conflict" means "inconsistent with" or "at variance from" and the phrase "with any provision of this Constitution" means "each article, section, and clause of the basic document as amended."

We believe that many of the arguments stated in the letters published by Senator WILEY are applicable to the new Dirksen version. It is true now, as then, that there is no necessity for a revision of the treaty provision of the Constitution. Nor is there any occasion for a declaratory amendment; the argument that a treaty or agreement might be used to override the Bill of Rights is unfounded.

Although it is impossible to foresee the consequences in actual interpretation of the new section 1, the proponents make it clear that it is intended to do more than merely restate existing law and practice. Apparently its purpose is to rearrange the boundaries between Federal and State authority and to shift some of the powers of the executive to the judicial and legislative branches. Endless controversial searches would doubtless be invited into its meaning as disputes over particular treaty provisions arose.

Senator BRICKER has stated, it is reported, that the purpose of adding the three words "any provision of" is so that "other provisions of the Constitution could be weighed without reference to" the provision of article VI that treaties shall be the supreme law of the land anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding. (New York Times, March 14, 1956, p. 11, col. 1.)

Senator DIRKSEN is reported as saying that one effect of the amendment would be to nullify the 1916 treaty with Canada governing protection of migratory birds (New York Times, March 4, 1956, p. 12, col. 1), apparently believing that it would confine the treaty power to those enumerated subjects on which Congress has express powers to legislate.

The majority report states that if an executive agreement involved a matter within the delegated powers of Congress, the agreement would be ineffective unless Congress authorized or ratified it. The proposed amendment would seem to throw a cloud on the Executive's powers when he negotiates agreements under his diplomatic powers or his powers as Commander in Chief.

President Eisenhower in his press conference on April 4, 1956, stated:

"Now, as you know, there have been written into this latest version three words: 'any provisions of.' Those words are under the most earnest study by lawyer groups everywhere. They are advising me, and apparently they are advising Senator BRICKER and the rest; exactly what they mean, it is difficult to say."

Section 2 of the proposal is not needed. Its purpose could readily be achieved by Senate rule.

It is our hope that we can, through your replies to this letter, prepare a report similar to that prepared by Senator WILEY in 1953 and that it may be equally useful to the President and to the Senators in their consideration of the new Dirksen version of the Bricker amendment. We would appreciate your comments.

For your information, there is enclosed a statement of the Committee for Defense of the Constitution by Preserving the Treaty Power, which relates to the current Bricker amendment and to which each of us subscribes.

Sincerely,

JEFFERSON B. FORDHAM.
ERWIN GRISWOLD.
EUGENE V. ROSTOW.
E. BLYTHE STASON.
WILLIAM C. WARREN.

(Please address your reply to Jefferson B. Fordham, 3400 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia 4, Pa.)

APRIL 30, 1956.

COMMITTEE FOR DEFENSE OF THE CONSTITUTION BY PRESERVING THE TREATY POWER—STATEMENT OF POSITION ON THE BRICKER AMENDMENT (1956)

We continue to oppose amending the Constitution as proposed by the so-called Bricker amendment, in its latest version as well as in its numerous earlier forms. The present proposal either is merely a superfluous restatement of existing law, and as such wholly unnecessary, or it is an ambiguous and dangerous limitation on the President and the Federal power to deal effectively with foreign nations. This is certainly no time to introduce a Trojan horse into our Constitution or to downgrade our President as our spokesman in world affairs.

The key provisions of the Bricker amendment, including the so-called which clause, were thoroughly considered during the 1954 Senate debate, and defeated. A revised version, however, including the "which" clause but minus the word "which," was reintroduced and hearings were held by the Senate Judiciary Committee during 1955. Now a majority of the Judiciary Committee has abandoned that version and recently, without further hearings or public discussion, has reported favorably this substitute amendment proposed by Senator DIRKSEN: "A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with any provision of this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect." [1]

[1] The only other provision reported out (March 5, 1956) was one requiring a rollcall vote on treaties—a requirement which might well be an improvement in the Senate rules, but certainly not one belonging in the Constitution.

BAD LAW

The three italicized words, according to the report of the majority of the Senate committee, require that any treaty or other international agreement be tested against each article, section, and clause of the Constitution, taken separately. This violates the elementary commonsense rule of construction under which our Constitution has been interpreted in literally thousands of decisions over the past 167 years. Any document, whether it be a constitution, a statute, a will or a contract, must be construed as a whole, each part in its proper relation to the others. By this legerdemain, however, far-reaching results would be accomplished according to the majority report. But the committee does not say which or how many of our presently valid and lawful treaties or executive agreements would suddenly become unconstitutional under the proposed amendment. Presumably, only future litigation would answer such practical and vital questions.

THE ATTACK ON THE EXECUTIVE

A main purpose of the amendment is to restrict the effectiveness of executive agreements made by the President, and about half the report is devoted to establishing such an interpretation. The report makes plain that the amendment is intended to make the internal effectiveness of executive agreements subordinate to State laws, even where the agreements are clearly within the scope of the President's diplomatic powers and his powers as Commander in Chief. Moreover, under the report's interpretation of the amendment, all executive agreements involving any matter within the delegated powers of Congress would be ineffective, not merely when in conflict with a Federal statute, which is the law today, but in all cases where not specifically authorized or ratified by Congress.

THE 10,000-WORD AMENDMENT

To explain the 25-word amendment the majority report takes 10,000 words (twice the number in the original Constitution). Aside from the one new phrase, the words which the proponents chose for their amendment stand alone, uncontaminated by the known seem innocent enough. If these words could objectives, they could be taken as an attempt merely to restate what is already the law—that the Constitution is supreme over treaties and executive agreements, as it is over laws. But when the proponents take 10,000 words to build their own interpretation of their own amendment, we are faced with amending the Constitution by committee report. With such a legislative record, we could not trust even merely declaratory words to carry only their ordinary meaning.

BAD POLICY

The present and all prior versions of the Bricker amendment bear the same stamp—the fewer international agreements the bet-make them, and becloud their legality. In ter, so cut down the President's powers to our whole history there has never been a worse time to pursue such a course. War has become annihilation. The future peace and welfare of our people (or of any people) lies in reaching agreement in their relations with others. To obstruct our own path for reaching such agreements is folly.

SPONSORS

Lucius D. Clay, chairman; Frank Altschul, Stamford, Conn.; Laird Bell, Chicago, Ill.; Harold A. Black, Los Angeles, Calif.; James T. Brand, Salem, Oreg.; Harry Amos Bullis, Minneapolis, Minn.; Stuart Chevalier, Los Angeles, Calif.; Will L. Clayton, Houston, Tex.; Charles A. Coolidge, Boston, Mass.; Edward S. Corwin, Princeton, N. J.; Homer D. Crotty, Los Angeles, Calif.; Arthur H. Dean, Oyster Bay, N. Y.; Robert Dechert, Philadelphia, Pa.; Edwin D. Dickinson, Philadelphia, Pa.; Robert G. Dodge, Boston, Mass.; Henry S. Drinker, Philadelphia, Pa.; Farnham P. Griffiths, San Francisco, Calif.; Erwin N. Griswold, Cambridge, Mass.; James P. Hart, Austin, Tex.; Elizabeth E. Heffelfinger, Minneapolis, Minn.; Paul G. Hoffman, Pasadena, Calif.; Palmer Hoyt, Denver Colo.; Sarah T. Hughes, Dallas, Tex.; Devereux C. Josephs, New York, N. Y.; Jacob M. Lashley, St. Louis, Mo.; Monte M. Lemann, New Orleans, La.; John Lord O'Brian, Washington, D. C.; Joseph O'Meara, South Bend, Ind.; Elihu Root, Jr., New York, N. Y.; Marcus C. Sloss, San Francisco, Calif.; Geoffrey S. Smith, Philadelphia, Pa.; Anna Lord Strauss, New York, N. Y.; Gerard Swope, Sr., Ossining, N. Y.; Harrison Tweed, New York, N. Y.; Joseph N. Welch, Walpole, Mass.; Walter H. Wheeler, Jr., Stamford, Conn.; James D. Zellerbach, San Francisco, Calif.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Douglas Arant, Birmingham, Ala.; Harry S. Ashmore, Little Rock Ark.; Dana C. Backus, New York, N. Y.; Chauncey Belknap, New York, N. Y.; Francis M. Bird, Atlanta, Ga.; Edward F. Blettner, Jr., Winnetka, Ill.; George H. Bond, Jr., Syracuse, N. Y.; Henry Brandis, Jr., Chapel Hill, N. C.; Robert J. Bulkley, Cleveland, Ohio; Charles C. Cabot, Boston, Mass.; Hugh Calkins, Cleveland, Ohio; Hodding Carter, Greenville, Miss.; Stephen F. Chadwick, Jr., Seattle, Wash.; Frederick Chait, Philadelphia, Pa.; Edwin F. Chinlund, New York, N. Y.; Austin V. Clifford, Bloomington, Ind.; Ralph A. Colbert, Cleveland, Ohio; Edward A. Conway, Omaha, Nebr.; Jerome K. Crossman, Dallas, Tex.; Joseph B. Cumming, Augusta, Ga.; Stuart DeBard, Boston, Mass.; John V. Duncan, New York, N. Y.; Conover English, Newark, N. J.; Dana L. Farnsworth, Cambridge, Mass.; Jefferson B. Fordham, Philadelphia, Pa.; Eugene H. Freedheim, Cleveland, Ohio; W. St. John Garwood, Austin, Tex.; A. L. Gausewitz, Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Arthur J. Goldsmith, New York, N. Y.; Paul F. Good, Omaha, Nebr.; John Raeburn Green, St. Louis, Mo.; Herbert M. Hamblen, Spokane, Wash.; Paul F. Hannah, Waltham, Mass.; Joseph Harrison, Newark, N. J.; David Heath, Dallas, Tex.; Blakey Helm, Louisville, Ky.; Homer Hilton, Jr., Jackson, Mich.; John A. Houston, Galesburg, Ill.; Schuyler W. Jackson, Topeka, Kans.; William L. Josslin, Portland, Oreg.; Spencer L. Kimball, Salt Lake City, Utah; Edward C. King, Boulder, Colo.; Benjamin H. Kizer, Spokane, Wash.; Allen T. Klots, New York, N. Y.; Charles H. Leaphart, Missoula, Mont.; Sol M. Linowitz, Rochester, N. Y.; Herbert S. Little, Seattle, Wash.; Laurence M. Lombard, Boston, Mass.; Wilder Lucas, St. Louis, Mo.; Brunson MacChesney, Chicago, Ill.; Ross L. Malone, Roswell, N. Mex.; Gerald C. Mann, Dalias, Tex.; William L. Marbury, Baltimore, Md.; Robert E. Matthews, Columbus, Ohio; Carlyle E. Maw, New York, N. Y.; Edward D. McDougal, Jr., Chicago, Ill.; Frederick C. McKee, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Vincent L. McKusick, Portland, Maine; John R. McLane, Manchester, N. H.; Vernon X. Miller, Washington, D. C.; D. Howe Moffat, Salt Lake City, Utah; E. W. Moise, Atlanta, Ga.; Hugh Moore, Easton, Pa.; John E. Mulder, Philadelphia, Pa.; Arthur L. Newman, New York, N. Y.; Emory T. Nunneley, Jr., Minneapolis, Minn.; John Nuveen, Chicago, Ill.; Lithgow Osborne, New York, N. Y.; George H. Parsons, Seattle, Wash.; Endicott Peabody, Boston, Mass.; Theodore Pearson, New York, N. Y.; Raymond Pitcairn, Philadelphia, Pa.; William Poole, Wilmington, Del.; A. J. Gustin Priest, Charlottesville, Va.; Thomas V. Rankin, Boston, Mass.; F. D. G. Ribble, Charlottesville, Va.; Alvin J. Rockwell, San Francisco, Calif.; Murray Seasongood, Cincinnati, Ohio; Whitney North Seymour, New York, N. Y.; Francis Shackelford,

Atlanta, Ga.; Carl B. Spaeth, Stanford, Calif.; Harvey M. Spear, New York, N. Y.; Charles M. Spofford, New York, N. Y.; Waldo Stephenson, Oklahoma City, Okla.; John R. Stevenson, New York, N. Y.; William E. Stevenson, Oberlin, Ohio; Eugene C. Struckhoff, Concord, N. H.; Arthur E. Sutherland, Cambridge, Mass.; Dr. William H. Sweet, Brookline, Mass.; Kline R. Swygard, Corvallis, Oreg.; Sidney W. Thaxter, Portland, Maine; Lucious E. Thayer, Boston, Mass.; Mrs. Charles W. Tillett, Charlotte, N. C.; Elmer E. Todd, Seattle, Wash.; Lyman M. Tondel, New York, N. Y.; Henry P. Van Dusen, New York, N. Y.; R. Worth Vaughan, Tenafly, N. J.; W. W. Waymack, Adel, Iowa; Bethuel M. Webster, New York, N. Y.; C. R. Wharton, Greensboro, N. C.; Arthur E. Whittemore, Boston, Mass.; Robert W. Williams, Philadelphia, Pa.; Philip Willkie, Rushville, Ind.; Francis E. Winslow, Rocky Mount, N. C.; David J. Winton, Minneapolis, Minn.; H. B. Woodman, New York, N. Y.

Liberalization of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the major items of business which will soon come before the Senate is, of course, the important matter of liberalization of the Nation's old-age and survivors insurance system.

We have all been following with interest the deliberations of the Senate Finance Committee on this subject.

I personally feel that improvement of the system—liberalization of benefits and extension of coverage—is long overdue, although changes must, of course, be actuarilly sound.

In the May 1956 issue of the Journal of Lifetime Living magazine, there is an article which discusses looking after the needs of our older people. The article is entitled, "Nineteen Hundred and Fifty-Six: Boom Year for Seniors."

The article prominently features reference to my own bill, S. 2279, for a comprehensive system of grants-in-aid for the purpose of improving not only oldsters' pensions, but their health, housing, recreational opportunities, etc.

I send this article to the desk.

SHEBOYGAN, WIS., REPORT

I append to it two items. The first is a grassroots indication of what people in America are doing by themselves to assure a fairer break for our senior citizens.

This particular item represents the first few pages of a comprehensive report from the Sheboygan, Wis., Committee on the Aging. It shows how the committee set up its subcommittees and did necessary research work as a foundation.

ADDRESS BY J. R. COMINSKY

The second is an excerpt from a major address which was delivered on April 17 by Mr. J. R. Cominsky, publisher of the Saturday Review. In this address, entitled "Vocational Counselling is Unfinished Business," Mr. Cominsky makes a most provocative suggestion dealing with liberalized corporate tax credit for employment of senior citizens.

Mr. Cominsky, I may say, is contributing some of the most original thinking now being done in our country on the paradox of the lengthening of the life span, and the shortening of the work span in America. I have previously brought several of his suggestions to the attention of my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent that these three items be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the three items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Journal of Lifetime Living of May 1956]

1956: BOOM YEAR FOR SENIORS

Take a nation which has quadrupled its number of elders since 1900. Add two world wars, a financial depression, a few fist-shaking dictators, and a social or industrial revolution here and there, with an H-bomb thrown in for good measure.

What do you get? It is not surprising if you end up a little confused; and when you take stock, you are apt to find that you overlooked something.

It's a big something that Suncle Sam overlooked. He didn't expect, and didn't fully account for, a host of senior citizens, comprising almost 10 percent of our present population, and zooming higher and higher.

In the midst of all his other worries, he was caught with his statistics down, and with attitudes, policies, legislation, and an economy unprepared to cope with the wants and needs of this new kind of citizenry.

He is still dazed by it. But the alarm, which started to wake him with a tinkle, is now ringing like a firebell. The present session of Congress is swamped with measures for elders. There are more than 200 bills to liberalize social security. There are senior housing acts, and a proposal which would set up a Federal bureau for seniors. In the administrative branches of Government, and on the State and local levels, scores of new projects are afoot for the vocational, educational, recreational, and health betterment of the more mature set.

Politically, economically, and socially, seniors as a class, and as an issue, have moved into the big league of national affairs. In the haze of election maneuvers, it is hard to predict a score. But it seems clear that 1956 marks the beginning of a new emergence for men and women past 40—and especially for the 14 million who are 65 and over.

"Congress will have to take a whole new look at all the problems," Senator ALEXANDER WILEY told the Journal of Lifetime Living. "And it will have to do so this year."

JOBS, HOUSING, RECREATION

The senior Republican from Wisconsin now has before the Senate the most vital measure of the current crop—Senate bill 2279, which authorizes a new Federal series of 5-year annual grants to the States, for the purpose of developing and improving all programs and services for the 65'ers.

Insiders complain that the bill is too technical to have vote appeal—and the administration's Budget Bureau reportedly opposes it. But the Senator has stirred up something.

He wants more jobs for seniors, and an end to age discrimination in employment.

He wants more housing projects meeting the means and special needs of our elders.

He wants better educational and recreational facilities geared to the older league.

He wants more people trained to handle the problems of seniors medically, socially, and every other way, coupled with more research into every phase of their welfare.

And he wants it all coordinated, and watchfully guarded, by Uncle Sam personally.

"The Federal Government can't do it all." Senator WILEY says, "but it can help and encourage the States to do it."

A SENIOR DEPARTMENT

Under his bill, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would establish an administrative unit, functioning along the general lines of the Children's Bureau, established in 1912 and now part of the Social Security Administration.

The new unit would administer the grants, to be offered to the 48 States on a 50–50 matching basis. It would keep in touch with State, national, and international developments affecting senior citizens, and would serve as a clearinghouse of information and advice. It would suggest coordinated approaches to the problems involved, provide the States with specialists in various aspects of the work, make grants for special "pilot" or demonstration projects, and maintain contact with other public and private agencies.

The Senator is convinced that nothing less than such a comprehensive approach can do the job.

"We've been falling down in every single one of the major fields of activity concerning elders," he argues. "Just look at the situation.

"Average income for senior citizens is going down while living costs are going up. Job opportunities are also decreasing. The percentage of men gainfully employed after age 65 had decreased from 68 percent in 1890 to 42 percent in 1950. While 1 of 3 applicants for work is 45 or over, only 1 out of 7 placements is now made in this group.

"A third of the elderly are inadequately housed. Boarding and nursing homes have long waiting lists.

"It's the same with education and recreation. Most adult education programs are concerned only with younger folks. And while clubs and recreational programs for seniors are developing in some areas, the development is spotty, and the number of people who benefit is very small in relation to the total age group.

"There are some bright spots in the picture. But they're still the exception."

Senator WILEY has no fault to find with Federal officeholders now engaged in the field. "But how many are there?" he demanded. "I'll tell you. Recently I called up the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to talk to people working on the wants of seniors in that Department. And guess how many of these workers I found there? Three. Three employees to look after the needs of 14 million people."

ACTION VERSUS WORDS

"I think that typifies the situation. We sing songs, recite poems, and make speeches about senior folks—how much we love them, and what we ought to do for them. But when it comes to action, you see what we've done.

"We've been turning our backs on them—and the way our population is headed, that means we've been turning our backs on our future.

"We can't treat senior citizens as though they were liabilities—when the facts show that they're assets. We have to use and improve those assets now."

Toward this end, the first planks of a platform are at last coming out of the mill.

We have a long way to go for our senior utopia. But Congress is waking up, and we're getting a good start. A measure like the Wiley bill may be just what we need to tip the scales for our elders.

CHAPTER I OF REPORT OF SHEBOYGAN COMMITTEE OF THE AGING

THE COMMITTEE IS FORMED

The following committees were established:

1. Census committee: The census subcommittee was assigned the planning of the collection, through the field subcommittee's, data which would give an adequate picture of the characteristics of the aging population in Sheboygan County. It would be the further responsibility of the census subcommittee to organize the collection of data both from standard institutional files and from the United States Census.

Specifically, the census committee was assigned the responsibility of avoiding duplication of data.

2. Recreation: The content subcommittee on recreation was designed to collect all available information from whatever sources on the facilities, plans and present operating organizations whose primary aim is the execution of recreation and useful activities for persons 65 and over in Sheboygan County. The recreation subcommittee would ultimately, work closely with all other subcommittees.

3. Health and welfare: A joint subcommittee on health and welfare was organized for the initial phases of the committee's work. This subcommittee was assigned the responsibility of collecting information on the health facilities and services and the welfare facilities and services, both public and private, within the county which are available for the population under study. Special emphasis was placed on the collection of all possible data through existing organizations, in order to avoid painful, slow and expensive duplication of effort.

4. Employment: The employment subcommittee was established to survey and to examine the employment situation within the county, with specific reference to employment opportunities and policies relating to persons 65 and over. It is to be a further concern of this committee to survey the policies of local companies to ascertain the exact potential for full-time and part-time employment for persons 65 and over. This committee would also utilize institutional file information wherever possible.

5. Spiritual life committee: It was felt by the committee that no study of the problems of older persons would be complete without a careful examination of the services and functions of all church and spiritual groups in relation to the older persons.

6. Education: It was believed that all other subcommittee functions would act as a source of supply for information for the subcommittee on education. This subcommittee would have a dual purpose: (a) to educate the older persons as to the possibilities of making their own present lives more rich, more worthwhile, and more constructive; and (b) to undertake a broad program of public education aimed at familiarizing the general public with the problems which all persons, young and old, are apt to face when they have reached retirement age.

To supplement these 6 basic content committees, 26 area subcommittees, based on the political subdivisions of the county, were formed for the various townships, villages, and cities. Considerable effort was made to recruit adequate area chairmen who in turn would, at their own option, recruit the assistance of local persons to serve on their subcommittees. The basic purpose of these area subcommittees was to obtain information and data which was not readily available through institutional or organizational files nor through the Bureau of Census in Washington, D. C. Hence, the collection of all but the central core of data would rest upon the shoulders of these area subcommittees.

It is important to pay special tribute to those persons who have had little or no formal research experience before, who, with courage and good humor undertook a tremendously difficult task. The committee agreed that a relatively simple but broad gage questionnaire should be formulated which would make it possible for the local area subcommittees to collect information which would be of prime interest and concern to the committee as a whole.

In the latter part of October the first field series form (which was designed to collect those data probably not available through the United States Census, or other cannels) was distributed to the area chairman with the hope that these forms would be completed prior to a mid-November meeting. Most of the forms were completed in first-class shape and returned to the writer prior to the deadline.

It was thus that the Sheboygan County Committee on Aging actually launched its basic function as a research organization. It should be said, in concluding this chapter, that the basic function in the future will be twofold: First, to continue to collect such data deemed appropriate and necessary for adequate future planning; second, to carry on a continuing program of planning and action designed to enrich the declining years of all our senior citizens, present and future.

EXCERPTS FROM TEXT OF VOCATIONAL COUNSELLING IS UNFINISHED BUSINESS, AN ADDRESS DELIVERED BY J. R. COMINSKY, PUBLISHER OF THE SATURDAY REVIEW, BEFORE A CONFERENCE OF THE ALUMNAE ADVISORY CENTER ON CONFLICTING JOB ATTITUDES: HOW CAN WE RESOLVE THEM? ON TUESDAY AFTERNOON, APRIL 17, AT THE WQXR AUDITORIUM, NEW YORK TIMES, NEW YORK CITY

The interrelationship of all human endeavor could not be exemplified better than to point out that while exciting news is flowing from the laboratories of the medical scientists and practitioners another kind of news is flowing from industrial and labor fronts to take the bloom off some great achievements of medicine. To state it bluntly: Of what use is a lengthened life span if it is accompanied by a greatly shortened working span?

This, of course, is no fault of medicine. It is not the fault of medicine that there has been in recent years an almost hysterical absorption with "security"—"security" at almost any price, it has seemed to me. And all the pension plans and retirement arrangements aren't worth the price we are paying for them if it means one able-bodied person, qualified in every other way, self-respecting and eager to work, cannot obtain employment after he passes the age of 40, or possibly a slightly higher limit. The life-span figure, large or small, becomes academic in the light of such a development, and all of us had better face up to it.

It would seem humane for insurance companies to restudy the present group life insurance plans which may be limiting the hiring of workers in their forties.

It would seem equally humane for the various States to restudy their unemployment insurance and disability compensation laws which may deter employers from hiring older people. It is a recognized fact that older workers take longer to recuperate and tend to raise the disability compensation rates paid by their employers in some States.

If a plan of State or Federal Government cooperation could be worked out whereby the employer were not penalized for this fact of life, he might take another view of the employee over 40.

It would also be humane for our leading and most responsible labor unions to study this problem in relation to the pressures now being put on employers for social benefits.

We might also explore Federal social security cooperation for persons who wish to work beyond the age of 65, with a possible lessened effectiveness offset by the Government's contribution.

Perhaps the simplest way to lift the burden and the penalties from the employer of the older worker would be to allow a Federal corporate tax credit based on percentages of employees in various age groups—such a credit at least in part to offset the extra insurance and other costs derived from actuarial accounting. Here is an area worthy of our deepest study and thought.

The complexity of this serious situation affecting so large a segment of our manpower flows from the fact that our retirement and pension plans are figured on the basis of chronological and not physiological factors. We understand what great differences in physical and mental power there can be in people of the same age. Yet this factor has been somewhat obscured in our social planning.

The drastic shortening of man's working span brings with it a problem that should concern every boy and girl going to college, and the parents, as well as the middle aged. The trial and error period, which in the past allowed a person to try his hand at a few jobs in the hope of finding the one he liked best and could do best, is now something that, in retrospect, went out with the model T Ford. Today a person's talents must be channeled immediately into the area in which he can be most effective, or he is sunk. That's the dilemma, and we may as well be realistic about it.

We haven't yet really begun to deal in a serious way with the psychological, social and economic problems created by our fantastic medical progress. The proposal of the Alumnae Advisory Center for a 5-year study to investigate a possible solution to problems faced by older women college graduates in New York and by those who want part-time jobs is an indication that there is a real stirring of interest in important places. I sincerely hope that the modest financial requirement for such a study will be supplied at the earliest possible date.

Our Guided Missiles Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. JACKSON. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a revealing report on the status of our critical missile program. This report appears in the latest issue of Look magazine, and was written by Mr. Trevor Gardner, former Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR GUIDED MISSILES CRISIS

(By Trevor Gardner)

The intercontinental ballistics missile is probably the greatest single advance in weapons that will be attained by any country in the next 10 years. The nation that gets it first may be in a position to determine the kind of world we will live in for the next generation. We and the Russians are racing for it. But our own effort is snarled up in bureaucratic redtape. Here's what's wrong:

1. The Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, each working on its own parochial guided-missiles program, are vying with each other in an intolerable rivalry.

2. The overall missiles program is smothering in an administrative nightmare of committees and subcommittees competing with each other for influence and appropriations.

3. The ICBM project, which 2½ years ago was given a top priority status, now shares top priority with many subsidiary missiles projects and the result is that there is no such thing as "top priority."

4. The executive personnel of the missiles program is notable for its preponderance of management experts recruited from private business, and for its poverty of full-time scientists who qualify as missiles experts and know what they're talking about.

I believe that if President Eisenhower suspected the real gravity of this situation he would, without doubt, step in and straighten things out. But the President's chief advisers have left him, at best, incompletely informed.

Meantime, the people—who, after all, are the ones most deeply concerned—remain the least informed of all. The public is bewildered by "artists' conceptions" of missiles that dont' exist (and anyway couldn't fly as the artists conceive them) and by half-truths, understatements and exaggerations about missiles that do exist or are about to exist or will never exist.

The President has said we are ahead of Russia in some missiles fields, but behind in others. Other officials of the executive branch have said the Russians are closing in on our lead in some fields and increasing their own lead in others. Responsible members of the Senate are now trying to find out just where we do stand.

The public knows there must be a gigantic program of some kind going on. Large numbers of people are being hired; loud test explosions are heard in the proving-ground areas, but the whole operation is strapped in by an official public-relations policy which is a heritage from wartime censorship. Nobody confirms and nobody denies.

Yet there are some things that can be told, and some questions that should be answered.

There have been various published estimates indicating that, by 1960 or earlier, the Russians may have intercontinental ballistics missiles with thermonuclear warheads. In my opinion, the Russians would then be in a position to destroy or blackmail this country unless we had similar weapons.

Are we following a course calculated to protect us from falling into this trap? The answer depends upon who is talking, and whom you believe.

The business executives who run the Government tell you in effect not to worry—your Government has the problem well in hand—and no changes are needed.

The Nation's greatest scientists, missiles engineers and military leaders—the American professional team—say there is a great deal about our missiles picture to worry any American; that our ICBM effort is not under control and that, unless great changes are made in the program immediately, we can do nothing but lose to the Russians.

You cannot believe both groups. They have nothing in common. There is no ground for compromise here any more than there is in running a race. Either you win it or you don't.

Three years ago, as the first civilian manager of the Air Force research and development activity, I chose to rely on the professionals. My experience during the 3 years that followed has only confirmed that choice.

In the face of the deadlock between the scientists and the executives, it is only natural to wonder where President Eisenhower stands. I believe the President's advisers, who are not missiles experts, have given him only an incomplete picture of the crisis. His own broad policy thinking about missiles could put this country on the right track if his civilian deputies kept him accurately informed.

To comprehend our danger clearly requires some understanding of the new family of missiles weapons that generated this danger in the first place. There is literally no end to destructive applications of the jet propulsion-missile principle. The press is full of reports about the development of missiles which are fired from the ground and aimed at enemy territory. We also hear about ground-to-aid missiles, the least effective of which is at least 10 times better than our most advanced antiaircraft guns. Other accounts report missiles that can be launched from submarines, from ships at sea, and even from mobile battlefield platforms. Some of these missiles breathe air. Others carry their own "air" with them. Some are short range—15 to 150 miles. Others are medium range, and still others are designed for great distances—5,000 to 6,000 miles.

While every potential new member of the rapidly growing missiles family will represent an important and valuable step in advanced weapons, the ICBM is clearly of the highest priority importance. The United States is engaged in a truly massive effort with respect to missiles. But by itself a mass of effort is not enough. The mass must be organized and the effort must be selective.

The reason for this is that, should the Russians perfect an ICBM in operational quantities, or even demonstrate it experimentally before we do, they will have the ability to hit our great Midwestern heartland with a weapon against which no defense is yet known. The only certain way to counter this kind of threat is to be able to fire, from our own independent bases on American soil, massive quantities of the same kind of weapon, capable of devastating an enemy as defenseless before it as we are. As long as we permit anything to interfere with the perfection of this weapon, we are like children making sling shots to repel an invasion from Mars.

As a Nation, we are in this kind of peril because, for a generation or more, we have consistently failed to recognize the giant steps the Germans and Russians have been taking in missile development. After each hot and cold war, we have cut back on our research and development budgets. It happened once again in 1953. These cuts were doubly disturbing to the scientific world, because by now the technical horizons of the problem were rapidly receding and widening. The inherent built-in complexities of the ICBM were mushrooming daily, invading almost every known realm of science.

To get an idea of the kind of effort we should be making, imagine an ICBM traveling at speeds over 4 miles a second—coast to coast in less than 15 minutes; climbing 500 miles into airless outer space; propelled by multimillion-horsepower plants; storing within its belly the very air these giant power plants must gulp to perform at all; controlled by a built-in electronic brain capable of making decisions in a ten-thousandth of any given second; able to withstand surface-friction heats so high that they vaporize any known metal.

That is "The Beast." It is the one weapon we need today, above all others. Can anyone doubt that the greatest scientific brains in the free world are needed for its creation?

In 1953, the Air Force asked Dr. John Von Neumann, one of America's most distinguished scientists, now a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, to head an advisory task force. The mission of the Von Neumann committee was to assist the Air Force in weighing the difficulties presented by the ICBM, to invent scientific shortcuts and solutions, and to come up with a practical set of specifications designed to give us the weapon we need in the shortest possible time.

This committee's conclusions reflected no doubts about our technical competence to solve this problem. Many members of the committee had helped develop the atomic bomb. Hard problems were not new to them. They believed the quick completion of the ICBM was well within the scope of America's great scientific resources.

What bothered the scientists was that in peacetime the cumbersome, time-consuming machinery of government could not be streamlined to permit the swift mobilization of the necessary resources. As a result, the committee's most urgent recommendations were focused upon how to organize the effort.

A unique and responsive machinery was organized quickly within the Air Force, under the brilliant leadership of Maj. Gen. Bernard A. Schriever. His assignment was to see that the work got started and to make whatever modifications in approach he and Dr. Von Neumann's advisory committee deemed necessary to bring off a test firing of the ICBM as soon as possible. General Schriever's project was therefore assigned the highest priority within the Air Force.

General Schriever immediately recruited Dr. Simon Ramo and Dr. Dean Wooldridge (who had also served on the Von Neumann committee) as his technical advisors and to help him secure the best scientific brains in America to work on this project full time. In complexity, General Schriever's job was much like the atomic bomb development; and in the beginning, he and his unusually fine organization were able to make dramatic progress because they were organized to make quick decisions.

The spirit we achieved in the Manhattan project, which gave us the A-bomb, was that the small problems about men, material, buildings, machine tools, and money were not to be allowed to block progress in any way. An environment was created in which all levels of management were encouraged to use their best judgment, to make quick decisions and to go ahead. The penalties for obstructing progress were severe. The same kind of spirit, the same sense of urgency, the same ability to get on with the job, are needed for a successful ICBM effort.

General Schriever's project had begun to breathe that way. In addition, the project was slated to graduate from No. 1 priority in the Air Force to the Nation's No. 1 priority. This, in fact, happened. But a lot of other things began to happen too. Unfortunately for the budget-controlled Secretary of Defense, the ballistics-missiles race with the Russians could not be deferred. This weapons revolution had a new character and a new dimension. As national recognition of the importance of the missile mounted, with its implied threat of unbalancing the budget, the Secretary of Defense was faced with his first major dilemma. Could the country afford this program or should it be deferred?

The Secretary of Defense decided that the venture was vital and that it could not be deferred, but the only way it could be financed without unbalancing the budget was to limit expenditures on other planned defense programs.

Air Force dollars for the program became plentiful, but since the total level of the Air Force budget was not materially increased, those dollars had to be made available through many sacrifices, including one-shot savings projects, reduction in planned procurement of jet aircraft and postponing the modernization and building of vitally needed new air bases. General Schriever and his organization were able to carry on, with the Air Force supporting the enormously expensive ICBM effort at this great and dangerous sacrifice.

Then the Army and Navy suddenly began to recognize the importance of the ballistics missile in their future. Both services immediately embarked upon a vast competition to get into the ballistics missiles act.

Each assigned its own highest priority to whatever ballistics-missiles projects it wanted to develop. And in a brief time, numerous new and different missiles projects sprang into being. None of these duplicated the ICBM. They were designed, rather, to

produce either an intermediate-range missile or a variety of short-range missiles.

But the Army and Navy were also required to rob their existing programs in order to finance new missile weapons. Not content to play second fiddle to the Air Force, the other services insisted upon and received the highest national priority for each of their own intermediate-range ballistic-missiles (IRBM) projects.

The ICBM, the one weapon we desperately need, was now in competition for the Nation's resources with many little brothers and sisters at the family table. And everyone was entitled to be served first. To make matters worse, the services then generated other phantom or study missiles programs. These don't yet enjoy the same top priority as the earlier programs do, but they are fighting hard for equality of treatment and no one will be too surprised if they win.

As if there were not enough clamoring mouths all demanding preferred treatment, the Secretary of Defense approved and the White House announced that a satellite would be launched in 1958 during the International Geophysical Year. This also, of course, is a top-priority project.

The Secretary of Defense has explained this rash of new programs, actual and pending, as a logical way to provide competition, designed to create a better product. Maybe you get a better product by creating a free-for-all. If so, it is a brandnew way to stimulate scientific invention.

Competitive interference was inevitable, of course, and it soon became apparent to all three services that rivalry and duplication were creating enormous confusion. None of the services really knew what its mission was or what its final role was going to be in the missiles program. Opinions were naturally voiced that a fourth armed service should be established to develop and use these missiles. Those opposed to this idea said that each service should be assigned its own part in the development and ultimate use of the new weapons. The resulting argument should have been decided early by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense, but the answer to this pressing problem was to defer making any decision at all. The whole fundamental question of roles and missions was left for decision at some future date.

Having given his blessing to this competitive scramble, the Secretary of Defense had to create executive and administrative mechanisms to monitor the claims and counterclaims of the competing services, and to control at least the more obvious duplications of effort. Moreover, someone had to see to it that the intense rivalry between the services would not result in each one lowering its own iron curtain to conceal its technical achievements from the others; unfortunately, interservice rivalries work that way.

But in the face of violently conflicting interservice claims, contradictory reports and confusion concerning achievements, the Secretary of Defense avoided another question: Should he concentrate all missiles authority in one office or in one individual? His first answer was to generate an appalling series of committees from each of the separate services—plus his own office. These committees were all composed of people who had other major jobs to perform and who, therefore, could devote only part time to the problem of managing a by-now unmanageable missiles program.

COMMITTEES, WATCHDOGS, AND MONITORS MOVE IN

None of the members of any of these committees are missiles experts. Realizing this fact, and being aware of his own individual part-time limitations, each committee member quickly appointed a deputy who (while also having a full-time job himself) could spare more time than his superior. This resulted in a group of phantom subcommittees to sharpen up the problems, and to present them to the major decision-making committees. None of the members of these phantom committees are missile experts. Most of them are not engineers.

General Schriever's once fine organization, streamlined in the Manhattan spirit to make quick decisions and get on with the job became hopelessly lost among coordinating committees from the other services, scientific advisory committees from the other services, Bureau of the Budget watchdogs, monitors from the Department of Defense, representatives of the National Security Council, and additional committees and subcommittees. In fact, General Schriever's organization was forced into doing everything but getting on with the vital business of making that one piece of hardware—the ICBM.

Yet today Washington's business executives continue to tell our people that the missiles program is well in hand—and there is no cause for worry. Only recently the Secretary of Defense installed an able chemical industrial executive as a special assistant for ballistics-missiles development. His job was described to the press as a missiles czar. But there never was and never will be a special assistant who could get all these committtees and subcommittees to resolve their disputes overnight and then act in unison on a continuing day-to-day basis.

Having served as a special assistant for 2 years before being appointed an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force by the President, I know that a special assistant just does not have enough basic responsibility and authority to resolve the interservice ballistics-missiles snarl in time to beat the Russians to the ICBM.

How can all this happen, many citizens will ask, when the President is himself a great general? It happens because, in areas of new technology, the communications system he relies on simply isn't working.

I am convinced that the President has not been given a clear picture of the ballistics-missiles crisis. Here are some of the things he might ask, for clarification and for the safety of our country:

Why did it take from August to November to make a decision to proceed with the medium-range missile? Why is the present organization so filled with committees? Why wasn't one man put in charge of the entire program at an early stage? Why was just another special assistant belatedly appointed? Won't interservice rivalries and the multiplicity of programs result in a slowdown in ICBM progress? Why isn't the ICBM given a clear top priority over other missiles programs?

What the program desperately needs is this:

1. The appointment of a missiles boss. In my opinion, he should be a Presidential appointee, reporting directly to the Secretary of Defense, and with him, directly to the President. He should be approved by the Senate. This missiles boss needs to have the power to solve all missiles problems as they arise, and to determine how missiles appropriations are to be spent.

2. After eliminating needless duplications, the missiles boss and his organization must assign an order of priority to each of the remaining programs, with the ICBM given first place.

3. The role and the mission of each of the services with respect to each of the programs should be clearly defined. Once definition has been achieved, assignment of responsibilities can be made intelligently to the appropriate services, in terms of their own functions in any future war.

4. The Congress should enact legislation giving the missiles boss and his organization fresh money with which to work. This would put a prompt end to the tragic Peter-to-pay-Paul robberies now depleting the operational capabilities of all the services. In giving the missiles boss and his organization fresh money, Congress should place these funds in a separate category and exempt them from the normal controls and restraints governing the spending of defense dollars in peacetime.

5. A separate congressional watchdog committee (like the Joint Atomic Energy Committee) should be formed to monitor these funds and the progress being made through their use.

Time is short. Action is required now, by the President and the Congress. Compared to what otherwise may befall us, Pearl Harbor could seem like child's play.

The Case for Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently, in Washington, Mr. J. D. Zellerbach, chairman of the Committee for Economic Development, delivered an address before the National Conference on International Economic and Social Development.

Mr. Zellerbach is one of the leading industrialists of the United States, and is a very clear thinker. He made a speech which is certainly provocative of thought. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE FOR FOREIGN AID

Those of us here today undoubtedly share many basic beliefs about the world outside the borders of our country.

We believe that our destiny is intimately wound up with the destinies of those millions abroad who only now are beginning to experience national independence and individual freedom.

And we realize, I think, that the job of keeping freedom a strong and growing force in the world is a long, hard job. That there are no short cuts around perseverance; no blueprints to tell us what to do. The job cannot be mechanized.

These thoughts are always in my mind when I think of foreign aid. I'm sure most of you will not find them exceptional. Yet we meet at a time when all signs indicate that the public at large is losing sight of the importance of foreign aid—is becoming impatient with the idea. Politicians, versed in reading public opinion, are finding it no longer pays to endorse foreign-aid programs. Foreign aid is out of fashion, so to speak.

I believe these are indications of a genuine lack of understanding—warnings that you and I and others in a position to influence public opinion have not been getting the case for foreign aid across to the people of this country forcefully enough.

I want briefly today to sketch that case as I see it—to show why I think foreign aid is not only important but is more important today than it has been since the early days of the Marshall plan.

When we talk about foreign aid today we talk mostly about helping the newly independent countries of Asia, the Middle East, and Africa with their economic de-

velopment. After all, it is in these countries that the issue between freedom and Communist tyranny is hottest today. The case for foreign aid must stand or fall on the promise such aid gives of tipping the balance in freedom's favor in these countries.

I think the cause of freedom—and therefore of the security of western civilization—is helped three ways by aiding these countries with their economic development.

First, in many countries such aid encourages national leaders who are experimenting with democratic forms of government and with the values of individual freedom and justice. We may not like the policies these leaders adopt from time to time at home or abroad. We may not be able to sign them up in a military alliance. But none of these drawbacks is one whit so important as the fact that today in some parts of the world men from nonwestern societies are championing concepts of freedom and democracy—seeing if they can make them take root outside of the Western World.

The job these leaders are trying to do is as herculean as it is historic. They are trying—sometimes hesitantly, sometimes awkwardly—to marry an essentially western concept of individual justice with a revived and revitalized pride in their own ancient and honorable cultures. And they are doing this in the midst of apalling poverty.

To have any chance of success these leaders must first be able to offer their people the prospect of a better material life and one free from the stigma of political and social inferiority. People must have hope and dignity in order to practice freedom and justice. We in the United States can participate in the process of providing the economic base for a better material life; we can thereby increase the chances that freedom and democracy will take permanent hold. Or we can stand aloof and leave the new leaders in these countries to struggle by themselves. We cannot deny them development, of course. They are going to get it one way or another. We can help—or we can stand aside and greatly increase the chances that development will come at the cost of freedom.

The second reason for aiding these countries with their economic development is much like the first. Whatever the aims and ideals of the new leaders, if we want to encourage the growth of freedom and democracy, the best way—sometimes the only way—is to participate in economic development projects. For only by working side by side at common tasks with the people of these countries can we hope to influence their political development in ways compatible with our own security and growth.

Democracy and freedom are not marketable like soap. They aren't preachable like communism. Unlike communism, democracy doesn't prescribe a single dogma, a single way of life. Quite the contrary. Our values constitute a way of making it possible for different peoples and cultures to live together in peace and freedom.

And the values of freedom and democracy can only be learned slowly. No one knows this better than those like Prime Minister Nehru of India and Prime Minister U Nu of Burma who champion these values in Asia today. No propaganda, no exhortations from afar will get them across. If we of the West are to help, we have to make contact—constant contact—with the people of these newly independent countries. There is no better way of making contact—often there is no other way—than by participating in economic development projects.

These arguments in the case for foreign aid stress the political aspects of the security of our civilization. The third argument in the case is more a matter of economics. It is a fact that Japan and many of the nations of the Atlantic Community depend for their economic strength and health on the trade and raw materials of these newly independent nations of the world.

The oil of the Middle East is absolutely essential today to fire the industries of Western Europe. Markets in southeast Asia are absolutely essential if Japan is to avoid the twin dangers of starvation and Communist absorption. The dollars that Britain earns from sales of Malayan rubber are absolutely essential to the viability of the world's largest single area of free trade, the sterling area. A crisis at any of these points would disrupt the unity of the Atlantic Community—and of the West with Japan.

The United States, too, is increasingly dependent on an expanding world economy—particularly for raw materials. And as economic development proceeds there will be new markets for American business—markets which will contribute to our growth and prosperity. But some, I think, tend to overemphasize these points. The case for foreign aid is based primarily on our political interests so seriously challenged by communism, today—on the need to encourage those experimenting for the first time with individual freedom and democracy; on the need to maintain constant contact with the people of the newly independent countries; and on the need to safeguard the economic strength of our industrial allies in Japan and Western Europe.

These arguments don't change with the zigzags of the Communist line, or with changes in poltical fashion here at home. They don't change, because they are based squarely on long-range requirements of our own national security.

Changes in Communist tactics do, however, expand and contract the urgency of the case for foreign aid. And today I submit Communist actions are underlining the urgency of foreign aid more clearly than ever before.

No one can deny now that milder winds are blowing from the Kremlin these days. But at best this is a mixed blessing. In place of the ruthless rigidities of Stalinist policy, we now have the ingenious flexibilities of peaceful coexistence. Stalinism is dead; but the Communist empire lives on.

Just consider these events of the past 8 months:

Last September Czechoslovakia offered arms to Egypt in exchange for Egyptian cotton. The Soviet regime announced it would help build the Aswan Dam on the Nile. This was followed by the Khrushchev-Bulganin tour of India, Burma, and Afghanistan. In each country important economic agreements were reached—a trade pact and a steel mill for India—development goods in exchange for Burma's surplus rice—economic agreements with Afghanistan which come close to integrating that country into the Communist empire.

These Russian moves were followed up by offers of aid and technical assistance to Middle Eastern countries in December and offers of trade and aid to Latin America, Pakistan, and Turkey in January and February. And as a backdrop for this diplomacy, the 20th Communist Party Congress in Moscow rewrote the gospel according to Lenin: War no longer is supposed to be inevitable and civil war is no longer necessary to establish Communist rule within a country. Communists, according to the latest word in party doctrine, can come to power through parliamentary means—although this has never been done to date. And in doing so they should make common cause with Socialists and others.

These are only the highspots. But even this list documents the vigor and ingenuity of Russia's peaceful coexistence diplomacy. The face of Communist colonialism today wears a benign smile; its hand is extended in a gesture of help to all who want a better material life.

Secure in our knowledge of the hollowness of Communist promises and the wickedness of Communist aims, we of the West have no trouble assessing all these blandishments for what they are. We are tempted to rest the case merely by warning the rest of the free world to beware Communists bearing gifts. After all, what have we to gain by trying to out-promise the Soviet regime?

Yet if ever it were dangerous to draw such a curtain of complacency around ourselves it is now. The desire for econmic development is the overriding passion in more than half of the world today. It makes the leaders of nations see peace where there is no peace. It makes them see friendship and independence where there is only deceit and slavery. To expect the leaders of the newly independent nations of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East to resist the temptations of trying to do business with Soviet Russia is to ignore the facts of life in all of these countries.

The cunning Soviet tactic of peaceful coexistence presents a tremendous challenge to our will and ingenuity today. And the acid test of this challenge is our willingness to draw on our material and intellectual resources to devise an effective program for giving genuine aid to the economic development of what we call the underdeveloped countries.

The foreign aid bill now before Congress is the beginning of the administration's answer to this challenge.

This bill does not anticipate any noticeable increase in expenditures on foreign economic aid. We should not confuse authorizations to spend money over a number of years with actual expenditures in 1 year.

It is a matter of record that I and my colleagues in CED think the United States should increase its annual investment in the economic development of underdeveloped countries. The free countries of Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America could probably use effectively between half a billion and $1.5 billion more in foreign development capital than they are now getting. I feel it is certainly in our interest to increase our annual expenditures in this field at least to some point between these limits. After all, these are sums that the $400 billion American economy can take very easily in its stride.

But as a first step the administration's bill deserves our earnest support. There are two aspects of the bill which are worthy of comment:

First, the President has asked for greater "flexibility" in the use of foreign aid appropriations. It is important that he get it.

Foreign aid money now is appropriated by function and area—that is defense support to be spent in the Middle East; development aid for Southeast Asia and so forth. These functional and area programs are drawn up about a year and a half in advance and, quite naturally, they very often fail to reflect the right balance in the need for aid when appropriations are finally made.

The President already has some authority to shift funds around among different areas and for different functions. He is now asking for more—to be exact for authority to spend about $500 million in foreign aid funds where, in his opinion, the need is greatest at the time the money is appropriated. This is a useful step in the right direction.

The pending bill also asks Congress to approve a new procedure whereby Congress will have a chance to approve in advance of appropriations the suitability of certain long-range development projects for United States aid.

Many of the development projects which we should be supporting cannot be completed short of several years—dams, road networks, harbor developments, water resource projects and so forth. Such projects might require a commitment from the United States to provide aid for several years running. In fact, however, the United States Government cannot make a binding commitment to give foreign aid longer than about 3 years.

Under the new procedure Congress would be asked to pass a form of resolution, taking note of a given project and endorsing its general qualifications for United States aid. This resolution would have no legal force. Any commitment the President might make would still be "subject to the willingness of the Congress to appropriate funds." However, such a resolution on the part of Congress would be an important aid to diplomacy. It would help in negotiations with foreign governments and it would help in cases where third countries or international institutions are participating in the project. This is also an important step in the right direction.

The first priority now should be to maintain foreign aid at least at present budgetary levels or above, with the addition of these new features requested of Congress by the administration. In this way we will not leave the field by default to the Soviet regime.

Our second objective should be to reexamine our approach to this aspect of our foreign economic policy to determine whether we are really devoting enough time, effort and budget to do the job effectively. As part of this reexamination, we should encourage the underdeveloped countries themselves to take more thorough inventories of their minimum and maximum investment needs so that we have a more accurate picture of the complete scope of the problem.

We need today to revive something of the spirit and the imagination that went into the Marshal plan. The system of mutual cooperation among all the participating countries, which was so important a feature of the Marshall plan, may yet have much to contribute in the underdeveloped areas. But the essence of the Marshall plan was a willingness to set the goals high and to devise effective methods to achieve them. That should also be our approach to this new challenge before us. I feel sure that a program of cooperation to achieve a better life in the new democracies struggling for their existence will get the generous endorsement of the American people.

The Law of the Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a very fine editorial broadcast, entitled "The Law of the Land," made over New York Station WMCA by Mr. Nathan Straus, president of the station, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LAW OF THE LAND

(Editorial broadcast over station WMCA by Nathan Straus, April 19, 1956)

As this editorial is broadcast, a courageous man lies in a hospital bed, praying for the preservation of his eyesight, fighting against being blind for life. He was attacked and maimed because he dared to write and to speak the truth. This happened in New York City.

At the same time, men are persecuted and attacked for speaking the truth as they see it in other parts of the country. Bitterness, man's inhumanity to man, vengefulness, are not confined to any part of our country. There are good men and bad men in every State and in every city and in every community. It ill befits a New Yorker to speak in self-righteous tones about injustice to people of a darker skin color, while congested slums, occupied by Negro and Puerto Rican families, still disgrace whole sections of our city.

Nevertheless, without boasting of our own virtues in New York, it may reasonably be asserted that widespread intolerance and hatred of the Negro is a mental disease or kind of astigmatism that afflicts a greater proportion of the people in some Southern States than in our own State.

Some southern newspapers attempt a defense of segregation and discrimination such as has not been attempted by any New York newspaper.

An examination of southern newspapers reveals that all of the reasons advanced against integration in the public schools consist essentially of four basic arguments. These are:

1. That integration is unwise now because the South needs time to prepare its people for such a fundamental step;

2. That the unanimous decision of the Supreme Court outlawing segregation in the public schools is unconstitutional and, therefore, any State may nullify the edict by interposing its own authority.

3. That the order to integrate the public schools at this time is politically inexpedient and must affect Democratic chances in the 1956 presidential election;

4. That segregation is justified by the doctrine of white supremacy.

It is true that integration is unwise now because the South needs time to prepare its people? Is it true that separation of the races is a way of life in the South, respected by both Negro and white citizens? Is it true that upsetting this traditional custom would inflame racial passions and endanger both races?

There is no doubt that time is a universal healer. The fact is, however, that the South has had, not 1 year or 2 years to prepare for integration—it has had 90 years. And what has been achieved in those 90 years? The races have been separated at every possible opportunity and the discredited doctrine of racism has been perpetuated year after year and decade after decade.

Moreover, the notion that violence will occur from integration is not necessarily true. There has been integration in some southern border States, during the last few years, without explosive incidents. In Missouri, the schools—notably in St. Louis, Kansas City, Springfield, and other cities—have shown steady progress under integration. Today, 12 years after its initiation in St. Louis, integration is an established fact. The same is true of Washington, D. C., Maryland, and Kentucky.

In the capitol of the United States, according to a survey made by the New York Times, "7 days after the Supreme Court ruled that racial segragation in the public schools was unconstitutional, the District of Columbia had a plan for desegration. * * * It acted with almost incredible speed to revolutionize a school system that for more than 90 years had operated under acts of Congress that legalized segregation." Now there are 147 schools with classes of mixed races. They contain all of Washington's 68,000 Negro pupils, outnumbering the white pupils nearly 2 to 1. Fears that school integration under such conditions might be difficult have proved wholly unjustified.

In West Virginia, Oklahoma, and, to an extent, in other States, integration is going on successfully, with only temporary, localized set-backs.

Actually, only five States, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, Virginia, and South Carolina, have openly declared defiance. Any delay granted to those States which have declared they will resist the law of the land, will encourage lawlessness amongst those States that have indicated they will abide by the law and can serve only to encourage evasion.

While complete equality, including integration of the school system, will undoubtedly take time, there is no evidence in history or in law that a policy or delay, linger, and wait will succeed any better in the future than it has in the past.

What is the second objection raised against the Supreme Court decision? It is that the Supreme Court decision itself is unconstitutional. In the words of Senator EASTLAND, of Mississippi, southerners are obliged to defy it.

This argument is an extension of the idea that the States are sovereign and can interpose their will against the Federal Government. The concept was resurrected from Civil War days by the Richmond News-Leader of Virginia, last November, in a series of editorials. The word "interposition" now has become the rallying cry for all those who believe in Jim Crow.

But not even southerners are in agreement on the doctrine. It has been branded as "legal poppycock" by Mississippi's Gov. J. P. Coleman. Tennessee's Gov. Frank Clement has refused to support it. Florida's Gov. LeRoy Collins has stated that interposition "would be the same as saying that, for limited purposes, we will secede from the Union. And that question has been settled, as we all well know."

Interposition was the subject of bitter disagreement in 1833 between John Calhoun and Daniel Webster. In the Senate in February of that year, Webster declared: "The right of State interposition strikes at the very foundation of legislative power of Congress. * * * It cannot make laws for the Union, if any part of the Union may pronounce its enactments void and of no effect. * * * I maintain, therefore, that * * * the acts of Congress and the decisions of the national courts must be of higher authority than State laws and State decisions.* * * Nullification is as distinctly revolutionary as secession."

The great Chief Justice, John Marshall, in his opinion in the case of *McCulloch* v. *Maryland*, said, on March 6, 1819: "* * * The instrument [the proposed constitution for the United States] * * * was submitted to the people. They acted upon it in the only manner in which they can act safely, effectively, and wisely, on such a subject, by assemblying in convention. It is true, they assembled in their several States—and where else should they have assembled? * * * But the people were at perfect liberty to accept or reject it; and their act was final * * *. The constitution, when thus adopted, was of complete obligation, and bound the State sovereignties * * *. The Government of the United States, then, though limited in its powers, is supreme; and its laws, when made in pursuance of the constitution, form the supreme law of the land."

We can dispose of the whole theory of interposition by this evidence that the highest legal opinion, in the present and in the past, has held that the Government of the United States is supreme.

The third argument advanced by the South to support evasion of the law is that it would be politically inexpedient to insist on integration because it would impel the South to form a third party based on principles acceptable to the Dixiecrats. This is an argument of desperation rather than of reason.

Actually, a third party would not benefit the South. On the contrary, it would render the Southern States politically impotent. Even the most rabid Dixiecrat knows that the progress of the South has been and is

today tied to the Democratic Party. Because of seniority, Members of Congress from the Southern States hold the major committee chairmanships. If the Southern States were to bolt the Democratic Party, such action would only serve to keep the Republican Party in power and lose for the South the great political influence it now wields in the halls of Congress.

The fourth and final reason offered by the South to support its plea that segregation is justified is the assertion that the white race is superior to the Negro race.

Thus under the banner of white supremacy, the South is successfully enlisting support for a revival of the Ku Klux Klan and similar organizations. The so-called White Citizens Councils are conducting a campaign of fear and economic boycott against the Negroes. Even substantial business groups are being wooed. Along the countryside in the vicinity of Charleston, S. C., large blackboards confront the eye, sponsored by the junior chamber of commerce. They show lifelike replicas of school blackboards with this imitation military legend scrawled in white chalk "Remember Operation Blackboard," a reminder to white citizens to use every possible device to evade integration of the public schools.

There is neither religious nor scientific sanction for the doctrine of white supremacy. All of the responsible religious leaders have emphatically denied the notion that God has given superior intelligence or superior virtue to the whites. Historically, Negroes have contributed materially to our civilization. Their achievements have been the more remarkable because of the handicaps of prejudice and discrimination under which they have suffered.

Today, no responsible scholar or scientist will claim that the white race is superior. All that is left in this doctrine of white supremacy is, therefore, unadulterated racial bigotry. Americans cannot honorably acknowledge or accept such a doctrine as a reason for evading the law of the land.

If there is no such thing as white supremacy, how can we eliminate conduct based on this prejudice from the heart of the Southland? We cannot legislate an end to bigotry in the minds of men. But we can, at least, insist on compliance with the law of the land as set forth in a unanimous opinion of the United States Supreme Court. We can refuse to participate in any device for evasion of the law. We can—and we must—insist that planks be incorporated in the political platforms of both political parties, demanding equal compliance with the Federal law, all of the Federal law, by all of the States of the Union—the South as well as the North. To do less is to give greater consideration to those who practice discrimination than to those who suffer from it.

Security for the Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, yesterday was Rural Life Sunday. Rev. John F. Streng, D. D., of St. John American Lutheran Church, of Beatrice, Nebr., preached an appropriate sermon entitled "Security for the Land," in which he dwelt upon the definite obligation for soil conservation.

I ask unanimous consent that the sermon be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECURITY FOR THE LAND

(Sermon by Rev. John F. Streng, D. D., St. John American Lutheran Church, Beatrice, Nebr.)

(Text: Deuteronomy 6: 17–19.)

Rural Life Sunday has become a time-honored institution and holiday in the church. The Hebrews in Old Testament times observed it with special care and consideration of God's laws concerning the land and its products and preservation. God's original creation included earth and man, both made from dust. The firmanent on high, its countless galaxies of other worlds including sun, moon, and stars, were all made subservient to the good earth. In every land leaders have paused on certain days to remind the people of God's admonition to cherish and care for earth which gives birth and nourishment. The Bible we have, tells us that God created man in His image, and the earth for man's pleasant; and that man was to inherit the earth to the glory of God! Thus man's relationship to the soil is God-given and will never be changed. Productive soil is, together with the salvation of mankind, God's most wonderful gift. It is the one lifeline without which neither man nor animal can find food, clothing, and shelter.

Virgin soil is a miracle of God's creation, a mixture of rock, plants, animals, and tiny living organisms constantly changing, yet always lifegiving. God's immutable law that the soil shall never cease to bring forth life is man's guaranty of divine favor, so long as man respects the soil. Down through the centuries man has not always dealt kindly with the soil, which because of man's sin is equally under the sign of divine punishment. Thorns and thistles were no part of God's original plan in Paradise; but nature groans and travails under the awful curse of man's sin. Man for selfish reasons sets aside God's law concerning birth—death—rebirth, when he employs sticks or stones, axes and plows, fire and water, to multilate God's land. Greed and neglect force land to deteriorate. Because man refuses to watch over it as a shepherd and steward, land is exposed to robbers and thieves, natural and artificial, and much good earth goes to waste.

Soil conservation is God's command. From Genesis to Revelations, the Lord constantly lays upon man's conscience a personal responsibility for the inheritance of the good earth, the cultivation of the land, and careful nurture of the same for the prosperity of posterity. Security of land and people lies not in weapons forced and forged from the soil's minerals, but in God's benevolent answer to the prayers and soil-conservation practices of Christian people everywhere. Soil stewardship is the most important law in God's word next to soul conservation. A better understanding of the value of property and the eternity of divine laws will solve the problem of worldwide starvation.

Man's relation to his Creator is the same regardless of skin. Worn out, eroded land is a visible, tangible proof that man has refused to be God's helper, determined to live as he pleases. Soil is not just so much dirt under our feet. It is a living, breathing, health-giving, life-sustaining creation. It can be either developed, destroyed or debauched. Wise and loving care will preserve it; ignorance and greed will ruin it.

Soil conservation is the tried method of overcoming selfishness, and therefore, meets with divine approval. Jesus was always comparing the Kingdom of God with something akin to the soil. Thus the church's message has always had the burden to stress God's complete and irrevocable ownership of all in heaven and earth. Only love for God and what is His can convert and change the human heart. The Church which the Bible calls God's handmaiden and hired hand is committed to call attention to the sin of soil exploitation. The Christian farmer is a Man of God. He knows that it is God's will to use good soil practices so that future generations may still enjoy the Lord's land. As humble coworker with his Creator, he studies soil economy, and helps his neighbor do likewise. The church has increasingly positively supported all programs that conserve the soil, but she must leave actual practices to those who are called of God to farm.

People are dependent upon the land passed on to them by their fathers. Each generation has a peculiar responsibility. Jesus severely condemned the unfaithful servant who returned the unused talent he had received (St. Matthew 24: 14–30). The church, as one of the most respected institutions in every community, must analyze conditions affecting the welfare of the people. According to statistics the United States population increases 9,000 per day or 3 million per year. Yet poductive areas are shrinking at the rate of 500,000 acres per year. More people must be fed on less soil; therefore soil conservation is a community enterprise. By fulfilling Jesus' command: "Love thy neighbor," genuine Christian brotherhood and Christlike goodwill extend to the soil. Careful economic research shows that recommended conservation practices increase production by 35 percent. Christian farmers are good citizens, good customers, good community builders. They pay their taxes and tithes regularly. They support unborn generations. They have the welfare of the entire Nation at heart. They know that change from soil abuse to achievement means prosperity. Vast scars of maltreated nature must heal through vegetation. Land crying out in anguish, washing away in its own tears of torture, bleeding from merciless gouging and gorging, can recuperate only through sympathetic soil surgery and care. The cattle on a thousand hills enjoy God's green carpet of nature using its delicious food for man. A nation that is impoverished through sterile land has stolen from God. We have a moral obligation to see to it that it may be well with us on the land that the Lord our God has given us.

Government has officially described a farm as a place of 3 to 4 acres, providing the annual value of agricultural products raised thereon as $150. What tremendous changes in farming many of us have seen in past decades. Today the size of the average Nebraska farm is 471 acres. The average farm in the United States has 242 acres; that is 104 acres more than in 1910. With rapid modern mechanization this trend continues, so that every farm journal emphasizes that the day of the small farmer, as we knew him, is limited.

God wants to be good to all. No wealth can buy all the rain, no dictator can command that rain fall only on his land. Both Old and New Testaments define stewards as such who hold in trust the possessions received from their Lord. We are responsible for the soil and its condition. County and State conservation groups and related projects are proof positive that all citizens have a stake in every acre of land regardless of whether the courthouse records show that temporary title is vested in someone's name. People pass on; but the soil remains. How glorious that in our day of frustration, sorrow, sin, temptation, and starvation, we live in a land where a goodly number of farmers are God-fearing men, who rear their family in the fear and admonition of the Lord. When the Lord decreed that man should have dominion over the earth He added the serious responsibility to cultivate and culture the soil.

The church thanks God for youth education on farm and in school, preparing them for future contributions in conservation. In America alone, some 2 million 4-H Club

members, 300,000 future farmers, 2 million boy and girl scouts, 300,000 future homemakers, and scores of other organized youth groups are taught that conservation and good stewardship are a good way to keep America the land of the free and home of the brave.

"Dig the ground and smoothly rake it,
Plant the seeds with loving care;
God's bright sun will shine upon them,
God's warm rain will find them there;
Carefully we'll watch and tend them;
Soon they'll show their thankful heads.
They will grow and bud and blossom, making flower beds."

Once upon a time God created a Garden in Eden; and when He comes again to judge the quick and the dead, each generation will have to account of its season of cultivation. Proverbs 24: 30–32, Job 12: 7–9. The thoughtful farmer will not plant seed that has not been carefully screened and cleaned. So God cannot plant His word into a heart that will not be cleaned of evil habits. God's word declares that man shall not reap good from malice, or righteousness from immorality, or love from hate. No one will draw out of God's bank more love and trust and thankfulness than they invested in soil and soul. God declares that whatsoever a man sows, that shall he also reap.

Seed, sower, and soil all are God's. He created a triple partnership of unique design and no man can dissolve it. Man can divorce himself from God's laws but he will suffer for it. Today's vast deserts are silent sandy monuments to man's defiance of God's laws. The earth suffers terribly under such abuse but God will some day remove its travail and restore it to its former beauty in Paradise. The best things in life are those nearest to us: the soil at our feet, the flower in the garden, the daily duties at hand, the health God gives us, and the path God has outlined for us. So we need not reach for the stars but do life's common work as it comes. That will please God more than anything else and it will occupy our mind with noble thoughts. Amen.

Progress in the Fisheries Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, a problem which has always confronted the fisheries industry has been the matter of preserving the product between the time it is caught and the time it is subsequently sold to a consumer.

One of the greatest advances toward the solution of this problem has been the development of a technique in which the freshest of fish is immediately prepared, fried, quickly frozen, and packaged for later sale and consumption. The technique has made good fishery products available in every part of the Nation at all times.

A part of the difficulty in the fish-stick business, as it is called, has been to establish standards for the product. In this effort, the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of Interior and the Department of Agriculture have been of great assistance. The appreciation of the industry was expressed in a resolution adopted by the National Fisheries Institute in convention in Florida recently and embodied in a letter addressed to the Honorable Wesley A. D'Ewart, Assistant Secretary of Interior. The letter reads as follows:

DEAR MR. D'EWART. At the closing business session of its recent convention, the National Fisheries Institute adopted a special resolution recognizing the splendid progress made in establishing grade standards for fishery products. We feel that this progress is considerable due to your efforts and the efforts of your assistants in the Fish and Wildlife Service. It gives me sincere pleasure, as president of the National Fisheries Institute, to convey to you the following resolution:

"Whereas the National Fisheries Institute at its 1954 convention gave special recognition to the problems of the infant fish-stick industry and the fish-stick committee was therefore created; and

"Whereas the fish-stick committee late in 1954 undertook to develop voluntary grade standards for frozen fried fish sticks and secured capable assistance from Fish and Wildlife Service technologists; and

"Whereas the entire fish-stick industry, through the fish-stick committee, at the 1955 convention requested the Fish and Wildlife Service to complete the development of practical grade standards and then to issue them on an official voluntary basis; and

"Whereas, at the present convention, the Honorable Wesley A. D'Ewart, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, has announced that official voluntary grade standards for fish sticks are to appear in the Federal Register within a few days: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the National Fisheries Institute in convention assembled at Miami Beach, Fla., April 18, 1956, recognize with gratitude the effective efforts of the Department of the Interior, the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Department of Agriculture in developing and establishing standards for grading fish sticks; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Department of the Interior, the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Department of Agriculture be urged to continue the programs to develop standards as requested by the industry."

Please accept this resolution as a token of the gratitude of the entire fishing industry.

Sincerely yours,
FRANK W. WILKISSON, *President*.

Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the First Unitarian Church in Baltimore recently held a Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration at which remarks were delivered by Dr. W. Waldemar W. Argow, minister of the church; the Honorable Emory H. Niles, chief judge of the Supreme Bench of Baltimore City; Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, of Maryland; the Honorable Simon E. Sobeloff, Solicitor General of the United States; and Dr. Carl B. Swisher, professor at the Johns Hopkins University. Their comments were eminently noteworthy and I ask unanimous consent that they be included in the Appendix of today's RECORD, notwithstanding the fact that according to an estimate by the Public Printer, the cost will be $294.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY DR. W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW, MINISTER OF THE FIRST UNITARIAN CHURCH, BALTIMORE CITY, ON THE OCCASION OF THE WOODROW WILSON CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION ON SUNDAY, APRIL 22, 1956, AT THE CHURCH

The First Unitarian Church of Baltimore City joins in this year's centennial celebration of Woodrow Wilson with a special pride: it was during his postgraduate years at the Johns Hopkins University that he was a member of our choir, contributing generously of his time and talent to our worship service. Therefore, in honoring him we honor ourselves.

We have asked Judge Emory H. Niles, chief judge of the supreme bench of Baltimore City, to introduce our guest speakers because his father, Judge Alfred S. Niles, was a fellow student of Woodrow Wilson at the Johns Hopkins University.

REMARKS OF JUDGE EMORY H. NILES, CHIEF JUDGE OF THE SUPREME BENCH OF BALTIMORE CITY

It is my privilege to introduce the distinguished speakers who will address us this morning.

They have come to honor Woodrow Wilson, one of the greatest men that America has produced. In doing honor to him they bring honor upon themselves and upon us.

It is, of course, unnecessary to pretend that Governor McKeldin, Solicitor General Sobeloff, and Professor Swisher are strangers. The first two were born in Baltimore, and the third has lived in Baltimore for approximately 20 years. All three have held public and private positions of high importance in the life of Baltimore, of Maryland, and of the United States, positions so important that they are well known to most of you. I shall not, therefore, attempt to recite details of their careers.

Governor McKeldin grew up in Baltimore and must have been in school here when Woodrow Wilson was nominated for the Presidency in the old Fifth Regiment Armory in 1912. I suggest that he was too young to have actually attended a session of the convention. He is named for the great Republican President, Theodore Roosevelt, who was Woodrow Wilson's greatest opponent. The Governor's presence here today to pay tribute to Woodrow Wilson accords with our fundamental tradition that we are Americans first and members of parties second. The Governor is not unknown to the members of this church, for he has spoken twice in this building during the last year. We welcome him again.

The Solicitor General, Simon E. Sobeloff, is likewise a Baltimorean. He was a young man when Wilson was nominated, and I think it probable that he attended the sessions of the nominating convention. He has been city solicitor of Baltimore, and United States Attorney for the District of Maryland. From 1952 to 1954 he was chief judge of the Court of Appeals of Maryland, the highest judicial office in this State. He resigned that office only to accept the office of Solicitor General of the United States, an office which he now holds, and which may be described as that of the principal lawyer for the Government of the United States. He has been appointed by President Eisenhower to be a judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, but has not yet been confirmed. The reasons for opposition to his confirmation do him honor, and I am sure that we who are present hope that

the opposition to his confirmation will be overcome, and that the principles for which he stands, and which we share, will be vindicated.

Prof. Carl B. Swisher was born in West Virginia, and grew up there. Dr. Swisher has been a student and teacher of political science all his life. He was a member of the faculty of Columbia University until he came to Baltimore in 1935 as a member of the faculty of the Johns Hopkins University. He is now the Thomas P. Stran professor of political science. Although the professorship which Dr. Swisher holds cannot technically be called that under which Woodrow Wilson studied while he was at Johns Hopkins, it can fairly be said, I think, that Dr. Swisher is truly the successor of the professor under whom Woodrow Wilson took his doctorate here and an academic child of Wilson. Woodrow Wilson made his great contributions to scholarship in the field of American history and government. Dr. Swisher's life has been spent on this subject, and his last book, which is entitled "Theory and Practice of American National Government," is reminiscent of Woodrow Wilson.

Governor McKeldin will speak on Woodrow Wilson as statesman. Judge Sobeloff will speak on Woodrow Wilson as humanitarian, and Dr. Swisher will speak on Woodrow Wilson as scholar.

On your behalf I again express our thanks to them.

REMARKS OF GOV. THEODORE R. MCKELDIN, OF MARYLAND

Woodrow Wilson became a legend while he was still alive. This is an unusual fate and proves that the man was a strong personality; but it is not altogether fortunate. For when a man becomes legendary the world begins to weave mythology about him. Friend and foe join to build up the legend, with the result that the plain truth becomes obscured and many years may pass before he is accorded his rightful place in histsory.

Even today, 32 years after his death, only a reckless man will assert that he knows exactly where Wilson stands in the list of American statesmen. Some of the most important ideas he introduced into our system of government have not yet been fully worked out. So as they succeed or fail under the test of time, Wilson's rank will be somewhat higher, or somewhat lower, than it is today.

But there is no longer any doubt that his final place in that list will be a high one, so his statecraft is worthy of careful study by anyone interested in the science and art of government. For a long time the outlines of that statecraft were made obscure and uncertain by the dust of political combat. Details that seemed tremendously important at the time have now sunk into insignificance. On the other hand, things to which nobody paid much attention at the time are now, 32 years later, seen to be of immense importance.

For example, his announcement immediately after his first election that he proposed to be not only President of the United States but also the leader of his party, evoked little serious comment. Most people, Republicans as well as Democrats, simply said, Why not? After all, he was the party leader, so why not say so? It was nothing new. Theodore Roosevelt, before him, had certainly been a party leader, and Abraham Lincoln before Roosevelt, and Jackson and Jefferson before Lincoln.

This reasoning ignores the psychological effect of bringing a thing into the open, whereby all subsequent generations must face it. We know now that Wilson's pronouncement actually transformed the Presidency in important respects. I mention this, not because it tells us much about Wilson as a statesman, but simply to illustrate how the perspective of more than 30 years gives a different look to nearly everything he did, including more important things.

Very little knowledge of history is needed to enable one to realize that the career of Wilson as a statesman is sharply divided by the year 1914. This was as unexpected by him as by the rest of the world, for nobody, not the most experienced and astute statesmen in the New World or the Old, had any real conception of what was coming. A great many people were talking about war, to be sure, but what they had in mind was at worst some such conflict as the American Civil War, which was a war of movement resulting in definite, measurable victory for one side. The inconceivably brutal and almost static slaughter of the First World War was beyond imagination—and it was not imagined.

Thus Wilson came to the Presidency under the impression that the utmost that would be required of him was a reformation and renovation of the system of government that had endured since 1789.

For that task he was splendidly equipped. As a student of government he had no superior in this country and few in the world. But he was more than a student. He had a logical and resourceful mind, capable of seeing the weak spot in the existing system of government and also capable of devising ways and means of strengthening it—practical ways and means, based on sound reasoning, ways and means that would work.

The excellence of the work done in the first 2 years of that administration is a matter of history. The first income-tax law, the Federal Reserve System, the Smith-Lever Agricultural Act, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Clayton Antitrust Act were all monumental achievements which stand to this day unchanged except as they have been expanded and strengthened.

But the most that can be said of all this is that it was sound statecraft in the old tradition. It moved in the same direction that Theodore Roosevelt had been going 10 years earlier. New conditions had imposed new methods, but the spirit of it all was identical with the reforming spirit that had animated the men who organized the Republican Party 60 years earlier, and the aim of it was no more than to guarantee to every American citizen the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit, of happiness. Had this been the sum of his achievements Wilson would have come down in history as a strong and able statesman, but in no way unique.

It was when the world was riven asunder by the explosion in Europe that the situation was created that gave him a place apart from all his predecessors by compelling him to devise and practice a form of statecraft different from anything known in this or any other country. For the First World War literally demolished a world that had existed ever since the reorganization of Europe after the Dark Ages. Statesmen everywhere had the very foundations of their profession blown from under them. Not even the Napoleonic wars made such a complete wreck of the fundamental principles of diplomacy, government, and war. A large part of Europe was physically devastated, but all of Europe and most of the rest of the world was psychologically shattered.

Every man charged with the conduct of public affairs had to reconstruct his system of ideas; but many of them built after the fashion of the poorer citizens of Rome after the fall of the empire, who constructed their houses with stones snatched from the ruined Colosseum. All over Europe men tried to reconstruct their national home with ideas taken from the fallen empires—and poor, and crooked and rickety most of them proved to be.

One statesman only came forward in that emergency with plans for a completely new structure of the world, built with new materials. He was Woodrow Wilson, who perceived that the political philosophy of isolated nationalism had run its course and, like all outworn philosophies, was now most completely false in precisely those aspects that had once been true. This was an idea born of the stresses of the time, not inherited from the Founding Fathers of the Republic. It could not be, for in George Washington's day nationalism was just beginning its triumphant career.

It is true, of course, that the idea of collective security was not original with Woodrow Wilson, any more than the idea of the Declaration of Independence was original with Thomas Jefferson, or the idea that the world is round was original with Christopher Columbus. Nevertheless, Jefferson and Columbus were great men because they gave force and effect to the idea. So did Wilson; and that was the element of greatness in him.

Yet it was precisely at this point that he doomed himself to failure, for it was at this point that he broke the connection between his own mind and the prevailing thought of the time. We must remember that all his brilliant successes in domestic policies, although they were called innovations, were not in fact novelties but merely extensions of practices and ideas that had long been familiar to the American people. The Federal Reserve System, for instance, was new in its structural details, but the idea of with the other memorable reforms. In doan elastic currency was very old. So it was mestic affairs Wilson was a successful statesman not because he induced us to do things we had never thought of but because he showed us how to do what we had long wanted to do.

But the idea that the free nations are interdependent, that none can be secure unless and until all are secure, was a genuine novelty. It had not been true 50 years earlier. What made it true was a combination of circumstances. For one thing, international trade had developed until the prosperity of each individual nation was tied in with the prosperity of its neighbors. For another, communications had developed until what was being thought and said in London and Washington was known within hours, possibly within minutes, in Peking and New Delhi. Finally, the science of warfare had developed until not merely soldiers, but every citizen of every belligerent had become part of its fighting forces.

But when such great changes as these occur, the wisest men in the world do not see all their implications immediately and the mass of the people do not see them for years. Wilson himself did not see them in 1914. There is no reason to doubt that at the outbreak of the war he really believed it was possible for this country to remain neutral and yet remain free. He did not voluntarily yield that belief; the facts simply smashed it down.

However, he was the President, which is to say, he was the best-informed man in the country, possibly in the world. He knew a great deal that was not clearly apparent, often not apparent at all, to the general public. Some people say, in that case he should have informed the public, but that is nonsense; you can't inform a hundred million people rapidly. You can tell them, and Wilson did tell them; but they are not really informed until they have not only heard the news but are convinced that it is true, and convincing people takes time.

In this case there was no time. Some kind of war settlement had to be made then and there, for anarchy was marching hard on the heels of war. The question that Wilson had to answer in 1919 was this: Should he act on the truth as he knew it, but as most of the people did not know it, at risk of losing his leadership and being repudiated; or should he act on outworn and false, but familiar principles, thereby retaining his in-

fluence, but at risk of building a peace structure on such rotten foundations that it would certainly fall down within a few years? Essentially this meant, should he act in behalf of Wilson, the man, or should he act in behalf of the country and the world?

He chose to act for the country and the world; and that made him a great man.

It is true that he failed. The world did not build on the foundation that he laid, and the peace did fall down within 20 years. It is true that he contributed somewhat to his own failure, partly by mishandling men and misjudging events, partly because he collapsed physically. But the failure of the peace treaty and the League of Nations was not the final test of the statesman. That test came when he was called on to risk everything on adherence to what he knew was truth although others could not see it. In that test he did not fail, and so his greatness has survived the ruin of all his hopes.

I am aware of all the charges that have been brought against Woodrow Wilson. Some, but not all of them can be refuted, but at this moment I am not interested in refuting any. Grant that he was stubborn. Grant that he was arrogant. Grant that he was tactless and hopelessly deficient in the arts of conciliation and compromise. All this does not alter the fact that on the supremely important point he was right. This is his enduring honor. May I add, parenthetically, that it is also the great honor of certain of his political opponents, as, for example, William H. Taft and A. Lawrence Lowell, that they, keenly aware of all Wilson's faults, nevertheless saw that he was right on the main thing and supported him strongly.

The whole story of Woodrow Wilson is one that discourages fainthearted men, and men eaten by personal ambition. There is no comfort in it for them, none at all. For the moral of it is that really great statecraft is highly dangerous to the statesman. It is on a lower level that men achieve dazzling personal success—the level of extending and improving, not building from the ground up. Washington, leaving the Presidency amid a storm of vilification and abuse; Lincoln, dead in the moment of victory; Wilson, broken and defeated in his supreme effort—these are typical of men so great that their true stature cannot be appreciated, or even seen, by their contemporaries.

Yet if each of these is in some sense a tragedy, each is tragedy in the Greek manner, high tragedy that, while it arouses terror and pity, at the same time gives a lift to the spirit. You and I may know well enough that we cannot rival or even understand them; yet the mere knowledge that there have been such men reflects honor upon us all. Correggio, on seeing one of Raphael's masterpieces, cried out, "And I, too, am a painter." So you and I, looking with amazement at Washington, Lincoln, Wilson, may reflect, "And I, too, am an American" and be strengthened and emboldened by the thought.

So in this, Wilson's centennial year, I see little profit in speculation as to what might have been had he done otherwise, or had the wheel of fortune spun somewhat faster or somewhat slower. We need not distract our minds over what might have been; it is enough to know what was. It is enough that this American statesman boldly proclaimed the truth when to suppress it would have been more profitable; and so handed down to us the legacy of a great ideal. Thus he became one to whom we may apply the mighty eulogy in the Apocrypha.

"Let us now praise famous men,
And our fathers that begot us.
Such as did bear rule in their kingdoms,
Men renowned for their power,
Giving counsel by their understanding * * *
Leaders of the people by their counsels,
Wise and eloquent in their instructions * * *
Their bodies are buried in peace;
But their name liveth for evermore."

REMARKS OF SIMON E. SOBELOFF, SOLICITOR GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

It is in accordance with custom, when a personality is to be honored and there are several to participate in the program, to dissect the subject into separate categories, as you have ordered today. Thus Dr. Swisher was given the assignment "Wilson the Scholar"; the Governor has discussed "Wilson the Statesman," and I am directed to speak of "Wilson the Humanitarian."

But in truth, Wilson was an integrated personality not readily divisible into unrelated segments. His depth of insight and integrity as a scholar, his courage and devotion to duty as a statesman are inseparable from the qualities which may be said to exemplify his broad humanitarianism. In the rich tapestry of his eventful life these several strands are interwoven, and indeed they cannot be separated without losing the pattern of the fabric as a whole.

Thus, when we examine his incomparable state papers, we behold at once the flowering of a lifetime of scholarship in history and political science and the practical wisdom of a statesman; but these are illumined by his vision of the good life and an orderly world, and made dynamic by his ardent zeal for the welfare of his fellow men.

Woodrow Wilson's humanitarianism was not the superficial, backslapping "hail fellow well met" type, characteristic of so many in politics. He was, in fact, at times a bit austere and unbending, even harsh in dealing with people—a defect which hampered him—but he proved himself, nevertheless, a skillful administrator and negotiator.

As president of Princeton, Wilson's drive against the social snobbery of the college clubs is a reflection of his democratic concepts and so was his resistance to the domination of wealthy donors in university affairs. Though unpopular in some quarters, the implications of these ideas were noted by the wider public beyond the campus and had not a little to do with his nomination as a candidate for Governor of New Jersey.

There is not time this morning to dwell upon many facets of Woodrow Wilson's social thought, which are interesting and impressive even to those who may find themselves in dissent. Necessarily I limit myself to a single one, and even that can be dealt with only sketchily. It fell to Woodrow Wilson to lead this Nation in the First World War and to articulate its war aims. Of course, Wilson did not originate the idea of a League of Nations. The dream of peace and freedom, sometimes realized, too often rudely shattered, had been in the minds of men for centuries. It was Wilson's great merit that he wrought mightily to convert the old-age dream into a durable political reality.

The clarity and eloquence of his speeches resounded throughout the world, and he gave moving utterance to our deepest national aspirations. He was more than a master of the potent phrase; he possessed the vital spark of vivid insight. Pertaining to the assigned theme—Wilson's humanitarianism—the high purpose which he declared was not less than to put an end to war and make the world safe for democracy. It captivated multitudes in our country and everywhere. Scoffers and cynics slur and disparage such designs; others, borne down by the wearying weight of things, and their fiber spent, fall victim to apathy or despair; but it is precisely through such persistent moral and spiritual self-consciousness that man has risen as far as he has from primitive barbarism. Wilson became the symbol of the passionate hopes of the masses of men who believed with religious fervor that the League of Nations fashioned by Wilson, would free mankind from recurrent scourges of bloodshed and destruction.

America was not yet ready to go the way Wilson pointed. Without the adherence of the United States the League of Nations was doomed inevitably to failure, and after a few years of unhappy existence it gave up the ghost. Let philosophers of history carry on their fruitless debates as to whether, if the United States Senate had ratified the Treaty, the agony of a second World War and its sequels, which still oppress and baffle us, would have been averted.

What of today? Are we in a better state? This is a time of conflict and confusion in which the deepest issues of the nature of man and the aims of his society are being debated. Cherished democratic ideals are under heavy assault and our basic assumptions in respect to the freedom of the individual are being contradicted. The stress of this period makes it increasingly clear to all thinking persons that having won liberty, a nation cannot rest in the assurance that it may enjoy it without further care or effort. The defense of freedom is a perpetual struggle against dangers internal and external. It is a problem that is never solved, a task never completed. The securing of freedom is not the burden of courts alone, or of Congress alone, or of the executive branch alone, or merely of all departments of Government together. The maintenance of freedom is the responsibility of every citizen and requires not only abstract approval of the slogans of freedom, but devotion in our hearts to freedom's cause and a determination to live by its precepts. This calls for knowledge and understanding and unremitting alertness and sustained effort to oppose acts and usages that are destructive of freedom.

In the field of our foreign relations, we find in the United Nations that the veto power, as so persistently exploited and abused by the Soviet Union, has seriously impaired the United Nation's effectiveness. Indeed, the organization has too often been converted into a forum for the conduct of the cold war, and we are bewildered by the erratic alternations of soft speech and extravagant vituperations, the sullen scowls and specious smiles of modern diplomacy. Even now, as the Near East teeters on the edge of war, with menacing possibilities for the peace of the entire world, the Soviet Union's arms shipments to the Arab nations inexorably continue and the peril of a disastrous conflagration keeps mounting daily. The true meaning behind diplomatic language lies (if we may be permitted such a word) in a confusing obscurity. No wonder a spirit of deep apprehension prevails.

Yet we are not resigned to utter pessimism. We look back to an early chapter in the history of our own Nation and take heart. Two years before our union of the Thirteen Original States was launched in 1787, Thomas Paine, one of its promoters, hopelessly said, "made up as it is of people from different nations, accustomed to different forms and habits of governments, speaking different languages, and more different in their modes of worship, it would appear that the union of such people was impracticable." History attests how wide of the mark Thomas Paine's prophesy has been.

An so, despite difficulties and discouragements, our Nation, under the leadership of President Eisenhower, is not abandoning the struggle for a peace based on righteousness, but perseveres in the hope that in time mutual distrust and accusation will subside and an increasing measure of tranquility, freedom and justice be attained. Thus the President said in his San Francisco speech last June, "The munitions of peace are justice, honesty, mutual understanding, and respect for others. So believing and so motivated, the United States will leave no stone unturned to work for peace. We shall reject no method, however novel, that holds out any hope, however faint, for a just and lasting peace." And some months earlier, he declared in his address to the United Nations, "the United States pledges before you—and therefore before the world—its deter-

mination to help solve the fearful atomic dilemma—to devote its entire heart and mind to find the way by which the miraculous inventiveness of man shall not be dedicated to his death, but consecrated to his life."

It would be pleasant to be able to report that more has been achieved but it would be calamitous to resign ourselves to accepting less. Our moral duty and our religious command is to "seek peace and pursue it."

This is also the spirit in which Wilson labored and selflessly gave his last measure of strength. His grandest work did not attain success in his lifetime, but there is no dishonor in defeat where there is integrity, high principle and generous devotion to an exalted humanitarian aim.

"The work of justice," the prophet Isaiah has told us, "shall be peace; and the effect of justice quietness and assurance forever." The eternal verity of this utterance is ineluctable and a faltering mankind still gropes toward its full understanding. In the heat of controversy there is inevitable exaggeration of a man's imperfections and limitations and a calculated disparagement of his better qualities, aims and deeds. After the lapse of a third of a century, however, such hostile detractions are muted and there is a softer, juster, more discriminating appreciation of Wilson's character and the grandeur of the ideal for which he struggled with unselfish heart. Today Wilson's life is part of the national heritage all Americans hold in common. When mankind sees this righteous goal with brighter clarity the glory of Woodrow Wilson will shine; for his exceptional talents of mind and heart, his learning and his statesmanship converged in a magnificent humanitarian vision of a world at peace and united, not by fears, but by justice.

REMARKS OF DR. CARL B. SWISHER, PROFESSOR AT THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

It is a unique experience in American history that in the planning of a memorial to a President of the United States, one-third of the time should be allocated to the subject as a scholar. Such an allocation is appropriately made only in the instance of Woodrow Wilson. He has been our only professor in the White House. Thomas Jefferson, it is true, founded a State university, the University of Virginia. The two Presidents Adams were men of great learning. Grover Cleveland had a post-presidential connection with Princeton University. And William Howard Taft was a professor at Yale Law School between his presidential period and his appointment as Chief Justice and as such he wrote a thoughtful book on the presidency.

Of all our Presidents, it was only Wilson who began with a definitely scholarly career and pursued that career with such success that it might well have led him away from Government service rather than into it. Yet it is to be remembered that scholarship has many facets. There are in particular two types of emphasis. One emphasis is on the disciplined and meticulous collection of facts that have not been collected before, the addition to the sum total of the knowledge of mankind. The other is the play of the processes of thought upon facts in such a way as to illuminate their meaning. Both types of scholarship are needed, and the two are needed in combination. Wilson combined the two types, but his emphasis was always on the second. He was never interested in facts for the sake of facts alone. He was not a collector or an antiquarian. But from earliest boyhood he was interested in men and their history and in the discovery of the meaning of history, with particular emphasis on the history of governments. He read not merely to know but to understand. Ray Stannard Baker, author of Wilson's multiple volume biography, quotes Wilson the college student as warning against cramming into one's head too many ideas of other men lest there be not enough room for thoughts of one's own. He studied in order to understand and to develop his own ideas, and he developed ideas not because his aim was abstract thinking but because from early life he expected some day to be a statesman. "The Senator from Virginia," he signed himself once upon a time when in college. The purpose of scholarship, or of Wilson's personal scholarship at any rate, was statesmanship.

For all the help that he may have received along the way from dedicated teachers, Wilson seems not to have been outstandingly the product of any one of them. He used them, as it is indeed the function of teachers to be used, but he operated under his own dynamics and with his own sense of direction. The one person of predominant scholarly influence in his life, it would seem, was his father, a Presbyterian minister, from whom he imbibed a deep sense of moral values and high standards of literary performance. As a college student at Princeton it seems to have been a group of choice fellow students who served as friends, foils in debate, and sources of ideas, rather than teachers or administrators. When a college senior he wrote a paper on "Cabinet Government in the United States, which was published, ironically, under the editorship of Henry Cabot Lodge, he 'spake as one having authority." He sized up the separation of powers in the United States, he found it wanting, and in ringing tones he proclaimed its defects. He admired the writings of distinguished Englishmen such as Edmund Burke and Walter Bagehot and accepted many of their ideas, and at a later date at the Johns Hopkins University he enjoyed the lectures of James Bryce, another Englishman who told the American people much that they needed to know about their own Government, but in essence, even as to these men, his thinking was his own. He was an independent scholar on his way to service of the state.

Wilson studied law at the University of Virginia not because he wanted a conventional law practice but because he believed the law the appropriate route to statesmanship. He was frankly bored with much of the mass of material he had to memorize to get a degree and to secure admission to the bar but he did the work with the long-range goal in mind. He began practice in Atlanta—or at any rate he opened an office there. But in addition to the difficulties of most young lawyers in building a clientele he had the handicap of not being vitally interested in his profession for its own sake. As the public continued to ignore him he rethought his life plan, admitted the fact that he was far more interested in the living ideas of history and political science than in petty legal controversies which would for long constitute the grist of his practice, and decided to go back to school.

So it was that in 1883 Wilson became a graduate student in history and political science at the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, a unique graduate institution then only 7 years of age. There with a small group of able teachers and a unique group of fellow students he resumed his story of American history and American government. While a student he wrote and read to seminars the chapters of what was perhaps his most distinguished book, Congressional Government. With keen powers and great self-assurance he exposed the operations of Congress as work bogged down in committees and as leading politicians determined the nature and extent of the legislative grist. Here again, as the kind of student every graduate school longs for, it appears that he gave intellectual leadership to a greater extent than his acceptance of leadership from others. He continued to recoil at requirements laid upon him by others. He wrote no doctoral dissertation as such and seems to have been determined not to write one. When after 2 years at Johns Hopkins he left to teach at Bryn Mawr, it required persuasion from his wife and from his Johns Hopkins teachers to get him to present his Congressional Government as his dissertation and to return to Baltimore to take the dreaded examinations. He of course came through with flying colors and ended up a Ph. D. almost in spite of himself. It is of note that while teaching full time at a number of other institutions he returned to Johns Hopkins for a part of each of 10 years to lecture where he had been a graduate student, receiving in the beginning the munificent sum of $500 for a series of 25 lectures.

Bryn Mawr, where he had his first teaching appointment, seems to have been regarded from the beginning as but a temporary stop. There he could teach only women, and in the teaching of women he saw little to be gained in his struggle toward statesmanship or the teaching of prospective statesmen. His next stop was Wesleyan University, in Connecticut, where he enjoyed the experience of teaching men. But it was the call to Princeton, his college home, that placed him completely in his academic element. It was during the years from 1890 to 1902 that he developed at Princeton his reputation as a lecturer and wrote most of the books that stand as his scholarly monument. He was still, or perhaps increasingly, the man of ideas. He continued to perfect his literary artistry, with hopes on the part of his wife, indeed, that he would seek a predominantly literary career. Although he was immensely popular with students, his popularity was primarily as a lecturer rather than as a tutor and close associate. He was so sensitive to any kind of imperfect performance that he found the reading of student papers extremely painful. He was at his best in the organization and delivery of lectures with all the finesse of which he was capable. Among his books, including a biography of George Washington, Division and Reunion, The State, and others, we find further examples of his intellectual performance. Historians complained of him that they contained not so much history as what Woodrow Wilson thought about history. It is true in general that they represented appraisals of history rather than collections of historical facts not hitherto assembled. It is also true that today they are for the most part period pieces rather than volumes in current use. As themselves a part of the everflowing stream of American history, nevertheless they have a value and a significance not to be attributed to the works of other and more pedantic historians who then criticized him.

By 1902 Professor Wilson's prestige was such as to make him the logical selection of the presidency of Princeton. At this time, in directing the course of a great university, he entered in earnest on a career of active statesmanship, even though statesmanship in the specialized field of scholarship. At this point the important materials begin to fall within the jurisdictions of Governor McKeldin and Judge Sobeloff, who have spoken before me. Suffice it in large part to say that the qualities that had been developing over long years of teaching and writing came more and more into fruition. He fought for high intellectual and ethical standards, and with the aristocracy of his earlier training he refused to "suffer fools gladly," whether in matters of university finance, the social organization of the university community, or in scholarship. He found low-level academic politics as painful as he had found immature student performance. He fought to make Princeton the great university it was capable of becoming, and he never fully understood how trustees and deans and faculty could operate on a lower level. The fact that in important matters some of them temporarily defeated him made him willing to look toward farther horizons and

lead to his election first as Governor of New Jersey and then as President of the United States.

While it is true that Woodrow Wilson was a scholar in the presidency, it is also true that he had first been a statesman in scholarship. In Washington he was uncomfortable with the rough-and-tumble, no-holds-barred type of politician he met in many posts. He could denounce a group of United States Senators as "a little group of willful men" without sensing the nature of their willfulness or developing adequately the means of dealing with it. Himself a man of ideas and ideals, he could not effectively operate with men who could not rise to his dimension. Yet to an amazing degree he made his ideals live for the American people and gave idealistic leadership when war provided one of the major crises of our times. True, he had vision of world unity and consequently of world peace beyond the range of the great body of human imagination. A point was reached at which the weariness of the people with idealistic strain, the cupidity of politicians seeking selfish advantage, and indeed his own inability to implement adequately his own idealism led to political defeat. But as we see it now the cause on which he had embarked was not one to be achieved merely by the ratification of a treay and the support of an organization. We now see that minds throughout the entire world had to undergo changes and require decades, rather than months or years, before effective unity could be achieved. If Wilson failed, he nevertheless gave a tremendous impetus to the kind of shift in attitude that must take place if mankind is to survive.

A final word as to this scholar who became President, this professor in the White House. His was a great democratic ideal, the ideal approximating that of Lincoln, from whom in many ways he differed greatly but whom he greatly admired. Wilson was in every sense an intellectual aristocrat. To some his aristocracy seemed to reach the point of arrogance and to be devoid of that quality of humility that is essential to genuinely democratic performance. When we reach this point in our analysis we need to resort to careful definition of terms, and on this occasion there is inadequate time for defining them. Certain it is that Wilson was incapable of becoming the kind of politician who measured democratic sentiment merely by keeping his ear to the ground. He sought, instead, to mold and develop that sentiment by his personal example and by the persuasive statement of high ideals. Whence came those ideals which he sought to inculcate? For all his want of ability to assume an ear-to-the-ground posture I should hesitate to say that the ideals were not the major undertones of American sentiment, undertones that needed to be brought to the fore by means of artistic and persuasive statement such as that of which Woodrow Wilson was capable. If he at times guided by an eye turned inward rather than by an ear turned groundward, it would not seem inappropriate to suggest within the walls of this sanctuary that the mystic elements of inner communion may at times provide a better guide to the deeper spirit of mankind than the crasser techniques of public soundings.

However that may be, it was in his idealistic leadership as President that Wilson fulfilled his life both as a scholar and as a statesman. Wilson the man was greater than any of the books that he wrote. His books were stepping stones and not ends in themselves. It was as President and as the advocate of world union for the sake of world peace that he wrestled with possible achievements greater than himself. Here it was that he wrecked himself upon life. Here, for all the appearance of failure, is the measure of the aspiration and of the inner greatness of the man whom we commemorate on this occasion.

Constitutional Means Available for Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH Q. ALEXANDER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include, by request, the following letter from Mr. P. E. Thompson, Spencer, N. C., addressed to the editor of the Salisbury Post, Salisbury, N. C., entitled "Constitutional Means Available for Change":

CONSTITUTIONAL MEANS AVAILABLE FOR CHANGE

EDITOR POST:

In the beginning God created Heaven and the Earth, and as we know the Earth today, it is comprised of six Continents separated by thousands of miles of water or other natural barriers. God created man in his own image, and later created separate races, first mentioned in Genesis, 9th and 10th Chapter, as the descendants of Ham, and identified by the New International Encyclopedia as the black race. There are, as commonly accepted, five races: white (Caucasian), black (Ethiopian), yellow (Mongolian), brown (Malayan), and red (American Indian).

Since it has been determined that there is no difference in the blood of mankind, some people have been led to believe that there is no difference in the races. Blood in a human has no more to do with the nature than the sap in a tree, grafted, and producing different fruits, or different vegetation growing in the same soil. It is the seed that makes the difference as the Seed of Abraham, etc.

God further separated mankind by different languages resulting in the setting up of separate nations. These separate nations have increased in number, the latest being Israeli, created by the United Nations for the Jews. We have separate religious denominations, labor organizations, and many other separations, that many may have freedom of choice and develop along lines of their choosing, with no thought of superiority, striving only to improve and excell in doing good. I believe this is according to God's plan and man's desire.

When this great Nation was formed from 13 separate colonies, history tells us that the Founding Fathers had much difficulty in getting agreement to setting up a central government, but finally agreed on certain specific controls only. The Constitution provides for three separate branches of the Federal Government, each to be independent and supreme in its own branch. This Constitution provided that any changes in this basic law would be inaugurated by the legislative branch and ratified by three-fourths of the States before it would be effective.

1896 RULING

In 1896 the Supreme Court ruled on the race question that equal but separate for the races was according to the Constitution. I think that Court was as wise and as unprejudiced as the present personnel of the same Court, as much as I think George Washington, Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln were as wise as F. D. R. or Dwight Eisenhower, and there has not been any amendment since 1896 to change this basic law.

I think the present Court not only acted unwisely in its reversal of this decision, and caused unnecessary friction between the races, but violated the very Constitution which it is sworn to uphold. The decision of 1896 has been the law of the land for 60 years, and it certainly does not make for stability of the law for different personnel of the same Court to make different rulings. If such a radical change is to be made the Constitution plainly provides the procedure. It is not for different courts to say what they think the law ought to be, only what it is until changed.

I think the South is being unduly singled out on the question of racial prejudice. The present Chief Justice of the Supreme Court is from a State (California) which has intense prejudice against the yellow race, being the State most instrumental in securing the Chinese Exclusion Act, or Treaty, which was resented by all the yellow races, and I believe was the basic cause of the Pearl Harbor attack.

I think the South has done a pretty good job assisting the Negroes to advance from slavery, in less than a hundred years, to a position superior to any of the colored races of the world, and I venture to say that their standards of living will compare favorably with any people anywhere outside of America. In fact there ceases to be any complaint by the colored people of their economics condition or standard of schools, etc. Their only remaining desire is "Integration." The mixing of races in schools, especially in the lower grades where first impressions are formed, and where the doctrine of no difference in races is taught will eventually result in the beginning of a "mongrel" race. I ask the best people of both races, Is that what you want?

I think there is more sectional prejudice against the South than there is racial prejudice in the South. I think this is based more on ignorance of the subject than anything else. As hateful as slavery is to me, and most people of today, I do believe that God has used it sometimes as a blessing in disguise. I don't believe the Negroes would ever have reached the promised land of America had it not been for slavery. In colonial days England and other European nations had hundreds of ships in the slave trade. Slavery was first legalized in the colonies in Massachusetts in 1641. The first legal action against slavery was taken by Virginia in 1723.

CHANGE OF SCENE

After the northern colonies found that they could not use the slaves to advantage because of climate and their type of industries, they did not free them. They sold them to the southerners to be further enslaved, but in the South they were able to survive and multiply. I think those who sold them were just as guilty as those who bought them. Then they later prosecuted a war to free them with no provision to compensate the South for its loss. A recently reported statement by a colored bishop visiting in Russia that the "Negroes' life in America is like that of any other people."

In the past 5 years the colored race has increased in the South only 2 percent, and in the balance of the country 56 percent. At that rate, the so-called race problem will be removed from the South to such segregated sections as Harlem, and similar sections. I hope the colored people decide to stay and continue to advance in their separate business enterprises, schools, and professions. The South is the land of opportunity for the colored man as well as others of good will.

When a people are willing to accept such a radical and unprecedented directive as that of the Supreme Court of May 1954, and May 1955, I think they are ripe for dictatorship, whether by "nine old men" or by an overzealous younger one.

The South, with the highest percentage of American-born population, should be proud of the 100 Congressmen and several governors and legislatures in their determination to resist this dictatorial decision by every legal means, and I believe Virginia is proceeding properly in invoking the sovereign States right of interposition, not to annul, but to hold in abeyance the Court's directive until

a change in the Constitution can be properly submitted, and ratified by the necessary 34 States.

After humbly and prayerfully considering the above question, this is what I believe.

P. E. THOMPSON.

SPENCER, N. C., *April 16, 1956.*

Virtue and the Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN R. BUSH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of Saturady, May 5, 1956:

VIRTUE AND THE FARM BILL

The House has acceded to the request of the President and has passed legislation providing for the soil bank, which was the most important single proposal in the President's farm program as presented to Congress in his message of January 9. The bill calls for a total of $5.7 billion in additional farm spending over the next 4 years.

Though the President had asked only for the soil bank, on the desirability of which the administration and Congress were in complete agreement, it was probably expecting too much to suppose that Congress could resist the temptation to try to load it down with amendments of its own, designed to make itself solid with groups that might not stand to benefit from the soil bank. In some cases it failed to marshal the needed strength, but in several others it succeeded. The latter included at least one of the provisions that had been singled out specifically for criticism by the President in the message accompanying his veto of the original omnibus farm bill. This was a provision calling for mandatory supports for the principal feed grains other than corn—rye, oats, barley, and grain sorghums.

In calling for enactment of a soil-bank bill the President had taken into account the frequently repeated refrain of the Democratic leaders that it was imperative to get additional income into the hands of the farmers this year. This, in fact, was the sole basis on which the opposition attempted to reinstate 90-percent price supports in the bill vetoed by the President, a policy which, as one commentator recently put it, "is like prescribing a diet of sugar for a diabetic."

Congress had procrastinated so long before giving the President the soil bank when he first asked for it that it would have been of little use so far as increasing farm income this year was concerned. The President, in making his second request for the bank, therefore proposed that any farmer who formally contracted to withdraw acreage from surplus crops under the bank's provision receive an advance on the payment he was to receive after the contract had been carried out.

This, needless to say, put the Democrats, who had been demanding immediate cash for the farmer, in a highly uncomfortable position. Should they approve the proposal for prepayments and thus permit the administration to take credit for getting purchasing power promptly into the hands of the farmers? Or should they block the administration's plan, and run the risk of alienating perhaps an equal number of farm votes? And, if they chose the latter course, how would they rationalize their action?

In the end they chose the second course. This would seem to be dubious even from a political standpoint. But the opposition has insisted on making it a little ludicrous as well, by attempting to clothe their decision in the robe of moral rectitude. Their position, it would seem, comes down to this: It is politically moral for you yourself to pump out additional income to the farmer if you do it through 90-percent rigid supports, a mechanism under which the producers of crops already in surplus are encouraged to increase that surplus; it is immoral when someone else proposes to raise farm income through an apparatus which is based on the sound principle that to be eligible for additional income the farmer must cooperate in reducing the farm surplus.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am happy on the occasion of the 165th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution to join in tribute to the people of Poland and the indomitable spirit which they have shown throughout the centuries.

No one can turn the pages of history without realizing the brilliant contribution which the Polish people have made to mankind in the field of literature, in the field of music, in the field of science, in the military and other fields.

No one could travel throughout Poland, meeting some of its outstanding leaders, as it has been my privilege to do in days gone by, without sensing the genius of the people.

We in America are fortunate in having some 6 million fellow citizens of Polish descent. They have contributed greatly to the life of the Nation in time of peace and in time of war, and are today playing their part in the struggle in which we are engaged for freedom and independence in a peaceful world.

America and Poland have had much in common in their love of liberty, justice, and peace and have evidenced their friendship in experience shared, and in mutual assistance rendered in time of need.

During the Revolutionary War, it was General Kosciusko and General Pulaski who came to the assistance of America.

During and after the First World War, our national leaders contributed greatly to the rebirth and rebuilding of Poland.

During the Second World War, the soldiers of Poland fought brilliantly in many theaters of the war. They fought on land, they fought in the air, their aviators winning especial renown. They fought on despite unbelievable suffering inflicted upon those at home.

We all appreciate the unbelievable suffering which those in the homeland have experienced under the yoke of Communist aggression.

We are confident, however, that the spirit of Poland which proved indomitable despite 150 years of partition by the forces of three empires will again prove indomitable despite the circumstances by which Poland is today confronted.

We look forward to the day when the ideals and courage of the Polish people will be rewarded by a government which is again independent, playing its proper role among the free nations of the world.

The State Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Urges Congressional Action Against Unfair Import Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on January 30, 1956, the following bipartisan-supported resolution, urging congressional action against unfair-import competition, was approved by the State Senate of Pennsylvania.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION URGING CONGRESSIONAL ACTION AGAINST UNFAIR IMPORT COMPETITION

Whereas the increased importation of numerous products that come into competition with the output of factories, farms, and mines of Pennsylvania, replacing the products of Pennsylvania's industries, is a constant menace to the State's continuing economic stability; and

Whereas the lower wages paid abroad make it impossible for many of our smaller and medium-sized producers to compete with imports without resorting to ruinous price cutting, which in turn would result either in financial losses or heavy pressure for wage reductions and outright unemployment; and

Whereas our national obligations have reached such extreme proportions that the national income must be maintained at its present unprecedented high level, or close thereto, lest we become insolvent; and

Whereas unemployment caused by the imports of residual oil, which increased 300 percent from an average of 45 million barrels in 1946, to more than 136 million barrels in 1954, or the yearly equivalent of 33 million tons of coal; and unemployment caused by imports of crude oil; various types of glass, steel, aluminum, brass, and zinc products; pottery and chinaware; granite, tiles, cement, hardboard, plywood, hardware, plumbing, flat glass and other building supplies, lace, carpets and all kinds of woolen, cotton and synthetic fiber manufactured goods; leather and fabric gloves; bicycles; hydraulic turbines; machine tools and other machinery; heavy electrical equipment and other electrical industry products and electronics; watches, clocks and parts; optical industry products; cutlery; scientific apparatus; pencils and pens; pins, clips, and fastenders; soft fiber; insulation board and manufactured cork products; chemicals; toys; mushrooms; farm, dairy and dried milk products; wallpaper; hats and millinery; printing industry products; ladies' handbags and leather goods; nails, wire, screws, bolts and nuts and many other commodities; will render the upholding of the economy at its high levels most uncertain and difficult, unless all import trade is placed on a fair competitive basis and the potential injury therefrom thus eliminated; and

Whereas agricultural products such as wheat, wheat flour, cotton, butter, cheese and peanuts enjoy the protection of import quotas; and

Whereas a maximum of satisfactory trade results from a prosperous domestic economy

freed from the threat of a breakdown resulting from unfair import competition: Therefore be it

Resolved (if the house of representatives concurs), That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States that adequate safeguards be provided in tariff and trade legislation, including import quotas, against the destruction or lowering of our American standard of living, the labor standard of our workmen, and the stability of our economy by unfair import competition and that the existing trade agreements legislation be amended accordingly; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each Senator and Representative from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.

Dinosaur National Monument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "What's the Rush About Dinosaur?" published in the Deseret (Utah) News of April 26, 1956. The editorial refers to the proposal to make a national park of Dinosaur National Monument.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The sudden excitement over making Dinosaur National Monument a national park should be recognized for what it is—nothing but a hangover of the bitter fight over Dinosaur in connection with the Colorado River storage project.

As such, it is perhaps at least partly understandable, but it is nonetheless ill-advised. By acting hastily in this matter, the Nation could do serious harm to the long-range national park program with which we are all sympathetically concerned.

Let us review the facts, objectively and without sectional heat:

Utah and other upper-basin States agreed that Echo Park Dam should not be made a part of the recently approved legislation authorizing the upper Colorado project. This agreement was fully kept. Echo Park was taken from the legislation, and no effort was made to restore it in the Senate-House conference or elsewhere. It is completely out of the initial phase of the project, which cannot now be amended.

This means there is no time pressure. Conservationists who are dedicated to keeping a storage dam and reservoir out of Dinosaur need have no worry in the forseeable future. They have no reason to rush through a bill to change the existing monument to park status. There is plenty of time to consider the proposal fully and act in wisdom instead of in haste.

Several pertinent questions need full consideration.

First of all, would it be wise to add additional lands to our national parks system at a time when the National Park Service has insufficient funds to keep up the units now under its supervision? The Senate Appropriations Committee this week approved a larger budget for parks maintenance than was available last year, but still had to strike out such needed items as an oil road around the rim of Cedar Breaks National Monument, a road from U. S. 91 into Zion National Monument, a road into Arches National Monument and development of a water supply at Capitol Reef National Monument.

These are all units of the National Park System in the same general area as Dinosaur—and other developments in other areas were also left out. It would be well to take care of what we have before going on to more ambitious expansion.

Secondly, there is very serious question whether the canyons of the Green and Yampa Rivers are as deserving of national-park status as several other areas in the same Colorado River Basin. This question has been raised before, but the conservationists categorically refused to consider it when the Echo Park issue was being debated. The conservationists may have felt the question was introduced solely as a diversionary tactic at that time—but now that all time pressure has been removed, it can be impartially reconsidered.

The National Park Service's own Survey of the Recreational Resources of the Colorado River Basin lists numerous areas of genuinely outstanding scenic value. Among them are:

Monument Valley, already world famous, but still without status as a national park or monument.

The Gray's Pasture Land's End area, a broad expanse of fantastic country which includes the incredible and still unsurveyed Land of the Standing Men, famous Dead Horse Point—which the late Believe It or Not Ripley rated as a more magnificent view than the Grand Canyon itself—and the spectacular Needles area. Many naturalists believe this vast area holds some of our most outstanding scenery—not excluding that of our present highly spectacular parks and monuments.

The Escalante, Hole in the Rock, Rainbow Bridge country, filled with startling and colorful rock formations.

It is not suggested that the Nation rush out and set up a new national park in any or all of these areas, any more than it hasten to give Dinosaur national-park status. On the contrary, it is suggested—in fact, urged—that we do not make wasteful haste at all.

With ample time available, a thorough study of all of the scenic potential of the Colorado Plateau can be made, and a wise decision be based on the factual foundation such a study will establish.

Poland's Constitution Day

SPEECH
OF
HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, which is the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution of 1791, I would like—since that heroic nation is unable to speak for itself—to commemorate for its people this significant occasion marking the former freedom and democratic practices of that nation; and also to express the hope felt by myself and millions of others in our own free land and that the future will bring to the Poles behind the Iron Curtain a release from their present bondage and an opportunity once more to function as free men in true national freedom. Not only is this the hope of individual Americans and of Americans like ourselves who represent the people of the United States in the Congress: The State Department, in a statement issued yesterday, pointed out that in recent years May 3 has become something more than the day Poles and their friends celebrate as Poland's National Day. "It has become a day on which the United States reaffirms its assurances that it is not reconciled to the bondage of Poland."

We look forward with the Polish people to the day when they can again celebrate this great occasion as a free nation.

Definite Relief for Cotton Growers Required

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith the text of a letter I sent to Secretary Benson, on April 25, 1956:

Hon. EZRA T. BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington 25, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This letter is to bring to your attention the plight of the extra long staple cotton growers in the United States, and to ask your best effort in alleviating the current conditions.

Basically, the problem facing our domestic producers are directly traceable to excessive imports of long staple cotton from Egypt.

It is my purpose to request that you use the provision of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act to deal with this matter. As you know, under the provisions of this Act the Secretary of Agriculture has the right and the responsibility to recommend to the President the initiation of proceedings looking toward import restrictions, when such imports are shown to be the detriment of domestic producers.

Currently, foreign grown cotton accounts for almost 100 percent of American mill consumption. Most of this foreign cotton is purchased from Egypt, while our own cotton is stored in warehouses and domestic acreage is further decreased. Our imports from Egypt have reached 95,000 bales annually, the near-maximum under the quota system.

Time was when our State Department advocated liberal importing of cotton from Egypt to discourage that nation's trade with Communist-controlled nations. But the record shows that Egypt has increased trade with these Red nations, and her attitude toward the United States and other freedom-loving nations has become auspect, thus the original contention of the State Department is destroyed.

Egypt has acted, overall, in a manner very hostile to the United States. She protested our spending money paid us by the Italians for defense bases in Italy. She asked for our aid in building the Aswam Dam, accepted our offer to do so, and turned her back on the United States to deal even more with Russia. She demanded our money to buy planes and train pilots to fight army boll-worms attacking Egyptian cotton.

General Nasser, dictator of Egypt, has been responsible for the present crises in the Mid-

dle East, due to his acceptance of Red arms from Czechoslovakia. Those arms include submarines which will fly the Egyptian flag but be manned by Communist technicians under Russian tutelage. Those subs will ply the Mediterranean in the shadow of our 6th Fleet.

Egypt refused to import much of our surplus wheat, at a time when we desperately needed a new wheat market, yet she accepted wheat from Russia during this same period.

It does not seem logical, nor in the interest of fair play and justice, to continue to appease a nation definitely hostile to the United States, and particularly to the detriment of our domestic cotton growers and at the expense of their cotton market. Enlightened self-interest requires the action requested herein.

I, therefore, strongly urge your using section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act to lower the import quota and to place a tariff designed to protect American interests on foreign-produced extra-long staple cotton.

Your prompt attention, consideration, and reply will be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

Basic Issues Involved In the Labor Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, one of Arizona's most distinguished citizens, Mr. Frank Brophy, has written a most searching article dwelling on the basic issues involved in what is wrongly referred to as the labor problem. Because of the current and proper interest in this subject, I suggest that my colleagues read the article, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Arizona Republic of May 4, 1956]

LETTER TO THE EDITOR: CANDLE OF VISION

(By Frank Cullen Brophy)

Jack Hellman asks (letter April 21) through your letters to the editor column that I write a piece on some subject "close to the heart of labor"; and he very wisely suggests "it is better to light one little candle than to curse the darkness." This admonition, I suspect, has been borrowed from by friend, Father James Keller, who started the Christopher (the Christ bearer) movement some years ago. He has often given that wise counsel to a world grown bitter and confused in the darkness of minds that are warped by fear and hatred.

I, too, shall borrow a phrase to start my reply. The famous George Russell (AE) once titled a book of essays "The Candle of Vision," and if I remember correctly, it contained the most devastating criticism of a fellow poet I have ever read. AE was no "silver spoon" writer. In his younger years he served as a clerk in a dry goods shop. He was a wise, intuitive and kindly man who could be roused to rip the hide off Rudyard Kipling only when the poet laureate had debauched a fine poetic talent in order to please his imperial masters, the British Tory ruling class.

Had I the talent of AE I, too, might have done a more memorable piece on the author of The Voice of Arizona Labor who used his position to villify and sneer at Senator GOLDWATER. GOLDWATER's offense was that he had the intelligence to perceive that certain labor politicians were betraying the very people they posed as befriending, and he had the courage to expose them, even when he knew that the wealth and power of the newly formed labor political party (AFL–CIO) would be thrown against him. At the appropriate time these same union-political forces will, no doubt, eulogize some wealthy political Milquetoast, like Harriman or Stevenson, for the sordid reason that they may agree to prostitute themselves to a power-hungry pack of leaders who want to control the revolt of the masses of America.

But now I shall try to oblige Mr. Hellman and write something close to the heart of labor—not the labor professionals, I must add.

The labor problem, as I see it, is the human problem. It is the endless tragedy of man's inhumanity to man. Confucius faced it when he urged his fellow Chinese never to do unto others except as one would have them do unto them. When the Son of Man, who loved men as only God can love, came down to this earth, he simply said "Love one another." To those who could not see themselves except in the role of exploiters, he urged: "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and all things shall be added to you."

These are very unrealistic and impractical words according to the concepts of politicians, financiers, economists and labor bosses, yet they have come down the millennia of years—challenged, but never erased. Each century has produced its little crop of politicians, demagogs, rulers and powerful ones. Their words and pronouncements usually precede them into oblivion. They are the constant proof that the foolishness of God is greater than the wisdom of men; but, of course, the kind of men who deceive their fellow man, and thereby rise to seats of power and eminence never admit anything so preposterous—at least in public.

The labor problem is one that touches all of us—rich and poor, fools and philosophers. Since the fall of Adam, man has been doomed to earn his bread by the sweat of his brow. The laborer does it at the end of a shovel, the corporation lawyer over a desk strewn with books and papers, the executive on a mahogany table with a mind bedeviled by doubts and hopes.

One day, I lunched with one of the richest men in America. He had a lettuce sandwich and a glass of milk. He looked as unhappy as Dives must have looked when he begged in Hell for just one drop of water. I have also lunched with a peasant on a bowl of strong soup, a hunk of French bread and a bottle of wine. He looked as happy as a king is supposed to look, but seldom does. This is the paradox of mankind. It is also the paradox of the labor problem. It cannot be solved by forcing men to join unions. It cannot be solved by strikebreakers and starvation wages. In fact, it cannot be solved—period. It can only be alleviated.

When those strong enough to maintain positions of power and trust will do for those beneath them as they would want it done to themselves were the positions reversed, then progress in easing the pain that gnaws at the heart of labor will be made. When those in authority reject the temptations of pride and greed and try to guide their actions with a spirit of fair dealing and justice, then progress in the labor problem is being made. When the man at the bottom, or in the middle, can face life with a minimum of envy, hatred, and greed, he is helping work out the labor problem though he may little suspect it. I repeat what I said in the beginning. The labor problem is the human problem, and the answer to the human problem will only be found in the mystery that lies hidden in the heart of God.

I frankly admit that my candle of vision is a tiny one; but if it has been lighted by only a spark thrown off from the mighty flame that is the Light of the World, then it will not have burned in vain.

Cash Payments to Totally and Permanently Disabled Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Inspiration Does It" written by Inman H. Douglass, and published in a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor. The article deals with cash payments to totally and permanently disabled persons.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON.—The routine listening to routine testimony came to a sudden halt the other day in the Senate Finance Committee. Hearings had been droning along on H. R. 7225, the social security bill to provide among other things, cash payments beginning at age 50 to persons totally and permanently disabled.

Reason for the quickened interest was the testimony of a lively new witness on the stand, who might himself have been once classified as disabled, but who quite definitely had declassified himself.

"There are no disabled," vigorously declared Henry Viscardi, Jr., the legless president of Abilities, Inc., a Long Island, N. Y., firm that employs only disabled persons. The next hour Mr. Viscardi spent explaining his statement.

Abilities, Inc., produces electronic parts for airplane manufacturers and other industries, and seems to specialize in positively demonstrating what other opponents of the disability provisions of H. R. 7225 have been more quietly saying: that ability is vastly more than a physical condition.

To back this up, Mr. Viscardi briefly told the thrilling story of his unique organization, a corporation formed in 1952 with $8,000 of borrowed capital. It now consists of 176 men and women considered disabled from a medical and physical standpoint who successfully compete in the open market against firms that employ nonimpaired workers.

Accepting neither charity, donations, nor Government grants, the corporation has repaid out of operating profits the $8,000 borrowed capital, with interest, but the main thing it does not accept is disability. The central theme of its philosophy is the restoration and preservation of the incentive, dignity, resourcefulness, and productivity of the individual regardless of his physical handicap.

Mr. Viscardi personally believes that the passage of the proposed legislation to provide cash benefits for the disabled would "destroy all opportunity for the disabled to help themselves." He said it would make them kept citizens.

His firm has been able to provide a more-than-average wage level for its employees,

and a retirement fund as well—a fund for disabled disabled workers. Asked when a company employee became disabled, Mr. Viscardi replied that that would be when a person could no longer perform the work for which he was trained and could not be trained to perform some other type of work. He added that so far no employee had applied for corporation-provided disability benefits; they are still at work. "It is his abilities that count, not his disabilities," Mr. Viscardi stressed.

"What a disabled person wants and what he needs is not a pension or pity but the dignity of a productive life. A disabled person wants a chance to help himself, a chance to seek the challenges of life—a meaningful life—instead of a guaranteed existence."

Committee members, witnesses, and spectators alike were captivated by this testimony of what the spirit of man can both do and undo: doing of the possible proving to be the undoing of the impossible. There was no doubt that Mr. Viscardi was, so far, the star witness of this series of hearings which began early in February.

Here was a modest little man, asking for nothing and offering nothing but the observation that he was apprehensive of the destructive effect that the passage of this bill would have on that class of people who are regarded as disabled. Almost apologetically he expressed regret over not having something more constructive to offer. He kept trying to bring his testimony to a close, but the Senators would not let him go. They wanted to know more about his work, how he went about rehabilitating people, training them, lifting up their spirits, and enabling them to become self-supporting.

He was sorry, he said, that he couldn't give more of an answer to those questions. All he could say was that he was obsessed with a burning drive to prove that a person doesn't have to be disabled. One of the Senators replied in substance: "Mr. Viscardi, if you could tell how you get your inspiration and have been able to impart it here to us today, and how you could impart it to others, we would have the answer to this whole problem."

It was as though a fresh breeze of earth-free inspiration had suddenly swept the room clean of dusty, time-tangled convention. It would have indeed been difficult for anyone at that moment to define the term "disability."

Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two bulletins from the GTA Daily Radio Roundup, dated April 26, 1956, and April 30, 1956, respectively.

There being no objection, the bulletins were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP

THURSDAY, APRIL 26, 1956

A hornet's nest of criticism was stirred up by Congress when it passed its 1956 farm bill. Newspaper editorials buzzed angrily over the proposal to restore 90 percent supports, to continue dual parity, and other features to help bolster farm income. And, the same editorial columns cheered wildly when the President killed the bill with a veto. Big-city newspapers kept up a steady barrage of opposition to the bill. And, as usual, many of them succeeded in picturing the farmer as an inefficient individual, asking pampering and subsidies from the rest of the country.

An editor of a daily newspaper in southern Minnesota notes all these complaints, and doesn't like them at all. Here's what the editor of the Mankato Free Press has to say: "Sometimes it seems to us that the farmer himself, the farm bloc in Congress, and the several nationwide organizations which represent the farmer, all have done a poor job in selling the rest of the Nation on the simply magnificent job that the farmer has done in making agriculture the efficient, productive, modern industry that it is today. Also of the tremendously important part that particular industry plays in our national defense."

These thoughts, says the editor, were prompted by the comment of an eastern journalist to the effect that a particular farm legislative proposal was "just another subsidy for the farmer." The Mankato editor says there are three words that have no place in that statement. They are, he comments, these three—"for the farmer." He declares that, "The soil bank, price supports, all of the other aids the farmer has received to stabilize prices and keep his industry productive and efficient, have benefited the Nation at large far more than they have benefited the farmer personally."

He goes on to point out the vital role that agriculture has played in our national defense—how a great amount of our staying power in time of past wars has been due to the ability of our farmers to sustain and step up food and fiber production. But, unfortunately for the farmers' public relations, people have forgotten that just a few years ago we were faced, not with too much food, but with the actual danger of shortages. Farmers met that challenge and produced plenty. They came through with flying colors. But, they failed to get the credit and recognition deserved for that job. It's quickly forgotten by journalists who complain of aids "for the farmer."

The truth of the matter is that farmers, when it comes to efficiency, belong at the head of the class. They've accomplished miracles of production and deserve credit, not abuse, for the job they've performed. Everybody has benefited. That's what the Mankato editor is saying. Legislative aids to bolster farm income are not "just another subsidy for the farmer" but an intelligent way to help people in the city, in industry, in the whole nation.

This broadcast comes to you from GTA, the co-op way, grain marketing cooperative of thousands of Midwest farmers.

MONDAY, APRIL 30, 1956

As you heard in the news, the House Agriculture Committee has just okayed the new farm bill. Now the House is ready to act on the compromise measure including the soil bank. We hope, naturally, that Congress passes and gives the President the soil bank he wants. For those who say the soil bank gives farmers less than it takes away, in the small print, all we can say is, give it a chance. Then we can know if it works or not. The same as the farmers gave the Secretary of Agriculture a chance for 1 year, 2 years, 3 years, and now, in the fourth and politically important year.

What manner of man is this high priest of low farm prices these days when his vision is 6½ percent higher than it was just a few months ago. As the St. Louis Post Dispatch writes, he's a changed man, and here's the story about "Ezra's Changing Image." "Secretary of Agriculture Benson has now completed the job of putting into force a new schedule of election-year farm price supports, and it seems clear that the popular image of the Secretary will have to be revised." And, the St. Louis Post Dispatch goes on: "Ever since coming into office, Secretary Benson has been known as a perfect lion of a man—brave, flinty, indomitable, foe of expediency, embodiment of unyielding principle. In short, just great.

"When he called the Brannan plan morally corrupt, his own purity of character shone forth like a new weather beacon. Here was a man who, as he himself did not mind suggesting, would always do right, and whole right, and nothing but the right. Now it does not quite track. Ezra turns out to be about as flexible as the sliding-scale price supports he used to advocate up to a few weeks ago. Basically, the farm situation has not undergone any drastic change within the last month. Yet Secretary Benson is now setting all the major price supports well above the levels where he had previously announced they would be set.

"How does it happen," the St. Louis newspaper asks, "that brave and flinty Ezra could consider 75 percent of parity an adequate support level for cotton in March, but in April deems 82½ percent necessary? What considerations impelled him to raise wheat from 76 to 84 percent, commercial corn from 81 to 86 percent, rice from 75 to 83 percent, and so on? The answer is, of course, well-known and does not have much to do with principle. Secretary Benson changed his mind because the President told him to. And, the President told him to because sugar coating was needed, at least enough to last until November, for the pill of the farm bill veto."

That is what the writers of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch say, and those men are as much against firm price supports as Ezra still is. On our part, we are pleased rather than indignant. We are pleased when any move is made to help farmers get a more decent income. And, so we take some pride in what Farmers Union and GTA have done to make Ezra Taft Benson ante up 6½ percent, to raise his sights above the disaster level, to recognize finally that farmers need money and income, the same as other people. And, we are glad to know that it has not warped his moral integrity, nor made him yield principle for 6½ percent. We hope he comes around to 90 percent, but we doubt if he will, unless the President tells him to.

Thanks for listening, and listen again tomorrow—to GTA, the co-op way.

Rochambeau (14th Street) Bridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Susie P. Glasgow, of Alexandria, Va., which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of Sunday, April 15, 1956, relating to a proposed name for the 14th Street Bridge across the Potomac River, in Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROCHAMBEAU BRIDGE

Mr. Charles Parmer's listing of our indebtness to Rochambeau and his troops merits action. Let's name the 14th Street Bridge Rochambeau Bridge. Honor our debt to Ro-

chambeau, his troops and our French ally, as well as perpetuate recognition of our indebtedness by generations yet to come.

SUSIE P. GLASGOW.

ALEXANDRIA.

Resolution by Hawaii Residents' Association, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas on October 28, 1951, seven leaders of the Communist Party in Hawaii were indicted under the Smith Act and charged with conspiring to teach and advocate the overthrow of our American Government by force and violence; and

Whereas on June 19, 1953, these seven Communist leaders were found guilty as charged, and were, on July 3, 1953, sentenced to pay fines and serve prison sentences; and

Whereas all seven convicted defendants have since remained free on bail pending appeal of their cases to the United States Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals; and

Whereas at least five of these convicted defendants have, since their conviction under the Smith Act, continued to occupy positions of power and influence closely associated with Communist activities in Hawaii; and

Whereas the long delay in judicial procedures incident to the appeals in the cases of these defendants has tended increasingly to promote, among Hawaii's people, the conclusion that "after all, conspiring to teach and advocate the overthrow of our Government by force and violence cannot be a very serious matter if the courts do not move faster to complete actions against persons indicted for and convicted of such conspiracy"; and

Whereas during the long delay since conviction of the seven Hawaii Communists, the Communist propaganda apparatus, both here and on the mainland, has continued its effort to convince the public that these cases are frameups, and that the courts, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation have been engaged in a nefarious plot against the seven defendants; and

Whereas the long delay, now approaching 3 years in duration, appears to have fostered disrespect for and lack of trust in our courts and in the administration of justice; and

Whereas it would appear that any question involved in the cases against the seven convicted Communists could be settled with justice and fairness to all concerned in a matter of several months at most: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (1) That the Hawaii Residents' Association (IMUA),[1] convinced that justice delayed is justice denied," hereby expresses its concern over the 3-year delay in bringing the cases of the seven convicted Hawaii Communists to final settlement; (2) that the Hawaii Residents' Association, by this resolution, calls attention to the harmful effects on the attitudes and thinking of our people—and especially on our growing children—of the courts' slowness to act in a matter involving so seriously the welfare and safety of our Government; (3) that the Department of Justice and the courts be requested promptly to examine the validity of the reasons which have been advanced for the long delay in these cases; and that these be weighed against the definite damage which has been and is being done to our Territory by failure to bring these litigations to a prompt conclusion; (4) that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Attorney General of the United States, the chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives, the United States Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, the United States District Court of Appeals of the Ninth Circuit Court, the Governor of Hawaii, and the Delegate from Hawaii to the Congress of the United States.

The above resolution was passed unanimously at a regularly called meeting of the Hawaii Residents' Association, Inc. (IMUA), on April 26, 1956, in Honolulu, T. H., U. S. A.

LAWRENCE M. JUDD,
President, Hawaii Residents' Associates, Inc.

[1] IMUA is an Hawaiian word meaning "Forward."

The Efficient Use of Railroad Boxcars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. BARRETT
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "It Should Be Probed," published in the Wyoming State Tribune, Cheyenne, Wyo., on April 22, 1956. The author, Lewis E. Bates, is one of the best editorial writers in the West. He calls attention to a problem of extreme importance. As the editorial so aptly points out, the existing regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission are causing a nationwide boxcar shortage as a result of their ruling prohibiting railroad-truck freight service. I hope the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will prepare proposed legislation to remedy this situation. I believe the time has come to modernize antiquated regulations which may have been in order in the past, but which now tend to block the full and efficient use of our transportation machinery.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT SHOULD BE PROBED

Congressional investigation is indeed warranted in the matter of Interstate Commerce Commission regulations which restrict, so as to virtually prohibit, railroad-truck freight service and therefore efficient use of railroad boxcars.

The national boxcar shortage is again a serious matter. It is not so much that the railroads do not have enough cars. They do. It is because outmoded ICC rules prevent the coordinated use of those cars so they would be in plentiful supply when needed, and where needed.

The waste of cars in Wyoming, which is but a fraction of that over the Nation, was well highlighted in an editorial written for the Green River Star by Adria Reynolds, a former railroader and presently president of the Wyoming Press Association.

The editorial was published early this week in the Tribune, and it has attracted much attention, particularly from railroad workers, who know the problem and therefore the truth in Mr. Reynolds' remarks.

Mr. Reynolds wrote:

"At present, the railroad is required to load and package cars daily from Ogden and Salt Lake City to Green River and Rock Springs, even though the amount of merchandise in each car is small. I believe a single substitute highway vehicle would handle these shipments and serve merchants and other consignees of freight, including those at Evanston and other intermediate rail points, with better and faster service.

"Similarly, peddler cars, i. e., cars stopping to unload freight at various towns, are handled westbound, all adding up to wasteful use of approximately 75 cars per month or about 900 cars per year in this relatively small service area. These freight cars are tied up 2 to 3 days each to handle these often-small amounts of merchandise business, but could be put to better use if loaded with soda ash, lumber, grain or other commodities in carload service."

He added that "if our little area shows such wasteful use of approximately 900 cars annually, it is not impossible to accept the estimate of the loss of the use of at least 100,000 box cars annually in the Nation, needlessly used in package car and peddler car service."

Such waste is intolerable, when relief ways and means are at hand. Someone at Washington certainly ought to drag this out in the open and do something about it.

Army's Esprit de Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of May 6, 1956:

ARMY'S ESPRIT DE CORPS—AN EXAMINATION OF THE RELATION OF RECENT ORDERS TO FIGHTING ABILITY OF THE TROOPS

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The United States Army sometimes is the despair of its best friends.

At Fort Ord, Calif., at Fort Bragg, N. C., and in Germany some of the Army's recent decisions have destroyed considerable good will, dispersed some well-trained units, and reduced esprit de corps.

The units affected are small. But the ineptitude that has materially reduced their usefulness has been displayed so often before that its repetition is discouraging to some, infuriating to others.

The Army is stressing the need for tradition, symbolism, and esprit de corps, the necessity for eliminating frequent transfers and for providing service "homes" for officer and enlisted men. But at the same time it has taken actions that have precisely the opposite effect.

SPECIAL FORCES CUT

Item: At Fort Bragg, N. C., the Army has built up a psychological warfare center and a group of specially selected and specially trained troops for guerrilla warfare and action behind enemy lines. Many of these men are former nationals of Poland, Hungary, Germany, Russia, and other foreign countries. Most are masters of two or more languages. All of them paratroopers.

They are perhaps one of the most thoroughly trained units in the Army. They are organized as the 77th Special Forces Group Airborne at Bragg. A companion group, trained at Bragg, is the 10th Special Forces Group. It is in Germany.

Their creation in 1952 answered at long last, the well-founded contention that the Army had never paid enough attention to guerrilla and unconventional warfare.

The Special Forces fulfilled the need for a force capable of mustering underground aid. Thus it seemed to many to be an important strategic and psychological instrument in the cold war.

The Russians apparently thought so too, for these troops were honored recently by an attack in Red Star, the Soviet army's newspaper and by propaganda blasts from Radio Moscow.

The training, esprit, pride of place, distinction of bearing, and capabilities of these troops were so good that they may have aroused envy in lesser units. In any case the Army has taken three actions that have reduced and will still further reduce the combat effectiveness of these units.

In the current fiscal year, which ends June 30, their manpower was cut drastically. The 77th Group at Bragg was reduced by one-quarter and the 10th Group in Germany by two-thirds.

On April 15, the green beret, which was as much a distinctive badge as a useful head covering for special forces, was eliminated by a desk order from the Pentagon.

And on June 1, a second cut is to be superimposed on the first. The 77th is to be reduced from 1,250 to 1,000 men, just one-half of its original strength.

FAMED UNIT DEACTIVATED

Item: At Fort Ord, Calif., the 6th Division, a training division that had built up high morale, has been deactivated. Its colors have been furled. Several historic units with long records and traditions were in this division. The men had been taught the traditions; the regiments had become their service homes.

One unit in particular had built high morale. It was the 20th Infantry Regiment. The Army, in a general shift of units, changed the name of the 20th Regiment to the 6003 Service Unit.

The 20th has also been known as "Sykes Regulars" after the Civil War Union general, George Sykes.

Due, at least in part to the effective protests of Allen Griffin, publisher of the Monterey Peninsula Herald, the name of the 20th was preserved. The colors are being shifted to another regiment at Panama but the men who made the esprit, who had their service home in the 20th are left behind.

It is pretty hard to build up enthusiasm in a unit called the 6003 SU but the men are doing it all over again. They are trying to get permission to call themselves the RFA (Reserves Forces Act) Regiment.

Meanwhile, the colors of other outfits that belong to the now deactivated 6th Division have been shifted elsewhere. The value of a unit home has been lost—even though the names and designations of famous regiments have been retained.

The moral of all this is pretty plain. It has been spelled out time and again in any number of surveys of what was wrong with the Army. The old band-of-brothers concept, the sense of belonging that marked the old Army has gone. One of the most precious intangibles, a place in a unit with traditions, is still too often disregarded.

Above all, the Army still seems to be opposed to elite troops. It seems to be trying to cut down to size those who rise above the ruck. Men won't reenlist to join the common denominators. They want a service home and they want a sense of pride in belonging to the "best damned squad in the best damned platoon in the best damned company in the best damned regiment in the Army."

If green berets and old traditions contribute to this they are beyond price.

Soviet Makes Trade Gains in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include an article by R. Hart Phillips in the New York Times of May 6, 1956, that, in my opinion, deserves the thoughtful reading of every Member of the Congress. The article follows:

HAVANA, April 30.—The new world peace policy of the Soviet Union has been preceded by a program of economic penetration of Latin America. And many here believe the new policy is more dangerous to the United States than the former bellicosity of the Russians.

The Soviet Union is already stepping into the vacuum created by the inability of the United States to purchase the mounting quantities of raw materials in Latin America and the inability of the Latin Americans to pay the high prices for United States exports. Latin America is a price market and will buy the cheapest product, particularly when the seller is also the buyer of its raw materials. Cuba, faced with a world surplus of sugar and the continual efforts of United States producers to cut Cuba's sales to the United States, was highly pleased to sell half a million tons of sugar to the Soviet Union in 1955. This year Cuba expects to sell a larger quantity of sugar to the Soviet Union. This situation is being repeated in various Latin American countries, according to commercial reports.

SOVIET BLOC GOODS ON SALE

A walk through Havana's streets reveals where some of the money obtained from the Soviet sugar sales is going. One can buy in the shops Pilsener beer, ham from Prague or Hungary, sausages from Poland, caviar and vodka from the Soviet, tiles and light bulbs from Czechoslovakia. The motorcycle market in Cuba, formerly held by the United States and Britain and later shared with West Germany, is being rapidly captured by Czechoslovakia. The new Skoda automobiles, which recently arrived, are being viewed by the surprised Cuban public.

What makes the business so attractive to the Cubans, are the quick deliveries and long-term credits offered, particularly on machinery, in contrast with the system of advance irrevocable credits placed in New York for purchases from United States exporters.

Not a week passes but that salesmen, engineers and technicians from countries behind the Iron Curtain arrive in Cuba. These men give the impression of carefully avoiding any contact with Cuban Communists and on the surface are interested only in business. They offer the most attractive prices and terms for the growing exports from satellite countries of tractors, bicycles, machine tools, machinery for manufacturing plants, fertilizer, cement, agricultural and mining machinery, and many cheap industrial products.

The same thing is happening in other Latin American countries. Recently, it is reported, a successful trip was made by a commercial mission from East Germany to the Argentine and to Chile.

These salesmen and technicians easily obtain and take back with them much information that it would be difficult for a Soviet agent to obtain. With a sufficient number of commercial agents traveling throughout Latin America spreading the propaganda of economic coexistence and collecting information, it is plain that the Cominform is no longer needed in this part of the world.

THE AGRARIAN SCISSORS

Some years ago a Russian economist, Eugene Varga, predicted the shift in Latin America toward economic coexistence with the Soviet Union based on a chart that he called Agrarian Scissors of Latin America. He showed the line of the upward trend of inflated United States industrial prices crossed by the descending line of agrarian prices in Latin America. He pointed out that as the blades of the scissors opened wider, so in the same proportion did the chances of Soviet coexistence with Latin America become better.

Beaumont Enterprise Named Outstanding Texas Daily

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK B. BROOKS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have always been proud to be able to claim that I have some printer's ink in my blood. I worked for the Beaumont (Tex.) Enterprise for 3 years beginning September 12, 1938, and I have followed the progress of this fine newspaper closely ever since.

In the May issue of Harper's Magazine, the Beaumont Enterprise was commended as "the best edited newspaper in Texas." Although the article was generally unfriendly to our daily press in Texas, I was pleased to note that in considering the Enterprise the information was based on a factual analysis of the actual number of inches of international and national news coverage.

This type of full coverage is typical of the fairness and thoroughness of the Enterprise and the deep responsibility its editor, Mr. Robert W. Akers; managing editor, T. T. Hunt; news editor, Don Streater; city editor, Bob Packwood; and other members of the editorial staff feel toward their readers. This example is the finest traditions of our American freedom of the press, and through this full publication of news which vitally concerns our citizens, their rights and interests are protected.

I would like to take this opportunity of presenting for the attention of the House the following excerpt from the Harper's article which concerns the Beaumont Enterprise:

In this journalistic Sahara there is one notable oasis: the Beaumont Enterprise. It is far and away the best edited newspaper in Texas, and the only one, with the possible exception of the Corpus Christi Caller, which gives intelligent and balanced coverage of national and international news. In comparison with the big city dailies, the Enter-

prise has only a modest amount of space available. Nevertheless, it devotes about half of its news columns—like the responsible press in other States—to world and national news. In January the Enterprise printed an average of 18 columns of news every day; and 10½ of these columns originated outside the State. Even more surprising—for Texas—is its fairness. At the height of the Dixon-Yates controversy, for example, the Enterprise printed the Republican and Democratic arguments in parallel columns on the front page. No other Texas daily remotely approached this kind of even-handed treatment.

Famous Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I insert an article extracted from a brochure published by Maine's Department of Commerce and Industry.

Mr. Speaker, Maine is proud of the many fine things she produces, for there are few who are not familiar with the succulence of her potatoes, her dairy products, her poultry and meat products, and her foods from the sea; with the excellent quality of her woodpulp, her lumber, and the other harvests of Maine's forests; with the majestic scenery and the multiple advantages that Maine offers to the vacationer and the sportsmen.

But caught up in the fascination of such an array of productivity, it is very easy for one to neglect one other facet of production which is Maine's proud lot—the production of famous Americans.

The article follows:

DONALD CAMERON, WILSON'S MILLS, MAINE

(By Denis O'Brien)

For a long, memorable weekend last June, the eyes of America and in fact, the whole world were focused on Paramachenee, in the Rangeley Lakes region of Maine. Because, during that weekend, Maine played host to President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Ike, as ardent a disciple of Isaac Walton as ever wet a line, fished fabulous Parmachenee, caught his full quota of speckled beauties. Characteristically, he left a memento of his trip that will always be treasured by the people of that area.

His guide while fishing was Donald Cameron, of Wilson's Mills, Maine. When the President left, he promised he would do a portrait of Don. Lo and behold, a few short weeks afterwards, the distinctive painting arrived, and was presented to Don in appropriate ceremonies.

Cold black-and-white photography cannot capture the warmth of the President's portrayal, but the faithful reproduction is strikingly attested to by this shot of Don himself holding his prized picture.

Almost 40 years ago, a very great American sat in the sanctuary of his trophy-laden study and re-lived some golden moments out of his exciting, rough riding past. He was an ardent admirer of Maine, and says as such in an article he penned that long gone March day, whose opening words are:

"I owe a personal debt to Maine because of my association with certain staunch friends in Aroostook County, an association that helped and benefited me throughout my life in more ways than one."

The staunch friends he referred to were members of the Sewall family of Island Falls, especially Bill, and Bill's bosom comrade, Wilmot Dow. Under the spell of the man's words, we accompany him in his descent down Katahdin; share wintry nights in balsam bunks in front of a blazing bough; and smack our lips hungrily as he partakes of venison, trout and partridge. He recalls that when he became President of the United States, the Sewalls and his old Maine friends came down to Washington to visit him. He concludes with this touching tribute: "Never were there more welcome guests at the White House."

Those affectionate lines were written at Sagamore Hill, March 20, 1918.

The man who wrote them was Theodore Roosevelt.

The imperial Kennebec curves again on its majestic course and, suddenly, for the first time, we see the granite gray State capitol building loom up. That brief glimpse, from broad picture windows of the warm, spacious, speeding train, reminds us it is time to reach for our bags and don our coats. We are nearing Augusta.

It wasn't always thus, though.

Once, it wasn't even Augusta. Once, it was Cushnoc or—as the dusky, moccasin-shod Indians pronounced it—"Koussinoc." There were no well-appointed trains then that roared their way over ribbons of steel. Instead a frail, but seaworthy shallop, small and primitive, battled the billows and steered by the stars from far-off Plymouth Coloney on Massachusetts Bay. Few journeys were more hazardous; each trip might well be the last. But the fate of that desperate, hard pressed, indomitable band of Pilgrims depended upon the successful outcome of each perilous voyage. They knew they must reach Koussinoc (to barter for precious Indian furs they used as payments on their over-extended London loans to keep their precarious settlement alive) and that knowledge spurred those men onward. What men they were.

The Bradfords and the Winthrops, the Howlands and the Winslows, trod these forests. An ancient historian relates how young John Howland, peering down river on a certain soft spring morn nearly a third off of a thousand years ago, espied the slight shallop steadily coursing upwards to the Koussinoc trading post Howland presided over.

"By my faith, I wonder," he conjectured idly," who is in charge of her this trip? To whom did she entrust herself for delivery and guidance? To ye olde, fearless fighter, Capt. Myles Standish? Or to ye dashing, up-and-coming young John Alden? (Two centuries later, America's most beloved poet, Maine's own Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, had his own answer to another question concerning the same two gentlemen.)

No, there weren't—always—picture windows to look out of when approaching Augusta. Or, rather, Cushnoc.

Or—excuse us—Koussinoc.

Free Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Now's a Good Time To Contemplate That Free Federal Aid," published in an Ephraim, Utah, newspaper of April 20, 1956. The editorial relates to so-called free Federal aid.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

How's your bank account this week? Did it show any shrinkage over the past week end? If not, you must be one of those rare humans who filed your income tax return early, a person with a lot of exemptions, one who had a disheartening low income during 1955, or who did some figure juggling which you hope the boys in the Internal Revenue Department will fail to detect.

It would be most interesting to know how much money went out of Ephraim for Federal income taxes the past week or so. We've asked a few people what they would estimate it to be and all seemed to think it would be arcund $100,000, maybe more. All were agreed that it was probably far more than all the property taxes, car licenses, and other direct taxes (not including sales tax) paid by the people of the community.

One person knew of a local resident who was knicked to the tune of about $3,600 for income taxes. A few others were estimated to be well over the $1,000 mark.

With that kind of money going out of Ephriam, it's not hard to understand why it is so difficult to make badly needed local improvements, such as replacing the public school building which has been so outmoded, dangerous, and inadequate for so many years.

But with that kind of money going out of Ephriam it is hard to understand how so many still refer to Federal aid as free money. Right now is a good time to ponder that matter and, if one reasons honestly and sensibly, he is certain to come up with the conclusion that Federal aid is some of the most expensive aid we get.

The collection of the income taxes—which taxes supply such a large part of Federal revenues—is expensive to the Federal Government and to the taxpayers alike. It takes an army of agents to check the returns, to prepare and send out the forms, and check up on cases which appear inaccurate, inconsistent, or downright dishonest.

It takes another small army to compile, audit, alot, earmark, and distribute Federal funds. If we in Ephriam could just send our income taxes to Washington and have them returned to us less the various costs along the way, it is doubtful if much more than half would ever get back. That is how free Federal aid can be. The earners and producers provide the taxes from which hundreds of thousands of nonproducers take the cream for a living often much easier and richer than that enjoyed by the producers.

This is a good time to realize that every extravagance in government is paid for right out of the pockets of the citizens. Government does not produce wealth. It simply takes wealth produced by its citizens and distributes it where it seems most needed or where there is the most political pressure.

Yes, right now, while the paying of income taxes is fresh in the memory, is a good time to resolve to ask for no unneeded and undeserved Government handouts for ourselves and to use all the influence at our disposal to see that they are not given to others, also to insist that Government employees give an honest day's labor each day they are on the Government payroll. In this way and this way only can taxes be reduced.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Men of Arlington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DOWDY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, May 6, 1956, was held the 23d annual Odd Fellow pilgrimage to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. Odd Fellows and Rebekahs were present from all parts of North America to honor the Unknown Soldier.

The memorial address was delivered by the Honorable H. Sanders Anglea, sovereign grand master of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows. The title of his inspiring message was "Men of Arlington."

Under unanimous consent, I include this address in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Our colleagues, Hon. PERCY PRIEST, of Tennessee, and Hon. LESTER JOHNSON, of Wisconsin, join me in this request:

MEN OF ARLINGTON

(Memorial address delivered by H. Sanders Anglea, sovereign grand master of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows, on May 6, 1956, at Arlington National Cemetery on the occasion of the annual Odd Fellow pilgrimage to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier)

General Commanding Soaper, officers, Chevaliers, ladies, and friends, I am sure that it goes without saying, that, on behalf of the entire membership of the world of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows, I am both delighted and gratified that such a great number of our members have journeyed from the four corners of the North American Continent to take part in this solemn, patriotic, and sacred ceremony whereby Odd Fellows and Rebekahs and freedom-loving people all over the world take time out from their daily routine of life to join with us who are assembled here to do honor and pay tribute to the Unknown American Soldier whose mortal and revered remains rest within the shadow of this great Amphitheater.

You may think it strange that I say to you in my opening remarks that I have heard it said a thousand times that the most important thing in life to an individual is his or her good health, and, quite frankly, I have been guilty of making the same statement many, many times. May I say that within the past few days I have come to realize that such a statement is grossly false, even though I have not recently enjoyed the best of health, and am now under the care of two physicians, because, when a man such as I sits in the solitude of his office, just as I have done for the past few days, and attempts to assemble his thoughts to be expressed on a great occasion such as this, one soon comes to the full realization that the most valuable possession that any individual can own is his freedom; freedom to worship as one pleases, freedom to walk alone or with a friend, freedom from want, freedom from fear, freedom to write as we please, freedom of speech and freedom of assembly such as we have today.

It is a great honor that is ours to have the privilege of meeting here as free men and free women to do honor to the Unknown Soldier and the Men of Arlington according to the dictates of our own hearts. Freedom as we of the free world know it, was and is a gift of God to all mankind, although, through selfishness and greed on the part of a few, the great majority of mankind from the beginning of time have had to fight and even wage wars to preserve it. This National Cemetery serves as mute evidence of the great sacrifices that have been made to preserve the freedom I am talking about for you and for me. Each monument and each small marker that you see are the markers along the highway of freedom that extends from this day of honor all the way back through the years to the founding of this great Nation. We, as Americans, as we relive, by memory and the teachings of our history books, the journey of our country on this highway of freedom can well be proud of the fact that not a marker in this cemetery or any other cemetery is standing because we have engaged in war as aggressors. Again I say, that freedom alone is our most valuable asset, and by comparison all other values dwindle into unimportance. Health and wealth are to be desired, but I, for one, would sacrifice both for freedom, the kind that you and I are now enjoying, the kind that you and I have come to take for granted, the kind that makes you and me owe a special prayer to our Maker and a great debt to the Men of Arlington, and I refer to the men of all our Arlingtons whether at home or abroad, through whose efforts the gift of God has been placed into our hands.

It is to be regretted that those of us who are privileged to make this memorial address each year are not endowed with the wisdom of the Great Emancipator, and that we do not have sufficient command of the English language as to make the pillars of this structure vibrate and ring with our sincerity just as has done the entire world wherever and whenever the words of Mr. Lincoln's Gettysburg Address have been repeated. On that great occasion when those historic words were uttered and became sound waves that have been heard and appreciated for their simplicity and sincerity for more than 90 years, President Lincoln wove a few words into this beautiful sentence: "The world will little note nor long remember what we say here." As we all know, Mr. Lincoln was mistaken in this statement, because his Gettysburg Address has become, and will continue to be, one of the outstanding classics of modern English literature. I know that I can truthfully say to you that "the world will little note nor long remember what we say here," but this statement will not be true of us as individuals, as this occasion will remain engraved upon our minds and our hearts until the last day of our respective lives. As we approach the moment when we are privileged to place the wreaths at the tomb of America's best known and most beloved hero, our minds will be closed to the audible word, and only our hearts will feel the joy that is ours in representing some 2 million or more Odd Fellows and Rebekahs scattered throughout the free world, and we will know that each of these members whom we represent will, in their own way and in their own language, offer a prayer today that this young hero will not have died in vain, and that the principles upon which our freedom is based and for which he died, will be preserved and respected by all nations, tongues, and kindreds of the earth until time shall be no more. While our words and our actions of today may be soon forgotten, it will not matter, for the words and actions of today deal with and pay well deserved honor to the past. But it is not the past alone which belongs to these who lie here. They gave their lives for the future, a future which can be realized only as we give ourselves to make secure the peace and freedom for which they died.

The sincerity of the motives which have caused us to assemble for this sacred rite can be indicated only by the measure of our personal devotion in all of our tomorrows to the principles for which these have died. Only so is their sacrifice not in vain. Only so is the sincerity of our words of tribute established. Here we have dealt with the past, the future lies along the highway of tomorrow.

Here today we have a singular privilege granted to no other fraternal order to pay a military tribute to the past. Let us not forget that tomorrow we have an equally singular responsibility for the future, a responsibility begotten by the privilege of today. The highway of the past is dotted with these markers of honor designating the graves of those who made that past glorious. The highway of the future will be marked by the deeds of us who walk that road, you and I.

If that future be made glorious by the peace and freedom for which these have made the supreme sacrifice, then we too shall be called upon to make our own sacrifices. For only at the price of such self-giving is peace and freedom purchased. It is ours to make the sacrificial gift of time and effort to participate in the responsibilities of citizenship. This is our peacetime contribution to their wartime sacrifice.

What of the influence of 2 million Odd Fellows and Rebekahs unselfishly giving their support to the modern counterpart of the little red schoolhouse? The seed of citizenship and love of freedom is sown here. What of our influence in preserving and strengthening the democratic principles or our communities against the tyranny of dictatorship? What of our influence in establishing and maintaining Christian homes in which God is worshipped and followed as the guide of life? Here are the roots of freedom from fear.

What of our influence in the support of public worship that God may be known publicly and sought after according to the dictates of men's consciences? Here are the roots of freedom of religion.

All of these responsibilities to our community life, our homes, and our churches, have been instilled into us by our forefathers. But the privilege to exercise these responsibilities in the manner of freemen today is ours because of the sacrifice of the "Men of Arlington." To see that they have not died in vain; to make tomorrow free is our sacred responsibility and the greatest tribute we can pay these honored dead.

During the past few minutes we have talked much about the highway of national life that extends from here to the very beginning of this great Nation; about the markers of sacrifice that endlessly line this

highway of the past. Now may I say that this highway of national life does not end here today; it extends into our future and each of our tomorrows and if I had but one wish to express on this occasion, it would be this: That the highway of tomorrow be also lined with markers, not small ones of sacrifice but large ones of accomplishment, and each would bear this inscription: "This is the way to life everlasting, this is the way to everlasting peace and freedom, this is the way to the Saviour of all mankind. This highway was built by men and women of all nations through a common understanding of the problems of each other and this understanding was made possible through the united effort of the churches of the world with the cooperation of the world's great fraternities that have enlightened all men as to the value of the principles of friendship, love, truth, faith, hope, and charity." Such an inscription would satisfy me because the use of the words "world's great fraternities" would include the Odd Fellows and Rebekahs of the past, present, and future, and particularly you who are present today and those 2 million whom we are privileged to represent.

Just being here in Arlington National Cemetery today gives one the feeling of being in church and, rightfully so, because these are sacred grounds where we walk softly and reverently. Yes, sacred grounds wherein repose the mortal remains of the greatest men into whose bodies God permitted the breath of life to be breathed; men whose names, deeds and souls have become immortal. The very memory of these men feed our veins and our sinews with renewed hope, thereby giving us the strength to push aside any and all attempts at invasion from without and from this strength comes the courage to face the future with the firm resolve that the cloak of peace and individual freedom, on tomorrow, will once again drape the shoulders of the world. As I look about me, the soil of this holy place loses its identity as such and the marble and stone pillars and encasements no longer impress me as elements of nature and in their stead I see and feel the tender and encircling arms of an everloving God with whom are now gathered in blessed and everlasting fellowship these men of Arlington, who so well, faithfully, and bravely did the work here on earth that was patterned for them in heaven by the great Author of the universe. Even now, as the slight breeze passes through the leaves of the nearby trees manufacturing its own little murmur, one can almost hear the voice of the Saviour saying to the men of Arlington, "Well done thou good and faithful servants, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

The Soil-Bank Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much impressed with the debate on the soil-bank bill that has been before us. Practically all of the argument that has been presented thus far accents the immediate economic value to the farmers of the soil-bank program. It is not my purpose to deny or to take issue with those who argue this point of view, but, Mr. Speaker, I think there is another viewpoint—a long-range viewpoint that should be called to the attention of the Members of the House. Therefore, I should like to address my remarks to the soil-bank program as it relates to the economics of America over a period of years—what it means not alone to the farmers but to all America and to posterity.

The conservation-reserve provision of the soil-bank program is a great step in the direction of a more efficient land-use program.

The need for soil conservation can scarcely be overemphasized. History is replete with examples of nations that have declined or perished because of land impoverishment through misuse, neglect, and erosion.

Accelerated erosion of the soil is not merely a recent threat to human security; it is as old as agriculture itself. Erosion most likely began when the first rain struck the first furrow turned by a crude implement in the hands of prehistoric man. There is little doubt that it has been going on ever since, wherever man's efforts to gain a livelihood from the soil have led him to remove the natural cover of protective vegetation. History, to a great extent, is a record of man's efforts to wrest the land from nature, simply because he relies for sustenance on the products of the soil. Yet in many instances his conquest of the land has been disastrous. Over extensive areas, his culture of the earth has resulted in extreme impoverishment or nearly complete destruction of the soil resources upon which he is dependent. When this has occurred on a wide scale, the consequence has been the disappearance of civilization from the affected region. To illustrate the effects of soil erosion during ancient times, I would like to quote a few lines from an article entitled "Erosion at Its Worst, and a Hundred Dead Cities," written during 1939 by Dr. Walter C. Lowdermilk, former Assistant Chief of the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture:

> The dead cities of north Syria reveal a period of history of which very little is thus far known. It was a local civilization but very advanced and rich, with highly developed and distinctive Syrian art found nowhere else. * * * Today, after 13 centuries of neglect and patch cultivation to cereals by seminomadic descendants of the invaders, and of overgrazing by their goats, soil erosion has completed the destruction of the good earth with a thoroughness that has left this once fertile land a complete manmade desert, void of vegetation, water, and soil, except in rare pockets with scanty cover of crops and thorn bushes. The ruins of a highly developed architecture tell of the advanced culture of this region.
>
> As in north China, north Africa, Transjordan, and elsewhere, soil erosion is clearly the principal agent in destroying the land and in undermining the civilization and culture which was dependent upon it. The early inhabitants found primeval forests here. Then began moderate clearing, deforestation and cultivation of slopes. Ancient cultivation up through the Roman period was intelligent and demonstrated an understanding on the part of the inhabitants of conservation of soils and rain waters by terraces and check dams. At this time the region was highly prosperous, populous, and flourishing. But in A. D. 630 the Arab invasion swept away progress in agriculture. The vineyards and olive trees were destroyed, and the land was put under patch cultivation to grain crops and heavily grazed. After the destruction and dispersal of the former population, neglect of the land brought * * * on erosion of the soil. * * *
>
> These hundred or more dead cities are dead forever because their soils are gone beyond any hope of reclamation. * * * Man and erosion have devastated this area for a geologic age. Here the unpardonable sin of land use has been committed.

Soil conservationists find in Syria many lessons which we in this country may well take to heart. It is true that we have for some time now attempted to preserve our forests and to rebuild our soil, but have we done enough? Have we used our acres in such a way as to yield the greatest returns to our farmers and to the Nation as a whole? When we examine areas where erosion has taken its toll, such as the Dust Bowl, I think the answer is quite clear. There is very little doubt about the fact that many acres now being used for cultivated crops should never have been plowed. Many of these acres should be restored to forests and grasslands.

The conservation reserve provision of the soil-bank proposal is a major forward step in the direction of achieving a better land-use program. If finally adopted, the conservation reserve plan will lead to a program yielding greater net returns to farmers today and at the same time leading to a land-use program that will make it possible to provide fertile farmlands for future generations.

The objective of this program as originally proposed was to shift about 25 million acres from cropland to forage, trees, or water storage. This shift as proposed was intended to lead to a long-range adjustment in land use. Some of our less productive lands would be brought into the program, as well as some of the acres which have been diverted out of wheat and cotton into feed grains and other crops.

The current legislation with respect to the soil bank, if enacted and approved during this session of the Congress, would provide a maximum of $450 million annually to carry out the conservation reserve phase of the program.

The Government, through the agricultural conservation program currently in operation and the conservation reserve provision of the soil-bank program, makes manifest the obligation of the whole people to share the responsibility, as well as the benefits, of assuring the continued fertility of our soil. By helping farmers, with money or conservation materials and technical services, to accomplish specified conservation practices, the program practically and directly helps make effective the research and educational work done by the Federal and State agencies. Funds appropriated to help conserve the soil and water resources of the Nation are a practical investment in the future welfare and productivity of the country. There is every reason to believe that soil conservation is our common concern whether we are farmers, manufacturers, food processors, bankers, merchants or professional people.

It is evident that continued and ever-increasing measures to conserve and rebuild the fertility of our land are necessary if the health and the level of living of Americans are to be maintained.

Experience has proved that neither an awareness on the part of the farmers of the need for conserving our national soil and water resources nor technical advice about the kind of conservation practices needed will get the job done, unless accompanied by measures which make it economically possible for the farmer to accomplish such practices. To maintain the strength of our Nation there are no more important appropriations than those for our overall conservation program.

The provisions for financial assistance to farmers to carry out the land use program proposed under the conservation reserve features of the soil bank proposal would provide an incentive to farmers to cooperate in making this program a success. Under the program the Government would bear a fair share of the costs involved in establishing a suitable cover. As farmers reorganize their farms along these soil conserving lines, they would be eligible to receive annual payments for a period of years related to the length of time needed to establish the new use of the land.

The acreage reserve phase of the soil-bank proposal has been referred to as a deferred-production plan. It would be voluntary and temporary, and generally aimed at reducing production, and hence carryover, of those agricultural products which are currently in greatest surplus. Under the plan as originally introduced, it was contemplated that it would be applied to such crops as wheat, cotton, corn, and rice and would remain in operation until carryover stocks of these commodities have been reduced to desirable levels.

The essence of the proposed program is that farmers would voluntarily reduce production of specified crops below their allotted acreage. The acreage withheld from production of any specific crop would be placed in the reserve. In return for placing a part of his allotted acres in the reserve, the farmer would receive as compensation certificates which would be redeemable by the Commodity Credit Corporation in cash or in kind. The basis for the value of the certificates would be the normal yield on the designated reserve acres.

This phase of the program would serve to achieve at least two important objectives: First, reduce surpluses, and second, encourage soil conservation. Much of the land now being used to produce crops in excess of domestic, export, and normal carryover requirements would be devoted to producing soil-building crops. The compensation received by farmers for cooperating in the program would reimburse them for their loss of production on the acres placed in the reserve.

The operation of the soil-bank program would beyond a doubt improve the economic position of the agricultural sector of our economy. I would like to mention but a few of the ways in which this would be accomplished: First, storage costs would be reduced as surpluses are reduced; second, as surpluses are reduced and supplies again are held at desirable levels market prices will tend to rise to legal support levels or even above established price support levels, thus giving farmers greater returns on that output produced on fewer acres; third, the compensatory payments will increase farm income.

It should be noted that the compensatory payments will be partly offset by savings on storage costs as surpluses are reduced to reasonable levels.

It is conceivable that within 2 or 3 years if farmers cooperate in the acreage-reserve program, and 15 to 20 million acres of the land devoted to the crops now in greatest surplus are taken out of production of those crops, assuming normal yields, surpluses would be reduced sufficiently to result in a supply situation that would result in higher market prices. The higher market prices together with the soil-bank payments under the conservation reserve and the acreage reserve would probably provide a higher net return to producers of many of the crops to which the program may be applied. While any statements one might make with respect to the extent of the economic benefits of this program are at present hypothetical, it is, nevertheless, logical to conclude that the benefits will be substantial.

Current pending legislation with respect to the acreage reserve places a limit of $800 million per year on expenditures under this phase of the program.

The proposed soil bank program has received widespread endorsement from conservation groups and leading farm organizations. While there may be differences of opinion with respect to specific details of its operation, there appears to be more or less general endorsement of the concept of the soil bank as such. I would like to quote the following views of leaders of farm organizations and conservation groups concerning the soil bank program made at hearings of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Mr. Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation stated:

For the past 3 years the American Farm Bureau Federation has been on record in favor of what we have called a soil-bank program, by which we mean that we should utilize our surplus productive capacity so that farmers would store fertility in the soil rather than to produce surpluses for the Commodity Credit Corporation. * * *

The basic purpose of the surplus reduction and soil-bank plan, as we conceive it, is to bring about at the earliest feasible date a balance between annual supply and effective demand and to make more rapid progress toward the liquidation of current surplus stocks.

Mr. Herschel D. Newsom, master, National Grange, had the following to say with respect to the soil-bank program:

The Grange has long recognized and repeatedly stated that a form of land rental type program—preferably as closely related as we can honestly relate it to a long-range, sound soil-conservation objective—has a real place in both emergency type farm legislation and in long-term permanent legislation.

* * * The acreage reserve program, seems basically sound and substantially in accord, we believe—on a hasty and superficial examination of its contents—with Grange program and policy and with the above three-point program, insofar as our present Government-held stocks are concerned.

Mr. Charles H. Callison, conservation director, National Wildlife Federation, made the following statement:

We foresee in this proposal, this plan to authorize or implement the setting aside of certain acreages on the farms of the Nation for conservation practices, these acres to be taken out of production of general farm crops and livestock, great benefits in the conservation of our natural resources, not only the soil and water resources, but those related resources.

This plan is bound to have extremely important, and beneficial wildlife effects, because in these areas which may be set aside as an acreage reserve or as a soil bank, which areas will be left ungrazed and uncropped, you are bound to produce excellent farm game cover.

Not only that, it will help control the runoff and check soil erosion which is detrimental to fish in the streams of the watersheds.

If there is included in the program the idea that has been advanced for a timber bank, and we hope that it is included, we can see even greater benefits from the standpoint of wildlife production, because the planting of trees, the reforestation of marginal areas on farms that are suitable for that type of use, will produce cover for many kinds of wildlife.

We feel that any comprehensive-conservation program must take into consideration not narrowly just the soil and water, but all the natural products of the land.

Mr. Joseph W. Penfold, conservation director, Izaak Walton League of America, Denver, Colo., said:

We have been interested in it for quite some time. As a matter of fact, our original committee started in Illinois something more than 3 years ago working on a soil-bank plan. * * *

At our last national convention, last spring, the membership, through their delegates, adopted some general principles of the soil-bank plan. * * * In our several years of developing the idea and discussing it with farm people and others all over the country—we have not stressed the wildlife aspects for a couple reasons: One of them, because we think the soil-bank plan is a very important and worthwhile program aside from wildlife angles; and also, if we were to come out stressing wildlife, they would immediately assume that our interest was strictly wildlife, which is not the case.

* * * We see the opportunity as well as responsibility in our State game and fish departments to cooperate in this program so that the maximum values are achieved with the minimum of costs.

I feel that this soil-bank program is worthy of our wholehearted support, and that it should be enacted at an early date so that it can be put into operation during this crop year. I feel confident that if enacted it will be an important step in the direction of improved soil conservation, surplus reduction, and higher farm income.

A 90-Year-Old Idea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. FORRESTER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago one of Washington's daily

newspapers carried an article stating that the idea of decorating the graves of the soldiers involved in the War Between the States and memorializing those heroes was born in Columbus, Ga.

Hon. W. C. Tucker, editor of the Columbus Enquirer, Columbus, Ga., was in Washington attending the National Association of Newspaper Editors Convention, and the Washington newspaper article was called to his attention. Mr. Tucker, being completely familiar with the history of that idea, wrote in his column of April 26, 1956, a review of that history, which I am sure will be of interest, and which because of its historical significance should be preserved. Mr. Tucker's article is as follows:

TOP O' THE MORN

(By W. C. Tucker)

A 90-YEAR-OLD IDEA

It was 90 years ago today that an idea born in Columbus came to fruition, with the result that each year since southern Memorial Day has been observed on April 26.

It was in this fair city on the banks of the Chattahoochee that a group of ladies formed themselves into an organization to plan an annual memorial service in tribute to the heroes of the Confederacy.

The first such service was held at St. Luke Methodist Church with Col. James N. Ramsey delivering the oration. It was the start of a beautiful custom that has survived the years.

IDEA IS OFFERED

Historians tell us that Miss Lizzie Rutherford suggested the idea of Southern Memorial Day to a group of ladies after they had gone to the cemetery to care for the graves of the soldiers buried there. Miss Rutherford said she had been reading The Initials, by Baroness Tautphoeus and that she was impressed with a description of a custom of the Roman Catholics in decorating the graves on All Saints' Day. She would like to see such a custom here, said Miss Rutherford, and the matter was taken up by the Soldiers' Aid Society, which adopted the idea and immediately organized itself into the Ladies Memorial Association.

April 26 was later chosen as the date for the observance, as it was upon that day in 1865 that Gen. Joseph E. Johnston, the last Confederate leader to surrender, laid down his arms.

Adopting the idea of the observance, the Ladies Memorial Association instructed its secretary, Mrs. Charles J. Williams, to write to women and organizations elsewhere, asking cooperation in extending the idea of holding appropriate exercises for the Confederate soldiers.

LETTER TO THE ENQUIRER

Mrs. Williams sent letters to several Southern newspapers asking assistance in the matter of observing southern Memorial Day. The letter appeared in the March 11, 1866, issue of the Enquirer as follows:

"EDITOR, ENQUIRER: The ladies now and have been for several days engaged in the sad but pleasant duty of ornamenting and improving that portion of the city cemetery sacred to the memory of our gallant Confederate dead, but we feel it an unfinished work unless a day be set apart annually for its especial attention. We cannot raise monumental shafts and inscribe thereon their many deeds of heroism, but we can keep alive the memory of the debt we owe them, by dedicating at least 1 day in each year to embellishing their humble graves with flowers. Therefore, we beg the assistance of the press and the ladies throughout the South to aid us in our efforts to set apart a certain day to be observed from the Potomac to the Rio Grande, and be handed down through time as a religious custom of the country, to wreath the graves of our martyred dead with flowers. (We would propose the 6th of April, as at that time our land might be truly called "the land of flowers.") Let every city, town, and village join in the pleasant duty. Let all be alike remembered, from the heroes of Manassas to those who expired amid the death throes of our hallowed cause. We'll crown alike the honored resting places of the immortal Jackson in Virginia, Johnston at Shiloh, Cleburne in Tennessee, and the host of gallant privates who adorned our ranks. All did their duty and to all we owe our gratitude. Let the soldiers' graves, for that day at least, be the southern mecca to whose shrine her sorrowing women, like pilgrims, may annually bring their grateful hearts and floral offerings. And when we remember the thousands who were buried "with their material cloaks around them," without Christian ceremony of interment for their beloved bodies, we would invoke the aid of the most thrilling eloquence throughout the land to inaugurate this custom, by delivering on the appointed day this year, a eulogy on the unburied dead of our glorious Southern Army—they died for their country. Whether their country had or had not the right to demand the sacrifice is no longer a question of discussion with us. We leave that for future nations to decide. That it was demanded—that they nobly responded and fell holy sacrifices on their country's altar, and are thereby entitled to their country's gratitude—none will deny. The proud banner under which they rallied in defense of the noblest cause for which heroes fought, or trusting women prayed, has been furled forever. The country for which they suffered and died, has now no name or place among the nations of the earth. Legislative enactments may not now be made to do honor to their memories, but the veriest radical that ever traced his genealogy back to the deck of the Mayflower, could not deny us the simple privilege of paying honor to those who died defending the life, honor, and happiness of the

"SOUTHERN WOMEN."

SUGGESTING APRIL 26

Historians say the above letter was sent to the press by Mrs. Williams, though her name did not appear in connection with it as it appeared in the Enquirer and in the Sun and Times of the same date it was published in this newspaper.

It will be noted that the date April 6 was suggested in the letter to the editor of the Enquirer. On March 13, 1866, the following appeared in the Enquirer:

"For the ENQUIRER:

"OUR CONFEDERATE DEAD

"I hope every southern heart will respond to a suggestion in an article published in your Sunday issue advocating that a special day be set apart in each year to do appropriate honor to our heroic dead with suitable public eulogies, and wherever practicable, to adorn their graves with southern flowers. I would suggest as a proper day for this offering—the 26th of April—the day of General Johnston's surrender. I believe the proposition will meet the approval of the southern ladies as it will by every

"CITIZEN."

SELECTION OF DATE

Announcement of selection of April 26 as the date for the memorial service was contained in the Enquirer of March 14, 1866. Here is the item as appeared in this newspaper at that time:

"The proposition to appoint the 26th of April, as the anniversary on which all Southern women are called on to decorate the graves of our deceased soldiers, meets the cordial approbation of the ladies interested in the work here.

"On the 26th of April (God willing) we will inaugurate this custom in Columbus and we earnestly hope that it will never fall into desuetude."

Stories appeared in later issues of the Enquirer on the forming of plans for the exercises and the April 27 issue carried a story of the first Memorial Day program.

In addition to the oration at the St. Luke Church, the graves of the soldiers in Linwood Cemetery were decorated by the ladies.

This custom has persisted since that day in 1866. The same organization that held the first exercise—the Ladies Memorial Association—has once again decorated the graves of the Confederate dead in Linwood Cemetery and it has arranged for the exercises that are to be held this afternoon at First Baptist Church.

OBSERVANCE KEPT ALIVE

The good ladies of Columbus have adhered to the admonishment of the Enquirer in its issue of March 4, 1866, against allowing Memoiral Day to "fall in desuetude."

For 90 years, they have kept the beautiful custom alive in the birthplace of the idea.

Will the observance of southern Memorial Day continue over the years to come?

The Enquirer, which played an important role in the inauguration of Memorial Day, hopes most earnestly that the people of this city will not allow anything whatever to stop the observance.

This newspaper hopes that interest in the idea will not lag but that the work of those courageous and patriotic women of the sixties and of the years that have followed will be perpetuated by the succeeding generations. The Enquirer hopes that the Ladies Memorial Association of Columbus will never die but that it will keep alive the spirit that was evident in the first exercises on that long-ago April 26 when first Columbus citizens gathered to pay tribute to Confederate patriots.

ONE NATION TODAY

Section fought against section in the conflict of the sixties. The discussion of the issues of the conflict have continued through the years that followed the surrender of Gen. Robert E. Lee at Appomattox in 1865. Whatever may have been the issues that resulted in the great Civil War, southerners displayed a courage that has not been excelled in this land or in any other. Southerners though they were, they were Americans nonetheless. They fought for what they thought was right and they fought with a devotion to duty that won the plaudits of everyone.

Americans lie yonder in Linwood Cemetery beneath the Stars-and-Bars-draped graves. Americans lie in Confederate cemeteries throughout the Southland, having fought for a noble cause and having won the undying admiration of the great Southland.

Since the War Between the States, new issues and new problems have arisen to unite the South with the North in a common national interest. The boys of both North and South have fought side by side for the same cause and in defense of the same nation in four wars that followed the one that tore this country asunder. But now there is a united Nation, despite the domestic problems and controversies the arise from time to time, and the South is as much a part of this Nation as any other area or section.

Southern customs and traditions will continue over the years, however, and it is for the perpetuity of one of these—southern Memorial Day—that the Enquirer pleads today.

The Townsend Plan for Help to the Aged, the Money Therefor To Be Supplied by a National Gross Income Tax, Is a Sound Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the Townsend plan has been changed very materially. The plan presently recommended by Dr. Townsend is simple, and a similar plan has been tried and found to be sound and successful. The basic idea of the Townsend plan now, is that to provide for the aged the Government levy a gross income tax. A similar plan has been tried in the Territory of Hawaii and has thus furnished us a yardstick by which to measure the success of such a plan.

Dr. Francis E. Townsend is the authentic pioneer in the development of a plan to give proper aid to the aged. He was born in 1867 and will be 90 years old on January 13, 1957, and is still vigorous and active both physically and mentally.

The Townsend plan has gone through several evolutionary changes largely by the thinking of Dr. Townsend, but also because he has had the support of some very important people who have had experience in the administration of welfare funds under the Social Security System. One of these persons is John C. Cunio, of Modesto, Calif. He has been a member of the California State Welfare Board for over 20 years. This board distributes the social-security funds that the National Government sends to California for distribution to those who qualify. In that manner he has learned how cumbersome and sometimes unjust the present system is.

The present Townsend plan is to levy a gross income tax on all those earning more than $250 per month. This plan has the support of some people who are authorities on tax problems. It also has been operated and found to be practical and workable.

The Territory of Hawaii has a gross income tax which went into effect in 1935. This is a business privilege tax measured by gross proceeds of sales or gross income. The tax rate is 1 percent on wholesaling and blind persons, 1½ percent producing and manufacturing, except sugar producers and canneries who are taxed at the rate of 2½ percent which is also the applicable rate on all other taxable gross receipts. A $1 license must be secured and renewed annually on a calendar year basis.

Returns are due and the tax payable on or before the 20th day of the following month. An annual summary and reconciliation return must be filed on or before March 20 of each year.

Taxes are payable at the time of filing of the monthly return, also when annual return is filed if additional tax is due.

Now fortunately there is concrete evidence by persons who are experts in taxation problems that the Townsend plan of today, which provides for a gross income tax levy is a sound system.

In the American Weekly, dated April 22, 1956, was a very interesting article by T. Coleman Andrews, former Commissioner of Internal Revenue, entitled "Let's Get Rid of the Income Tax." He points out very vividly how damaging and unfair the income tax is, and refers to it as "legalized confiscation," "too complicated," "unstable." He goes on to show the great inequities in our income tax. For instance he states that a man who earns $200,000 a year—he specifically refers to a boxing champion—pays 50 times as much as a person whose tax is on a $4,000 income.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am going to place into the RECORD following my remarks the article which I hope every Member of the House will read. It is startling how the Government takes fabulous sums from persons who by ability, ingenuity, and persistent effort contribute wealth which could be turned into producing channels which could bring the cost of living down and produce plenty where now we have poverty.

I particularly hope that everyone will read the predictions which some of the Members of Congress who were against the income tax made and compare them with what has happened.

Private enterprise which is prized by all Americans would be helped immeasurably if the Townsend Plan were placed into effect and the taxes were lowered.

In Indiana the gross income tax is used to solve its financial problems as well as to build up the State. Here is what Indiana said about its plan, printed in U. S. News & World Report, May 27, 1955, page 125:

> There is a race in Indiana and a race to debt free Indiana, the State that is attracting more industries per capita than any other. No State debt. Constitution does it. Surplus $80,000 million. No nuisance or penalty tax. No net income, use, retail sales, corporate or manufacturer's tax. Only one-fourth of 1 percent on gross receipts from sales for processing, resale, etc. not in interstate or foreign commerce; 1 percent on other receipts derived in Indiana except from sale to ultimate consumer (one-half of 1 percent); there is no tax on receipts from sales in interstate or foreign commerce.

Such a plan if placed into effect could not only solve the problem of taking care of the aged and disabled but could also solve the problem created by the large influx of people to California. With such a scheme in operation undoubtedly new industries would rapidly spring up to give employment to these new citizens of California.

Mr. Speaker, this is from page 12 of U. S. News & World Report under date of April 20, 1956, volume XL, No. 16:

> What of the idea to end the income tax? It's catching on. The only question is, Where else can $30 billion come from? Individuals pay about that much out of their income. Tax on retail sales might be geared at a high enough level to meet part of that bill. A turnover tax is used by Russia, along with a low-income tax. That fosters monopoly, as a way to avoid as many transactions as possible. A flat tax on gross income is another one.
>
> Chances are that there'll always be an income tax, but someday it might be forced lower. Right now a good many people are forced to work a large part of the year just to pay taxes. Then they must knock themselves out week ends filling out complicated forms to make sure that the Government gets every nickel of their income that it can.
>
> Salaried people, wage earners, those whose taxes are withheld at the source, are the ones hardest hit today. They're the ones talking revolt.
>
> Businessmen often have expense accounts. Labor leaders usually enjoy big expense accounts. Professional people are able to take deductions of many kinds not available to the man who has only a salary. Farmers, where income comes into the tax range, have a broad range of deductions.
>
> Income taxes today are highly discriminatory, with privileges for some and a crackdown on others. An idea is getting around that, if everybody paid taxes on the same basis as everybody else, tax rates could be lower.

The following editorial from the Modesto Bee, Modesto, Calif., under date of April 18, 1956, as follows:

TAX INEQUITIES NEED CONTINUED ATTENTION

This is the period when the inequalities of their tax system are borne home to the American people.

When they made out their income-tax returns, Federal and State, many people had a vague and garbled sense that there is a growing minority which enjoys various kinds of preferences, exemptions, and loopholes out of reach to the ordinary salary and wage earner.

And they are right in this vague impression. There are oil nabobs with $100,000 a year from royalties who get a depletion allowance and pay less than 50 percent in taxes. The ordinary single Joe without an oil well would pay nearly 70 percent.

There are people with enough money to buy substantial shares of stock, hold them 6 months, sell them at a profit, and pay a capital-gains tax far lower than the usual income tax.

There are executives allowed to take part of their pay in shares of stock on which they pay capital gains rather than ordinary income taxes. There are others with handsome expense accounts out of reach of the tax. And there are the holders of tax exempt municipal bonds.

The ordinary salaried man takes his tax straight and it is bitter brew beside the sweetened portion of the favored.

This picture has led within the last few weeks to strong attacks on the tax system by two national publications, Life magazine and Collier's.

The situation flows first from a system of income-tax rates jacked to great heights. This has stimulated tremendous pressure on Congress to provide exemptions. Primarily those who have the power of the checkbook at campaign time and the organized voting blocs have been the successful ones with Congress.

Such are the political realities of the situation that a favor given is virtually never retracted. It goes the other way; one favor invites another and the end of this process is the disintegration of the Federal income-tax system.

Sooner or later the solution must be to rewrite our tax laws, invest them with equity and equality and, once that is achieved, hold the line.

It will be well therefore for the American people to retain their interest in this subject beyond the filing deadlines.

The Agricultural Act of 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 3, the House passed H. R. 10875, the Agricultural Act of 1956. For the convenience of the Members and to answer numerous inquiries from throughout the Nation, I am inserting at this place in the RECORD a concise statement of the major provisions of this legislation.

H. R. 10875 embodies the principal provisions of H. R. 12 which were not specifically pointed out by the President as reasons for his veto of H. R. 12.

Important provisions of the vetoed H. R. 12 which are not embraced in H. R. 10875 include the 90 percent of parity price supports for major crops, alternate parity computations, an increase in the minimum support level for the dairy industry, and the domestic parity programs for wheat and rice.

In presenting H. R. 10875, the report from the House Committee on Agriculture said:

> A majority of the members of this committee and, we believe, a majority of both Houses of the Congress still feel that these provisions (objected to by the President) would have checked and changed the tragic downward trend of the farmers' income and would have improved both farm income and farm purchasing power. But in the present situation, appreciating the right of the President to exercise the constitutional powers of his high office, the committee realizes it would be futile to present again legislation embracing the very provisions which met with the objection of the President.

Thus, H. R. 10875 retains every feature of H. R. 12 that tends to stabilize the agricultural economy, and not specifically rejected by the President.

H. R. 10875 AS PASSED BY THE HOUSE—MAJOR PROVISIONS

First. A $1,250,000,000-a-year soil bank, in two parts:

(a) An acreage reserve designed to reduce acreage of wheat, cotton, corn, peanuts, rice, tobacco, feed grains, other field crops, and grazing lands. Payment to farmers would be made to reduce their acreage of these crops below their acreage allotments of wheat, cotton, peanuts, rice, and tobacco; below their farm base acreage in the case of corn; below their 3-year average in the case of feed grains; or in accordance with regulations set up by the Secretary of Agriculture, in the case of grazing lands. The Department of Agriculture's present estimates of the payments which would be made per acre for this reduction are: Tobacco, $100–$300; cotton, $48–$60; peanuts, $50–$70; wheat, $18–$25; corn, $36-$50; rice, $60–$75; and feed grains, $15–$50. A maximum of $800 million a year could be expended on the acreage reserve for the next 4 years.

(b) A conservaton reserve designed to remove acreage from crop production on a semipermanent basis, for which payments approximately equivalent to the rental value of the land would be made, with an annual limit of $450 million.

Compulsory features, proposed in other soil bank legislation, were not included in H. R. 12—vetoed—or in this bill; limits have been put on the amounts that can be spent on specific crops, thus assuring an equitable distribution of funds; and provision is made for the protection of tenants and sharecroppers.

Second. Corn: The bill authorizes five different programs under which corn farmers may receive price supports on corn in 1956, as follows:

(a) Producers in the commercial area who elect to comply with the acreage allotments previously announced by the Secretary—at the rate of approximately 43 million acres—will be eligible for price supports at $1.50 per bushel—86.2 percent of parity—under that program, without putting land into the soil bank.

(b) For the operation of the soil bank the bill increases the corn acreage allotment for 1956 by 9 million acres to a total of 51 million acres. Corn producers in the commercial producing area may qualify for price supports at $1.50 per bushel—86.2 percent of parity—by planting within their allotment from the 51 million-acre base acreage, provided they put into the soil bank an amount of cropland equal to 15 percent of their base acreage of corn.

(c) Producers in the commercial corn area who do not comply with the regular acreage allotments previously announced nor with the base acreage setup for soil bank purposes will still be eligible for price supports, under the noncompliance program recently announced by the Secretary, at the rate of $1.25 per bushel—about 83 percent of the support level of compliance corn in the commercial area.

(d) Corn producers outside the commercial corn area may comply with the feed-grain provisions of the soil bank and qualify for support at about $1.24 per bushel—82½ percent of the support level of compliance corn in the commercial area—by planting a total of not to exceed 85 percent of their 3-year average of feed grains and placing into the soil bank an acreage equal to 15 percent of their average feed grain acreage.

(e) Corn producers outside the commercial area who do not choose to participate in the feed-grain and soil bank programs authorized by this bill will be eligible for supports at approximately $1.12½ per bushel—75 percent of the support level of compliance corn in the commercial area—under the regular support program previously announced by the Secretary.

Third. Feed grains: Classified as feed grains in the bill are grain sorghums, oats, barley, rye, and corn outside the commercial corn area. Producers of feed grains may became eligible for price support at a higher level than that previously announced by the Secretary only by complying with the acreage reduction provisions of the soil bank. These requirements are that the producer not plant a total acreage of feed grains in excess of 85 percent of his base acreage—which in 1956 will be his average of the previous 3 years—and that he devote an acreage of cropland equal to 15 percent of such base acreage to the soil bank program.

Producers who comply with these requirements in 1956 will be eligible for price support on their grain sorghums, oats, barley, and rye at 81.2 percent of parity—5 parity points below the support level of commercial area corn which has been set by the Secretary at 86.2 percent for 1956—and in the case of corn, 82.5 percent of the support level of commercial area corn. On the basis of present parity calculations this amounts, in terms of national averages, to about: Oats, 69 cents; barley, $1.08; rye, $1.35; grain sorghums per hundredweight, $2.09; and corn, $1.24.

Feed grain producers who do not choose to participate in the soil bank program will be eligible for price supports at 70 percent of parity as previously announced by the Secretary—except in the case of corn in the noncommercial area which is 75 percent of the support price in the commercial area.

Fourth. Grazing lands: The Secretary is directed to include grazing lands in the acreage reserve program of the soil bank and to formulate a program under which farmers and ranchers would be compensated for placing a portion of their grazing lands in the acreage reserve and "making a corresponding reduction in livestock units." A limitation of $50 million annually is placed upon the amount that can be spent on the grazing lands portion of the soil bank program.

Fifth. Other field crops: The bill authorizes the inclusion of "other field crops" in the acreage reserve program. The Secretary is authorized to formulate acreage reserve programs for such other field crops as he might designate, such as potatoes, field peas, and so forth. A limitation of $50 million is placed upon the amount which can be spent annually on such programs.

Sixth. Soil bank payments: The Secretary is directed to make payments to participants in the acreage reserve program as soon as he ascertains that the participant has complied with the agreement to reduce his acreage. Under the previous provisions of the bill the Secretary was authorized to make payment upon the certification of the participant that he "has complied with all requirements for such payment."

In addition to the stipulated acreage reduction, there are a number of other requirements that are or may be a part of the obligation of the participant. In the case of some of these—such as not harvesting any crop from the land or not permitting the land to be grazed—the participant could not certify that he had performed until the contract period had expired. It is probable, therefore, that under the previous provisions of the bill payment could not have been made to the farmer in most instances until after the full year's program had expired.

The Cooley amendment will make it possible for the Secretary to make payment in full to farmers participating in the program as soon as their acreage has

been measured and it is ascertained that they have complied with the acreage reduction stipulated in their contracts. Thus, if the program is put into effect for 1956 crops, farmlands could be measured for compliance with the acreage reserve program at the same time they are measured for compliance with acreage allotments—which measurements will be made in most cases in the early summer—and payment in full for participation in the 1956 acreage reserve program could be made at that time.

Seventh. Appeals procedure: Procedures are provided for appeal by producers whose soil bank contracts have been canceled because of alleged violation.

Eighth. Production on Government-owned lands: The President is directed to restrict insofar as practicable the leasing of Government-owned lands for the production of agricultural commodities in surplus supply.

Ninth. Cotton: The bill provides that the national marketing quota for cotton for the 1957 and 1958 crops shall not result in a national acreage allotment for those years smaller than the national acreage allotment for 1956. It establishes for 1957 and 1958 for cotton a special national acreage reserve of 100,000 acres, in addition to the national allotment, to be distributed to States and counties to aid in establishing in all counties minimum farm allotments of 4 acres or the highest acreage planted on the farm in the preceding 3 years, whichever is smaller.

Tenth. Surplus commodities—other provisions: The bill embraces improvements in the disposal of surplus commodities and other important provisions, some of which are discussed below.

To facilitate surplus disposal in the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to process food commodities, such as grains, into a form—meal or flour—which can be used in the home and is also given authority long sought by both the State and the Federal Government to donate food commodities to certain penal institutions.

To facilitate surplus disposal abroad, the President is given authority to pay ocean freight on surplus commodities donated for use in other countries and to step up disposal under title II of Public Law 480 from $300 million to $500 million.

An attack is made upon the surplus problem affecting long staple cotton by again placing extra long staple cotton, now exempt from quotas, within the quota set up for all cotton longer than 1⅛ inches.

Solution of our surplus problem, particularly in textiles, would be substantially assisted by authority clearly given the President in this bill to negotiate voluntary agreements with representatives of other countries with respect to importations into the United States of competing agricultural commodities or products made therefrom.

An appropriation of an additional $500 million annually is authorized for section 32 funds, for use in surplus removal and disposal operations, particularly for perishable commodities.

The bill authorizes the appointment of a Surplus Disposal Administrator in the Department of Agriculture.

Provision is made for the appointment of a commission to study and make recommendations to Congress on increased industrial use of agricultural products.

In order to encourage further the underplanting of acreage allotments, the bill authorized a producer, for the first time, to plant only a part or even none of an acreage allotment for 3 successive years without losing his history and the right to future allotments. This could eliminate the practice of planting merely to retain history for allotment purposes, which is now required.

To make present production adjustment laws more effective, the bill increases to 75 percent of the support price the penalty for exceeding peanut-marketing quotas.

In addition to these specific new authorizations to deal with the surplus problem—authority which the Secretary of Agriculture does not now have—there are other directives in the bill designed also to deal with the surplus situation.

The Secretary of Agriculture is directed to make a study of proposals for disposing of surplus food commodities domestically through some kind of food-stamp plan. He is directed to report to Congress within 90 days on this important matter. He is directed to make a similar study and report on the matter of establishing strategic stockpiles of agricultural commodities both in the United States and abroad for use in the event of war or similar emergency. He is directed to use existing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to dispose of surpluses generally and long-staple cotton specifically.

Address Delivered by Hon. John P. Saylor, House of Representatives, at the American Mining Congress, Cincinnati, Ohio, on Monday, May 7, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address which I gave this morning before the American Mining Congress at Cincinnati, Ohio:

Mr. Shoemaker, fellow members of the panel, members of the American Mining Congress, and guests, it is a distinct pleasure and I deem it a high privilege to be invited here today to speak to you on the subject Congress and the Coal Industry.

Last week, a Representative from Texas told me that he had read about my scheduled appearance here today. He said: "I am glad to know that the American Mining Congress is meeting in Cincinnati. We have had to listen to so much talk in the Halls of Congress about the coal industry that I was beginning to think that the legislative branch of our Government was becoming the Mining Congress."

It is true that a considerable amount of time has been devoted to the coal industry in recent sessions of Congress, but certainly no more than the subject warrants. To my way of thinking, the industry's importance and its problems should have been given far more attention on Capitol Hill long before the current crusade got under way. Had such been the case, our subsequent efforts would have taken effect much more quickly.

During the immediate postwar period, the coal business was good and Congress had no notion of the industry's miseries that lay dead ahead. Not until 1949, when production dropped to 447 million tons—as opposed to 599 million tons in the preceding year—did the industry itself evidence any concern. Even the thud created by this downward plunge was not sufficiently shocking to bring about complete unity of forces within the industry. By now foreign residual oil was flowing freely into the Eastern seaboard, and there was an earnest, but somewhat disjointed, effort to remedy the situation through legislation. This effort, of course, proved to be abortive, partially because the advent of the Korean war in the summer of 1950 brought with it increased demand for all fuels. Coal again was called upon to fill the power gap when our country went to war.

Actually, the coal industry probably would have been better off had this artificial stimulus to production not taken place. Both Congress and the industry were lulled into a temporary sense of security while the oil import problem proceeded to get out of hand.

My tenure in office dates back to the fall of 1949. The district which I represent produced about 23 percent of Pennsylvania's total output that year, so quite naturally I was intensely interested in the condition of the coal industry. I might say parenthetically that, while I never worked in the mines it has been my privilege to associate with operators and miners all my life, so I consider I have at least a working knowledge of the industry. I have often discussed industry economics with a number of gentlemen who are members of the American Mining Congress, including Dr. Charles Potter, a friend of many years.

The danger signal was up for the coal industry by the time I became a Member of Congress, but then came Korea and the temporary upturn in demand. Finally in 1952, coal and allied industries became understandingly alarmed when business again went into reverse.

That was the year in which coal-State Members of Congress first took the offensive in order to prevent a serious fuel problem from becoming a national catastrophe. We attacked the oil import program vehemently. We went after the Government for its inequitable fuel-buying policies. We insisted upon a change in attitude of foreign governments which were accepting our handouts and then refusing to buy the products of our mines.

Against the backdrop of a rapidly expanding economy, the industry was in the uniquely unfortunate position of being one important segment of our business enterprise not prospering. As a consequence, it was extremely difficult to secure recognition for the serious problems affecting coal. When we pointed out that thousands of our miners were unemployed because of the oil import program, the general reaction was that they should seek opportunities elsewhere. Some went so far as to say that coal was really a "dying" industry, notwithstanding the fact that America would have to rely heavily upon coal for its rising energy needs in the years ahead.

We who live in coal districts or are otherwise associated with the industry realized the danger inherent in the loss of our skilled workers. We knew that it was not in the public interest to allow mines to close and deteriorate. We recognized the dangerous implications of the disappearance of investment capital for the maintenance and expansion of existing coal properties and for the development of new properties. We knew it, but we could not convince the rest of the Nation of the grave significance of these conditions.

We in Congress thereupon began to put more emphasis upon the coal industry's relationship to national defense. This was the strategy born of necessity. We took somewhat the same course of action that Mustafa Kemal followed at the beginning of this century in Turkey. He was a fervent patriot who as a youth learned that his political views were not acceptable to incumbent government leaders; in fact, he was at one time banished to Damascus for publicly expressing his views. Members of Congress from coal districts escaped that fate, but there were times—such as when more billions of dollars were appropriated for foreign countries while our pleas were being ignored—that we felt we could have done better had we been from Damascus or someplace else outside the United States. Kemal finally decided to abandon politics for a military career. Years later, as the famous Ataturk, he became President of the Turkish Republic when it was established in 1923. Thus he was able to command a tremendous influence in politics and national affairs after all.

The coal industry's economic tables had produced no significant results, so we turned to the mobilization angle. We made it clear that in an emergency there would not be enough steel if there were not enough coal. No steel—no airplanes, tanks, guns, shells, or ships. After many months, this method of approach began to penetrate. In 1954 the Defense Mobilization Director took up the fight, warning that a deteriorating coal industry could represent a real threat to our mobilization base requirements.

Meanwhile, President Eisenhower had appointed a Cabinet committee to make a study of the fuels picture. In February 1955, it issued a report recommending a five-point program for the resuscitation of the coal industry. These recommendations included a long-needed check on excessive oil imports. This provision was made into law through the medium of a national security amendment to the extension of the Trade Agreements Act in 1955. Thus, for the first time in history, international oil companies were put on notice that there was a limit to the amount of foreign oil they could bring into our markets. I might say here that I am not satisfied with the levels decided upon.

The fact is that excessive imports are finally being recognized as a threat to our national security, and a line has been drawn. We have stemmed the tide, and have had an opportunity to reconnoiter. We are finally in the position of being able to try to roll back the tide and erect flood walls in the form of quota limitations.

On February 10 of this year I introduced House Resolution 400, which since has received the unanimous approval of the House of Representatives. Needless to say, I shall be looking forward to recommendations from members of the American Mining Congress. This is one effort in which we are going to need the combined best thinking of coal producers, miners, transporters, and the consumers.

I am also hopeful that Mr. Patchell, the Pennsylvania Railroad research and development executive who preceded me on this platform this morning, will offer his recommendations when our subcommittee hearings get underway shortly. I shall also look forward to testimony from equipment manufacturers and all other industries and labor groups allied with coal in any way.

Now, I have invited members of this audience to participate in our hearings, yet I have not explained the provisions of House Resolution 400. I assume that most of you are familiar with it, at least to the extent that we in Congress want to learn whether an effective research program for coal might be developed in the same magnitude as those which have been and are currently conducted by the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the National Science Foundation, and similar groups.

My resolution provides for investigating such fields of research as coal production, coal transportation, coal distribution, coal utilization, and a general appraisal of all coal technology. The job cut out for us is a big one, and no doubt many new facets will present themselves as our investigations proceed.

Since my resolution passed the House, I have received correspondence and personal calls from university officials, industrial research firms, and from coal people themselves. Let me read one analysis of the situation:

"The coal industry in 1956 is at a stage similar to that of agriculture in 1862, when the Morrill Act established the land-grant college system and the Hatch Act in 1887 which established the agricultural experiment stations * * * much research was needed to correct the problems."

The House Interior and Insular Affairs subcommittee which will carry out the objectives of House Resolution 400 had its first meeting last Thursday. You will be interested to know that hearings will open in Washington on June 4. Let me say that you gentlemen can have every confidence in the Congressmen who will be serving with Chairman EDMONDSON and me on this subcommittee. While I happen to be the only member from East of the Mississippi, all of my colleagues on the subcommittee are from coal-producing districts, and all are highly conscious of the need for a vigorous coal industry.

It is our fervent hope that House Resolution 400 will eventually settle the industry's principal problems. Meanwhile, Congress must not relent in other undertakings necessary to ease coal's inequitable burdens. In addition to the foreign oil problem, such matters as conservation of natural gas and increased depletion allowance for coal are subjects that cannot be laid aside on Capitol Hill.

The Government's policy on development of peacetime uses of atomic energy is one item that must be watched carefully. The time has come to turn off the stream of Treasury dollars that are flowing freely in an attempt to produce—at astronomical costs—the same kind of electricity that coal-fired plants have been turning out for years. The efforts of private utilities in this direction are most welcome, but I object to the Atomic Energy Commission's use of false figures on coal reserves and other spurious devices in the campaign for what could become an atomic TVA. Next will come the request for the Government to underwrite risk insurance necessary for the operation of reactors in populated communities. Such investments are unfair—not only to the coal industry, but also to every other United States taxpayer.

Within the past few weeks, a number of other Members of Congress have risen to challenge the AEC's determined effort to create subsidized atomic power competition for the coal industry. We are hoping that similar support will come to coal's defense with respect to the other problems that are confronting the industry. If you will permit me to refer once more to foreign oil, I should like to point out that during the current session of Congress an increasing number of Representatives and Senators have come to recognize the danger in the theories of free traders. Congressmen from New England and the South have become much disturbed about excessive imports that are imperilling their home industries. Just before leaving Washington last Friday, I talked with a member of the Georgia delegation who was denouncing a bill that would give the State Department even greater authority in the making of tariff concessions. He emphasized that this is a fight which we must wage together, so I reminded him that he was not in our camp in the past when we had bills up to place a quota on oil imports.

"Oh, I realize that I didn't vote for you on those bills," he said. "But actually I have been on your side all along."

We must continue to present a united front and keep our problems before the Nation if we are to continue our progress toward getting more remedial action from unfair policies harmful to coal. The fact is that there is national danger in a mobilization program that does not include a vigorous coal industry capable of accelerating production to meet emergency demands.

According to recent developments, this situation is finally being recognized, yet we must remember back to other periods when upward spirals in production developed an overconfidence that resolved itself into a sense of complacency. The ills brought on by unrealistic Government policies will not cure themselves. They may appear innocuous when the general state of affairs is in good health, but the time may come when they threaten the position of the entire industry. The cure must be undertaken as soon as possible, and with unity of determination I am sure that we can and will restore the coal industry to its rightful place in a growing economy and in America's defense structure.

Decrease in Number of United States Farms and Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a radio talk by R. K. Bliss, head of the extension service, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa. His talk is entitled "Decrease in Number of United States Farms and Farmers," and is a very informative one which in a measure shows the great changes taking place in agriculture in the United States.

The address follows:

DECREASE IN NUMBER OF UNITED STATES FARMS AND FARMERS

(Radio talk by R. K. Bliss, April 6, 1956, extension service, Iowa State College)

During the past few months there has been much "viewing with alarm" concerning the decrease in the number of farms in the United States. Those who express this concern apparently do not know that the decrease in number of farms is not something that has developed recently but has been going on for 20 years at about the present rate.

Statistics compiled by the Bureau of the Census show that there were over 2 million more farms in the United States in 1935 than there were 20 years later in 1955. The census also shows that during the same period the number of people living on farms declined by almost 10 million.

Is this reduction in number of farms and people living on farms good or bad? Let us consider the situation from the following angles:

1. Decrease in number of farms.
2. Decrease in percentage of people required to produce food.
3. Farm power and improved agricultural practices.
4. Comments on the general situation.

DECREASE IN NUMBER OF UNITED STATES FARMS

First let us take a look at the decrease in the number of United States farms. The reduction in the number of farms began actively about 20 years ago and has been going on steadily since.

The Bureau of the Census reports, by 5-year periods since 1935, are as follows:

Number of United States farms:

1935	6,812,350
1940	6,096,799
1945	5,859,169
1950	5,382,162
1955	4,782,393

From 1935 to 1955, a period of 20 years, there has been a reduction of 2,029,957 farms in the United States. At the same time the area of land in farms has increased by over 100 million acres or an area almost 3 times the size of the State of Iowa. Farms have grown larger both because of a decrease in numbers and also an increase in total acres.

Percentagewise there were about 42 percent more farms in the United States in 1935 than in 1955.

Let us now take a look at the past 10 years. In 1945 the Bureau of the Census reported 5,859,169 farms in the United States. In 1955 the Bureau reports 4,782,393 farms or a decrease in the number of farms during the past 10 years of 1,076,776 farms.

Percentagewise there were 22½ percent more farms in the United States in 1945 than in 1955. This was a greater percentage decrease than in the 10-year period from 1935 to 1945.

Let us now consider the period from 1940 to 1955 which covers World War II and the Korean war and was the most prosperous period in the history of United States agriculture. During this period of great agricultural prosperity the number of farms in the United States decreased by 1,314,406. Percentagewise there were 27½ percent more farms in 1940 than in 1955.

Increase in farms from 1930 to 1935. For comparison let us consider the period from 1930 to 1935. During this period of world depression and extreme agricultural hardships in the United States the number of farms increased 523,000. Percentagewise the number of farms increased 8 percent in the United States from 1930 to 1935.

You will note that during the period of farm prosperity the number of farms decreased, while during the very severe world depression the number of farms increased.

But someone may say that farms are being bought up by outside interests. Probably some of them are but let us again take a look at the record.

Farm tenantry decreased from 42.1 percent in 1935 to 24.4 percent in 1954.

On the other hand farmers owning and operating their own land increased from 47.1 percent in 1935 to 57.2 percent in 1954. Part owner operators, that is farmers who own land and rent additional land, increased from 10.1 percent in 1935 to 17.9 percent in 1954.

Percentagewise tenancy has materially decreased since the world depression and farmers who own and operate their farms have increased. This is an encouraging development.

As compared with the total number of farms the principal percentage increase has been in farms whose annual gross sales range from $2,500 annually to $25,000 annually. From 1949 to 1954 there was an increase in the number of these farms of about 4½ percent. Iowa farms fall principally in this group. As compared with the total number, farms—the value of whose gross sales was over $25,000—increased less than 1 percent during the same period.

The fact is we have in the United States many farms that are too small to be operated with modern machinery and are uneconomical. Actually the reduction in the number of people required to operate farms represents the most significant progress that has been made in solving the farm problem. Suppose, for example, that present farm income had to be divided among 2 million more farms representing 10 million more people. Now let us turn to the percentage of the population necessary to produce food.

PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION REQUIRED TO PRODUCE FOOD

At the close of the Revolutionary War from 85 to 90 percent of the population was engaged in producing food. In 1955, the percentage of the population engaged in producing food had dropped to 13½ percent and still we are burdened with food surpluses.

This is the change that has taken place in agriculture in this country in the past 165 years. The change in the past 20 years has been little short of astounding. In brief, about 40 percent fewer people in 1955 are producing 40 percent more food than in 1935. Why this change?

FARM POWER ALONG WITH IMPROVED AGRICULTURAL PRACTICES

Probably the principal reason for this recent increase in production per man is the increase in farm power—the gasoline engine and electricity. When I was a boy we plowed the ground with 14-inch, 16-inch, or 18-inch walking plows pulled by horses. Now we plow with gang plows, cultivate with two-row cultivators, pick the corn with a mechanical picker, etc. Is it any wonder that family farms have grown larger?

When the farmer got through fieldwork 50 years ago, he usually had a couple of hours of chores ahead of him. Now electricity helps mightily with the chores, operating milking machines, pumping water, taking care of lighting buildings, etc. This also increases the ability of the farm family to operate a larger farm.

COMMENTS ON THE GENERAL SITUATION

Our big problem in food production now appears to be one of controlling our inventive genius and scientific ability in such a way as not to oversupply the food market with surpluses. This is not an easy job. The capacity of people to consume food is limited regardless of the money they have to spend. Even the millionaire can eat only one steak and no more than the average man, but he can buy several expensive cars and build bigger houses. Food is different from other commodities. You can consume so much and no more.

There is one phase of the agricultural problem which we have handled badly. We have destroyed much good soil and we have frightfully misused our timber resources in the past. The proposed conservation reserve which takes acres out of production for a period of years is a part solution of our production problem and a good one. It can be used to restore grass in the Dust Bowl and to reforest or seed down unproductive cropland. This is good conservation and builds for the future.

The acreage reserve by keeping land completely out of production for a short period to reduce the surplus also helps to limit production and also builds for the future. In my opinion, we should move toward making Government payments to support farm prices contingent on the farmer following conservation practices on his farm. I see no good reason for helping to keep a man farming who will not cooperate in conserving his soil.

There are about 1½ million farms in the United States that are classed either as part-time farms or that have an income of less than $250 a year. It is clear that there will have to be a further reduction in number of farms in order to bring agricultural per capita income up to a par with urban income. We should help these low-income farmers make the best possible use of the acres they now have, but we should also thruogh our employment agencies find part-time or full-time work off of the farm for them. They and their children should have vocational training to better fit them for urban jobs.

We are going through an agricultural revolution of readjustments and there is no easy solution.

There is, however, a bright side to the picture.

United States farm people generally enjoy a good standard of living. This is especially true of the farm people of Iowa.

It is a fact that as the percentage of people required to produce food in the United States has decreased the total prosperity of all, including farmers, has increased. This is generally true of all nations. It does not seem that we should be disturbed too much concerning a decrease in farms. We should be alert, however, to help such farmers get good jobs elsewhere.

Poland's Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

POLISH LEGION OF
AMERICAN VETERANS, U. S. A.,
Chicago, Ill., May 2, 1956.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Enclosed please find copy of two resolutions which were passed unanimously at the national executive committee of the Polish Legion of American Veterans in Detroit, Mich., on April 28, 1956.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS J. SPYCHALSKI,
National Commander.
LEONARD J. WOLODZKO,
National Adjutant.

POLAND'S CONSTITUTION OF MAY 3, 1791

Whereas the Polish Legion of American Veterans, U. S. A., takes cognizance of and recognizes the 165th anniversary of the adoption of Poland's Constitution of May 3, 1791; and

Whereas this constitution, as does that of the United States of America, stresses the ideals of human dignity and liberty; and

Whereas the Polish Legion of American Veterans, U. S. A., believed that unless these ideals are adhered to with unwavering devo-

tion and resolve, liberty will perish from this earth: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the delegates assembled at the national executive committee of the Polish Legion of American Veterans, U. S. A., this 28th day of April 1956 in Detroit, Mich.—

1. The United States and all the free people of this world stand firm and unyielding before the autocrats of the world and resolve firmly to guarantee these principles to all the people of Poland, as well as to all the people of the world.

2. To implement the above the United States must:

(a) Withdraw immediately recognition of the Communist Government of Poland.

(b) Unequivocally repudiate the shameful agreements of Yalta and Teheran by which human dignity and liberty for many nation's and peoples were lost.

(c) Conduct diplomatic negotiations with Russia and all nations in firm resolve that enslavement of all people however manifested shall perish from this earth and that all people have the inherent right to determine their own national destiny.

(d) Condemn the shameful imprisonment of 15 Polish officials invited to Red Russia and then treacherously imprisoned, and demand the release of those still in their prisons though their terms have long expired.

PENSIONS TO VETERANS OF OUR ARMED FORCES

Whereas over 20 million veterans of military and naval service in these United States of America have given years of their lives to the service of their country, and,

Whereas many score of these veterans have suffered physical and other disabilities during their said terms of military service, and,

Whereas the tremendous sacrifices of these veterans, of the lives, health and personal liberties during such military service to protect our freedoms and liberties can never be adequately measured nor compensated, and,

Whereas certain forces are now attempting to modify or eliminate pensions to veterans of our Armed Forces granted to them in a small, meager way to show the gratitude of their country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the delegates assembled at the national executive committee of the Polish Legion of American Veterans, U. S. A., this 28th day of April 1956, in Detroit, Mich., That this organization is unequivocally opposed to any modifications decreasing or eliminating the present grossly inadequate pension payments to our veterans.

POLISH LEGION OF AMERICAN VETERANS, U. S. A.
LOUIS J. SPYCHALSKI,
National Commander.
LEONARD J. WOLODZKO,
National Adjutant.

Africa Report Shows up Competitive Labor Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include excerpts from an article appearing in the April 29, 1956, edition of the Salt Lake Tribune.

This column points up one of the numerous difficulties encountered by domestic mines in competing with foreign production, namely, the extremely low wage scales in many foreign countries. With the domestic purchase program for tungsten coming to a close in the next few weeks and with foreign tungsten being produced by labor paid a small fraction of that received by American miners, a very serious and critical situation is developing in our domestic tungsten industry.

The above-mentioned follows:

AFRICA REPORT SHOWS UP COMPETITIVE LABOR COSTS

(By Robert W. Bernick)

With the closing of the western tungsten mines at advent of end of Government stockpiling program, new light is thrown on competitive labor costs in foreign tungsten mines.

As was reported in the Salt Lake Tribune, Minerals Engineering Co. of Grand Junction, Colo., and Salt Lake City, has determined that in order to survive as a tungsten firm it would reopen the San Alberto properties in Sonora Province, Mexico.

• • • • •

It is not, however, possible for western United States mines to compete with foreign inflow of tungsten mined by labor paid at about $1.50 a day when domestic firms must pay a minimum of between $16 and $20 a day to American miners and millmen.

To date Washington has unerringly followed a path of semisubsidization through stockpile purchasing rather than select the alternative of tariffs suggested by the industry.

What has happened to lead and zinc, tungsten, manganese, and antimony also can happen to a few other metals apparently enjoying a boom here and elsewhere in the world.

Uranium, of course, is a fixed-price affair with an uncertain future unless the gap between production for military stockpile and eventual civilian consumption is reduced from the now predicted 10-year period.

And it seems incredible to propose that copper, which has enjoyed an inflationary binge the last several months, could be situated at any date as is lead and zinc, et al.

However, Leonard Ingalls, writing in New York Times from Tsumeb in southwest Africa, describes how investment by United States mining companies has revived what was formerly a ghost town into a thriving camp based on production of copper, lead and zinc, cadmium, and germanium—a metal finding vogue in transistor manufacture.

In 1947, says Mr. Ingalls, the Tsumeb Corp., supported mostly by United States capital, and associated with the American Metal Co., Ltd., New York, purchased the Tsumeb mines.

With expenditure of $16 million, new modern properties were quickly placed into production. Some 3,830 are employed—730 white persons and 3,100 Negroes.

The latter are the miners and are from the Ovambo Tribe in northern southwest Africa, who came to Tsumeb on a 15-month contract without their families. "They earn from 25 cents to $1.54 a day for 8 hours' work," and work 6 days a week.

The Times states the miners "get good food and medical attention free, and they sleep in compounds, 12 men to a room, with only a half-inch felt pad between each man and his concrete bunk.

"A first-class white artisan at the mine is paid $6 basic wage and rents a company house for $6 a month. He also is paid a $75 monthly cost-of-living bonus."

When we add these figures on the basis of a 24-day month for the Tsumeb miner and a 22-day month for the miner at Park City, Summit County, or in Big Indian district, San Juan County, we find that:

The producer of lead-zinc and copper in southwest Africa is being paid monthly around $30 in money. The Utah miner is making anywhere between $400 and $440 a month. In neither case do we include overtime or fringe benefits which most certainly would increase the disparity.

Miners in Utah even make substantially more than white skilled artisans at Tsumeb.

In eliminating ghost towns throughout the world foreign mining ventures are increasing the chances of creating ghost towns in the West—unless miners surrender their hard-won standard of living.

As this is just as unthinkable as creating another United States subsidy monster similar to agriculture, the alternatives are either to raise wages in Africa—which American voters cannot do—or impose tariffs.

The Case for the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON L. LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am offering for insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Dr. William Howard Lewis, of Rome, Ga. It is such a splendid presentation of the South's position on the recent decision by the Supreme Court declaring segregation in the schools unconstitutional that I wish every person in America could read it. It is written by a man born in the North who years ago cast his lot with the South. The article is entitled "The Case for the South," by Dr. William Howard Lewis:

I was born and for 35 years lived a "dam Yankee." For almost 40 years I have lived in the South. In these years of the practice of medicine, I have come to know my fellow Southerners intimately. I feel that, knowing both sections, or shall we say, both peoples, I am in a position to interpret the problem better perhaps than a born southerner. I am grieved at the misrepresentations which the North accepts and much of the biased propaganda emanating from that source. I believe that the real picture should be painted before it is too late, that the North should understand the background for the attitude of the South.

Experts have made quick surveys, spot checks, and snapshots of the South. Their observations are based upon segments of area and time. It is not that simple.

This is not intended to be a legal discourse but a long-time survey to show who the southerner is and why he things and feels the way he does. It may not conform to ideas which exist elsewhere but it is founded upon many years of association and observation.

The title of this article is correct. This is presented neither as a defense nor an apology. The South does not wish nor need either. This is intended as an educational effort to show what the real problem is, that it concerns both North and South and that the South understands the common problem best. It is an effort to show that the problem is far more than political, more than race itself—that ultimately it is a problem of our civilization.

What is the South? It is not simply a geographic area. It is a people with a way of life and individual principles of its own—until 1940. These people came from the

British Isles: English, Scotch, Welsh, and Irish. That generation had the initiative, the courage, and the industry to leave their homes and venture upon a virgin continent. A sturdy group.

They come of the stock which wrested the Magna Carta from the king. They come of the stock which drafted the Declaration of Independence, which drew up the Bill of Rights. In their blood today flows the same spirit of independence and opposition to outside interference. They are well nigh, in character and political principle, the only remnant of the original United States of America.

They are individuals, self reliant, capable of resentment but not cherishing it for long. They want to be allowed to solve their own problems. They are not naturally impetuous but slow to react and stubborn in that reaction.

They have a very personal standard of liberty and dislike regimentation. They believe that the States have certain rights which the Federal Government cannot transcend.

They are nature lovers, fundamentally agricultural although recent farm economics have forced many of them into the cities against their will. A southerner loves his mountains and his forests, his streams and his fields. He prefers to live rather than to strive. Like all nature lovers he is religious and with it has a peace of mind and natural philosophy which the driving northerner cannot comprehend but might well envy. A man is judged for what he is and not for what he may possess of his social status. The southerner wishes leisure to enjoy life and has no great desire for material possessions. He relies upon his own resources for his livelihood and hoes not approve of a paternalistic government. He hesitates to sacrifice his personal independence for security in the mass.

Since the great northern invasion of industry and population beginning in 1940 there has been much change of which he does not entirely approve and often resents. His way of life is threatened. What of these northerners who have come into our midst? There is no antagonism, no line is drawn. They are welcome, sometimes to their surprise. They discover the South, the real South of which they had been quite ignorant. They accept it heartily, they appreciate its way of life and become loyal southerners. Two Presidents have adopted us. There must be a reason. But the reason cannot be defined, it must be experienced.

The French Revolution began in a very moderate way. In the early assembly were a large group of competent men who believed that the form of the government should be modified. They consisted of philosophers, students, socially minded men, and a minority of radicals. For a year or two its deliberations were logical and constructive. Then through disagreement and dissatisfaction the constructive group lost control, the radicals got in the saddle, and the gillotine became the law.

When mutual understanding is not arrived at, when no sincere effort is made to secure a mutual understanding, the radicals have a field day. It is to this juncture that the Supreme Court has brought the races and North and South with its school decision. Whether this decision was strictly legal, the South questions. The Vice President definitely considers it to have been political, when he says "a great Republican Chief Justice, Earl Warren, has ordered an end to racial segregation in the Nation's schools."

About 1830 a young Frenchman by the name of de Toqueville spent almost a year in this country studying our governmental machine from the New England town meeting through city and State to the Federal Government. He pointed out its strong and weak points. He said in substance, "The Supreme Court is the most powerful body in the world. As long as its members are men of high intellect and integrity the Court will be a bulwark. If it ever becomes a political body, it will endanger the whole structure."

It is doubtful if this matter would ever have been presented to the Court if both political parties were not contending for the Negro vote, which in certain pivotal States practically holds the balance of power. The South suspects that the Court threw politics into the scales of justice.

The South believes that the States have certain rights within the Constitution and that the school decision adds to the centralization of power for which the Federal Government has been reaching for two decades. The South believes that this violates the basic principles of division of authority and that the threat is vital to every State in the Nation. In that direction lies tyranny.

Politicians, governors, legislators—North and South—have used the segregation decision as a political football while the innocent people of both races are incited to apprehension, animosity and hatred. We have too many politicians and too few statesmen. With a few exceptions it has been impossible for the South to present its case in a rational way in the northern press. If there is prejudice in the South there is censorship in the North where the accused cannot present its case to the court of public opinion. Is this a fair trial? Is this good sportsmanship? How much does the North really know of the problem? Propaganda is not always the presentation of facts.

Up to the time of the decision of the Supreme Court the races in the South lived in accord and mutual respect. Before the Supreme Court decision there was much heard of the criticism by Moscow of the racial situation in America and the "liberals" insisted that our social standards would not be respected by other peoples until this was remedied. The Communists sent agitators among the colored people and the "intellectuals" and aroused dissatisfaction. The South has little doubt that the Communists laid the egg and that we hatched it. As usual we fell into the Communist trap.

The North's knowledge of the South's negro problem dates largely from "Uncle Tom's Cabin" probably the world's foremost propaganda effort. In this was portrayed both aspects and both true—the care of the white slave owner with Little Eva and Uncle Tom and the cruelty of Simon Legree. The picture of the latter has remained fixed but that of Little Eva and Uncle Tom has faded.

The slave was the capital of the plantation owner, generally the only capital, as he was very commonly in debt to Old or to New England. Being capital it was to his interest to care for them and this he did with few exceptions. An English traveler along the eastern border of the South about 1830 published in the record of his trip that the slaves of the South were far better off than the working man of England. This naturally raised a furor but was quite true and could have been said of the working man of the North at that period.

There is a northern concept of the mistress of a southern plantation as a charming aristocrat living in luxury and idleness. She was undoubtedly charming but she carried a responsibility and task which none of her northern sisters faced. There might have been five or a thousand slaves and in the strictest sense they belonged to her household. She had to supervise their food supply from soil to table. Hers was the task of director of the looms and sewing rooms to provide the clothing. Particularly did she care for the sick, often staying up all night in a Negro cottage or on larger establishments in their own hospital. She looked after their order and sanitation at a time when disease was a constant presence. No wonder, after the Emancipation Proclamation, that the slaves did not revolt, as the North had expected. With the white master in the army the former slaves carried on for their mistress and her children. The life of the owners of the plantation had little romance and leisure but much responsibility and care. Theirs was the white man's burden.

A great section of the slave owners did not approve of slavery. They had inherited it and they were involved in the system. There was studious consideration in regard to how it could be ended as it was generally realized that eventually it had to go. Many went so far as to free their slaves. But the Northern radicals would not give them time, they demanded immediate action. The Anglo Saxon South, pondering its own plans for the future of its own problem resented outside dictation and the Civil War broke out. How like the problems and urgency today. Neither North nor South wanted that war. The great mass of white people on both sides desired patient consideration and peaceful solution but they were swept off their feet by radicals on both sides. It is a fair assumption that if Boston and Charleston could have been quarantined there would have been no war.

Speaking of Boston how many know that many great fortunes were made in New England by the owners of the slave ships? The slaves did not come to the South in ships of southern registry. When the first slave ship landed on our shores it brought an invisible cargo—the race problem.

Let us begin at the beginning. Probably the greatest injustice ever done the Negro was to liberate him without any provision for his status after liberation. Accustomed always to being cared for by his "white folks" he was in no position to care for himself. Millions of Negroes were freed and the only persons to care for or supervise him were the same "white folks" now reduced by the ravages of war to almost an equal degree of poverty. Then came 10 years of "reconstruction" and "carpet bagging" when what little economy of the South which was left was exploited and the Negro was encouraged by northern whites to dominate the southern whites. The bayonets of Federal troops were used for years to support carpet-bag rule and Negro equality. It was an era of social, political and economic tragedy. Space does not permit a description of this period but it was fully as bad as the war years. Again it was hatred and prejudice, not Lincoln's plan. There was, about 1861, a bill before the Congress for the Federal Government to buy the freedom of the slaves by the issuance of bonds to come due in 1900. So far had sane thinking gone. Again the radicals blocked it. How small would have been the cost.

Out of hardship and privation the Southern whites slowly developed a new economy and along with them carried the Negroes. They were still mutually dependant and both knew it. The whites gave the Negroes supervision, employment, and what education they could out of their meager resources. The North left them strictly alone to struggle with a problem which no other people had ever faced.

This was the period when the North loaned capital to the South at 12 percent interest and more. The South needed capital and could not bargain. How different from today when we scatter billions across the world "for free." This was the era when Henry Grady described the southern funeral where everything from pick to casket, shroud and Bible came from the North and the South supplied only the corpse and the grave. Such was the economic exploitation of the Southern white by the Northern white.

This was the era of differential freight rates discriminating against Southern in-

dustry, ports and products. Only yesterday were these rates annulled. Was it because of the vast amount of northern capital now in the South?

The memory of this persists, the persecution, the financial and economic enslavement, the political denouncement, the superior attitude and it has much to do with the resentment by the southerner of northern dictation.

There was an intangible handicap under which the South operated. For several generations, despairing of opportunity in the South thousands of ambitious young southerners went North to contribute their efforts to the development of the northern economy depriving their native people of an executive potential. This must have been costly.

When 1917 came all this did not delay southern boys from enlisting in large proportion. It was their country which was at war and the past was forgotten. Following that war came a realization by the South that it must develop and that it had much for development. Great progress was beginning and then came 10 years of depression with all which it involved, again in hardship and delay. However, to the South the depression was not as devastating as to the North. In the South there was so little difference between prosperity and depression.

We number two arrived with millions of southern boys seeing the entire Nation for the first time along with stupendous industrial development in the South. At the same time millions of northern boys saw the South for the first time, many to come back later and make their homes in the South and marry southern girls.

Why recite all this? To show that until 1940 the South had no surplus wealth to spend upon social, civic, or educational development.

Some years ago the Negro president of a Negro college in Albany, Ga., wrote a book upon the Negro problem. Significantly he entitled it, "You Can't Build a Chimney From the Top." It is an excellent presentation of the situation. In summary he set forth that the Negro race is not yet qualified for full association, morally or intellectually. They are not yet capable of assimilation of education, they lack thrift, self-control, constructive ambition and social courtesies.

He emphasized that the Negro's best friend is the southern white race. He cited many trips which he made in the North to secure funds and where he made talks in prominent white churches. In no instance was any effort made to secure him accommodations and he commonly had to put up in unfortunate quarters. In only one instance did a white man offer him accommodations and he was a saloon keeper. His white fellow churchmen were willing to give him their money but withheld their association.

He described how the influential people of Albany helped him develop his college, provide funds and gave him counsel. He also described an enlightening incident. At one time a paved highway was built through the college campus. A young white man persisted in driving through the campus at high speed endangering the pupils. After several requests to exercise care he continued his reckless driving. The college president then took out an injunction. That night he received a phone call to the effect "we are coming to get you." At midnight four dark cars drove up and took up positions on each side of the house. A man rang the bell and demanded of the wife of the colored president that he come out. She said he would not do so. They then said he would come out or they would burn the house over his head.

He came out, agreed to have the injunction rescinded and they left. At one in the morning he went to the house of the sheriff, related what had happened and asked that the warrant be withdrawn. In reply the sheriff, of his own accord, issued another warrant, this time to keep the peace. The final comment upon this incident speaks volumes. "In 2 years they had sold their plantations and gone back to Ohio where they came from." The Southern sheriff would not permit respected colored persons to be abused and evidently the white population ostracised these men. No outsider could tell them how to run their business.

It has been observed that "the North loves the Negro as a race, the South loves him as an individual." In the South the Negro has his "white folks" who counsel him, advance him money when in financial straits and stand for him before the law. When he goes North he finds little such personal relationship or practical consideration. He is a lost ball in the weeds.

Some years ago the Negro editor of a New Jersey paper who had not been in the South for many years, having heard some very serious reports, decided that he would see for himself. He made an extensive tour and came back and wrote an editorial. It was to the effect that the Negro should stay in the South where he had better treatment and greater opportunities. He cited the improving school systems, the thousands of Negroes who owned their own farms, the good relations between the races.

He also cited a Negro who owned a theater and a bus line in Charleston, S. C., and a large insurance company in South Carolina, operated by and for Negroes. These in the State where his paper was published, he observed, could not occur. True, there were civil rights statutes, but a Negro would never get a franchise for such businesses.

No one knows better than the southerner that his educational plant has been inadequate. Its roots go back to slavery times when the big plantation owners refused to tax themselves for schools for the lesser whites and certainly not for the slaves. Then till 1940 there was too little income in Southern States to develop a comprehensive public school system for the white children and less for the Negro. This the southerner knew too well. Since 1940 there has been great improvement equaled nowhere in the Nation. In the forefront has been provision for Negro schools and the South has expended millions in every State for the most modern school structures for Negroes, better than those for the whites. The decision of the Supreme Court did not stop the building nor the appropriation of additional funds.

It is a fair assumption that over 99 percent of these funds come from the white taxpayer. He does not begrudge it but he regards it as the white man's responsibility. If he is putting up that much money should he not be entitled to assign the manner in which it should be spent?

As the old South realized that slavery was doomed and was casting about for some means of progressive change so the new South has realized that the Negro and the white child must have better educational facilities and it is acting upon its convictions. As the radicals brought on the Civil War just so now the radicals of both races are arousing the resentment of the South at the very time when it is beginning to successfully cope with its own problem. Why shouldn's the southerner resent it?

A recent survey in U. S. News & World Report of the schools in Washington, D. C., reports the scholarship standard to be very low. Sixty percent are Negroes and the white scholarship standard is held to the level of the colored. This coming at a time when the standards of all our schools is lamented, when colleges find that high school graduates cannot read, spell, write or figure, when industry is calling for 100,000 qualified technical men and cannot get them, when the Armed Forces report only 14 percent of the inductees capable of taking training for the special branches.

How much more must we endanger our educational standards by diluting our schools with pupils, who, through no fault of their own, cannot attain a high average level of scholarship? In all probability millions more Negroes will locate in the North in years to come and that problem will become greater. Has the white child no rights?

At present in educational circles is talk of special classes and advancement for the "unusual" child in the white group. What will happen to the balance of the white children if held back further to the level of the colored children in their classes? Has the white child, North or South, no rights?

It is a fair question to ask the members of the Supreme Court—"Do you or would you send your children to the public schools of Washington or to private schools?" If they say they do or would send them to private schools simply because they can afford it, how about the white parents who cannot afford it and who are moving out of Washington in order that their children may secure an adequate education?

The High Court was very solicitous for the the Negro child. Did it give the white child any consideration? In the early school years up to college age, the child is in the formative period. He is sensitive to his associations, surroundings and suggestions. Today we are very conscious of this.

Where there are few colored children this is no great factor but where there are a large or major proportion of colored it is a situation which demands consideration. This feature presents the greatest if not the main objection raised by the southerner and he is in a psoition to know whereof he speaks. The southerner lives with the Negro problem and understands it. The northerner lives outside the Negro problem and does not understand it. The college and university level presents no such problem.

Probably not one parent in a hundred in the North is confronted by such a situation. As parents they dare not condemn the white parents of the South who know the problem and who place the future welfare and character of their children above all else. This is the crux of the resistance. Perhaps this will help to explain why millions of thinking, moderate people of the South are fixed in their opposition to the ruling of the Supreme Court. They think more of their children than did the Court.

Legislation will not remedy nor control social problems. We tried it with prohibition and in varying degrees with prostitution. You cannot alter nor compromise with natural law without a penalty. Nature strives for the average. Do we want an average black and white, because that is the termination. As a nation of do-gooders we have lost all perspective, appreciation and understanding of real values and forces. Has the white race no rights or will they be legislated out? The white and colored can go forward on parallel lines together but they cannot go up as a unit, only to an average.

To return to the summit. If the high Court considers that the Negro has been deprived of a right what about the Asiatic Exclusion Act placed upon our statutes at the insistence of California. This is segregation on a continental scale. No tirades are directed at California for this. They too are race and civilization conscious.

Up to the beginning of the century the immigrants to this country came from northern Europe with similar backgrounds and standards. From then to the First World War came millions from other sections with different backgrounds and social and political potentials. The Congress did not believe that these people could be well assimilated and an immigration restriction act

was passed. It was a recognition of a danger to our standards of civilization. With the new thought of the High Court, intellectuals (self-admitted) and the Communists, why not rescind this act and the Asiatic Exclusion Act? Why not consistency?

The southerner is greatly puzzled over the Constitution. Following the Constitution, as expounded by several rulings of the Supreme Court, the South spent millions of dollars upon new scchools, separate but equal. They made every effort to conform to the law. Then at high noon on a certain Monday the Court decreed that the South was violating the Constitution. At the tick of the clock the Constitution had changed. The South wonders what the Constitution may be at noon of some future Monday. Indeed, why have a constitution?

Ethically and logically, citizenship is not a right but a privilege. For several decades after our independence a number of the States recognized this by imposing qualifications for voting. These restrictions did not last long. Now merely because one has been born he is a voting citizen.

All men are not "created equal" nor do they develop equally. This phrase of equality by birth was debated vigorously in the constitutional convention but won out. As a result, predicated upon this, has grown up a process of legislation which may well be challenged. Citizenship has its obligations, of character, intelligence and a discernment of the common and national good, not merely of local and group advantage.

To justify citizenship the Negro—as well as the white—has obligations. The Negro must think as a citizen, not merely as a Negro. He must learn that the more he expects of society the more must he return to society. He must appreciate the dignity of work and that a fair unit of work must be rendered for a fair unit of pay. He must learn the value of order and cleanliness in his living. That lack of this means a poor citizen regardless of color. He must learn thrift, that any person who has nothing remaining upon Monday morning from the previous week's pay is a poor citizen. He must learn that a sense of responsibility, trustworthiness, integrity, and honor are the badges of character. A great many have attained this standard. The mass have not.

Theorists have pointed to Booker T. Washington and George Washington Carver and Marian Anderson as representatives of the race. Great as these names are they are no more typical than are Edison, Einstein, and Shubert typical of the white race. In the past hundred years the Negro in America has come far but how far has the white race come in 30 centuries?

The origins of the white population of the South have been traced. It is of no less moment to trace the origins of the colored population as it throws light upon the variation in progress of individuals of the race today.

The colored population originated in Africa but to dismiss this factor by terming them Africans is an oversimplification. There was a definite variation in the cultures of the Negroes in their native state perhaps relatively as great as in the European backgrounds of the whites.

True they had not risen above the tribal level. A clear picture can be secured from the volumes of In Darkest Africa being an account by Henry M. Stanley of his expedition for the relief of Dr. Livingstone. He describes the many different Negro tribes which he encountered and there was a wide variation in their culture. Many were what could be regarded as in a primitive state while others had attained a distinct degree of organization and relative advancement. However, nowhere did he find the wheel or any evidence of a written language.

The stream of slave material came from all these levels and the purchasers soon learned that members of certain tribes were much more desirable than others. In point of time and background the upper group might have been a thousand years in advance.

This source variation may well account for the present variation in culture of the individuals of the colored race in our midst as it also does in the white race. It would also demonstrate that the present advanced group is not representative but the result of selective evolution just as in the white race. It also indicates that a uniform progress cannot be expected of them as a race any more than before their arrival upon these shores.

There is one aspect of the decision of the Supreme Court which the proponents of the colored race appear to have overlooked. The learned judges made this a sociological argument when they obviously regarded the white race as superior by stating that only by association with white children could the colored child advance.

The great number of colored persons who have attained a high level of culture indicates that the Negro is an undeveloped race rather than specifically an inferior one as the Court seems to imply. It is only natural that some members of this upper group should be militant in their efforts to elevate the entire body but they have failed to realize that nature operates slowly, especially in the mass and that she cannot be forced. Nature's tool is evolution which is constructive, not revolution which is destructive. Impatience may be understandable but it is not the part of wisdom.

The present campaign has set back good relations and progress for many years. The colored race is entitled to more intelligent leadership. They need another Booker Washington.

There is one logical solution to the problem. The Negro must develop a pride of race and free himself from his present inferiority attitude. Instead of agitators he needs constructive leaders of his own race who will seek to develop its progress and culture within the capacity and pattern of their own people. These leaders should devote their efforts to development of the entire group along their own potential channels to build up a pride of their own and not in aggressive competition with the white race. They should have pride in race. Their record justifies it. This is statesmanship.

The situation which irks the southerner most, aside from outside dictation, is that the North is guilty of the very charges of which it accuses the South.

In both sections are certain levels of population which are prone to violence in race situations. The North has shouted loudly of lynchings which have disappeared. The North forgets race battles in St. Louis, Chicago, and Detroit where probably more Negroes died than in all the lynchings in the South. These were not lynchings, they were just riots.

There have been serious disurbances in the North where Negroes moved into white sections. In other areas where Negroes moved in, the value of real estate dropped—a financial index of the white attitude. In the big cities of the North are Negro ghettos, centers of crowding, sickness, violence, disorder. Sections in which a white man may hardly dare to venture. Segregation? Parks and playgrounds formerly white, when invaded by the Negro are shunned by whites. Segregation?

The first real disturbance after the Court's decision did not occur in the South but in the small Ohio city of Hillsboro. True it was not extensive because the school was small but revolt it was. The Northern press gave it some mention; the Southern press practically none. Possibly because they regarded it as a natural event.

Do you find Negroes welcome in first-class hotels and restaurants in the North? Segregation? Ten years ago my Northern friends looked down their noses at me. Now they are alarmed. They ask "What can we do about it?" The camel got his head under the tent and his tail followed.

Unconsciously the Southerner is fighting more than the problem of race. He is fighting for our standards of civilization. No civilization is any stronger than the individuals and the elements which compose it.

History is the mirror of the future. Ancient Egypt through the centuries built a great civilization which existed for 2,000 years. In their wars they brought into their nation hundreds of thousands of captives as slaves, Ethiopians and Asiatics. The integration was slow but inevitable. Their customs and standards, those of different races, gradually infiltrated, they gradually interbred. Rawlinson in his history, published in 1880, observes that by 1500 B. C. Egyptian progress ceased and her civilization sank to a level from which it has never recovered. He attributed it to an assimilation of the standards and intellectual level of and interbreeding with the various races which they had brought into their midst.

In their turn Greece and Rome went the same way. The primary groups built great civilizations but integrated eventually with the great body of slaves and foreign elements which grew in their midst. The constructive elements of the original group were diluted with miscellaneous elements and made them an easy prey to conquest. Great civilizations have always degenerated from within before conquest from without. Is this significant?

A famous English statesman once said in regard to the American Colonies, "You cannot indict a whole people." The North, the South, the Negro cannot be indicted as a whole. Too many are not partisan, are moderate and do not believe that the situation can be solved off hand. It may take a century if then.

Through slavery for a century and a half the Southerner has guided and assisted the Negro to where he has advanced far from his original state. The Southerner has been his understanding friend. The present movement, by alienating these white friends has done the Negro most serious injury which will take a long time to repair. He has lost far more than he can possibly gain.

It should be set forth without question that there are many thousands of colored persons who have obtained a high cultural social and intellectual level both North and South. This the unbiased Southerner freely acknowledges. He respects them, they are his friends. The Northerner regards them as representative.

No race has come as far in as short a time. The above group is the cultural peak but there is a great body which is far from that peak and which will require an unknown period of time for it to develop. This the cultured group knows.

In the South the great mass of the colored people do not desire integration. They want their own schools with their own people. But they are not vocal. They fear the conflicts not only with white adults but with white pupils. Can the Supreme Court control such personal conflict at the school level?

It might be well here to touch briefly upon the Tuscaloosa incident. When the colored woman entered the university she created little interest. However, when the students learned that she was a trial balloon for the NAACP they remonstrated. A previous refusal of a colored girl by the University was due, according to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to the fact that she was unmarried and 3 months pregnant.

It is for the vast majorities of our people in the light of history, facts, truth and reality to readjust the balance with sane counsel

and prayerful consideration. It is for them to restrain the radicals in every quarter. It is for them to realize that adjustments cannot come by legislation nor can they be forced. It is for them to see the whole problem and not just a segment, to appreciate that it is not merely our present but our whole future which is at stake. The present may well become most critical. It may be later than we think. It is for the moderates to rally now to the defense of generations yet unborn. When passion, the spawn of prejudice, takes over, disaster comes.

Plentiful Jobs, Good Pay Are in Prospect for Fall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, various magazine and newspaper writers have been predicting the economic situation for the remainder of 1956. One such estimate has been made by James Y. Newton in Sunday's Washington Star. This columnist predicts that jobs will be plentiful and good overall pay is in prospect for the job seeker. Mr. Speaker, I append herewith the article in full:

THE WAGE EARNER: PLENTIFUL JOBS, GOOD PAY ARE IN PROSPECT FOR FALL

Election day, 1956, should find a near-record number of people employed and bringing home pay checks of near-record size. The worker's dinner pail, ever the concern of those seeking political office, should be brimming over.

The overall outlook is good both for jobs and wages through next fall. There are some pools of unemployment—the old ones in Northern textile centers and coal mining regions of a dozen States. New unemployment is concentrated largely in the farm-equipment and automobile industries where upward of 120,000 workers have been laid off. Unemployment could be the deciding election factor in some localities, but it is not likely to be a matter of national concern this year.

It is even likely that those who have been laid off in the automobile industry, mostly around Detroit, may be back at work come the first Tuesday in November. This is because the auto poducers are planning new model changes early this year to boost sagging sales and their factories could be running full blast by November.

STEEL WAGES AT ISSUE

United States Steel and other basic steel producers are preparing for new contract negotiations with the AFL–CIO United Steelworkers. The present wage agreement, covering a half million workers, expires June 30.

A deadlock on issues and a strike, such as the one the steel industry suffered for months in 1952, could have a marked depressing effect on the whole American economy.

Most labor experts do not believe there will be a strike in steel this year, however. Their predictions are based, for the most part, on the unprecedented prosperity of the industry. For example, profits of United States Steel are running away over last year, which was an excellent year itself. The corporation most likely would go far in meeting the steelworkers' demands rather than risk interruption of this period of prosperity. And United States Steel usually sets the industry pattern on wages.

Latest Commerce-Labor Department figures show that 63.1 million persons were employed in March, 2.5 million more than in March last year, when the job upswing following the 1954 recession had not gained full momentum. Because of the seasonal factors there always are more people employed in October and November than in March. Last year, for example, November employment totaled 64.8 million. It is expected the total for the month this year will be higher, perhaps topping the all-time employment high of 65.5 million reached last August.

Despite the auto industry layoffs, unemployment in March was 2.8 million, about 350,000 less than in the same month of 1955.

On wages the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that take-home pay of factory workers and the amount of goods and services it could buy reached new peaks for March.

Net spendable earnings of a worker with three dependents were $72.10 in March, while those of a worker with no dependents were $64.77. This was a gain of 33 cents over February, and an increase of more than $2.70 or about 4 percent over last March.

The March figures were exceeded only in the last few months of 1955 when the auto industry was going full tilt making new 1956 models and factory hours were consequently somewhat higher. BLS said the stability of consumer prices over the year has meant that virtually all gains in factory take-home pay have resulted in increasing buying power for the worker. Compared to March a year ago, buying power was up almost 4 percent.

These happy conditions for the worker are expected to carry through election time.

A survey conducted by the Federal Reserve Bulletin illustrated dramatically the improved economic lot of the worker over what it was before the 1952 election.

In the past 5 years hourly and weekly earnings in manufacturing have increased 25 percent. Since consumer prices have been relatively stable, increases in dollar earnings have represented almost equivalent gains in real earnings—that is, in terms of buyinig power of the dollar.

OTHER BENEFITS ADDED

"Changes in wages have not fully represented growth in workers' compensation over the 5-year period," the Federal Reserve points out. "Through collective bargaining, private security and welfare programs—such as pensions and health and other insurance—have been extended rapidly, and last year supplementary unemployment benefits were introduced. Growth of these deferred benefits has added to the security of the worker and has further increased his stake in a stable purchasing power for the dollar."

Wage settlements this year, not reflected in the Federal Reserve earnings figures, have tended to be on the liberal side. So from the standpoint of pay, at least, the worker should be in a happy frame of mind come election day.

Dictatorial Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I have here an editorial which appeared in the Devils Lake (N. Dak.) Journal on April 27, 1956. It points up the high-handed manner in which the Indian Bureau deals with the Indians, and I believe should be brought to the attention of the Congress:

Another example of the dictatorial policies of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in their treatment of Indians has come to light on the Fort Totten Reservation.

Members of the Devils Lake Sioux Tribal executive committee have contended that, in compliance with Federal regulations, they should have been consulted on the appointment of a judge when law and order enforcement was returned to the Bureau.

However, the Bureau, apparently feeling that it wanted to appoint a man who would do its bidding, has never consulted the committee.

One member of the committee said that it was pushing a local attorney for judge because it felt that he would possess a knowledge of the law and would make independent decisions.

The Bureau, however, has a convenient explanation for not abiding by regulations and consulting with the committee on the appointment.

According to the Bureau, there is no duly constituted tribal governing body on the Devils Lake Reservation, so the Assistant Secretary of the Interior granted an exception to the regulations so that judges could be appointed without confirmation of a tribal body.

Actually, the committee held an election last May under the constitution and bylaws of the tribe and the superintendent of the agency swore them in 5 days later.

To further explain its action, the Bureau wrote in a letter from Washington to the area director at Aberdeen, S. Dak.: "Regulations do contemplate that where a tribal governing body exists, it will be given the opportunity of ratifying or confirming the appointment of such judges. However, the Secretary of the Interior may at any time make an exception to the departmental regulations and such an exception has been made in this instance."

In effect, what the Bureau is trying to say is that there are regulations but they only need to be followed when the Government sees fit to do so.

We can imagine what respect for our laws would be generated if certain people were told they would need to abide by them only when they had the inclination.

Such inconsistency can only result in the loss of respect for laws and regulations, for actually people have no idea when they will be followed or when they will be flouted with the blessing of authorities.

Considering the failure of the Bureau to abide by regulations in the appointment of a judge, it is no wonder that there sometimes appears to be a lack of respect for law enforcement on the reservation.

It is up to the Government to first set a proper example, which they have failed to do by ignoring Federal regulations.

Air Force Under Secretary Douglas Speaks at Third Annual Airpower Banquet at Madison, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Madison, Wis., the capital of the Badger State, is the host city for Truax Air Force Base. Thanks to a series of

commanding officers at Truax who have been community-relations conscious, and to the presence in Madison of a group of younger leaders of the community who have served Truax both in and out of uniform, the Madison-Truax relationship has served as an example for air defense bases throughout the Air Force. A day-to-day understanding between Truax and the city of Madison has probably reached its most solid effectiveness under the present base commander Col. Frederick Nelander. Leaders in fostering community understanding have been Collins Ferris, a Madison banker who doubles as chief of staff of Wisconsin's Air National Guard, and was Truax's first commanding officer after its reactivation following the outbreak in Korea; Arlie Mucks, Jr., of the Madison Chamber of Commerce and Foundation, an Air National Guard officer; and Robert Skuldt, manager of the Madison Municipal Airport, also an Air National Guard officer.

For the past 3 years, the Madison Chamber of Commerce and Foundation has sponsored an annual airpower banquet at which the civilian and military leaders of the community have been brought together. The speaker at the first banquet in 1954 was one of the Badger State's native sons, Air Force Chief of Staff Gen. Nathan Twining. The 1955 speaker was Gen. Benjamin Chidlaw, then commanding general of the Air Defense Command. This year's speaker was the Honorable James H. Douglas, Under Secretary of the Air Force.

I have been honored with an invitation to each of these three airpower banquets, and this year was privileged to introduce Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to insert herewith the text of Secretary Douglas' remarks at Madison on April 24, preceded by my own introductory comments:

Tonight I want to tell you a story.

Once upon a time—it seems so very long ago—when skies were dark and clouds hung low upon the earth, a fair maid named Truax met and kept steady company with a handsome young man named Madison. It was a war-time affair, and when necessity no longer threw them together, it faded fairly quickly. Truax packed her trunks and returned to her mother in Washington. Madison, glad to be free from his wartime obligations, went his carefree, growing way. He grew ever taller, always stronger, happier, and more prosperous than ever before. People liked his company. A well-known national magazine said he was about the finest company to be found anywhere.

But then the skies darkened and clouds hung low upon the earth again. Lightning struck half way around the world in a remote place that few people outside the University of Wisconsin knew much about—Korea.

And one morning a very grim looking woman with a Washington accent stood on Madison's doorstep. There were no pleasantries, there wasn't time for pleasantries. Her message was brief: "Madison, you remember my daughter Truax. She needs you, you and your neighbors need her. I'm on my way to Korea. Take good care of her."

Madison was a man of honor, and so he and Truax were married. Some folks said it was a shotgun wedding. Others said it was strictly a marriage of convenience. In either case, they said, it couldn't, wouldn't last.

But this has been a most successful union, as those of us gathered in this third family reunion will testify.

The marriage has not always been serene, of course not. But what marriage is?

There have been misunderstandings to be sure. But what marriage doesn't have misunderstandings?

Day by day, and for the most part, there has been understanding, respect, appreciation, determination to make a go of it. And what marriage ever succeeded without them?

This is not a fairy tale, it doesn't have a "they lived happily ever after" ending. This is a story of a successful marriage, the kind that members of the family work at and keep working at.

Madison, like most handome, high-spirited men, doesn't like to be ignored by his mother-in-law. He didn't like it last month, for instance, when his mother-in-law visited Truax without bothering to look him up or to speak to him. But did he sulk in silence or rant in rage? Happily he did not. Rather he sent two of his favorite and ablest sons, Bob and Arlie, to Washington to call on his mother-in-law, make a few suggestions relating to family etiquette, remind his mother-in-law, first, of his need to be kept informed, and second, that he had some important investments and interests that needed to be protected.

Since that time, another outstanding member of the family, Fred, who is closely tied to his mother, and always wears a favorite uniform furnished by his grandmother—but who is nevertheless a great favorite of his father—called a family meeting which has done a great deal to improve the understanding and good feeling of all the family.

And so as a friend of the family, it is my pleasure to congratulate you on the success of your family relationship and to thank you for inviting me to attend this third family reunion.

Our speaker tonight, in terms of this story, might be referred to Madison's brother-in-law. Certainly he is one of the Air Force's finest, most devoted sons. A native of our neighboring Iowa, he is a resident of our neighboring Illinois. A lawyer by profession, a businessman in practical experience, he is a public servant out of a keen sense of public responsibility.

Along his busy pathway he has followed the course of civic duty. World War I found him in uniform; 1932 found him as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. World War II found him as a colonel in the Air Force, Chief of Staff of the Air Transport Command.

Among his varied business interests he has found time to serve as a trustee of the University of Chicago, a member of the executive board of the Boy Scouts of America, and other positions of high civic responsibility.

In March of 1953, President Eisenhower designated him as Undersecretary of the Air Force, a position which he has continued to hold under two Secretaries.

He is one of the Air Force's most devoted servants, and it is my pleasure to welcome the Honorable James H. Douglas to the Second District of Wisconsin and to the city of Madison tonight.

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE JAMES H. DOUGLAS, UNDER SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, BEFORE THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ANNUAL AIRPOWER BANQUET, MADISON, WIS., APRIL 24, 1956

Ladies and gentlemen, I am honored by your invitation to attend this annual airpower banquet, and I welcome the opportunity to report on our Air Force, and Air Force problems, to a community that is as airminded as is Madison. For those of us who spend pretty long days in the Pentagon in planning and justifying and explaining requirements, it is always a healthy and rewarding experience to get to an Air Force installation, and to get a little acquainted with the community upon which the officers and airmen of a wing or squadron rely for the neighborly interest and encouragement that we all find essential to satisfactory living. This is particularly so when one finds not only a keen interest in airpower, so evident in this audience, but also the active day-to-day support that you give to Air Force activities at Truax Field. We in the Air Force greatly admire your fine contribution to this cordial and constructive base-city relationship. And we hope you share the pride we take in what has been accomplished. We in the Air Force regard the Madison-Truax partnership as something to be sought after and achieved at scores of bases across the Nation where high-performance aircraft are operated close to residential areas. This community-interceptor base relationship problem recalls a clipping I found on my bureau one evening during the efforts of my wife to instill in me a higher tolerance, and perhaps affection for cats. The clipping read: "No man likes a cat until a smart cat likes a man, then he becomes a cat lover." Perhaps no community likes interceptors until a smart interceptor squadron likes a community, makes its defense mission understood, and makes an intelligent effort to minimize noise and hazards. Then perhaps the community becomes an Air Force lover.

The community-Air Force partnership has never been more at a premium than it is today. The development of atomic weapons and long range aircraft have created a new situation. For the first time in the history of our Nation we find ourselves within range of the atomic striking force of a potential enemy. This potential enemy has an overwhelming strength on the ground, and has little dependence upon sea lanes, so the one instrument of military force upon which we can rely as a deterrent to Soviet military aggression, and for survival in the event of attack is air atomic striking power and air defense.

So long as a potential enemy has the capability to inflict great damage upon us we must accept the heavy burden imposed by the cost of a modern air force in terms of manpower, money and national resource. This is no small matter as at present the service departments account for more than half of the national budget, and the Air Force for nearly half of that amount. The objective of our program is first of all to develop and maintain an air atomic striking force so powerful that no potential enemy can resort to full scale war as a rational means of achieving his goal. We are adding to this deterrent a strong air defense comprising fighter interceptors, and Air Force and Army ground-to-air missiles. And the striking force is supplemented by a tactical Air Force which supports our ground forces and may be particularly useful in meeting limited aggression.

Our organizational or program goal for these forces is 137 wings, including 11 troop carrier wings. Let me review our progress toward meeting this goal. As an Air Force consists primarily of men, bases and aircraft and missiles, we must look at three principal areas of activity. First, the development of a personnel force that is sufficiently large, skilled and dedicated to perform a wide range of difficult and challenging jobs. Second, the development of a system of bases so located and constructed as to support the effective use of our personnel and aircraft; and third, the development and rapid introduction into operational use of new and improved aircraft and missiles.

In the personnel field we are moving ahead with our program to procure, train, and hold the people who have the stamina, aptitude and skill needed to maintain and operate the intricate aircraft and electronic components which provide the basis for modern air power. We have talked a lot about this

increasing skill requirement over the past several years, as there are still those who think of military training as physical training and close order drill. This is no longer the case in any of the services, and I think we find the greatest requirement for technical skills in the Air Force. There are enough tubes and bulbs in one of the F–89 aircraft used by your National Guard squadron here to make 80 home radio sets. The maintenance crews on this plane must deal with an electrical system that is just as complex as the combined circuits of a city power station. In the cockpit of a B–47 the aircraft commander and his copilot have about 350 switches and controls to operate and check compared to 130 for the B–29. There are endless examples, but these will leave no doubt that we have a vastly greater need for technical knowledge and skills than we had 10 years ago. Also, when we consider the increased cost and speed and striking power of today's combat aircraft, we realize that there is less margin for indecision or error in judgment on the part of our pilots and other aircrew members than there has ever been.

Our number one problem is technical skills. In order to bring our newly enlisted airmen into their first productive assignment as quickly and economically as possible, we have streamlined our training programs. For the 65 percent of our recruits who are selected to attend formal technical schools we have shortened the period of formal basic training from 11 to 6 weeks. At the technical schools they are taught to perform specialized duties in the repair and maintenance of specific powerplant or communizations equipment—a procedure which enables them to qualify for productive assignments early in their first enlistment. Those who choose an Air Force career are later selected to attend advanced courses where they can acquire a broader knowledge of career fields in which they can progress to the highest grade.

Our improved reenlistment rates during the past year have produced a tremendous saving in training cost. For instance we were able to reenlist 11,000 more airmen during the first 4 months of this fiscal year than during the corresponding period of the preceding year. It is hard to put a sure cash value on this accomplishment, but I am advised that such reenlistment meant that we were able to retain skills which cost us about $160 million to produce. The cost of the pay raise for the same period was less than $50 million so we may be said to have paid for the pay raise three times over. In addition to the pay raise we have taken many constructive steps over the past year to increase the attractiveness of an Air Force career. Among other things we are providing better choice of assignment, fewer transfers and additional payment for the cost of transfers.

The problem of retention of skilled airmen is far from solved. We have not been able to achieve a satisfactory reenlistment rate among our people who are highly skilled in such technical fields as electronics and aircraft maintenance. Industry competition is too strong. We must continue to provide inducements that will increase the attractions and satisfactions of an Air Force career.

Although the matter of retaining our technically skilled airmen has been and is our most critical problem, we are also trying to reduce the separation rate of commissioned personnel—especially those who are completing their first period of service and represent a large investment as pilots and crew personnel. To keep pace with the increased complexity and performance of aircraft, we have had to raise the level of qualifications and proficiency for our pilots. They receive more preflight instruction; more flying time; and the demands upon them are constantly increasing as faster and more advanced aircraft enter the Air Force inventory. Inducements aimed at this group include better BOQ's and more adequate family housing, more stable assignments and the proposed increase in the number of our regular officers.

As a final comment on the personnel element of our buildup, I want to emphasize that the highly trained, skilled and career-minded, officer and airman are the all important factor in the air power equation. Today the airmen who operate radar equipment guarding the approaches to cities packed with millions of people are charged with a tremendous public trust. Also, the responsibility of the aircraft commander of a B–52 may well give us pause. His aircraft represents a cost of more than $8 million, and in the event of war he might be called upon to deliver nuclear weapons against the aggressor. There are factors that account for our emphasis on quality as we build to our 137 wings and 975,000 officers and airmen.

One of our most acute problems in carrying out our expansion program is that of developing an adequate base system to support Air Force training and operations at home and overseas. Since 1950 nearly $5 billion of construction has been completed, and nearly $2 billion of work is under contract. The 1957 military construction program will authorize an additional $1.2 billion for Air Force base construction. This immense program serves two vital needs: to support of the Air Force expansion from some 48 wings in 1950 to the programed 137, and also to accommodate conversion from World War II aircraft to the fast, heavy jet aircraft of today. We will have homes for the 137 wings when that goal is reached in June of 1957, but there will be deficiencies in operational facilities, in recreational facilities and particularly in family housing.

Family facilities at most of our bases today are inadequate and many of our people have to rent or buy homes at a considerable distance from their work and often homes unsuitable to their needs. Progress is being made to remedy this situation. Overseas, more than 14,000 units are under construction or planned. And nearly 50,000 are programed in this country. The first of these are under construction under FHA title 8 financing. More than 500 title 8 units are programed for your local base.

In the field of weapons development we have introduced an impresive number of new and improved aircraft into combat units during the past year. Our first B–52 wing is in training at Castle Air Force Base in California. The performance of this plane has exceeded our expectations. Equipped with a nuclear bomb, the B–52 is clearly the single most significant weapon in our whole military arsenal. My respect for the B–52 was enhanced by a flight in one several months ago, which included an effortless climb to 40,000 feet in a matter of minutes and refueling contacts with a tanker at 15,000 feet.

Also during the year we have equipped several tactical wings with the B–57 light bomber and with F–100 supersabres, the first operational model of the century series aircraft, and the fastest of our operational fighters.

The F–101 has completed it testing and is on order. This is the long-range fighter that can carry nuclear weapons, fly escort or reconnaissance missions, or act as a long-range interceptor. It is a big fighter, and weighs about as much as the old B–17, our World War II flying fortress.

The F–102, a Delta-wing interceptor, with electronic equipment that will guide it to bomber aircraft under all conditions of weather, day or night, has shown up well in tests and is getting into substantial production. Armed with rockets which can destroy an attacking bomber, these planes are scheduled for delivery to the Truax interceptor units.

In the day-fighter class we have the F–104. This latest air-superiority weapon has performed well at supersonic speeds in its long period of tests and in the public demonstration this month. I believe it is the fastest, highest-flying fighter in the air.

The F–105 is a supersonic fighter bomber and in flight testing. It will be a highly effective weapon for the tactical mission.

During 1955 the C–123 went into operation as an up-to-date troop carrier aircraft capable of using rough fields for landing and takeoff. This modern troop-carrier plane is being supplemented by the larger turbo-prop C–130.

In the transport field the C–133 will fly shortly. It has a range of 3,500 nautical miles, a payload capacity of more than 50,000 pounds and a speed much higher than that of our C–124 Globemaster. The C–133—in spite of its great size—can use fields suitable for present transports.

Great progress has been made in the guided missile field, and the major share of public interest in recent months has focused on the intercontinental ballistic missile and intermediate range missile development. In the ICBM field the Atlas has been under development by the Convair Division of the General Dynamics Corp., San Diego, Calif., for a number of years. The Titan is being developed by the Denver Division of the Martin Co. of Baltimore, Md. For the IRBM or Thor program, the Douglas Aircraft Co. of Santa Monica, Calif., has been assigned development responsibility.

In the airbreathing category we have under development two intercontinental missiles, the North American Navaho and the Northrup Snark. These have a range and destructive potential comparable to the ICBM's, but might soon be vulnerable to air defense weapons.

Our own progress in relation to Soviet airpower is today receiving careful examination. Particularly serious concern has been expressed regarding our long-range missile program and Soviet developments in that field. And we are not unaware of Khrushchev's statement made only yesterday.

You can be sure that we recognize the tremendous potential which long-range missiles have for the delivery of nuclear explosives, and the importance of having them available in our arsenal at the earliest time. You can also be sure that we are bending every effort to the development of both the intercontinental and intermediate range ballistic missiles, and also toward the early availability of Snark and Navaho. Perhaps the ballistic missile approaches being the absolute weapon. It has our highest priority. But I think it falls into perspective when I say we do not foresee a situation in which it will completely supplant our manned aircraft.

Also it does not appear that achievement of a Soviet IRBM ahead of us would necessarily greatly damage our deterrent position. The Soviet already has sufficient short- and medium-range striking power to accomplish near its borders what could be accomplished with the intermediate-range ballistic missile. Even their achievement of the ICBM would not immediately affect our ability to inflict vast damage with manned bombers. And our striking power should remain an effective deterrent so long as it is judged capable of inflicting unacceptable damage.

Now, let me summarize briefly what kind of airpower, and what level of airpower, we have achieved through the programs I have just discussed.

At the beginning of this calendar year we had 128 wings operational, 116 of which are apportioned among our 3 major combat elements: the Strategic Air Command, the Tactical Air Command, and the Air Defense Command. This force is supported by nearly

300 major bases in this country and overseas.

In the Strategic Air Command, which is our most powerful agent of deterrence, we have today the ability to destroy an enemy's warmaking capacity and his will to fight.

In the Tactical Air Command we have a highly mobile light bomber and fighter-bomber force that can destroy enemy troop concentrations and lines of communications and can employ atomic weapons. These units can also—from forward bases and by refueling—supplement strategic strikes against interior targets with their atomic armament.

In the Continental Air Defense Command we have a constantly increasing capability to detect, intercept, and destroy invading bomber aircraft before they reach our vital target centers. Behind a network of radar which guards our northern approaches and coastal flanks, our manned interceptors, such as those here at Truax and the Army anti-aircraft missiles and artillery are ready for instant action against an attacker. The Navy as well as the Army plays an important part in our air defense.

Troop carrier and Military Air Transport Service supplement each other in providing tactical airlift for the Army and an overseas lift to meet the D-day requirements for all the services. The Military Air Transport Service, comprising more than 500 4-engine aircraft, is extremely useful in serving our forces overseas in peacetime and is necessary to meet the logistic requirements of modern warfare.

Your Air Force is making progress in bringing advanced aircraft and weapons into operational units. Its combat potential is expanding. We should not, however, for a moment be complacent about our situation or our program. We have unsolved problems. We have need to reexamine requirements frequently. We are strong today. We must be alert to stay strong for tomorrow. We must move ahead fast in developing new and improved air weapons and in converting them rapidly into operational use. For this task we are fortunate in the experience and wisdom of our Chief of Staff, General Twining, of Secretary Quarles, the Secretary of Defense, and our Commander in Chief, the President.

We Must Not Forget the Polish People

SPEECH
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, on May 3 the free people of the world pay homage to Polish Constitution Day, which the Poles themselves are prevented from observing because of the Communist conspiracy that presently dominates their land. Since the current tactical maneuvers of the Soviet Union are leading people to expect some changes in its policies toward the satellite countries, it would be well to examine the situation with reference to Poland.

The Polish Constitution was brought into force on May 3, 1791—just 2 years after our own, and was inspired by the same faith in freedom. Shortly thereafter Poland was again occupied by a foreign aggressor and remained occupied until 1918. The freedom after World War I was short-lived because the conspiracy of Hitler and Stalin showed its first fruits in the brutal partition of Poland. Stalin—and now his heirs—have prevented Poland from regaining its freedom until today.

But what of Soviet Russia's new tactics—their talk of reducing tensions and of peaceful coexistence? There are some palace revolutions occurring in Poland these days which follow the pattern of Moscow itself in removing those Communists of the Stalin cult. These changes, rather than giving the people their rights, are merely shifting the rank of certain Communists.

When Boleslaw Bierut, chairman of the Polish Communist Central Committee, died recently, the world wondered who would succeed him as the top Polish Communist. His successor was Edward Ochab, whose previous record forecasts little change for the better.

But throughout the Communist domination the gallant Poles have never lost hope of eventually realizing their legitimate ambitions for independence and the right to form a government in accord with the popular will of the people. All the information we have confirms the fact that the Poles are as bitterly opposed to communism as they were to any foreign domination.

These people must not be allowed to lose hope. They must feel certain that we who still hold freedom dear have not forgotten them. They need such reassurance that we are giving in the Congress today. And you may feel certain that our words and sentiments circulate rapidly through the Polish nation.

While being cautious of the Soviet Union's new tactics, we can still utilize them. Let us repeat over and over again that we are awaiting some positive results of their propaganda words. Let us encourage the enslaved peoples to maintain their pressures on their Soviet rulers. Eventually the irresistible forces that topple all tyrants must sweep the Communist conspiracy out of every corner of the earth.

Political Stress on Domestic Issues Threatens United States International Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith an editorial which appeared in the April 23, 1956, issue of Export Trade and Shipper magazine:

POLITICAL STRESS ON DOMESTIC ISSUES THREATENS UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL FUTURE

A substantial marginal percentage of United States exports in the past 10 years has been made possible only because of dollars which were available to foreign buyers through grants and loans of United States taxpayers' funds, Government expenditures for offshore procurement, and similar temporary means. And as such expenditures are further reduced, as must be the case if only gradually, the volume of United States exports must inevitably decline unless there is a compensating increase of United States tourist expenditures—and of United States imports.

Given a reasonable break, over a period of years, it is not only conceivable but probable that aggregate dollar earnings of other countries will increase enough to pay not only for the present volume of United States exports, but to permit a gradual increase of exports to new high levels. But will we be given a reasonable break? This depends largely on the attitude of our own lawmakers in Washington.

The administration, ever since the President's message of March 30, 1954, has been pressing for foreign economic and trade policies based on a realistic approach to international economic conditions. The Congress last year grudgingly granted a small part of this program, in the form of a seriously emasculated H. R. 1. The only progress this year is represented by approval by a majority of the House Ways and Means Committee of H. R. 5550, now awaiting clearance by the Rules Committee for action on the floor.

Much more is involved in this situation, however, than the future of American exports, important as they are. The underdeveloped areas of the world are clamoring for economic development, for industrial plant and equipment, for technical aid. To the extent that United States capital goods manufacturers can supply the equipment, they will be pretty well assuring for themselves a future market, both for replacement and future expansion.

But the ability of United States producers to supply the capital-goods needs of the Far and Middle East, Africa, and Latin America, depends in the last analysis on the future availability of dollar payment; and by law, even the credit facilities made available by Eximbank must be predicated on sound banking practices in appraising the future ability of the concerned country to pay in United States dollars.

Here is where the Communist trade drive is threatening economic penetration of the underdeveloped areas. By accepting goods in payment, barter transactions in fact, they have a strong tactical advantage over us and over other free world nations. Already a number of the concerned countries are strongly neutralist, others are veering in that direction, and from neutralism it is not a very long jump into some form of economic association with the Communist bloc.

Meanwhile what are we doing to counter the Red offensive? At the very least, Congress is dragging its feet on H. R. 5550, on H. R. 6040, and on every other phase of the President's program to liberalize our international trade policies. Solicitude for domestic minority groups is blinding many Congressmen to the international threat that hangs over us. And grossly exaggerated emphasis on the income of the uneconomic fringe of our farm population continues to result in overproduction of many crops, which we are dumping under Public Law 480 and in other subsidized ways, in competition with the production of many of those very countries to which the Soviets are making enticing overtures.

Nobody can deny that there is a farm problem—due in large part to too many farmers working too much marginal land. Nor do we deny that acceptance of more imports of quite a few varieties would probably force temporarily painful shifts, of labor and capital, in certain industries. In shooting wars the price of victory has been the lives of many thousands of American boys. Are some readjustments in our domestic economy too great a sacrifice, too high a price, for victory in an economic war?

Election year politics have involved severe criticism of the Department of State, both by Democrats and isolationist-protectionist bloc Republicans, on the grounds of bad judgment in the handling of international problems. Without entering into this debate, we would emphasize that the real threat by the Communists today is on the economic front, and the glaring weakness of our international relations has derived in major part from our failure to adapt our foreign economic policies to the modern international economic environment.

This failure cannot be laid at the feet of the Department of State or any other administrative agency. The blame rests squarely on the Congress, or at least on that considerable number of Senators and Representatives who have persisted in allowing the clamor of pressure groups, within their constituencies, to deafen them to the deterioration of America's international position—for which they have themselves to blame.

The cost of rational foreign economic policy, in terms of internal economic adjustments, would be small indeed as compared with the sheer calamity to America if Communist economic penetration should succeed in driving a further wedge between us and that third of the world's entire population which exists—some barely exist—in the politically sensitive underdeveloped areas of the world today.

To Protect the Welfare Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was very much impressed with the editorial applause given the Senate Subcommittee on Welfare and Pension Funds headed by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois.

Senator DOUGLAS has done a commendable job in this field and I wish to include the following editorial from the April 27, 1956, issue of the Illinois Tradesman as part of my remarks. The editorial follows:

TO PROTECT THE WELFARE FUNDS

In an era when all too many congressional committees have resorted to headline-hunting and vaudeville performances, the conduct of the Senate Subcommittee on Welfare and Pension Funds—headed by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS [Democrat, Illinois]—has been exemplary and constructive.

The committee has looked into the handling of these funds with an impartial and objective approach. It has looked not only at malfeasance and some bad practices by business firms but at the lessons to be learned from the great number of honestly administered welfare and pension funds.

It has found, for instance, that over 75 million Americans are directly covered or affected by the funds that have been developed in recent years. It has acknowledged the necessity of Federal legislation to insure their sound operation and to protect the rights and equities of individuals.

Average Americans who get their information from the daily papers are apt to have the seriously wrong impression that, because corruption makes news and honesty and integrity are rarely given public appreciation, all welfare funds are mishandled.

This misconception, to the extent that it is believed by sections of the public, is a serious danger, because millions of working Americans have benefited from the welfare and pension funds—in many cases established by unions and management through collective bargaining.

The AFL–CIO will strongly support most of the Douglas subcommittee recommendations. We have pointed out, in resolution and in speech, that welfare funds are a sacred trust, and that their handling must meet the highest ethical standards. Basic legislation designed to protect the workers' equities while leaving flexibility in the collective bargaining area will be welcomed by decent unions, decent management and the public.

Senator DOUGLAS, who has always set a high standard of legislative activity, has, through the work of his committee, once again performed a great public service.

What-For of Loose Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, as an ardent supporter of the McCarran-Walter Act, I include as a part of my remarks an article by George Todt which appeared in the Valley Times, San Fernando Valley, Calif., of April 10, 1956:

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION—WHAT-FOR OF LOOSE IMMIGRATION?

The Supreme Court of the United States repeatedly has held that no alien has the "right" to come to this country, and that it is an inherent aspect of sovereignty of any nation to control the admission of aliens.

There are at least four groups working overtime inside America to destroy the McCarran-Walter Act who blithely ignore what the Supreme Court has held to be correct. They are (1) professional politicians who would sell out American interests in return for minority bloc votes; (2) professional immigration promoters; (3) pinks and sincere but misguided "liberals," and (4) out and out Reds.

Most of the "bleeding hearts" who rail against the Immigration and Nationality Act, or McCarran-Walter Act as it has come to be known, all too often betray abject ignorance of its provisions. Their inspired "arguments" usually consist mainly of emotional diatribes against straw men. Prominent in their harangues are such explosive items as "racism," "discrimination," and "arbitrary actions." High-powered pressure groups spread their slanted propaganda with greater effect than it deserves. This is only accomplished at all because a large segment of the mass communications media in America is always to be found at the beck and call of the selfish and unfeeling conspirators who would sell Joe Doakes into the future bondage of collective—and veddy, veddy Socialist—world government. Their aim is to turn America into an international dumping ground for the world's surplus people.

Now just what are some pertinent facts which concern this matter in reality? In the first place, most of us may be in for a shocking surprise. Competent experts estimate that there are already 5 million illegal immigrants in the United States today. Perhaps it is more appropriately time for a head count—and subsequent roundup—of those who have unlawfully sneaked inside this Nation in defiance of her laws and duly constituted national sovereignty.

It would also be interesting to learn what number of bona fide American citizens in the ranks of labor are out of work today—or on welfare rolls—because they cannot obtain the jobs which are presently being held down by these 5 million of unlawful residents on our soil. These outlaws—for that is precisely what they are—should be swiftly rounded up and sent to their homelands before there is any further loose talk of bringing in additional droves of refugees and displaced persons about the globe.

Those who yell loudest for increased immigration above and beyond the McCarran-Walter Act usually pose as the great friends of labor. Yet it becomes increasingly difficult to see how hordes of cheap workers flooding into this country can have any beneficial effect upon the American working man—in or out of unions. As long as there are millions of unemployed here—why bring in more bodies by the millions to seek nonexistent jobs?

The McCarran-Walter Act was passed overwhelmingly over the veto of former President Harry S. Truman in 1952. A special committee of the Senate had spent 4 years in working out details of the bill. A tremendous amount of study, research, and investigations went into the finished product. As it was written, it was endorsed by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Department of Justice, the Visa Division, and other interested divisions of the Department of State, by the Central Intelligence Agency, and by other executive departments. More than 100 patriotic, civic, and religious organizations gave the bill their unstinted endorsement. The only opposition came from the American Committee for the Foreign Born and from the National Lawyers Guild, both of which have been cited by the Attorney General and the House Committee on Un-American Activities as Communist fronts.

Actually, the McCarran-Walter Act excludes, without partiality, Fascists, Nazis, and Communists from this country—and it would be difficult for any fair-minded person to see how it could have been written with any greater degree of fairness than was incorporated within its provisions. The hysterical, emotion-packed propaganda against it today stems, in largest measure, from those giddy do-gooders who insist that the rich Americans owe the rest of the world its living—at United States taxpayer expense.

We should have for ourselves either an effective immigration system, or none at all. If the latter philosophy is to prevail—why, then, tear down the bars and allow anybody to come here who wishes to do so. Such an invasion by the international dissatisfied set would quickly accomplish the destruction of the traditional American way of life in short order and impoverish our citizens, but so what? Our one-worlders would be happy, wouldn't they? What could really be more important than this?

Petition Opposing Alcoholic Beverage Advertising in Interstate Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, it is my pleasure to submit herewith, for the RECORD, a petition which I have received from the members of the Alabama

Woman's Christian Temperance Union in my district:

PETITION

To our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition you to exercise the proper discretion vested in you by passing legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air, a practice which nullifies the rights of the States under the 21st amendment to control the sale of such beverages. At a time when 1 out of 10 drinkers is becoming an alcoholic there should be no encouragement to increase the use of such beverages. Children and youth are being misled to consider them harmless, especially by the powerful audio and visual suggestions of radio and television.

Mrs. H. F. Bryan, Mrs. W. M. Key, Sr., Mrs. Madge L. Craig, Mrs. R. L. Byars, Mrs. K. C. Gilbert, Mrs. J. G. Campbell, Mrs. A. Patterson, Mrs. J. L. Smith, Mrs. D. J. Duffee, Mrs. L. M. Smith, Mr. T. W. Ward, Mrs. A. W. Baker, Mrs. R. H. Outlaw, Mrs. J. D. Norman, Mrs. Wallace Norman, Mrs. C. S. Sherman, Mrs. E. K. Ross, Mrs. C. E. Allen, Mrs. A. W. Holmberg, Mrs. J. J. Chisolm, Mrs. B. B. Gillespie, Mrs. H. H. Murdock, Mrs. J. E. Dillard, Mrs. A. R. Allen, Mrs. P. A. Morgan, Mrs. V. Pennington, Mrs. Bertha Wallis, Mrs. W. A. Coggin, Mrs. Joel Appleby, Mrs. Lizzie Lumpkin, Mrs. Katherine Truss, Mrs. E. R. Ferguson, Mrs. A. D. Spiegle, Mrs. W. B. Norton, Mrs. Ernest B. Box, Mrs. Bessie Thornhill, Mrs. H. H. Vann, Mrs. A. C. Lee, Mrs. W. H. Savage, Mrs. Marjorie Geno, Mrs. E. T. Etheredge, Mrs. G. S. Theros, Mrs. Alice N. Coleman, Mrs. Zula Roper, Mrs. A. E. Whitehouse, Mrs. Kate Boyle, Mrs. G. D. Shubert, Mrs. W. H. Sharp, Mrs. Catherine Dillard.

GOP's Espousal of Soil Bank Is Tinged With Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Republican administration's sudden espousal of a soil-bank program presents an interesting case history in political expediency. Newspaper columnist Drew Pearson in his May 5, 1956, column covers some of the history of the administration's reversal of position on a soil-bank bill.

I was interested in Mr. Pearson's analysis because I introduced an acreage conservation bill—H. R. 5942—last year on May 2, 1955. My bill is a soil-bank bill.

The administration and its Department of Agriculture opposed my bill as late as November of 1955 for the same reasons that it opposed the Honorable FRED MARSHALL'S bill. In essence, the administration's opposition to a soil-bank program was that it would be too costly.

However, as the second session of this Congress approached, the Republican administration became frantic over declining farm income. It had to hit on some gimmick to regain lost ground with hard-hit farmers. The soil-bank plan looked good to the Republicans, so they clasped the program to their bosoms with fervor. In addition, the administration wanted pre-payments—borrowing on next year's income—so that money would be paid out before elections.

The administration has also overemphasized what a soil-bank bill will do. In the newspaper ads that were run in the newspapers by Republicans during the month of February an effort was made to create the impression that immediate passage of a soil bank would put hundreds of millions of dollars in farmers' hands by spring planting time. The newspaper ads did not point out that this would be replacement income and not new or additional farm income.

I believe that farmers saw through the ad, and that explains why so few ballots were sent in to support the Republican's appeal for action. I know that the number of ballots my office received was less than two dozen.

Here is the full text of Mr. Pearson's column on the administration's attitude toward the soil bank:

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND—BENSON REJECTED SOIL-BANK PLAN

(By Drew Pearson)

The backstage maneuvering over a farm bill have been happening with such lightning speed that the press, let alone the public, can't keep up with it. Seldom, however, has politics been so wrapped up in any legislation, even in an election year.

With dire reports coming from the farm belt following Ike's veto of the farm bill, the Republicans were almost frantic in their desire to pass something to put immediate cash in the farmer's pocket. Secretary of Agriculture Benson was also frantic in his desire to get credit for the soil bank.

Appearing before the House Agriculture Committee, Benson was asked by Chairman HAROLD COOLEY, North Carolina Democrat:

"Mr. Secretary, you have presented something you call the soil bank. But you overlook the fact that in 1934 we spent $637 million starting to build up the soil of this country. And from that year on, we continued to build up the soil. Every year that you've been in office, however, you have asked us for less and less money for soil. You asked us last year for $175 million and we voted you $250 million.

"And now suddenly you want what you call a soil bank.

"I remember last February," continued COOLEY, "I wrote you a letter asking you in detail about setting aside an acreage reserve in the form of a soil bank. And you kept my letter from February until July. Then, after conferring with all your assistants, you finally answered that it was too expensive and impractical.

PREELECTION BONUS

"Now, can you tell me today," concluded COOLEY, "one authority you need for a soil bank that you don't already have in the bill passed 20 years ago by the Democrats?"

Benson turned to his lawyers for advice. Before they could answer, COOLEY continued:

"I can think of two—authority to make long-term contracts with farmers and authority to protect the future basic allotments of farmers.

"All right," said COOLEY, "you send me in writing the authority you need and we'll pass it."

Benson, however, didn't warm up to the idea at all. He wanted a brandnew bill. The White House also asked for authority to make advance payments to farmers out of the soil-bank program to the tune of $500 million.

This pre-election bonus outraged Democratic leaders in general and Congressman JAMIE WHITTEN, of Mississippi, in particular.

"If a Democratic President were to recommend paying the farmer part of his 1957 income in 1956, just before the November election, as Eisenhower has recommended," observed WHITTEN, "the press would carry big headlines accusing the Democrats of trying to borrow the farm vote—which incidently would be borrowing it with the farmer's own money loaned against his own next year's depleted income."

BRANNAN PLAN

His dander up, WHITTEN called his Appropriations Subcommittee and O. K.'d a $1,200,000,000 appropriation based on the old Henry Wallace soil-bank bill which had been on the statute books for 20 years. This would have given an immediate payment instead of borrowing against the future.

The House Rules Committee, however, rejected the appropriation on the ground that the Henry Wallace law needed amendments.

COOLEY offered a 29-line amendment to the Henry Wallace soil bank law which brought it completely up to date.

Republicans, however, refused to accept it. What they wanted was not a modernized revamped Democratic bill, but a new bil bearing the trade mark of Benson and Eisenhower.

After counting noses, the Demorcatic high command figured it was short 20 House Republicans necessary to pass the Whitten-Cooley soil plan.

So overnight, COOLEY proposed a modified Brannan plan with a subsidy to farmers.

"If you want to put money in the farmers' pocket," he told Republicans, "let's do it outright without any subterfuge. Let's not borrow from their next year's income.

"You already have a Brannan plan for wool, a crop chiefly raised by the big Republican sheepmen of Utah and Wyoming," argued COOLEY. "And Benson is supporting sugar at 98 percent of parity—a crop highly important to his State of Utah. So let's be fair and vote the Brannan plan for other crops."

There were howls of protest from Republicans, however, and the modified Brannan plan was dropped.

The Impact of Population and Industrial Growth on Our Nation's Metropolitan Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address of Mr. LeRoy D. Owen, of Los Angeles, Calif., president, Society of Industrial Realtors, before the 31st annual meeting of the American Industrial Development Council, San Francisco, April 12, 1956.

Mr. Owen, in his notable address, stresses that sober reflection must be given to the shifting sands of our popu-

lation and the impact it is creating on our metropolitan areas in various parts of the United States. A sound balance between the Nation's industry and agriculture is essential to our economic stability.

He further points out that if our social and economic structure is to remain stable and sound, we must spread our constantly and rapidly increasing population throughout the country and prevent the concentration of population in the metropolitan areas and in certain States. This ever-growing and shifting population should be distributed more equitably, if we are to prevent the neglect and abandonment of the development of our natural resources which these people are leaving behind in the States that are being vacated.

Mr. Owen's statement is obviously the result of profound thought and study, and in my judgment merits careful consideration:

THE IMPACT OF POPULATION AND INDUSTRIAL GROWTH ON OUR NATION'S METROPOLITAN AREAS

When Mr. Clawson, your program chairman, invited me to speak at this conference of the American Industrial Development Council I was delighted to accept. There is much in common between your organization and the one which I have the honor to represent—the Society of Industrial Realtors.

Today the memberships of both the council and SIR are composed of industrial development representatives of railroads, utility companies, real estate managers of large corporations, representatives of banks, chambers of commerce, and State industrial development commissions.

Many SIR's, particularly among our associate membership, are also members of the American Industrial Development Council. This similarity of membership indicates a mutual and common interest in the purposes of both organizations. Your members and those of SIR have a definite interest in the orderly development of industrial enterprises.

I should like to talk to you briefly today on the subject, The Impact of Population and Industrial Growth on Our Nation's Metropolitan Areas. It is a definite problem which confronts us.

It is my belief that we as citizens of the United States are not giving enough thought to this subject and therefore it behooves such organizations as the AIDC and the SIR, along with all similar organizations, to pinpoint the facts in the hope that constructive future planning will bring beneficial results to our Nation and prevent undue deterioration of our metropolitan areas.

There are three facets which must be considered.

1. The rapid growth in population of our metropolitan areas, namely, New York City, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, the bay area of San Francisco and Oakland, and Los Angeles.

2. The growing menace of traffic congestion with its slaughter of Americans on our highways, and, lastly

3. The agricultural problem, occasioned by the falling off of farm income, overproduction and maldistribution of agricultural products.

Presently, it is estimated that there are approximately 165 million people in the United States. In 1975 it is estimated this figure will be over 221 million, an increase of 35 percent.

We are not giving proper attention to the problems occasioned by this growing population and the shifts which are taking place. Farm population dropped 3½ percent from 1953 to 1954.

Thirty-one and one-half million persons moved during the year ending April 1955. Of this group 22.1 percent were rural, nonfarm, or suburban residents.

Stanford Research Institute in August 1955 completed an intensive study of population trends in the United States through 1975. This report is not only factual and enlightening, but, if the deductions are sound, it is a forceful warning of difficulties ahead for many sections of our Nation.

The Pacific region—Washington, Oregon, California—has had by far the highest inmigration among the regions of the United States, averaging about 330,000 per year from 1940 to 1954. The estimated annual in-migration from 1955 to 1975 for the region will be 364,000. Estimated population in 1975—29,439,000, an increase of 75.9 percent over 1954.

The East South Central region comprises the States of Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, and Alabama. From 1940 to 1954 these States lost population by out-migration of over 125,000 per year. The estimated annual out-migration from 1955 to 1975 for this region is 138,000 people. Estimated population in 1975—13,100,000, an increase of only 12.1 percent over 1954.

When we recall that the overall population increase for the United States is estimated at 35 percent from 1954 to 1975 these figures, for these two regions; namely, the Pacific and the East South Central States, are startling and point to problems ahead.

Our major cities are growing. In recent years the rate has stepped up decidedly. Pressures due to population growth have increased to such an extent that our people should be concerned. No metropolitan area is free from these problems:

1. Traffic congestion.
2. Increased taxation.
3. Lack of adequate school facilities.
4. Increasing blight of downtown areas.
5. Concern as to changing property values.
6. A growing crime rate and juvenile delinquency.

This concentration of population in our metropolitan areas is a severe drain on our national income, a challenge to our economy, our present efficiency, our know-how.

Traffic congestion in our metropolitan areas is taking millions of productive hours from our economy. Greater mobility is necessary, but there is grave doubt that it can be obtained. In many cities it is physically impossible, the cost too great.

Traffic congestion in major urban centers requires special consideration. A general highway program can ease the urban problem somewhat if it provides new bypass highways around urban centers. But the solution to urban traffic congestion requires much more than this.

Involved are all the possibilities of traffic engineering and the use of different modes of mass transportation.

In 1920 there were 9 million motor vehicles registered in the United States. Today there are about 60 million. By 1965, conservatively, there will be 81 million.

It is estimated the Nation is spending about $40 billion each year to get people and things from place to place by motor transportation, an amount which is about one-tenth of the value of all goods and services provided in the Nation each year.

The Citizens Traffic Safety Board of New York has recently estimated that traffic delays have cost its citizens more than $1 billion a year, which included wages estimated at $350 million.

In Chicago a few years ago buses were stationary 20 percent of their trip time; now they are stationary 40 percent of the time, due to traffic delays.

This result is inevitable when we try to force thousands of automobiles and trucks on city streets, of the same original width which accommodated the horse and buggy vehicles of our youth. Our cities are out of date, made so by the automobile.

An improved national highway system, one advocated by President Eisenhower, will help bring a liquidity in the movement of people, which will tend to assist our metropolitan areas.

Distance is less important than time. A realistic highway system in the United States will create time and serve our population well, protect metropolitan property values, and assist in curtailing the shameful slaughter and maiming of our citizens through traffic accidents, which, in 1955, killed nearly 38,500 people; with an estimated cost for medical bills, property damage, and other expenses of nearly $5 billion.

In thos sections of our country where improved highways have been constructed dividends from benefits have been large.

Agricultural areas have been brought closer to the metropolitan centers. Time has been saved in moving products to the cities. Industry has moved from the metropolitan areas to rural communities with sufficient land for future expansion at sensible prices. Employees have ideal living conditions near their employment, free from traffic congestion.

Rural communities profit through this partnership with industry, taxes are tempered, out-migration of people is not a necessity because of new employment, and generally the economy of the community is stabilized.

Recently, we contacted our associate members, representing Chrysler, General Motors, and Westinghouse, to inquire as to their company's experience in locating plants in rural areas. Within recent years 22 plants have been located in farming communities and employ 32,400 people. These moves have proven sound, both from the standpoint of industry and the community where these plants have been located. Certainly, it has been beneficial to our metropolitan areas, with no loss sustained.

I have corresponded with Secretary of Agriculture Benson and enjoyed a luncheon date in Washington with Undersecretary True D. Morse relative to the pending farm bill in Congress and more particularly to the proposed soil bank program.

This program asks the farmer to refrain from planting or utilizing all of his land, and to curtail production. This approach is not typical American. It is contrary to the spirit of our people. It is a negative approach to solving the problem. It is an economic waste to permit land or buildings to remain idle or vacant. It is unsound to discharge productivity of any kind.

I have suggested to Secretary Benson that it should be brought forcefully to the attention of those both in rural and metropolitan areas the desirability of encouraging the establishment of industrial plants in rural areas in close proximity to metropolitan centers.

This is a positive approach for the utilization of land which might become a part of the soil bank and tend, even in a small measure, to improve the agricultural situation on a permanent basis.

Land, considered for the soil bank, might well be used for industrial development and thus create additional income for the farmer from rent or through the sale of a portion of his property.

The establishment of industrial plants in rural areas creates employment for our agricultural population, with an increasing number of available hours for nonfarm labor due to mechanization of agricultural pursuits.

Industries may purchase rural property at reasonable prices to meet present and future demands. Current high prices of industrial property in metropolitan areas is a present deterrent to industrial development.

Employees welcome the opportunity of working in rural areas which provide fine residential subdivisions within easy access—free from traffic congestion—to their employment, and an opportunity to enjoy living advantages not obtainable in metropolitan areas.

You may be interested in Secretary Benson's response to the above comments and suggestions. He rightfully points out that a sound balance between the Nation's industry and agriculture is essential to economic stability. He is of the opinion that the rural-development program, which President Eisenhower recently described as "soundly conceived and basic approach toward solving a highly important social and economic problem," is a step forward in the permanent solution of economic stresses in many sections of our country.

"An important objective of the rural development program is increased industry in rural areas and encouragement of an economy in which farmers supplement their incomes through work off the farm." The Department of Agriculture, "using facilities of the Federal Government" is endeavoring to aggressively encourage "farm, business, and other local leadership in trade area and community development programs.

"Over 20 States have now taken the lead in the rural-development program through organization and planning for work in one or more counties in each State."

He concludes with this statement: "Rural development is the concern of the business and industrial as well as the agricultural community. In many rural areas of extremely low income, better agriculture and more efficient farms are only half the answer; industry, vocational training in nonagricultural skills, better management of community resources must proceed parallel to improvement in agriculture."

I readily admit that I am confused. Certainly I do not have the answer to the surplus with which we are confronted. I'm convinced it is due to Federal tampering of basic economic principles some year ago and I believe Secretary Benson and President Eisenhower are sincerely trying to correct a difficult condition which exists in our agricultural regions.

After analyzing population figures, the movement of people from one section to another, the growth of our metropolitan areas, the increase of population in many States—notably in the West—and, at the same time, the continued loss of population in other States—notably Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama and Mississippi—what basic conclusions do we reach?

As I see them, perhaps they can be enumerated as follows:

1. The population growth of the United States with estimates indicating a population in 1975 approaching over 221 million people is certain to require good planning to eliminate maladjustments.

2. If the social and economic structure of the United States is to remain stable and sound, we must spread this growing population throughout the country and prevent the concentration of population in metropolitan centers and certain States.

3. We should give more attention to the development of natural resources of those States which are rapidly losing population to encourage the establishment of industry in those States to provide a livelihood for the people and otherwise discourage them from seeking new homes to insure a better way of life.

4. Recognizing that people will move from place to place and that it will be difficult to control the growth of our cities in certain States, we must be alert in providing those necessities which are essential to accommodate the people in these areas. This involves a realistic and practical development of our transportation and communication facilities. More highways and more mass transportation facilities will be needed. The decentralization of industry should be encouraged, away from our cities, and adjacent to residential areas, to eliminate transportation as much as possible on our highways.

A realistic zoning plan, with due regard to residential, commercial, and industrial property, is most important for the future protection of any growing community.

Careful planning is needed to insure a well-balanced economy between industrial and residential areas which will spread the tax load, and, in turn, make it possible to provide essential utilities such as sewers, water, power, and adequate school systems.

I hope that you as members of AIDC will agree with me in some of the thoughts expressed today. Your council, the Society of Industrial Realtors and other business and civic organizations can well give thought to the ever-changing conditions which confront our people. If we so direct our energies sincerely we shall make a definite contribution to the welfare of this great Nation.

Origin of Christian Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH P. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mrs. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Mr. Willard E. Edwards which appeared in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin on December 31, 1955. Mr. Edwards is the originator of the perpetual calendar. He informs me that the question of amendments to our calendar is on the agenda of the United Nations Economic and Social Council. The article follows:

ORIGIN OF CHRISTIAN TIME

(By Willard E. Edwards, originator of the perpetual calendar)

Dionysius Exiguus is credited with introducing, between A. D. 525 and 533, the system of reckoning years according to a Christian era. He computed the incarnation of Christ as March 25, 753 A. U. C., the date of the vernal equinox at that time, and March 25 is still celebrated as Lady Day or Annunciation Day.

He took the date of birth as 9 months and 7 days after the incarnation date. This placed the Nativity on December 31 at the end of the Roman year 753.

To calculate the birthdate anniversary for A. D. 525, Dionysius took the date of the vernal equinox, March 20 in that year, and again added 280 days. He thus obtained December 25 as the 525th anniversary, and December 25 has been used ever since as the fixed date for Christmas. It was first made a legal holiday in Rome in A. D. 534.

Dionysius also fixed March 25 as the beginning of the Christian year in order to commemorate the incarnation. This practice continued in general use until the Gregorian calendar reform in 1582. It also continued in legal use until 1752 in England and in America. We find the Latin dating expression "Anno incarnationis Dominicae"—in the year of our Lord's incarnation. We also find "Anno ab incarnatione Domini nostri Jesu Christi primo"—in the first year of our Lord Jesus Christ from the incarnation. The latter expression is usually shortened to "Anno Domini primo."

Without doubt, the incarnation is one of the most important tenets of the Christian Church. It therefore seems certain that Dionysius definitely intended the Christian era to begin on March 25, 753 A. U. C. to commemorate this important event.

(The designation A. U. C. is from Ab Urbe Condita, or Anno Urbis Conditae, and means dating from the founding of the city of Rome.)

However, some chronologists reject the incarnation date. Possibly they are non-Christians, or perhaps nonbelievers in the incarnation. In any case, they take the day following the calculated birthdate of Jesus as the beginning of the era. This date is January 1, 754 A. U. C. It is accepted as January 1, A. D. 1, and therein lies a discrepancy.

MEASURING TIME AND DISTANCE

In measuring time from any reference point, one year is not accomplished until 12 full months have elapsed. It is reasonable to assume that Dionysius was well aware of this fact and that he called the incarnation year merely "the first year." It is also reasonable to believe that he called the anniversary date of March 25, 754 A. U. C. the beginning of the second year, or "the year one." See the accompanying chart.

Ordinal numbers indicate the order in a series, as 1st, 2d, 3d, etc. Cardinal numbers tell how many, as 1, 2, 3, or I, II, III, etc. In the dating of years, Roman cardinal numerals should not be read as ordinals. Anno I Domini, or A. D. I, should be read "in the year one of our Lord." It includes the period between the end of the first year and the end of the second year, counted from the incarnation.

Counting from the beginning of A. D. 1 is the same as counting from the beginning of the second year. For instance, it is agreed that from January 1, A. D. 1 to January 1, A. D. 1956 is 1955 years. Still 1956 is the 1956th year only if January 1, A. D. 1 is used as the starting point.

Such a system is equivalent, in measuring distance, to saying that from the 1-inch mark on a ruler to the 11-inch mark is 10 inches. Yet from the 11-inch mark to the 12-inch mark is the 11th inch only if we start measuring from the 1-inch mark.

WE START COUNTING FROM ZERO

However, it is convenient and logical to start measuring from the zero point on a ruler, 1 inch before the 1-inch mark. See any engineer's scale. We both count and measure from zero, not from one. The first or prime meridian through Greenwich is the zero meridian. Zero is a real number, 1 less than 1, and is correctly shown as the first numeral (0, 1, 2, 3, etc.).

But whether zero is shown on a ruler or merely understood, we customarily start measuring from the beginning of the scale markings. We do not start from the 1-inch mark.

And so it is with counting or measuring time. We start counting the daily hours with and from zero or 0000, the beginning of the day or the zero hours. We do not start measuring or counting hours from 1 a. m. or 0100. Neither is there any logical reason for starting to count the years of the Christian era from the year A. D. 1.

After 1 hour has elapsed, we can record the figure 1 or 0100. After 1 year has elapsed, we can record the figure 1 or A. D. 1. This is the logical way to count or record time, whether it is in units of hours, days, years, or centuries.

The first day of each year could also be called the zero day, or January 0, a day apart from any week. This New Year's Day holiday, followed by 52 even weeks, would allow our annual calendar to become fixed and perpetual.

This is proposed in the perpetual calendar, a plan now being studied for possible international adoption by the United Nations.

There is nothing to be gained by cherishing or defending a mistake, misunderstanding, or outmoded custom of the past. Having two systems of counting time is confusing and contrary to reason. Counting years from the year 1 is an awkward and misunderstood way of reckoning.

It seems certain that Dionysius Exiguus did not intend the designation A. D. 1 to be used for the first year of the Christian era. He was a scholar, a theologian, and an astronomer. Although he made a mistake of 4 years in calculating the Nativity, it is extremely doubtful that he started counting from the year one.

DATING FROM THE INCARNATION

He dated the beginning of the Christian era (Christ on earth) from the Incarnation. His first year was from March 25, 753 A. U. C. to March 25, 754 A. U. C. He called March 25, 754 A. U. C. the beginning of the second year, or A. D. 1, because that was 1 year after his calculated incarnation date. This second year (A. D. 1) was from March 25, 754 A. U. C. to March 25, 755 A. U. C.

Dionysius deserves more credit and understanding than he has previously received from chronologists and historians.

Prior to his time January 1 had been used as the beginning of the year. However, Dionysius fixed March 25 as the beginning date to impressively commemorate the Incarnation. This date was then used for over a thousand years, until the Gregorian calendar change was made in 1582.

At that time, the beginning of the Christian year was moved forward 84 days from March 25 to January 1. This allowed the entire year 754 A. U. C., as we now know it, to become recognized as the year A. D. 1. It also allowed a near coincidence between January 1, A. D. 1 and December 31, 753 A. U. C., the latter date being the birthdate of Jesus as calculated by Dionysius.

This caused the mistaken conception of the Christian era beginning with the Nativity and having its first year dated A. D. 1.

It is therefore fitting to recognize Dionysius' beginning date for the era as being moved from March 25, 753 A. U. C. to January 1, 753 A. U. C. This preserves the Incarnation origin and places the dating of our years on a mathematically sound basis. It also reduces to 3 years the error between the new accepted birthdate of Christ (December 31, 749 A. U. C.) and the practical beginning date of the Christian era.

A dating system is intended to show the passage of time from a reference or starting point. January 1, 1956, was the 1,956th anniversary of the Christian era. The era was then 1956 years old, and the year 1956 should be thought of as the 1957th year. Throughout this 1957th year, events will be recorded as occurring in 1956, since the era will not become 1957 years old until January 1, 1957.

Wedding anniversaries are readily understood. When we marry, we are beginning the "zero year," or first year of marriage. After 1 year has elapsed, we have our first wedding anniversary. Its number is anniversary No. 1, the marriage is 1 year old, and we are then beginning the second year. Counting years of the Christian era is no different. The principle is exactly the same.

TIME IS A MEASURABLE DURATION

Dionysius dated the years of the Christian era from the Incarnation. He fixed March 25 as the beginning of the Christian year. The first year was called simply "Anno incarnationis Dominicae"—in the year of our Lord's incarnation, or "Anno Domini primo"—in the first year of our Lord.

After the end of the first year, events in the second year were correctly dated Anno I Domini, or A. D. I. This year date, the year 1, later became incorrectly thought of as "the first year of our Lord."

In recognizing the Christian era as beginning with 753 A. U. C., this first year should never be shown as A. D. 1. It may be shown as A. D i, for "Anno incarnationis Dominicae," or as A D. 1st, for "Anno Domini primo." It may also be correctly shown numerically as A. D. 0, for "the zero year."

The beginning of the Christian year was changed from March 25 to January 1 in 1582. January 1, A. D. 1 then became mistakenly accepted by some as the beginning of the Christian era. This was due to its proximity to the calculated birth of Jesus.

However, evidence points to the wisdom of accepting January 1, A. D. 1 as the first anniversary of the Christian era. Therefore, the beginning date of this era should be recorded as January 1, 753 A. U. C. General agreement on this date will prevent dating confusion. It will not change our numerical A. D. dating, but it will put it on a mathematically sound basis.

Time is a measurable duration, and the years should be recorded exactly as we record wedding anniversaries. January 1, 1956, was the 1956th anniversary of the Christian era. The year 1956 is the 1957th year of this era. The 20th century will then be correctly recorded as beginning with January 1, 1900, and ending with December 31, 1999.

This period is the natural and the popular conception of the century. Let us be rational and consistent in recording the years, especially when it can be done so easily.

A Just Pension for Veterans and Their Widows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter dated May 4, 1956, which I have received from Ray J. Tucker, of Metropolitan Barracks No. 370, Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, McKeesport, Pa., concerning a "just pension" for veterans and their widows:

METROPOLITAN BARRACKS NO. 370,
VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
McKeesport, Pa., May 4, 1956.

Hon. ELMER J. HOLLAND,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: The veterans of World War I wish to call your attention to a condition that is deplorable in this great land of ours.

Veterans of all previous wars of our country have been recognized in their old age, but for some unknown reason, we have become the forgotten man and we insist that corrective measures be started to see that these men and women who were hailed in 1917–18 as the flower of this Nation's youth and as heroes who offered their all on the altar of our country in its hour of need, be given the same just consideration extended all previous war veterans.

We should be given adequate security in our twilight years to enable us to stand shoulder to shoulder with pride and serene dignity among all our fellow citizens. We ask your support to call to the attention of Congress our demands for a just pension, automatically, for every veteran reaching age 60 (without regard to his financial status), and the same pension to his widow when the veteran passes on. We also demand hospitalization when needed for all war veterans, without the pauper's oath and without any discrimination because of the war served.

These are the most urgently needed things at present and must be considered if we are to keep alive the patriotism of future generations. When the growing generation reads of the recommendations of a committee (headed by a general drawing down a generous pension from his country), that veterans be denied pensions, hospitalization, and other benefits, they will be shocked and will look askance at the recruiting ads which stress the gratitude the Nation has for its boys and girls who serve our beloved flag, especially in war.

This attitude at a time when billions are being poured into aid programs for foreign countries (some of which were our enemies in 1917–18 and again in 1941–45) will convince the young blood of our Nation that it is a poor choice for them.

Your consideration and support will be appreciated.

Yours truly,

RAY J. TUCKER.

Salk Vaccine Outlook Still Far From Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks an information article on the Salk vaccine outlook written by Jane Krieger and appearing in the New York Times of April 22, 1956. Throughout the country there are millions of persons deeply interested in this matter.

The article follows:

SALK VACCINE OUTLOOK: STILL FAR FROM ENOUGH—SUPPLY IS LAGGING BEHIND DEMAND AND THE DISTRIBUTION IS UNEVEN

(By Jane Krieger)

The big question about the Salk polio vaccine is no longer whether it is safe but when there will be enough to go around. The best answer the Government's Public Health Service could give last week was that it "hoped" vaccine supplies would be adequate to give most children under 15 and pregnant women at least one shot by July 1.

Why, after a year of commercial production, is the vaccine still in short supply? How much has been produced and where has it gone? Who is eligible to receive it now? How is it being distributed? What are the prospects that you and your family can get the vaccine this year?

CURRENT OUTLOOK

This is the picture as the Public Health Service and the drug manufacturers now see it:

The vaccine shortage: This is due simply to the requirements of production and testing. Polio vaccine cannot be turned out like aspirin. In fact, the Public Health Service says the technical problems inherent in making the Salk vaccine "are among the most complex in the field of large-scale bio-

logic preparations." There is a delicate balance between inactivating the live polio virus used in the vaccine and retaining its ability to produce immunity. The whole process takes about 4 months—including a month and a half for testing. This is not unduly long; it takes about 2 months to make smallpox vaccine, up to 6 months for diphtheria vaccine. But the demand for these drugs is no longer widespread and they can be stockpiled. There hasn't been time yet to stockpile the Salk vaccine; demand is at least twice as great as supply.

Production and use: Since last April 12, when the vaccine was put on the market, 47,127,000 shots have been released by the Public Health Service. Of this, 32,829,000 shots have been allocated to the States and Territories for distribution; 13,723,000 went to the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis which gave them free to 1st and 2d-graders last year; 11,000 were exported and 564,000 went into commercial channels before the Government established distribution controls last May.

MOST 5-TO-9'S

Upward of 20 million youngsters—including almost the entire 5-to-9 age group—have received some vaccine.

Priorities: The Public Health Service recommended last week that the States give priority to children under 15 and expectant mothers. But this is only a recommendation. Each State sets its own priority schedule depending upon the number of children in each age group, the prevalence of polio in its area, and supply and demand. State priorities vary greatly—New York, for example, gives priority to children from 6 months to 15 years; Virginia, to the 1-to-10 group, Washington (where demand has been relatively low) to everyone under 20 and pregnant women.

Distribution: When a batch of vaccine is ready for release, the Public Health Service parcels it out among the States on the basis of child population; each State decides how much of its allocation is to be distributed free and how much through private physicians; the pharmaceutical-house salesmen decide which physicians to sell it to and the physicians decide which patients to sell it to.

Take New York State, for example. The Public Health Service wires Health Commissioner Herman Hilleboe that it is holding 50,000 shots of, say, Lilly vaccine for New York. Commissioner Hilleboe wires back that the State will buy 35,000 shots for free distribution through various public agencies and doctors, and that Lilly's salesmen may sell the rest directly to private New York physicians.

Theoretically, the drug salesmen then sell to doctors on a first-come, first-served basis. But with polio vaccine at a premium, inevitably some salesmen give it to their best customers first and other use it to persuade doctors to buy other products made by their company. Doctors, by and large, are observing the age priorities. But since there is not enough vaccine for everyone who has priority, a doctor may distribute his limited supplies to his best patients first.

FREE DISTRIBUTION

As for free shots, the system varies widely from State to State and even from city to city. New York State distributes roughly 70 percent of its vaccine free and New York City offers one free shot for every pre-school child as long as its supply holds out. Michigan, which has a long tradition of free vaccination, distributes all of its polio vaccine free. So do several Southern States. Iowa, on the other hand, has distributed only 12 percent free; New Jersey, about 47 percent. In many States, county and State medical associations have exerted telling pressure against free vaccine on the ground that it is "socialized medicine."

The prospects: The Public Health Service went haywire on its optimistic supply predictions last year and is not making any more forecasts. Unofficially, however, health men figure that between now and July 1 the vaccine manufacturers should turn out something approaching 25 million doses. That would be enough to give 1 shot to roughly 80 percent of unvaccinated children under 15 and pregnant women.

What it comes down to, then, it this: If you have a family physician your chances of getting the vaccine for your eligible children this summer are better than if you approach a strange doctor. But even your family physician may not be willing to give second shots until all his eligible patients have received their first injection. If your children are 15 or older you will probably not be able to get them the vaccine at least until next winter. As for adults, there are no plans for injecting them until the supply picture has improved radically.

Miami Daily News Urges Prompt Congressional Consideration of H. R. 10469

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on April 12 I introduced H. R. 10469. This bill calls for an orderly gradual termination of the GI home-loan guaranty program which is due to expire July 25, 1957.

It provides for a full 3-year extension of benefits for disabled World War II veterans. All others would receive a 1-month extension for every 2 months of active World War II service, up to a maximum extension of 3 years.

The Miami Daily News, Miami, Fla.'s oldest newspaper, in an editorial April 28, 1956, points up the need for immediate congressional action on extension of the GI home-loan guaranty program. H. R. 10469 accomplishes this and it is now before the Veterans' Affairs Committee. This program has proven to be vitally important to our entire economy. It has profited the entire populace, both veteran and nonveteran alike. I am hopeful that it will receive prompt consideration.

I urge each of the Members to read the editorial which follows:

ACTION IS NEEDED ON GI HOMES BILL

Congress should reach an early determination whether or not to extend the veterans' home loan guaranty program now due to expire in July 1957. Nearly everyone concerned is agreed the program must come to an end some time; the only question is when and how.

As it stands, less than 4 million out of the estimated 15 million World War II veterans have availed themselves of the right to buy homes with Government-guaranteed loans. For veterans of the Korean war housing benefits do not expire until 1965.

Representative DANTE FASCELL, of Miami, has introduced an amendment to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, the so-called GI bill of rights, which would extend the housing benefits for 3 years and provide for an orderly termination of the program. Not all eligible veterans would be given the 3-year extension from July 1957. The extended period would be automatically afforded to all wounded veterans, but the length of extension for others would depend upon service. An additional month would be given for each 2 months of service between September 15, 1940, and July 26, 1947.

The Eisenhower administration is opposed to any extension at all, holding that a reasonable time has already been given veterans to exercise their rights. Proponents of extension argue, however, that the average age of a veteran buying a home has been 32 years. As of the first of this year, there were 2,218,000 veterans under 29.

If there is to be no extension, the fact should be established as far in advance of the expiration date as possible in order to avoid a last-minute rush. An orderly termination such as the Fascell bill proposes would soften the impact of a rush by veterans to get in under the wire. In the case of such a last-minute stampede, builders fear a shortage of homes and appliances resulting in inflationary prices.

It is particularly important to Miami's vast home-building industry that Congress settle the matter at the earliest possible moment.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, friends of Poland celebrate the 165th anniversary of an instrument that marked a milestone in the history of a brave people—the Polish Constitution of 1791. The constitution was an attempt to do away with an outmoded government and replace it with a modern parliamentary system. By instituting drastic reforms it afforded the possibility of sound, progressive national life. In the light of the years which have followed it can be considered one of the greatest achievements in Polish history.

But in celebrating Polish Constitution Day in 1956 the true friends of Poland do not dwell overlong on the victories of the past—they examine the present and look toward the future.

The present times are indeed times of trouble. Poland today has been made the satellite of an ancient enemy, Soviet Russia. It has been subjected to ruthless, thorough, relentless sovietization. It has been flooded with Soviet propaganda, its press forced to reproduce Soviet articles, its moving-picture theaters to exhibit Soviet pictures. Soviet specialists and technicians swarm over Poland. The Polish economy has been twisted and bent to meet Soviet needs. Soviet officials occupy key positions in the army, in the secret police, and in the administration.

The teaching of religion has been suppressed, in line with Communist philosophy. Hundreds of the adherents of religious orders have been thrown into prison. The Catholic Church has been completely subordinated to the sovietized Polish Government. The children

of Poland are being taught to turn their backs on the God of their fathers. They are being made to forget the ancient cultural traditions which have been the glory of their homeland.

But though the present may be dark, the future is not without hope. The year 1956 may, indeed, bring new opportunities for greater freedom undreamed of a short time ago. The latest revelations of the Stalin reign of terror in the U. S. S. R. have turned the spotlight on a fundamental weakness in any regime based on forced labor, oppression, and murder: the dictators' haunting fear of being liquidated, just as they themselves have liquidated others.

Nothing should instill more hope in the hearts of an appressed people than the knowledge that their slave masters are divided amongst themselves. In the words of an old saying "When knaves fall out, true men come to their own."

The heartfelt wish of the American people, and of their representatives in Congress, is that the day may not be far distant when the true, freedom-loving people of Poland "come to their own."

Jonathan Daniels and the "Quiet South"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I believe our school integration crisis tests the real fiber of our country in a way it has not been tested for many years. Too, I am convinced that if the moderates in the South are listened to—men whose first loyalty is to the law, who are not afraid of change, and who seek always to widen the common ground between their followmen—we will work out this problem in a way which will enhance the best traditions of our country.

One of these moderates is Jonathan Daniels who edits the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer. Asked to appraise the segregation problem in his region, Daniels recently recently wrote the letter printed below to his friend Roger W. Remington, of the Bangor (Maine) Daily News:

DEAR ROGER: There are a thousand miles between us but the policy of your Bangor Daily News "to tend to affairs in our own backyard for the most part and not stick our noses into distant regional matters" is pretty much the policy, too, of the News and Observer in Raleigh, N. C.

Yet at the same time I can appreciate your statement that "this segregation thing seems to be burgeoning into something approaching a civil cold war, and so even we Yankees way off in the northeast corner of America have a stake in it." I agree with you.

I think more and more as the tensions grow around this problem in this southern part of the Nation that real national unity today depends upon more national understanding of the problem.

And I have a feeling that somehow we newspapermen, North and South, have failed to a considerable degree in serving that understanding. That ought not to be the case. Someone has said that in recent months there have been more northern newspapermen looking at the problem on the Southern scene than would normally be expected to cover a war. Some of them undoubtedly have come South to find the facts to meet the already fixed views of their editors and readers back North.

They have found what they wanted—and the fault for that lies with some southern factmakers as well as Yankee factfinders.

I believe, however, that the great majority of newspapermen who have come South to cover this story have sought conscientiously to cover the story objectively (whatever that may mean). Unfortunately, the trouble in all the reporting may lie in the journalistic fact which brought all of them southward: That news is conflict, whether it be an affray on State Street in Bangor or a collision between the Russian and American delegates in the United Nations.

If you came now out of Maine into this beautiful southern spring you could certainly find the facts of cold Civil War. There are white southerners of prominence and great articulateness who say that never will they let one Negro child enter one white school.

And you will find, too (not silent) Negro leaders who demand that there be complete intermingling in all the schools tomorrow—or yesterday.

Such white southern leaders readily speak in cold defiance of the law—though the methods they urge are usually devices of evasion rather than those of open and stubborn refusal to comply with the law.

On the other hand, such Negro leaders, confident that the Court is on their side, have too often acted in ways which have incited angers rather than served solutions.

Probably I waste time in telling you about these two groups of active and articulate persons. What they say and do is speeded to Bangor on the news wires—indeed to the last mile of Aroostook and all around the world. What you don't get—and I don't know how you can get it—is the news about the troubled heart of the South. It is troubled and torn. The great mass of white southerners are much like the people of Maine. The will to cruelty here is as limited as it is around Bangor. The love of America and respect for its law is as great here.

And the odd thing is that the prejudice against the Negro which the North sees in the South is here also accompanied by much affection for Negroes.

Do not misunderstand me: the South has not always been fair or just to the Negro. It has not understood his aspirations or given him the dignity to which all human beings are entitled. That troubles many southerners as it has naturally angered many Negroes. The South has made willing and indigenous advance in fairness and justice.

But the South knows that much of the present social and intellectual inferiority, which is often stated as reason for denying the Negro the new rights ordered by the Court, derives not merely from race but from disadvantage imposed in the past.

There is reason for troubled hearts in the South. The danger is not so much that the South will defy the law as that it will by one device or another deny its children, white and Negro together. The pattern attracting attention in more and more Southern States is a retreat from public schools which they cannot control. Neither Maine nor any other State in this mobile Nation is too far off to have a stake in that.

More ignorance in the South would not only bring disaster to our hopes at home, it would also mean that those thousands of southerners, now year by year dispersing to all parts of the Nation, would bring only ignorance with them. For the South, I said recently, those who propose abandonment of the schools proposed something beyond secession from the Union. They urge secession from civilization.

That secession, of course, will neither be defended nor suppressed by troops. It will not be prevented by northern impatience with a South which may seem to many anciently recalcitrant in its ways. Thousands of southerners who cherish education for their children and all the children of the South will fight at home—where the fighting can be tough—against any such educational secession.

They will not be helped by anger and impatience from abroad—from Bangor, for instance, or Boston, or New York.

Between the extremists on this question in the South there is a great, troubled, honest, hopeful body of southerners who believe that all the children can be safely and creatively served within the law. But if any man in Maine believes that will be an easy business, he had better stay with his complacency in Bangor.

If a man from Maine does wish to serve in a problem in which, indeed, the whole Nation has a stake, I would beg him to remember that between the contending thunders from the South, there is a quiet South, too, of thousands of southerners more troubled than angry, more prayerful than articulate. Their silence may be ominous. It may be the mark of hope. Exterior impatience could only serve to drive them into the company of the angry extremes which have already seized all the microphones.

If I were a man from Maine, I hope I would remember that there is a gentle South, an orderly South, a South with hopes as precious as this first spring.

As a southerner, I know that what the South needs from all the North to the very tip of Maine is not its impatience but its prayers.

Sincerely,

JONATHAN DANIELS.

A Bombshell Fizzles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Evening Star of Saturday, May 5, 1956:

A BOMBSHELL FIZZLES

Some people must have been holding their breath when a Senate committee began its investigation of Murray Chotiner and his clients. For judging from many of the accounts of this affair, Vice President NIXON was going to be in pretty hot water before the committee got through.

Now Mr. Chotiner has come and gone. We know that he was Mr. NIXON'S campaign manager in 1952. We also know, although less emphasis was put on it, that he served in similar capacities for Senator KNOWLAND and Chief Justice Warren. We know that he represented some clients who are not exactly the kind of people one would be anxious to take home to meet the wife and children. And, finally, we know that his activity in behalf of the clients took him to the Department of Justice, where no favoritism was shown him, and to the White House in behalf of two airlines, both of which lost their cases.

But as the smoke drifts away, it is clear that the political bombshell has fizzled out. Mr. Chotiner, at least as far as the rec-

ord shows now, did nothing improper, nothing that scores of other lawyers are not doing every day for their clients. There is not a particle of evidence that Mr. NIXON had anything to do with these cases, or even that he knew about them. And certainly no one is going to contend that anything improper was done at the White House or by the Department of Justice.

What, then, was the excitement all about? Well, this is a political year. Mr. NIXON is a prime political target and it is to be expected that the Democrats and their partisans will take pot shots at him—maybe, even, that they will not always aim above the belt. This may be upsetting to Mr. NIXON'S partisans, but they should not lose too much sleep over it. Their man can take care of himself in this kind of politicking.

Democrats Loading Their Elephant Guns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Sunday's Washington Star entitled "Democrats Loading Their Elephant Guns":

DEMOCRATS LOADING THEIR ELEPHANT GUNS

(By Frank R. Kent)

The type of campaign the Democrats plan to make this fall was somewhat stupidly revealed last week by Chairman Paul Butler of the Democratic National Committee on the Meet the Press television program. Not that there was much of a secret about it, but the naive, not to say crude, manner in which this brash young Indiana politician proceeded to outline what he intends to do was, to say the least, unusual.

LINE NOT PAYING OFF

So far as the President is concerned, Mr. Butler affirmed that his health was bound to be an issue, that the Democrats would emphasize his "lack of leadership" and his "failure to keep his promises." This, of course, is what the Messrs. Stevenson and KEFAUVER have been for weeks throatily asserting in their frantic effort to bag delegates for their August convention. It is also the theme upon which Senators such as MORSE of Oregon, and HUMPHREY of Minnesota, steadily harp. However, it seems more or less clear that this line is not really paying off. For one reason the health issue becomes ridiculous when compared to the Democratic performance of four times nominating the late F. D. Roosevelt, whose crippled state made him a vastly worse health risk than General Eisenhower, and the care taken to prevent his true condition from being fully understood by the American people contrasts most unfavorably with the complete frankness of this President and his doctors.

It is also true that the "lack of leadership" and "failure to keep his promises" allegations have fallen flat because they are so obviously partisan and so feebly supported that they are not taken too seriously even by the Democratic propagandists. Considering these facts, it was not surprising when Mr. Butler was asked what he had to say about Vice President NIXON'S now openly announced candidacy for renomination that his avid eyes brightened and his voice became more vibrant when he said, "Oh, we are certainly going to train our biggest guns on him." At the moment that is the Democratic strategy. Mr. NIXON is to be made the villain. Already, the Democratic cartoonists and the egghead intellectuals are concentrating on selling the American people on the idea that if Mr. Eisenhower is reelected (which seems fairly certain) and should he die before his second term ends (which, according to his doctors, seems most improbable) then the diabolic NIXON would become President.

Of course, if these things happen, that would be true—but not many balanced persons think either that they will happen or, if they did, that it would be an unmitigated calamity. The truth is that in the past 4 years Mr. NIXON has been the target for one of the most venomous and vindictive propaganda attacks leveled at any public man for a long time. When, after his "big-gun" statement, Chairman Butler was asked whether he thought that Mr. NIXON had been a bad Vice President, he dodged the question by declaring that Mr. NIXON, in his campaigns, had made shameful insinuations against his opponents. In effect, Mr. Butler said when NIXON ran for the Senate and House in California he had charged his opponents with being "subversive" and in 1952 had even reflected upon the patriotism of "that great President," Mr. Truman. Of course, this was not true. What Mr. NIXON did say was that the Truman administration had been "soft" on communism.

NIXON HELD JUSTIFIED

Certainly, no one who recalls Mr. Truman's frequent statements that the Alger Hiss case was only a "red herring" and who, among other things, remembers the manner in which he ignored the FBI's warning and information concerning the late Harry Dexter White, can feel that Mr. NIXON was not fully justified in what he said. Of course, when Mr. NIXON ran for the Senate, his opponent was Representative Helen Gahagan Douglas. Mrs. Douglas, a very handsome movie actress, was not a Communist and no one said she was. Nevertheless, she was affiliated with some very leftwing organizations and was an ardent radical of the extreme New Deal and Fair Deal type. Mr. NIXON did not libel her at all, but he did beat her very badly.

Enough has been said to show that Democratic "big guns" from Mr. Butler down are all being primed for an assault on Mr. NIXON. But they have little material and a poor case. Nor is Mr. NIXON a helpless, tongue-tied individual. On the contrary, he is one of the most effective and hard-hitting campaigners in the country, as his political and journalistic critics will find out before long. There are already signs that instead of a liability to the President he will turn out to be an asset. He is able, honest, forthright, and attractive. His record is clean. None of the charges against him can be made to stick. The Republicans are lucky to have him as the Eisenhower running mate. Certainly Mr. Eisenhower thinks so.

Immunity Under the Fifth Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial appearing in the Shreveport Times of April 30, 1956, entitled "Court Has Two Views About Immunity":

COURT HAS TWO VIEWS ABOUT IMMUNITY

Somewhat unnoticed generally, the United States Supreme Court recently made some emphatic statements in support of the principle of immunity contained in the fifth amendment. They came in the decision holding that the city of New York was not justified in removing a municipal college professor who had pleaded the fifth amendment when questioned about his possible Communist associations or activities.

Perhaps even less generally noted was the fact that these current contentions of the Supreme Court were very much the opposite of its own similar contentions in a previous case and indicated that the Court takes one position concerning immunity in cases involving capitalism and another position on cases involving communism—being against immunity in the former and for immunity in the latter.

In the current New York City College decision, the five-man majority opinion, written by Justice Tom Clark, contained a number of strong observations about the importance of the fifth amendment and the right of the individual to claim immunity from answering questions in any type of case. The opinion stated that the right of refusal to testify "has been recognized as one of the most valuable prerogatives of the citizen."

But in 1937 the Supreme Court said, in another decision, and with all of the liberal justices of that Court concurring, that the immunity privilege was not important. In an opinion at that time, the late Justice Cardozo, one of the most liberal Justices of that day, wrote:

"It (fifth amendment immunity) might be lost and justice still be done. Indeed, today as in the past, there are students of our penal system who look upon the immunity as a mischief rather than a benefit and would limit its scope or destroy it altogether. * * *

"No doubt, there would remain a need to give protection against torture, physical or mental. Justice, however, would not perish if the accused was subject to a duty to respond to orderly inquiry."

Justice Hugo Black, on the Court in 1937 as he is now, concurred in the Cardozo opinion that fifth amendment immunity did not really amount to much and also concurred in the current Clark opinion that it is "one of the most valuable prerogatives of the citizen."

The 1937 case was one which dealt with business interests supposedly engaged in illegal operation. For them, use of fifth amendment immunity was something terrible, in the opinion of the Supreme Court. The current New York City case is in the field of efforts to destroy Americanism and its liberties. Here immunity is of the highest importance, the Court holds.

In other words, the Supreme Court in these two separated decisions, has held that immunity is not important in cases involving economic liberties but it is highly important in cases involving so-called political liberties, even where the latter type of immunity might mitigate against welfare of the Government of which the Court is a part.

Independence for the Handicapped Through Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride and satisfaction

that I request the privilege of inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of an essay entitled "Independence for the Handicapped Through Employment," by Alaire Dickson, a student at Gooding High School, Gooding, Idaho.

Miss Dickson's essay won the $1,000 first prize in the 1956 national essay contest conducted by the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped. Miss Dickson and the four other prize winners will receive their awards from Vice President NIXON at the annual meeting of the President's Committee on May 17 here in Washington.

The competition for this contest brought entries from 36 States, with more than 10,000 students participating.

The essay follows:

INDEPENDENCE FOR THE HANDICAPPED THROUGH EMPLOYMENT

(By Alaire Dickson, Gooding High School, Gooding, Idaho)

The man sat there, looking at the letter he held in his hand. From this letter his gaze shifted to the pile of books on his smoking stand and from these books he looked across the room and on out through the window across the wide expanse of snow covered lawn until his gaze at last rested on a solitary tree, outlined against the horizon in the dusk, its branches bare and gaunt.

A woman entered the room but paused and left quietly knowing that the man was deep in concentrated thought. How many times in the last year she had seen him sitting with the same quiet look on his face.

This man was her son and he had once been happy and full of life.

After his return from the war he had been different. He was still cheerful at times but for the most part he was despondent and sat in his chair in the way she had just left him. He was now a cripple, ranked among those others who were physically handicapped. He had lost his left arm and leg in one of those maddening surges up the Korean hills.

When he was first released from the hospital he had spent long hours reading accounts of the physically handicapped and their successes in the world. He had started his adjusted way of life with hope and optimism. But things had not quite worked out for him as in his stories and he had gradually become disheartened and discouraged.

As the man in the chair gazed at the tree in the distance, he thought back over the past few months. He had tried, hadn't he? He did have a degree, didn't he? If circumstances weren't the way they were, he would have a job and be looking forward to settling down and establishing a place for himself and his community. But no, that was impossible. How could a cripple find work, degree or no degree? People just did not want to be bothered with someone physically handicapped when there were plenty of able-bodied men available. American people, who have so much to be thankful for and look forward to, were so busy and wrapped up in their own affairs that they could not be bothered by a disabled person. He supposed it might be hard for these people to keep their emotions under control if there was a person around to be pitied. But wait, was he being entirely fair?.

This letter from the Plainview Construction Co. was the answer to his last application for work. It was like a stack of others in his desk. All polite and all saying that maybe later * * *. Yes, maybe later but he was going to keep trying. Others such as Hank Viscardi, who was a cripple, had found good jobs for thousands of the physically handicapped; and Eddie Axlrod, who had started a crusade for the handicapped even though he did not have long to live himself. These others had kept on trying until they had accomplished something. These were only two of the thousands who had made successful lives. He laid down the letter and picked up his pipe.

It was a warm, sunny day toward the last of January, and the inneroffice of the Plainview Construction Co. was flooded with sunlight.

The big man behind the desk rang for his secretary, and asked her, "Miss Larson, will you please send in Mr. Thames?"

Soon Mr. Thames entered the inneroffice, and after the usual greetings he seated himself and waited for his boss to explain why he had sent for him. The big man offered Mr. Thames a cigar and then began to speak.

"Do you remember that young man who was in about a month ago? The one that had his left arm and leg shot off in the war?"

Mr. Thames replied that he did remember the same young man.

"The point is," the big man continued, "we do need another blueprint man, and I have given a lot of thought to the idea of employing that young man. At first I didn't feel I wanted to be bothered with even an interview, but then after he had gone I began to think of the matter in a little different light, I sent for you because I wanted your opinion. I have looked up the records on this man, and he was a top man in college before he went to war. I think he is just the man we want. What do you think?"

Mr. Thames sat there for a moment looking at his cigar. "You know, Bill, ever since that young man was here and applied for that job I have been thinking a lot about it, too. That man should have the same chance for happiness as anyone else, and I feel it is part of our job as American citizens to do all that we can to make it easier for him and for other physically handicapped persons, too. What good are we as citizens if we cannot even try to help fellow men like him to have a small bit of the security that we could give him? And you know, Bill, that statistics and records prove that the physically handicapped are the top workers in most cases."

The big man answered:

"I am glad you approve because I wasn't sure just how the rest of the staff would take having someone around that they had to—well, sort of look out for."

"Now, wait a minute, Bill. I think you've got the wrong idea right there. That man doesn't need anyone to look out for him. One of the things he would hate the most would be a feeling of his fellow workers pitying him. He is really no different from you and I; he has had bad luck but he doesn't want to be carried around on a pillow. All he needs is a chance to prove what he is worth, and it is up to you to provide that chance.

"Thanks a lot. I just wasn't quite sure what to do. Let's keep this little talk confidential and wait and see how the rest of the employees take it.

"Sure, Bill. I don't think you will regret hiring him."

The mother of the disabled man was busy in her kitchen preparing a light lunch to be eaten out on the terrace. It was a warm, balmy evening, the kind of an evening that didn't come often in this part of Vermont during the summer months. She looked up from her work and began to talk to her son who was leaning against the table with his one arm over his crutch.

"Hasn't this been an enjoyable summer? So different from last year. You know, son, I was down at the market this afternoon and I overheard two men talking about you. The one man was telling the other about your new leg. He was saying that you had gotten so you hardly limped at all and that that was very exceptional for only having it fitted 6 months ago. Then he asked, "Wasn't it wonderful about your job down at the Plainview Co.?" The other man replied, "It was grand that you had such a good outlook toward the future." It wasn't until then that I noticed that that man carried a red and white cane."

Her son turned away and picked up a plate of date bread and made his way out onto the terrace where he contentedly seated himself and thanked God for his good fortune. He was now among the lucky of the physically handicapped. He now had security and respect and he had something to work for. Yes, life in general, was good.

The big man named Bill sat behind his desk and watched the leaves fall from the big maple outside his office window. This had been a good year, business was good and he was satisfied. He felt good, he had done something worthwhile besides earn money in the past year. He had not known before how wonderful it felt to do for someone else. Yes, employing the war veteran had done great things for him. He felt a new responsibility toward his fellow men and he liked that feeling. This next year he was going to do all he could to help other handicapped people in his community. After all, that was the least he could do. He had been surprised at the way all his employees had picked up and had done better as a result of their respect for the handicapped man. He was even considering investing some money in some way to help the handicapped. Yes, this had been a full year.

Two Weddings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, my good friend Bert Gipple, of the Galesville Republican, makes a very interesting commentary on the recent marriages of Grace Kelly and Margaret Truman in the April 26 issue of the paper. Mr. Gipple sold his newspaper several years ago, but he is still active in community affairs and writes a column every week, at the age of 85. He is one of those independent editors who freely speaks his own mind and whose paper always had an editorial policy.

I know many Americans share the same views as those expressed in the editorial; our colleague, Congressman USHER BURDICK, wrote in like vein in a recent newsletter.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am asking that Mr. Gipple's editorial be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I call my colleagues' attention to the article, knowing that they will draw their own conclusions:

TWO WEDDINGS

Don't blame the American press for the space given in news columns, pictures, syndicate stories and other play-up of the marriage of an American actress to the prince of a European principality who lords over the 368 acres which comprise his domain, and within is the greatest gambling establishment in the world, which provides the revenue for its government.

The press was merely supplying the demand of millions of readers, for something sensational, and the newspapers went to it for weeks before and afterward, even to stat-

ing the hour the "royal" pair retired to the nuptial couch.

Scarcely an article of the bride's apparel was left undescribed; how 35 designers and work people were engaged six weeks on her gown alone; how her diamonds and other jewels glistened; how thousands in resplendent uniforms and other garb packed the palace and cathedral or swarmed outside for the two marriage ceremonies; how scores of newspapers took ship across the seas to watch every move and cable every detail; that a special representative of the President of the United States was sent to express congratulations. The whole a grand show in which a fortune was expended for fanfare.

A few days later, in a simple ceremony in a little church in a small Missouri city, the same church in which her parents were married, another young woman was united in matrimony—the only child of a former President of the greatest Nation on earth. A woman whose name and charming personality were known the world over. The bridegroom was a newsman—a worker, not a playboy. The bride's costume was not elaborate; the diamond on a finger blazed no brighter than that of thousands of brides in the ordinary walks of life. The father who gave the bride away was in semiformal day dress. As one reporter stated, it was the same kind of wedding ceremony as that of any small town girl in any small town. To the last word it conformed to the traditional American spirit. There was no palatial yacht awaiting the couple to carry them away on their honeymoon.

Which of these weddings attested Americanism is for the world to decide. And in these turbulent times that decision is important.

Virtue and the Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times:

VIRTUE AND THE FARM BILL

The House has acceded to the request of the President and has passed legislation providing for the soil bank, which was the most important single proposal in the President's farm program as presented to Congress in his message of January 9. The bill calls for a total of $5.7 billion in additional farm spending over the next 4 years.

Though the President had asked only for the soil bank, on the desirability of which the administration and Congress were in complete agreement, it was probably expecting too much to suppose that Congress could resist the temptation to try to load it down with amendments of its own, designed to make itself solid with groups that might not stand to benefit from the soil bank. In some cases it failed to marshal the needed strength, but in several others it succeeded. The latter included at least one of the provisions that had been singled out specifically for criticism by the President in the massage accompanying his veto of the original omnibus farm bill. This was a provision calling for mandatory supports for the principal feed grains other than corn—rye, oats, barley, and grain sorghums.

In calling for enactment of a soil-bank bill the President had taken into account the frequently repeated refrain of the Democratic leaders that it was imperative to get additional income into the hands of the farmers this year. This, in fact, was the sole basis on which the opposition attempted to reinstate 90-percent price supports in the bill vetoed by the President—a policy which, as one commentator recently put it, "is like prescribing a diet of sugar for a diabetic."

Congress had procrastinated so long before giving the President the soil bank when he first asked for it that it would have been of little use so far as increasing farm income this year was concerned. The President, in making his second request for the bank, therefore proposed that any farmer who formally contracted to withdraw acreage from surplus crops under the bank's provision receive an advance on the payment he was to receive after the contract had been carried out.

This, needless to say, put the Democrats, who had been demanding immediate cash for the farmer, in a highly uncomfortable position. Should they approve the proposal for prepayments and thus permit the administration to take credit for getting purchasing power promptly into the hands of the farmers? Or should they block the administration's plan, and run the risk of alienating perhaps an equal number of farm votes? And if they chose the latter course, how would they rationalize their action?

In the end they chose the second course. This would seem to be dubious even from a political standpoint. But the opposition has insisted on making it a little ludicrous as well, by attempting to clothe their decision in the robe of moral rectitude. Their position, it would seem, comes down to this: It is politically moral for you yourself to pump out additional income to the farmer if you do it through 90 percent rigid supports, a mechanism under which the producers of crops already in surplus are encouraged to increase that surplus; it is immoral when someone else proposes to raise farm income through an apparatus which is based on the sound principle that to be eligible for additional income the farmer must cooperate in reducing the farm surplus.

United States Faces Shortage in Scientific and Engineering Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following statement by David Sarnoff, chairman of the board, Radio Corporation of America, before the Subcommittee on Research and Development of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

STATEMENT BY DAVID SARNOFF, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, RADIO CORPORATION OF AMERICA, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY, UNITED STATES CONGRESS, APRIL 25, 1956

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, permit me to congratulate your Subcommittee on Research and Development and its able Chairman, the Hon. MELVIN PRICE, upon your initiative in undertaking an earnest inquiry into the problem of scientific and technological manpower. I fully share your concern in this area and therefore consider it a privilege to appear here today.

The existence of the problem is by this time fairly common knowledge. There has been no dearth of warnings about the shortage of trained men for our vast and ever growing industrial complex.

What is needed, however, is a thorough examination of the whole field, including a systematic collation and appraisal of suggested solutions, as a basis for recommending practical action. This, as I see it, is the heavy assignment shouldered by your subcommittee and it can count, I feel confident, on the understanding and cooperation of industrial, educational and military leaders.

An important byproduct of the inquiry, of course, should be a clearer appreciation by the American people as a whole of the dimensions and urgency of the problem. Under our way of life, an enlightened and sympathetic public opinion is indispensable in attacking and surmounting major challenges. This is especially true where, in Congressman PRICE's words, "the emphasis must be on Federal leadership," because "only the Federal Government has the resources and prestige" required for adequate and effective action.

American security and industrial strength, two goals which are completely intermeshed, are today dependent upon our success in overcoming present shortages and assuring an expanded reservoir of scientists and physicists, trained engineers and technicians. This hardly needs to be proved, it is so self-evident. There is no substitute for brains and practical skills in a technical age like ours. Automation, it is true, is advancing with giant steps. But every step, if it is not to turn into a stumble, demands additional contingents of qualified personnel.

The best machines and weapons are worthless if there are not enough competent men to operate them. What is more, neither machines nor weapons will long remain the best unless research and development are maintained at a high level and dynamic tempo, which in turn calls for a constant accretion of specialized personnel.

Science and technology have long been the hallmarks of our American civilization. Throughout the world, our industrial and technical progress is described as Americanization. American supremacy in these fields is historic.

It is extremely disturbing, therefore, to learn that Soviet Russia is already turning out engineers at a greater rate than we do. It comes as a shock to be told that if the present trends continue, the land of communism will, within a decade or sooner, outstrip the United States across the technological board. In the struggle between freedom and communism now underway, this is a situation that we cannot afford to view complacently.

I skip the supporting statistics. These will no doubt be developed in other testimony. Besides, your subcommittee has already done a necessary and splendid job in collecting and publishing, just last month, the basic facts on "Engineering and Scientific Manpower in the United States, Western Europe, and Soviet Russia." Those facts leave us little margin for smugness.

Of course, a police state can and does compel its youth to enter careers of its own choosing. It conscripts minds as ruthlessly as it conscripts bodies. That kind of regimentation, thank God, is ruled out in our country. Other methods, wholly within the framework of our cherished freedom of choice, must be developed and put to work.

We must not let our natural revulsion against the fallacies and the crimes of communism and its dictators lead us to underrate the capacities and abilities of the Russian people. Their youth are made to feel it is their patriotic duty to study and acquire knowledge and skill in the fields of science and technology. The Soviet Government even goes so far as to extend special privileges to its scientists and engineers.

In America, science and technology have long been so all-pervasive, so familiar, that they are taken for granted. Some of the aura of excitement and adventure which surrounded them in an earlier period has begun to fade out.

We must rekindle in our youth that sense of adventure in pushing forward the horizons of science, research, and invention. They must be helped to feel the thrill of delving into the mysteries of chemistry and physics, electronics, atomics, and aerodynamics. They must be made conscious of wonderful scientific worlds to be explored, mapped, and opened up for the good of all mankind.

That task belongs primarily to the schools. But parents, industry, the press, and social organizations can play a vital role.

Despite the many opportunities for gainful employment in the technical fields available and widely advertised—the fact is that not enough young Americans are taking up scientific careers. Why? Many guesses have been made. But it is vitally necessary that concrete knowledge replace guesswork on this score. Why should not these young Americans themselves be questioned on that subject? It seems to me that a survey or poll of students in the senior year of high school and the freshman year of college—the critical years of career decisions—might well provide information helpful in drawing more qualified people into engineering and related fields.

Our economy and our national safety alike will suffer seriously unless we act now and vigorously to solve the urgent problem of technical manpower. The immediate lack—already an embarrassment to large and small companies—will not cure itself. The diagnosis must be made and the therapy prescribed.

Long-term treatment is essential; but interim measures, short-term remedies, are also vital. The recommendations I should like, with your permission, to put on record today are in that short-term category. They are not presented as cure-alls, but simply as measures that could go a long way toward ameliorating the present critical situation.

A current shortage of teachers in scientific and technical subjects is generally recognized as one of the immediate problems. Several months ago, at a dinner of the National Security Industrial Association held in Washington, D. C., I proposed the establishment of what I described as a "National Educational Reserve." It would comprise qualified teachers of mathematics, physics, chemistry, engineering and related subjects, to be drawn from the ranks of industrial technology.

I suggested that industry release—with full pay, for at least 1 year—a reasonable number of men and women for teaching assignments in nearby educational institutions, particularly the upper grades in high schools. This unique Reserve could also mobilize persons who have reached the retirement age in the military services and in industry, but whose experience and knowledge would make them competent and inspiring teachers. It could take in, also, qualified people willing to teach in night schools without taking leave from their industry jobs.

The number of teachers furnished by any single company would be too small to entail hardship for the plants, offices and laboratories from which they are detached. But, if drawn from a wide list of organizations, it could be large enough to give new impetus to the teaching of sciences in our school system. This would be especially true at the high school level, which is at present the tightest bottleneck.

I envisage this educational reserve, of course, as a temporary expedient, let's say for 5 years, to help meet an immediate need, while more permanent solutions are being worked out. Moreover, whether the initiative is taken by industry or Government or, as would be more likely, by both, the plan itself would naturally be drawn with the consent and cooperation of school authorities, who would prescribe the courses and regulate the instruction.

As we all know, many men and women who normally would have become teachers of the sciences have gone instead into industry, where the economic rewards are more attractive. The fact that teachers are generally underpaid, that many of them can do better in private jobs, enters into the equation of teacher shortages and must be remedied. That aspect, too, I hope, will be covered in the course of this inquiry.

Meanwhile, it is a fact that industry has siphoned off some personnel from the educational system. It would seem to be industry's obligation to recognize this fact. But, obligation aside, industry would be well advised, as a matter of clear self-interest, to help replenish the reservoir of trained manpower by stimulating relevant studies at all educational levels. Its current hunger for engineers and other specialists will turn into a serious famine if existing conditions are not quickly improved. Industry must take a leaf from far-sighted conservationists, who plant two trees for every tree they cut down.

I am quite confident that, in the main, industry will cooperate with an educational reserve. The public is not fully aware of the extent to which corporations today are providing scholarships, fellowships, and other inducements to promote the study of engineering and science. Some of them, in addition, are contributing funds to help maintain or enlarge educational institutions related to their particular fields of enterprise. The Radio Corporation of America, I am pleased to be able to say, has been among the pioneers in such endeavors. All of which attests, if any proof were needed, that industry is in a mood to support any practical undertaking likely to increase the flow of trained manpower into its ranks.

The teachers in the proposed educational reserve would obviously be persons with backgrounds of practical experience. Thus they could bring into the classroom the breath of living reality. They would help to stimulate that sense of adventure in technical careers to which I have already alluded. They would inspire many an able and imaginative student to follow the scientific and technological disciplines into the college years. Enthusiasm is contagious.

To make the project attractive, teachers enrolled in the Reserve should be given recognition and status through membership in an organization somewhat similar to the various national military reserves. I believe it should be set up on a national scale, perhaps by an act of Congress, with membership carrying appropriate titles, diplomas, and the like. The educational reservists would thus be recognized, and rightly so, as a vital element in the equation of national security.

I have presented this concept in broad terms. There may be flaws in it which a detailed formulation could correct. Since its presentation the response to the proposal from many quarters has been impressively favorable. I trust that we can move ahead without undue delay, because each passing day makes our problem more difficult.

It is the unique nature of science that the more it accomplishes, the more remains to be accomplished. Every new invention or discovery, far from narrowing down the perspective, opens up exciting new horizons of exploration. Science, of which engineering is a part, is never static or finished. Its every achievement marks a new beginning. Though rooted in the past, its thinking and its mood are ever geared to the future.

In attacking the problem of manpower, we must, therefore, also gear our planning to the future. Nuclear energy, as the most recent development, with almost limitless prospects of growth and useful application, necessarily plays a large role in the planning. The awesome destructive aspects of this new force in our lives are overdramatized, to the point where its beneficient potentials are obscured.

We must bring home to the youth of the Nation the truth that nuclear energy is essentially a force for good, capable of creating a world of abundance to match men's most optimistic dreams. With this in mind, I wish to make another recommendation:

To signalize the importance of the scientist, the physicist, the engineer, the man of technology in the dawning age of nuclear power, I suggest the construction of atomic reactors on the campuses of a selected and limited number of American colleges and universities. This step would serve many purposes directly and indirectly in line with the attainment of the goals we seek.

These reactors would operate to stimulate the interest of students in matters scientific. They would help to enhance the prestige of the physical science departments of the various schools involved. These factors in turn would help to build up the enrollment of young people in the technical fields.

The presence of the reactor would provide a living laboratory, to heighten the realism of instruction. It would enable the student to get a glimpse of his own role in the nuclear future. Under the guidance of competent teachers, it would stir him to visions of applying this force for constructive purposes. The impact on the student, in short, would be at once inspirational and practical.

Incidentally, each reactor could be utilized to furnish power for the operation of the college or university where it is located. In this way the actual or prospective science student would not only have the possibility of working on a reactor in being, but would be permitted to see nuclear energy in its peaceful use.

Gentlemen, to insure the continuation of technological progress in our country, to guarantee American security, we must solve the problem of specialized manpower. We must, without further delay, devise and implement means of attracting ever-increasing numbers of our ablest young men and women to scientific studies. Every new student carries the possibility of important contributions to science, research, and invention. We must nourish that possibility and encourage its expression.

Experience has taught that the beginnings of our progress as individuals and as a Nation have often been found in tiny seeds. The steam engine was born in a tea kettle; the airplane came out of a bicycle shop; the automobile first sputtered and moved in a small carriage shop; and broadcasting started from an amateur station in a private garage. Today, the architects of our future are largely the young people in our schools. We must stimulate their vision of achievement and open to them the paths to its realization.

The problem of adequate-trained manpower, underlined for us by the progress in Soviet Russia, must be met promptly and with full recognition of its immediacy and urgency. I am convinced that if all of us face up to the challenge now, America can solve this problem and maintain our leadership in science and technology.

Perspective on Airpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Sunday's Washington Star:

PERSPECTIVE ON AIRPOWER

President Eisenhower has given a sense of perspective to the current Senate inquiry into the status of our air power. As he has just told his news conference, the fact that we seem to be lagging behind the Russians in the production of intercontinental bombers like our B–52s should not be allowed to obscure the overall picture of our strength in the skies. Nor should it be taken to mean that some sort of "crash program" must be launched forthwith to insure that we will have more such bombers than the Soviet Union.

Actually, the B–52s of our Strategic Air Command represent only one part of the aerial might of the United States. The other parts, as the President has said, ought not to be overlooked or underestimated. They include our globe-circling overseas bases and our great fleet of B–47 medium bombers. They include also by far the most powerful of the world's naval aircraft and carriers. In these categories—forward bases, planes like the B–47 and an incomparable flying Navy—we are decidedly superior to the Russians, even though they may be threatening to surpass SAC, 3 or 4 years from now, in the field of intercontinental superbombers.

The President has spoken commonsense in declaring that it is not necessarily true that we must keep ahead of the Russians, numerically, in the B–52 class. Their requirements differ from ours, and ours from theirs. So our airpower must be tailored accordingly, with emphasis on quality and with a constant awareness that "it is vital that we get what we believe we need," and not just quantity to match the quantity of Soviet intercontinental bombers. When the Defense Department presents the full picture to the Senate investigators, then the American people, as Mr. Eisenhower has suggested may find that our total sky strength promises to keep on being second to none.

The Tragedy of the Marines in the Creek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent granted me so to do, I call to your attention, and that of my colleagues, an editorial appearing in the Christian Science Monitor on Thursday, May 3, 1956. Being a member of the Armed Services Committee, I feel this editorial is very pertinent:

THE LESSON OF RIBBON CREEK

The problem which has been agonizingly dramatized in Parris Island's Ribbon Creek is one so deep and so wide that it reaches into every home, every schoolroom, of the land. It has always been just as deep and wide. For it is this:

How to implant the hard virtues without stamping out the tender ones. How to instill loyalty, obedience, discipline, a sense of duty, fortitude, and resolution, and at the same time preserve the equal values of compassion, affection, initiative, and individuality.

Every parent, every teacher—whether he will or no—faces this question daily. The difference between their task and that of the military commander is but one of emphasis. If it may be said that the trend of the times has carried modern parents too far in one direction, then it must be said that the continuing shadow of "the ordeal of battle," as Marine General Pate puts it, has kept the military oriented too single-mindedly, perhaps, toward the other.

For it is upon the hard virtues that military necessities make hard demands. And military (and naval) services of all nations stress them. Every nation has need of especially trained elite units which stress them even more. The prime American example is the Marine Corps. And the men in the ranks of that corps have been products for over half a century of the Parris Island system. But, says the marines' commandant with forthright frankness, "these men are products of a system which also produced the tragedy of Ribbon Creek." And he promises the American people to do something about it.

As to the mechanics of the system and its reorganization: Marine combat units are organized much as are the Army's—officers in command of companies and most platoons, in continuing and direct contact with the men. But marine trainees are organized into companies almost the size of battalions, with few officers and with all platoons under sergeants. General Pate promises that there will be greatly increase officer supervision.

This alone would require the premise that officers are, ipso facto, more skillful and humane than sergeants—a shaky assumption. The core of the trouble has been that all instruction and, in effect, most discipline have been left to the drill sergeants. Supervision from the officer level above and appeals from the recruit level below have tended to stop at a chasm which yawns between the experienced and well-entrenched corps of noncoms and the commissioned officers. The latter are largely submerged in administrative duties.

The drill instructors of today, no doubt, are less experienced than those of the old Marine Corps. As to that General Pate is correct. But we doubt seriously that the system is any less vulnerable to petty tyranny and brutality than before World War I and during the 20 years after, when there were no citizen marines and the public didn't care.

All of which leads back to the essential problem. This the Marine Corps must solve, no matter how much the drill instructors are supervised by officers; else drinking and capricious punishment could spawn another tragedy some day. The whole Nation must face it too. For signs multiply that American society is failing to teach many of the strong virtues—and not succeeding spectacularly with the others.

Fluoridation of Drinking Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN DIES
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

NATURAL FOOD ASSOCIATES,
Atlanta, Tex., May 2, 1956.

Congressman MARTIN DIES,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DIES: Artificial fluoridation of public-drinking water is a hoax on the American people. Last week the Texas Medical Association voted unanimously not to indorse it and voted further not to let the subject come up again for 5 years.

The simple truth is that the United States Health Department is trying to force mass medication on the American people.

There should be a congressional investigation of this matter. The security of our Nation is endangered by the instillation of fluorine in our Army, Navy, and Airbases.

I know that you are very busy but this matter is vitally important now. If you would like to have scientific information about this subject I will be glad to send it to you.

Sincerely,

DR. JOE D. NICHOLS, M. D.

No Disarmament Pact in View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Roscoe Drummond in the following article entitled "Where the Disarmament Talks Stand," makes a number of intelligent observations on the current U. N. disarmament talks in London. The article which appeared in the May 6, 1956, issue of the New York Herald Tribune is worthy of the attention of our colleagues:

WHERE THE DISARMAMENT TALKS STAND
(By Roscoe Drummond)

If we are going to understand what hasn't been happening at the U. N. disarmament talks in London, we have to dissect some of the diplomatic double-talk. This clarifying statement comes from British Prime Minister Sir Anthony Eden: "This (disarmament) is just the kind of question we have to consider and examine in the light of the discussions we have had, and we would be wise to do that for the purpose of getting results rather than for any other purpose." What Sir Anthony is really saying, I think—and he can be vague with the best of them—is that nothing has been settled, that nobody wants to take the blame for ending the negotiations, and that we ought not to make things worse by using harsh words. That's true, but we also ought not to make things obscure by using mellifluous words. Harold E. Stassen, chief American delegate to the meeting, threw his own shaft of darkness on the situation with this report at his London press conference: "There has been important progress and significant steps to move together. The areas of disagreement remain more important than the areas of agreement."

What Mr. Stassen is really saying is that progress seems significant only because so little has been made in the past and that, actually, no disarmament pact is in sight at all, anywhere, as far ahead as anybody can see.

Of course, the discussions should continue—and they will. The Soviet Union does not want the discussions to break down even if they do not want them to produce any universal disarmament at this stage. And our position should be visible for the whole world to see—a willingness to make a solid beginning of arms reduction based on a system of inspection which would rule out the danger of a surprise attack.

But the ingredients of a workable, disarmament-inspection system are not within reach, and the last thing the West can afford to do is to start down the road of a paper disarmament treaty which cannot be wit-

nessed and policed to make sure that it is being totally observed.

The ingredients are simple if both sides want an inspection that works. They are (1) sufficient inspection on both sides that will prevent the surprise use of nuclear weapons; (2) an agreed level of forces, both conventional and nuclear, which does not destroy the deterrent balance of power between the Communist world and the free world.

When Mr. Stassen says that "important progress" has been made, he means only that if you rule out the biggest issue of arms inspection, the Soviet and Western proposals for arms cuts are nearer today than at any time since the talks began.

When Mr. Stassen says that the "areas of disagreement remain more important than the areas of agreement," he means there is no real meeting of the minds whatsoever on arms control and inspection.

There are two tremendous gaps between the Soviet and American positions. We have accepted the Soviet proposal for "ground inspection"—inspection of nonatomic installations, depots, arsenals, and staging bases. Moscow has not accepted the American proposals for air inspection. We have offered to exchange full inventories of military establishments. Moscow has rejected it.

We have advocated that U. N. treaty inspectors have unimpeded access to the agreed areas of inspection. No strings. No limitations. Moscow ties inspection to the U. N. Security Council which, through the veto, enables the Soviet Union to impede access whenever the Soviets so willed.

I can discern no evidence that the Kremlin wants to make any mutual disarmament possible now. Obviously it wants to keep talking disarmament in order that it can maintain the appearance of pressing for disarmament. But U. N. statistics show that the Kremlin increased its military spending last year by 12 percent.

There is an understandable reason why the Soviets don't want to accept mutual disarmament at this time. They no doubt feel that soft words and continuous talk will cause the West by itself to relax its defenses.

That would be fatal. True military strength will not build the peace, but it is the shield to the free world without which there would be no chance of building the peace.

Los Angeles Seeks More International Air Travel Out of Los Angeles International Airport—Board of Supervisors Unanimously So Resolve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I call to your attention, and that of my other colleagues, a memorandum of minutes of the Board of Supervisors in Los Angeles County, Calif., relating to international air travel out of Los Angeles International Airport:

The board met in regular session. Present: Supervisors Kenneth Hahn, John Anson Ford, Burton W. Chace, and Roger W. Jessup; and Harold J. Ostly, clerk, by James S. Allison, deputy clerk. Absent: Chairman Herbert C. Legg.

• • • • •

IN RE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

On motion of Supervisor Ford, unanimously carried (Supervisor Jessup being temporarily absent) it is ordered that Supervisor Chace be and he is hereby appointed chairman pro tempore until the return of Chairman Herbert C. Legg.

• • • • •

Minute Book No. 426, page 37:

IN RE APPLICATION OF KLM ROYAL DUTCH AIRLINES FOR PERMIT TO OPERATE OUT OF LOS ANGELES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT: ORDER SUPPORTING AND INSTRUCTING CLERK TO SUBMIT PETITION TO CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD, WASHINGTON, D. C.

On motion of Supervisor Ford, unanimously carried, it is ordered that the request of the KLM Royal Dutch Airlines for foreign air carrier operating permit out of Los Angeles Airport be, and the same is hereby supported by this board, and that in view of the destiny of Los Angeles as one of the greatest international airports in the world, it is ordered that the clerk of this board be and he is hereby instructed to petition the Civil Aeronautics Board in Washington, D. C., urging serious consideration of said application in order that there may be speedy establishment of a direct Los Angeles-Amsterdam air connection.

I, Harold J. Ostly, county clerk of the county of Los Angeles and ex officio clerk of the board of supervisors of said county, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of the original minutes of the board of supervisors, as entered in Minute Book No. 426, page 37, in re application of KLM Royal Dutch Airlines for permit to operate out of Los Angeles International Airport: Order supporting and instructing clerk to submit petition to Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D. C.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the board of supervisors, this 26th day of April 1956.

HAROLD J. OSTLY,
County Clerk and ex officio Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, State of California.
By JAMES S. ALLISON.

Federal Highway and Highway Revenue Acts of 1956

SPEECH
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10660) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I strongly favor this legislation as it is essential that we have a sound highway system throughout our entire country. It is vital to our commerce and industry, and it is necessary for the Federal Government to take the leadership in developing an adequate system of interstate highways. I have always favored a sound interstate highway system and I have consistently supported all sound proposals to attain this goal. However, I did not feel justified to vote for the highway proposal submitted during the last session of Congress, as the financing provisions of this legislation were not equitable.

I feel that the committee has done a remarkable job in considering this legislation. They have included the best features of the highway proposals and have endeavored to equitably distribute the load to pay for the highway program. They have used extremely sound judgment in including the Davis-Bacon provisions in this legislation as this provision will have a stabilizing effect and will protect the individual communities when the constructon program is underway.

Mr. Chairman, our highway system is today entirely inadequate. It has not only contributed to highway accidents but has actually formed a roadblock for commerce throughout the country. This bill with its long-range aspects will eliminate most of the present inadequacies and will contribute much in the further development of our country.

Soviet Union Taking Lead in Airpower and Missiles Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, permit me to direct the attention of our colleagues to Mr. Stewart Alsop's column entitled "Missiles and the President" which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune for May 6, 1956. It is as follows:

MATTER OF FACT
(By Stewart Alsop)
MISSILES AND THE PRESIDENT

WASHINGTON.—In this era of complacency, the most cogent warnings are blithely disregarded. For example, former Assistant Secretary of the Air Force Trevor Gardner has written two articles in Look magazine citing undenied facts to prove that this country is losing both the airpower and the missiles race to the Soviet Union. Hardly anybody has paid much attention. Perhaps more attention would have been paid if it had been known that the second Gardner article, on the missiles race, was written in the hope that it would be read by President Eisenhower, and that the President would recognize in it a special, hidden meaning. The story goes back to last November, when the President, at a meeting of the National Security Council at Camp David, again took up the reins of Government after his heart attack. At the Camp David meeting, the President was briefed on the major problems confronting his administration. Gardner, together with Deputy Secretary of Defense Reuben Robertson, and one or two others, was assigned to brief the President on the missile problem. The President was told how, in midsummer, almost certain knowledge had come into the hands of the Government that the Soviets were already testing medium-range missiles. He was told how a decision had very recently been taken to start a new missiles program to attempt to match the Soviet achievement in the medium-range field. And the cumbrous organization of the whole missile program was described to the President.

After his briefing, the President asked certain angry questions. And that is why Gardner's second article, "Our Guided Missile Crisis," should have had a special significance to the President. Toward the end of the article, there appears the following paragraph, which Gardner italicized:

"Why did it take from August to November to make a decision to proceed with the medium-range missile? Why is the present organization so filled with committees? Why wasn't one man put in charge of the entire programs at an early stage? * * * Won't interservice rivalries and the multiplicity of programs result in a slow-down of intercontinetal ballistic missile progress? Why isn't the ICBM given a clear top priority over other missiles programs?"

These are, in paraphrase, precisely the same questions which the President asked the assembled moguls of his administration at Camp David, after he had been briefed on the missiles crisis by Gardner and Robertson. The questions remain unanswered—a point which Gardner, when he wrote the article, undoubtedly hoped would strike the President.

The President has, in fact, recognized from the first the huge significance of the evidence of Soviet success in the missile field. After the evidence became available, and while the President was vacationing in Colorado before his heart attack Secretary of the Air Force Donald Quarles wrote a memorandum for him on the missile problem.

The Quarles memorandum took the line that the Soviet achievement was important, but not decisively important, in view of the continuing superiority of the United States in the air-atomic field. The memorandum recommended progress in the missile field with all practicable speed.

The President revised the memorandum in his own hand, underlining the decisive importance of the Soviet achievement, changing "all practicable" to "all possible," and assigning top priority to missile development. Again, at the Camp David meeting, as the questions paraphrased by Gardner suggest, the President made it abundantly clear that he was deeply disturbed by our relative lack of progress in the missile field. He said that he was determined to get someone to run the missiles program the way it ought to be run, even if he had to do the job himself.

Yet, the President's angry questions still need answering, and, as Gardner proves beyond question in his article, the missiles program is still inadequate and badly organized. It is not really being run by any one. Why?

Gardner asked the same question in his article: "How can all this happen, many citizens will ask, when the President himself is a great general? It happens because * * * the communications system he relies on simply isn't working."

This is another way of saying that the built-in resistance in the vast bureaucracy of the defense establishment to the needed drastic change in the organization of our missile effort has, so far, proved too strong for the President to buck—about as disturbing a conclusion as it is possible to imagine.

Gen. Milan Stefanik

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, many of us paused briefly last Friday, May 4, to mark the anniversary of the death of Gen. Milan Stefanik. Stefanik was a Slovak and one of the great leaders of the Slovak people. But he was more than a mere national figure. He was a man respected in the years during and just after World War I, and revered in memory now, as a true statesman in the cause of all the democratic values which Americans and Slovaks alike hold dear. Though 37 years have passed since his tragic death, we can never forget what he did and stood for. His life will always give new inspiration to all believers in freedom and justice, whether they now enjoy and vigilantly defend the blessings of liberty in the United States, or are suffering under the tyranny of a cruel dictatorship behind the Iron Curtain.

Support of Our National Parks Is a Public Responsibility and a Public Privilege

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent granted me so to do, I am pleased to herewith present a timely and significant article appearing in the Christian Science Monitor under date of Thursday, May 3, 1956.

SUPPORT OF NATIONAL PARKS: A PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY

In addition to efforts of those charged with immediate responsibility for the national parks—efforts now being carried forward in the National Park Service's Mission 66—the private citizen has a vital role in helping to safeguard these natural treasure houses of beauty and inspiration.

THE NATIONAL PARKS: A HERITAGE WORTH SAVING

(By Max K. Gilstrap)

WASHINGTON.—A massive effort to save the national parks from further despoliation and even eventual destruction has begun to gather momentum. Its continued progress will depend upon how much Americans treasure their priceless scenic and historic heritage, on how much support they give to the protective efforts now under way. Only an aroused and vocal public—the people who own the parks—can insure that the parks and monuments will be saved.

Of greatest significance, Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service and originator of the bold, imaginative Mission 66 program to provide urgently needed parks preservation over a period of 10 years, has enunciated his unequivocal stand to keep the park areas free from any activities that would impair their natural state as envisioned by the park founders.

Affirming that the National Park Service's fundamental policy of protection has not changed, Mr. Wirth says, nevertheless: "There are situations and conditions in the national park system to which I object. * * * As rapidly as it is feasible to do so we hope to remedy them, meanwhile preventing others from developing or becoming established.

"We definitely do not want the national parks to be resorts as that word is commonly understood," says Mr. Wirth.

Challenge anticipated

Along with this heartening policy statement, the best news the Nation could have with spring in the air and the wilderness beckoning is the hearty reception that has been given here in Washington to Mission 66.

Park officials warn, however, that the assistance program in the national parks has just begun after long years of neglect and that the upward trail ahead is beset with the obstacle of general apathy and the challenge to promote public enlightenment. These must be met before the peaks of parks preservation are reached. Even then, continued vigilance and efforts will be necessary.

Park enthusiasts have been pleased with the reception given the Park Service's Mission 66 plan. President Eisenhower enthusiastically approved the program, and his administration authorized a very substantial increase in the Park Service's rather modest 1957 appropriations request.

Not to be outdone, Congress, with a warming glow of appreciation for the Nation's great scenic and historical shrines, increased the appropriations again.

As it now stands, the House has passed a 1957 national parks appropriation in the amount of $67,688,000 and the Senate has approved one of $68,020,000. All that remains is the minor task of adjusting the differences in conference.

What about the Mission 66 program after 1957?

Budgetary plans for the succeeding 9 years will follow a funding schedule set forth in the Mission 66 report and in a booklet, Our Heritage, published by the Park Service. As the program rolls forward, revisions will be made according to needs.

Besides yearly appropriations necessary to carry out the program, certain authorities will be needed to facilitate operations. Thus three bills have been introduced for this purpose. These bills, recognizing Mission 66 as a 10-year program, would be an expression of congressional approval of the entire program.

Public briefed

In brief, there are five things the public should know about Mission 66 at this time, according to Howard R. Stagner, assistant chief of the Mission 66 staff:

1. The program will go forward only so long as the American people are actively behind it.

2. Mission 66 is basically a conservation program. However, it necessarily includes a great deal of construction. But it will not invade areas that must be left alone, nor intrude upon significant features. Only adequate and properly designed developments will be installed. Relocation of developments that now intrude will be accomplished.

3. Mission 66 is a 10-year program, and while every area will benefit, not all areas will benefit during the first few years. To be practical and fair, the Park Service will take care of the most urgent needs first.

4. The Mission 66 plan for any area must be scaled to its anticipated future use. In the past, when travel grew from 100,000 to 200,000, the problem could be met merely by expanding facilities. Jumping from 1 million to 2 million is a far different problem. It cannot be met merely by expanding, but will require a different plan of operation if the basic purposes of the national parks are to be fulfilled.

5. The national park system cannot continue to absorb the expanding recreational needs of the Nation. The expansion of State, county, and municipal parks and recreation areas must go on concurrently. Other places are needed to provide local recreation and special uses for which the national parks, with a distinctive national purpose, are neither well situated nor suited.

Mr. Wirth expresses deep appreciation for the support being given Mission 66 by the public, the press, the administration, and Congress. He asks for public patience and restraint as the Park Service strives to strike

a proper balance between use, preservation, and development. He assures that each area will receive fair and proper treatment in accordance with the urgency and extent of its needs.

Mr. Wirth says that as Mission 66 goes forward its guiding principles are the fundamental preservation and public use of the national parks. "These principles will prevail," he says; "it is only our practices, the way of meeting the objectives, that change with the times. Our national parks must be used if they are to be of their intended value to the Nation, but that use must not destroy or impair their distinctive features and inspirational quality and atmosphere."

PARKS ARE NOT RESORTS

(By Conrad L. Wirth, Director, National Park Service)

WASHINGTON.—One of the many blessings that we enjoy in this free country of ours is a magnificent heritage of scenic beauty and historic shrines in the national-park system. The people of this country have entrusted the National Park Service with responsibility for passing this heritage on to generations yet unborn, a heritage unimpaired for their use and enjoyment. I speak for all of us in the National Park Service when I say that we shall carry out that trust.

Mission 66, a program of conservation formulated by the National Park Service, recommended by the Department of the Interior and the President, and now given general approval of the Congress, is directed to the fulfillment of the original purposes of parks use and preservation. We are enjoined by the 1916 act creating the National Park Service to promote and regulate the use of the areas entrusted to our keeping for the purpose which the act defines.

The Mission 66 report rightly declares that substantial and appropriate use is the best means by which this basic purpose is realized and is the best guaranty of perpetuating the system.

Thus far, thanks to the fine backing of the Department of the Interior and the splendid cooperation of conservation and civic groups and information media throughout the country we have been successful in fighting off such threats to the parks as:

The building of an aerial tramway far up the slopes of Mt. Rainer; carving up a quarter million acres of unique rain forest from Olympic National Park; construction of a dam which would drown some 19,000 acres of Glacier National Park; erection of a television tower atop a historic landmark on the Oregon Trail; and the installation of a whole series of reservoirs in the majestic wilderness of Kings Canyon National Park.

Had these and other proposals been successful they would undoubtedly have resulted in impairment of the parks.

An examination of the Mission 66 proposals will disclose the special stress given to enlarging and strengthening the Service's interpretive program. This program makes for a fuller appreciation of our heritage; we value it also because such appreciation carries with it a stronger attitude of protectiveness toward the parks.

We are endeavoring, in Mission 66, to provide adequately for those kinds of enjoyment that are suitable and nonimpairing, by installing more campgrounds in proper locations; by improving our trail systems so that more people may be induced to take to the trails; by applying proper protective measures to back-country and other wilderness areas; and by correcting, as rapidly as possible situations—many of them of long standing—which today's volume and pattern of use have rendered undesirable, but which cannot be corrected overnight.

With respect to this latter effort, let me cite two examples from Yellowstone.

1. The old canyon development was placed close to the rim of the magnificent Grand Canyon of the Yellowstone; it is now in the process of being moved back from the rim, at considerable expense to both the concessionaire and the National Park Service.

2. The impact of heavy public use that results from the concentration of facilities close to Old Faithful has caused considerable damage to the formations; it is the plan of the Service eventually to move these developments away from the formations.

Mission 66 contemplates actually moving out some of the facilities from certain areas of the parks system, the redevelopment and improvement of others, and the encouragement of communities adjoining the parks to care for the ever-increasing numbers of park visitors.

In Everglades National Park, we have determined that, if there are to be any overnight accommodations at all, they shall be only those needed to permit visitors to obtain an understanding of the park. In other words, they would be solely an adjunct to interpretation.

In some instances, the gradual expansion of facilities near focal points of interest has produced a difficult problem of protecting some of the most valuable treasures of the parks. We have long been aware that some of these situations need correction. We have moved, and will continue to move toward such correction as rapidly as we can overcome some of the economic difficulties involved and when the necessary public support has developed.

We definitely do not want the national parks to be resorts, as that word is commonly understood.

Another thing. We have resisted, and shall continue to resist pressure and extensions of national park road systems which are not fully justified. Our principal task today, as far as roads are concerned, is to make them safe for today's travel, but not to make speedways of them.

It is certain that the national park system cannot meet all the needs of the American people even for the types of outdoor recreation that all would agree are proper, or at least acceptable. Therefore, an important part of mission 66 is to encourage other agencies to assume their fair share of the load. There is room, too, for highly developed resorts such as Sun Valley, but at sites elsewhere than in the parks.

There are situations and conditions in the national park system to which I object. Many of these were not objectionable years ago when first installed, but changing conditions and increased use have made them inconsistent with the national park concept today. As rapidly as it is feasible to do so, we hope to remedy them, meanwhile preventing others from developing or becoming established.

In moving toward our goals, it is particularly important that we keep a sense of proportion and that we do not, by poorly timed moves on relatively minor matters, defeat or endanger objectives of greater importance.

My hope is that we shall be able fully to achieve the goal of mission 66. I hope at the end of 10 years, when the National Park Service will observe its 50th anniversary, to be able to say:

"The parks have been developed and staffed to provide facilities of all approved types, sufficient to meet the needs of those who visit them, at the same time guaranteeing the continued protection and preservation of the natural and historic heritage of which we are the trustees for the American people."

'Copter Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, with the advent of ultra high-speed travel by air, many of our cities are seriously considering the problem of the increasing delays in airport-to-city transportation. It is a marked inconsstency in our air travel planning to develop faster flight facilities only to defeat this advantage by continuing to rely on antiquated and time-consuming passenger service from outlying airports to adjacent metropolitan areas.

To meet this problem, the Civil Aeronautics Board has authorized helicopter service for three of the major city airports. However, the need for expansion of this authorization to include more of our traffic-congested cities has not been recognized by the Board. Indeed, for several years, the Board has even refused to grant hearings to several other cities throughout the Nation, including my own city of San Francisco, which deserves to be heard on this question. Passenger service requirements can be well demonstrated by these areas. To further deny them a hearing is to compound the effects which delay in establishing helicopter service will certainly bring in the anticipated airport-traffic increase of the coming years. In the hope that action will be taken to give the problem formal consideration, I am submitting the following editorial from the San Francisco Examiner of Tuesday, May 1, 1956:

'COPTER SERVICE

Every major airline serving San Francisco has now placed orders for jets or turboprops or both. The near advent of these high-speed planes makes more necessary than ever a helicopter passenger service radiating from San Francisco International Airport to all principal cities of the bay region.

The turboprop will shave 28 minutes off the Los Angeles-San Francisco flight time, doing the run in 1 hour and 7 minutes. But if the flight is completed at a morning or evening rush hour, as many of them are, a traveler bound for Berkeley will need another hour and 7 minutes by car to get there. A helicopter could do it in less than 15 minutes.

The pure jet will knock 3 hours off the New York-San Francisco flight time, making it in 5 hours. After that swift journey, a crowded airport bus on a crowded freeway will seem a horse and buggy to the traveler. A helicopter could deposit him downtown in 7 minutes.

Three cities—New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles—now have such 'copter service. Every large metropolitan area needs it, for it is the one way to outwit surface congestion.

Thus far, however, the Civil Aeronautics Board and Post Office Department have refused to grant mail subsidies for helicopter operations in additional cities. Without subsidy the service is not possible.

Such cities as Detroit, Philadelphia, Boston, and Cleveland have the same interest

in this matter as San Francisco. We suggest our Bay area officials and Congressmen take the lead in forming these cities into a bloc that can make itself heard before the CAB and Postmaster General.

Federal Tax Policy for Economic Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address entitled "Federal Tax Policy for Economic Growth" by Representative WILBUR D. MILLS, of Arkansas, before the 44th annual meeting of the United States Chamber of Commerce, Statler Hotel, May 1, 1956:

In the decade since the end of the Second World War, the American economy has dramatically demonstrated the vigor of its basic growth-generating forces. Apart from the mild recession of 1949 and the drop in 1954, the Nation's economic growth has been remarkably steady. For the decade as a whole, the private economy has grown at an annual rate of about 3½ percent in constant 1955 prices.

One of the most important factors in this growth is the character of the people of this country. Our perpetual dissatisfaction with present achievements, our alertness in recognizing problems and our welcome acceptance of the challenge they present, and the nearly universal conviction that better ways of living are to be had if we apply the proper effort, imagination, and creativeness in our undertakings—these attitudes are the well springs from which our material progress flows. Our spirit is that of the quest; the rewards to that spirit are daily unfolded before us.

The economy's performance since the end of World War II confirms the importance of sound public policy in providing the setting in which this spirit can impel our private-enterprise economy to new achievements. An instrument of this public policy has been the Employment Act of 1946 and the executive and congressional machinery which it established.

Recently, the Tax Policy Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report concluded an intensive study of the impact of the Federal tax system on the economic development of the Nation. Drawing on this study, I should like to suggest certain economic principles for Federal tax policy and offer some suggestions as to the nature of the revisions necessary for a more rigorous observance of these principles in our tax law.

THE LEVEL OF TAX REVENUES

In the fiscal year 1955, the Federal Government's net budget receipts amounted to $60.3 billion. On the basis of recent information it now seems that net receipts for fiscal 1956 may run as much as $3 billion greater than the $64.5 billion estimated in January of this year. During the past 10 fiscal years, the people and businesses of this country have paid to the Federal Government $494.1 billion. I mention this staggering amount only to remove any doubt you might have that I am perfectly well aware of the fact that taxes are high.

In recent years, we have become increasingly aware of the fact that a close relationship exists between the amount of money the Federal Government collects and spends and the level of activity in the economy as a whole. Although we still maintain that the basic purpose of taxation is to raise revenue to finance expenditures, we also recognize the fact that when Federal Government activities represent one-fifth of the national income, the manner in which those activities are financed will have significant economic consequences.

It is generally agreed, for example, that when the private economy is not fully using available resources, reducing taxes relative to spending will have a stimulating effect. It is also generally agreed that when the economy is pressing hard on available resources, increasing taxes relative to spending will help to repress inflationary pressures. Once the level of Government spending has been determined, changing the level of tax receipts is an effective way to minimize economic fluctuations. We cannot afford to neglect this important tool, since these fluctuations represent significant obstacles to the attainment of our objective of steady economic growth. Recessionary movements interrupt the process of growth by leaving some of our growing resources idle, while inflation makes continued growth more difficult to maintain.

Our first principle, therefore, is that the level of taxes should be related to the level of Government expenditures by the need for full use of growing productive resources and stability in the general price level. In practice, this means that we should move in the direction of reducing deficits or increasing budget surpluses during times of inflationary pressure, using at least some of our surplus for purposes of reducing debt. In times of recession, on the other hand, we should not be reluctant to move in the direction of deficits if these are needed to maintain full employment.

It now appears that we may well end fiscal year 1956 with a budget surplus as much as $2 billion, considerably in excess of the $200 million estimated for the year in the President's January budget message. The suggestion has been made that a budget surplus of this size makes possible, in fact requires, tax reduction. I am sure no one will argue with the point of view that, all other things being equal, tax reduction is a desirable course of action. We should bear in mind, however, that this healthy budget surplus is primarily the automatic result of the sharp rise in personal and corporation incomes in 1955 and not the result of corresponding reductions in expenditures. If, as it appears likely to many, that rise should resume during the course of the year, devoting any substantial portion of the budget surplus to tax reduction might well result in strong inflationary pressures which would cancel out, through price increases and general economic instability, the benefits from lower tax liabilities. It is possible, of course, that as we go further into 1956, the prospects for continued economic expansion may weaken. If persistent economic weakness should appear, tax reduction to stimulate private demand would be entirely appropriate.

Some maintain that top priority should be given to tax reduction lest continuation of present high rates destroy the spirit of quest which I have identified as a prime source of our Nation's growth and development. The actual growth record of the economy over the past decade, coinciding with the highest peacetime tax rates we have ever known, I believe, shows that this danger has been exaggerated. Present tax rates are certainly too high for the long run. At the present time, however, I am more concerned about the short-run inflationary dangers in premature or ill-timed tax reduction.

One might well ask, "if we cannot provide tax reduction now, with a budget surplus of the size now anticipated, and with the country at peace, what hope for tax cuts is there?" I think the chances for tax reduction are excellent. If we exercise the proper fiscal responsibility and integrity, if we insist that Federal tax policy reflect the need for avoiding both inflation and recession, these chances will be greatly enhanced. If we succeed in moderating short-run economic fluctuations, we can count on a steady growth over the next decade which will make possible substantial reductions in effective Federal tax rates.

RESPONSIVENESS OF THE FEDERAL REVENUE SYSTEM TO ECONOMIC FLUCTUATIONS

The legislative record of the postwar decade demonstrates the willingness of the Congress to make adjustments in fiscal and monetary policy to offset recessionary and inflationary movements, once these movements are recognized. However, a considerable period may elapse between the time economic disturbances get under way and the time adequate objective evidence with respect to their character and direction is available. The Congress cannot be expected to legislate significant changes in, say, individual income tax rates on the basis of forecasts of short-run economic fluctuations, it must wait until a basic need for such changes is clear. During this lag, however, the economic disturbances may gain considerable momentum, thereby increasing the difficulties in taking appropriate action. To the extent that our fiscal and monetary system contains automatic features for offsetting fluctuations, the problems of economic stabilization facing the Congress and the administration are reduced.

Our present tax system contains a number of such features. Chief among these are the individual and corporation income taxes. Other elements of the Federal revenue system respond sluggishly to changes in national income. In the interests of strengthening the automatic countercyclical responsiveness of the tax system, therefore, we should avoid tax changes which would weaken our income taxes and force heavier reliance on other elements in the revenue system. For example, proposals for shifting to a general manufacturer's sales tax to finance income-tax reductions or to impose constitutional limitations on income-tax rates, thereby requiring relatively greater use of consumption taxes, not only would violate generally held concepts of fairness but would represent a serious threat to economic stability.

The automatic stabilizing capacity of income taxes depends on the size and composition of the tax base, the degree of effective progression in the tax-rate structure, and the promptness with which tax payments are made. In all but the last respect there is considerable room for improving the built-in flexibility of the income taxes.

For example, only about 40 percent of what the Department of Commerce describes as personal income enters the individual income-tax base, and some of the types of income which are most sensitive to broad changes in economic conditions are not fully subject to tax. Of course, considerations other than those of strengthening built-in flexibility must be taken into account in determining the appropriate tax treatment of various kinds of income and expense. Nevertheless, it must be recognized that a tax proposal which would have the effect of partially or fully sheltering income from tax will involve a cost—perhaps a significant one—in reducing the capacity of the tax system automatically to damp down undesirable economic fluctuations.

Very considerable improvements can be made in increasing the effective progression of the tax-rate structure. We have heard a great deal in recent years about the allegedly pernicious effects of income-tax progression on incentives and, therefore, on economic growth. This question, among others, was

carefully explored last year in the study conducted by the Subcommittee on Tax Policy. Taking full account of the testimony of the most extreme critics of the present tax structure, it is fair to report as the conclusion of this study that most of the criticism of the individual income tax is not properly directed against progression per se, but rather against the level of the whole rate schedule.

The study also revealed, by reference to statistics from tax returns, that effective progression in the individual income tax is considerably less than that suggested by the statutory tax-rate schedules. At the present time, for example, less than one-fifth of individual income-tax revenues is produced by marginal rates above the first bracket. Moreover, when full allowance is made for all the income received by the taxpayer, the data show that for individuals with adjusted gross incomes over $100,000 effective rates varied, in 1951, from 37 to 68 percent and averaged about 45 percent.

These data suggest to me that we can greatly strengthen effective progression in the individual income tax, and thereby fortify the ability of the tax to counteract economic fluctuations, without increasing the level of individual income taxes. In fact, if it were possible to broaden the tax base, we could both increase progression and lower tax rates at the same time. There are, admittedly, substantial difficulties in pursuing this objective, but the rewards would be very great indeed.

THE FEDERAL TAX SYSTEM AND BALANCED ECONOMIC GROWTH

The excellent postwar record of the American economy in maintaining steady growth is due, in large part, to the fact that we have maintained an approximate balance between consumer expenditures and capital outlays. When this balance is upset, economic difficulties quickly follow. A rate of growth in consumption in excess of investment results in a faltering in the rise in living standards because of the failure of productive capacity to keep pace with the expansion of consumption needs. On the other hand, too rapid a rate of capital formation means sacrifices of current living standards and threatens idle capacity and disorganization of further growth. Imbalance between consumption and investment, therefore, can be a seriously destabilizing development.

On the whole, the Federal tax system has contributed toward maintaining an appropriate balance between consumption and investment. Both business and consumers have had to forego—over the last decade—some of the gains that would have been possible had the world been less troubled by international tensions and conflicts. But the sacrifice has not been markedly one-sided. In the interests of continuing economic growth and stability in the present environment of world affairs, we want to avoid unsettling shifts in tax burdens.

I do not mean to suggest that any adjustment in relative tax burdens would be unwarranted. There are numerous ways in which our tax system can and should be modified to provide a fairer distribution of the total tax load. Such adjustments are always timely, given due regard to their revenue effects. I do mean to caution against broad shifts in the balance between consumption and investment impacts of taxation which do not accord with basic economic requirements. Relatively heavier tax burdens on consumers in order to ease taxes on business would clearly not be in order when slackening economic growth is associated with lagging consumer demand and idle plant and equipment. By the same token, we would want to avoid heavier relative tax burdens on business at a time when rising consumer demand was inadequate to induce the desired rate of growth in industrial capacity.

Balanced economic growth also requires that taxes fall as neutrally as possible among all taxpayers. It is in this respect that I believe the maxim about taxation for revenue purposes only is most meaningful, for the use of tax devices to effect particular economic results is, on the whole, a dangerour policy to pursue. The present tax law is replete with preferential provisions for special tax-paying groups and measures up poorly to the standard of neutrality.

A common characteristic of these preferential provisions is that they tend to induce taxpayers to use the resources at their disposal in a different manner from that which would be called for by prudent management in both business and personal life. We pride ourselves on the effectiveness with which the price system, operating in free markets, acts to signal consumers, investors, and managers to use their resources in the most efficient way possible. Special tax provisions often introduce considerations which are at variance with the signals of the market place. If the benefits from these special tax provisions are great enough, they may outweigh market considerations. The result will be interference in the allocation of resources and therefore a lower total real value for the product of the economy.

Any one of the present preferential provisions, by itself, may well be quite laudable. But we have to recognize that a tax benefit to encourage any one industry or group necessarily means willingness to deter the growth of others not equally favored. Much of the legislative history of our tax system is a reflection of the efforts of some such group to obtain for itself tax concessions similar to those previously extended to another. It is simply a basic fact of our fiscal life that the more preferential treatment we give any one taxpayer or group of taxpayers, the less we can give to all others.

We must also recognize how great a responsibility is assumed in providing preferential tax treatment. These provisions represent value judgments about the type of economic activity most essential to the process of economic growth. This is the very type of decision which virtually all of us feel cannot be safely made except by the impersonal mechanism of the price system.

A fundamental objective in formulating tax policy should be to strive for neutrality and uniformity in the application of our tax laws. Greater uniformity would eliminate or reduce distortions in economic development, provide us a much fairer tax system, and greater automatic responsiveness to changes in levels of economic activity.

THE FEDERAL REVENUE SYSTEM AND THE COMPETITIVE POSITION OF NEW AND SMALL BUSINESS

Apart from the sentimental attachment that all of us have to new and small businesses, there is, I believe, a sound scientific basis for emphasizing their importance in our economy. They represent often the concrete expression of the creativeness and imagination which are basic resources for economic progress. A constant stream of new businesses is our best assurance that established companies will continue to face the challenges which are so important in the development of new products and new and better production methods. A large number of small businesses is required to insure that control over the use of resources, output, and prices is widely diffused, and therefore that these resources will be most efficiently used.

Tax policy must prevent tax discrimination against small and new business. It must avoid reinforcing those pressures in the economy for the submergence of such businesses, either by failure or by amalgamation with larger business units. The rise in mergers and other consolidations in recent months is one of the factors that suggests the need for reexamination of public policy in this area. Even though these mergers do not necessarily involve small companies, the increasing concentration of business which they frequently produce threatens the continuing independence of small firms. Data on the rate of business failures, over 90 percent of which refers to small businesses, are also cause for concern. The information supplied by the SEC–FTC, while not conclusive, strongly suggests that small businesses are not sharing the rewards of the current high level of business activity on an equal basis with their larger competitors.

Tax considerations are frequently identified as major factors working against small and new companies. Although it is difficult to determine the significance of these considerations, we must be alert to this type of possibility and scrutinize both the existing tax law and all new tax proposals for their implications in this respect.

To recapitulate, Federal tax policy for steady economic growth should (1) relate the levels of Government revenues and expenditures to the need for full use of growing productive resources and stability in the general price level; (2) strengthen the income tax in order to increase the built-in stabilizing capacity of the Federal tax system. I hasten to add, parenthetically, that this is not to be construed as urging a bigger income-tax bite; (3) maintain a careful balance between those elements of the tax system which rest most heavily on consumption and on investment and seek greater neutrality among taxpayers; and (4) protect the competitive position of small and new businesses.

I would like to outline, very broadly, the type of tax revision implied by these recommendations.

In the individual income tax area there is considerable need for greater effective progression of tax liabilities, particularly in the low- and middle-income range. I mean that the starting rate in many of these brackets is too high. In recent years, about 80 percent of individual returns have been subject to tax at only the first bracket rate. For these taxpayers, progression in effective tax rates depends largely on the number of dependents claimed. A substantial improvement, both in the distribution of tax burdens and in the automatic responsiveness of the tax, would result if ways could be found to split the present first bracket and provide a lower starting rate.

Furthermore I do not believe that the interests of a truly progressive income tax are well served by a marginal rate structure which reaches 91 percent. It has been repeatedly pointed out that these upper rates are largely fictitious. The Statistics of Income for 1952, for example, show that out of 13 million returns with itemized deductions, only 1,279 returns reported taxable income to any part of which the top marginal rate was applicable. That's less than one one-hundredth of 1 percent.

These high rates are part of the vicious circle in which the income tax has been ensnared. When we have rates so high taxpayers make determined efforts to obtain preferential treatment for various types of income and expenses. To the extent that they succeed the tax base shrinks, thereby reeinforcing the need for high tax rates. It seems to me, therefore, that we should concentrate on restoring the shrunken tax base while at the same time reducing the top marginal tax rates. These might top off at, say, 65 or 70 percent, depending on how successful efforts to broaden the tax base are.

In this connection high priority should be given to the present treatment of capital gains. Most experts in taxation agree that,

because of the taxpayer's control over the realization of capital gains and losses, it would not be practicable or desirable to treat such gains and losses like ordinary income and losses. While recognizing the need for some differential treatment, I think it is highly doubtful that the present preferential treatment is best suited to meet the problems that arise in this tax area. The present treatment offers strong inducements to middle and upper bracket taxpayers to convert ordinary income into capital gains and to seek legislation which extends capital gains treatment to an ever-widening array of receipts. Even a cursory review of the present capital-gains basket reveals a large number of income items which involve neither a capital asset nor a sale or exchange.

The basic problems in the capital gains area are of definition. A determined effort should be made to resolve these problems. At the very least, proposals for further extension of capital-gains treatment as a relief device should be resisted.

In the area of taxation of business income one of the most pressing problems is the treatment of net operating losses. The basic purposes of providing a carryover of net operating business losses appear to be disregarded by the present law which makes these carryovers prime booty acquired in the process of business combination. The transferability of these losses has been a major contributing factor in the recent merger movement. The technical problems in this area are certainly thorny, but revision is urgently required.

Much can be said in favor of the accelerated depreciation provisions included in the 1954 code, although they are not entirely irreproachable. On the other hand, coupled with capital-gains treatment for gains realized on the sale of assets depreciated under the new provisions, Treasury revenues may seriously suffer, and more important, uneconomic replacement practices are encouraged. Sound economic replacement practices should be encouraged. It would be a highly desirable reform to limit the accelerated depreciation provisions to assets with normal useful lives somewhat greater than the 3 years stipulated in the present statute and to modify the application of capital-gains treatment to depreciable property.

Another problem concerns the appropriate treatment of dividend distributions. We are all aware of the undesirable bias which the present corporation income tax may impose against external equity financing. The individual dividends-received credit and exclusion are not, in the view of most disinterested tax experts, the appropriate approach to the solution of this problem. I think these provisions should be eliminated in favor of some provision at the corporate level for putting dividend and interest payments on a par.

In the excise area, efforts are currently being made to simplify a wide range of technical provisions, primarily relating to compliance and administration. We must begin to give consideration to reduction or elimination of a number of excises which have differentially adverse effects on business-cost structures and competitive relationships. The taxes on transportation, on communications, and on business machines and equipment are cases in point, although not the only ones.

Finally, our estate and gift taxes should be substantially modified. At the present time, they produce only very modest revenues and, therefore, do not well perform the basic function of any tax. Moreover, the structure of these taxes is such as to invite tax avoidance. Even more so than in the case of income taxes, progression in the estate and gift taxes is fictitious. On the other hand, there are other elements of these taxes which contribute toward the merger of small family businesses into large public companies. Revision of our estate and gift taxes should seek to make them more truly progressive, more productive of revenue, and at the same time less biased against family enterprises.

I must acknowledge that I've carved out a large order in my last remarks. We have recently witnessed the magnitude of the undertaking involved in even a comparatively modest revision of our internal-revenue laws. On the other hand, the interests of steady economic growth are more compelling, surely, than consideration of the difficulties involved in large-scale tax revision. This revision is necessary if we are to develop a tax system which is fair and which conforms to sound economic principles.

As a postscript, I should like to add that the extent to which such revision entails a net loss of revenue to the Government must be given careful consideration in the timing of legislation. I do not know whether it would be possible to undertake these constructive reforms with no net revenue loss. Some tax experts argue affirmatively on this question. If this is not the case, however, we should attempt to gear any revision program to periods in which tax reductions are called for to sustain economic growth. The present economic condition of the country, as I have suggested, does not appear to warrant or even permit any significant reduction in revenues, unless we are willing to impose heavier responsibility on the Federal Reserve System to contain inflationary pressures. Should the economic outlook change, however, we should be ready with a program for general tax revision and reduction. I hope that the discussion today will make some modest contribution in stimulating interest in such a program.

H. R. 5550

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution which was forwarded to me by William G. Daugherty, president, Ohio Glass Workers Protective League, Newark, Ohio:

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition and memoralize you, in accordance with amendment 1 to the Constitution of the United States of America, to refrain from enacting H. R. 5550 and instead to bring the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade before the Congress of the United States in accordance with the treatymaking provisions of the Constitution, for the following reasons:

1. Passage of H. R. 5550 would impair the right of petition and redress guaranteed in our Constitution, since tariff policy and foreign commerce would be made subject to determinations by an international agency.

2. H. R. 5550 would hinder labor and business from obtaining effective action by the Congress of the United States, as guaranteed by article 1, section 8, of the Constitution, which declares: "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises * * * to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States."

3. H. R. 5550 would remove from Congress its full and effective freedom to exercise its constitutional responsibilities in these fields.

4. H. R. 5550 would remove tariff and trade policy determinations from the Federal Government and subject them to an international organization in which the people of the United States are not adequately represented and where the United States delegate would have but 1 of the 35 votes, the same as the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, Haiti, and other countries with populations less than many cities and States in this Nation.

Now, therefore, we request that this petition and memorial be formally placed before the Congress of the United States.

OHIO GLASS WORKERS PROTECTIVE LEAGUE,
WILLIAM A. DAUGHERTY,
President.
JAMES BURDEN, *Secretary.*

Poland's Defiance of Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Star of May 7, 1956:

POLAND'S DEFIANCE OF MOSCOW—POLES DUE TO CITE ISSUES THAT WOULD NEVER HAVE BEEN RAISED UNDER STALIN

(By Dorothy Thompson)

Monarchies provide a legitimate succession through the king's bodily heirs. Constitutional republics like our own provide for it in written law. In Great Britain and France the ultimate repository of authority was fixed, only after generations of struggle, in the lower house of parliament, representative of the whole people.

By such means states are assured of the basic requirement of stable government—continuity.

The two previous Soviet governments were both based on seizures of power and naked force—Lenin's by revolutionary upheaval, Stalin's by the camarilla he built around his person, through which he became a more absolute ruler than any 15th century czar.

The Russian Communist Party has neither exercised authority nor been trained to do so. It has merely rubberstamped edicts to give the appearance of authority. Therefore an inner political crisis must develop.

This crisis cannot be confined to the Soviet Union. Stalin's authority extended to all the satellite states, whose governments, without exception, are based on seizures of power under protection of threat of Russian arms. Though theoretically independent, these states, in reality, have been totally subservient to Moscow. In effect they have been colonies.

But in reconciling itself to Tito, the Russian Government also established the right of all states outside Soviet frontiers to work out their own destinies. By posthumously challenging Stalin in the Soviet Union, it is encouraging a revisionist attitude toward his policies in the satellites.

This is especially discernible in Poland, the only satellite that fought with the Allies and whose treatment cannot be justified as meted out to a defeated enemy—a nation in which burns the fiercest patriotism in Europe, and one which, historically, has no reason to trust Russia.

Regardless of the fact that Poland has a Communist-Socialist government, no government of an acutely national conscious nation can successfully establish its legitimate right to govern as the instrument of a foreign power, especially when the power has re-

peatedly manifested its enmity toward the nation as such.

The pulse, therefore, of the present strength or weakness of the Soviet Union can best be taken in Warsaw.

The Polish Government is showing no fear of Stalin's successors.

Directly, or through the controlled press, it has raised four issues that, it is safe to say, would never have been aired under Stalin.

The Government has presented a list of Polish Communists liquidated in Russia between 1938 and 1942, claiming these were 80 percent of the party's membership.

It has arrested two top men of the security police.

The Association of Polish Writers has demanded immediate trial of informers who have denounced patriotic Polish writers to the security police.

The press has demanded clarification of the massacre of Polish officers in the Katyn Forest during World War II.

To raise this fourth issue is daring indeed. The Polish Government in exile in London was recognized by Stalin until it demanded an investigation of the Katyn Forest massacre, by the International Red Cross.

Furious at the implication that the Russians rather than the Germans may have committed this atrocity—a suspicion subsequently evidently supported—Stalin, in fury, broke off relations with the London government and created, in Kiev, the Lublin government, subsequently installing it in Warsaw with Russian bayonets.

Can it be that Russia's own creation now is prepared to make overtures to the Poles still in exile?

The Warsaw government may be overreaching itself. But such symptoms indicate that it is, apparently, no longer afraid of the Kremlin.

The National Water Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Exeter News-Letter, Exeter, N. H., Thursday, May 3, 1956, entitled "The National Water Supply":

Although Exeter is indeed fortunate in its abundant supply of municipal water and rural residents in the region seem to find an undiminishing supply in private wells, the picture in many parts of the country is one of anxious concern.

Geologists estimate that of the 4,300 billion gallons of water released over the United States daily in the form of rain or snow, only 1,300 billion gallons go to streams or into underground water supplies. The remainder is absorbed by plants or returns directly to the atmosphere through evaporation.

And while the present demand for fresh water is only 200 billion gallons, by 1975 the need is expected to jump to nearly 300 billion. Surprisingly, irrigation and industry together account for over 90 percent of inland water usage with the remainder being used by home dwellers. Industry is constantly developing methods of reclaiming water for reuse, but irrigation methods require improvement to eliminate waste, especially in the agricultural West and Southwest where water demands cause the greatest anxiety.

The hope of the future, especially in arid sections of the country, is the progress being made in conversion of sea water. Present calculations indicate the converted sea water costs about 10 times as much as undistributed irrigation water and about four times as much as municipal water.

Don't Return Enemy Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I filed with the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on April 30, 1956, in support of my bill H. R. 80 to authorize the immediate sale of Government-held properties of the General Aniline & Film Corp.:

Mr. Chairman, I welcome the opportunity of explaining my reasons for the introduction of H. R. 80, which would amend the Trading With the Enemy Act by authorizing the immediate sale of alien properties after a finding by the President that it is in the national interest to do so and impound the proceeds of the sale until final judicial determination of legal ownership. This bill is identical with one I introduced in the 83d Congress, H. R. 5988.

The principal properties of the General Aniline & Film Corp., a multimillion dollar corporation under the control of the Alien Property Custodian, is located in the district which I represent, and the thousands of employees of that corporation, as well as other residents in that area, are vitally interested in, and affected by, the eventual decision which the Congress will make with respect to the ownership and management of these properties.

Since I first looked into this matter, I was, and still am thoroughly convinced that our Government should get out of the business of operating these industries which were seized at the outbreak of the last world war from our former enemies, Germany and Japan. The employees of the corporation are anxious for the Federal Government to be eliminated and normal private enterprise operations be established so that the company can grow and prosper.

There are two decisions this committee and the Congress must make in this matter: Should the properties be returned to their prewar owners and, in the case of the General Aniline & Film Corp., were the former owners enemy aliens? In the latter issue, our Supreme Court has ruled that, since some of the stockholders of the parent company were German nationals, the status of enemy ownership attached to the entire corporate ownership. Therefore, we can dismiss that issue from our further consideration since it has already been adjudicated by our courts. Our attention can now be centered in the question of whether to return the properties in kind or hold the proceeds in ecrow pending settlement of the pending suits. The legality of such procedure seems to be well established according to the brief submitted by the Department of Justice in this matter.

Under existing law, the Government cannot dispose of vested alien properties if the seizure itself is challenged by legal action. In the drafting of the Trading With the Enemy Act that provision was a very fine idea, and unquestionably a very considerate thought—during the heat of the last World War. It was intended to protect those who were not actually our enemies at the time of seizure.

The only trouble with the thought is that the objective could be so easily thwarted because the Germans learned back in World War I how to hide, or cloak, their ownership of various properties. As a result, we have seemingly endless lawsuits with their inherent delays, all to the disadvantage of this country. Delays will continue to consume time until 1 of 2 things happen: either the Congress is softened up by time and pressure until it returns the property to former owners, or our Government loses its lawsuit in the litigation instigated by the claimants, and is required to reconvey the properties. In either event we, the United States Government and the American people, lose.

We should look into history, or the record, on this subject. There we will find that the same influences were at work immediately after World War I as are occurring now. We find that it took the Congress 10 years—from 1922 to 1932—to realize it had made a mistake when it returned the properties held by citizens of our former enemies at the end of World War I. The same parties were involved then as they are now—Germany and the United States.

I sincerely believe that H. R. 80 is the most expeditious form of getting the Government out the chemical, dye, photographic, and duplicating-machine business in respect to this subject of war reparations of World War II, and at the same time do justice to the former owners. In brief, we would abide by the treaty with our World War II allies (the Paris Reparations Agreement) and, too, the agreement we signed with the Federal Republic of Germany, our former enemy.

Instead of operating these seized industries in question, we would sell them as provided in the Trading With the Enemy Act law, retain the proceeds in our Treasury to await the outcome of any litigation—paying in money those former owners who proved their claims and who were not our enemy.

By passage of H. R. 80, lawsuits could still continue, the qualified and proven claimant would be paid money instead of being handed a going and thriving American company. The Office of Alien Property (the custodian) could be cut back to a litigating agency, and the claims of our own citizens who have been wronged in two world wars could be paid.

I do not think that any of us can deny the fact that as long as these large corporations remain in the hands of our Alien Property Custodian there will be strong pressures and well-financed efforts by the former owners to regain the assets.

Allow me to forecast to you what will happen if these vested assets are returned to their former owners as is seriously urged upon the Congress by some persons.

A return of these properties would:

1. Require substantial and indefinite appropriations from the Federal Treasury.

2. Reverse the present policy of the United States and its World War II allies with respect to reparations, and deprive this country completely of all reparations.

3. Open up a huge pork barrel to the old enemy cartels without whose backing Hitler could not have forced the world to the very brink of disaster.

4. Provide a gift or windfall of some $200 million to individuals and organizations, some of whom are not even of German or Japanese nationality.

5. Enable the recapture, through devious means, of the huge business enterprises by the very persons they were taken from—in some instances in both world wars.

6. Endanger the security of secret processes essential to the defense of the United States.

These, as I see it, are the principal objections to a return of the properties. But

let us look at these objections more closely.

The first point is appropriations, the cost to us as taxpayers, and I don't need to remind you of the widespread demand these days that taxes be reduced.

The value of all of the vested properties under consideration here is better than a half billion dollars. That is the basic cost figure with which we must begin.

Around $225 million of these properties have already been liquidated and the moneys transferred to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission and disbursed to thousands of our citizens (prisoners of war,; internees, both civilian and military; religious organizations, etc.) who were the victims of suffering or damage, one or another, in the last war. So, over $225 million must be replaced immediately in our Treasury if the policy of property return is adopted.

This is what we might call a downpayment, and that is exactly what it is.

However, all of the property under question here is valued at well over a half billion dollars. This is property now held by the United States Government, and if it is given back, it must be replaced in our Treasury. So with a return we will make the second downpayment of around $300 million if our Government makes good on its promise to compensate our own citizens for their war damages. Now we are up to the half-billion dollar mark.

And there could be more, much more. For instance, what about enemy property located in the territories of our allies? Under our leadership, all of them seized this enemy property. And they also agreed to retain it. Also, they gave up in return for such retention the right to any other reparations from our former enemies. These are our agreements. We made them.

Now, if we reverse ourselves and return the property we have in our possession, who is going to pay the bill of our allies for the damages which their citizens suffered? Remember, this is our doing. After the United States made these arrangements by international treaties and agreements, our allies certainly had a right to rely on us. So now if we reverse ourselves certainly we will be called upon to pay this additional bill, and maybe we will have to do so.

This will add at least $300 million to our cost—that is, the amount of property our allies reported to the Interallied Reparations Agency they had seized.

Now our total is over $800 million—over three-quarters of a billion dollars. That is the price tag attached to the policy of property return. Do you want to buy it? I surely do not.

Now, let us look at the second point, reparations. This is a point that seems to be overlooked generally.

Much has been said in the press and in congressional hearings about the sanctity of private property—that governments should not seize it—and that such seizure is a complete reversal of our historic policy, followed in World War I—of retaining custody of enemy private property during hostilities, and then returning it after the war is over.

Yes, that is what we did in World War I, but that turned out to be quite a mistake—one that cost the United States billions of dollars. Anyone can be forgiven for making a mistake once, but to make the same mistake twice is both foolish and unpardonable.

After World War I we returned the enemy property we had seized—and received in return Germany's solemn promise that she would pay the war claims of our citizens. Of course, Germany defaulted. We gave up our collateral in return for a scrap of paper. Many of these claims are still unpaid.

Thirty years have passed—another world conflict is history—and in 1953, mind you—just 3 years ago—Germany again solemnly promised to pay these World War I—not World War II—but World War I claims. She says she will do it over a period of 26 years. If she does—I say "if"—some of our citizens will have waited about 56 years for the payment of their claims against Germany.

Will Germany default again? You may say we should not speculate on such a question, but the prospects are not bright you must agree.

World War II is over—the victorious allies met with their defeated enemies—the subject of reparations was under consideration—everyone knew of Germany's default on reparations after World War I—no one wanted that to happen again—so it was agreed that the enemy property that had been seized in the territory of each of the allies, would be retained by them—in lieu of any other reparations payments.

Remember that—"in lieu of any other reparations payments." We lost once—neither we, nor our allies, want that to happen again. Germany has agreed to this plan. In 1952, she signed the Bonn Convention agreeing that this property should be retained by the allies as their only reparations—and agreeing that she would compensate her own nationals for their losses due to property seizures by the allied powers.

Now this made sense. It would appear that we had refused to make the same mistake of World War I all over again.

Remember what I said about Germany's earlier default?

But listen to this. On March 7, 1954, Chancellor Adenauer appealed to the United States to return the vested German property.

So—just 2 years after another solemn agreement—the Bonn Agreement of 1952—we have the first move to cancel it.

So here we go again—down the same old disastrous and costly road. This German appeal is based on the historic policy of the sanctity of private property. Can't we see that we are talking about reparations—and not private property?

Can't we remember that obtaining reparations after fighting a victorious war is also a historic policy?

Can't we see—are we so blind not to see that the pressure to enact this legislation for return of the properties is coming from a few selfish people—the old notorious cartels that backed the Nazi machine in its attempt at world conquest? How blind and stupid and softhearted and fickle do they think we are?

This leads to my next point.

Under point 3, let's look at the cartel angle involved here. The name, "I. G. Farben" is notorious the world over.

Here is the world's greatest chemical trust—the one that gave to the murderous Hitler the technical know-how he needed. The one whose branches, spread throughout the world, constituted the greatest network for economic espionage ever seen. The one that was able to keep from us the secrets of synthetic rubber, among other things, when we needed that knowledge for our war effort. And the same one—I. G. Farben—that ordered destroyed—and the orders were carried out—a nitrocellulose plant located at Afton Lake, N. Y. Nitrocellulose is the basis of high explosives, and the plant was destroyed—on orders from Germany—at the time Hitler started his invasion of Europe. It took us 2 years to replace that destroyed potential of war production.

These are the type of people a return of the property would aid—these and their fronts—not the little man, the little German, for whom it may be possible to generate some sympathy, but the big business tycoons and the international financial brigands.

That brings me to the next point—the windfall, bonus, or gift—call it what you will—that would be involved in a return of the property, and this is the most compelling argument of all against the proposed return.

When these properties were seized, they were much smaller than they are today, both in size and in value.

Their increased values all were brought about by American management backed by American labor and American know-how.

Let's look at just a few of them—increase in value since 1942: General Aniline and Film Corp., from $35 million to $106 million. Schering Corp., from $1,300,000 to its sales price of $30 million. Spur Distributing Co., from $1 million to $3,300,000. Karl Lieberknecht, from $365,000 to $6,500,000.

These are just a few. The increased value of all the properties—this windfall, bonus, or what have you—is close to $200 million. Of all the giveaways this is the most flagrant and unjustified. You may wish to be a party to such an outrage, Mr. Chairman, but I hope you will excuse me.

Let us go to the next point.

It is the plan of the United States and its allies, solemnized by international agreements and treaties to not only keep this enemy property, but to try and make sure that it would never again fall into enemy hands.

In World War I, the then Custodian, after he had sold the German Bosch properties to citizens of our country, proudly announced that never again would this company fall into alien hands. Within a very few years, however, Robert Bosch, of Germany, had regained ownership of the corporation. The American purchasers had resold the firm to its original owners.

Came World War II, and Bosch property was again vested in our Alien Property Custodian. It was sold again in 1948, but this time in order to forestall a return to alien ownership, the certificate of incorporation was amended so as to restrict the ownership of the stock to American nationals.

The same thing was done when Schering Corp. was sold. This technique was applied in other sales.

Our Government believed that these companies should move into the American economy, and stay there.

That is one of the basic purposes of my bill, H. R. 80, to sell these companies into our economy. And they should be kept there.

All this leads me to my last point. One that involves the security of our Nation, and should be of paramount importance in your consideration.

Let us use but one example—General Aniline & Film Corp.

This is the major holding of our Alien Property Custodian, the largest single reparation we have, and the greatest I. G. Farben property taken from our former enemies by any allied custodian. This company has two of its principal plants in my district, as I have said, and consequently I am greatly interested in it, as well as the entire alien property problem.

This company has many secret processes that today are part of our defense effort. Some of them are so secret that it would be dangerous to even apply for a patent, and thereby risk exposure. It is working closely with our Government and the Department of Defense.

This property was vested from a Swiss corporation, now loud in its protestations of neutrality and innocence. The Department of Justice says that this Swiss claimant was and is a cloak for I. G. Farben of Germany.

The reluctance of the Swiss to come to issue and trial of this question, and they brought suit in 1947 for return of the property, would indicate there is more here than meets the eye.

Now we know the Germans are expert at cloaking or hiding their external assets. We learned that in two world wars. They want this company with its treasure trove of dollars and know-how—American-developed know-how and American dollar earnings.

Representatives of the Swiss cloak deny this, and have even testified they want to "Americanize" the company, that they will

sell it to Americans, but only after it is first returned to them.

Now if this were true, all they would have to do is to stipulate with the Department of Justice so as to allow our Government to make the sale. The lawsuit would then continue for the money resulting from such a sale. This is just what my bill would allow.

The Department of Justice conducts these sales in public to the highest qualified bidder. It has done so for years, and the sales have been successful. In this way, the retention of this great corporation by American owners could be made certain.

But no—the Swiss cloak won't agree to this. They want General Aniline back in their hands and what they will do with it no one can be sure.

They, by this stand, obviously want more than money.

Mr. Chairman, this problem has beset the Congress for many years since World War II. It is saturated with cross currents of conflicting interests, pressures, influences, and lobbyists. It is time to have it settled with finality. Both Democratic and Republican administrations have endorsed the provisions of H. R. 80—it has no partisan conflict. I urge that you make possible prompt action by the Congress at this session by reporting favorably H. R. 80, or some bill of similar nature and purpose. Thank you for your attention and consideration of these views.

Sell Enemy Assets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement filed by my colleague, Representative LEO W. O'BRIEN, before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, April 30, 1956, in support of his bill, H. R. 3608, and similar bills which would allow the Attorney General to sell vested enemy assets seized during World War II:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I, too, am very glad to have this opportunity to appear here today and say a few words in behalf of my bill, H. R. 3608, which is identical to that I introduced in the 83d Congress (H. R. 5896) and pertaining to the same subject, the Trading With the Enemy Act.

This resolution is also identical with that of my distinguished colleague, also from New York, Congressman COLE.

Like him, I have the sincere hope that this legislation will be acted upon by this committee.

I believe that our Government should be relieved of the very heavy burden, and duty, of operating the industries seized as reparations from our former enemies, Germany and Japan, during World War II.

If there is litigation involved, then let this matter be settled by our courts. I trust and believe in, and I am sure you do, too, our system of jurisprudence.

My colleague, Congressman COLE, has in detail explained the ramifications of the vested property subject. He has described the errors we made following World War I.

I say, let's not do that again.

In brief, I most sincerely subscribe to the remarks of Representative COLE for the good of this country.

I am more than generally acquainted with the subject before this committee. As you know, the most important and largest vested property—or single seizure involved here—is the General Aniline & Film Corp. One of its very main manufacturing operations, or plants—the oldest dye manufacturing plant in this country—is located in my district—the Albany, N. Y., area.

Our Government retains it as an I. G. Farben cartel holding—a former enemy possession located in the United States.

A Swiss corporation, known as I. G. Chemie but more generally referred to as Interhandel, has sued this Government for its return. This they have the right to do.

But as I understand it, they are close to losing this lawsuit in the American courts—after an 8-year fight. The suit was dismissed, and with prejudice, by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia unanimously. This was for failure to produce required documents on the court's order. However, and in spite of 8 years of litigation, the court gave the Swiss corporation another 6 months' grace in which to produce these documents to prove ownership. An appeal was made to the United States Supreme Court, which refused—unanimously—to hear the case. May I say here that time continues to drag on, and that the same documents, awaited for more than 8 years now, are still awaited.

Now, here is an interesting point which I would like to bring to the attention of this committee. The Swiss firm, I. G. Chemie or Interhandel, lays claim that under the laws of its country, Switzerland, it cannot obtain release of the necessary documents to conclusively establish ownership. Yet, on the other hand, they are the plaintiff seeking the protection of our courts.

Our Department of Justice will tell you, if you ask, that when its lawyers visited Switzerland under court order to inspect the documents claimed to be held by I. G. Chemie, or Interhandel, that the Swiss Government immediately seized these documents and has kept them under lock and key ever since.

Such an order was also given to the attorneys for I. G. Chemie or Interhandel here in the United States, and our Department of Justice opened its files to them.

I think this an important point for the consideration of this commmittee and one to bear in mind.

I also think that this incident tends to set the scene for what has been going on now for some time on this subject—the pressure for return for these properties—and as exemplified by Chancellor Adenauer's request for return of the properties just 2 years after he signed an agreement that the United States shall retain these vestings as our only reparations of World War II.

On another interesting point, the Swiss newspapers—comparable to our own daily financial publications, have reported expenditures by I. G. Chemie, or Interhandel, of over $400,000 in 1954 and around $350,000 in 1955 for the lawsuit and attorney fees in the United States.

This, of course, is the action to gain return of the General Aniline & Film Corp. This is a little over $750,000 in only 2 years. This, mind you, is for only 2 years and the claimant, I. G. Chemie, or Interhandel, filed its suit against this Government around 8 years or so ago. I wonder how much their total bill is now, overall, in this particular case?

I cite these figures without any insinuations of wrongdoing in any way. They are large enough, however, to be given consideration by this commmittee.

I might add that the articles, appearing in the Swiss financial newspapers, were connected with complaints by stockholders of Interhandel. And complaints which inquired as to where these funds were spent. The articles I have read merely gave totals without a breakdown of expenditures.

May I leave these thoughts with you as I think they should be given consideration.

In conclusion, I believe that this problem should be disposed of as quickly as possible—for economical reasons to this Government, and I sincerely believe there is every fairness in my bill and/or that of Congressman COLE'S which will expedite this matter and still leave the door open to a legitimate and qualified claimant who is not a former enemy.

Thank you for the opportunity of appearing here today. I hope that you will consider my remarks as part of the record of this hearing.

Amends in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of May 7, 1956:

AMENDS IN POLAND

As part of its de-Stalinization program, the Red regime at Warsaw has now announced that it intends to restore pensions and honors to the survivors of the non-Communist Polish Home Army. In effect, this means that some amends are at last going to be made for one of the blackest and most ignoble of Soviet deeds in the Second World War.

For the Polish Home Army was that brave force of resistance fighters who in 1944 staged a great uprising against the Nazi occupiers of Warsaw. They did this on the assumption—backed by Moscow's radio broadcasts—that they would have help from the massive Soviet military might that was then idly deployed within a stone's throw of the city. But their appeals for aid went unanswered, except for what little the faraway Western allies could send them by air. As for Stalin's Russia, it deliberately turned a deaf ear to them, callously letting them be crushed by Hitler's troops—and it did so for a brutally Machiavellian political reason.

The reason was simply this: That Stalin had already worked out his plan to convert Poland into an enslaved Red statellite country when the peace came, and so he saw to it that the heroic non-Communist home army was decimated to keeping with that plan. Moreover, in the postwar period, he and his henchmen in Warsaw siezed, deported and jailed many of the officers and men of that army, and through all the years that have since passed these patriots, together with their families, have been treated as "enemies of the people." There have been few baser acts in modern history.

But now, according to the Warsaw Reds, this great wrong is to be righted. It cannot be righted, of course, although the mere fact that it has been acknowledged, and that compensatory action is to be taken, should be of some comfort to the victims. As for the overwhelming majority of the Polish people, they bitterly remember the evil done their Home Army and they will not be satisfied until the overall crime of their forced communization is wiped out and their country made free again.

NATO Expansion Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph of May 5, 1956:

ON FOREIGN POLICY: NATO EXPANSION URGED

(By E. F. Tompkins)

This week, Secretary of State Dulles attended in Paris a Foreign Ministers' meeting at NATO.

Last week, he announced that he would have in his portfolio some ideas to expand NATO into wider fields and activities.

"The North Atlantic Treaty Organization," Mr. Dulles said, "already serves as an indispensable instrument of the Atlantic community. But the time has come, I believe, to consider whether its Organization does not need to be further developed."

The suggested venture calls for skeptical scrutiny.

Mr. Dulles observed that organizations like NATO are of two kinds—those that have a temporary function, which are allowed normally to lapse, and those that expand and endure.

NATO was set up for emergency service—as a rampart against Communist aggression—and was obviously intended to expire when its work should be done.

FOR GROWING NATO

But, when Secretary Dulles said:

"We believe that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization ought to be in the class of organizations which grow rather than those which dry up because they were only designed to serve a limited purpose which may in due course be fulfilled."

Here was an expression of the bureaucratic mind. In international affairs, as in domestic politics, when an agency has been established, they who operate it or subsist on its patronage acquire a vested interest in it.

Their interest impels them to keep the agency alive and to make it grow, even when it is no longer useful. New agencies are constantly created, but old agencies are seldom permitted to die, or even to remain static.

MORE BUREAUCRACIES

This is a recognized law that explains the proliferation of bureaucracies at home and abroad. The State Department, accordingly, wants NATO to be a perpetual bureaucracy as well as a growing one.

Mr. Dulles said:

"The North Atlantic Treaty Organization * * * in its own distinctive way contains the possibilities of great development. It was, to be sure, conceived primarily as a military alliance * * * but the organization can and should be more."

Now, in what respects? Mr. Dulles was asked if political and economic possibilities were not the only means whereby NATO could be made to grow.

The Secretary of State solemnly replied: "I would say we are thinking on both."

Moreover, the Secretary specifically observed that a revised NATO need not be confined to its present geographical region. Thus the new NATO concept clearly emerges.

ATLANTIC UNION PLAN

Consciously or not, Secretary Dulles has taken to Paris the Atlantic Union plan to institute world government by enlarging and extending the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

For several years, the Atlantic Union Committee has been futilely backing a congressional resolution to support its plan.

If the State Department, operating through NATO, can put life into the scheme, much time—and many tax-exempt contributions—will be saved for the internationalists.

Results and Prestige

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I would like to insert in the RECORD an editorial, entitled "Results and Prestige," which appeared in the Manhattan (Kans.) Mercury under date of April 20, 1956.

Written by the editor of that newspaper, Mr. Bill Colvin, the editorial clearly indicates that the conduct of international relations is the concern of everyone; and that only through the efforts of representative mediation can national differences be peacefully adjusted. The United Nations organization merits fair, but yet constructive, analysis by all citizens when we consider the general good which can be achieved through its designated objectives.

The editorial, which follows, cites an example of what can be achieved:

RESULTS AND PRESTIGE

International agreements being what they are worth on the world market today an all-out, tickertape, Fifth Avenue parade may not be in order for the pact brought about between Egypt and Israel.

Nevertheless, and acknowledging that those peoples have previously framed near-worthless agreements, the cease-fire that Dag Hammarskjold has effected should elicit hosannas, congratulations and definite sighs of relief in the Western World.

All is not solved in the cease-fire. The U. N. secretary-general has his work cut out for him yet. And considering the bloody history of the area extending far into early biblical days there is no assurance of permanency if, as and when Dag bats 1,000 percent.

But for the moment, in light of the dark prospects of war just recently, Hammarskjold brightened things considerably.

In so doing he has not only caused the free nations to breath easier but he has made a new convincing argument for the United Nations as an instrument of peace without armed enforcement.

Congratulations to All in A-Test

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, as one vitally interested in our civil-defense program, I wish to join in the tribute paid to the people of New Jersey in the following editorial which appeared in the May 3 issue of the Newark Star-Ledger:

CONGRATULATIONS TO ALL IN A-TEST

New Jersey's civil defense officials, and most particularly, the public, deserve a big bouquet for their part in Tuesday night's statewide "Operation May Day" test.

Every community in the State responded to the "Red alert" by setting off its warning sirens and the response of the public in all areas was generally described as excellent.

Of course, there were a few isolated instances of public indifference that must be expected in any large scale maneuver involving all the people of a populous State. But the test as a whole was a great success and congratulations are due all around.

The Parris Island Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of Thursday, May 3, 1956, in which the newspaper discusses and comments on the recent tragedy that occurred at the marine base at Parris Island:

THE PARRIS ISLAND REPORT

The Parris Island tragedy of Sunday night, April 8, in which six Marine recruits were marched to their deaths by drowning in a tidewater creek created nationwide grief and indignation. It required unsparing investigation, complete candor as to any top-level official laxity, and reforms that would not undermine the basic methods that make Marines about the best fighting men in the world. These demands seem to have been fully met in the report of the court of inquiry and the accompanying statement of larger scope by the corps Commandant, Gen. Randolph McC. Pate.

The court finds—and this is a charge that awaits the process of proof and rebuttal in the general court-martial ordered—"that Staff Sergeant McKeon at the time he marched his platoon into Ribbon Creek was under the influence of alcohol to an unknown degree." It asserts that he drank vodka in the morning, afternoon, and early evening of that day while on duty as drill instructor. This charge, if true, helps to explain what the public found incomprehensible in the strange behavior of the leader of this death march.

Other findings of fact as to Sergeant McKeon will be read in relation to this central charge: he knew that some members of his platoon could not swim; he was quoted as saying that "those who couldn't swim would drown"; he "took no measures to insure that the water area in which he was about to lead his platoon (as a punitive act) was safe to enter."

But, not imposing upon the admiration and gratitude the American people feel for the Marines, General Pate did not retreat from the question whether there was something wrong at Parris Island besides Sergeant McKeon. He straightforwardly admitted there was. Senseless acts in the nature of hazing occurred occasionally in Marine training. Since World War II practices had

crept into the handling of recruits that were not only unnecessary but also did not comport with the dignity of the individual or his self-respect. Rare in the past, these had increased somewhat in recent years because of lack of mature judgment on the part of a certain few drill instructors.

So, declining to limit the issue to an inexperienced drill sergeant, and acknowledging that the Marine Corps itself was on trial, General Pate reorganizes training and command, lays down new lines of more exacting supervision and monitoring by officers, and promises to "preserve the best features of the present system, eradicate any existing deficiencies, and prevent others from occurring in the future." Actual training of recruits will remain with the same men who give them orders in battle, "the men who are the backbone of our corps, the noncommissioned officers." On this essential he does not yield.

General Pate has dealt with this tragic incident in a spirit of compassion, firmness but commonsense that does not lose sight of the fundamentals. One bad day at Parris Island shocked the Nation, but that Nation cannot forget those countless other days far back into the past when word that the Marines had landed lifted the hearts of fighting men and the people back home who knew that grueling training guaranteed victory over a cruel enemy, shortened wars and saved American lives.

Disabled American Veterans Endorse Extension of GI Home Loan Guaranty Program and Principle of H. R. 10469

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, extension of the GI home loan guaranty program must become reality in this session of Congress. It is now due to expire July 25, 1957.

This portion of the Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944 has not burdened the American taxpayer. It instead has been to a large degree self-supporting. It has enabled the World War II veteran to become an integral part of his community through becoming a homeowner. Owning our own home was a privilege that only a limited few Americans could take advantage of prior to the enactment of this act. Through the act's home-loan guaranty provisions millions of veterans—yes, millions—now can say that they, too, own a small part of these great United States.

I ask you, What better could we do than to offer and allow our veterans an opportunity to own their own plot of land and their own home?

Is it too much to ask that we give them nothing other than an opportunity to purchase a home by merely guaranteeing their loan? I am sure that there are none who would or could objectively object to the granting of this consideration to our veterans.

Some 11 million veterans have not yet used their entitlement. Others have used only a part and still have a portion of their benefit remaining. Many of these World War II veterans are just now reaching the age and stage of financial responsibility where they can profitably afford to become homeowners.

Should we now take away their opportunity to purchase a home under the terms of this act merely because they have not yet reached this state? I think not.

Instead, I believe we should extend this proven program now, in this session of Congress. Let us allow ample time for these other millions of veterans to adequately prepare themselves so that they, too, can join in owning their own small part of America.

A bill I introduced April 12, 1956, will accomplish this. It provides for a gradual termination of the program over a maximum period of 3 years from the present expiration date July 25, 1957, by allowing a 1-month extension for each 2 months of active World War II service. It goes one step further and provides all disabled World War II veterans with an extension of 3 full years.

Maj. Omer W. Clark, of the Disabled American Veterans, has written me a letter wherein he states that his organization would endorse any reasonable extension of the GI home loan guaranty program and that H. R. 10469 definitely falls in this category. The letter follows:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. DANTE B. FASCELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FASCELL: The provisions of H. R. 10469, the bill which you introduced to amend section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide an additional period for World War II veterans to obtain guaranteed loans have been considered together with the information contained in the reprints of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD concerning your reasons for believing that this is desirable legislation. There has also been noted H. R. 10884, a bill introduced by Mr. MURRAY of Illinois, on the same general subject but somewhat different in its time provisions.

It is my opinion that the Disabled American Veterans is definitely desirous of seeing that otherwise eligible veterans are enabled to obtain guaranteed loans after the present deadline of July 25, 1957, and to that end should be recorded as favoring any reasonable proposed legislation seeking to extend the time limit. The bill you have introduced is definitely in this category.

Sincerely yours,
OMER W. CLARK,
Director of Legislation.

Library Services Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the New York Times, New York, N. Y., Saturday, May 5, 1956, entitled "Library Service Bill":

The library services bill, H. R. 2840, is now before the House. The list of sponsors is bipartisan.

This bill would grant a total of $7,500,000 a year for 5 years to States matching the grants. The objective is to bring books and other library services to rural families who have none at all, and to improve library services for an additional 53 million Americans whose libraries are inadequate. The States and localities will have complete authority under the program established by the bill.

In the great cities we are accustomed to impressive library service. Our cousins in the villages and on the farms are entitled to it too. This legislation would stimulate the extension services of the various States and the regional cooperative services based on metropolitan centers. The funds proposed are modest, the period limited. It is believed that local communities in rural areas, having tasted the advantages of good libraries, would then wish to continue the services with local and State funds.

The free public library is a vital symbol of educational opportunity, and it is to be hoped that Congress will pass H. R. 2840.

Attorney Charles J. Rozmarek's Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader-Evening News of Wednesday, May 2, 1956, in which the newspaper comments on the address of Charles J. Rozmarek, president of the Polish-American Congress, who recently spoke in Wilkes-Barre:

MR. ROZMAREK'S WARNING

Two paragraphs in the address of Charles J. Rozmarek, president of the Polish-American Congress, at a dinner meeting in Wilkes-Barre under auspices of the northeastern Pennsylvania division, should be called to the attention of Government officials in Washington for their guidance. These are the ones we have in mind:

"Anyone who thinks that the destruction of Stalin as a demigod by the present Red rulers marks a basic change in Soviet policy, reveals an appalling ignorance of the true nature of communism. Aggression, slavery, subversion, and world conquest form the very basis of communism.

"Those who govern Russia today denounce Stalin, so that the blame for all the bloody Red crimes of the past, in whose guilt they share, would fall on the head of Stalin alone. They know that their rehabilitation in world opinion would help to relax our guard."

In 1944, Attorney Rozmarek and his associates in the Polish-American Congress warned the Government not to place any trust in Communist promises. The tragic results of the Government's failure to heed this advice long have been apparent.

The 1956 warning is no less important. Attorney Rozmarek has been in the forefront of the fight against communism 2 decades, and he has learned a great deal about the workings of the system in a key post that has given him access to information and practices on an international scale. He has dealt directly with the victims of communism, and he knows, from bitter and costly experience, how it operates. There is no guesswork in his views.

The Reds are past masters at deception and treachery. The record is replete with evi-

dence of their duplicity. Not one positive step has been taken by them recently to lend substance to their smiles and honeyed words, so we must assume their objective remains the same.

America cannot afford to make the same mistake twice. It might be fatal. That is why Attorney Rozmarek's warning should not be taken lightly.

Nationalism or Internationalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Evening Star of May 7, 1956:

NATIONALISM OR INTERNATIONALISM?—WILL NATO CEASE AS MILITARY COALITION AND BECOME POLITICAL-ECONOMIC AGENCY?

(By Constantine Brown)

The dwindling group of conservative Republicans in the Senate is seriously worried over the planned transformation of NATO from a military coalition to an international political-economic agency.

They say frankly in Senate cloakrooms that this is definitely a preliminary step toward an Atlantic Union and eventually toward world government. This is what the extremist internationalists in this country have been advocating for some time as the only solution for permanent peace.

Despite assurances given them by the State Department spokesmen that nothing of the sort is in Secretary Dulles' mind and that a rectification of NATO has become necessary because of changing world conditions, they continue to look askance at the activities of the NATO foreign ministers in Paris.

At this time it is still difficult to see how Congress, regardless of its subservience to the wishes of the executive branch on foreign policy, could agree to abandon its right of control over the distribution of taxpayers' funds in favor of an international agency.

This would mean abandonment of our sovereignty. But the conservative Senators (and the suspicions of the Republicans are shared by some Democrats) feel that in its drive to end the cold war and assure what optimists believe to be peace in our time, the administration might be prepared to go far to reach that goal.

These Senators see considerable significance in the fact that Secretary Dulles spurned only last March the suggestion of Italy's President Giovanni Gronchi for changing the NATO's face and transforming it from a military into an economic and political organization.

The concept was not that of President Gronchi alone. It was hatched in Rome and Paris as a means to obtain further economic support from American appropriations earmarked for military defense.

The idea was to aid underdeveloped regions in NATO areas. The French hoped to reduce tension in North Africa and also in their central African empire without heavy expense to their own taxpayers who were already balking at the existing small levies.

Paris had already suggested Morocco and Tunisia be made members of NATO. The Italians hoped to spend the thus-diverted NATO fund for relief in southern Italy—without raising taxes on the prosperous industrialists in northern Italy.

These facts were known to the administration and are believed to be responsible for Mr. Dulles turning down Mr. Gronchi's trial balloon.

The evident flop of NATO as a military coalition necessitated, in the minds of some of our policy makers, a change of strategy to prevent a serious disillusionment of the American people who have spent tens of billions to erect what was described to them as a "wall against further Soviet expansion."

It is at this juncture that the believers in One World were able to press their case subtly. What happened behind closed doors in the councils of the administration is little known. But the fact remains that Mr. Dulles changed his tune. He is now discussing in Paris the Italian-French proposal and the form under which they could be presented to Congress and be made acceptable.

What worries our Senators is that nationalism is stronger today in Europe and Asia than ever before. It is only in the United States that internationalism is cherished particularly by a small but powerful minority of so-called intellectuals who have for years branded nationalism as jingoism and isolationism. And both these, it is argued publicly, sow the seeds of discord in the world and are responsible for the precarious conditions in which we live.

These arguments have an impact on the American people who are highly prosperous and hope to remain so by agreeing to peace at any price.

Thus while the rest of the world, without exception, has become in recent years strongly nationalistic, there is a drive to convince the American people that the path of internationalism will lead to a lasting and permanent peace.

International relations are a two-way street, although for the last 10 years they seem to have been a one-way avenue in which we were the givers and our allies, or so-called allies, were the receivers.

The danger of the new policy, as the conservatives see it, is that we are going into a blind alley. In the demands of our allies in continental Europe our policymakers see the dawn of a new great era of unity and brotherhood of all nations (eventually including the Communists whose avowed aim is to destroy us).

But our allies who proposed the present scheme are prompted by only two objectives: to desist from further defense preparations and expenditures and use the American taxpayers' money for their own purpose.

Durham Believes Richard Nixon Will Help Ike Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the information obtained by the Inquiring Reporter is especially revealing when you consider that the information comes from Durham, N. C.; and the following column is by the Inquiring Reporter from the Durham Sun in the May 4, 1956, issue:

DURHAM BELIEVES RICHARD NIXON WILL HELP IKE CAMPAIGN

Today's question: As a running mate, do you think NIXON will help—or hinder—Eisenhower's chances?

All five of the persons questioned on today's topic said that NIXON will help President Eisenhower in his efforts to stay in the White House.

Today's question was submitted by John E. Allgood, 2020 Wa Wa Avenue, to whom the Durham Sun has forwarded $1. The Sun will pay $1 for each question used.

The answers:

B. J. Ross, 2607 Cascadilla St., salesman: "Personally, I think NIXON will help Eisenhower. He has proven to be a good man already and the voters will keep that in mind. I think Mr. NIXON has served his country well and, for that reason, will give Eisenhower a boost."

Zack Downey, 3029 University Drive, construction worker: "Mr. NIXON will help Eisenhower. He has impressed many with his efforts thus far. Sure, he has some enemies, but most folks, particularly the Republicans, must realize that he has been a valuable part of the successful program carried out by Eisenhower's administration."

Mrs. R. C. Denson, Duke Homestead Road, housewife: "I think he will help Mr. Eisenhower. Certainly if Eisenhower didn't feel that he would be an asset, he never would have given him the opportunity to be his running mate. With some effort, I think Eisenhower could have talked NIXON out of running with him again. He didn't. That indicates to me that Eisenhower himself must feel that NIXON will help rather than hurt him in trying to remain in the White House."

R. G. Earp, Leesville Road, clerk: "Because he has done a good job thus far, Mr. NIXON will help Eisenhower. He has a good record as the White House's top aid to the President. There are some, naturally, who have tried to talk against NIXON. That doesn't worry me. Any man in his position will have some opposition. I think NIXON has a pleasing way about him. He appears sincere and, above all, the President must think he has done a good job. If Eisenhower didn't feel that NIXON could help him, I think he would have tried to plant a few roadblocks here and there to discourage him from running."

John Mabry, 408 South Miami Boulevard, fruit-stand attendant: "Mr. NIXON will help the President in his campaign. He and Eisenhower have formed a good combination thus far. There is no reason to think that the two will not continue to run our country in a good manner. I think the President trusts NIXON and realizes what a good man he is. With Eisenhower's confidence in him, NIXON can do nothing but help the President win again."

Petition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON G. ROGERS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a petition that I have received from some of my good constituents from the city and county of Denver.

The petition is as follows:

We, the undersigned, voters of your district, wish to express our approval of the following bills, and respectfully urge you to do all in your power to see that they are passed: H. R. 7922, H. R. 8000, H. R. 9004, H. R. 9331, H. R. 9902, and H. R. 9430; in

order to protect the rights of public safety and freedom from annoyance.

Any acknowledgment can be made, with regard to the petition, to the first signer.

May M. Waller, Rosina Williams, Mabel Hobbs, Emma A. Livingston, Florence M. Brase, Jessie MacKay, Blanche Doughty, Mildred C. Barber, Blanche Burrows, Lillian F. Sullivan, Alice L. Welton, Mary R. Lindsey, Belle D. Ryan, Mrs. Mary Denter, Mrs. Hilma Gardner, T. H. Waller, Eva J. Walter, Margaret M. Kain, Denver, Colo.

Library Services Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, as one of the sponsors of the library services bill, may I take this opportunity to thank the members of the Education Committee and Rules Committee for bringing this legislation to the floor.

My constituents in Ohio's 22d District are extremely fortunate in that they have outstandingly good library facilities, and they make good use of them. We are justly proud of the famous Cleveland Public Library. Other Ohio cities like Toledo, Cincinnati, Columbus, Dayton, Akron, and Youngstown have fine libraries, too.

But Ohio is also an agricultural State. The Ohio Development and Publicity Commission reports that some 80 percent of Ohio's area is still farmland and that Ohio stands 11th among the States in agriculture, Library service in these rural areas is quite inadequate. For example:

Libraries in 1 county—Adams—received less than 11 cents per capita to operate their service in 1954. The combined income of the 2 libraries in this county was $2,300.

Another—Morrow—received 18 cents per capita. Four libraries in this county had a combined income of $3,150.

Libraries in 15 counties in Ohio rereived less than 50 cents per capita to operate their service in 1954.

Libraries in 29 counties received between 50 cents and 99 cents for service in the same year.

Thus exactly half of Ohio's 88 counties were getting less—and many much less—than a dollar per capita for library service. The amount of money required for minimum library service has been established by the American Library Association as $1.50 per capita. This standard was established in 1948 and does not take into account the inflation of the last 8 years.

Ninety-nine of the 271 public libraries in Ohio received less than $7,000 as an operating budget in 1954. That amount is not enough to hire one librarian, rent space, pay for heat and light, and have money left over to buy an adequate supply of books.

A survey by the Ohio State Library showed 850,000 residents of the State with inadequate service.

Mr. Speaker, libraries in my district will receive none of this money since the program is limited to communities with less than 10,000 population. But I am happy to support this legislation in the interest of hundreds of thousands of citizens of my State, in addition to some 27 million people throughout this country, who are without access to modern library services.

I urge that favorable action be taken on this library services bill.

Self-Help Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following recent editorial from the New York Times in which the newspaper comments on President Eisenhower's foreign-aid message to Congress:

SELF-HELP ABROAD

When President Eisenhower sent his foreign aid message to Congress more than a month ago he described the program as "indispensable to the security of every American citizen." That, we believe, describes the situation in a nutshell. The authorization of over $4.5 billion that Congress is asked to approve for the next fiscal year is not a relief expenditure, a giveaway program or any other form of charitable enterprise. It is the sum considered necessary to insure the continuing security of the United States, apart from the funds—many times larger—spent directly on our own military establishment.

As Secretary Dulles described this "hard-earned taxpayers' money," it is part payment for the "national insurance policy" we have had to take out against potential Soviet aggression; and it ought to be considered in the same light as all the other defense expenditures that run to more than $40 billion a year. The only difference is that this small fraction of the total is spent in various forms of assistance abroad. Most of it, as a matter of military necessity, goes for direct military or so-called "defense support" purposes, the latter being defined as budgetary and economic aid needed to enable our friends and allies to have the armed forces necessary to resist aggression. The question naturally arises, does the peaceful front the rulers of the Soviet Union are now turning to the wolrd mean that we can afford to let our guard down? To ask the question is to answer it. Obviously we cannot afford to do so, although the ostensible slackening of the Soviet military threat makes the temptation stronger every day.

This is where the necessity of imaginative, vigorous, dynamic statesmanship on the part of both the administration and the Congress comes in. Until the imperialists who rule Russia show by positive action that they are no longer interested in pushing outward the limits of the Russian Empire we must keep our defensive strength at high level. But at the same time we have to recognize that military strength is worse than useless without moral strength; and moral strength in very large and important parts of the world—including the neutral areas—requires the positive, nonmilitary kind of assistance in improving the economic and social condition of our fellow men, without involving them in political entanglements, that only one free nation can given to another. Some of this may be done, as Mr. Dulles suggested, by private investment; but for a long time to come most of it will have to be done through governments. It involves long-term planning; and the relatively small amount that the President has asked for this purpose can be but a mere beginning.

Certainly economic-aid programs are expensive; but to place all our faith in mere military aid and its concomitants is to bury our head in the sand and invite both moral and political diasaster. Both kinds of assistance are needed, and the United States can afford both kinds. In fact, at the present stage of world affairs, the United States cannot possibly afford not to engage in both kinds, with the stress increasingly on the economic and social progress that flows naturally from a peaceful and flourishing democracy.

Strange Inconsistencies of Americans for Democratic Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, as David Lawrence in the Washington Star of May 7, 1956, so ably points out, among the group of so-called liberals who are attacking Vice President NIXON and the Republican Party are leaders in the Americans for Democratic Action, whose actions are in no sense liberal. Mr. Lawrence's article is as follows:

STRANGE INCONSISTENCIES OF ADA—RAUH'S PART IN HUGHES CASE SEEN NEVER FULLY EXPLAINED

There's an old saying that "people in glass houses shouldn't throw stones" and it might be applied in one of the issues facing Adlai Stevenson and the group of so-called liberals who have been trying to smear Vice President NIXON with unproved charges.

Mr. Stevenson has not said a word to the American people, for example, about the strange behavior of the chairman of the Americans for Democratic Action, an organization which supported him so enthusiastically in 1952 and from which group he drafted some of the principal advisers in his campaign.

Does Mr. Stevenson approve of what the chairman of that group did recently in trying to get a United States Senator? Will Mr. Stevenson accept support from the ADA once more? The question is raised in the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post in an editorial that has stirred political circles in Washington. Its full text follows:

"Two months seems long enough to wait for some indication as to how the faultlessly tailored members of Americans for Democratic Action feel about their chairman, Mr. Joseph L. Rauh, Jr.

"There are good reasons to wonder. On February 3, one Paul H. Hughes was acquitted in a New York Federal court of two charges of perjury. One charge was that Hughes lied when he testified previously that he had overheard Mr. Rauh talk on

the telephone with Brig. Gen. Telford Taylor (retired), another ADA official, concerning arrangements to give financial assistance to Harvey Matusow, the in-and-out witness who recanted testimony he had given in several trials of Communists. The jury found Hughes not guilty.

"Upon four other charges growing out of Hughes' efforts to palm himself off to liberal groups as a former member of Senator McCarthy's staff with important dirt to sell, the jury disagreed. It was testified that among those who fell for Hughes' fabrications were some of the brass of the Washington Post and Mr. Rauh of the ADA.

"Rauh testified that he did not know that the Hughes material was phony although some of it was so preposterous that it ought not to have deceived even the most dedicated liberal. Hughes testified that Rauh knew that the material was fictitious. Despite the fact that it was Rauh's word against that of a confessed forger whom his own lawyer described as a louse, the jury could not reach a verdict.

"The thing which might reasonably be troubling the membership of ADA is its chairman's involvement in practices which ADA and its allies have consistently condemned and which they have accused Senator McCarthy of employing. The ADA has waxed eloquent against the use of informers by the Department of Justice, but it seemed willing to avail itself of the services of a man who represented himself as an informer and a purloiner of documents.

"Senator McCarthy has been a pain in the neck to many Americans, including so-called right-wingers, but the evidence in the Hughes trial seems to indicate that in ADA circles McCarthyism is not considered reprehensible when practiced by dedicated liberals against reationaries and their ilk.

"Anyway it would be enlightening to learn whether there are any back benchers in ADA who are even mildly disturbed by their chairman's carryings on. At the moment the betting is the other way. If Mr. Rauh does not get a grant from the Fund for the Republic, invitations to give the Thomas Jefferson lectures at four Ivy League universities, and the applase of all right-thinking liberals, he has a right to be a disappointed man."

Some other aspects of the same question were discussed by Senator Goldwater, Republican, of Arizona, in a speech in the Senate which was printed in the Congressional Record last April 16. Senator Goldwater mentioned "the role of the Democratic National Committee in this sordid conspiracy," and specifically the part played by Mr. Clayton Fritchey, deputy chairman of the committee and editor of the Democratic Digest. The Arizona Senator called on candidate Stevenson to take a good look at the Hughes case, and added:

"In all, Mr. Fritchey handed over $2,500 to Hughes, and his friend, Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., of ADA, left-wing fame, tossed an additional $8,500 in the till to keep Hughes' imagination well oiled so that the supply of scandalous memoranda would not dry up."

There are many unsolved puzzles in the Hughes case. Messrs. Fritchey and Rauh and the others who paid money to Hughes had a perfect right, of course, to look into the offerings of a man who claimed to have reliable information which, if true, would lead to the expulsion of Senator McCarthy. But just why it took so many months to discover that Hughes was not an employee of either the Senate or of Senator McCarthy, as Hughes claimed, and why the money was doled out to Hughes over so long a period of time has never been adequately explained.

Nor is it clear why the Senate itself doesn't take up the Hughes case. For it has a committee especially ordered to investigate improper attempts to influence United States Senators. There have been Senate hearings on attempts indirectly to contribute to a Senator's campaign fund in connection with legislation and lots of front-page stuff was developed last week about some telephone calls made by a couple of clerks at the White House as a courtesy to a lawyer who happens to have been campaign manager in past years for three prominent personalities in the Republican Party—Senator Knowland, Chief Justice Warren, and Vice President Nixon.

Yet the Hughes case involves something that touches far more intimately the integrity of the Senate than did the episode in connection with the pending gas bill. For the Hughes case reveals, in a court of law, evidence that efforts were made to use several thousands of dollars to intimidate into silence or to influence in some way the course of action of a United States Senator whose speeches in fighting the Communist menace in America happen to have been distasteful to political groups and organizations opposed to his views.

Facts on Our Economy Versus Eisenhower Peace and Prosperity Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the people are being subjected to an unprecedented wave of "peace and prsoperity" publicity, all involving the claim that everything is wonderful and that anyone who doubts it is a prophet of gloom and doom.

There are certain facts, however, that deserve attention. It is absurd, for example, to ignore the factor of Government spending for defense—more than $35 billion a year—in promoting employment. The spending is necessary—we must spend for security—but we should not pretend that the Federal budget is a peacetime budget.

We should also take honest cognizance of the soft spots, such as lower income for farmers and layoffs of scores of thousands of automotive and farm-machinery workers. In this connection, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I offer the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

SELECTIVE PROSPERITY

Talk about prosperity is one form of production which is likely to keep on rising, at least, until early November. Therefore, we return to J. A. Livingston's recent observations on the theme. They were nonpolitical, businesslike, and informative. Since the Nation is best served by information, we recapitulate a few of them:

"Despite his veto of the fixed-parity farm bill, President Eisenhower called for fixed price supports from 82.5 percent of parity up.

"Eastern steel mills are setting new production records, but some steel-products fabricators are laying off men. Automobile production in the Detroit area is 20 percent under last year.

"Business failures are rising and new incorporations are declining. There is renewed pressure for higher prices. Business loans of member banks of the Federal Reserve System are up $5 billion, or 20 percent greater than they were a year ago.

"The Federal Reserve System found it necessary to raise rediscount rates, bringing the bank interest rate to about 4 percent. The higher rediscount rate also depressed the bond market. Businessmen are thinking twice about new financing for expansion or to increase inventories.

"Overall production showed a slight decrease from February to March, and retail trade has turned sluggish."

Our economy displays many favorable aspects, and some of the weak features doubtless will prove transient. Yet Mr. Livingston's observations are supported by the substantial slump in farm equipment and automobile sales, as reported by the New York Times service. Now comes the news that here in St. Louis construction was off $9 million in the first 4 months of 1956. These are warning signals, and only the imprudent will ignore them.

The Rigid Decline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I would like to present an editorial which I believe points up some salient features of our current agricultural situation.

This editorial appeared in the May 3 edition of the Lynden Tribune, an outstanding weekly newspaper published in the heart of one of the finest agricultural valleys in the Nation. The publishers of this paper are William and Julian Lewis, who have lived most of their lives in the Lynden Valley and know its farms and farmers. I believe this editorial represents the thinking of many people in my congressional district, both in and out of agriculture. The editorial reads as follows:

PULL TOGETHER

One of the reasons Uncle Sam's agricultural program for 1956 is again being booted around like a football may be because the major farm organizations are not pulling together for a single working solution.

In commenting on President Ike's veto of the farm bill, Roy Battles, assistant to National Grange Master Herschel Newsom said:

"The National Grange office expressed itself as 'shocked' by the veto." "It was not a perfect bill, but neither was it a bad bill. Congress and the administration * * * brought forth a mouse of an agricultural program for 1956 * * * President Eisenhower's veto assured that agriculture would draw a virtual goose egg out of this session" were some of the quotations from the Friday, April 27, edition of the Washington State Grange News.

On the other side of the fence, the American Farm Bureau Federation praised Ike's veto and said the bill was "utterly bad legislation." "Higher price supports, increased set-aside, two- and three-price schemes, dual parity standards, increased payments, every conceivable devise to confuse and conceal the inescapable truth that attempts to legislate prosperity into agriculture are a miserable failure."

These two opposite views of farm legislation leave the program as juicy bait for candidates for public office. It appears that rather than work together for a uniform farm program which would appeal to the majority of farmers, the three major farm organizations are themselves carrying on a

continuous drive for support and membership.

In every year but one since 1947, farm income has declined. And in all these years until mid-1955, high rigid price supports were in effect. It was under such price supports that our present farm problem developed. In other words, if high rigid price supports were the answer to our problem, we would have no problem. In view of this, the road for all farm organizations to travel, if they sincerely wish to serve the farmers, is no dusty, winding trail.

It is one of realizing that the farm population is going down because American agriculture has been steadily producing more and more with fewer hands. This is the dream of every underdeveloped country in the world. Why smash this mark of advanced technology and industry civilization with rigid farm supports?

The Alaska Mental Health Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming support for the Alaska mental health bill from responsible lay and professional authorities has been splendid testimony to the merits of this proposal. It was an especial pleasure to me when the Oregon Journal, one of our fine Portland newspapers, in its issue of April 22 published an editorial in support of this bill.

I would like at this time under unanimous consent to include the Journal's eloquent statement in the RECORD:

HOSPITAL BILL ATTACK SENSELESS

Strange things happen in the giddy political whirl which surrounds Congress, but one of the strangest in many a day is the sudden appearance of a propaganda campaign against the Alaska mental hospital bill.

For many years the Alaskans have sought their own mental hospital. At present, cases from the Territory are cared for at the Morningside Hospital in Portland, a private institution operating under contract with the Government.

Alaska has no facilities and patients awaiting transfer here are kept in a Federal jail. Furthermore, Alaskans want their relatives in an institution which is within easy visiting distance.

The bill, introduced by Representative EDITH GREEN, Democrat, of Oregon, provides $6,500,000 for a hospital or hospitals in the Territory and $6 million to be used over 10 years for maintenance. After that the Territory would take over. The bill also provides a grant of 1 million acres of public land for support of the program and for a reciprocity program, similar to those between States, under which stateside patients in Alaska could be cared for there until transfer and vice versa.

It is the last two provisions which are causing all the furor. The opponents envision the 1 million-acre land grant as an American counterpart of a Siberian concentration camp for political exiles, with the reciprocity sections providing the machinery for such exile.

Jessen's Weekly, a newspaper published in Fairbanks, Alaska, editorially expresses complete bewilderment. Opposition, it says, might have been expected from Oregon, which stands to lose financially, but adds that Oregon's Representative GREEN has been the principal proponent.

One of the first to raise the concentration camp cry was the Santa Ana, Calif., Register, and it was picked up by such organizations as Merwin K. Hart's Economic Council and the Minute Women.

Oregon and other States have used grants of public lands for support of schools and no one, with the possible exception of the children themselves, thought they were in a concentration camp.

The hospital bill has passed the House and had a good chance of getting through the Senate until the whispering campaign was started.

If the bill is loosely drawn, then let changes be made, but the senseless charges as to the general intent of the bill and its sponsors should not be allowed to delay passage beyond this session of Congress.

New Deal Economic Reforms Commended by Eisenhower Adviser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in a spirit of benevolent bipartisanship to acknowledge that a spokesman of this administration apparently has acknowledged that everything we Democrats ever did was not necessarily wicked, socialistic, confused, and destructive.

A gentleman on the staff of the White House itself, Mr. Gabriel Hauge, apparently made a speech in St. Louis in which he paid tribute to the contributions of the New Deal and the Fair Deal in building strength in America.

This is so unusual that I am glad to offer for the RECORD the editorial comment on Mr. Hauge's speech from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. I commend Mr. Hauge's attitude to the attention of Republican campaigners, including that ferocious campaigner of 1952 and 1954, Vice President NIXON, as a model of candor and integrity they well might follow themselves in the months ahead.

I offer herewith the editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

CREDIT TO GABRIEL HAUGE

Gabriel Hauge is President Eisenhower's administrative assistant for economic affairs. When he addressed the St. Louis Association of Credit Men last week he did something very, very few members of the Eisenhower administration have ever done—he gave credit to the immediately preceding Democratic administrations for their good works, many of which benefit the country directly today.

Mr. Hauge is an economist who believes strongly in free private enterprise, but this did not keep him from paying his respects to agricultural supports, deposit insurance, public housing, unemployment compensation, and social security. These New Deal reforms and others which might be listed have put, as Mr. Hauge so well phrased it, "a floor over the pit of personal disaster."

What Mr. Hauge said every other economist in the country knows and so do the politicians regardless of political affiliation. We commend Mr. Hague for a display of realism and fairness which in turn commends him.

Dangers for the United States in the Middle-East Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address delivered by the very able gentleman from Texas, the Honorable OMAR BURLESON, before the American Council of Judaism, Inc.:

DANGERS FOR THE UNITED STATES IN THE MIDDLE-EAST CRISIS

(By Representative OMAR BURLESON before the American Council for Judaism, Inc., 12th annual conference, Chicago, Ill., April 28, 1956)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, my fellow Americans, I am pleased, as I am highly honored, at the invitation you have extended me to be with you on this occasion.

It gives me satisfaction to be identified with such men in your organization as your president, Clarence L. Coleman, Jr.; the chairman of your board, Lessing J. Rosenwald; your executive vice president, Dr. Elmer Berger; and others.

As a citizen of this great country, I am encouraged by the work, the attitude, and the dedication to principle of the American Council for Judaism. As a United States legislator and a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I am, if anything, even more keenly aware of the fact that you perform a great work, a much-needed service. I think every man and woman of your group displays great courage in taking the position you do on so many questions of concern to all Americans. I know your task is not an easy one, but I am deeply impressed by the fact that you have willingly shouldered the grave responsibility of attempting to inform not only Americans of the Jewish faith but all Americans that no international movement of a political nature represents all the people of Jewish faith; that the national identification of people of Jewish faith is with their country of citizenship; and that Americans of Jewish faith are by no means unified behind a proposition which, according to certain well-known propaganda media, suggests American Jews need and want a homeland other than these United States with its equality for all who are its citizens.

One could easily conclude that when 17 organizations, commonly referred to as Jewish groups, meet in Washington for a common purpose, they represent all the Jews of this country. In fact, it would appear that the motivation of such meetings is to give the impression they do represent everybody and that the political pressures they apply have virtually universal support.

Not long ago, I was walking through the corridors of the Capitol of the United States with your Dr. Berger. We encountered a fellow Congressman of mine. I performed introductions and explained that Dr. Berger was connected with, and devoting his time to, the American Council for Judaism. "Oh, yes," my colleague responded, "I have had a considerable amount of literature on the subject of Israel." He, of course, had no idea what organization it was that had sent him

literature on the subject of Israel, but Dr. Berger and I were reasonably sure it was not the American Council for Judaism.

This, however, is how it is with a great many people with whom I come in contact. Pressure groups are certainly not new in Washington. But pressure from so many different sources concentrated in one spot, in the manner of the Zionists, amounts to a tremendously powerful force.

That is one of the reasons why it is encouraging and inspiring to me to know of a group of Americans who will take a stand against this force in the face of tremendous opposition and unpopularity. It is something in Washington to see a pressure group pressurized. That, it seems to me, is just what your organization had the courage to do when it contacted the Secretary of State to advise him that the 17 so-called Jewish organizations united to press for arms to Israel did not represent the views of all Americans of Jewish faith.

I wonder how many of you realize the total impact of the work you are doing. Of course, you know your purpose is to inform the public generally that you do not subscribe to the idea of Jewish nationalism. But I can testify that you do far more than this. By the stand you have taken, you give courage to those of us in political life who are sensitive to the enormous pressures which are put upon us virtually every day in the year.

The sad and bitter truth of the matter is that objectivity—a desire to keep an open mind on certain problems—runs the grave risk of being denounced as anti-Semitism. There is always the possibility of this devastating accusation being made when any of us in public office dare raise our voice against the methods of the Zionists of this country, or when we happen to disagree with any expression of the views of those who are dedicated to putting the power and influence of the United States at the disposal of, and for the furtherance of, the national aspirations of the Zionist State of Israel.

My subject this evening is Dangers for the United States in the Middle East Crisis. Certainly I do not represent myself as being an expert on this subject. There are those present who could better lay claim to such a qualification.

The claim I make for myself is objectivity. I can further assure you that I feel free of emotion in discussing these issues which are obviously loaded with emotionalism.

It seems obvious to me that before we can begin to understand the nature of the crisis which the United States faces in this most strategic area of the world, we must go back a little to the history of the problem which lies at the root of the trouble.

The Middle East, for a long time the world's forgotten child, has come alive—almost too much alive. The nationalism of the long-dormant Arab world is engaged in a bitter conflict with the nationalism of the State of Israel.

Arab nationalism and the consciousness of the necessity for social reform are mingled with a deep suspicion of the West which has a long history of colonialism in the area. Not unrelated to this suspicion and no little part of the antagonism to Israel is the historical fact that the Zionist experiment in Palestine—under the Balfour Declaration—entered the area as part of the colonial controls imposed at the end of World War I.

The Middle East, as you know, is of vitally strategic importance—oil and millions of people now stirring in a variety of emergent national revolutions make it so. Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, recently told a congressional committee; and here I quote:

"The importance of the Middle East to the free world can hardly be overestimated militarily and economically. First, its huge oil reserves now supply most of the wants of Europe, and their loss would be disastrous. Second, its geographic location is astride the lines of communication between West and East; and, third, it is only in this area that the Soviets have no buffer states."

In the Middle East lie the largest oil resources in the world—75 percent of the known reserves available to the free world. From the strategic United States airbase at Dhahran in Saudi Arabia, which figured so prominently in recent headlines, the Baku oilfields and other important industrial centers in the Communist world are easy targets.

The peacetime economy of Western Europe and of our allies there is dependent upon oil. And suppose, despite all of our efforts to wage peace, we should fail and find ourselves involved in a war with the Soviet Union. The problem of tankerage for oil which would be needed by our allies would be greatly increased if Middle East supply centers are lost, even assuming without argument that the supplies could be produced from our own sources. Furthermore, should the Soviet Union obtain access to the oil concessions of the Middle East now controlled by our allies, such acquisition might eliminate from the inscrutable calculation of the Kremlin one possible deterrent to war. Such a deterrent may now exist in the form of insufficient petroleum supplies under the control of the Soviet Union.

This Middle East area is important not only in itself, but because of the intimate ties of the people to struggling Arab nationalists in north Africa, to the west, and to the newly created Asian nations to the east. What is of moment in Cairo soon reverberates from Marrakech, in Morocco, to Bandung, in Indonesia.

The significance of the whole bloc of nations was dramatically illustrated at Bandung only about a year ago. If any of us are concerned with the welfare of our country for the future—in our own lifetime or certainly that of our children—we must find the ways to help these vast numbers of people to understand their aspirations and assist in the realization of their legitimate hopes.

It solves none of these problems for us to know that the United States has perhaps inherited more than it has created, of these annoyances and suspicions. There is little room in statesmanship for such rationalizing. The task of statesmanship is to obtain the facts, to face them and to construct the road of peace upon them.

In 1917 a hard-pressed British Government issued the Balfour Declaration as a war measure in the struggle against the Central Powers. The Balfour Declaration was a grant to establish—not a political state—but a Jewish homeland in Palestine for religious-minded Jews and refugees. And this grant was conditional: for included in the 67 words of the ambiguous declaration was the safeguarding clause which specifically protected the rights of the existing Arab communities.

Also included in the declaration was a general prohibition against anything being done by the Zionists "which may prejudice * * * the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country."

As we look back on the cumulative results of the history of Palestine, from the days of the declaration until now, it seems accurate to say that while Zionism exploited to the full the affirmations relating to the ambiguous entity designated as a national home, no one did anything effective about implementing either of the qualifying conditions.

At that time the Arabs constituted approximately nine-tenths of Palestine's population with the Jewish population in the Holy Land less than 50,000 at the turn of the century. The British hastened to assure the Arabs, who were rebelling against their Ottoman overseers, that they had no intent to subjugate the Arabs to Zionist rule.

Here I think it is important, for an understanding of the present impasse, to understand that this question of immigration was always the principal bone of contention.

Zionists were more or less satisfied with the yardstick of economic absorptive capacity. With this as the motivation, they appealed to the Jews of the world to supply money to build a Zionist economy in Palestine which might support increasing numbers of Jewish immigrants. At the same time, they opposed as contrary to the Balfour Declaration and the later mandate, every effort to establish self-government in Palestine, while there was still an Arab majority in the country.

Clearly, therefore, what the Zionists wanted and what was the substance of their long-range strategy was always a state in Palestine which they would control. While they were a minority in the country they demanded the right of complete sovereignty in the all-important question of immigration which would eventually determine the political character of the country. For all practical purposes, they succeeded in exercising this right.

Furthermore, and this is important both as history and in terms of understanding the present conflict, although the Zionists of Palestine could not accomplish this purpose alone, they were able to do so by reason of the political mechanism they operated, first in Britain and later in the United States.

In this process, the rights of the Arab population of Palestine were slowly whittled away. And, if I may say so, the increasing dependence of the Zionists in Palestine upon Jews outside for both political and economic support certainly blurred the qualification of the Balfour Declaration, which was intended as a safeguard against the involvement of non-Palestinian Jews in the political destiny of the Palestinian-Zionist undertaking. I suspect that it was precisely this increasing involvement of American Jews in a Zionist quasi-government in Palestine which brought about the creation of the American Council for Judaism.

This long-range strategy of Zionism, of course, became apparent only with the passing of time. The years between 1919–20 and 1947 were characterized by a three-way conflict. This was among official Zionism, which never lost sight of the political strategy of immigration, however much less official followers looked upon immigration as humanitarian; Arab nationalists who saw the ultimate outcome of such a policy; and the British Government, charged under the mandate with assisting the people of the country to reach an eventual condition of self-government.

Something like halfway through this three-way struggle, Hitler's rise to power confronted the world with as revolting and atavistic a chapter of savagery and brutality as any historic period has ever seen. And when the Hitler madness grew to the proportions of a threat to the whole civilized world, the specter of another global war confronted mankind. So another impasse was added to the long-festering Palestine problem. For in the very face of the need of refuge for as many of Europe's Jews as could be saved, there arose a complicating factor—the necessity for the West to have a friendly—or at least a nonantagonistic—hinterland of people in the Middle East.

British efforts to find a way out of this dilemma produced the campaigns of illegal Zionist immigration and subsequent violence for Palestine.

By the spring of 1947, the British had decided to give up the ghost and place the Palestine controversy before the United Nations. A special session of the General As-

sembly was convened, an investigating committee was sent to the troubled area, and 7 months later the international organization recommended the partition of Palestine. The bitter struggle for votes at Lake Success was featured by unparalleled pressures.

During the following spring, the United States reconsidered the partition plan. Reports of the National Security Council and the Central Intelligence Agency warned that the Palestine turmoil resulting from the actions of the United Nations acutely endangered the security of the United States. A trusteesship for Palestine became the new policy. While the United Nations debate was in progress, on May 15, 1948, the Zionists succeeded in setting up an independent state in Palestine, in territory which had been occupied for over 1,300 years by Arabs and which had not been Jewish for 2,000 years. Since that day, the Middle East struggle between the Arab and the Israeli has continued unabated.

Partition would never have won had it not been for the human factor. With the end of World War II, the plight of the displaced persons was pitiable. It was simple for the outside world, for humanitarian-minded Christians and Jews alike, to embrace a solution which seemed to solve two pressing problems at the same time—that of the refugees and that of the form of government Palestine was to assume. This is why so many Americans espoused the Zionist cause and favored the establishment of Israel.

Sympathy for the plight of the displaced persons was an emotion which we shall certainly never have cause to regret. But the support we gave to the Zionist plan for solving this problem by creating a Zionist state in Palestine has cost us dearly. It seriously undermined for our country the priceless high prestige we had always enjoyed in the Middle East among the people there because, unlike the British, the French, and the Spanish, we had never been a colonizing power. Our educators and missionaries had given to these people an example of selfless devotion to their welfare; an example of democracy at its best.

Tragically, this inestimable heritage of good will built up over the years was transformed, in a few moments, relatively speaking, by our well-meaning but ill-advised attempt to make it up to the Jews of Europe through aid to the Zionists in the Middle East.

What we achieved instead, in the Middle East, was to antagonize and embitter some 40 million people—an important part of the vast numbers of underdeveloped peoples whose friendship and support are really the big stakes in the East-West struggle. For if we, together with our allies in Western Europe, cannot persuade these underdeveloped peoples of the sincerity and integrity of our way of life, we—and our Western European allies—will some day be surrounded by great, heavily populated, rich-in-natural-resources areas of the world filled with suspicion and antagonism.

And, as we have come to expect, this embitterment to which we contributed in the Arab world was not missed by the Kremlin.

Disillusioned with the United States and the West, the Arabs were ripe for Russian advances. The more partial we became to the Zionists and the Israelis, the more the Arabs found themselves turning to the Soviets.

We, as Americans, make a great mistake—or perhaps I should say we are in danger of compounding our past errors—if we look upon this Soviet advance as an occasion for us to choose between Israel or the Arab States. This would suggest we must abandon one or the other.

In my humble opinion, the only American way to look at the present situation is against the background of this historical development of the problem which I have recited here in an extremely abridged form. What has taken place is that, for the first time in about two decades, the Arab States think they have a great power on their side. We know this great power is only another—and more vicious—form of colonialism. But our knowledge of this fact is not enough to save the Arab world for us. We fear Soviet advances will not stop at simple, commercial deals as the Arabs believe they will. But our knowledge of this fact, too, is not enough to prevent the subversion of the area.

If, as even the President of the United States has said, the Middle East is of great strategic importance to us, our national responsibility calls for positive action and avoidance of further negative irritants. Only in this way do we stand a chance of seizing away from the Soviets what now appears to be the initiative they have captured in the area.

It should be obvious to even the most partisan supporters of Israel that if the entire Arab world should go Communist, one casualty of such a catastrophe would be Israel itself.

Paradoxically, had we been less partial to Israel in the past, Israel, as well as the rest of the free world, might today be much more secure.

I am appalled when I reflect upon the difficulty of the problems we must face if we are to avert the most tragic consequences in the Middle East. For this task we shall need every ounce of our insight, our finest diplomatic skill, and a kind of transcendental integrity. Above all, we shall need to present to the world a nation united behind a policy motivated by the most unselfish, the most humane, the most impartial of motives. Unless we can so present ourselves, especially to the protagonists in the conflict, our efforts are doomed from the start.

It is for this reason, I am sure, that the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, said what he did to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last February. You will recall that he repeated an earlier statement expressing the hope that the Arab-Israeli dispute be kept out of the presidential election campaign this year. The position of the Secretary of State is one with which I find myself in the most heartfelt agreement.

It seems to me that so long as the question of United States policy for the Middle East continues to be a political football on the domestic scene we shall never arrive at any solution in the national interest. In this problem, as in all our problems of foreign policy, we must stick closely to the basic principle that differences among us cease at the water's edge. It is time for all candidates for public office in the United States—Republicans and Democrats alike—who have viewed this controversy as a convenient means of bartering for votes to realize that we have been callously playing politics with American national security.

When our first Secretary of Defense, James Forrestal, tried to get the Nation's two political parties to agree not to press the Middle East issue, he was met by rebuff and scorn. Mr. Forrestal was told that the Democratic Party would be bound to lose the advantage in certain States. His answer, as revealed in his diaries, was "It is about time that somebody should pay some consideration to whether we might not lose the United States." That retort of Mr. Forrestal's is more applicable today than ever.

Those of us who sincerely desire to demonstrate our friendship for the small State of Israel certainly will be yielding no ground if we ask that as the Middle East is debated, as it may be in election campaigns where our whole foreign policy is a legitimate subject for debate on a high level, the debate be on the issues of broad American interests in the whole area. It seems to me proper to ask any groups of Americans to assist in maintaining the debate on such a high level by avoiding the kind of partisan pressure tactics which led even so strong a friend of Zionism as Mr. Truman to complain. I think to suggest such standards for the debate is not to impugn the rights of any Americans. For our rights entail also responsibilities. And one responsibility of any American who petitions his Government is to be sure he is doing so as a free, sovereign, American citizen.

What I mean to say, above all, is that delicate negotiations which might lead to a just and equitable settlement of the complex problem in the Middle East can never be conducted against a background of bartering for a Jewish vote which I do not believe exists; the implied acceptance of which I believe to be a slander upon the integrity and the desire of Americans of Jewish faith to be part and parcel of the American people.

Among the many extremely useful things your organization has done, to my mind, have been your vigorous and repeated assertions that there is no such things as a Jewish vote presumably committed uncritically to the advancement of the foreign State of Israel. It seems to me to be self-evident that Americans who happen to profess the religion of Judaism, do not behave any differently in the voting booth than do Americans who happen to be Baptists or those who happen to be Methodists, Catholics, or Latter Day Saints.

I hope your organization continues to make it clear, particularly in this most important election campaign in which we are all about to become engaged, that anyone who says American Jews vote as a bloc to favor Israel slanders Jews, complicates an already highly complex problem for the United States Government and actually does Israel more harm than good.

Prof. William Ernest Hocking, of Harvard, in a letter to the New York Herald Tribune on March 4 wrote; and here I quote:

"We are again at a time when presidential issues are in the air, and when, as our political life has been running, it is prudent for any candidate or potential candidate to 'speak comfortably to Jerusalem.' I raise the question: What would happen if some presidential possibility were to speak uncomfortably to the present-day Jerusalem, in the interests of the honor and independence of the American voter?

"If it were suggested that votes might be lost, I ask, whose votes? They could be none but those prepared to put the interest of a foreign state prior to the interest of this country and of mankind. But can any candidate afford to lose them?

"I am looking for the man who will state this disgraceful situation clearly to the American people and publicly renounce any such vote."

I make no pretense to being the man for whom Professor Hocking is looking. But here and now I am prepared to say, as soberly as I know how, that I am one of what I fervently hope will be an increasing number who may seek to qualify.

My interest in this particular aspect of United States foreign policy is not new. About 2 years ago while witnesses from the Department of State were testifying on the foreign-aid program before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, they were questioned about the millions of dollars from the United States, contributed by American citizens in the form of bond sales and through the United Jewish Appeal to the Israeli Government.

Mr. Arthur Z. Gardiner, then politico-economic advisor to the State Department's Bureau of Near Eastern, South Asian, and African Affairs, said of these contributions, and I quote:

"Now these contributions, of course, are deductible for purposes of tax computation and they certainly have a bearing on our income-tax structure. How to evaluate or appraise that, I do not know."

A little later, Mr. Norman S. Paul, who was the State Department's Middle East regional director, made an extremely interesting statement. Here I quote him:

"The funds they have received through the United Jewish Appeal, just as the funds they received through these bond drives, have made up the pool from which they meet their defense as well as other requirements. * * * We can trace our funds definitely into projects and determine the commodities, but I don't think you could take the United Jewish Appeal contributions and do the same thing."

At this point, I said that if funds collected by the United Jewish Appeal were used for defense and for general economic development of Israel, they should definitely be taken into account in arriving at the question of what Israel needed from us. I said—and here I quote myself:

"When the dollars in the barrel are stirred you can't identify each, but nevertheless, those exempt contributions, as are the reparations payments, become available for any use. Why should this committee not take into consideration all these other contributions when we are considering grants-in-aid on that basis?"

I think of these questions our committee discussed 2 years ago when I notice that the increased armaments in the hands of Egypt are now being used as a sales-argument to raise a greatly increased quota this year for the United Jewish Appeal. I wonder about the logic, for the United States, in such a situation. One of the reasons Egypt turned to Czechoslovakia for arms was that the dollar cost of American arms to the Egyptians was too high. Egypt needed those arms to meet what, with concern for its own national security, it believed to be a rising threat from Israel following the Gaza attack of February 1955. Yet we in the United States help make it possible for Israel to purchase arms with dollars imported through the United Jewish Appeal but not segregated for strictly charitable purposes.

Soberly, earnestly, I ask those who direct and support such policies if they are of real, unqualified assistance to the United States at a time when our Nation's interests are gravely imperiled in the Middle East.

I am not making any accusations. I have little evidence of the extent—if any—to which the American taxpayer is without his knowledge or consent underwriting either the military power of the State of Israel or the pressure politics of the Zionist movement in the United States. I would hope, for the sake of our country and for all our citizens, that it is possible for someone to secure a detailed, fully audited breakdown, to the last dollar, of the ultimate disposition of the vast sums of money collected every year in this country in the name of philanthropy and which, to the extent that they are deductible from income tax, are subsidized by the American taxpayer.

It may be that such an accounting is available. If it is, I have not seen it. I raise the question only to point out that publication of such an accounting is perhaps long overdue. I raise it in the fervent wish that my suspicions may be proved to be unfounded. I raise it in all sincerity, hoping at the same time that I may be forced to apologize for giving rise to fears which may have no foundation.

I raise the question now, as I did in 1954, because of its very grave bearing upon our chances for reaching a settlement of the crisis in the Middle East. One of the factors which adds enormously to the difficulties we face in this area is the conviction, shared by many of the Arab States, that the United States Government is hopelessly subservient to Zionist pressures. One of the strongest indications, to the Arabs, that this is the case, is the fact that apparently no official of the United States Government dares to raise this kind of question in connection with what happens to the vast sums of money raised in this country and made available to the Israeli Government.

Once this, and perhaps certain other questions are clarified, it seems to me that American public opinion should certainly be willing to support a compromise settlement for the Middle East—a settlement which would be in the interests of American security; a settlement which would do justice to the Arabs, and a settlement which would not drive the Israelis into the sea—a widely held fear.

Such a settlement must accord justice to both sides. There are 900,000 Arab refugees who have become the innocent victims of the creation of the State of Israel. Both sides must be induced to make concessions which will help settle this problem. If Israel will offer to repatriate Arab refugees, that is, to let them have their land back or else compensate them for their losses, much of the Arab grievance would be dissipated. Many of the Arabs will not wish to return, but will prefer compensation. This refugee problem lies at the heart of the conflict.

Let us remember that just concessions at this time can avoid disaster. The alternative is that either the Israelis attack and conquer the Arabs or the Arabs attack and conquer them. In neither case is it likely that Israel can win. Should they initially conquer the Arabs, the task confronting 1,700,000 people of keeping under subjugation 40 million Arabs will prove an impossible one. Moslems of the surrounding countries will inevitably become involved. The floodgates to communism will be opened by the Arabs as they struggle to free themselves from any temporary rule under the Israelis. Can the West afford to permit this to happen? On the other hand, it becomes very difficult to see what the West can do if the Arabs become strong enough to attempt to throw Israel into the sea and if there is built into such strength increasing bitterness and hostility. For it is a certainty that the United States, either together with the West or alone, cannot engage the whole Moslem world in conflict in Israel's behalf. Nor can the United States alone, or with its allies, long avoid a decision to help the Moslem world in its emergent renaissance from North Africa to Indonesia.

In the vast expanse of territory and peoples, Israel must be seen in its proper perspective; and, in the long pull of history, if Israel is to endure it will be a service to it if American Jews do not encourage it, either directly or through pressure on their own Government, to hold an exaggerated opinion of its place in the context of world politics.

Unless one believes in some kind of pan-Israelism, or in some new version of the "white man's burden" in the form of an Israel destined to dominate the Middle East, I think nothing I have said can be construed as anti-Israel. Moreover, because I think I know something of the history of the problem, I am sympathetic to the reason why the Israelis hold an exaggerated opinion of their role in history. For too long the West—unmindful of consequences—yielded to almost every whim of Israel's Zionist progenitors.

But there comes a time, and nearly a decade in the life of a nation may not be too soon, when a sovereign nation demonstrates its maturity by seeing itself in its true proportions and in the perspective of the world's insistent desire for peace. One certain contribution Israel could make today to the peace of the world is to renounce its Zionist internationale; to bestow neither favors upon, nor require obligations of, people who are not its citizens; to turn its national face and energies, which are great, to the Middle East; to act the mature part which it claims for itself in its own comparisons of its sovereignty with the Arab world and, with a generosity commensurate with the favoritism it has enjoyed in the past, actively seek a peace with its Middle East neighbors. This, more than its propaganda, would demonstrate its dedication to western hopes for peace. In this way Israel might repay some of its debt to the West and, not the least, to Jewish citizens of the western nations, who for a complexity of reasons have showered on Israel and its Zionist antecedents innumerable blessings.

The role of impartiality for which the Department of State has pleaded is motivated by a desire to keep the Communists out of the area. In any arms race between the United States and Russia, the 40 million Arabs can more quickly absorb Russian weapons, incremented by the large obsolete quantities possessed by the Kremlin, than can the West supply Israel with arms. Israel's future then lies in making such concessions as will buy them what they most need to survive, namely, peace.

Will this problem ever be finally and completely solved? As Americans, we are accustomed to attacking problems head-on and fighting our way through to a complete and total solution. In my native State of Texas, for instance, the problems with which we deal seem to fall pretty largely in the area of combating the ravages of nature. We have to contend with drought, with excessive rains, with tornadoes, and floods. In all these cases, catastrophic though they may be, there is at least the satisfaction of knowing on which side we are.

In the political field, however, and most typically, it seems to me, in connection with the problems we have to face in the Middle East, we are dealing with issues which are not nearly as clear-cut and where, instead of there being a black-and-white contrast between good and evil, we have a situation in which there are shades of gray over virtually everything.

I have the feeling that the situation in the Middle East is in many ways comparable to that which prevailed there during the Middle Ages and earlier when the conflict, instead of taking place between Arab and Zionist nationalism was between two different groups, each of which referred to the other as infidels. Moslems and Christians for many generations in that area engaged in bloody battles with each other until somehow, with neither side ever being completely victorious, a kind of modus vivendi came to exist between them. The Christians and the Moslems never really made a formal peace with each other. I am sure that they still think of each other (privately) as infidels. Nevertheless, with the passing of time, they did learn to live with each other. The conflict between them, although never really resolved, did manage, by the very fact that it continued for so long, to ameliorate itself.

I am an optimist about the Middle East. However, I am not so much of an optimist as to believe that we are going to find a just, a permanent, and a peaceful solution which will satisfy everyone within the very near future.

Perhaps, in the present situation, we should lower our sights a bit. I believe if we accept the probability that the best we can hope to achieve for some time is a gradual amelioration of the intense emotionalism and bitterness which have characterized both sides to this controversy, we shall have come a long way.

In the long run, at any rate, it may be that this realistic view will help prevent the situation in the Middle East from deteriorating to the one irrevocable disaster of all-out war. Such a war could benefit no one except the power-hungry masters of the Soviet Union.

Perhaps our immediate objective, therefore, should simply be, not a final peace, but the continued absence of war. If both parties to the controversy continue to live as neighbors, if not at peace then at least not actually engaged in physical combat, the very passing of time itself may tend to dull the edge of the hatred which now divides them.

With the passing of time and the lessening of the hatred—and everything which we, as Americans of good will, can do to encourage the lessening of that hatred—the day of a final, lasting, and peaceful solution may not be as far off as it sometimes may seem.

I wish for the American Council for Judaism continued success in offsetting spurious claims to real authority over American Jews advanced by individuals or groups precommitted to linking American power and prestige in the area only to Israel.

We've Got To Attract and Keep the Men To Man Our Planes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, when Gen. Horace Wade spoke in behalf of his Strategic Air Command and emphasized the fact that we are spending "billions for equipment and peanuts for people," he put his finger on the glaring defect in the treatment we accord those who want to elect the armed services as a career but who, out of deference to the needs of their families and consideration for their own future, are forced to seek more lucrative employment in industry and the professions.

General Wade, in his appearance before the Senate subcommittee, was supporting his chief, General LeMay, and the substance of their joint recommendation was to the effect that an adequate program of incentives designed to encourage enlistments could actually save money while making possible a truly professional Air Force.

The average serviceman occupies in the minds of too many of us the role of "hero in war, zero in peace"; and while nothing is too great for the soldier or airman who mans our defenses when we are under attack, our treatment of him in peacetime is both illogical and senseless. We spend millions on a modern plane and then expect the man who pilots it to work for less than an ordinary mechanic's wages, even though he has to be a technician of the highest type. But the thing we sacrifice so readily that is above price is the esprit de corps without which no military service ever amounted to a hill of beans. I say, with all of the emphasis I can command, that the time is here when we must make military service so attractive economically that we will have no difficulty in recruiting and keeping on the job the cream of American manhood to protect us from those who would destroy us.

H. R. 6376: The Alaska Mental Health Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I am able to state that the Portland Chamber of Commerce in my district has made a careful study through two of its committees of the Alaska mental health bill H. R. 6376. Following the favorable action of both committees, the bill has been endorsed by the board of directors of the chamber. Because of the thorough analysis of the bill which preceded the action of the chamber of commerce and because this action I believe represents the overwhelming support for this bill in my own area, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the conclusions of the two committees and the endorsement by the chamber of commerce.

PORTLAND CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Portland, Oreg., April 19, 1956.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: The hospital for Alaska insane bill has been put through the study procedure here—two committees have it. The Alaska committee has been able to sound out Alaska contacts and has brought here for consultation on the subject the Director of the Alaska Native Service. That committee is bringing out a report favoring the bill.

The chamber's health affairs committee investigates from a different approach, but their consideration of the bill appears to be leading to a favorable report.

Without such studies chamber action is unsound. Committee work, as you know, requires time. In this instance, however, it appears that favorable committee action will go to the chamber board late this week and at present it would seem likely that the board action would be to adopt the reports of the committees.

Sincerely yours,
DAVID C. DUNCAN, *President.*

APRIL 10, 1956.

To: The board of directors.
Subject: House bill 6376.

At a regular meeting of the Alaska committee, held on April 10, the committee considered House bill 6376, which provides for the hospitalization and care of the mentally ill of Alaska. This is an enabling act, cited as the Alaska Mental Health Act, the purposes of which is to transfer from the Federal Government to the Territory of Alaska basic responsibility and authority for the hospitalization, care, and treatment of the mentally ill of Alaska, and in connection with such transfer provides: (a) to modernize procedures for such hospitalization (including commitment), care, and treatment and to authorize the Territory to modify or supersede such procedures; (b) to assist in providing for the Territory necessary facilities for a comprehensive mental health program in Alaska, including inpatient and out-patient facilities; (c) to provide for a land grant to the Territory to assist in placing the program on a firm, long-term basis; (d) to provide for a 10-year program of grants-in-aid to the Territory to enable the Territory gradually to assume the full operating costs of the program.

The Alaska Committee recommends that the board of directors of the Portland Chamber of Commerce support passage of House bill 6376.

CARTER BRANDON,
Secretary, the Alaska Committee.

Approved by the board of directors, Portland Chamber of Commerce, April 20, 1956.

APRIL 19, 1956.

Memorandum to: Board of directors of the Portland Chamber of Commerce.
Re: Action of health affairs committee on House bill 6376, hospitalization and care the mentally ill of Alaska.

The health affairs committee of the Portland Chamber of Commerce at their regular meeting held in the chamber of commerce board of directors room an Wednesday noon, April 18, 1956, considered H. R. 6376 to provide for the hospitalization and care of mentally ill in Alaska, as well as the report of Mr. O'BRIEN of New York, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

In consideration of this bill, it was brought out neither the Oregon State Medical Society or Multnomah County Medical Society had any opposition to the measure. It was developed there was a general feeling on the part of members of the health affairs committee the facilities for the hospitalization and care of the mentally ill in Alaska was a necessity for the territory.

It was regularly moved, seconded, and adopted that the health affairs committee concur with the recommendations of the Alaska committee and recommend the board of directors approve House bill 6376.

Respectfully submitted.

GUY E. LEONARD,
Secretary, Health Affairs Committee.

Approved by the board of directors, Portland Chamber of Commerce, April 20, 1956.

PORTLAND CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Portland, Oreg., April 24, 1956.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: The board of directors has adopted the two committee reports favoring passage of your bill respecting the Alaska insane.

Your sincerely,
DAVID C. DUNCAN,
President.

Spirit Lives On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IVOR D. FENTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in commemoration of the 165th anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day, I included in the RECORD an editorial "Spirit Lives On," from the columns of the Shenandoah (Pa.) Evening Herald of May 3. It is a fine tribute to a great people:

In honor of Poland's early recognition and adherence to the principle of equality of man, freemen everywhere beyond the Iron Curtain today salute the Polish people on the 165th anniversary of their constitution.

In more happy years, the Poles joyously commemorated adoption of the constitution in 1791 annually on May 3; it was truly an eventful day in Poland.

But when the Kremlin's puppets forcibly gained control of the country, they were

quick to abolish constitution day. It was their evil intent to destroy this proud memory and obliterate everything it stood for.

Nevertheless, while the Reds did away with constitution day, they have never succeeded in stamping out the gallant spirit which lives on in the minds and hearts of all loyal Poles.

Here in Shenandoah, where so many good Americans are justly proud of their Polish ties, today occasions fervent hopes and prayers that the time will soon come when the yoke of tyranny may be overthrown in Poland and freedom and equality restored.

The Southern Position With Respect to the Biracial System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include one of the most able presentations of the southern position in regard to the racial problem I have seen, by Dr. C. K. Brown, of Davidson College, North Carolina.

The address follows:

THE SOUTHERN POSITION WITH RESPECT TO THE BIRACIAL SYSTEM

(Address delivered by C. K. Brown to the students of Davidson College, March 1, 1956)

In a time when much is being said about oppressed minorities, it is well to remember that the white people of the South are a minority in the Nation. They are not an aggressive minority. They do not seek to impose their pattern of life upon the people of other regions. They are willing to concede to other regions the degree of freedom that they would like to have to establish social arrangements, not inconsistent with the basic law to which they have assented, within their own bounds. For at least a century the South has struggled to retain the degree of local autonomy to which it feels entitled under the American system of government. This is not a purely selfish struggle; the principle at issue is important, the South thinks, to all the diverse regions of the American commonwealth.

For some years now the South has been subjected to heavy pressure to abandon its biracial social structure. This pressure has been applied by the Federal Government, which, in the words of the Charlotte News (editorial of November 26, 1955), has undertaken "a monumental project in the field of social engineering"; by the NAACP, which is determined to exploit the Federal power to the utmost in establishing relationships that are obnoxious to the overwhelming majority of the white people of the South; by the northern press, which is almost unanimous in its conviction that the South should be prodded into accepting the ideas of other sections, because, as the editor of Harper's magazine, for example, believes, the white people of the South don't do anything without being prodded (January 1956, p. 24); and by a small group of white persons in the South, who, chiefly on religious grounds, consider the biracial system to be a relic of a benighted past.

In the course of this campaign many intemperate things have been said and done; things that were calculated to infuriate the white South. The southern people have been called prejudiced, unenlightened, undemocratic, and unchristian. These intemperate attacks have evoked a number of intemperate responses from the less disciplined members of the southern community. The result is that a tremendous amount of ill-will and resentment has been generated, not only between blacks and whites but between members of the white race who hold different views on this troublesome subject. If this atmosphere continues, the issue that has been forced upon the South may find no acceptable solution in our time. I am convinced that there are, among the white people of the South, as many persons with a sense of decency, with a love for fair dealing, and with an understanding of the Christian teaching as are to be found in any group of comparable size elsewhere in the country. These are the people who in the end will have to solve this problem. Their task is being made much more difficult by their antagonists, who seem to regard them as deficient in all the great qualities of heart and mind.

The South recognizes the race problems as one of the greatest magnitude. It does not regard it as arising simply out of the prejudices of men of different color. It considers race to be a fact, just as sex is a fact. It is not moved by this off-hand assertion that science can discover no difference among races. It holds that there are differences among races, that those differences cannot be eliminated except by amalgamation of blood, that this is not desirable from the viewpoint of any race, and that if two races are to live happily together in the same region, each must know the bounds within which it can function without being offensive to the other. Rules establishing such bounds are to be found in every society containing discrete elements. Some of them are embodied only in custom; some are expressed in the formal requirements of law. The one can be just as compulsory as the other. Often customary boundaries are colder and less human than those that are established in law, for the reason that they appear to depend more upon personal decision. There is a grand impersonality about the law that softens the impact of its requirements.

Now, the Supreme Court has declared that the Southern States shall no longer embody in their law the boundaries that they have considered it desirable to maintain between the races. In the Brown case the Court interpreted the legal requirement of separate schools as a denial of the right of Negroes to attend white schools, although the law equally denies the right of white children to attend Negro schools. The South has bitterly protested this decision as an exercise of power that the Federal Government does not possess. It finds no language in the Constitution to justify such interference in the internal affairs of the States. "Equal protection of the law," upon which the Court relied, covers the protection of person and property against the depredations of others. The phrase cannot be stretched to include a right to be educated side by side with other persons who desire to be educated separately. It is no instrument for forcing the association of persons against their will. Under cover of the phrase, however, the Court has ruled in effect that people have a vested interest in associating with others whether the others like it or not. Now a vested interest is a right that the State will enforce against all and sundry and without regard to their likes or dislikes. Its purpose is to protect people in the enjoyment of rights already acquired; it cannot be employed as a means of bestowing rights.

Southern opposition to the Court's decision cannot be dismissed as disrespect for law. It is the expression of an important judgment concerning the sort of government under which all, black and white, North and South, are likely to find it tolerable in the end to live. In the South's view, the Court has shown disrespect for law by basing its decision on a sociological theory that is popular at the moment. The Court quotes with approval the finding of a lower court that "Segregation * * * has a tendency * * * to deprive (Negro children) of some of the benefits they would receive in a racial integrated school system." Then the Court says: "Whatever may have been the extent of psychological knowledge at the time of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*, this finding is amply supported by modern authority" (p. 494). *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* was the 1896 case in which the Court held that equal but separable facilities met all the requirements of the law. There is no contention that the law has changed since that time; only that our psychological knowledge has changed. Among the authorities cited by the Court are: K. B. Clark, Effect of Prejudice and Discrimination on Personality Development, Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth, 1950; Witmer and Kotinsky, Personality in the Making, 1952; Deutscher and Chein, The Psychological Effects of Enforced Segregation; A Survey of Social Science Opinion, 1948.

Thus lightly does the Court turn over the making of law to social-science opinion and the writers of books on psychology. And if to one kind of opinion or to one group of writers, why not to another? Some have already insisted that the writers of political textbooks have been consulted. Certain it is that the prestige of the Court south of the Potomac is not enhanced when the Vice President of the United States publicly takes credit, on behalf of his party, for the Court's decision. "Speaking for a unanimous Court," Mr. NIXON is reported to have said, "a great Republican Chief Justice, Earl Warren, has ordered an end to racial segregation in the Nation's public schools." You may put the commas in that wherever you like, but they won't drive the politics out. The phrase "the Nation's public schools" has a sinister implication. Under the Court's decision the schools would no longer be North Carolina's or Georgia's or Mississippi's.

In its opinion the Court held that even though "buildings, curriculums, qualifications and salaries of teachers, and other tangible factors" are equal, the Negroes are denied equal opportunity unless they can go to the same schools with white children. In other words, there is no objective test of equality in schools. There is something that the white children bring to their schools that the Negroes cannot bring to theirs. It is nowhere asserted that white children cannot get a good education without attending Negro schools. This is a very clear compliment to the white man's culture. Referring to its own decision in the Sweatt case, the Court said: "In the finding that a segregated law school for Negroes could not provide them equal educational opportunities, this Court relied in large part on 'those qualities which are incapable of objective measurement but which make for greatness in a law school'" (p. 493). If one wishes to put the matter that way, one might go on and say that no power on earth can provide the Negroes with equal educational opportunities. What can these immeasurable qualities that make for greatness be but the sum total of all that the long history of the white man enables him to bring to the support of his endeavors?

The Court stressed the contention that the members of a minority who must attend separate schools develop a sense of inferiority. But the mere fact of being in a minority does not lead to a sense of inferiority. The Jews are a minority, and they have been subjected to a good deal of social differentiation, but they give no evidence of any feeling of inferiority. On the contrary, they are fully aware of their intellectual powers and their business acumen and are conscious of the proud spiritual heritage that they bear.

Here we come face to face with a fact that sets limits to anything that we can do in the premises. The Negro in America is in a sense a displaced person. He brought with him to this land only the most primitive type of culture and one that was bound to be obliterated in contact with the advanced civilization of the white man. In these circumstances the Negro could do nothing but appropriate and adapt the white man's culture to the best of his ability. In this process he has had the sympathetic help of a host of white southerners, and he will continue to have it. But no man can bestow upon him an inheritance that is not his. However willing we are to share it with him, there is a sense in which it must remain ours and not his. The Pilgrim fathers can never be his fathers; the signers of the Declaration can never be his ancestors. Whether he attends mixed schools or separate schools, it will be another's culture that he is striving to appropriate.

The confusion of our age is revealed in the fact that the advocates of mixed schools cite the immeasurable qualities that make for greatness as something that is being withheld from the Negroes, while at the same time they belittle the white man's culture as a thing not worthy of the loyalty of its custodians. On the one hand we are told that Negroes should be allowed a more intimate association in order that they may better acquire what the white man already has; on the other, we are told that the white man's civilization can no longer be seen through the prejudiced eyes of our fathers as having unique qualities that ought to be preserved. The second of these attitudes has been carried to the point where Prof. Richard M. Weaver, of the University of Chicago can assert that we are an impious people, having lost respect for all that went before us. And a recent reviewer, writing in the new National Weekly suggests that we are "systematically instilling into the adolescent mind contempt for the traditional culture of western man" (December 14, 1955, p. 25).

If there is such a contempt, it arises, I think, from the fact that we regard our vast production of economic goods as the most brilliant achievement of our culture. When I say "we," I mean the American people as a whole—the observation is less applicable, I believe, to the South than to any other section. The Bureau of Indian Affairs has recently begun the project of moving large numbers of Indians from their western lands into the industrial cities where they may enjoy what are called the fruits of 20th century civilization, up to and including television sets (Atlantic Monthly, March 1956, p. 54). These same fruits are clamored for by people all over the world, especially the people of color, and by the Negroes at home. For this false appraisal of our civilization they are less to blame than we. We have affronted the rest of the world by our vulgar displays, and we have affronted the best of our own traditions by our shameless materialism. Mixed with our materialism, however, is our generosity. We honestly want other people to share what we fatuously call the good things of life. We seem to consider it our destiny to invite the world to a feast, and the world is willing, of course, to come; but its coming does not indicate that it understands or respects or desires to appropriate anything that lies back of our economic productivity. From each table that we set they retire grumbling for more and liking us not one whit better.

Surely our culture is more than the goods that we can produce. The white man does have a history, and it is not contemptible. Indeed, almost all of recorded history belongs to him. The intellectual power of the Greeks, the organizational skill of the Romans, the spiritual insight of the Hebrews, the music of the Germans, the art of the Italians, the Anglo-Saxon genius for self-government—all of these are a part of his heritage. Modern science is almost wholly his creation; and the Christian religion has, in the providence of God, been committed to him for propagation. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves for encouraging other peoples to imitate and adopt the worst features of our civilization. The white people of the South are, I believe, as eager as any to share the best that we have, but they do not think that this sharing can best be done by submitting their culture to a process of erosion. They think it to the best interest of all to maintain the sort of social barriers that from time immemorial have been the means of preserving cultural and racial integrity. The South, in a word, conceives of human society as a thing having structure and not as something without form and void, in which persons are mere economic competitors, having no distinguishing features and bent solely upon increasing their incomes. Modern industrial man has largely lost this sense of structure. The South is on the defensive today because it still retains it.

Structure implies boundaries that cannot safely be crossed. Such boundaries have long existed between the sexes, although they have become much less formidable in recent years, with results that are not altogether good. There was sound wisdom, for example, in the designation of certain topics that men should not discuss with women. Rules covering such matters were not devised to prove that women are inferior to men, but to improve the quality of the association one with the other. A society with structure must be supported by mutual respect and a mutual spirit of helpfulness on the opposite sides of its boundary lines. It is more dependent upon good manners than it is upon the level of income. It need not be a society without mutual affection. Countless instances of such affection rush to the mind of any southerner. I cite but one. U. B. Phillips quotes an inscription found on the gravestone of a slave: "John, A Faithful Servant and True Friend; Kindly and Considerate; Loyal and Affectionate; The Family He Served Honors Him in Death; But in Life They Gave Him Love; For He Was One of Them." (Life and Labor in the Old South, p. 215.)

It is not necessary for me to say much about the Christian doctrine of brotherhood. All Christians are indeed brothers in Christ. "In Christ there is no east nor west." But Christian brotherhood implies no sort of equality beyond this, and it certainly sets up no preemptive right of intrusion. It is strange that the concept of brotherhood should be used to describe a condition of worldly equality. Brothers are not equal and cannot be; brotherhood, as Professor Weaver has observed, is status in a family. There are big brother and little brother, each with duties of his own and responsibility to the other. Nowhere in the New Testament can I find that it is the purpose of Christianity to wipe out the differences that exist among men. It deals not with the many points in which they differ, but with the one point in which they are all alike. Some men have black skins, but all have black hearts. In dealing with this common characteristic, Christianity does not destroy the differences of men. It does something grander than that: it makes those differences irrelevant. If Jesus had intended to endorse the struggles of men for worldly position and prerogative He could never have said that the meek shall inherit the earth. And if all the differences were to be wiped out, little room would be left for the charity enjoined by the rich 13th chapter of First Corinthians.

Eisenhower's Special Commission Came With General's Timing To Delay Consideration of Veterans' and Dependents' Legislation in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith material contained in the national legislative bulletin of the American Legion in regard to the General Bradley Commission report. The recommendations of the special commission set up by President Eisenhower should be most closely scrutinized by every Member of Congress.

The material follows:

THE BRADLEY COMMISSION REPORT

Whether by design or accident, the long awaited Bradley report came with a general's correct timing to strategically and tactically hurl an explosion into the midst of consideration of veterans' and dependents' legislation in Congress. The 415 pages of words, charts, and graphs recommended such an upset of accepted American philosophy on the treatment of war veterans, that it practically stopped everyone in his tracks. The House Veterans' Affairs Committee, in reducing it to briefest treatment, has prepared a blue sheet of 25 pages. Even the latter is so complex as to require a corps of expert service officers to ferret out the ultimately intended impact of the report and recommendations.

At best the report has caused the House Veterans' Affairs Committee to delay its decision as to whether or not to report out war veterans' security bill, H. R. 7886. In fairness to the committee, in spite of the fact that they have had H. R. 7886 under consideration for 2 months and should now be in position to render decision based upon complete knowledge of the situation surrounding the bill, the decision to withhold action on H. R. 7886 until after taking a further look at the Bradley report and hearing what veterans' organizations have to say about it, is a debatable issue. At least, when our bill gets on the floor of the House, it cannot be further stalled by those who would condemn the bill and attempt to force it back to committee because the latter had not held hearings on the Bradley recommendations. Such hearings may start on the 8th. The American Legion will present its views on the 9th.

As we go to press the national executive committee has just concluded its annual May meeting. The Bradley report was the principal item on the agenda. Details of its recommendations are not available to us now. However, the national executive committee discussion and its resolution will be the basis for our position before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee next Wednesday. You will be informed of the events.

WHAT TO DO NOW

We have not completely appraised the damage done by the report, but we know it has fed the boilers for steam for the opponents to the present system of veterans' and dependents' benefits. We urge upon all of you to get busier than ever before in insisting that the members of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee promptly vote

favorably on the American Legion's war veterans' security bill, H. R. 7886.

WHAT DOES GENERAL BRADLEY RECOMMEND?

Obviously, we cannot print the entire report—not even the brief of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. Therefore, material below will have to be taken out of context. The Bradley Commission recommends:

"Military service in time of war or peace should be treated as discharging an obligation of citizenship and not of itself as a basis for future Government benefits.

"Special veterans' benefits should be provided only for the significant requirements of veterans that arise directly out of their military service.

"The ordinary or non-service-connected needs which veterans have in common with all citizens should be met wherever possible through the general welfare programs under which veterans are covered along with other people. Veterans' non-service-connected benefits should be minimized and gradually eliminated.

"The non-service-connected benefits are the lowest priority among veterans' programs. Their justification is weak and their basic philosophy is backward-looking rather than constructive. Our society has developed more equitable means of meeting most of the same needs and big strides are being made in closing remaining gaps. The non-service-connected benefits should be limited to a minimum level and retained only as a reserve line of honorable protection for veterans whose means are shown to be inadequate and who fail to qualify for basic protection under the general old-age and survivors' insurance system.

The Government in general, and the executive branch in particular, should adopt a positive policy toward meeting fully and promptly the legitimate needs of veterans. This policy should have the aim of alleviating war-incurred handicaps of servicemen as early as possible after separation and helping them become productive and useful members of their communities. The provision of constructive and adequate readjustment benefits, as a rule, should discharge the Government's obligation to war veterans who have no service-connected disability.

"As a nation we should keep the whole range of our needs in perspective. We ought to make sure that we meet the high priority service-connected needs of our veterans—and this is fully within our means and our volition as a nation. However, it would be dangerous to overemphasize veterans' non-service-connected benefit programs at the expense of essential national security and other general public programs."

COMPENSATION FOR SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES AND DEATH

"The Veterans' Administration Schedule for Rating Disabilities should be revised thoroughly so that it will reflect up-to-date medical, economic, and social thinking with respect to rating and compensation of disability. This revision should be based on thorough factual studies by a broadly representative group of experts, including physicians, economists, sociologists, psychologists, and lawyers.

"Shortened life expectancy due to disability or impairment of physical vitality may result in loss of earning capacity. It is appropriate, therefore, to reflect in the compensation scale some allowance for reduced longevity among disabled veterans providing it is held to modest weight and account is taken of the fact that liberal benefits for survivors are provided by the Government.

"Special consideration should be given to disabilities rated at 10 and 20 percent to determine whether significant economic impairment exists.

"Consideration should be given to discharge of the Government's obligation in static cases rated at 10 and 20 percent by an appropriate lump-sum or short-term settlement.

"The presumption of service connection for chronic diseases, tropical diseases, psychoses, tuberculosis, and multiple sclerosis as now listed should be withdrawn.

"There is otherwise in the law sufficient protection for the veteran to establish service connection of any and all diseases. Accepted medical principles can reasonably and accurately establish the onset of a disease and the disability process. Where there is reasonable doubt, the law provides for the doubt to be resolved in favor of the veteran.

"In view of the rapid and continuing growth of Federal disability benefits, a prompt effort should be made at an appropriate level in the executive branch to develop common standards for evaluation of disability and compensation under the several programs.

"A small lump-sum payment at the time of death, with monthly payments thereafter, is the best combination of benefits for survivors. In keeping with the idea that survivor payments represent a community sharing of the risk in a public enterprise, the monthly payments should be limited to those who were dependent upon the deceased, or who would have been dependent if he had lived.

"That the Veterans' Administration's death compensation be paid only to the survivors of members or former members of the Armed Forces who die from service-connected causes. The Commission feels that adequate benefits for civilian groups are necessary, but that such benefits should be provided through separate laws not administered by the Veterans' Administration.

"That the monthly amount of death compensation be related to the military pay of the deceased, within limits."

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS FOR WAR VETERANS

"Readjustment benefits should assist the individual veteran in meeting specific problems which result from his service in the Armed Forces or from conditions affecting his return to civilian life. A variety of benefits will be needed because individual problems will differ.

"Provision of a varied range of benefits does not mean, however, that there should be benefits for everyone. Except for mustering-out pay, at separation, no contribution to readjustment is made by providing benefits that do not actually contribute to readjustment, simply to assure that every veteran will receive something. Varied benefits should be available, not with the expectation that each will be used by all, but to assure that each major transitional problem that may affect a sizable number of individuals is provided for.

"Readjustment benefits should be used during the period in which the veteran is reestablishing himself in civilian life. Benefits that are used after this readjustment is completed are not, in any real sense, readjustment benefits; and benefits that are available over too long a period may actually discourage the veteran from taking steps, or making decisions, which are needed for his readjustment."

HOUSING

"The program for World War II veterans should be transferred to the Federal Housing Administration. In order to avoid a last-minute rush and allow an orderly termination of the program, the benefits should be extend and gradually decreased over a 2-year period."

VETERANS' PREFERENCE

"The reemployment-rights program fills a positive function in assisting exservicemen to return to employment. Inconsistencies in the statute should be clarified and resources augmented.

"The Commission believes that veterans' preference in entering civil service and the special appeals procedure for veterans should be provided for a limited period after discharge (say 5 years), but should not continue for nondisabled veterans after a reasonable period for readjustment has been provided. There is no justification for special retention rights for nondisabled veterans, beyond crediting toward length of service the time spent in the Armed Forces during wartime. For veterans with a significant compensable service-connected disability, a permanent preference both in hiring and retention seems justifiable, since their disability may put them at a disadvantage both in obtaining and retaining jobs. Such permanent preference should not be given, however, to those only with minor disabilities—certainly not to those with less than 30-percent ratings."

BENEFITS FOR PEACETIME EX-SERVICEMEN

"The Veterans' Administration should continue to provide disability and death compensation benefits for peacetime servicemen, and the rates payable should be the same as to those who served in wartime."

NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED PENSIONS

"Keeping in mind the basic role and the contributory character of the OASI program, veterans' pension benefits should not exceed average benefits which will be paid under OASI when it reaches reasonable maturity.

"At present, a monthly pension of $70 for a veteran pensioner alone and $105 for a veteran with a dependent wife would appear to fulfill these criteria. Benefit levels for veterans in need of regular care, and for survivors of veterans should be established in accordance with their comparative needs.

"All pension benefits should be reduced in full by the amount of family income from any source, except income from work or public assistance. Income from work which is not in excess of $100 per year should not reduce the pension. Additional work income should reduce benefits by some practical formula, such as by $50 for each $100 earned. With earnings large enough to reduce the amount of pension to less than $50 for any year, a pension should no longer be payable for that year.

"The test of impairment at ages 65 to 70 should be made more realistic by requiring at least a 30 percent disability. However, those found individually unemployed despite a lesser disability might be put on the roll in recognition of special circumstances, as is done now, with the changes in procedure recommended below.

"Applicants for pensions at ages below 55 and those aged 55 or over who claim to be unemployable due to a disability which is of lesser degree than that required for a pension at their age, should be referred to the Federal-State Vocational Rehabilitation Service. Only if the Rehabilitation Service declares the veteran is unable to overcome his impairment and the Employment Service certifies its inability to place him, should the veteran be put on the pension roll.

"Survivors' pensions should be available to the widow and/or children of any deceased eligible war veteran who are in presumptive need because their total family income falls below the amount fixed by the Government provided that:

"A widow, to be eligible, must (a) not have remarried, and (b) have a dependent child in her care, or have attained age 65, or be permanently and totally disabled or otherwise unemployable as certified by the State Employment Service; and

"A widow must have been married to the veteran at least 1 year prior to his death in order to qualify for benefits.

"The income standards for payment of pension benefits to survivors should be governed by the same type of formula recommended earlier for pensions to veterans."

MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director.

Speaker Blatt Honored by House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared in the Columbia Record on April 10, 1956.

Solomon Blatt has been honored by the South Carolina Legislature as few men have been honored by that body. He has served with distinction as speaker for 18 years. He is an old schoolmate of mine, and I am proud to call him a friend. He is 1 of only 2 or 3 members of the Jewish faith in the South Carolina General Assembly. He has forged ahead by sterling worth, ability, and integrity. His achievement is evidence of the evaluation that South Carolina places upon these characteristics.

The article follows:

SPEAKER BLATT HONORED BY HOUSE

Speaker of the House of Representatives Solomon Blatt was presented with a plaque today honoring his service in the lower legislative chamber both as a member as as its speaker. Blatt is shown receiving the plaque from Representative Charlie V. Verner, of Greenville, who presented it on behalf of the membership. The other photo is of the plaque, in silver on hardwood. The inscription reads: "With deep appreciation to Speaker Solomon Blatt for impartial, devoted, and progressive service to his county and State from the 91st South Carolina House of Representatives. Unanimously presented April 10, 1956."

Speaker Blatt in accepting the plaque said: "The people of South Carolina have been unjustly damned for racial intolerance." He declared the State "accepts a man for what he is."

Blatt, honored by his colleagues with a plaque denoting his years of service in the chair and also in the house, took the opportunity to make the observation. He said his own life, and the honor accorded him by the membership proves the lack of intolerance in this State. He is the son of Jewish immigrants.

The veteran speaker, who has served in the chair for 14 of his 22 years in the lower legislative chamber, told his associates that "I do not deserve this honor." His voice choked with emotion, he said, "If there is anything decent in me, it was given to me by my daddy, who has gone on, and my mother, who still lives. It was given to me while I was in my early youth, the son of immigrants to this country."

He lauded South Carolina for giving "strength and courage to all citizens, of whatever creed they may have."

Presentation of the plaque, a silver shield mounted on polished hardwood, came as a surprise to Blatt. It was made by Representative Charlie V. Verner, of Greenville, who had apparently risen to deliver a farewell speech to the house. Verner leaves the lower chamber today, soon to assume a position on the employment security commission.

Paying tribute to the speaker, he said, "I have seen him stand up under severe circumstances when the welfare of the State is at stake. * * * I have never known a fairer man." Verner described the 60-year-old Blackville native as a "man of integrity, with a high regard for those things he thinks are right. * * * I have never seen a member (of the house) more dedicated to the State and its institutions. No man has worked harder for good government in the past 25 or so years."

The presentation came on the closing day of the current general assembly. Statewide business was effectively adjourned March 24, but 2 weeks since have been devoted to local legislative matters. Members convene in a daylong session today to consider two gubernatorial vetoes which were routine matters requested by delegations and finally to wind up the 91st assembly.

Blatt thanked the members "for your expression of confidence and esteem. I am very humble and grateful," he said. He paid tribute to Verner, who had presented the plaque on behalf of the 123 other members of the house.

He praised the record of the assembly, citing its record of progress in improvement programs at the State (mental) hospital, in the public schools, at the State's penal institutions, and at the schools for the deaf and blind and the crippled children.

"I cannot fully express myself today," he said, "but I want to thank the people of my county (Barnwell) who made it possible for me to be here, and also the people of South Carolina who were constantly at my side to aid my journey."

The plaque contains the State seals, plus this inscription: "With deep appreciation to Speaker Solomon Blatt for impartial, devoted, and progressive service to his county and State from the 91st South Carolina House of Representatives. Unanimously presented April 10, 1956."

In Defense of the Automobile Worker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal about the automobile industry in the last few months. There have been extensive congressional hearings investigating numerous charges and countercharges. While there may possibly be room for improvement in contract relations between factory and dealer, I do feel that undue criticism has been leveled at the entire industry for isolated cases of dissatisfaction with a particular motor vehicle.

Recently, a Member of Congress inserted several letters in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that create the impression that automobiles generally are not being properly assembled or serviced. I challenge such an allegation. The case referred to in the RECORD involved 1 dealer; there are 45,704 automobile dealers in the United States. Further, the charge that inferior workmanship is widespread in the industry is a slap at the thousands of workers throughout America's greatest business enterprise.

I am quite familiar with the methods employed in the automobile factories and you may be assured that most careful consideration is always given to the safety element and proper construction of each individual car. I am also familiar with the pride that the employees take in their craftsmanship. These men and women deeply resent the inference that their work is not as thorough as it might be. I am not saying that there never has been a car with mechanical imperfections; in any human endeavor, mistakes will be made. However, proceeding from the specific to the general is definitely not in keeping with the American concept of fair play.

How a Bank Solved a Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, how to preserve the family-sized farm is one of today's biggest challenges to all Americans who believe in the community values of family-sized farming. Here is an interesting, human account of how a local institution—the Citizens National Bank of Marshfield, Wis., of which Mr. John L. Stauber is president—solved a local farm problem. I commend it to my colleagues' careful attention:

HOW A BANK SOLVED A FARM PROBLEM

The Citizens National Bank is located in Marshfield, Wis., a city of nearly 15,000 population situated in a vast agricultural region nearly in the exact geographic center of the State. This was not always an agricultural area but at one time the land of this area supported a dense and excellent growth of both hardwood and coniferous trees. The community of Marshfield and its surrounding area grew up with the harvesting of this timber crop and Marshfield became a center of the industry as well as the railroad shipping center. As the trees were removed and the timber became scarce in the area, the lumber activity moved north in Wisconsin. As the lumber camps moved north, the land which grew this great crop of timber was being cleared and farms began to dot the countryside. As the land was cleared and broke, it was found the soil was a heavy soil and had excellent water holding capacity. It was found that, when broke, the soil was a very productive one and agriculture moved in fast behind the moving timber and lumber camps. In just a short period of time, the area around Marshfield became one of the leading agricultural areas of the State. Because red clover grew so abundantly on this virgin silt loam soil, it became known as the "Cloverland" of Wisconsin. Due to the excellent hay and pasture provided by this red clover and the good grass growth, agriculture became highly specialized in dairying. It developed into one of the highest concentrated milk-producing areas in the Nation and soon became known as the cheese capital of the country.

However, as good as the soil seemed at the turn of the century when the farms were being hued out of the timberland, and as well as clover grew on this newly opened virgin soil, it did not take long to find that this abundant clover production was not a permanent thing. By the early twenties, farms

which had been cleared for some time were no longer supporting the excellent crop of clover and the area began to lose its name of Cloverland. With this came a problem of production. Dairy cattle numbered high and demanded large amounts of forage. The farmers had built their buildings and farming around the dairy cow and could not change very well. Besides the area was too far north for corn production and dairy farming seemed the only type suited. Farmers were turning to purchased roughages and mill feeds to substitute for the lack of the good homegrown clover. The purchase of feed was also necessary because the value of the timothy and other grasses which were replacing the clover had much lower feeding value. This problem continued to become more and more serious as farmers were forced to buy more and more shipped in feeding stuffs and as their net incomes began to drop to where more and more feed loans were necessary to carry them through the feeding period. The farmers of this once naturad dairy section were no longer in a good competitive position with other areas of the State where legumes still flourished.

Research workers at the college of agriculture, at the State university, became aware of this problem and set out to find out what had caused it and what could be done. The cause was soon determined to be the fact that the soil in this area was a silt loam soil of granitic origin and was naturally low in plant food and acid. They found that the soil produced abundantly when first opened due to the plowing under of a large amount of accumulated forest litter which was high in plant-food value. As this material had been derived from centuries of forest cover decomposed it gave up to the soil large amounts of lime and other plant foods which provided ample amounts for top crop growth. The soil had naturally good water-holding capacity so water was seldom a problem and given the good plant foods provided by this organic matter plowed under, the clover and other crops grew their best. However, as this litter decomposed and was used up in farming the land, the soil reverted to its natural acid and infertile condition. With this came the decline in ability of the soil to support good crop production and especially the clover. Research plots were started at the Experiment Station at Marshfield and at the Clark County Farm at Owen to find out what could be done. The research bore fruit in a short time as the effects of the acid soil was shown on clover production. By use of large amounts of lime and fertilizer, it was found that not only could red clover be grown on the soil in even higher yields than when the soil was first opened, but that the much more valuable legume alfalfa could also be raised where it had never been grown before by proper soil adjustment with lime and fertilizer. It was apparent to the research workers that planting and growing alfalfa on the dairy farms of the area would solve the problem of declining production and purchased feeds. It would mean that the dairy farmers of the area could again produce abundant crops of high-quality feed for their milking herds and again resume their place in the dairy farming of Wisconsin.

There was one big question in the program as worked out by the research workers. How was the farmer going to manage to treat his land in the recommended way to grow this alfalfa? The amount of lime and fertilizer required was large and the cost per acre high, amounting to about $50 per acre. How could the farmer afford that kind of program to improve his lot when he had to borrow money for feed and his dairy profit was not too good? He could not use a short-term 6-month loan as he knew he would not have the money in that time to pay back the loan.

What was needed was some kind of loan which would recognize the fact that this was a production investment in the soil. Its use would increase the productive capacity of the farm and the net income of the farmer thus allowing repayment out of the loan's increased income. The credit needed would have to recognize the long-term aspects of soil-building programs and that the loan would well repay itself, but that this could be done over several years and not all in one crop season. The research workers had found out how to do the job but could not solve the problem of how to get it on the farms.

Mr. John L. Stauber of the Citizens National Bank heard about this program. He immediately saw the good such a soil-fertility program could do for the areas, as he too was concerned about the large feed bills for purchased feeds on the farms in the area. Further, he realized that his bank was in a city surrounded by a large farm area and in a city which depended in a large measure upon the business of these farm people. Not only could this program help the farmers to help themselves to higher profits by growing their own feed but it would reflect in a better business for the entire city if farmers prospered and spent more in the area. Armed with this idea and backed by the university research workers and county extension personnel, Mr. Stauber set out to find out how he could help get this program started. Several meetings were organized by Mr. Stauber at which time bankers from neighboring cities were invited to discuss this problem with university personnel and farmers and to visit research plots and a few farms where the alfalfa program was going and where it could be proved it would work.

In order to get the program really going and to get a number of farmers started to prove its worth, Mr. Stauber convinced his board of directors to establish a new loan policy to farmers for his program. This program was called, the Alfalfa Loan Program by the Citizens National Bank.

Here is a typical example:

"Mr. FISCHER. Mr. Stauber I would like to speak to you about an alfalfa loan.

"Mr. STAUBER. How many acres are you interested in?

"Mr. FISCHER. Forty acres.

"Mr. STAUBER. Well, Mr. Fischer, our program calls for a 10-acre test and the average cost will run about $50 per acre.

"Mr. FISCHER. I have my soil tests and because I have put on quite a bit of lime and fertilizer, I only need about $1,000.

"Mr. STAUBER. I notice you are arranging for a chattel loan of $1,500 on a new tractor.

"Mr. FISCHER. Yes, those arrangements have been made.

"Mr. STAUBER. All right, Warren, if you will include the alfalfa loan with the chattel, we will go along. The $1,500 loan will be on a 6 percent note and the $1,000 loan will be at 2 percent with a 2-year maturity.

"Mr. FISCHER. How about repayment of the alfalfa loan?

"Mr. STAUBER. Looking over your soil tests, I note you will need about 160 tons of lime. Have you signed up under the soil-conservation practice?

"Mr. FISCHER. Yes, I have.

"Mr. STAUBER. Well, then you should receive one-half of your lime costs from the Government and that amounts to about $350. When you receive that check, you apply it on your loan and at the end of 1 year, you will have to pay your interest and renew the balance for another year. If there is a balance due at the final maturity, we will make you a regular loan at the going rate."

Most of the bank's loans, however, did not exceed $500 and these were all unsecured. In the past 6 years, the bank has loaned over $100,000 and its present exposure is $22,000.

By use of radio, farm meetings, newspaper ads, and billboards, the Citizens National Bank spread the news about their loans and also championed the story of soil building for alfalfa production. For a period of 3 years, this concentrated effort was continued by the bank to get the information to the farmers and to constantly remind them of the value of this program to their future. Through the loan program several plots of 10 acres and more begin to appear on farms scattered throughout the area. The bank arranged meetings on these farms so others could see how the alfalfa program actually worked. These farmers were asked to tell their story about alfalfa over the radio and in the papers so that other farmers might hear first-hand from people who had actually tried the program. The reports made by farmers who started on the program were almost unbelievable and even beyond the expectations of the bank. Farmers reported that they had been buying hay every year and now had hay to sell. Others reported they cut their feed purchase by as much as 80 percent and still others reported they could almost double their herd size. With these kinds of reports and actual factual data to give out from farms, the program began to spread rapidly. The original education part had been accomplished through the very active program of the bank. Not only were farmers convinced it could be done, but banks were becoming convinced of the value of such loans and many of them started to give long term land improvement loans. Today, alfalfa is a byword on most farmer's tongues in the area. If they have not already started growing it, they are in the process of getting ready to do so.

Through the efforts of the Citizens National Bank a farm problem of its area has been solved. A far-reaching program of soil fertility and forage production has been so well entrenched on the farms and in the minds of the farmers of the area that its effects are yet to be fully realized. A serious problem and one which could have well meant the decline of the prosperity of the community was solved. The program which was envisioned as the solution to this problem by the university was given a chance to prove itself. Without this support, it would not have been possible to get the program started. The university or the county extension personnel did not have the budget or means of using the broad means of communication which was used nor of getting money into the hands of the farmers to start the program.

The Citizens National Bank of Marshfield saw the problem and acted to help find the solution and then proceeded to put the solution of the problem to practice. Such action has made a permanent improvement in their community and has broadened the agricultural possibilities of the area. This is real progress towards a better living for all and a real American way of solving our problems in whatever field they may present themselves.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this is the 165th anniversary of the adoption by the people of Poland of their Constitution of May 3, 1791. That constitution, following so closely upon ours of the United States of America, was a triumph of democratic principles

which has remained as a guiding light through all the hard, harsh years of Poland's oppression.

Today, as for most of the time that followed the adoption of her constitution, Poland writhes in the grip of aggressive tyranny. The country is a prisoner, but the minds and hearts of the men and women of Poland remain free. The magnificent ideals of the constitution of May 3, 1791, are firmly held and proudly believed. The day will surely come when Poland shall again stand forth as the land of freedom, peace, and prosperity.

On this anniversary I proudly join in honoring and saluting a courageous people, a country magnificent even in oppression, and a document that ranks with the world's finest expositions of the principles of human liberty and dignity.

Million Dollar Armory With No Federal Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 5, a million dollar National Guard armory was dedicated in Kansas City, Kans. Dedication of National Guard armories are frequent occasions. This was an exception, because no Federal funds were used, the structure being financed by city and State funds.

The Kansas City Star and the Kansas City Kansan cooperated splendidly in publicity before, during, and after the ceremony.

Some excerpts from the Kansas City Kansan, which had a special Armory edition, devoting over half of the paper Friday, May 4, to the armory, will give some idea and this modern facility:

FINEST NATIONAL GUARD ARMORY LOOKS ITS PART—CRISPLY MILITARY IN SETTING AND DESIGN, NEW BUILDING HERE HAS MOST UP-TO-DATE FACILITIES ATTRACTIVELY INCORPORATED FOR EFFICIENT USE BY UNITS OF KANSAS CITY, KANS., STATION

(By Bob Newman)

Blocked securely into the side of what remains of a bill is the new Kansas City, Kans., National Guard Armory, as crisply military as a private's freshly polished boots.

Viewed from 18th Street, across the huge natural amphitheater which serves as combination drill field, parade ground, and athletic field, the facade of the $675,00 structure, faced with corrugated aluminum, flashes in the sun.

This is the business side of what is considered the finest National Guard Armory in the United States, and where Kansas City, Kans., guardsmen from now on will work, drill, and play in increasing numbers.

Immediately beneath the formal reviewing stand, which juts, boxlike, from the main part of the building, is a huge mouth of a door through which trucks can be driven into the bowels of the building.

FOR SPEEDY MOVEMENTS

Inside, supplies and equipment can be loaded or unloaded, quickly, with room for as many as five trucks at once, thus enabling units to load and move out quickly in time of emergency.

To the right of this entrance, which is flanked on both sides by enclosed concrete stairways leading to the reviewing platform, are the offices of the ranking National Guard commanders, including the office of Col. Mahlon S. Weed, station commander.

* * * * *

Above these offices face the windows of the administrative offices of the 137th Infantry Regiment, largest administrative unit housed in the building, and commanded by Colonel Weed.

SPACIOUS DINING HALL

To the left on the ground level is found the 200-man capacity dining hall, also viewing the drill field which eventually will be seeded to one vast expanse of greenness.

Above the dining hall is the spacious enlisted men's lounge, also fronting the drill field.

The personality of the building, however, centers at the reviewing platform enclosure which appears as an extension of the walls and roof. Dimensions are 98 feet width, 28 feet height, and 10-foot horizontal depth.

The vertical interior of the enclosure is faced with corrugated aluminum, upon which black 28-inch letters spell "Kansas National Guard." Beneath this, centered squarely, is a 6-foot diameter, porcelain-on-steel, yellow sunflower against a blue background.

BRILLIANTLY ILLUMINATED

A continuous row of floodlights angled from the base of the reviewing platform train toward this facade, which afford a brilliant night display.

As the visitor goes around either side of the 4-story building, up one of the steeply sloped and grass-terraced hillsides, the main entrance is found facing the west. It actually is on the second level.

Parking space is available here.

Entering the lobby, a visitor is first attracted to the inside athletic court and drill hall, which also can be used as an auditorium and has a stage at one end.

Seating capacity for basketball games is estimated at 1,500 to 1,800 persons and for stage events at over 3,000. The playing court is full regulation size, being 50 by 94 feet.

SEATING IN BALCONY

The upper balcony, where most of the seating is, is broken at the west end by a concrete-block film-projection booth.

The basketball goals, of the latest type, can be raised and lowered electrically.

The second floor is composed of offices, classrooms, and the spacious, well-furnished enlisted men's or general lounge. A typical classroom, where the guardsmen will hear lectures during their weekly drills, is about 18 by 23 feet in size, well lighted by fluorescent tubes, and contains the necessary classroom aids.

Dropping to the first, or basement level (actually only the rear portion of this level is underground), the huge insulated firing range can be inspected.

ACOUSTICAL INSULATION

Walled with concrete, and padded in the forward portion with thick slabs of sound absorbent acoustical material, the range has eight firing slots. The length to the target area is 135 feet from wall to wall.

Targets are attached to frames which can be rolled into firing position by means of overhead pulleys, enabling targets to be changed without a halt in operations.

The slugs are reflected downward into a dirt pit and safety sandbags by a 45-degree slanted facing of ⅜-inch steel boiler plate.

A highly engineered fluorescent lighting combination—all tubes protected from slugs—lights the target area to a degree which is reminiscent of natural sunlight.

The remainder of the range is lighted by over 80 fluorescent tubes in banks hidden underneath overhead reinforced concrete beams.

STORAGE FOR WEAPONS

On this level are kept in eight separate bank-type vaults, the rifles, machineguns, mortars, and light artillery pieces of the various units. There also is a supply unit for each component, all of which face the vaulted interior drive for loading and unloading supply trucks inside.

On this level are found two shower and locker rooms, the kitchen adjoining the mess hall (which can be converted into two classrooms by a folding door arrangement), the furnace room, a huge locker room with over 400 lockers, affording 1 for each guardsman, and the dispensary.

The latter, which includes a medical supply room and treatment room, is intended to serve both for minor first aid and as an emergency civilian medical center in time of disaster.

Third floor spaces (found only in the main or center section of the building) are restricted to a communications room and two overnight sleeping rooms for the accommodation of visiting inspecting officers.

OFFICERS' ASSEMBLY ROOM

Only spaces found on the fourth level are occupied by the officers' assembly room and lounge, which has continuous banks of windows facing both the outside drill field and the gymnasium.

The building is of reinforced concrete substructure, topped by a steel frame and concrete block walls faced with buff brick.

Interior decoration is plain, but tasteful, the concrete block wall faces painted in pastel shades. Both the officers' and enlisted men's lounges contain comfortable and attractive furniture.

Lighting of the entire facility is considered to be the best engineered of any new building in the Kansas City area. Of particular note is the overhead lighting arrangement in the gymnasium, composed of 24 equally spaced clusters of 1 1,000-watt incandescent lamp and 2 400-watt mercury vapor lamps.

The gymnasium roof is acoustically insulated with the same slabs of material (precast concrete mixed with wood shavings) that face a portion of the firing range walls.

The Decline of Invention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal, Tuesday, April 10, 1956, which calls attention to our weakened patent system which slows down the flow of new discoveries:

THE DECLINE OF INVENTION: OUR WEAKENED PATENT SYSTEM SLOWS THE FLOW OF NEW DISCOVERIES

(By Richard Spencer)

Almost every day someone in Washington warns that Russia may be overtaking the United States in the fields of atomic weapons, aircraft, and guided missiles. At the same time some industrialists and economists are concerned about the relative lack of really new consumer products.

Whether or not one considers these fears exaggerated, the demonstrable fact is that invention—the key both to national security and industrial strength—is on the decline in this country. To the extent this is recognized, it is usually attributed to the shortage of scientists or some similar deficiency. Yet there is another and perhaps more basic reason which is hardly ever mentioned.

This is the steady emaciation, over the last 30 years or so, of the American patent system. The United States Constitution itself stipulates the granting of patents to encourage the progress of science, and the kind of patent system a nation adopts will indeed either foster or impede invention. Today the Soviet Union has one of the strongest systems in the world to encourage inventions; the United States has one of the weakest.

From 1790 to 1930 the American patent system provided sufficient incentive to our inventors to carry this country to the pinnacle of military power and industrial might. It did this by granting limited, exclusive rights in exchange for new inventions and discoveries. Beginning in 1930, however, a series of blows has been rained on this system.

POLITICAL DEVICES

The patent right itself has been largely nullified by placing the standard of invention beyond the reach of the average American inventor. The remedy for infringement has been weakened by the development of new legal defenses. Instead of being treated as ordinary legal instruments, patents have come to be regarded as economic devices.

Lately still another—and weirder—concept is coming to the fore. Patents are being used as quasi-political regulative instruments in antitrust decrees. Proceeding against leading firms with strong patent positions, the Government brings suit to break up the defendant's alleged concentrtaion of economic power. In the settlement, however, the Government agrees to the alternative of stripping the defendant of its patent rights.

Thus, in the recent American Telephone & Telegraph case all existing and all future patents of the company were thrown open. In the International Business Machines case, reported a day or two later, the company consented to license all existing and future patents for a period of 5 years only. "To encourage the growth of other manufacturers," the Government said, "the inventions of the defendant are made available to competitors."

This new view of patents as a regulative device was well expressed in the United Shoe Machinery case 3 years ago. "Defendant is not being punished for abusive practices respecting patents for it engaged in none," explained the court; "it is being required to reduce the monopoly power it has * * * compulsory licensing is in effect a partial dissolution on a nonconfiscatory basis."

In these cases the policy of encouraging new inventions is weighed against the policy of limiting the growth of monopoly, and the recent decrees indicate that the Government considers it more important to encourage competition than to encourage invention. This is indeed a delicate balance and an interesting hypothesis.

A. T. & T. and I. B. M. are the great pioneers in research and invention in their industries, which accounts for their leadership and their strong patent positions, as well as for the fact that they were selected as defendants. Under the decrees, not only have their long-established methods of doing business been disrupted, which will interfere with efficient operations for years to come, but management will no longer be in a position to authorize the expenditure of millions of dollars in the development of new commercial products and processes, since competitors will be free to copy them.

These same companies are also leading contributors to the national defense effort. Disruptive influences in their businesses will be reflected in that effort. More important will be the further retardation of invention in two such vital fields as electronics and computers, both of which are of critical importance to atomic energy, aircraft, and guided missiles.

The United States aircraft industry itself suffers from the effects of an open patent pool of the kind now taking shape in electronics under the A. T. & T. settlement. In 1935 Gen. William Mitchell, a man of unusual vision, told a congressional committee the aircraft pool was a threat to our national safety.

As for atomic energy, with its unlimited potential, it has been locked away from private industry for so long that today it also stands in dire need of invention and development, both civilian and military. Yet the law which liberalized some aspects of atomic energy in 1954 also encased it in compulsory patent licensing of the type ordained in the I. B. M. decree.

ACQUISITIVE GOVERNMENT

This atomic law states that all nonmilitary inventions "made or conceived under any contract, subcontract arrangement, or other relationship with the (Atomic Energy) Commission" belong to the Commission. This by itself is reason enough for a company to give the Government a wide berth if it expects to own patents of its own. If, by avoiding Government contracts, a firm should acquire atomic energy patents, the Commission can, until September 1, 1959, declare them "affected with the public interest" and grant compulsory licenses under them.

Still another provision requires everyone, including the reader of this article, to report nuclear inventions or discoveries to the AEC within 90 days or, alternatively, to file an application for a patent within the same period. To avoid the penalties and the criminal implications of the act, discretion suggests a policy of accepting the door as being locked, and not even thinking about the subject for fear of conceiving an invention that should be reported.

The main reason given in support of these patent provisions is that they are necessary to prevent some "inside" or "ground floor" company, engaged in the atomic-energy program from the beginning, from obtaining a monopoly position through patents that would "create roadblocks in the path of progress." If ever this was a valid argument, it is tenable no longer. The patent provisions are the real roadblocks.

At one point or another during the course of history, England, Germany, Switzerland, and Holland were caught with their patent systems down and each learned the same identical lesson. They saw science, invention, and technology slipping away from their own economies only to appear in and add to the economies of other countries. Each promptly adopted and still maintains a strong patent system.

PRODIGIOUS OUTPOURING

So long as or own patent system was strong, the flow of invention was prodigious. By 1890, the centenary of the system, it had already brought forth the cotton gin, sewing machine, steamboat, locomotive, sleeping car, air brake, telegraph, electric light, telephone, reaper, binder, match, and many other products. For national defense inventors had produced the magazine rifle, the revolver, the machine gun, the Springfield rifle, the breech-loading gun, and the torpedo.

A comparable stream of inventions—the motion picture, the automobile, the camera, gasoline, radio, etc.—continued thereafter. But in 1930 the flow started to diminish. Although our population has increased enormously since 1930 and, although billions of dollars are being spent on research and invention today where hundreds of thousands were spent then, the Patent Office received more applications and granted more patents in 1930 than it has in any year since.

Already we seem to be developing a replacement economy in which new consumer products are lacking. Invention, in the form of putting on sale something the purchasing public has never been offered before, is sadly missing. Digital computors and automation, after all, are of little interest to the consumer. Without inventive incentive, whence will come the new products to spur the economy?

The need, therefore, is to restore the patent system. Just as patents were made an exception to the Statute on Monopolies in 1623, so today, to quicken the pace of our lagging technology and provide an adequate incentive for invention, patents must be made wholly exempt from the Federal antimonopoly laws. Defenses in suits must be limited to the traditional questions of validity and infringement.

Until the patent system is restored to full strength, the necessary research and development in atomic energy, aircraft and guided missiles—and in new consumer goods—will not take place. Patents are that important.

Address of Hon. Robert P. Weatherford, Jr., Mayor of the City of Independence, Mo., Before the Missouri Federation of Democratic Women's Clubs, Clinton, Mo., April 28, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Robert P. Weatherford, Jr., mayor of the city of Independence, Mo., delivered a speech before the Missouri Federation of Democratic Women's Clubs at Clinton, Mo., on April 28, 1956.

This speech sets out in a masterful manner what has happened to the American farmer over the past 3½ years. We still do not have farm legislation because the President saw fit to veto H. R. 12. Had the President signed this bill, it would have added $3.1 billion to the 1956 farm income, and would have restored this year's take-home pay to the American farmer almost to the level of 1952, the last year in which farmer's prices averaged 100 percent of parity.

The so-called soil-bank bill recently passed by the House, will do little to raise the income of the family sized farmer. The chief reason given by the President for his veto of H. R. 12 was that this bill contained price-support provisions for the five basic farm commodities at 90 percent of parity. It seems strange, but it is no less true, that this administration recommended and sought to enact legislation which would have guaranteed Dixon-Yates 125 percent of parity for 25 years, and only a Democratically controlled House and Senate prevented that measure from becoming law. It seems even stranger that an administration should deny to the American farmer 90

percent of parity while seeking to guarantee a corporation 125 percent of parity. One is forced to the conclusion that whether the Republican Party favors parity or not depends entirely upon who gets it.

The address follows:

Madam Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, this is a season of ardent, amorous endeavors by the Republican Party. They love everyone. Even the Vice President has laid aside his little hatchet. He is the complete embodiment of sweetness, meekness, and love. He even loves us Democrats. He is going so far overboard with his sparkling personality that I predict, come November, the jury will bring in a verdict for the plaintiff in the breach of promise suit known as America versus republicanism

They certainly love the farmers. They are so concerned about your welfare—your income—your future. They want you to plant no more, eat it yourselves, and go bankrupt on a full stomach. On October 10, 1952, the Republican general said "The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of the 90 percent of parity price support, and it is pledging even more than that to help the farmer obtain his full parity, 100 percent, with the guaranty to price supports of 90 percent." Then, down in Columbia, S. C., he said, "I believe wholeheartedly and without any 'ifs' or 'buts' in Federal programs to stabilize farm prices, including the present program insuring 90 percent of parity on all basic commodities."

Farmers, have they kept their word with you? Have your farm products brought 90 to 100 percent of parity? Has the cost of your farm operations, your replacement of machinery and tools—your purchasing power—your interest rates—stayed parallel to your income? Every farmer in America not only in the Fourth Congressional District of Missouri, should look at his checkbook every morning and every night—then ask himself repeatedly—have the Republicans kept their word and their promises?

If 4 years of Republican bungling, fumbling, and juggling have done anything for you, Mr. Farmer, then vote Republican by all means. It is apparent to all Americans that the concern for the farmer, the interest in this basic industry of America, the social and economic future of the farmer, so far as the Republican Party is concerned, is strictly on a 4-year basis and their record conclusively proves this fact.

The Democratic Party is concerned with the welfare of humanity regardless of a man's station in life or the vocation he may follow. Since the inauguration of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman the American farmer has progressed, improved himself economically, has prospered steadily, has educated his family excellently, and experienced economic security, but the day that big business moved in to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue and buckled the leash into the collar ring, the farmers have been on a narrow unchartered path of betrayal. Where were you betrayed? Why it was at about the ninth hole at Augusta, I think. Ezra flew down from Washington, determined to scuttle the only piece of legislation containing the farmers' last hopes. The "five-star playboy" nodded agreement, picked up his putter, throttled up his putt-putt and went over to take another swing. Just where does this leave the American farmer?

Four years of republicanism. Four years of declining prices. Four years of increasing interest rates. And—nothing ahead under this repugnant republicanism but—Vote for us and we will give you another 4 years of flexibility and vetoes.

They were stuck with Ezra, and from first-hand information I can impart to you why they were stuck with him. I was introduced to this great Secretary of Agriculture in 1950 in a western State. I was introduced to "the man who would have been Secretary of Agriculture had not my fellow townsman defeated Mr. Dewey in 1948." Now, the Republican Party had some rather long-standing debts to be paid, so while they are paying their old debts out, the American farmer is getting deeper and deeper in debt.

The only program that the Secretary of Agriculture has is a complex of surplus and flexible price supports. The result has been confusion, bickering, and not one constructive aid for the farm family in 4 years. He is against any program for the benefit of the American farmer that does not originate in his own little selfish mind, and as the late James A. Reed diagnosed the ability of Arthur Hyde, so I submit the same applies to flexible Ezra. The Senator said: "I doubt if he can tell a bull calf from a heifer."

Let's take a look at big business. Let us observe if it is following along the parallel course that agriculture is following. The Associated Press reported on April 24 that United States Steel set an all-time record for the first quarter of the year for income, sales, and production. Sales totaled $1,100,453,-080 for the first quarter. The net income for the first quarter was $104,160,945. The Associated Press also, on April 24 stated that the General Motors Corp. made a 31 percent return in 1955, which was considered extremely high profits by the Senate's Big Business Committee and a judiciary Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly suggested that it might be helpful for competition if General Motors cut its connection with its financing subsidiary, namely General Motors Acceptance Corp. The Senate report noted that General Motors made a 1955 profit of 31 percent on capital investment after taxes and stated that this compared with 12 percent for the average American manufacturing firm. Did you farmers make this kind of profit on your capital investment?

The 83d Congress repealed all excess profits tax. Are you enjoying this kind of Republican tax cut? Take a look at the excess profits taxes paid by some corporations in 1953, before the tax was repealed by the Republican Congress. Their profits are much higher now than they were then. Therefore, the excess profits taxes would be much greater today than in 1953, but this money is now retained in the pockets of these big business corporations. General Motors was relieved of $192 million, which was the amount they paid in 1953; General Electric, $72 million paid in 1953; United States Steel, $53 million paid in 1953, and in that same year nine corporations paid excess profits taxes of $429 million.

Has the Republican Party from Eisenhower down done anything for you taxwise? Hogs sold in 1952 for 100 percent of parity. In 1955 hogs were selling for 50 percent of parity. Grade A milk delivered in Kansas City in 1951 sold for $6 per hundredweight. The average price to consumers the same year was 20 cents a quart. Grade A milk delivered in Kansas City in 1955 brought the farmer $4 per hundredweight, and the average price to consumers the same year was 21 cents a quart. Yet the cost of living to the farmer is four-tenths of 1 percent under an all-time high.

Under the Benson program of hesitation, fluctuation, and exasperation, farm families forced from the land over the last 3-year period in the United States total 600,000 and in Missouri, 28,431. In this congressional district 2,136 were forced from the land in the last 3 years. The source of this information is from the Bureau of the Census. How does this compare with General Motors and United States Steel?

In 1953 and 1954 farm mortgage debts increased $1.1 billion. Farm bank borrowing increased $1 billion. Farm real-estate inventory dropped $4.5 billion. The livestock inventory dropped $7.5 billion. The source of this information is from the agricultural statistics of the United States Department of Agriculture of which Mr. Benson is the boss.

All this happened under the administration of Eisenhower and flexible Ezra, and the impact of it is right here in these 8 counties of the Fourth Congressional District. Just check your neighborhood for facts. By comparison, from 1952 to 1955, industrial stocks increased 62 percent. Corporate profits, after taxes, increased 32 percent. Stockholders' dividends increased 19 percent. Nonfarm income increased 14 percent. Farm net income decreased 23 percent. The source of this information—the Department of Labor, statistical report. The net income lost by farmers for the 3-year period 1953 through 1955 was $12 billion. The source of this information—Agricultural Statistics, page 483, table 666. This under the administration that loves the farmer.

Flexible Ezra is confused about surpluses which is nothing more than a smoke screen to hoodwink the American farmer. If this Nation used entirely from Government surplus, food and fiber as an overall average, it would last 4 months and 5 days; and this information, for the benefit of the Republicans, comes from the financial report of the Commodity Credit Corporation, dated December 31, 1955.

No, this isn't a big-businees administration. They love the farmer. They love the average American citizen. He is better off than he ever was. What is good for General Motors is good for the Nation. Then why in the name of all that is high and holy isn't the Nation getting the same treatment that General Motors is receiving? How is your bank balance, Mr. Farmer? You are an orphan and the Republicans won't even set up a welfare department to help you.

They talk about reduced spending, but no tax cuts. What happened to their balanced budget? The Federal budget from 1950 to 1953 under Harry S. Truman totaled $223.3 billion. From 1954 through 1957 the big-business budget, instead of having been reduced, will total $262.6 billion. Eisenhower's big-business economy 4-year budget exceeds the Truman 4-year budget by $39.3 billion. The source of this information—Budget, page 1165.

Farmers and every person associated directly or indirectly with agriculture—look at the smiling faces and listen to the soothing words from the Republican National Committee. Take a look at your bank book before breakfast and after supper in the evening and see if you get the same stimulating response from your bank book as radiated upon the grinning face on the TV screen. It other words, in grim reality, ask yourself this question: Have they kept their word with me?

The impact of this Republican philosophy should be discussed at your firesides and, farmers, if you are better off financially, if you are happy with your idle lands, if your bankbook has been enhanced and if your future is secure, then by all means vote the Republican ticket. What about national security?' The United Press, on April 24, quotes the following statement from Mr. Allen Dulles, Central Intelligence Director, who stated that the Communist chieftain was exaggerating in claiming Russia "quickly" will have an intercontinental missile with an H-bomb warhead. He says—"I think what he had to say is a little bit on the high side." Dulles then laughingly added "it is a change to have a man in the Soviet Union who blurps out things. Maybe someday we will get a little more intelligence." This statement, mind you, from the head of the American Central Intelligence Office. Mr. Allen Dulles makes such a statement while that unguided missile, John Foster Dulles, is launched on another world-circling orbit. Truthfully,

guided missiles will be a welcome change from the rudderless type.

They have lost or alienated most of our former allies and friends throughout the world, hoping for foreign intelligence by a slip of the tongue from the Soviet party chief. The looseleaf portfolio of National Security and Foreign Affairs seems to also be on a flexible support basis. Brink of War Johnnie with portfolio, suitcase and all is now caught in a revolving door with an outboard motor attached to the seat of his pants. In the face of evident facts—that Soviet armies, industries, research and real estate agents are plotting our destruction, they say so and have no hestancy about it. The United States defense budget is mutilated upon White House insistence. Bulganin smiles at Khrushchev and Khrushchev smiles at Zukov and he, in turn, smiles at his old friend Eisenhower; then we see that face-splitting personality grin at a TV camera.

Now, the Secretary of Defense, better known as Bird Dog Charlie is worried. He has built more long-range bombers, more jet fighters, more guided missiles, stepped up research and built ironclad defenses with his famous mouth-filling phrases during the last 30 days than American war potential could build in a generation. The reason for this is that he is scared to death of STUART SYMINGTON'S investigation into the Air Force and in the entire defense picture. This is all under Republican administration. With the exception of George Washington, this country has invariably come into a state of highly organized confusion every time it has entrusted its affairs to political generals or military statesmen.

You will hear much from these smiling faces on TV of peace—yes—all about prosperity and plenty, but just sit down around your family table and figure it out for yourselves.

The attempted betrayal of the South in an effort to scuttle the TVA and the overt attempt at the planned wreckage of Rural Electrification by big business inside the White House is an issue which demands an exacting penalty from the Republican Party. The American people will hold the Republicans responsible for giving away the natural resources of this Nation such as water power, electric power, timber lands and oil rights to the favored few of the palace guard.

I am a Southerner. Missouri is a southern State. There is a very clear and craftily conceived political scheme devised by the Republican Party to divide the Democratic Party in the south in an attempt to secure another 4-year lease on the White House. The leaders of both races in the southern States must also see through this as it is a very simple tactic of divide and conquer then abandon for another quardrennium. Southern people are too intelligent and too cultured to fall for such an obvious political trick. The South can and will settle its own problems far more efficiently and justly than can Mr. Brownell and Company. The Democratic Party will carry every southern State.

General Eisenhower is a Republican. They have recently raised him to sainthood. He is strong enough to run, but not strong enough to be criticized. The Republican Party is the party of big business beyond the shadow of a doubt, and the General, as the head of the party, is responsible for his conduct, for all the assistant presidents and for the administration of the affairs of the American people.

In the newspapers throughout the land yesterday the Democratic Party acquired a long sought and most familiar asset in the person of one Mr. NIXON. Let us reason this out. In the light of known facts and in the face of an unpredictable future, the pre-convention announcement of the Republican Party of its candidates deserves the careful scrutiny of every American. Every voter in this Nation must examine the Republican vice presidential candidate as nature and fate have eclipsed the focal point upon which the campaigns of American history have centered. The Republicans and Democrats of this Nation are now confronted by the Nixon-Eisenhower ticket respectively. This is the most unique problem that has ever confronted political decisions of the intelligent electorate of this Nation. Instead of voting for the captain of the team with the toughest game of the season scheduled for November 6 the studious and intelligent student body of America is asked to focus their entire attention and vote on a third string substitute. This is the dilemma that the Republican high command and the Madison Avenue advertising boys have to overcome, and we Democrats doubt if they can.

Your speaker was in Washington some 6 weeks ago. I visited in the House of Representatives' Office Building and in the Senate Office Building. I concluded, beyond the shadow of a doubt that we have the most vigorous, the most tenacious and the most deermined friend of agriculture in GEORGE H. CHRSTOPHER. He impartially represents all people alike whether they be rural or urban people.

Farmers, you are represented by a fighting member of your number. Your fireside is defended by a man of the soil. Your welfare and your progress dominate his thinking. Nowhere in this Fourth Congressional District in either party can voters lay their hand upon the shoulder of a native son more devoted, better informed, nor a more skilled fighter in your behalf than the Congressman of the Fourth District of Missouri, the Honorable GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER. You can't afford to be without him in the years which lie ahead.

I, therefore, predict that the Democratic Party will restore the Government to the people come next November and, making no political predictions, but only expressing my own personal wish and fervent prayer the ticket will read: "Democratic Party: Stuart Symington, Frank C. Clement, George H. Christopher."

Message to Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article prepared by me for insertion in Town and Village, a newspaper circulated in the Stuyvesant Town area of New York City which is in my district:

In one of my recent columns for Town and Village in which I tried to give my constituents a picture of the working day of a Congressman, I told of how he must take time off to ask himself questions about national problems and policies.

It must not be supposed though that questions are enough. They have to be pursued until the right answers are found.

By this time, of course, I have arrived at a number of conclusions and I want to deal with one in particular which seems to be particularly important; and that is the administration's foreign policy.

I judge from the letters that I get from my district that nobody is fooled by the bluster and braggadocio that substitute so very often for genuine diplomacy. Nor I think, is there any failure to recognize that in the basic goals, the present administration has added nothing to the fundamentals laid down by the prior administrations. We seek peace and in order to help achieve that goal, we want to be strong, we want to have friends, and exert an influence on world opinion. Along those broad lines the administration has the support of the Democratic legislators far more than it has the support of its own party members. Across my desk there come many leaflets, pamphlets and documents of all sorts. Quite a number of them are from "die-hard" Republicans and isolationists and they make it pretty clear that they are outraged by the administration's foreign policy.

My criticism of it is of another character. It stems from the fact that they inherited a good idea from the past administration and have fouled it up in its application. As a result we are now losing friends and alienating people because the methods vary from dull to Dulles, and often with sheer incompetence.

A particular defect of the administration's foreign policy efforts is in its inflexibility. Another is that it substitutes advertising slogans which, though they may tickle partisan supporters in this country, give offense to thoughtful national leaders the world over. Still another is that the administration is halfhearted about its policy, doing things too late and floundering in a spate of words rather than action. Still another is in its ambiguity.

Look, for example, at the bluster and big talk as to China and the unleasing of Chiang Kai-shek or at the gaffe of Goa that so deeply and unnecessarily came out with its tremendous offense to hundreds of millions of the people of India. Consider the gap between the solid support of United States policies 5 and 6 years ago and the wavering, the neutralism, and the open opposition today. Consider how little and late the administration is when it now tries to revive the essence of a point 4 program, 1 of the greatest concepts developed in America's foreign policy, which was shamefully left to wither on the vine. And consider what passes for smartness in the ambiguities about our support of the anticolonial movement and our unbelievable confusion in regard to Israel.

One does not have to have any particular sympathies for the state of Israel and the heroic struggle which it is undergoing, to recognize one simple truth, that Israel wants peace and that in this basic drive, Israel completely synchronizes with the stated United States policy as to maintenance of peace. You may have difference of opinions on this or that aspect of the Near East problem, but you cannot blind yourself to the fact that the United States wants peace and that alone of all the nations in that area, Israel wants peace and that its neighbors do not, as is clear from the fact that they will not even sit down to discuss peace with Israel.

Yet this basic and, one would suppose, elementary truth is obscured by all kinds of double talk that evades this central common interest of the United States and the state of Israel.

Recently I had occasion to say a few words in Congress about the eighth year of independence of Israel as follows:

"This occasion, however, must not be noted without regard for the threats of and actual aggression that hover like a calamitous cloud over the State of Israel. The cry of the victims reaches out to us and calls upon us to reassert vigorously our national policy to prevent aggression and to warn and, if need be, punish aggressors.

"The security of the State of Israel is vital to the stability of the entire area of the Middle East and this in turn is basic to America's own defense and the defense of the free world. This calls for an administrative policy of action rather than of inaction; and of direct, friendly, and timely intervention rather than by a nod to our allies.

It calls for prompt and sympathetic action as to the defense needs of the State of Israel, out of the same considerations that justify our provision for our own defense needs and for those of the Western World.

"It calls for an ample and timely counterweight to the armaments furnished by the Communist and satellite governments.

"Above all, it calls for a clear unambiguous assertion on the highest level that the United States is committed to the proposition that peace is indivisible and that peace and the safeguards of peace for the State of Israel are basic in our national policy."

Can anything be more unrealistic than to drift along in our present policy of lack of policy?

Perhaps there is no more flaming example of the folly of this course than the recent announcement that while the United States will not itself supply the defensive arms asked for by Israel, it will not object if its allies, largely armed by the United States, will supply such weapons. This, in Mr. Dulles' book, may seem smart; and may appeal to the men in the gray flannel suits on Madison Avenue on which the administration leans so heavily. Yet it is still a diplomatic blunder of the first magnitude. For here is action, or rather inaction, that is certainly calculated to alienate everybody. The Israelis must certainly continue with their sense of injustice when they cannot get defensive arms from the United States. The Arabs are annoyed because of this "go-ahead" signal to allies of the United States.

This is perhaps the most glaring example of the Eisenhower-Dulles foreign policy. In reviewing the world situation, however, it seems to be only typical.

How To Improve the Income Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, some individuals today are advocating repeal of the Federal income tax on the ground that it has become too complicated and too erratic in its application. In my opinion, this proposal is like trying to cure the patient by killing him. It is totally unrealistic to talk about abolishing the income tax.

The individual income tax is today producing about $31 billion annually, close to one-half of the general revenues of the Federal Government. The corporation income tax produces another $20 billion. Thus, the income tax as a whole raises about $51 billion annually. We have to face the plain fact that without this source of revenue our Nation would have been crippled during critical years of its history.

Those who suggest abolition of the income tax have not offered any alternative source of revenue. I can only suppose that such an alternative would take the form of a general sales tax or some similar proposal. Primary reliance on such a method of taxation would impose unfair burdens on millions of Americans. Those least able to pay would be those hardest hit. Therefore, to be realistic, we must recognize that, so long as our Government requires billions for our security and other essential operations, the income tax is the only practical and fair method of raising most of this revenue.

This is not to say that there is not room for improvement in our income tax structure. Far from it. In 1954, the Republican 83d Congress enacted the new Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which I sponsored. That mammoth legislation, covering thousands of changes in the tax laws, corrected countless inequities which had accumulated over the years. Many loopholes which had been permitted to exist in the past were closed. Fairer treatment for millions of taxpayers was provided, including more generous medical deductions, more liberal treatment of dependents, the exemption of sickness and accident benefits, tax advantages for retirement income, and the deduction of child care expenses of working mothers, to mention only a few.

It has been estimated that about 700,000 man-hours of work went into the development of that legislation. Experts from all over the country lent their assistance. There is no question but that the present strength and vitality of our economy is due in no small part to the sounder tax rules which the new law contains. We were successful in developing greater simplicity and clarity in many areas which had confused taxpayers in the past.

The fact remains, and I would be the last to deny it, that the income tax is still complicated and still poses difficult problems for the average taxpayer. We must recognize that every time a new relief provision is enacted, whether for business or for the average individual, and no matter how meritorious, new complexities are created in the tax structure. This is inevitable. Each new amendment designed to promote greater equity in the system as a whole must take the form of an exception to the general rules. Thus, no matter how sound, no matter how fair, each new exception almost invariably creates a new complication.

Moreover, it must not be thought that these special relief provisions are simply for the benefit of the well-to-do. They are not. The most costly of them are primarily for the benefit of low-income taxpayers. The retirement income tax credit, the extra $600 exemption for those aged 65 and over, and many others are examples of special relief provisions which mainly benefit those with small incomes.

Today, Congress is besieged with demands for further changes in the tax law, each designed to lessen the impact of the income tax in some particular area. I have received hundreds of such suggestions in my own office. They include increased deductions for child care, increased deductions for charitable contributions, larger deductions for dependents, bigger medical expense deductions, the allowance of deductions for tuition and other educational expenses, the deduction of the transportation expenses of handicapped persons; the deduction of life insurance premiums, a deduction for the cost of repairing and maintaining a home, the exemption of pensions generally, the complete exemption of active duty pay of members of the armed services, an additional exemption for the totally disabled, and so forth. These are only a few of the many examples which could be cited. There are countless more. Some involve a negligible loss of revenue. Some involve a potential revenue loss of hundreds of millions of dollars. With many of them I am entirely sympathetic. However, each one, if enacted, would whittle down a little more the total income tax base, and would, thus, to that extent, increase the burden of less fortunate taxpayers. Each one would add a new exception to the tax law. Each one would add a new complication to our already complex income tax forms.

We would seem, therefore, to be faced with this dilemma: Shall we ignore these reasonable and just demands for fair treatment or shall we adopt many of them and by so doing add further complexities to our already complicated tax law? I submit that there is another alternative which would go a long way toward solving this problem.

I believe that the underlying cause of most demands for special relief is the excessive nature of our tax rates. Our lowest tax bracket rate today is 20 percent. Our highest is 91 percent. Think of it. The Government takes over 90 cents out of every dollar earned in the top bracket. No wonder serious hardships arise and special relief becomes necessary.

I realize that some claim that the rates at the very top of the scale are largely fictitious because certain of these taxpayers can avoid the full impact of the rates by taking advantage of relief provisions. There is an element of truth in this argument. Some can avoid the full impact of the tax rates. However, the fact is that many others cannot. It seems to me that this very lack of uniformity in the incidence of the top rates is a compelling argument for their reduction to more reasonable levels.

I do not believe that the average American has any conception of how high our tax rates are. On March 18 of this year, George Gallup released the results of a nationwide poll taken to determine what the public itself believes the proper tax rates should be. The results were startling. The public set the proper tax level of a family of four with an income of $5,000 at $235. Actually, a family with that income today pays $420 under our present tax rates, almost twice what the public thinks is fair. The public set the tax level of a similar family with an income of $10,000 at $690, when in actuality that family pays $1,372 under our present law, again about twice as much. Finally, when the public was asked to fix the tax for a family of four with a $50,000 income, it set the tax at $7,125 instead of the $18,294 which it actually is, almost three times as much.

It is these excessive rates which are the villain of the income-tax problem. They stifle initiative. They encourage evasion. They breed disrespect for the tax system. They create severe individual hardships which in turn create the demand for special relief provisions. This, then, is the real cause of our income-tax difficulties. When the rates become too high, as they obviously have,

special exceptions necessarily have to be adopted in order to soften their impact. At the same time, special restrictions have to be enacted in order to prevent the evasion and avoidance which excessive rates openly invite. In my opinion, the present complexity of our income-tax system is due almost exclusively to this cause. Those who seek to cure the problem by abolishing the income tax would provide a more worthwhile and constructive public service if they would recognize the true nature of the problem and develop appropriate remedies within the framework of the existing income-tax system.

I propose this program as a first step toward a fairer and simpler income-tax system, to be undertaken as soon as the budget permits:

First. The top bracket rate should be reduced to at least 75 percent.

Second. All other bracket rates, including the bottom, should be graduated downward to conform to the new top rate; and

Third. The law should be simplified by the elimination of as many of the special exceptions as possible.

Certainly it seems reasonable enough that any individual be permitted to keep at least one-quarter of any income he receives. Moreover, this would not need to be a costly program. Substantial reduction in the progressive rates would have relatively little revenue effect, because only a very minor portion of our total revenue today is derived from these high bracket rates. However, I feel strongly that any such rate revision should be accompanied by a tax reduction benefiting those in the first bracket. Any tax reduction program must help all of our taxpayers. Naturally, across-the-board relief of this kind is much more costly.

For example, of the approximately $31 billion produced by the individual income tax, about $25 billion comes from the first bracket rate of 20 percent applicable to all taxpayers. This fact brings out two important points. First, it shows that the entire progressive element of our income tax—the portion of the rates above 20 percent—produces only $6 billion or 19 percent of the total individual income-tax revenue. Secondly, it shows that any reduction in the first bracket results inevitably in a substantial reduction in revenues.

I point these facts out simply to indicate the revenue implications of the tax program I have proposed. I have no information at this time which would suggest that the budget will permit substantial tax reduction in the immediate future. However, I believe that preparatory work should be begun immediately to develop a constructive program of this type. Excellent studies have been made recently of the economic impact of the income tax. It is time now that the tax committees of the Congress assume the obligation of developing a sound tax program. For this reason, I propose that the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation begin immediately to prepare studies and recommendations along the lines of my proposals.

In conclusion, I believe that the advantages of my program are tremendous. It would encourage individual initiative. It would lessen the demands for special treatment. It would simplify the tax laws. It would reduce evasion and avoidance. It would ease the compliance problems of the taxpayer. It would simplify the administrative problems of the Government. It would strengthen public confidence in the income tax.

It is a program that should recommend itself to every Member of Congress, irrespective of party.

NATO Parliamentary Conferences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to support the resolution (H. J. Res. 501) which authorizes participation by the United States in the NATO parliamentary conferences. It was by distinct honor to serve as one of the six House delegates to the NATO conference in Paris last July when we met for 5 days with the representatives of the 15 countries associated in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. We exchanged views and opinions pertaining to the maintenance of peace and security of the nations concerned, and we discussed ways to obtain closer social, economic and cultural relations between the peoples of the Atlantic community. We were also briefed by the top military leaders of NATO regarding the military position of the NATO countries.

All in all, it was a most interesting and inspiring gathering from which we came away with the feeling that we have many friends in the world who are just as determined as we are to carry on the struggle against communism. I also came away with a better understanding of the urgent need for maintaining the military power and strength of the free world to assure its continued freedom. In this respect, there is not the least doubt that NATO has shown itself to be a strong force and a deterrent against communism in Europe.

Fundamentally, NATO is a defense organization which was founded 7 years ago to check Communist aggression. The agreement signed by the NATO nations states that "they are resolved to unite their efforts for collective defense and for the preservation of peace and security." But in addition to defense, the 15 NATO nations can also serve as a springboard from which to attack Soviet Russia in the event of war. The Soviet leaders know this and for that reason they have made the dissolution of NATO their No. 1 objective. Continued Russian attacks on NATO through threats, cajolery, deception and charmed smiles, all of which are aimed to destroy NATO, only prove NATO's strength and the need for maintaining this Organization as an instrument for free world security.

NATO has shown itself to be a bulwark of freedom and democracy. We must do everything possible to keep it strong because through NATO our allies are strengthened, militarily and economically. The only thing which Communist Russia understands, fears, and respects above all else is strength. As long as we have the power to resist and restrain the Russians, as long as we have the means and the strength to destroy them—they will never attack us. Only a strong military posture by the United States and its allies will convince the Russian leaders that they have nothing to gain by force or war.

Today 15 nations are united in a defense pact under the auspices of NATO. Each of these nations is contributing manpower, equipment, and resources. American generals lead the military forces of these 15 nations. There is perfect harmony and understanding in this amalgamation of military power which is bent on preventing a third world war. I believe that this spirit of unity and cooperation on both sides of the Atlantic constitutes one of the strongest influences for peace in the world today.

As a defense organization, NATO pursues a practical course in that it is geared for immediate and collective action in the military field. Of late, NATO is also developing its political and economic aspects, so that in time it is hoped that NATO can also become a powerful organ for greater economic and political cooperation in advancing peace and improving standards of living among the nations associated with it. I should like to see, however, a strengthening of the nonmilitary aspects of NATO to a greater extent than in the past, though military defense should still remain its primary purpose.

May I also assure my colleagues that both the Allied Command and NATO are prepared to use all their resources not only for the defense of Europe, but also for the defense of North and South America, if need be. Our allies readily understand the importance of protecting American production plants at all costs and to maintain the arsenal of democracy in the United States.

Last summer, during the period of the great smile, Russia was busily engaged in consolidating her positions in Europe, beginning with Finland in the north, through Germany, Austria, and Yugoslavia to the Mediterranean area. She has succeeded to some extent in neutralizing these countries, in alienating them from the West, and even in crippling the NATO organization. Russia has not stopped there. Its current friendly demeanor is aimed primarily to weaken and finally split NATO and the Atlantic defense system. A notable example is the recent action of the Parliament in Iceland which called for the removal of American troops from that strategic island in the North Atlantic.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we should do everything within our power to strengthen NATO and to keep it strong in accordance with the recently declared policy of our Secretary of State, who understands and appreciates the importance of NATO for the free world. Mr.

Dulles said that NATO must either "grow" or "tend to dry up." I believe also that the interchange of ideas among the representatives of the parliamentary bodies of the 15 NATO countries is beneficial and constructive and should be continued in the future as well. Our country and this legislative body should participate in future NATO meetings to discuss problems of mutual interest and to seek greater understanding among the nations concerned.

Pension Plan for the Self-Employed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in the first session of this Congress bills were again introduced to provide an annuity program for self-employed persons, such as physicians, lawyers, dentists, ministers of a church, and so forth. Representatives KEOGH and JENKINS proposed such legislation on January 5, 1955, by the introduction of H. R. 9 and H. R. 10.

Mr. Leslie Gould in an editorial appearing in the April 23, 1956, issue of the New York Journal-American discloses the desirability of such pension-plan proposals. I commend the editorial, which follows, to the attention of our colleagues:

UNITED STATES SHOULD FOLLOW BRITAIN ON AIDING SELF-EMPLOYED

The British have just taken a significant step toward ending the discrimination against the self-employed for their old age.

The move, included in the new British budget, is important for its possible effect on similar efforts in this country to end this discrimination.

There are more than 10 million self-employed in the United States. These include farmers, doctors, lawyers, accountants, brokers, engineers, salesmen, and funeral directors.

Under present tax laws they are denied a tax credit or deduction for contributions to specified private pension funds.

There is a bill before the House—it passed the Ways and Means Committee by a 16-to-8 vote last year—to accord the self-employed the same treatment as now granted employees. Employees include officers of a corporation. Also employees of a partnership—such as a law or accounting firm or of any professional person. But the partners in such a firm or individual professional people and the farmers and salesmen are now denied this treatment.

PRESENT LAW UNFAIR

This is unfair. It is discrimination never intended under the Constitution. But to date, the matter has been kicked around in Congress, getting nowhere until this present House bill.

One of the troubles is that no administration has sponsored this needed change. That includes the present Eisenhower one. The British development may help change that "hands off" stand. Also, it looks like the Treasury will wind up the current year with a surplus, maybe as much as $2 billion—so the Treasury no longer has its pat argument of being against it for its effect on the budget. Regardless of its effect on the budget, the present tax law is discriminatory and it should be changed.

The British Government's proposals go far beyond the relief provided in the present House bill. The same tax break as granted corporation workers is to be accorded the British self-employed. Cost of annuities would be deductible, thus reducing the taxable net income.

RELIEF EXTENDED

This relief is to be extended by Britain to employees not now covered by their employer, whether the employer is a corporation or not.

This is part of the just announced British anti-inflation program. It is designed to encourage saving, which is what contributions to a pension plan are.

Under present American tax laws, the self-employed can only provide for his old age out of net income—that is after the high income taxes. And the taxes are high no matter what the bracket.

The proposal is so fair and equitable, that it is amazing that there should be any delays in providing this relief. It is in keeping with the basic American philosophy of proviate endeavor.

Washington Turns Out To Honor Clifford Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under consent granted by the House, I am including a fine article from the Wichita Eagle, Wichita, Kans., that pays tribute to our colleague from Kansas, the Honorable CLIFFORD R. HOPE. The article is by Mr. William P. Helm, of the Washington bureau of the Wichita Eagle. It concerns a dinner given in honor of Mr. HOPE by the Organization of Professional Employees of the Department of Agriculture. Mr. HOPE was presented with a plaque of praise for services rendered to agriculture and to the Nation.

The article follows:

WASHINGTON TURNS OUT TO HONOR CLIFFORD HOPE

(By William P. Helm)

WASHINGTON, May 3.—Men of the Government who've known and worked with CLIFFORD HOPE long years turned out tonight to hail him as one grand guy at a testimonial dinner. HOPE, retiring Congressman from the Kansas Fifth District, who lives at Garden City, was overwhelmed.

For nearly 30 years, or since March 4, 1927, HOPE has served in Congress. Some of those whose memories went back to his early days on the House Agricultural Committee were here tonight to wish him well and honor him for what they termed his outstanding service. Among his intimates he is known as "CLIFF," among his colleagues as "Mr. AGRICULTURE." Both affectionate names were given him tonight.

HOUSE, SENATE REPRESENTED

House and Senate were represented among the speakers. Senator FRANK CARLSON, Republican, of Kansas, spoke for the latter, Congressman HAROLD D. COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, for the former. The one is the Democratic chairman of the House committee that HOPE himself headed when Republicans controlled the House, the other chaired the Senate Agriculture Committee at the same time.

Sponsor of the dinner was the Department's group known as the Organization of Professional Employees of the Department of Agriculture. Its chairman, Dr. Stanley B. Fracker, presented HOPE a plaque of praise for his many services to agriculture and the Nation.

For the Department, Under Secretary True D. Morse was the speaker. For conservationists within the Department, Richard McArdle, Chief of the Forest Service, was selected to make the address. Hundreds of Department workers, high and low, and others of Washington officialdom were present.

The dinner was held in the Department's cafeteria and those promoting the affair lamented that space restricted attendance to only 300. There could have been other hundreds, they said, had there been places to seat them.

CARLSON PRAISES

Typical of the many kind and laudatory expressions was that of Senator CARLSON, HOPE's long-time close friend. In his address, CARLSON said:

"When my close and trustworthy friend, CLIFF HOPE, told me several months ago he was retiring from public service, my reaction was one later shared by the people of his home district and farm families everywhere, one of dismay and deep regret. I still feel the hard-pressed farmers of the Nation are losing a great champion, but in all fairness I must say retirement was never more richly deserved.

"Congressman HOPE has served the Fifth Congressional District of our home State through 30 of this country's most turbulent, trying, and revolutionary years. He has served it in a way to win the respect and affection of his constituents and colleagues alike. He has won his place and held it because he has kept mental pace with the fast-changing times.

HIGHLIGHTS

"There are many high points in his enviable 30-year career, but the ones to which CLIFF HOPE himself points with quiet pride are those concerning soil- and water-conservation legislation, and laws to promote agricultural research—particularly in the area of marketing research. His first major effort in this field came in 1935, when he was responsible in large measure for the original Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, the forerunner of much of the Nation's farm program today.

Another milestone came just a little more than 2 years ago with the passage of the Hope-Aiken Act to establish the small watershed program.

As chairman of the House Agriculture Committee in the 83d Congress, he also established the insured loan program for soil and water conservation.

He is still working on better means for marketing farm products, a job which had its first major impetus with passage of the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, which he co-authored.

Congressman HOPE entered the political arena as a representative in the Kansas Legislature in 1920. He was reelected to that post in 1922 and 1924, serving as speaker pro tempore in the 1923 session and speaker of the house in 1925–26. He has been a member of the House Committee on Agriculture continuously since entering Congress in 1927, and was chairman of that committee during the 80th and 83d sessions.

Although agriculture has been his principal field, Congressman HOPE has had numerous other chores here in Washington. He has served as a member of the Labor Com-

mittee and was appointed to several special committees, including the vital Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning of the 78th Congress. He visited and made economic surveys of Russia, Iran, Egypt, Greece, Italy, and most of Western Europe in 1945 in connection with this latter work.

And now the CLIFF HOPE public-service story is drawing to a close. The last political chapter reveals CLIFF at the height of his popularity and respect. Even now, when he could easily taper off his heavy schedule of congressional activities in view of his announced retirement, CLIFF HOPE remains one of the most conscientious, responsible, and hard-working men on Capitol Hill. He is still keeping trust with the remarkable faith his constituents and the American farmer have shown him.

I, for one, will sorely miss his wise counsel and personal friendship here on Capitol Hill. And I am convinced that in the years ahead we all will realize more fully what major contributions he has made to the economic welfare of the Nation.

Hearst, Smith, and Conniff Win Pulitzer Prize

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, the 1956 Pulitzer prize for distinguished reporting on international affairs has been awarded to Mr. William Randolph Hearst, Jr., Kingsbury Smith, and Frank Conniff. The award is based on interviews in January and February 1955 with the 4 top Soviet leaders. I congratulate Mr. Hearst and his colleagues for this journalistic achievement, which did much to open the door to a better understanding of conditions behind the Iron Curtain.

During my recent visit to the Soviet Union and five satellite countries I carried with me the articles written by Mr. Hearst, Mr. Smith, and Mr. Conniff, and I found that they were invaluable in providing me with advance information. I wish to include at this point in the RECORD a newspaper article which appeared in the Los Angeles Examiner for May 8, 1956, describing this award.

The article follows:

(By Joseph R. Marshall)

NEW YORK, May 7.—The 1956 Pulitzer prize for distinguished reporting on international affairs was awarded today to William Randolph Hearst, Jr., Kingsbury Smith, and Frank Conniff.

The top American journalism award was given the reportorial team by the trustees of Columbia University for a "series of exclusive interviews with leaders of the Soviet Union" in January and February 1955.

Hearst, editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers, Smith, now vice president and general manager of International News Service, and Conniff, editorial assistant to Hearst, obtained historic and unprecedented interviews with the four top leaders of the Soviet Union at the time when Georgi Malenkov was being ousted from the premiership.

JOURNALISTIC ACHIEVEMENT

Commenting on the international reporting award, the university pointed out:

"No other American or foreign journalist or journalists have ever achieved such a succession of interviews with leading members of the Soviet regime. No other journalistic achievement in foreign affairs in 1955 carried such a worldwide impact as did these interviews and the subsequent articles.

"They provided the first definite indication of what the policy of the new rulers of Russia would be on the great issues of war and peace, as well as an extraordinary insight into the thinking and personalities of these leaders of the Soviet regime. For days, the interviews were headline news throughout the world.

"Actually, the February 1955, interviews were with the four men who were to have the key roles for the Russians at the July summit meeting at Geneva—Soviet Deputy Premier and Foreign Minister V. M. Molotov; Nikita Khrushchev, first secretary of the Russian Community Party; Soviet Marshal Georgi Zhukov, first deputy defense minister, and Soviet Premier Nikolai Bulganin."

CIVIL WAR NOVEL HONORED

Mackinlay Kantor's Civil War novel, "Andersonville," the story of a notorious Southern prisoner-of-war camp, won the fiction award. The dramatized "Diary of Anne Frank," by Frances Goodrich and Albert Hackett, won the prize for the best American play.

The journalism awards, for work done in 1955, were headed by a meritorious public service prize to the Watsonville, Calif., Register-Pajaronian for its courageous exposure of corruption in public office, which led to the resignation of a district attorney and a conviction of one of his associates.

Except for the public service award, a gold medal, the eight journalism prizes all carry a stipend of $1,000. The letters and music awards are $500 each.

The award for local news stories written "under the pressure of edition time" went to Executive Editor Lee Hills, of the Detroit Free Press. The award was given for his "aggressive, resourceful, and comprehensive front-page report of the United Automobile Workers' negotiations with Ford and General Motors for a guaranteed annual wage."

The award for local reporting with edition time not a factor went to Arthur Daley of the New York Times for his "outstanding coverage and commentary on the world of sports in his daily column, Sports of the Times."

The prize for reporting on national affairs was given Charles L. Bartlett, Washington correspondent of the Chattanooga (Tenn.) Times, "for the original disclosures that led to the resignation of Harold E. Talbott as Secretary of the Air Force."

The 1956 prizes were the 39th annual awards established under the will of Joseph Pulitzer, publisher of the New York World. The awards are made each year by trustees of the university on recommendation of the Advisory Board on the Pulitzer Prizes.

Other journalism awards were:

FARM VISIT

For editorial writing, Lauren K. Soth of the Des Moines (Iowa) Register-Tribune for his February 10, 1955, editorial inviting a Russian farm delegation to the United States.

For cartoons, Robert York of the Louisville (Ky.) Times for his cartoon, "Achilles," showing a figure of American prosperity tapering to a weak Achilles heel labeled "Farm prices."

For news photography, the New York Daily News for its consistently excellent news-picture coverage exemplified by its photograph Bomber Crashes in Street.

The other awards went to:

For history, Richard Hofstadter for his book, The Age of Freedom.

For biography, Talbot Hamlin for Benjamin Henry Latrobe.

For poetry, Elizabeth Bishop for Poems: North and South—a Cold Spring.

For music, Ernst Koch for Symphony Number Three.

A New York City School Won the Battle Against Segregation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article describing the excellent efforts of Morris High School, of the Bronx, N. Y., in its fight against segregation. The article by Madeline Ryttenberg and Nick D'Incecco appeared in the May 4, 1956, issue of the New York Journal-American:

CRISIS IN THE CLASSROOMS—HOW SCHOOL WON INTEGRATION BATTLE—PRINCIPAL CALLED FOR REZONING AND URGED PARENTS NOT TO SHIFT PUPILS

(By Madeline Ryttenberg and Nick D'Incecco)

In 1947, Morris High School was a school in trouble.

Its enrollment was dropping; its teacher morale was ebbing; its discipline problems were rising; its student achievement was falling.

Why?

It was becoming a segregated school.

The story of Morris High School is a case history of city schools faced with the subtle segregation imposed in New York—and other large northern cities—by community prejudices; a segregation more elusive but no less rigid than the legal variety found below the Mason-Dixon line.

The Public Education Association in a report made last year, revealed 71 percent of the city's elementary schools and an unknown—but probably lesser—number of our junior and senior high schools are segregated in fact if not in law. The reason: They draw an overwhelming number of their students either from "continental white" children or from Puerto Rican and Negroes.

This deplorable condition, the PEA said, comes about mainly because schools in New York are neighborhood schools. Their enrollments will reflect the characteristics of the areas they serve—and New York, like most urban areas, shunts its minority groups into restricted residential sections.

That is precisely what happened to Morris High School.

During and right after World War II, the character of the South Bronx area from which Morris draws most of its students changed rapidly.

Large numbers of Negroes and Puerto Ricans moved in. And, as they appeared, the oldtime residents of the area did 1 of 3 things:

1. They moved away.

2. They sent their children to private schools.

3. They used subterfuge to send their children to other public schools not so hard hit by the impact of minority groups.

As a result, the oldest high school in the Bronx saw its enrollment dwindle to 1,400 students—80 percent of whom were Negro and Puerto Rican. Much the same thing was happening to Julia Wadleigh High School nearby—and Julia Wadleigh finally closed its doors as a high school.

COMMUNITY BACKS FIGHT FOR SURVIVAL

But Morris decided to fight.

Under the leadership, first of Dr. Jacob L. Bernstein and then of Dr. William Friedman who succeeded him as principal, the school went to the community and said, in effect:

"Unless you help, Morris is doomed to become a wholly segregated school—something no person of good will wants to see in our city. Unless you help, Morris may have to close its doors completely. We can do much of the job, but we cannot do it all. This is your school and it will become what you want it to be."

The approach worked. Church and civic groups held meetings to urge the oldtime residents to keep their children in school. Special efforts went into enlivening the PTA and getting newcomers and oldtimers in the organization acquainted with each other.

Meanwhile, the school went to work in other ways. School district lines were changed to draw in areas which Negroes and Puerto Ricans had not settled so heavily.

In addition, some junior high schools in the district with heavy Negro and Puerto Rican enrollments were allowed to send their students to other high schools if parents wished.

This matter of zoning was also taken up in the PEA report. Talking of elementary and junior high schools, it said the school system apparently has not deliberately zoned school districts to funnel minority groups into particular schools.

But the school system generally has also failed to rezone the schools, where this can be done, to bring about a better balance in school enrollments.

And, by failing to use integration as a principle in its zoning, the report says, the school system has allowed many schools to assume the patterns of segregation.

High schools, which draw their students from wider areas, were not included in the report; the high school division at the board of education says boundaries have been adjusted for 20 years to recognize shifts in the city's population.

Nevertheless, Morris and Julia Wadleigh show that high schools can be hit by the problem, too.

The board of education repeated last December its determination to integrate the school system "as quickly as practicable." On February 3, the Brooklyn chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People felt it necessary to bring the case of *PS 258* v. *PS 61* to the board's attention.

The NAACP charged that PS 258 opened last October with an enrollment of 98 percent Negro. It said plans for PS 61, scheduled for completion this year "strongly suggest an all-white student body."

And the 20-block area between the schools is an interracial section; the NAACP wants rezoning which is now under consideration by the zoning subcommission of the board's commission on integration.

Morris High School used zoning to good effect in its fight against segregation. It also had other weapons.

It was proud of its top rating as a college preparatory high school; but school officials recognized that most of the new students didn't have the resources for higher education.

To fill their needs, a multiple track curriculum was installed to allow youngsters to choose the path of education best suited to them.

Teenagers who wanted college could still prepare for it. Those who didn't could learn the basic tools of earning a living—and get a commercial or general diploma as well:

Says Friedman:

"You can't handle a situation like this simply by rezoning and modernizing the building.

"You have to make sure that the tensions between the students don't rise again; that means, in the long run, making sure that each child gets what he needs from the school because a child who is achieving something for himself won't make trouble for others."

OTHER KEY WEAPONS AGAINST SEGREGATION

Morris did other things, too.

It made students responsible for monitoring the halls and entrances of what Friedman calls their school home. Leadership classes gave students school problems to solve—such as overcrowding in the halls and arranging assembly programs.

It developed a strong guidance program to work with youngsters who showed signs of getting into trouble or falling behind in their work. (Morris, as a difficult school, gets more special staff for such activities.)

It worked with the faculty to make them aware of tensions in the student body and how to deal with them.

"Our faculty," says Friedman, "is younger than average, partly because younger people are more adaptable to the problems we face, partly because the old-timers have been transferring out* * * not because of prejudice but because they are less adjustable to the new curriculum and methods."

The result of all this?

Registration at Morris has gone up to 2,500—and the student body is now 35 percent Negro, 35 percent Puerto Rican, and 30 percent continental white.

The youngsters have desegregated their own activities. Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Chinese, and continental whites have been elected by the entire student body as officers in their general organization.

Every school is an individual educational community with its own individual problems. Perhaps the answers Morris found successful won't work everywhere. But its battle shows that a determined effort can defeat even the insidious effects of the unofficial segregation which grips so many of our schools.

Woodrow Wilson Centennial Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include a proclamation of the President of the United States concerning the Woodrow Wilson centennial year:

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—A PROCLAMATION

WOODROW WILSON CENTENNIAL YEAR

Whereas Woodrow Wilson, the 28th President of the United States, gave to this Nation and to the world a concept of peace based on justice and freedom and supported by the brotherhood of man; and

Whereas this scholar, educator, and statesman led the United States successfully through the ordeal of a devastating war, which was fought to preserve those high principles which this Nation cherishes; and

Whereas Woodrow Wilson's outstanding character, his devotion to his country's service, his efforts to strengthen the Government and to promote the public welfare, his dependence upon divine guidance, and his unfailing confidence in our system of free government and the ultimate wisdom of the American people, are a lasting inspiration to the Nation; and

Whereas the year 1956 marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of Woodrow Wilson, and the Congress, by a joint resolution approved August 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 964), established the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission to develop plans for commemorating that event; and by a joint resolution approved April 27, 1956, has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to observe the anniversary with appropriate ceremonies.

Now, therefore, I, Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, do hereby call upon the people of the United States to observe the centennial of the birth of Woodrow Wilson; and I urge interested individuals and organizations, both private and governmental, to participate in appropriate ceremonies during 1956 designed to honor and commemorate his life, his ideals, and his concern for the freedom of peoples throughout the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 27th day of April in the year of our Lord 1956, and of the independence of the United States of America the 180th.

[SEAL] DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

By the President:

JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State.

United Mine Workers of America Express Opposition to the Passage of H. R. 5550

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on April 26, 1956, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], placed a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD entitled "The Coal Industry and H. R. 5550." Among other things, this article included the following paragraph, and I quote:

Although representatives of the coal industry were opposed last year to the enactment of H. R. 1, the 3-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, no spokesman either from the management of labor side of the coal industry came before the Ways and Means Committee to oppose enactment of this bill. This shows that even though the representatives of the coal industry were opposed to further reduction of tariffs, that they recognized that H. R. 5550 will not lower tariffs by one iota, but would on the contrary, help to get the greatest benefits for American export trade from foreign countries.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know about our colleague's mail, but I am thoroughly familiar with mine. On March 6, 1956, I received a letter from the United Mine Workers of America reiterating their opposition to the Reciprocal Trade Agree-

ments Act and their vigorous opposition to the passage of H. R. 5550. Included with that letter was an attachment which further explained their opposition to this bill. As part of my remarks, I include both communications:

MARCH 5, 1956.

The Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: For many years the United Mine Workers of America has opposed the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. We have opposed it because there is nothing reciprocal about it. It is used by the State Department without regard for the best interests of American business and labor, which must meet low-wage foreign competition.

H. R. 5550, a bill now in the Ways and Means Committee, sets up a rulemaking body which would legalize the rules and laws which up to now have been made illegally by the so-called General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Each year the opposition to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act grows stronger. We are confident the day will come when the plight of American industry will force Congress to rewrite this legislation. As long as the Congress maintains full power to regulate commerce and to levy and collect duties on imports, we must accept its decisions. But we bitterly oppose the usurpation of these powers by GATT and the legal recognition of its stepchild, the Organization for Trade Cooperation.

We respectfully ask each Member of Congress from the coal-mining States to oppose the passage of H. R. 5550.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. HOWE,
Director, Labor's Non-Partisan League.

ORGANIZATION FOR TRADE COOPERATION, H. R. 5550

The OTC, or Organization for Trade Cooperation, would be a specialized agency of the United Nations dedicated to the administration of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, or GATT. This is the new international trade organization that Congress is now being asked to approve. The bill is H. R. 5550 and is now before the Ways and Means Committee of the House. The new OTC represents an effort to unload GATT on the United States in a form that will make it permanent.

The so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreement, of which OTC is a part, is now 21 years old. The United Mine Workers of America has opposed the Reciprocal Trades Act since its inception.

OTC has been advertised as calling for no supranational power, yet that is exactly what it would have in practice and in fact—and that is also exactly what the State Department wants it to have. Otherwise the Department would not be interested in it. Since the OTC would have an assembly, which means a law or rule-making body, passage of H. R. 5550 would make legal the rules and laws which up to now have been made illegally by the so-called General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Our Constitution conferred upon Congress in unmistakable black and white the power to regulate foreign commerce and to lay and collect duties on imports. Congress has legislated repeatedly since 1951, when the escape-clause amendment to the Trade Agreements Extension Act of that year was adopted. Congress has made its will known repeatedly in legislation, in many amendments to that escape clause, to make sure that all American producers faced with hurtful import competition have a reasonable remedy.

This legislation has been rendered impotent by the stubborn opposition of the State Department—a Department that seems to find it hard to believe that American producers are entitled to the most elementary considerations of fair treatment.

For years the United Mine Workers of America has advocated and supported legislation to provide quota limitations on foreign imports. Now we are told that Congress cannot legislate quotas or provide the mechanism for their imposition by an administrative agency without violating the letter and spirit of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

By just what pattern of reasoning the State Department could arrive at the notion that they could properly bind Congress against any particular type of legislation on quotas, or anything else, has not yet been explained. These powers have been, in effect, usurped by GATT and because of ignorance and indifference on the part of the Congress, they have succeeded in getting away with murder. Now they are attempting to make the past actions of GATT legitimate by having Congress pass H. R. 5550 which sets up the Organization for Trade Cooperation.

By defeating H. R. 5550 Congress would recapture its constitutional authority and responsibility and once more labor and business, the producers of this country, would regain their lost voices in the determination and direction of trade policies that are of the greatest importance.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the above letter and attachment were mailed to every Representative from districts where coal is mined and that a copy of same was read into the record of the hearings on H. R. 5550 by Representative CLEVELAND BAILEY.

I am also informed that coal-industry representatives support the same position as taken by the United Mine Workers of America.

The Polish Constitution of 1791

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, May 3, 1956, commemorated the 165th anniversary of the Polish Constitution. The freedoms voiced in that promulgation have been denied Poland time and time again; however, its people have never ceased in their efforts to regain their independence.

We may compare the struggle of humankind in the achievement of democracy to the erection of a multicolumned, solem temple or to the building of a majestic road, audaciously projected into the unknown and into the future. These splendid structures are adorned and brightened by lofty burning tripods or marked by milestones—each representing a symbolic step or a glorious conquest of humanity over nature's adversities, or the triumph against a tyrannical will imposed through history by dictators or avaricious men. Representative of such indelible marks of history is, indeed, the Polish Constitution of 1791.

By its enactment humanity achieved another step in the recognition of man's individual rights and freedom. Many progressive social and political reforms were inaugurated by this document. Participation by the peasants and the local towns in the right of representation in the national government was firmly recognized. The Polish Constitution, based upon two other great documents of that period—the American Declaration of Independence and the French Declaration of the Rights of Man—proclaimed the concept of liberty for all men and recognized that man is endowed with certain inalienable rights and that for the protection of these rights "governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Unfortunately, the country which gained life with such a stupendous monument of freedom was chosen to remain through history as an example to other men—an example of the fact that an author ofttimes endures suffering instead of recompense for such a splendid donation to humanity. "Martyrized Poland," they have properly called it, and, in truth, few people have suffered so much from foreign oppression and aggression.

Although Poland has, perhaps, been through the centuries the bloodiest battleground of Europe, its spirit of independence, its wholehearted dedication to God have never faltered. What a glorious proof of good faith the Communists could now give if they would free Poland. What coherence and logic would appear in their behavior if, after renouncing Stalin and denouncing his crimes, they would redress and repair the tortious acts inflicted upon the Polish people. In other words, if they free now a few persons who were put in dungeons by their bloody leader, there is far more reason that they should free an entire people from the oppressive status that same leader has thrust upon them.

It is only natural that the American people look with every sympathy to this anguishing country. We cannot forget the land of Kosciusko and Pulaski. In our hearts there is engraved forever the memory that during World War I 300,000 Polish-Americans served in defense of their adopted country, and almost 1 million fought in World War II.

We in the United States proclaim our admiration for the Polish people, and fervently pray that the day may not be far off when the freedom and happiness of man will be the object of the Government of Poland and of other enslaved nations.

Alger Hiss' Big Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I am enclosing, under my permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the REC-

ORD, an article from the News and Courier, Charleston, S. C., under date of May 1, 1956.

The editorial has to do with the appearance of Hiss at Princeton University. It will be recalled that some time ago the distinguished member from New Jersey, Mr. TUMULTY, made a magnificent speech on the floor of the House in which he lamented the action on the part of the school permitting this convicted perjurer to speak to the students. It will be recalled that Mr. TUMULTY observed that Hiss had chosen the wrong subject—that Hiss was an authority, not on Geneva, but on how to fabricate falsehoods. This editorial further expounds on the theme which was so ably advocated by our fine colleague from New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY] in his opposition to Hiss' appearance at Princeton. I think the school made a mistake in permitting him to appear. I do not believe even Voltaire, if he were living, would favor such a thing. I agree with the stand taken by the most outspoken newspaper in the South—the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier:

ALGER HISS' BIG VICTORY

Some liberals are now trying to say that Alger Hiss' appearance before a student debating society at Princeton University represents a victory for academic freedom.

Actually, the invitation extended to Hiss represented a victory for the convicted perjurer and a victory for sophomoric stupidity, but a defeat for decency and a defeat for academic freedom.

We do not blame college officials—or at least we do not blame them very much—for what happened. The blame belongs to the students. Once the invitation had been extended by the students, Hiss' victory was won. If Princeton officials had stepped in and canceled the invitation, they would not have erased his triumph. For it was the invitation—rather than the speech—that represented victory. And cancellation would only have had the effect of making Hiss pose as a martyr to whom freedom of speech had been denied.

Today, the liberals are saying, "How can it hurt a group of students of reasonable intelligence and with open minds, to hear a speech by anyone?"

And the liberals add, "The students knew of Hiss' record. Certainly they can be trusted to form their own judgment of whatever he told them in a speech."

But the point is that while the speech may not, and probably did not, hurt the students, it certainly helped Hiss. And Hiss is a person outside the pale of decent men. He is a convicted and unrepentant perjurer. The only reason he has never been tried on other counts is that the statute of limitations saved him.

Ever since he got out of jail, Hiss has been angling for invitations just such as the one at Princeton. Why? Because after 2 or 3 of such invitations a seed of doubt about his guilt is planted in the mind of the public. The general reaction, after a number of such speeches, is that if Princeton and similar institutions endorse him, there must be some doubt about the justice of his criminal conviction.

Of course this is exactly what Hiss wants. More important, it is exactly what his Red and pink and "liberal" associates want. True enough, Priceton did not endorse Hiss. But the general public often reads merely the headlines—not the fine print.

No, it didn't hurt the Princeton debaters to hear Hiss. But certainly they had him talk on the wrong subject. Hiss now is a recognized authority on only one matter—how to tell all-important, whopping lies about betrayers of the United States. If he were going to talk on anything, that was the matter he should have discussed.

We can well understand how, for instance, the FBI college might invite a veteran burglar to talk on safecracking; or how the War College might invite a traitor to talk on breaking secret codes; or how a Princeton debating society might invite a Communist to talk on the blessings of communism, as seen through Red eyes.

But for the FBI to invite a burglar to discuss ethics or jurisprudence would be the height of effrontery both to our moral code and our system of justice. The same can be said about the other comparisons offered above.

If the Princeton students had thought through all of those various matters, we don't believe they would have embarrassed their university or the country by their asinine, sophomoric invitation.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Engineering Research and Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, not long ago it was my pleasure to deliver an address in Madison, Wis., before a section of the American Society of Tool Engineers. My subject was the competitive race between the United States and the Soviet Union, in the field of guided missiles, research, and development. Subsequent developments have underlined the significance of this subject.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks on that evening be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

I am indeed honored to address your society. It is one which contributes indispensably to the future of America.

In our industrial society, trained and skilled manpower and tools are the keys to production and to success.

And you highly trained engineers, and your companies, have the responsibility and satisfaction of creating the tools which make America great.

We of the United States, as you know, lead the world in production. We have accomplished the greatest feats of engineering. We are looked to, and increasingly visited, for our advanced industrial know-how.

OUR RACE WITH SOVIETS FOR SUPREMACY

And we are now, of course, engaged in a tremendous struggle to determine whether free men can remain supreme in their production achievements and thereby remain free, or whether they might become the slaves of a Communist industrial state, because of the latter's possible gaining of supremacy in time to come.

I am convinced, as I know you are, that just as we have won in shooting wars against dictators, so in peacetime we can prevail in competition against a dictatorship.

I do not believe in either overestimating or underestimating Soviet engineering capabilities. But I, for one, after years of warning about the Kremlin's determination, was not surprised when Khrushchev announced in Burma last December that "we shall see who has more engineers, the United States or the Soviet Union."

WE MUST BE NO. 1 ON GUIDED MISSILES

I want to talk to you tonight about the implications of this matter of the number of engineers and the quality of engineers.

It is particularly appropriate that you and I weigh the problem on this occasion, because just during this past week, a subcommittee of the United States Senate Armed Services Committee began, as you know, an investigation of the program of our guided missile and long-range and medium-range bomber programs.

I am not on that particular committee. I don't purport to know what its findings will be.

A great deal of its testimony must necessarily be in executive session, because matters of the highest security will be taken up, just as they are taken up in many of our Senate Foreign Relations Committee meetings.

SOME REPORTS ASSERT REDS ARE AHEAD OF US

But I do know this: There has been report after report, apparently based upon information available to United States and allied intelligence, that the Soviets have been making spectacular progress in guided missiles research.

Some reports assert that the Reds are actually ahead of us in the development of a 1,500-mile medium-range guided missile. Some reports assert that we are still ahead in the race for a 5,000-mile intercontinental guided missile, or a ballistic missile (the latter being, as you know, an unguided missile, fired like a bullet or an artillery shell).

It is next to impossible to know how reliable these various reports are. I have confidence in our military authorities, and I know that they have been trying to do their best. I have confidence in the President of the United States, who certainly has the finest military judgment available to this Nation in this hours of stress.

The President's recent request to the Congress for a half-billion doHars more in funds for long-range bombers—B-52's—showed, however, that all is not as well as we would want it to be. It shows that we have got to step up our activity.

The guided missile program, the bomber program, the development of antiguided missiles and antibomber systems—these will determine, in time to come, the very life of this Republic.

We dare not be second best in guided missiles; we cannot be second best in our bomber program.

DANGER OF SOVIET OVERCONFIDENCE IN A BLITZ

If ever the Soviet Union gets the idea that it could blitz us in an all-out attack, that it could rain down a shower of missiles with hydrogen bomb warheads on defenseless cities and defenseless airdromes, that it could smash our strategic air force before it could retaliate—if ever the Soviet Union gets that false idea—then it will be a bad day indeed, and the chance of war will be that much increased.

The recent appointment of a Chief of Guided Missiles in the Pentagon, shows that we recognize that we have got to proceed all-out on the development of that particular weapon.

We cannot, of course, put all our eggs in one basket. We cannot simply rely upon any one weapons system.

But neither can we be second best in the most crucial weapons and the most crucial weapons systems.

The day of mass armies is long since completely over. This is as you and I so well know, an age of science and technology.

But we are losing technicians from the Armed Forces at an alarming rate, and the strongest steps must be taken to replenish that supply.

We cannot have engineers and technicians available to the Armed Forces, unless in the first place, we graduate sufficient numbers of youngsters from the high schools and the institutions of higher learning in America.

OUR BASIC CHALLENGE—MATCHING SOVIET GRADUATES

And that brings me back to the principal point of my comments tonight. It brings me to the one point on which I know you, of this society, will agree with me completely. This Nation must take steps, in a comprehensive program, to expand the number of engineers and technicians available to United States society.

In the dictatorial state of the Soviets, they have power to order as many students as they wish to study engineering. Their government can order that enough money and facilities are made available for training engineers. They don't need to pay too much attention to the standard of living of the Russian people, and they pay no attention at all to their liberty.

Knowing that they need more engineers for defense and for their industrial machine, they merely arrange and order the number of engineers to be turned out.

It is something like our planning a production line to turn out machines. The single mindedness of their program makes it easier. But the concept of dictating to human beings is utterly objectionable to us.

We need more engineers, too, but we will leave the decisions basically to the people.

We do not coerce our people, nor require them to serve what some men may regard as the present fleeting interest of the state. One of our cherished liberties is the freedom of the individual to choose his own vocation.

LOW TECHNICAL STATE FROM WHICH SOVIETS STARTED

Meanwhile, there is no doubt whatsoever that Russia has come a long way in technical achievement since its 1917 revolution.

Czarist Russia was not an industrial state and was very backward in technological matters as compared to the United States.

Consequently, almost any Russian advances in engineering and science appear as great strides compared to the lack of such technical activity before the industrial revolution entered Russia.

About 40 years ago 50 percent of the Soviet population could not read. Since then they have built an elementary school system with a 7-year course and are planning, by 1960, 10 years of basic schooling will be compulsory throughout Russia.

Those schools are open 6 days a week, and more hours per day and more weeks per year than ours are. The students are treated with semimilitary discipline.

We might expect these students to be too machine-like to have the independent initiative and imagination of Americans when they grow up. But we must not discount the fact that they do turn out highly qualified technical engineers.

If we have as many engineers, I am sure that our results will be better than theirs. But there is a limit beyond which imagination and initiative cannot make up for numbers.

We must not let that limit be reached.

RUSSIAN ENGINEERS INCREASE RAPIDLY

In 1954 Russia had more than 540,000 engineers.

This increase to 540,000 engineers may be compared with the figures for 1929 when Russia had only 41,000 engineers.

They may also be compared with the American total of between 500,000 and 535,000 engineers.

In addition, their other scientists numbered about 160,000. We have between 210,000 and 225,000 such scientists.

Their combined total of engineers and scientists is 890,000, according to 1954 figures. Our total is between 700,000 and 740,000.

SOVIET EDUCATION'S VAST ENROLLMENT

Student enrollment in the Russian institutions of higher education rose to 2½ million students in the fall of 1954. And the growth of Soviet college population is continuing.

In 1954 universities and other institutions in the Soviet Union graduated 53,000 engineers.

The Soviet Union is stepping up its rate of graduating engineers. It graduated 63,000 in 1955.

While the Russians have been making this enormous effort in training engineers and scientists, we in the United States of America, speaking generally, have not been concentrating our national efforts upon the problem. We have not focused our attention on the production of engineers and scientists adequate to meet our needs in the modern world.

It is, of course, good that we leave the selection of the individual's career to the individual concerned. I would not have that changed one iota nor would you.

But let us look for a moment at how our achievement in the production of engineers and scientists stacks up against that of the Soviet Union.

AMERICA'S TECHNICAL POPULATION

In the United States, the creation of professional workers (including engineering and scientific people) has increased nearly two times as fast as the Nation's population.

In 1890 the census showed about 30,000 engineers in a total population of 63 million in the United States. In manufacturing, construction, utilities, and transportation, there was only one engineer for every 290 workers.

When the American population had risen to 151 million people in 1950, we had 535,000 engineers. That gave us one engineer for every 65 workers in those same fields of manufacturing, construction, utilities, and transportation.

This was a remarkable increase and is, to a great extent, responsible for the rise in our industrial efficiency and in our standard of living.

The United States now has between 700,000 and 740,000 engineers and scientists.

Most of these engineers and scientists are employed by private industry. More than 400,000 engineers and more than 100,000 scientists were working in private industry in January 1954.

ENGINEERS IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Not only industry but also Government requires engineers. More than 30 Federal agencies employ about 47,000 professional engineers. And many agencies have numerous high positions to fill. They cover the fields of mechanical, electrical, electronics, chemical and civil engineering, as well as others.

LOW RATE OF GRADUATION IN UNITED STATES

But the graduation of engineers and scientists in America (which moved up between World War II and Korea) has since slumped badly.

This fall not only reflects the decline in births about 20 years before but also the lack of enough discipline requiring study of mathematics and science in high school and college.

To put the sad story to you bluntly, the Soviet institutions of higher education are graduating engineers about 2½ times faster than we are—2½ times.

Now, this is a sorry state of affairs to face a country like ours which has developed a continent through hard work and technical know-how. Our country has always led the world in technical performance and engineering. We are a Nation accustomed to producing surpluses, not shortages.

NO NEED FOR FEAR OR DESPAIR

We must solve our shortage with courage and hard work. I do not believe in an attitude of fear or despair.

"For God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind" (II Timothy 1: 7). This is what Paul wrote to Timothy, and it is directly applicable to us as we face world problems today. We must banish fear. We must take courage. We will go forward to solve the difficult problems and to overcome the foes we face.

It was not through inattention or through lack of technical skill that we increased our national income from about 70 billions of dollars (which it was in 1939 when Wisconsin first sent me to Washington) to the current figure of about 327 billions of dollars. That is an increase of more than four times, and it was done in the comparatively small period of 17 years.

Now I am not saying that we have plenty of time in which to step up our production of technically skilled people. We don't have. We must work hard and fast.

We had, as you recall, 2 years in which to get ready even after we were attacked at Pearl Harbor, but we would not now have as much as 2 hours if we were attacked by atomic and hydrogen bombs showering our principal cities.

And in this connection may I remind you that, with the speed of modern airplanes, we, here in Wisconsin, are less than 5 hours from Soviet Siberia.

UNITED STATES CHIEFS WARNED AGAINST OVERCONFIDENCE

Adm. Arthur Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said in a speech last January that:

"Perhaps the most insidious weakness a nation can have is complacency. This is the belief that we can do everything better than anyone else."

I continue to quote Admiral Radford:

"It is something like the popular song called 'Anything You Can Do I Can Do Better.'"

He said that the Soviet achievements in developing "modern long-range bombers, submarines, jet engines, and nuclear weapons" rebutted the thought that we can afford to be complacent about Soviet technology. He concluded:

"There are no rational grounds to presuppose that American defense technology is invincible."

A recent statement by the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, after the atoms for peace conference, said that, "What we learned was enough to shatter any complacency we may have enjoyed in regard to our own imagination and ability."

Therefore, we must redirect and reemphasize our engineering program so as to step up the number of highly trained engineers available to support our expanding economy. Meanwhile, we must maintain our defense posture, our readiness to repel attacks, with the most advanced scientific weapons conceivable.

And this must be done within the freedom of our American competitive system of individual enterprise.

We have already made a start. We have already reversed the downward trend of engineering graduations, and we are aiming upward.

Fortunately, the enrollment in the engineering classes of our higher educational institutions in America has been increasing during the last 3 years.

The increase last fall was about 10 percent. And, if this trend continues, the Office of Education in Washington believes that there will be over 40,000 engineering graduates in 1964. This is a substantial increase, but we must remember that in 1950 we graduated over 52,000 engineers. With sound planning and energetic drive, we can again focus the attention of our professional people upon producing engineers who will help protect us from the Communist danger.

And this can be done through the incentive of our system of individual initiative.

THERE ARE ATTRACTIVE FINANCIAL INDUCEMENTS

Salaries and demand for engineering experience have been high. As you know, in city after city, the newspapers carry advertisements seeking engineering personnel for employment at high salaries with glowing futures.

The continuing demand for engineers and qualified scientists will probably serve to maintain the salary incentive. Consequently, boys and girls, who learn of the glowing opportunities in the engineering and scientific fields, will more and more wish to follow those careers.

INCREASE NUMBER OF MATH STUDENTS

But, one of the greatest problems in training engineers and scientists quickly is the lack of mathematicians in high school. Since 1910 there has been a consistent decline in the proportion of high school students who take college preparatory mathematics. This conclusion is the result of a survey by the Educational Testing Service under a grant from the Carnegie Corporation. The youngsters just don't realize how important their math is, to themselves and to the country.

One of the survey's conclusions, after looking at 60 mathematics classes, was stated as follows:

"That genuine and efficient mathematical learning was going on in only eight of them."

And that:

"What we are facing is not a shortage of talent, but of trained talent."

And that:

"It is a problem which merits the attention of all men and women accustomed to concerning themselves about the future of America."

Almost half of the schooltime of high-school children in Russia is spent on science and mathematics.

There has been a distressing tendency in our country to let study of mathematics slide. Under the elective system, most students avoid it. True, it is hard; but it sharpens the mind and it helps toward success in later life.

SIX-POINT PROGRAM TO SPUR ENGINEERING

Now, I earnestly urge that we give serious consideration to an engineering and scientific educational program under which we will do the following things:

1. Emphasize science and mechanics in counseling those boys and girls who show aptitude for that sort of thing.

2. Stimulate them to study hard and to keep up their studies.

3. Direct them to the sources of scholarships, to competitions for tuition grants, and to sources of loan funds which have been made available to foster scientific education.

4. As Government officials and as college or corporation executives, appropriate and allocate adequate funds for scientific study and research and for scholarships.

5. Help our great private and public university system in its wonderful work.

6. Counsel graduates as to scientific and engineering employment and so make the Nation's opportunities available to them.

UNCLE SAM IS FINANCING VAST RESEARCH

Uncle Sam is of course already busy. The Federal Government lets tremendous contracts for research and development. These are awarded on a competitive basis to universities, colleges, research institutions, and industrial corporations which have the skilled manpower and the facilities for their performance.

As a result, many of our colleges are being partially financed by doing Federal Government work in scientific and engineering fields.

And many of our companies are able to finance their engineering research and development by doing defense work for the Pentagon.

This is going on in our truly American way without subjecting the thinking of any of these universities, colleges, institutions, or corporations to the influence of what the Government wants them to think. And that is as it should be. For there must be no censorship of thought in our country.

So I leave with you the message that, although the future may look somber and although we may face a strong enemy, we need not despair. We can be of good cheer because we have the capacity, we have the energy, and we have the incentive to win.

But it will not be easy.

THE VITAL IMPORTANCE OF MACHINE TOOLS

I have been speaking principally about the shortage of United States engineers in relation to the Soviet's mammoth concentration on increasing the number of engineers for weapons development.

I want to emphasize now, however, that I am thinking of the shortage of engineers in terms of our peacetime economy, as well. I am thinking of engineers not simply for the development of guided missiles and B–52 bombers, but for the development of that vast array of tools, which you know, even better than I, is the backbone of America's industrial strength and its military might.

In modern war, toolmakers are as essential as soldiers. But the machine tool industry is an industry of feast or famine. There is either a great demand for its production, or there is little demand at all.

MACHINE TOOL RESERVE POOL

Our unfortunate experience in World War II, when we did not have nearly enough machine tools to turn out quickly the military equipment we needed, has led the Federal Government, as you know, to establish, very wisely, a machine tool reserve pool.

This is administered by the Department of Defense under policies defined by the Office of Defense Mobilization. Several years ago, an American industrialist, Harold S. Vance (formerly chairman of the executive committee of the Studebaker-Packard Corp. and now a member of the Atomic Energy Commission) headed a committee which described the policy to govern that reserve.

The Vance Committee concluded, after careful study, that a stockpile of end items was not enough. It recommended that machine tools be bought and stored against the time when war would suddenly require American industry to step up military production and go on an all-out basis. This Committee recommended annual appropriations of more than $500 million to establish this pool. Consequently, separate appropriations were made for the establishment of this reserve stockpile of machine tools.

It has been decided by the Pentagon to procure machine tools, both for stockpile and for current use, out of their general appropriations. The effect of this decision is to place the responsibility for stockpiling machine tools on each military service. This places the burden for justifying appropriations for this reserve where the burden lies for all military appropriations.

TRIGGER PROGRAM FOR M-DAY

One of your past presidents, Joe Crosby, is giving his time until July to the Department of Commerce to help solve the machine-tool problem. As you no doubt know, the Department of Commerce and the General Services Administration have cooperated to develop a trigger program to be shot into action, if and when we have an M-Day again.

The Government is now offering to enter into contracts with your companies effective immediately to produce specified machine tools which will be needed for wartime production. Manufacture of the tools would begin upon notice from the Government on or about M-Day. Later, these contracts may be made effective automatically on M-Day without further notice. The requirements of the contracts would be reviewed twice a year, and proper adjustment made. Just the other day, the Commerce Department and the General Services Administration completed their cooperative preparations for this machine tool trigger program.

THE CHALLENGE OF AUTOMATION

One cannot, I believe, discuss our machine tool industry without bringing up the challenging issue of automation.

There has been, as you know, concern expressed in some quarters, particularly labor circles, about the trend toward automation. There has been a fear that it would result in displacement of jobs.

There is no question but that in specific instances, some unemployment may result as manual jobs are replaced by machine-run machines. But the whole inspiring history of the expansion of the American free enterprise system has shown this fact—industrial progress in America, while invariably making obsolete some particular type of job, tremendously increases the number of new jobs in totally new fields.

The horseshoemaker, the harnessmaker, and the other jobs, which were dependent upon horses in the America of the 19th century, have been replaced. But there were literally millions of new jobs created, thanks to the "horseless carriage," the great American automobile industry.

The development of nuclear science, the continued progress in electronics, the miracles of American chemistry, particularly in developing new plastics—the miracles in physics research—these are symbols of the new frontiers of American industry.

So, contrary to the fear talk, we should welcome the trend to automation, because it means a higher, not a lower standard of living, more jobs, not fewer.

AUTOMATION NOT REALLY NEW

I should like to point out that automation is really only a further development of an old concept in America. It involves the increasing use of laborsaving machinery. This machinery is almost continuous in its operation and sometimes is self-regulated. It is, as you know, increasingly used in offices, as well as in factories.

MANY KINDS OF AUTOMATION

Some automatic machinery performs a cycle of operations according to an established pattern without further human intervention.

Other machines same human labor in the automatic movement and handling of materials.

Still other machines automatically control the work of machinery, substituting machine calculation in place of graders and inspectors.

And in offices, electric computers and data-processing machines perform miraculous calculations in split seconds.

PURPOSE OF AUTOMATION IS GOOD

All these are the brain-children of mankind. And they are calculated to lift toil from the backs of mankind, men and women.

As we exercise statesmanship, in government, in business and in labor, we can foresee a shining future when there will be more leisure, more happiness and less physical and mental exhaustion in the lives of all our people.

But we must exercise patience and forebearance, and labor long to foresee the problems which this transition to more automatic processes will entail.

If greater automation increases production, we must be sure that the engineers and the small entrepreneurs receive an adequate return for their imagination, foresight, and risk-taking.

On the tax phase, let me mention this: Whether or not the rapid tax amortization program is continued in connection with defense expenditures, the Government now permits a more realistic write down of investments in plant and facilities. This should stimulate the business of the machine-tool industry.

And of course, we must protect the rights of labor in this changing world. If workers have been faithfully doing one job for years, have acquired seniority rights and limited skills, we must try to help them to secure fair compensation for these rights or transfer them to the other jobs for which their study and increasing skill will fit them.

And here I must reemphasize that hard work and study throughout our lives will fit us for increasing responsibility.

FURTHER TRAINING OF WORKERS NECESSARY

If any workers are displaced by automation, they should be able, with proper help, to improve their skills to the point where they will earn more in more responsible jobs.

In this connection, I commend to your attention a pamphlet issued under the name of our Secretary of Labor. It is called, "The Skilled Work Force of the United States," and it deals, among other things with the relation of skill to unemployment. It points out that automation will increase the proportion of skilled workers in American life, and stresses the importance of continued self-education.

There are many ways in which our people can improve their skills. They can do it at home, in school, or while serving with the Armed Forces. Through initial apprenticeship, through technical institutions or junior colleges, by participating in training programs within industry and by accumulative job experience at their daily work. But no one becomes skilled by chance. You didn't, and no one else can. Special effort is necessary.

And so, while the Federal Government foresees the great gains coming from automation, it is not overlooking the considerations necessary to help gradual adjustments to the new jobs which automation will bring about.

WISCONSIN WILL PROSPER IN AUTOMATION ERA

It seems to me that a great State like Wisconsin, with a marvelous university system, a State which has rightly prided itself upon the skills and crafts of its laboring people and its managerial people, a State where quality of product has always been a matter of deepest pride, stands to benefit far more so than the average State—in the scientific, industrial, and atomic era of our times.

I look, therefore, for greater prosperity of our State, than we have ever known before. But I emphasize that it must be a well-rounded prosperity in which the progress of industry and labor is accompanied by prosperity in agriculture. Unfortunately, the latter situation—prosperity in farming—has not sufficiently prevailed, but it must prevail if our whole society is to remain healthy.

And I want to mention still another essential unit for well-rounded prosperity—our great teaching profession.

INCREASES TEACHING FACILITIES

In the process of greater automation, and the training of the greater number of scientists and engineers which automation will require, the Federal Government, as well as

private industry, should make increasing use of our great universities.

They should make increasing use of our splendid laboratories and our fine private inventive and engineering talent in the laboratories of our many corporations.

In this way, America can move ahead by improving our civilian economy while maintaining superiority in weapon systems for our own national survival.

In order to continue our technological progress, we need, as I have said, more engineers and scientists; and to train these, we need more teachers. Teachers are woefully underpaid. We must bring every effort to increase their compensation, so that they will regain the position of real leadership and the place of respected importance in our lives which we all remember our own teachers had 30 or 40 years ago.

CONCLUSION—THE BRIGHT HOPE OF OUR PIONEERING AGE

If we think ahead, if we continue to act with pioneering spirit, if we follow in the footsteps of the settlers of America, we will have nothing to fear from increasing automation.

We can rely on it, as Daniel Boone relied on his long rifle, for defense, for food, and for a better life.

If we avoid fear and if we follow hope, if we buckle down with hard work, we will succeed beyond the imagination of any of us here present.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, benefits for veterans who have fought in the great wars in defense of our country have been under continual attack by this administration. The Hoover Commission recommends the whittling away of veterans' hospitalization rights and other benefits. More recently the President's Commission on Veterans' Benefits, headed by Gen. Omar Bradley, proposes the ending of all veterans' benefits for non-service-connected disabilities.

I have long felt that some aid for the disabled, the aged, and the unemployable should extend to all our citizens, veterans and nonveterans alike; but I can see no valid reason for ending arbitrarily these benefits for our veterans.

One of the ablest arguments against the reasoning of the President's commission is that advanced by Mr. W. W. Campbell, of Portland, Oreg. Bill Campbell, as he is known to his fellow veterans, is a Marine Corps veteran of World War I, and has played an active and outstanding role in the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter to the editor by W. W. Campbell, which appeared in the Oregonian of April 27.

There being no objection, the letter to the editor was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETS' SPECIAL RIGHTS

TO THE EDITOR: The report of President Eisenhower's Bradley committee appears to be the most iniquitous proposal ever aimed against America's war veterans.

It would entirely disregard the Nation's historic and traditional policy of recognition of the right of war veterans to special consideration by reason of the sacrifices required of them in wartime far above and beyond any sacrifices required of the civilian population.

It would destroy this policy completely and swallow the entire veterans' program into the vast social security and public relief systems and the veterans would lose their identity.

While most veterans will agree that in our Nation of great wealth no citizen should be permitted to become an object of charity through physical disability, unemployability or old age, they can be expected to vigorously insist that the veterans' historic right of prior and special consideration be maintained—and on a separate basis.

There can be no doubt but that the Bradley report, no less than the Hoover report, was inspired by pressures from the "economy leaguers," the hard core of which is composed of what may well be dubbed the "econo-misers"—these being gentlemen who traditionally place dollar values above human values and are known to veterans as those flag-wavers who love the American serviceman while he is out fighting and dying to save the skin and treasure of the "econo-miser," but who hates the serviceman who manages to survive and return in need of assistance.

Among these may usually be found those who profit most from the Nation's wars.

W. W. CAMPBELL.

Address by Hon. William Langer, of North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech I made in New York City on September 29, 1955.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR LANGER AT CARNEGIE HALL, NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER 29, 1955

Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Sobell, and my friends, I am delighted that Mrs. Sobell told you that I was the Senator from North Dakota. North Dakota, believe it or not, is the greatest State in the Union. Every once in a while this evening when one of these distinguished guests came to me and said they were glad I was here and commenced to pay compliments to me for being here, I said to them that we have scores of folks out there in North Dakota who would do it if they were in my place.

I believe one of the greatest jobs in the United States is that of being United States Senator. That is especially true if you represent a great State, if you don't owe any obligations to anybody but to the people, where you can say anything you want to and do anything you want to and be entirely happy while you are doing it. I want the press to know that, and they are here, I understand, tonight, to report my speech. I want them to tell the press in North Dakota that WILLIAM LANGER spoke here tonight and he is very, very happy to be here.

Upon these other occasions on which I have appeared here in Carnegie Hall, I promised to put certain articles and legal instruments into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I placed, and maybe Mrs. Sobell will feel better, I think, when I tell her, I placed the William Peters case into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and he won. And I put the Schneider case into the RECORD, and he won. Of course, you all know that great champion of human rights here in New York City, Corliss Lamont. I can't tell you the great pleasure it gave me to rise on the Senate floor at the time when he was cited for contempt by the McCarthy committee, to appear there and help Senator LEHMAN, of your State, in that great fight we made to keep Corliss Lamont from being cited. And what particularly pleased me was that a few weeks later, we, Senator LEHMAN and I, had the great pleasure of reading the decision of the court upon the floor of the Senate, saying that Corliss Lamont was not guilty of contempt.

When I became attorney general of my State, as Mrs. Sobell told you, I was only a young fellow. I found 441 men (they weren't all men; there were 7 women) 441 altogether, confined in the penitentiary. It gave me a great deal of pleasure to have a thorough investigation made of every case. You would be interested to know that in there we found 2 Negroes, and you know in North Dakota we only have a population of 208 Negroes altogether, and so when I found 2 of them in the penitentiary sentenced to life, Mr. Williams and Mr. McGee, we spent $400 and got out the record and got it before the pardon board. Then we found out that both those men were absolutely innocent and both of them were discharged. It is our belief out there in North Dakota it is better to have 99 guilty go free than have 1 innocent man sent to the penitentiary.

When I came to the Senate, I had had varied experiences. One was as county attorney of a county, and as attorney general of the State, and as governor. When I became a United States Senator, I promptly proceeded to organize a committee on national penitentiaries. Nobody else wanted the job so they gave it to me. I was the chairman of that committee for a great number of years, and when the Democrats got in—due to WAYNE MORSE—I lost my chairmanship and the result was I am only 1 of 3.

In these penitentiaries we have 21,500 inmates and most of these people haven't got a friend on earth. A lot of them aren't as lucky as Morton Sobell to have a beautiful, fine wife who is loyal to him and anxious to help him. You find quite the opposite in some of these cases. As chairman of that committee and as a member of that committee, I have investigated many penitentiaries in the United States of America, every Federal prison, all 18 of them, and also the work farms. It is a very simple procedure. You get up about 3 o'clock in the morning and you go over to the penitentiary and investigate the food. You have a card of admittance and they can't keep you out, because you are either the chairman or a member of this committee. We investigate to see whether there's been any discrimination—any racial discrimination. We investigate to find out whether there has been an excess of solitary confinement. We make a thorough investigation to ascertain just exactly how that penitentiary is run. And you know, my friends, upon my tombstone, if I have nothing else, I hope there will be something on there that will say that since the organization of that committee there has not been a single riot in all the 11 years in any Federal penitentiary, not one. Certainly we people here in America can run those prisons in a humane manner and not run them the way Atlanta prison was run shortly before this committee was created. All the riots that they have had in various States

(men have been killed, guards have been killed, guards have been held as hostages, and millions of dollars worth of property has been burned), have been due to the fact that the prisoners were not treated in a humane manner, with sufficient food and with all that goes with being confined in a penitentiary.

Yet I can tell you this—of all the prisons in the United States, the worst hellhole of all is Alcatraz. I have been there time and again. I have made report after report asking that that prison be closed up. It was established by Spain during the period of the Spanish Inquisition over 400 years ago. There it is today, 12 acres, not enough land out there to give exercise to the prisoners. Former Attorney General Frank Murphy made an investigation of Alcatraz and he recommended that it be closed. I've taken this matter up as a United States Senator time and time again, and I'm happy to inform you tonight that at last Jim Bennett, Director of Prisons of the United States Government, is also recommending that Alcatraz be closed, closed forever in the United States of America.

Being attorney general of a State is a replica of being Attorney General of the United States. The United States Attorney General only operates on a larger scale than does the attorney general of the State. I have always maintained that it's the duty of the attorney general of the State to be just as much interested in seeing that no innocent man is sent to a penitentiary, as it is to see a guilty man sent there. As chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate that was my object. It's hard to describe to you here tonight the terrific power, the almost unbelievable power, that is in the hands of the Attorney General of the United States of America. The entire Department of Justice is in his hands, the FBI, J. Edgar Hoover's department, 10,000 young men and some women who are working for them. You can readily understand that when a prosecutor goes in convinced that a man is guilty, what small chance that man has. I think it is just as much the duty of the FBI and the Attorney General to dig up the other side of the question.

So it was when Mrs. Sobell came to me in Washington in 1954 I said to Mrs. Sobell, "I am satisfied that the Attorney General of the United States, when the Judiciary Committee asks him to intercede, will see that you get a fair deal." Now the Sobell case is going to be up in the Court of Appeals. I want you to know that just as soon as that is disposed of, and also in the meantime, we will do what we can down there in that Senate. Believe me, that body of Senators is an honest group of men who want to do what's right. When you know those men, when you know them as I know them, you're proud of them. Now some of the men may not agree with some of your views on some matters. A Senator may be in favor of the railroads, but he's elected by the people and if the people weren't interested enough to elect somebody who had opposite views, certainly that Senator has a right to make his views known to the country. We have down there the conservatives, and the so-called liberals, and I want to tell you tonight there's no distinction either side of the aisle between Democrats and Republicans, because we have liberals and conservatives on the Democratic side and liberals and conservatives on the Republican side. Happy to say that down there some of my most liberal friends and some of the best men on that Judiciary Committee, some of the men who are just as much interested in Morton Sobell as I am myself, would gladly put their hands to the plow, to help out to see that he gets the justice to which he is entitled.

May I say, however, that there's one thing that I've discovered down there in Washington that I don't like—and it isn't only down there but I found that in State after State after State. You find a prosecutor who wants to make a record, a prosecutor who will get hold of the press and get them to write up stories, just like they did in the Sobell case, month after month after month after month, and poison the feelings of the people in that community before the man ever comes to trial at all, stories that aren't true, stories that mention people who never are called to testify when the trial itself takes place. They create a prejudiced atmosphere—my friend Waldo Frank referred to the atmosphere in the courtroom. In spite of the fact that a juror may be honest and say that he isn't prejudiced in that particular lawsuit, nevertheless, subconsciously, there in the back of his head he's read these stories and he's heard this stuff over the radio. You can't tell me that it hasn't made an impression. I believe if we're going to have the kind of justice we're so proud of in the United States of America, the kind of justice we should have, and the kind of justice that I believe every member of the Senate Judiciary Committee wants, somehow or other we've got to do something when a poor man, or a rich man either for that matter, when any man is charged with a crime, so that the newspapers don't blazen a lot of stuff that isn't true about that man or about that woman, and prejudice the community.

I want you folks to know that the Judiciary Committee has this very much at heart—this matter of convicting an innocent person before he's proven guilty, in the minds of the public, so that when you finally get a jury, they're unconsciously prejudiced, with the result that instead of having a fair trial like our Constitution says every man or woman should have, that man or woman doesn't get it. And I think that down there in Washington too we need legislation—I don't mean a new law, but I mean an interpretation which will say to the Attorney General of the United States: We believe it is just as much your duty to see to it that an innocent man is not sent to the penitentiary as it is to send a guilty man there—just as much your duty to use all the services of the F. B. I., all the services of all these other men that you've got, to see that all the evidence is brought out, to see that no evidence is suppressed and that the jury may have all the facts. And so tonight, ladies and gentlemen, I can't tell you how delighted I've been to have been invited here. I want you to come forward, Mrs. Sobell. [Motions to Mrs. Sobell to stand at his side.]

My friends, I want you to know that I've got four daughters just about the same age as this young lady standing here beside me tonight, and I pledge you that everything I can do as a member of the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate will be done to see that her husband gets justice.

One Hundredth Anniversary of the Order of the Sisters of Providence in the Pacific Northwest

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared relative to the 100th anniversary of the Order of the Sisters of Providence in the Pacific Northwest.

Not only has this order of sisters pioneered in religious and charitable work, but it has been outstanding in the field of hospital work in the Pacific Northwest.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

I should like to call to the attention of the Senate a centennial observance in the State of Washington which has more than sectional interest. I refer to the 100th anniversary of the Sisters of Providence Order in the Pacific Northwest and the work carried on, first by a handful, and then by an ever-growing militant army of dedicated Christians intent upon alleviating ignorance and suffering in the northwest corner of our Nation.

Eighteen hundred and fifty-six was the year when five Sisters of Charity of Providence arrived at Fort Vancouver. They have traveled by riverboats, overland wagons, and packtrains before arriving at Fort Vancouver, Wash. At that time, Vancouver was a fur trading post of the Hudson's Bay Co. The northwest will never forget the leader of that group, Mother Mary Joseph. The daughter of a Montreal carriage maker, she was familiar with woodworking tools, a gifted wood carver, and an architectural designer, in addition to being a practical builder. Upon arrival at Fort Vancouver, she transformed a shack into a residence and schoolrooms.

We still point to that school as being the first permanent school to be established in the State of Washington. Today we know it as Providence Academy.

Mother Mary Joseph then converted a log cabin into St. Joseph's Hospital. This was the first permanent hospital in the Pacific Northwest. It is still in operation and last year had 3,368 patients.

Both the school and the hospital had been established by 1858.

Early in the 1860's the Sisters of Providence had set up schools at Walla Walla, Steilacoom, Cowlitz, and Colville. These schools educated the territories' youngsters before public schools were established.

Seattle began to feel that beneficent hand of the Providence nuns in 1877. Pioneer doctors and city fathers of that day had called for establishment of a farm to care for the poor and aged. This was set up at Georgetown. Only a year elapsed before the first Providence hospital was built and placed in operation at Fifth and Madison Streets in downtown Seattle. Now, Providence Hospital is located at 17th and East Jefferson Streets and cares for more than 16,000 patients per year.

In addition, the Northwest now boasts the 600 bed Sacred Heart Hospital in Spokane which annually cares for more than 22,000 patients and St. Elizabeth's in Yakima which cares for more than 8,000 patients.

The motivation of the order and the motto probably accounts greatly for the success with which the order accomplished from its very beginning. Its motto is: "The Charity of Christ impels us."

The founding of the order took place in Montreal when a wealthy widow established an Institute of Servants of the Poor.

The Order of the Sisters of Charity of Providence has left a permanent mark upon the entire North American continent by establishing hospitals, schools, and homes for the aged along the Pacific coast from Anchorage and Fairbanks, Alaska, to Burbank, Calif., and from Seattle to Montreal.

The hospitals of the order are internationally known for representing the highest standards of medical science.

Never in the order's life has the original intent been forgotten. In addition to caring adequately for the sick and needy, they

have maintained clinical and outpatient services for the needy and have kept their hospital kitchen doors open to the hungry.

It is fitting that there will be a series of observances starting April 8, and concluding June 15, throughout the Pacific Northwest. One of the highlights of the celebration will be a solemn pontifical mass on May 8, at St. James Church, Vancouver, with His Excellency the Most Reverend Thomas A. Connolly, archbishop of Seattle, as the celebrant. His Excellency the Most Reverend Edward D. Howard, archbishop of Portland, will preach the sermon.

Then, a solemn pontifical mass of thanksgiving will mark the formal ceremonies June 14 in Mount St. Vincent Chapel, Seattle.

Archbishop Connolly will be the celebrant, and the Most Reverend Joseph P. Dougherty, bishop of Yakima, will preach the sermon.

The applied Christianity of this order has known no racial, religious, or monetary bounds.

Widespread public gratitude knows no bounds in this centennial observance.

Library Services Act

SPEECH
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2840) to promote the further development of public-library service in rural areas.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I do not oppose the library extension service, in fact, I believe it is highly desirable, but it is a local matter. In my own district we have rural service, paid for by the taxpayers. I want to raise the point, however, that no Federal function is involved under the provisions of the bill now under consideration. For that reason it should be rejected.

It has been stressed in this debate that only a small amount of money is involved and for a limited period of time. Just as sure as I stand here when the 5-year period has expired it will be extended and the money requested will be doubled or tripled. That is the nature of Federal bureaucracy.

Is there any interstate question involved here? Absolutely no. Are not the local communities in a position to finance this kind of program? Of course they are.

The gentleman from Alabama recited an experience. I have had similar experiences. The women in that community provided the service. Have we reached a point in this country where we take the position that Uncle Sam has got to take care of local activities in communities all over this country?

It is said that this is only $7½ million. Over a 5-year period it is over $37 million. It is, of course, very little money in comparison with some of our spending programs. But do not forget this bill only gets the camel's nose under the tent; this is operation "foot in the door."

What is wrong? Why cannot the local communities sponsor this highly desirable program? I will tell you why. Because local officials refuse to tax for that purpose. It is a whole lot easier to come to the Federal Government to make this soft touch, and that is what this is. It is much easier to present a case to the Congress of the United States for these funds than it is to appear before the local county board or before the local State legislature. It seems to me that those who advocate that we take Federal money when we are hopelessly in debt, $282 billion—oh, $37 million is chicken feed. That is true. But I say to you that the issue here is not whether this is a good idea. It is a good idea, but let the local officials tax their people for it. You are asking now that my people be taxed twice for a library service they are already supporting on the local level.

Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, I ask the question: Is this the first move to put over Federal aid to education? I hope not.

Speech of Harvey V. Higley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, at River Falls, Wis., April 29, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on April 29, at River Falls, Wis., the veterans of the State of Wisconsin celebrated "May Day—U. S. A. Way." It was my privilege to attend that celebration and to witness a parade several miles in length. But one of the things which stood out above everything else was a speech delivered by Harvey V. Higley, of my State, who is Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. It was a challenging speech. It spoke of our heritage and our obligations under the facts of life as they exist today.

I am happy, Mr. President, to ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY HARVEY V. HIGLEY, ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS, AT "MAY DAY—U. S. A. WAY" OBSERVANCE, RIVER FALLS, WIS., APRIL 29, 1956

I am honored to be here. It gives me deep pleasure to be part of this truly American observance of May Day.

This kind of May Day should be among the most important holidays of our year. It gives us pause to consider our way of life—to renew our faith in it—to remind ourselves that we live in freedom—that we are grateful for our freedom—that it is our American freedom that has made this the greatest Nation on earth.

Too often we forget our heritage. We become complacent. We tend to accept our American way of life with barely a passing thought. But on this May Day I hope that you and I, and all of our fellow Americans everywhere, will remember that our freedoms had to be won, that they had to be achieved and made strong and secure with the blood and sacrifices of the millions of Americans who participated in the struggles for freedom through the proud history of our land.

You and I must remember that our four basic freedoms are built into the solid foundations of our free land. Those freedoms developed in America. Because of them our country has developed and grown and prospered.

The four basic freedoms became part of our Constitution as one of the first orders of business of the very first Congress of the United States. On December 15, 1791, they went into effect. We can truly call them our birthright, for they are as old and as strong as America itself. If ever we let them be taken from us, there is little doubt that the entire structure of our way of life would crash into ruins.

Just to hear their names is like listening to noble music. Freedom of religion. Freedom of speech. Freedom of the press. Freedom of the right to petition.

But as freedom does not come of itself, but must be won, so too, freedom must be cherished and defended, or it cannot be kept.

You know, and I know, there is abroad in this atomic world a vicious philosophy of life. A philosophy that fears freedom. That hates freedom. That would like to destroy freedom. A philosophy that would like to rip freedom away from its basic place in the life of our Western World.

The Communists have been devilishly ingenious in their attempts to foist their way of life on the rest of the world. They have tried "little wars." They have tried infiltration. They have tried terrorism.

Now, we read in the newspapers that two "happy salesmen" from Moscow are touring the world. They have with them a sample case—about which they talk constantly—but which they never open. They tell us that inside their happy sample case they carry friendship and peace—an easing of international tension—an end to atomic war—an East-West handclasp that will somehow blend freedom with communism, and—who knows—perhaps they hope, will blend communism with freedom.

All this, they tell us, is in their sample case. But while we listen and look, it will pay Americans to remember this slogan:

Beward of shoddy merchandise.

Now, please do not misunderstand me. I want to make it perfectly clear that nobody but a fool would want to close the door to lasting peace. We in America have made it plain that peace is our business. But a wise man insists on business that is conducted in good faith.

What do we see over the shoulders of the two "happy salesmen" from Moscow? We see Stalin, 3 years dead, suddenly transformed by his one-time friends and associates from hero and saint to a deep-dyed villain.

Do any of you remember what the central committee of the Communist Party of Russia said at the time Stalin died? I took the trouble to look this up so that I can quote it exactly: "The heart of the comrade and inspired continuer of Lenin's will—the wise leader and teacher of the Communist Party and the Soviet people, Joseph Vissarionovitch Stalin—has stopped beating. Stalin's name is boundlessly dear to our party, to the Soviet people, to the workers of the whole world."

That's what they said about their man Stalin in 1953. That was the year when they made their people stand for hours in sub-zero weather in Red Square to get a view of the "sainted" Stalin's body. Khrushchev was there. So was Bulganin. So was Molotov and all the other leaders.

But what of today, 1956?

Listen to the words of Khrushchev, senior member of the two "happy salesmen": "The Russian Communist Party," he says, "vigorously condemns the cult of the individual," and of making "a particular leader the hero and miracle worker."

Listen to Malenkov, who was Stalin's chosen successor, and is now the kisser of babies in England: "One-man rule," says Malenkov, "led to arbitrary, irrevocable decisions, highhandedness, serious abnormalities." Truly, the understatement of the year.

Quite a switch. Quite a change of pace. Did they mean what they said in 1953? Do they mean what they say now? These are sane, sensible questions you and I must ask, and demand truthful answers, if we are to remember our purpose: Beware of shoddy merchandise.

America wants peace. We do not want betrayal. We intend to be sure of what we're being offered.

Today's top-ranking Soviet specialist on international trade is an Armenian named Mikoyan. Mikoyan has been shrewd enough to stay alive through all the devious twists and turns of Soviet policy since the early days of Stalin. For years he was one of Stalin's close associates.

But this is 1956. So what is Mikoyan now doing? He has called for a revision of all textbooks on Soviet history—to "correct mistakes." Mistakes about what? "About allegedly subversive activity," says Mikoyan, "of former party leaders who, many years after the events described, were wrongly declared enemies of the people."

In other words, many Russians who were liquidated as criminals and traitors under Stalin, are now to be rehabilitated.

What a solace this rehabilitation must be to the late accused, and to their grieving widows and orphans, if any are still alive.

They've made Stalin, literally, the goat, the scapegoat. They're driven him away with rocks and curses to bear all the sins of communism. Now we are asked to believe that Khrushchev and Bulganin, the "happy salesmen," are purged of all guilt * * * the same Khrushchev and Bulganin who you and I know have been at least accessories in these crimes of communism against humanity. We are asked to believe their present words are honorable, and that their current deeds are to be accepted at face value.

Ladies and gentlemen, veterans, fellow Americans, can we believe them?

At the very least, we must be extremely careful to examine meticulously their words and their deeds, and we must beware of shoddy merchandise.

Bear in mind that Communists have proved ever since they took over Russia that they are good at timing. Now listen to another statement from Khrushchev. He said this, appropriately enough, on St. Valentine's Day: "Soviet leaders want to be friends with the United States, and cooperate * * * in peace and international security. We propose this with good intentions, without holding a knife behind our backs."

Does he mean it? We hope so. Our leaders are going to try and find out but I can't escape a personal feeling of doubt.

This past December, Mrs. Higley and I were visiting in India. On the day we arrived in Calcutta, this same Mr. Khrushchev had just completed another speech to thousands of Indians just a few blocks from our hotel.

He said then that the Western Powers had plotted to make the Nazis attack Russia in World War II. Right now, he charged, we Western Powers were up to the same old tricks, trying to push Western Germany into a war against the Soviet. He denounced our stand on Formosa. He discussed Formosa, which he described as the "lawful possession" of Red China, and berated us for keeping this island from being overrun by the Reds.

Did that speech represent what he really means? Or does he mean what he says now?

Is there any way on earth of knowing when past apostles of fraud and deceit begin telling the truth?

I think we have the right to pin these "salesmen" down. As long as they think it advisable to make such sudden turnabouts to gain our friendship and goodwill, they might very well make a few more reversals. We in the free world would like to see more changes from falsehoods to truth. For example?

The Communists said we and the South Koreans started the Korean conflict. They never have withdrawn that false charge.

They accused us of using germ warfare in Korea. They never have admitted to that fabrication.

They declared war upon Japan just 2 days after the atomic bomb on Hiroshima had virtually forced the Japanese to capitulate. Yet, ever since that war ended—just 6 days after Russia got in it—they have taken complete credit for victory. This myth, too, has never been set straight.

They promised free elections in East Germany, Poland, and Austria. Yet, have you ever heard of such elections taking place? Still more fantasies and broken promises.

When you examine merchandise to try to decide whether it is good or shoddy, you have to take a long look also at the reliability of the company in back of the product, and of the manner in which it has been doing business.

We cannot easily forget about the blockade of Berlin, the disheartening succession of Russian vetoes and walkouts at the United Nations, the fomenting of war in Indochina, the imprisonment of American citizens on false spy charges, Khrushchev's boast—just a few days ago—of a projectile with a hydrogen bomb warhead that can be dropped at any point on the surface of the earth, and many such portrayals of their international behavior.

All this, of course, poses a serious problem for Americans.

We cannot and must not turn our backs on anything that promises a just and honorable peace for the world.

However, we cannot afford to be gullible when examining something offered to us that may seriously affect our way of life.

And what is it—this way of life we Americans hold so sacred—a way of life that has been forged for the past two centuries into something strong and beautiful and everlasting.

What of the merchandise we have on our counter? We proudly stand behind its unimpeachable quality. The merchandise and the quality have been the same since our country was founded. We proudly display it for all the world to see, without maneuvering the package first one way and then the other—for we don't have to fool the customer.

It is a way of life based on the rights of man, not just some men some of the time, but all men all of the time.

It is a way of life that is a living testament of the teachings of the great religions of the world that man has been created in the image of God, that therefore man must be free, that he has the right to live in liberty and equality.

It is a way of life that has been firmly rooted in the four freedoms of America: in freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and in the right to petition.

The War of Revolution, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, two World Wars, the Korean conflict, through them all the concepts of freedoms we hold so dear have been temptered in steel and in blood.

I say to you, thank God for our heritage and for our way of life.

Thank God for our wonderful free nation.

Let us never take our freedoms and our way of life for granted. Let us cherish them with all our hearts and with all our might.

There is no such thing as talking or thinking too much about our American way of life. I think that every day—and especially here and now, on this May Day, U. S. A. way—it's good to be able to say: "God bless our land. God bless our life. God bless, and help us preserve, our freedom."

In that spirit, may God Almighty bring true peace to ourselves and to all mankind.

In that spirit, may our heritage continue to flourish, and may it serve as a beacon of light and of hope for all the world.

Remarks by Hon. W. Kerr Scott, of North Carolina, Before the Senators' Breakfast Group, on May 9, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, this morning it was my privilege to hear a short talk made by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT]. The Senator from North Carolina has a fine appreciation for the enduring values, including things of the spirit. He has a great understanding of human nature, as well as things of nature. His remarks are always helpful to others. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TALK BY SENATOR W. KERR SCOTT BEFORE THE SENATORS' BREAKFAST GROUP, UNITED STATES CAPITOL, MAY 9, 1956

Friends:

"One is nearer God's heart in a garden
Than anywhere else on earth."

So wrote the poet enthralled by the newfound discovery that flowers, even if not possessing a soul, are a part of the spiritual values with which the Creator has surrounded us and our lives.

Edward William Bok, a great American editor and public benefactor, recognized the spiritual value of flowers and man's need for their comfort and relaxing power when he built and endowed that famous beauty spot known as Mountain Lake Sanctuary, or Bok Tower, near Lake Wales, Fla.

He turned a barren, sandy wasteland into a garden of 53 acres of flowers and trees—and trees are only massive flowers—that has relieved the tensions and refreshed the souls of the hundreds of thousands of visitors who have passed through it.

And Luther Burbank, the great naturalist who spent his life skillfully blending the colors and other characteristics of flowers into even more splendid beauty, also found inspiration in the words of the poet, words inscribed on a plaque at Bok Tower:

"The kiss of the sun for a pardon,
The song of a bird for mirth,
One is nearer God's heart in a garden
Than anywhere else on earth."

Flowers, and the love and devotion they symbolize, are an integral part of the joys and sorrows of the most moving moments of life—of courtship, marriage, birthdays, illness, and even death.

They walk with us, and we among them, finding in them pleasure and solace all the days of our lives.

A wedding without a bridal bouquet would be like food without salt.

Death of a loved one calls for banks of flowers, a tribute to the goodness of his life and to ease the sorrow we feel at his or her passing.

Flowers even have a language of their own. Lovers and sweethearts know it and speak it to each other throughout courtship and marriage.

On Mother's Day we wear a red rose if the one who gave us life is still living, a white rose if she has passed on into the great beyond prepared for us by the Creator and from which no traveler returns.

In ancient days the warrior going forth to battle carried close to his heart a pressed flower, a talisman of love and devotion from his beloved designed to bring him home safely. And when the hero returned from the wars, a garland of flowers was placed around his neck by an acclaiming populace.

After a loved one dies we return, time and time again, to lay an offering of flowers on his grave—a silent tribute that speaks its own message.

And who, I ask, can look upon the splendors of a rose or the delicate face of a pansy and say with certainty that flowers themselves do not possess a soul.

Joyce Kilmer, after a solitary walk in the forest—surrounded on every hand by wild flowers shyly peeping toward the sun while protected from the raging winds by their big brothers, the trees—became pensive and wrote:

"I think that I shall never see
A poem as lovely as a tree.
A tree that may in summer wear
A nest of robins in her hair.
Poems are made by fools like me
But only God can make a tree."

"Consider the lilies of the field," we are told by the Master in Luke 12: 27, "how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin: And, yet I say unto you, that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these."

Yes; it is true, flowers neither toil nor spin, but Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one tiny flower created by God to sustain man in his deeper emotional and spiritual moments.

The conclusion is inescapable that Divine approval, if not guidance, has been given for our entwining the beauty, innocence, and purity as symbolized by flowers—and the inspiration, comfort, and pleasure they give us—into the fabric of our daily lives and our acceptance of the darkness of the grave.

In the song of Solomon, which depicts the love of Christ for the church, we read:

"I am the rose of Sharon, and the lily of the valleys," and, "For, lo, the winter is past, the rain is over and gone; the flowers appear on the earth; the time of the singing of birds is come."

As I reflect upon the words, "the flowers appear on the earth," I am aware of the fact that the flowers appear in this worship garden spot each time we meet here through the devotion and thoughtfulness of Mr. Bellamy, the only non-Senator member of our group who regularly attends. He has captured and faithfully nurtures the consciousness that flowers symbolize the love of man for man, the love of man for God, and the love of God for man.

Flowers truly are the currency of love, honor, and adoration. What boy raised in the country has not sought out in the early spring on sunny hillsides delicate, pale, dancing forget-me-nots to shyly lay a tight little bouquet in his mother's lap? What boy raised in the country has not searched the shady forest nooks for violets—those "purple teardrops that live betwist Heaven and earth, but closest to earth"—to honor that selfsame mother?

Our Father in Heaven, in casting the important scenes of His Divine Plan, has chosen flower bedecked gardens as the stage for most of them.

"And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden," we read in the second chapter of Genesis.

Centuries later it was in the Garden of Gethsemane that our Saviour fell upon His face, and the man-side of His nature cried out in anguish, "Oh, My Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me."

But, even then, winding along the garden paths, came the traitor Judas to betray Him to the multitude armed with swords and staves who demanded His crucifixion.

And when the shameful trial had ended, and He had died on the Cross, it was to a nearby garden that His sword-pierced body was taken for entombment.

It was from that spot, a garden where tiny early spring flowers were bravely lifting their heads toward the warmth of the sun, that the Saviour who died for the sins of all men arose on that first Easter Morn to take the place prepared for Him on the throne of the Lord God of Creation.

Yes, one is nearer God's Heart in a garden than anywhere else on earth.

It is only after the shouting and tumult has died, and our friends and loved ones left behind have bedecked our grave with flowers of remembrance, that we can get closer to the Heart of God than we can in a garden where flowers grow.

In closing I would leave you with the song of the Roadside Flowers:

"We are the roadside flowers,
Straying from garden grounds;—
Lovers of idle hours,
Breakers of ordered bounds.

"If only the earth will feed us,
If only the wind will be kind,
We blossom for those who need us,
The stragglers left behind.

"And, lo, the Lord of the Garden,
He makes His sun to rise,
And His rain to fall like pardon
On our dusty paradise.

"On us He has laid the duty—
The task of the wandering breed—
To better the world with beauty,
Wherever the way may lead.

"Who shall inquire of the season,
Or question the wind where it blows?
We blossom and ask no reason,
The Lord of the Garden knows."

International Bank for Reconstruction and Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Eugene R. Black, President of the World Bank, at the annual dinner of the Connecticut Chamber of Commerce, held in Hartford, Conn., on May 8, 1956. The subject of the address was "The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development."

I am advised by the Public Printer that it is estimated the article will make 2½ pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $200.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

(Address by Eugene R. Black, President of the World Bank, at the annual dinner of the Connecticut Chamber of Commerce, Hartford, Conn., May 8, 1956)

I want to talk with you this evening about the underdeveloped areas of the world. I chose this subject not only because of the work of the World Bank in these areas, but because I think America's attitude toward the problems of the underdeveloped world is going to be an increasingly important factor in the fight of freemen to withstand and throw back the incursions of Soviet communism.

The fears and hopes of the refugees living in squalor on the outskirts of Karachi and New Delhi, the yearnings of farmers scratching out a poor existence in Guatemala and Nicaragua, the dreams of the slumdwellers in Baghdad and Beirut—the aspirations of all these people are no longer of just local or regional importance. They have a relation—a very direct relation—to the realization of our own American dream.

As we look at the free world today, we must be struck by the fact that underdeveloped countries constitute at least two-thirds of it. Only Western Europe and North America can be described as developed areas, where adequate use is being made of natural resources and human talents and where, as a result, life can be lived in some dignity and reasonable material comfort.

In these respects, our Atlantic community is an island, less than half a billion people surrounded by more than a billion whose life has scarcely been touched by the material benefits of 20th century civilization. On this side of the Iron Curtain, a thousand million people are living with half the diet, a 10th of the doctors, a 10th of the schools, a 10th of the income that are standard in the United States. For hundreds of millions of them, life expectancy is less than 35 years—or about the same as it was in our Thirteen American Colonies two centuries ago.

This is certainly not the faultof the United States, and this country certainly has no obligation to do anything about it. For my own part, I am not one of those people who believes that we owe the world a living. But I do think it is very much to our own interest to do what we can, on an intelligent basis, to promote economic development in the rest of the world. Let me state why I think this is so.

Development abroad will enable foreign nations to produce the goods and services that can make them active trading partners, rather than supplicants for goods and services which the United States, in one way or another, has been giving away free. Development abroad will create and strengthen markets for goods produced in the United States and the rest of the Atlantic community. It will develop resources of primary materials which are vital to our industrial economies. Finally, I think economic development is one of the keys to stability and peace in the world.

Let me return to 1 or 2 of these points. In recent decades, export markets, by and large, have not been important to the American economy. They absorb only a small amount of our national product, and account for only a fraction of our national income. But this picture is changing.

Since 1940, there has been an enormous growth of physical plant in the United States. The physical volume of industrial production has nearly doubled, and the basic trend is still running upward.

America's capacity to save, to invest, and to produce is so great that in many industries we have already reached the point where capacity is more than enough to meet the demands of our own market. That capacity, if it is to be used, will have to be used for customers abroad. I am sure that you are keenly aware of this problem here in New England, where 1 job out of every 9, I am told, already depends on exports.

Developed countries, as you surely appreciate, are better markets than backward ones. Let's take an undeveloped country like Ethiopia. Here is a country rich in natural resources. It has just about the same population as New England, and about five times the territory. But on a percapita basis, its purchases of American goods amount only to about 50 cents a year.

Contrast this with Belgium and Luxembourg. These two countries also have about the same population as New England, crowded into one-sixth as much land. But they are highly developed countries, and they import American products at a rate of nearly $30 per capita per year.

In terms of export prospects, it surely is obvious that the United States would be better off in a world in which there were more $30 countries than there are today.

There is a second aspect of our relations with the underdeveloped countries that is of increasing importance to us. Over half the things we import come from those countries. They include such indispensable items as tin, copper, lead, maganese, bauxite, cobalt, and zinc. Although we are the world's greatest industrial producer, we mine within our own borders only about one-third of the number of basic materials we need. And as our industrial production mounts, our factories will grow more and more hungry for some of the things they must have from abroad to keep going.

So, whether we like it or not, we must take an increasing interest in the development of raw materials production abroad. Here again, I know that a keen awareness of this problem must exist in New England, where a substantial part of your requirements for fuel, and for raw materials needed by such industries as your metals industry here in Connecticut, must come from abroad.

But, if Americans are seriously interested in increasing trade and in making the most use of productive capacity, they must actively help to increase production abroad. Most of your production in Connecticut is for a high-income market. You are not going to sell your metal products, your machine tools, and your other finished goods more extensively in the underdeveloped areas unless the people of thes areas have the money to buy them. And they are not going to have the money to buy them without more production, more earnings, and more savings of their own.

An important avenue—and potentially a wide one—to increasing world commerce is to put more investment into productive facilities overseas. This kind of investment, of course, is the World Bank's principal business. The bank has now been in operation for nearly 10 years, and has invested about $2½ billion in public and private projects in 40 different countries. Our first loans were made in advance of the Marshall plan to help maintain a flow of imports from the United States that were essential to reconstruction in Western Europe.

Although we have continued to lend in Europe, most of our operations since 1947 have been carried out in underdeveloped countries. These countries are not poor because they lack natural resources; they are poor because they have not yet done enough to develop the resources they have. To give you two extreme examples: Despite a hydroelectric power potential of some millions of kilowatts, west Pakistan today has less than 50,000 kilowatts of electric generating capacity based on water power. Honduras, a farm country which is one of the largest in Central America, has only 20 miles of paved road.

The fundamental task which the loans of the bank are helping to carry out is to construct or enlarge the basic facilities essential to modern economies. Since reconstruction, we have lent $660 million for the expansion of electric power services. We have lent another $600 million for transportation facilities—to buy equipment for the construction or operation of motor roads, railroads, ports and inland waterways.

We have lent a quarter of a billion dollars for industry, and a little less than that for the improvement or expansion of agriculture through land reclamation, irrigation and farm mechanization. Finally, we have lent about $140 million for programs of development embracing projects in several or all of these basic fields.

Connecticut products, I may say, have been sent all over the world to play their part in projects financed by the bank. Our borrowers have needed them, for instance, for electric power installations in Chile, Finland, India and Mexico; for farm development in Paraguay and Pakistan; for railway improvements in Brazil and Columbia; and for air transport in Australia.

A few minutes ago, I referred to the Bank's "business," and I used that term advisedly. We do not pay our bills from your taxes; we support our activities out of our own earnings. Our loans are being repaid on schedule—indeed, we have received more than $110 million of repayments ahead of time. Our net income is running at a rate of nearly $30 million a year, and our reserves out of earnings and commissions amount to more than $200 million.

So far from competing with private capital, the Bank has worked actively—and successfully—to encourage the participation of private capital in international investment. While we began our lending operations 9 years ago out of payments which our member governments made for shares of our stock, our most important source of new capital has been private funds.

We have tapped that source most often by the sale of our bonds, of which $650 million worth are now outstanding. We have also sold some $225 million worth of our loans to other investors, who either buy them out of our portfolio or participate in the loans when they are made.

Up to now, I have spoken in terms of dollars, but only as a convenient way of describing sums that include other money as well. The Bank is an international organization, and its sources of finance are by no means confined to the United States. We have lent 18 different currencies in all; and in recent years, half of our new loan funds—from foreign government subscriptions to our capital, from our sales of bonds to foreign investors, and from earnings—have come from outside the United States.

The fact that the Bank is an international organization is of advantage to the governments of developed countries, including the United States, because it enables them to share out development costs with private investors and with each other.

The Bank's international character also gives rise to another advantage of greatest importance—and that is the opportunity to work effectively and closely with borrowers and borrowing countries in ways, that for the most part, are not equally open to individual governments in their dealings with other nations. Precisely because we are international, we cannot in truth be charged by our borrowers with operating from selfish motives of profit or economic exploitation, nor can we be charged with discriminating between different countries for reasons of politics, strategy or diplomacy.

We can, and do, apply business-like standards to our lendfng. The Bank lends, in the normal course, for specific projects. We do not finance the whole cost of those projects; the borrower himself must make a substantial investment, and is usually required to find all those funds needed for local expenditures on labor and materials. We estimate that our $2.5 billion of lending is being matched by well over $3 billion of other investment.

We pick and test our projects with a great deal of care. I am not going to describe the process in any detail; I would rather tell you what the loans are helping to do.

In Iraq a couple of weeks ago, young King Faisal dedicated the Wadi Tharthar project for turning the floods of the Tigris River away from the city of Baghdad and the surrounding farm area. In 1950, we had lent the Iraq Government $12.8 million for the equipment and engineering services that were needed to construct the scheme. The project will save Iraq some $4 million a year that the government and individuals have spent, on the average, for levee construction and disaster relief; and it will prevent damage which as recently as 1954 amounted to an estimated $80 million from a single flood. And the Bank has its money back already; after the project had been well advanced, government oil revenues had increased so much that half the loan was canceled and the other half was repaid in advance.

Or take the case of Gwelo. This is a town sitting on a mile-high prairie in the center of Southern Rhodesia, and it is a symbol of what the Bank is helping to accomplish in a young and growing country. The town is at the center of the Southern Rhodesian railway system, to which new equipment is being added with the help of Bank financing; and it is near the start of an entirely new rail line, built under a Bank loan, that connects to a new seaport on the Indian Ocean. More than that, Gwelo is close to a new power plant of some 120,000 kilowatts generating capacity—one of several plants that has been built with Bank help.

The town is a bustling place of some 30,000 people. It is the headquarters of engineering and construction companies; is fatctories make chemicals, shoes, leather goods, razor blades, steel castings, concrete and many other products. All this is happening where only a few years ago there was a settlement of only a few hundred people—and Gwelo may be said, almost literally, to be the creation of electric power and transportation.

When the Bank lends for electric power development, it usually lends for sizeable projects. But in Mexico, we have lent for over 50 power installations, many of them quite small, and some of the most vivid examples of what electricity can do for progress are to be found among these small projects.

One of these installations was a generating plant of some 2,700 kilowatts capacity in the town of Ciudad del Carmen, a shrimp-fishing port on the Gulf of Mexico. This was Carmen's first dependable, 24-hour-a-day electric supply, and presented the first opportunity to make enough ice to fully protect the shrimp catch from spoiling. Nine deep freezing and ice manufacturing plants have now gone up in Carmen. A large shrimp canning factory has been built and is operating at a profit. Seven small yards have come into operation to build more fishing boats. Two years ago, only an occasional tramp steamer called at Carmen to pick up shrimp—today, modern refrigerator ships provide regular service from Carmen to Texas ports. Furniture plants and other small industries have begun to spring up. This town, which 3 years ago was almost literally in danger of drying up and blowing away, is now a busy and growing community. That is what a little electric power and a lot of private initiative have been able to do in Carmen.

An event smaller project, in this Mexican group, was the installation of some 600 kilowatts of generating capacity in the town of Tecuala, on Mexico's west coast. The plant began operating in 1951. At the same time, a paved road arrived to give Tecuala a better

connection with the surrounding farm country. The sequel to these two events was little short of explosive.

In the next 3 years, the population of the town grew from 5,000 to 13,000. The number of children in school increased sevenfold; and for the first time the adults of Tecuala, many of them illiterate, were able to have a night school. There is power now for the hospital and its first fluoroscope. The new electricity is powering two movie theaters, the town's first radio station, and the presses of its first newspaper. The number of small factories and processing plants has grown from 3 to more than 30. Among other things, Tecuala now makes ice, cornmeal, shoes, and furniture. The community is making more, earning more, and is much better able to satisfy its hunger for products from the outside world. To cite only one instance, there are today more than a dozen stores selling electrical appliances, as compared to none 5 years ago; and Tecuala is now a market for electric fans, electric irons, radios, and refrigerators. The mayor of the town sums up the whole story well when he says, "We have come out of the dark ages into the light."

Now let me switch from these small projects to a very big one—the biggest ever to be considered in the bank, and the biggest of its kind, in fact, ever to be planned anywhere. I am referring to the High Dam which the Egyptians intend to build at Aswan, near the first cataract of the Nile. The dam would be nearly 400 feet high, 3 miles thick and 5 miles wide, and would be 17 times greater in volume than the great Pyramid of Cheops. The dam would store enough water to inundate the entire State of Rhode Island, in a snake-like reservoir long enough to stretch from here to Richmond, Va.

As some of you are aware, the project actually consists of three elements. One is the construction of the high dam itself. Another is the use of water stored by the dam to extend perennial irrigation to some 2 million acres of land, or about a third more than are perennially irrigated at present, and including 1.3 million acres not now irrigated at all. The third element is the installation of a large hydroelectric powerplant, along with the necessary distribution facilities, which will more than double the present supply of electricity and help the continuing growth of industry in Egypt.

The Bank was informed late in 1952 that the Egyptians intended, if possible, to carry out this project. I myself discussed it with the Egyptian authorities on a visit I made to Cairo as part of a general trip to the Middle East early in 1953. The bank has been in close touch with the planning and preparation of the project since that time, and our own experts spent 5 months in Egypt in 1954 and 1955, making a detailed study.

We believe—as do private experts of international repute—that the project is entirely feasible. Further, we estimate that when the project is in full operation—which will not be for another 15 years or more—the value of new agricultural and industrial production and of other benefits will within a short span of years be more than equal to the investment required for the project.

But in the meantime, the problem of financing is a large one. We began close discussions of this with the Egyptian Finance Minister in the bank during November; and at the invitation of Colonel Nasser, the Prime Minister of Egypt, I went to Cairo earlier this year to discuss it further.

The estimated cost of the project and ancillary works is $1,350,000,000, of which some $400 million represents private investment. Our discussions centered on the balance—$950 million—which will take the form of Government expenditures. In line with the bank's usual practice, the Egyptian Government will take the responsibility for $550 million needed in Egyptian currency for local labor, services, and materials. That leaves $400 million needed in other currencies for equipment and services that will have to come from abroad.

I felt that of this amount the bank could lend half, or $200 million, but that it would be necessary for the Egyptian Government to find elsewhere the remainder of the foreign exchange needed. Before I went to Cairo, the American and British Governments had offered grant funds of $70 million—enough, it is estimated, to cover the foreign-exchange costs of diverting the Nile from its bed and completing the foundation of the dam. The two Governments also indicated that they would be prepared at a later date, in the light of the then existing circumstances, to give sympathetic consideration to financing the later stages of the project, as a supplement to bank lending.

The position of the two Governments, however, was contingent on lending by the bank. At the invitation of Colonel Nasser, I therefore went to Egypt to discuss with the Prime Minister himself the circumstances under which the bank would be willing to participate in the financing of the project. Most important, it was necessary to know whether the Egyptian Government was determined not only to give the necessary financial support to the project, but also to budget other public investment prudently and with foresight, so as to avoid bringing the project—and, indeed, the economy of Egypt itself—into jeopardy. During my visit to Cairo, the Prime Minister and I reached an understanding which was satisfactory to me.

The World Bank is not interested in projects only. It is even more interested in whether the underdeveloped countries are themselves making the most of their own opportunities. The effects of even the best project may be lost in an economy that is going adrift; and the whole process of development requires intelligent use of a country's resources as a whole. It calls for the wise budgeting and direction of public investment toward realistic goals, and it requires public economic and fiscal policies that will support private initiative and private investment.

The bank hammers very hard at this matter of encouraging private enterprise and private investment within the underdeveloped countries themselves. We have worked for proper Government policies, and we have declined to support Government ventures in fields of industry which should be competitive and for which, under the right circumstances, private capital could be found.

We discuss these considerations with prospective borrowers before we lend; we offer advice on these matters when we feel that it is useful to do so; and not infrequently our decision to lend or not to lend depends upon the outcome of these discussions. In more than one case, we have decided that our most effective contribution to development can be made by shelving loans until the prospective borrower has begun to straighten out his own affairs; and to do what lies within his power to do with resources already at his disposal.

In other words, the bank has not tried to be popular. We have tried to be effective and to win respect. And it is generally recognized, I think, that in these things, we have succeeded.

The bank, as I said, is an international institution. But I believe that it is serving your interests and the interests of the United States. It is helping to create production and earnings in the underdeveloped world, and it is helping to create paying customers abroad for communities like yours.

In Washington, Congress is now considering the administration's proposals for the continuation of economic aid to countries abroad. Without commenting specifically on those proposals, I want, from the vantage point of our exeperience in the bank, to offer some remarks about reasons that are put forward both for and against economic aid. Some of them, I think, confuse rather than clarify the issue. We hear it said, for example, that such massive amounts of aid are needed that to satisfy them would work serious damage on the American economy. I just do not believe that. It assumes that everything can be, and must be, done at once. But the fact is that the rate at which the underdeveloped countries can absorb new capital is limited; and that the number of useful projects on which public funds can be properly and effectively spent is far from infinite. The danger, in my opinion, is not that we shall try to do too much, but rather that we will find it possible to do too little.

On the other side, the most popular argument in favor of foreign aid is that it can win friends for the United States and the democracies of the West. This, too, seems doubtful to me. This kind of thinking in the past has already kept aid from being as effective as it might have been, because it has emphasized the act of giving—or in some cases, of lending—at the expense of careful attention to the study and selection of projects for economic merit.

On the recipient side, too, the friendship theory has not infrequently had unfortunate results which were quite the opposite of those intended. It has encouraged a supplicant attitude on the part of some underdeveloped countries, and has made it quite logical for them to feel resentment when one of them does not receive as much aid as some other. And in a few cases, the notion that American aid was intended to buy their favor has caused underdeveloped countries to decline that aid altogether.

To believe that economic aid can win friends is to take altogether too simple a view of international relations; and I think we must always remember the warnings of experienced diplomats that friendships cannot exist between nations in the same sense as it exists between one person and another. Indeed, if aid could win us friends in the sense that some people believe, the United States, after the expenditure of scores of billions of dollars since the war, already would be far and away the most befriended nation on earth.

What can exist between nations is mutual interest, based on geography, history and hany other factors—a complex in which aid can only be one part. I think that the United States, both acting on its own part and making the fullest possible use of international organizations like the Bank, can wisely and realistically support aid for economic development, and I think so because the United States itself will benefit from the growth in world production, markets and trade that economic development can help bring about. The right kind of program can mitigate the problem of scarcity overseas, and it can at the same time build markets for industrial nations like the United States and industrial communities like Connecticut. I think one important conclusion that follows from this is that the United States should give support to economic aid continuously, and not according to the rising or falling barometer of pressures in world politics.

There is, to my mind, just one other compelling reason to support economic development. It is that the course of development will become a more and more important factor in determining the kind of world we ourselves live in. The political and economic revolution that we ourselves helped begin in the 18th century is now beginning to march through many parts of the underdeveloped world. Wherever the revolution marches, we see political, economic and social institutions in the process of change.

The form in which these institutions begin to crystallize is of the utmost importance to us. In a better economic environ-

ment, there is a better chance for men to appreciate those values of freedom and democracy which mean so much in the West and so little in Moscow. If aid to economic development can help men prize and assert their independence, then it is something greatly worth doing. And if along with our aid we can demonstrate the validity of our own principles of freedom of individuals and of enterprise, then I think we are making some progress toward shaping the kind of world which we ourselves want. I think this is worth doing—not reluctantly and hesitantly, but on a scale and with a constancy of purpose equal to the importance of the task.

Address by the Prime Minister of Ireland Before the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, recently we were favored by an official visit by the distinguished Prime Minister of Ireland, the Honorable J. A. Costello. After a most impressive appearance before the United States Senate, the Prime Minister delivered a stirring address at the annual banquet of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, in Philadelphia. The speech is replete with factual data concerning the relationship between our citizens and the Irish people over past decades. His is an extraordinarily good presentation; and, because of its great merit, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is not as a mere formality or by way of introductory platitude that I say, at the outset of my remarks, how deeply gratified I am to be the guest, on this Saint Patrick's night, of the Society of the Friendly Sons of Saint Patrick of the City of Philadelphia.

On Saint Patrick's Day in particular it is natural that the Irish and the descendants of the Irish who glory in their ancient lineage, while giving testimony of the faith which Saint Patrick brought them, take pride and strength in the realization of the facts that no nation, other than the Irish nation, has borne so many children who were destined to contribute to the development and greatness of other nations and that no nation, other than the Irish nation, has for so long retained the affection of its exiles.

The land of the free (United States), which has since become the greatest Nation on the earth, gave bountifully to our exiles. Were it not for the welcome generosity of that great Nation who gave to our exiled ancestors that empty space of land that they sought, and shelter and freedom to labor, the Irish nation would be poor indeed and we would not be here tonight. But we are here, grateful in the recollection of what was done for them and deeply gratified by the knowledge that they have repaid the debt for the succor and the sustenance given to them in the contribution that they gave to the development of the material and spiritual resources of that great Nation and in defense of its unity and strength.

It is small wonder, therefore, that our people have found nowhere a home more closely linked in sympathy with their country of origin than here in the United States of America. It is hardly necessary for me to speak of the feelings of warm friendship and affection which we in Ireland have always entertained toward the American people. We are proud to remember that men and women of our race have contributed in a not insignificant measure to the founding and to the building of this mighty Nation. We are happy to recall the never-failing support which we received from this Nation, since its birth, throughout the course of our own long, and sometimes all but despairing, struggle for independence.

We of today can scarcely imagine what the blessed words of toleration must have meant to people who had experienced a very different attitude from the rulers of their native land. These sentiments were shared by your own Charles Carroll of Carrollton, the only Catholic who signed the Declaration of Independence, the last of the signers who stated that "when I signed the Declaration of Independence I had in view not only our independence from England but the toleration of all sects professing the Christian religion and communicating to them all equal rights." Your own Society of Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Philadelphia has in its membership and its activities given proof of your fidelity to those high principles.

The religious toleration which was granted to those early Irish emigrants is in the closest harmony with the traditions and practice of the Irish people themselves. In the 26 counties that now form the area of jurisdiction of the sovereign, independent, democratic Sttae of Ireland, no man need fear disability or discrimination on the ground of his religious belief. The fundamental law under which we are governed, the constitution of Ireland, contains explicit guaranties of freedom of conscience and of the free profession and practice of religion and prohibits the state from imposing any disabilities or making any discrimination on the ground of religious profession, belief, or status. When the ardently awaited reunion of the 32 counties of Ireland is secured, those guaranties will remain as an ample safeguard of religious freedom for all our people.

The men of Irish birth and descent who found here the freedom and security denied in the Ireland of those days made, in return, no small contribution to the development of this great city and of the Nation of which it became the birthplace and the first capital. They were active and successful in the commercial and political life of Philadelphia, and when the time came, they played a worthy part in the struggle which resulted in the creation of the United States of America. When, after small, informal beginnings, the Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick was founded in 1771, nearly all of the 24 original regular members were prosperous merchants whose names were well and favorably known in Philadelphia. From that early time members of your society have been significantly associated with the story of your country. Indeed, the history of your society is closely woven into the fabric of the greatness and glory of America. They stood sponsors at the birth of the Republic; they financed the War of Independence; they sat among the Founding Fathers; they marched with Washington from Philadelphia down to victory at Yorktown. They signed the Declaration of Independence. They were the first to proclaim the sacred documents of the new predestined Nation.

Turning from the Ireland of the past I would like to say a few brief words on the Ireland of the present and the future.

The Ireland of 1956 is a country that has left behind the growing pains of a young state. She has settled down to putting her house in order and has gradually but steadily improved the conditions of her people. She is no longer the land of the leprachaun, the shillelagh of the jaunting car. She has to face the difficulties of building up and managing the affairs of a young state beset by the problems of the atomic age. Even so, and even in the short period of her existence as a modern independent state, considerable progress has been made in the social, economic, political, cultural, and educational sectors of our national life.

The returned emigrant would note a significant change in the composition of the working population; the numbers engaged in agriculture have fallen substantially and the numbers engaged in industry have more than doubled. He would see the rapid strides made in industrialization, would note the many new factories which have been built since the 1920's and would observe how output has increased in a host of varied industries. Special mention must be made of the vast expansion in the electricity industry. The vision and daring of the men who conceived the Shannon scheme in the 1920's is coming to its fruition. The electrification of the whole countryside is well on its way and soon it is hoped that every farmhouse whether in Connemara, in Wexford, Donegal, or Kerry will feel the benefit. The scheme has already reached Connemara and you could now hear a seanchai speaking the native language and telling his tales in a house lit by an Irish electric lamp.

The face of the Irish countryside is being transformed. A variety of schemes are improving agricultural productivity and making rural life more attractive. Our returned emigrant would see the benefits which have been derived from such projects as rural electrification, land reclamation, the elimination of bovine tuberculosis, the farm buildings scheme, the widespread use of improved veterinary practices, the extension of agricultural advisory services and a host of other schemes. He would be struck by the evident prosperity of the countryside—a prosperity which, unlike the bad old days, has not enriched the pockets of the landlord. Irish farmers are now owners, not tenants, of the land they till.

Progress has been made in arterial drainage and utilizing the bogs, in planting trees on the hillsides, in founding both a mercantile fleet and an Irish airline. In the social field also, the progress has been equally remarkable. A vast program of housebuilding has gone far to eliminate the city slum and the rural hovel. We have built many new hospitals and have extended and renovated others. An energetic school-building and reconstruction policy has gone far to overcome the many years of neglect prior to the foundation of the state. Social welfare legislation has been recast and widely extended and general and specialist medical services are now available to a wide section of the community.

Beverage Alcohol and Its Attendant Evils—Award to Benny T. Rosell in Oratorical Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed

in the Appendix of the RECORD the prize-winning address delivered by Benny T. Rosell, of Phillips University, Enid, Okla., on the subject Beverage Alcohol and Its Attendant Evils. Mr. Rosell was awarded the second place in the contest sponsored by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEVERAGE ALCOHOL AND ITS ATTENDANT EVILS

(By Benny T. Rosell)

For many years the Star-Spangled Banner has gloriously flown over the lands and seas of my country—the Philippine Islands. Since my childhod, I have honored your flag; I have loved the great people, the vast continent, the noble ideals which the Stars and Stripes represent. Having this privilege to visit your country, I find that the sweetest flower that blooms in my heart is gratitude.

Like America, and because of American influence, the Philippines today is a democratic country. We know that the well being of a democratic society necessitates a well-informed citizenry. A government of the people, by the people, and for the people remains effective only when the people are imbued with a patriotic zeal to tackle the problems that threaten it. Public indifference is the cancer of democracy. But when conscientious citizens are well aware of the social problems and are ready to join hands to solve them—then, and only then, can democracy remain effective.

We are assembled here to sound the alarm against America's public enemy No. 1—named alcohol. It is a wanton killer at large. But many are misinformed and misled about alcohol and its attendant evils. Liquor has been effered to the American public in the guise of an angel. Liquor has been advertised in glowing colors with picturesque backgrounds. Every day, American homes are bombarded by the misleading claims of alcohol.

We find such claims as these: "It belongs there," "America pays highest tribute to its quality," "It is known by the company it keeps." My friends, those statements are true—but very misleading.

Surely, alcohol belongs there—in drunken brawls, in joints of immorality, in broken homes—but not in peaceful American homes, not in wholesome fellowship. Certainly, America pays highest tribute to its quality—67 million Americans drink; of them 7 million are heavy drinkers, addictive drinkers, and chronic alcoholics. Americans spend $10 billion annually for beverage alcohol. Consider the billions of dollars spent for liquor-bred crimes, the tremendous loss in American industries, the thousands of lives lost because of alcohol. What a tribute to its quality. Certainly, alcohol is known by the company it keeps. Having visited the skidrows of many cities, I know full well the company alcohol keeps. They are haggard, emaciated bodies in rags and dirt; they are deteriorated minds, weaklings, immoral persons, criminals.

The neat, handsome-looking man with a glass of liquor in his hand, we commonly see in liquor ads, is the picture of a man before drinking. The after-picture—the finished product of alcohol—is quite different. We see a staggering brute, an untidy, vomiting fool. If he drives his car after drinking, we may read about a drunken driver not resting in peace but resting in pieces. That, my friends, is the company alcohol keeps.

There are certain established facts about alcohol. Scientific facts reveal that alcohol is neither a food nor a stimulant, but a depressant narcotic drug. It is a poison. As such, alcohol produces toxic damage to the central nervous system; so much so, that lifesaving body reflexes are slowed down from 5 to 10 percent even by amounts of alcohol too small to be socially appreciable. Thus, alcohol reduces the efficiency of human activity; and never at any age does a human being improve his health as a result of the use of alcohol. Truly, "Wine is a mocker; strong drink is raging, and whosoever is deceived thereby is not wise."

Dr. Kelly, of Johns Hopkins University, said, "Alcohol is a habit-forming drug. Its high potency as a dangerous drug is a million times more hurtful than any conceivable accruing advantage. It has no place in medical practice."

When alcohol is imbibed, it is readily absorbed into the bloodstream, without being changed. Then it quickly acts on the brain; then it numbs the senses.

Because of its anesthetic effect, alcohol makes the drinker feel less—less stupid, so he thinks he is a gentleman of distinction—less tired, so he thinks he is refreshed—less troubled, so he thinks his problems are solved—less cautious, so he foolishly plunges himself into danger, killing himself and others—less obligated, so he neglects his responsibilities.

Friends, that is the nature of alcohol. That is the stuff that is highly advertised today. Why, even children sing the soothing advertisement melodies of liquor. Could it be that liquor advertisers have finally succeeded in making our homes the spawning bed for future criminals and alcoholics? "When lies are told often enough and loud enough, people will believe them." So, the liquor industry spends $250 million annually to advertise their product—to deceive the American people—to make it respectable and smart to drink. And you know, the ads of that worst poison killer today are allowed to circulate freely. It is a legalized killer.

Why is alcohol public enemy No. 1? The facts will show us. First, alcoholism is a serious disease. Only heart disease, cancer, and tuberculosis rank higher than alcoholism as great killers today. Alcoholism, however, is self-induced, caused by utter folly.

Second, alcohol is a major cause in traffic casualties. The best scientific evidence available shows that 40 percent of traffic deaths and injuries, a total of 800,000 in 1951, is due to drinking before or while driving.

Third, alcohol causes numerous moral problems and crimes. Homes have been deprived of the necessities and privileges of life because of the alcohol habit. Because alcohol releases inhibitions, it is a great factor in divorce, broken homes, prostitution, illicit sexual relations, rape, vandalism, murders, juvenile delinquency.

Fourth, alcohol expenditure is a tremendous waste of the Nation's resources. Ten billion dollars is spent annually by the American people for liquor. That means that the American public spend billions more for alcohol than for education and religion. Dr. Andrew C. Ivy declared: "There is something wrong with the quality of the sense of values of a population which spends more to put the brain to sleep than it does to awaken it and to create noble aspirations." In 1952 about $800 million was the cost of traffic accidents which involved liquor. About $3 billion is the expenditure for liquor-bred crimes every year. Dr. Pollock, the director of mental hygiene statistics for the State of New York, estimated that "the annual loss of productive human capacity due to drunkenness, alcoholism, and alcoholic mental disease in the United States is more than $5 billion." To add to that wanton waste who can estimate for me the cost of human lives lost because of alcohol? Friends, what the Government gets in liquor revenue, which is blood money, is unjustifiably small compared to that tremendous waste. Alcohol is, indeed, public enemy No. 1.

Now, we know the facts about alcohol—its effects, its attendant evils. When you realize that the Nation's Capital is one of the wettest spots in the Union you have great reason to be alarmed. Your country possesses tremendous power that could destroy the world—power under the disposal of men whom the people trust to represent them in high places.

During this critical age of history, this country, which is a leader of nations, needs a clear-thinking citizenry and sober leaders. Clear thinking and alcohol do not go together. When our leaders make plans and decisions under the dulling and befogging influence of alcohol, alcohol has struck a deadly blow at the very heart of American security.

Is it nothing to you that America is debased and plagued by the effects of alcohol? Is it nothing to you that in the drunken state of this Nation, peoples of the world will cry, "Lord, help my country to be unlike America?" Is it nothing to you that you are always in danger from those who drink? Is it nothing to you that society pays a tremendous price because of the evil effects of alcohol? Is it nothing to you that precious lives are lost every day because of alcohol? You cannot deny your personal involvement in this problem, even if you are a total abstainer. Liquor will not let you alone. So, face it; fight it.

But are hearts so calloused that they are not touched by the miseries caused by alcohol? Are attitudes so indifferent that they shirk from their responsibilities to themselves, to fellow men, and to God?

I believe that still ingrained in the hearts of the American people is that rugged pioneering spirit to fight for the right. I trust your valor to combat that enemy. You can do it through three lines of action.

First, practice and promote total abstinence. That is the safest way to escape the disasters of alcoholic indulgence. One who has courage enough to say "No, thank you" to the first drink will never be in danger from alcohol. The first drink is the beginning of the journey down a long, expensive, and dangerous road of alcoholic indulgence. With this habit-forming drug, moderation is hard to define and very difficult to practice. Different people vary in their susceptibility to this narcotic drug, but we know that 1 out of 9 becomes a heavy drinker. "First a man takes a drink; then the drink takes a drink; then the drink takes the man." Moderation is just the beginning—not the end—of alcoholism.

The moderate drinkers are the main factor in crimes and traffic fatalities. The moderate drinkers keep the brewers in good business. The moderate drinkers, not the alcoholics, are the tempters of drinkers-to-be. The wretched alcoholics are specimens that make liquor ads so ridiculous and sarcastic. Remember that, in any amount, alcohol has similar effects. So, practice and promote total abstinence.

Second, educate and motivate. Help expose the truth about alcohol. Most people do not know the facts. They are misled and misinformed. Support the organizations that are educating the citizenry about alcohol—stirring public opinion against it. The profit this effort promises is human welfare and happiness.

Education concerning alcohol and its attendant evils has a right place in our schools and in our homes. Since the problem affects morality, spirituality, and the welfare of society—since it corrupts the high ideals of religion, alcoholic indulgence must be vigorously fought from the pulpit of churches—from the very altars of God. We must educate and motivate.

Third, legislate. When public opinion rises to combat this social menace, laws suppressing it will be easier to enact and enforce. When conscientious citizens join hands and rally behind political leaders who are fighting against alcohol, then we shall be on the road to victroy. Experience since repeal of the eighteenth amendment shows that legalizing alcohol has only made its destructiveness much worse. Repeal was expected to solve bootlegging; but now bootleggers have

increased. But listen friends, it is not the bootlegger who turns cars upside down—kills people—and destroys the morality of society; it is the stuff he makes. Let us keep our eyes on the ball. Legalizing that stuff only brings it out from the dark caves to the open joints of the side streets—to be sold in abundance. Legalizing a menace to social welfare and legalizing the free circulation of its misleading claims is stooping down too low. Stop liquor adds on radio, television, movie, newspapers and magazines—and in the silence that would follow, let man listen to the dictates of his conscience. Down deep in the heart of man, I believe, he knows the fallacies of the claims of alcohol.

Thank God, you are living in a democratic society. The power of your Government emanates from you. Exercise your power. Use your precious vote wisely. Prohibition was repealed because of the apparent indifference of the citizens who thought their battle was over.

The fate of your posterity and the destiny of your country depend upon you. The battle against this enemy may not be won overnight, but oh the sweetness of victory dearly bought; only cowards glory in bloodless strife. As long as conscientious citizens continue to fight for the right, to root out the causes of many crimes, to produce and preserve a sober and clear-thinking citizenry, your land will long be a glorious home of the free and the land of the brave.

The Medical Library Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the April 13, 1956, issue of the New York, N. Y., Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEDICAL LIBRARY BILL

A bill now before the Senate would put the excellent medical library of the Armed Forces on a worthy footing. Called in a Hoover Commission report "the largest and most important medical library in the world," it is now housed in quite inadequate quarters in Washington. Its invaluable collections are in danger of ruin from crowding, fire, and rain; thousands of its volumes, for want of space, are stored elsewhere than in Washington; its services to the public have been seriously impaired.

The bill, introduced by Senators LISTER HILL and JOHN F. KENNEDY, would repair these faults by creating a National Library of Medicine, where the collections could be properly housed and cared for. As an independent agency, the library would be separate from the Department of Defense, which has other pressing matters on its hands.

At present the armed services' library has more than 650,000 bound volumes and adds over 25,000 a year. Its interlibrary loan service makes 133,000 volumes available to medical research workers annually. Now over 130 years old and with a record of serving civilian agencies and health workers since 1892, it has every right to be regarded as an invaluable national institution. The Senate should approve the Hill-Kennedy bill to create a National Library of Medicine.

The Administration's Farm Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter concerning the administration's farm policy, written by Mr. Carl J. Newhouse, of Alexandria, Minn., which was published in the Park Region Echo, Alexandria, Minn., for April 26, 1956.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN OUR MAILBAG

DEAR EDITOR: Ike's veto of the United States Senate-House compromise new guaranteed parity-price farm bill will go down in history as Black Monday for the farmers of our Nation and for the small-business man on Main Street depending on the farmers take-home pay and buying power. It shows definitely Ike's utter disrespect for the welfare of our family-sized farmers, in view of the glaring evidence in various States of the crisis on the farms. A radio commentator recently announced there were more bankruptcies filed by farmers and small-business men in the State of Ohio during 1955 than there ever has been before in history.

Besides Ike's totally ignoring the actual facts in the grassroot investigations last summer by the Senate Agricultural Committee, consisting of both Republicans and Democratic Senators, whose findings and report overwhelmingly showed the distress in general, the family-sized farmers are experiencing under the Republican sliding scale farm-price program, is a shame to our high office of Presidency.

Ike went back on his golden promise to agriculture on 90 percent, or even full parity in 1952. Thus, by what principle (when he lied then to gain votes) can we be assured of his and the Republican Party's 1956 campaign promises of being fulfilled? Ike's attitude of keeping the farmers on the sliding-scale price program, and from giving them a fair chance of sharing in on the Nation's prosperity now enjoyed by special-privileged monopolies and big interests in the upper-income brackets—is a sad episode by a President, supposed to be for all the people in our Nation.

One farmer expressed in a humorous way, in spite of his resentful feeling, that "Ike must be in love with Ezra." "They should get married and have the president of the Farm Bureau as their best man, and all other Farm Bureau leaders as sponsors of this big wedding affair."

Ike's weak alibi in his radio-TV veto message, proves what I, together with others observing the three presidential candidates' TV appearances the night before the primaries recently, that Ike is definitely not the same Ike now as he was in 1952. He has gotten to be bitter in his attitude and expressions. Not once during his whole pre-primary speech in that TV appearance did he crack a smile, even when interrupted and cheered by his audience. In 1952 and at other public occasions, his amiable expressions and attitude was always apparent—which now has vanished to a resentful attitude and bitterness.

It is quite understandable why this bitter, arrogant attiude has taken place the past 3 years. For 35 to 40 years of his life Ike was devoted to military life and his several years as military officer, and especially as a high-ranking general, he never was or could be criticized by his subrodinates. His opinion and orders were law. Now, as an honored, high-ranking public official as President, he has not been able to take constructive criticisms, and is plainly irritated when he and his Cabinet appointed members are being checked on and criticized. The big $64,000 question now is, Should a public official with such an assumed bitter attitude be continued as our President? I think it would be for the best of Ike's personal health and future peaceful living (and for the best of our country in general) that he be retired from the excessive strain and responsibilities as a President, who should and must assume himself instead of leaving a large share of his Presidential duties to subordinates, even while he so often goes golfing.

I do not mean but that a President needs to relax at times, but when like golfing gets to be a hobby, it becomes quite a different thing in respect to his official constitutional duties as President. The general comments by people of both party affiliations since Ike's veto, is "Why couldn't he sign the bill, when it was only for a 1-year trial?" (being it incorporated his favorite soil-bank features) and would have automatically reverted back to his and Benson's favored sliding-scale farm program again. Was it because Ike was afraid it would prove to be the doom of his and the Republican Party's sliding-scale farm price program philosophy?

CARL J. NEWHOUSE.

ALEXANDRIA, MINN.

The Business Recession of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Eisenhower in the White House," written by Robert J. Donovan and published in the New York Herald Tribune for May 3 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. This is a chapter in what seems to be a semiofficial history of the Eisenhower administration and the writer has obviously had access to inside and confidential information inasmuch as he describes what allegedly occurred at Cabinet meetings. His play by play account shows that while spokesmen for the administration were denouncing me as a "prophet of doom and gloom" and as one of the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse for stating at the beginning of 1954, that we were in a recession, the administration nevertheless knew that this was precisely what we were experiencing. Now after 2 years they evidently believe that the truth can now be told. I happen to believe that the truth about such matters should be told at the time, and not 2 years later. This is one further proof, if any more were needed, that I was right at the time and that Mr. Leonard Hall, the chairman of the Republican National Committee, tried to cover up the truth by resorting to personal abuse.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EISENHOWER IN THE WHITE HOUSE—WHITE HOUSE MOVES TO OVERCOME 1953–54 RECESSION; FINDS REAL DANGER IS DEFLATION AND NOT INFLATION

(By Robert J. Donovan)

The Nation's brush with the 1953–54 recession, viewed from a vantage point inside the Eisenhower administration, conjures up comparisons with a sickbed vigil and a medical consultation room.

The Republican administration was just beginning to live down the depression of a quarter of a century before when the patient began to show worrisome symptoms. Nobody in the White House needed to be reminded that a worse domestic calamity could scarcely befall the United States than a great dislocation of business, finance, and farming.

This was true not alone because of the personal hardships and political upheaval it would bring but because economic disaster in America would be a torpedo rammed under the free world's defenses against communism.

So when pallor appeared in the national economy toward the autumn of 1953, the White House meetings swiftly became preoccupied with diagnostic findings and remedial measures for what was recognized as a development of possibly grave import. For months thereafter an anxious temperature-taking went on in Cabinet sessions as the patient got sicker, then held his own, and finally, by July 1954, successfully passed the crisis.

When the administration took office, inflation caused by the economic boom of the Korean war was the bugaboo. First, Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey moved to tighten credit with a so-called hard-money policy. Then the administration discovered that the danger that loomed was deflation rather than inflation.

CASE HISTORY OF THE RECESSION

Here are highlights from the case history of the recession as the administration experts diagnosed and prescribed for the ailing economy:

September 25, 1953, Cabinet meeting: Dr. Arthur F. Burns, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, noted these warning symptoms: 1. A decline in the stock market. 2. An increase in business failures. 3. A dropping off in the volume of orders for durable goods. 4. A decline in residential building. 5. A drop in the average length of the work week. 6. Sagging farm prices. 7. Evidences of excessive inventories.

Burns said the situation was not critical. Strength was reflected in such things as the economy's ability to withstand the recent "hard money" credit squeeze, the favorable distribution of income among the people and the basic soundness of the inventory situation. Legislation was under study, he reported, for helping private business, tax reduction, and Government programs emphasizing loans rather than Government construction itself.

January 13, 1954: Walter Reuther, then president of the CIO, wrote to the President urging him to call a national conference on unemployment, saying that in the Detroit area 107,000 workers had been laid off.

REUTHER CALLS OWN CONFERENCE ON JOBLESS

(Reuther failed to persuade the President, but the labor leader himself called the conference in the spring. Meanwhile, week after week Republican legislators reported to Eisenhower that Congress and the country were worried. A congressional election was only a few months away.)

January 15, 1954, Cabinet meeting: Humphrey said it was his opinion that prosperity depended more upon the confidence of all the people than upon any particular Government measures other than removal of impediments to individual initiative. The President replied that he wished to avoid false expressions of confidence such as were proclamed in 1929, and he wanted to refrain from any suggestian that the Government was unable to act positively to strengthen the economy.

February 5, 1954, Cabinet meeting: The President informed the Cabinet that he had asked Burns to coordinate reports from the various departments and agencies on their plans for public works projects, saying that it was essential to have planning advanced enough to insure that men would be put to work quickly. He set July 1 as a tentative date for the Government to be prepared to act.

UNEMPLOYMENT TAKES TURN FOR THE WORSE

Humphrey said that a broad public-works program would be desirable if operations then in progress should fail to turn the tide. But he felt that these operations might very well succeed.

February 11, 1954, confidential White House briefing: On the basis of facts available, Burns said, the Government was now justified in taking action to strengthen the economy but not to launch a program to fight a real depression.

March 12, 1954, Cabinet meeting: The President was in deadly serious mood. The unemployment situation had worsened. The figure in March was 3,725,000 unemployed, or 5.8 percent of the entire civilian labor force. (The fact that unemployment was then at the crest was not known on this date. Eisenhower complained that plans were ready but when one came to look for recommendations at to when to put the plans into effect, one looked in vain.

Humphrey reminded the President that Senator DOUGLAS had warned that drastic action should not be taken before unemployment reached the level of 6 or 8 percent of the labor force. Eisenhower replied that timely action would forestall the need for drasic action; he insisted at least on preparedness to act at any moment.

BURNS REPORTS FAVORABLE TRENDS

March 19, 1954, Cabinet meeting: Burns reported that some favorable trends were appearing but urged that judgment be suspended for a while. The Council of Economic Advisers was moving ahead rapidly with projects if need should arise for them, he said.

March 26, 1954, Cabinet meeting: The sense of mounting urgency cntinued. Burns offered a list of actions that could be taken—modifying Federal Reserve requirements, liberalizing mortgage requirements, altering tax-depreciation policy, hastening domestic procurement. Eisenhower asked him to prepare an outline of useful legislation.

April 2, 1954, Cabinet meeting: Burns said that continuing economic troubles called for action he had suggested. The President said said they should be done without delay, but not in a way to jolt public confidence. Secretary of Defense Wilson noted an upturn in the automobile industry. Burns said he had discovered that plant expansion and building contracts had surprisingly continued at a very high rate through the whole 9 months of the general decline.

April 9, 1954, Cabinet meeting: Burns reported a sharp and significant division between the industrial situation, which was poor, and the financial situation, which was strong. He said the two trends must be reconciled either in a general decline or in a general advance. He predicted the latter.

April 30, 1954, Cabinet meeting: Burns optimistically noted that contrary to expectations, the economies of foreign countries had remained strong during the sag in American economy.

TRUMAN CALLS FOR PUBLIC WORKS RISE

(On May 11, 1954, the National Full Employment Conference of CIO leaders met in Washington and heard Reuther assail the administration for doing nothing to relieve unemployment. Two days later, Truman told the CIO Amalgamated Clothing Workers that the economy was suffering from "creeping McKinleyism" and proposed a $3 billion increase for public works and welfare).

May 14, 1954, Cabinet meeting: Burns said that even without new legislation, funds were probably available for military purchases, repair, and modernization of Federal buildings, construction of atomic energy installations, small bridges, and forest roads. Eisenhower answered that departments having money available for worthwhile projects should start them now.

May 21, 1954, Cabinet meeting: Burns reported that for the third consecutive month increases in orders and production surpassed decreases; that the economy might be swinging into an upturn.

June 11, 1954, Cabinet meeting: Burns presented definite evidence that recovery was under way but said the possibility remained that it would fizzle out. The President said, "Arthur, you'd have been a fine chief of staff during the war."

July 23, 1954: Burns announced that the midyear economic indicators showed definitely the decline had come to an end. To have passed from the Korean war economy to a peacetime economy without a far more serious drop, he said, was a tremendous accomplishment. With congressional elections approaching, the Cabinet cheerfully turned to a discussion of ways of making all this clear to the public; especially the now favorable comparison between 1954 and 1952, the last year of Democratic rule.

The Medical Library Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the April 1, 1956, issue of the Chicago, Ill., Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MEDICAL TREASURE THREATENED

The people of the United States own what is probably the largest and certainly the finest medical library in the world. Its services to physicians and all of the other health professions are immeasurable.

Yet this magnificent collection is housed today in various unsuitable spots. Part of it is in warehouses in Cleveland, part in an ancient building in Washington that was declared unsuitable for library use 30 years ago. It is accumulating scientific publications at a rate that requires a half mile of new shelf space annually, and its overflow is about to be consigned to some old frame barracks where a carelessly tossed cigaret butt could destroy the accumulation of 120 years, much of it irreplaceable.

This great medical library is neglected because, in the eyes of the Defense Department, 2 or 3 transcontinental bombers are worth more than proper housing for a national medical library. A task force of the Hoover Commission, headed by the late Chauncey McCormick of Chicago, recommended last year that the library be separated from the Defense Department and established as a truly national institution with an appropriate administrative organization, a proper building, and an adequate budget.

Senators HILL, Democrat, of Alabama, and KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, have

introduced a bill to carry out this recommendation. It would establish a national library of medicine under a board of civilian regents appointed by the President. The Surgeons General of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health Service and the Librarian of Congress would be ex officio members. The bill authorizes but does not provide appropriations for operation and housing. A proper library building would cost from five to ten million dollars.

The library is operated by the Defense Department because the Army started it. Joseph Lovell, the first Surgeon General of the Army, began collecting a library for his office before his death in 1836. The real father of the library, however, was Col. John Shaw Billings, one of the great pioneers of American medicine, who was Surgeon General of the Army from 1865 to 1895.

Colonel Billings remained active almost until his death in 1920, and found time to guide the merger of the institutions that formed the New York Public Library. He also planned the campus and hospitals and helped assemble the brilliant faculty of Johns Hopkins Medical School.

Under Colonel Billings the Surgeon General's library not only bought all the books and periodicals it could find funds for, it indexed them, too. Its index is today the most comprehensive in the world. In 1887 it also started a periodical index of medical and allied literature, which has been maintained.

In time the institution became known as the Armed Services Library. For the last 55 years its facilities have been available as well to civilian physicians, dentists, and other professionals. Last year it circulated 133,000 volumes, mostly to research workers, through its interlibrary exchange. Its staff answers a thousand reference questions a month. Many of the answers consist of exhaustive bibliographies in the field in which the inquirer is working.

Chicago, Cleveland, Washington, and the Public Health Center at Bethesda, Md., have all been suggested as sites for the National Library. It has also been suggested that it be placed under the Federal Public Health Service instead of an independent board of regents.

The collections of Crerar Library, the University of Chicago, Northwestern University, and other institutions already give this city vast sources of medical literature. If the library were located here in the communications center of the Nation, the circulation of its books throughout the country would be aided. The important thing at present, however, is to rescue the library from its status of stepchild in the Defense Department and confer on it the independent guidance that will preserve and enhance its usefulness.

Redistribution of Seats in the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and memorandum:

ITHACA N. Y., *April 24, 1956.*

Hon. W. STERLING COLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COLE: Fifty-seven years ago the Director of the Census instructed the Division of Methods and Results, which I then headed, to prepare tables based on the forthcoming figures of population to be used by Congress in redistributing seats in the House of Representatives.

Since then I have worked on the problem at intervals and now ask the help you have given me several times before in getting my results before Congress and the public.

Yours sincerely,

W. F. WILLCOX.

MEMORANDUM ON METHODS OF REDISTRIBUTING SEATS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AFTER A DECENNIAL CENSUS

(By Walter F. Willcox)

Two processes are involved in any redistribution of seats among the States.

1. Assigning (not apportioning) 1 seat to each State as required by the mandate: "Each State shall have at least 1 Representative." Congressional or statutory reapportionment, therefore, must start with a body like the Senate except that it is only half as large.

2. Apportioning whatever number of Representatives Congress decides upon, one after another, in the effort to transform the original body of 48, all of them having equal claims to their seats, into a body "apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers."

These apportioned Representatives, now numbering 387, cannot be apportioned by 1 procedure, as the 48 are and as all used to be before 1910, but one after another in answer to the question, "What State is entitled to the next seat?" That question is answered differently by different methods.

The proper way to judge these different methods is by asking how well the results of each carry out the provisions of the Constitution. The seven States listed below are all that need to be considered. They have the following population:

[In thousands]

State	Seat No.	District population
New York	1	14,830
California	2	10,586
Pennsylvania	3	10,498
Illinois	4	8,712
Ohio	5	7,947
Texas	6	7,711
Michigan	7	6,372

The methods still deserving attention are: (1) The method adopted after 1910, (2) the method adopted after 1940, (3) a novel method.

These 3 agree in giving the first 3 seats to the largest 3 States. The 7 would then stand as below:

[In thousands]

State	Seat No.	District population
Illinois	4	8,712
Ohio	5	7,947
Texas	6	7,711
New York	49	7,415
Michigan	7	6,372
California	50	5,293
Pennsylvania	51	5,249

The present method and the proposed one agree in apportioning the next seat, No. 52, to Illinois, while the 1910 method would give that seat to New York although 3 States then had a larger district population. The 1910 method should be ruled out and the choice limited to one between the present method and the proposed one.

The next question is, to what State should seat No. 53 be apportioned? The situation after 4 seats had been apportioned is shown below:

[In thousands]

State	Seat No.	District population
Ohio	5	7,947
Texas	6	7,711
New York	49	7,415
Michigan	7	6,372
California	50	5,293
Pennsylvania	51	5,249
Illinois	52	4,356

The present method gave the next seat, No. 53, to New York, although Ohio and Texas had larger district populations and had a better claim to the next two seats.

If that is admitted, the present method also should be abandoned and the novel one accepted. It adopts what seems to me a rule, both simple and correct, namely, apportion seat after seat to whatever State then has the largest district population.

Because this method reduces the difference between the largest and the smallest of the 48 district populations at each of the 387 steps it might well be called the method of minimum range. It would result in a House of Representatives wherein the average of the 48 district populations would be as small as possible and wherein also all Representatives would have as nearly the same number of constituents as the mathematical conditions permit. It would have the following advantages:

1. It would get rid of all difficult mathematics growing out of assuming a standard district population for the country and debating what weight should be given to the 48 fractional remainders after the population of each State has been divided by that number, a difficulty over which Congress and executive officers have worried from the time of Jefferson and Washington to the present day.

2. It is based on the two relevant passages of the Constitution.

3. Its results come as near as possible mathematically to equalizing the district populations of the 48 States.

April 26, 1956.

The Medical Library Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the April 10, 1956, issue of the Cambridge, Md., Banner.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

The Senate today is scheduled to begin hearings on a bill to create a new National Library of Medicine. The measure has been introduced by Senators LISTER HILL, of Alabama, and JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts. Rather than bring such a library into existence, it would provide the funds to decently house and maintain an existing collection of books.

This country actually has had such a medical library for more than 125 years. It was known originally as the Surgeon General's Library. Since 1952 it has been the Armed Forces Medical Library. Operated by the Federal Government as a research library, it has more than 650,000 bound vol-

umes which grows by 25,000 more each year. It also receives about 5,000 medical periodicals annually.

In a recent report, the Hoover Commission called this "the largest and most important medical library in the world. * * * No other medical agency of the Federal Government serves the future of medical research so intimately and so widely as does this unequaled collection of books, journals, and bibliographic services."

The library now is housed in a 69-year-old building. Every year it adds another mile of shelf space to carry new acquisitions. More than 130,000 books a year are loaned to research workers. Yet, one commentator observes that "Its priceless collections of medical literature are constantly threatened by loss from fire and have undergone actual damage through exposure to weather and improper storage."

A year ago, the Hoover Commission recognized that this collection in fact has become a national medical library and should be designated and supported as such. The Hill-Kennedy bill would set up a National Library of Medicine and provide the money to finance it. An independent agency, it would be administered by the Surgeons General of the Army, Navy, Air Force and Public Health Service, the Librarian of Congress and 12 leaders in various health fields named by the President.

Although it has been serving civilian agencies for around 60 years, the library costs are now borne by the Department of Defense. It is pointed out that "as it has no legal authorization to operate as a national institution primarily for civilian purposes, its expenses are hidden in 18 categories of the Department of Defense." Defense Department plans to build a structure to house the library have been shunted aside by overriding defense considerations.

Medical men say that the bill to create a national library lacks the dramatic impact of a new discovery in solving the riddles of disease but "It is fundamental * * * to the eventual achievement of these goals."

The Fund for the Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the article which follows appeared in the March 5, 1956 issue of the Presbyterian Outlook, published in Richmond, Va. The author, Mr. Albert Fowler, a resident of Rosemont, Pa., was editor of the Arnold J. Toynbee volume, War and Civilization, and has served on the faculty of Haverford College. Since the Fund for the Republic has been much criticized, on occasion, it seems to me that fairminded people will welcome the opportunity to read this sympathetic treatment of its activities:

THE FUND FOR THE REPUBLIC

(By Albert Fowler)

When the American Veterans' Committee presented Robert Hutchins with the Bill of Rights Award last October, he said: "I am surprised that there should be any difference of opinion about the Fund for the Republic." As president he was well aware that the fund had been criticized for supposed left-wing tendencies by Fulton Lewis, Jr., and the New York Journal American, and as an American devoted to the preservation of his country's heritage of freedom he replied to that criticism with courage and confidence.

The Fund for the Republic was authorized in 1951 by the Ford Foundation and incorporated in 1952 as an independent organization under a separate board of directors chosen for their interest in civil liberties and their ability to increase public knowledge of these basic rights. The chairman is Paul G. Hoffman, chairman of the board of Studebaker-Packard Corp., and other directors include Erwin N. Griswold, dean of Harvard Law School, Meyer Kestnbaum, president of Hart, Schaffner & Marx, and Jubal R. Parten, president of Woodley Petroleum Co.

Provided with $15 million by the Ford Foundation, the Fund for the Republic has devoted itself to the support of those liberties of thought, speech, and assembly without which this Nation would be unrecognizable.

POLICY OF PRIVATE GIFTS

Organizations like the Fund for the Republic and the Ford Foundation have been regarded as the finest flower of free enterprise, and it has been the policy of the country to encourage people to finance religious and educational endeavor through private contributions rather than through taxes. If powerful pressures had not been exerted against our traditional freedoms, the Ford Foundation would not have seen a need for the Fund for the Republic which Dr. Hutchins calls a fund for the American dream. If the fund takes the reason for its existence seriously and supports civil rights where they are threatened, it must inevitably expect a certain amount of criticism.

Early in 1953 the directors of the fund declared in a public statement: "The major factor affecting civil liberties today, in our opinion, is the menace of communism and Communist influence in this country. Coupled with this threat is the grave danger to civil liberties in methods that may be used to meet the threat."

A its first meeting the board of directors made a grant to a special committee of the American Bar Association dealing with individual rights as affected by national security. This committee studied the methods of congressional investigations, and the bar association adopted its recommendations for rules of procedure by an overwhelming vote in August 1954. Since then the administration of congressional investigations has improved, and one reason for the improvement has been the influence of the American Bar Association. This change was not achieved without criticism from those who wanted a free hand to deal with the Communist menace in whatever way suited them best.

STUDIED THE COMMUNIST RECORD

To get the facts straight and make them available for ready reference the Fund for the Republic then financed a study of official records of Communist activity. Under the able leadership of Arthur Sutherland, of Harvard Law School, a digest was prepared of the principal judicial and administrative hearings in which the Communist Party has been involved, and the completed volumes were distributed to university, research, and public libraries. Microfilm records of the leading court cases on Communist activities have been put in a few large libraries throughout the country. The fund has also made a grant to the Methodist Church for a study of the challenge of communism.

In response to calls from many quarters for a private committee to make a dispassionate appraisal of the loyalty-security program of the Federal Government, the fund for the Republic financed such a committee under the auspices of the New York City Bar Association. In appointing the members of this committee the bar association included lawyers from many parts of the country. The fund believed that one good way to show how the loyalty-security program operated was to compile the facts of individual cases, and Adma Yarmolinsky of the District of Columbia Bar Association was asked to secure what records he could from the defending lawyers. His report contains abstracts of over 300 cases, and 50 of these have been published. The facts of this report throw much light on whether individual rights have been sacrificed to the demands of national security and whether those demands have been excessive.

FREEDOM OF DISCUSSION

One of the foundation stones of Americanism is the freedom of discussion. The Illinois Department of the American Legion and its past commander, Irving Breakstone, have cooperated with the American Heritage Council of Chicago on a plan of popular education centering around discussion of basic documents in United States history. The fund for the Republic has made a grant to the council to assist this enterprise. It has also helped the Carrie Chapman Catt Memerial Fund with its Freedom Agenda project in which 500 communities are cooperating, and similar educational programs of the Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches, the Universalist Service Committee, the YMCA and YWCA. The more people know about their individual liberties, the safer their freedom will be.

The Fund for the Republic has honored with substantial awards organizations and communities that have distinguished themselves by their defense of civil liberties. One award went to the YMCA at the University of California at Berkeley for its outstanding program in race relations and its open platform policy, and another to the town of Waverly, Iowa, for its efforts on behalf of a Negro Air Force captain and his family. In this way the fund called the attention of the country to courageous and selfless devotion to the cause of freedom.

IN RACE RELATIONS

Individual rights have also been under pressure in the field of race relations, and it was natural for the Fund for the Republic to concern itself with racial discrimination. One of its largest grants went to the Southern Regional Council to strengthen the Atlanta headquarters and increase the professional staff of the council's affiliates in 12 Southern States. With this assistance the council is expanding community education in intergroup relations under the leadership of George S. Mitchell, who received the 1953 award of the Catholic Committee of the South for an outstanding contribution to the improvement of race relations. A recent grant to the Southern Presbyterian Church provides for local institutes for discussion of interracial problems and for the distribution of literature and visual aids. Similar assistance has been made available in this field to the Board of Social and Economic Relations of the Methodist Church, to the Presbyterian Church, United States of America, and to the National Council of Churches in connection with problems growing out of the Supreme Court's decision holding segregated schools unconstitutional.

The Fund for the Republic has also established a commission on race and housing to examine the obstacles encountered by minority groups, particularly Negroes, in finding places to live and in building new homes. No comprehensive survey of housing for minorities has ever been made, but it is thought that they pay more and get less than other sections of the population. This commission is headed by Earl B. Schwulst, chairman of the board of the Bowery Savings Bank, and among its members are Henry R. Luce, editor of Time and Life; Elliott V. Bell, editor of Business Week; and John J. Cavanaugh, director of the University of Notre Dame Foundation.

A CHANGING CLIMATE

Fortunately the climate of opinion is now more favorable to the cause of civil liberties than it was when the Fund for the Republic began its work in 1953. The eclipse of Senator McCARTHY, the apologies by Government agencies to people wronged by mistake or prejudice, the changes in passport regulations, the improved procedure in congressional investigations, are putting new heart in the belief that America does not have to suppress its liberties in order to protect them. But as long as the fund continues to carry out the purpose for which it was created, as long as it supports the freedoms guaranteed to all Americans by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights where they are under threat or pressure, it will come in for its share of criticism and will face the attack with courage and confidence.

The Medical Library Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Howard A. Rusk, M. D., entitled "Books Can Help To Cure," which appeared in the New York Times on April 8, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOOKS CAN HELP TO CURE—AN ANALYSIS OF THE FACTORS BEHIND BILL TO ESTABLISH NATIONAL MEDICAL LIBRARY

(By Howard A. Rusk, M. D.)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Next Tuesday Senate hearings will begin here on a little-publicized and undramatic bill which has tremendous significance for medical research in this country. It has been discussed very little in the congressional cloakrooms, but is a leading topic of discussion among medical researchers, physicians, and health teachers.

The bill, introduced by Senators LISTER HILL, Alabama, and JOHN F. KENNEDY, Massachusetts, is to create a decently housed, efficiently staffed, properly located and adequately financed National Library of Medicine.

For the past 130 years, our Nation has actually had such a national medical library. Known originally in 1836 as the Surgeon General's Library, it has been the Armed Forces Medical Library since 1952. One of three large research libraries operated by the Federal Government, it has over 650,000 bound volumes with more than a million titles, receives over 5,000 medical periodicals, and adds to its collection over 25,000 volumes a year.

The Hoover Commission Task Force on Federal Medical Services declared in its report, "today the largest and most important medical library in the world is the Armed Forces Medical Library. No other medical agency of the Federal Government serves the future of medical research so intimately and so widely as does this unequaled collection of books, journals, and bibliographic services."

NEED IS UNQUESTIONED

That new physical facilities for this library are needed stands without question. Its present quarters, built 69 years ago, have been outgrow and outmoded for 30 years. The library requires an additional mile of shelf space each year. Its interlibrary loan service places 133,000 volumes in the hands of thousands of medical research workers yearly. Over 1,000 reference questions are answered by its staff each year. Its priceless collections of medical literature are constantly threatened by loss from fire and have undergone actual damage through exposure to weather and improper storage.

Pointing out that the Armed Forces Medical Library has, in fact, become a national Library of Medicine, the Hoover Commission task force a year ago urged it be thus officially designated and be given clear statutory authority for the functions it now serves.

The bill introduced by Senators HILL and KENNEDY provides for such authority with adequate financing. As an independent agency, it would be administered by the Surgeons General of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health Service, the Librarian of Congress, and 12 leaders in the various health fields to be appointed by the President.

With the ever-increasing amounts of both public and private funds being spent for medical and related health research, the significance of a national library of medicine has increased. All professional organizations concerned with health, such as the American Medical Association, American Dental Association, and American Hospital Association, have strongly endorsed such a proposal.

RESEARCH INVOLVED

Dr. Alan Gregg, vice president of the Rockefeller Foundation and one of the world's authorities in medical research, has said, "No defense for the amounts being spent on medical research by all the Government agencies can be made if we continue to neglect the need for one adequate library, such as this library could be made."

The paramount importance of the Armed Forces Medical Library to our military services is without question. Since, however, it has been serving civilian agencies and health workers since 1892, it is not logical that its costs should be totally borne by the Department of Defense. Currently, as it has no legal authorization to operate as a national institution primarily for civilian purposes, its expenses are hidden within 18 different categories of the Department of Defense. In the past, each time the Department of Defense planned a building program for the library, it was squeezed out by other more strictly defense items.

As in the case of the National Gallery of Art, there are reasons to expect that substantial contributions from private foundations and other voluntary, civilian groups would be made to a National Library of Medicine. Such groups have been loath to support a library that by its title implied it was a military library.

The bill to create an adequate National Library of Medicine does not have the drama and glamour of increased funds for direct research activities which may solve the riddles of cancer, heart disease, arthritis and the other great killers and cripplers. It is fundamental, however, to the eventual achievement of those goals.

Wisconsin Soil Conservation Report, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is again my pleasure to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the annual report of M. F. Schweers, Wisconsin State conservationist, to district supervisors of the Soil Conservation Service in Wisconsin.

Mr. Schweers was thoughtful enough to furnish me with a copy of his annual, cumulative report, based on the annual reports submitted to him by the various soil conservation districts in Wisconsin.

Mr. Schweers has high hopes that the four remaining counties of Wisconsin which have not yet formed soil conservation districts may do so in 1956. The remaining 67 counties of the State are so organized.

Since last year, seven new locally organized watershed associations have come into being, making a total of 46 in the State. Other significant developments during the past year have included completion and dedication of the Coon Creek project, and approval of the Mill Creek project in Richland County.

I believe the accomplishments of the Soil Conservation Service in Wisconsin represent a laudable example of fine cooperation, dedication to service apart from dictation, and commendable leadership at the State level.

Mr. Schweers' report for 1955 follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE,
Madison, Wis., April 23, 1956.

To: Soil Conservation District Supervisors.
From: M. F. Schweers, State conservationist.
Subject: Acknowledgement of your 1955 SCD Reports.

"Success of the Coon Creek project rang the bells around the world, not the bells tolling hunger or the doom of progress, but rather those that tolled for better things from the land for the people."

These words were spoken by the first Chief of the Soil Conservation Service about the Nation's first large scale coordinated soil, water, forest, and wildlife conservation demonstration.

Dr. Hugh H. Bennett, now retired, made the above statement when he came back to Coon Valley last July 19 to help dedicate an official historical marker commemorating the watershed project. Governing bodies of the La-Crosse, Monroe, and Vernon County Soil Conservation Districts were among the sponsors of this recognition ceremony.

Inscribed upon the Coon Creek marker are these words:

"The success of the project is a tribute to farm families who had the courage, wisdom, foresight, and confidence to adopt the modern methods of soil conservation farming illustrated here."

Yes; the people of the Coon Creek Watershed played a major role in the conservation movement of Wisconsin and the Midwest. And, certainly the early farmer conservationists in each of your districts also deserve a tribute for their pioneering activities. After all, we know that the success or failure of our joint efforts lies in the hands of the farm families who till the land.

1955 REPORTS

As always, your reports were both interesting and informative. We were again pleased to note that a large number were mimeographed. Many had attractive covers. We sincerely hope that everyone who received a copy enjoyed and got as much out of it as we did.

In a special communication, SCS Administrator D. A. Williams asked that this acknowledgement also be made in his behalf. So, please consider this as a joint letter from him and us.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

"The best year we ever had." That, in effect, is what many of your reports say about

1955 and the statement is applicable to total accomplishments in the State.

When we acknowledged your annual reports 3 years ago we indicated that 1952 was the banner year. Up to that time it was the most productive year in the history of SCD-SCS operations in Wisconsin. Now we come to 1955 which surpasses the fine record made back in 1952. Of course, there are a few decreases among the many increases. But let's see what actually was done in these 2 years and how they compared.

Item	Unit	Accomplishments		1955/1952 (percent)
		1952	1955	
New cooperators	Number	6,866	2,996	44
Basic conservation plans	do	605	1,216	201
SCD cooperators serviced	do	13,222	13,022	98
Soil surveys	Acre	623,488	550,395	88
Soil descriptions	Number	30	102	340
Conservation crop rotations	Acre	(1)	314,472	
Contour strip cropping	do	65,698	59,174	90
Waterways	Mile	343	345	100
Terraces	do	301	335	111
Diversions	do	151	198	131
Closed drains	do	196	232	118
Open drains	do	649	977	151
Pasture improvement	Acre	8,266	20,773	251
Prevention of grazing damage	do	13,302	20,969	158
Woodland management	do	8,351	5,599	67
Tree planting	do	2,020	3,185	158
Field windbreaks	Mile	44	33	75
Wildlife area improvement	Acre	1,688	903	53
Fence row management	Mile	64	294	459
Major structures	Number	6	25	417
Farm ponds	do	23	79	343
Land smoothing	Acre		731	
ACP referrals	Number	20,030	14,670	73
ACP farms serviced	do	16,900	15,112	89
Direct SCS assistance to SCD's (includes part-time aids)	Man-year	153	155	101

[1] No record.

A few comments concerning the table are in order. You will note a material reduction in the number of new cooperators for last year as compared to 1952. On the other hand, the number of basic conservation plans increased materially. In planning for 1955, most governing bodies decided to devote more time to assisting farm families in the development of basic conservation plans rather than trying to secure an increase in the number of new cooperators. Frankly, we thoroughly agree with your thinking and the corresponding trend is very gratifying.

Although the acreage of soil surveys decreased, there was a considerable increase in the number of soil descriptions written. Added efforts are being devoted to characterizing soils in greater detail than formerly was thought necessary. Naturally, this work took time away from field mapping.

There was a slight reduction in contour strip cropping. This is to be expected as there has been a gradual downward trend for this practice. Yet, Wisconsin, as of last June 30, had over 40 percent of the total strip cropping in the nine Corn Belt States. Strip cropping is the most picturesque and spectacular of all practices. Having such a large percentage, one need not wonder why many people tell us that there is more obvious conservation work in Wisconsin than in any other State of the Midwest.

The reduction in wildlife area improvement may be attributed to the fact that the Service no longer provides wildlife packets.

We should like to call your attention to the nice increases in construction practices. We have one comment to offer. It concerns drainage. We want to point out that most of the open drains are surface ditches on land upon which there was very little if any change in land use.

The reduction in the number of ACP referrals was due to the fact that in 1955 the Service did not have the responsibility for determining need and practicability for some of the vegetative practices as we did in 1952.

While the Service does not maintain detailed records on such items as desirable land use conversions; influence on increasing farmer purchases of needed liming and fertilizing materials, and so forth, these basic factors are considered while assisting farm families in developing and carrying out their conservation plans. To do this job in 1955 Service personnel made over 13,000 personal calls on soil-conservation district cooperators.

The Service also assisted district governing bodies and collaborated with the Agricultural Extension Service and the State soil conservation committee in planning for and carrying out educational and information programs. We do not have data on the extent of these activities.

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Your reports indicate that the ACP contributed to improved interest in and the establishment of increased amounts of soil and water conservation practices.

County agricultural stabilization and conservation committees transferred more than $122,000 to the Soil Conservation Service under the SCS–ACP 5-percent program. Of this amount the Service "earned" just under $114,000. These funds were used in supplementing district staffs to handle or compensate for the additional workload resulting from the agricultural conservation program.

Layout accomplishments made under this joint program are included in the table appearing in the preceding section of this letter. Almost 9,000 of the referrals involved farms of soil conservation district cooperators. According to what you say, many of the farmers assisted solely on ACP have since indicated an interest in farm conservation plans and should ultimately become district cooperators.

PROGRAM BALANCE

The forestry, wildlife, pasture renovation, and gully and streambank erosion control phases of your programs are lagging somewhat behind cropland practices. Such a statement appears in a number of your reports. We know that everyone has done his utmost to bring these measures into balance as integral parts of the overall soil, water, forest, and wildlife conservation program. It has been a difficult task and new ideas on promotion and establishment are needed. Many district governing body plans for 1956 call for special emphasis on these practices.

WATERSHED ACTIVITIES

Many of your reports made reference to watershed associations. Records show that there are now 46 such groups in the State, varying in age from 0 to 10 years.

Lack of space prohibits quoting many of the favorable comments made about these organizations. More conservation on the land", "better balanced program", "local planning," "local leadership," "whole family participation," "social and economic advantages," etc., are among the remarks included in your reports or conveyed to us in contacts with enthusiastic association members.

The Sauk County SCD still leads the State in the number of associations with eight. There are seven in the Green County SCD.

One of the two contracted detention dams on the Kickapoo Pilot Watershed was completed in 1955. The other will be finished this year. There is a possibility for another and much larger structure provided the Vernon County SCD governing body is able to acquire necessary rights-of-way and land easements. Should this materialize the watershed above it will be about twice as large as the other two combined.

In order to facilitate activities under Public Law 566 the 1955 State legislature enacted several new laws. Copies of these have been transmitted to you. Among the provisions of the new laws are the following: (1) The State Soil Conservation Commitee has been designated to review applications for planning assistance; (2) villages and counties are permitted to appropriate funds for works of improvement as defined in the Federal statute; and (3) SCD governing bodies have been given additional responsibilities and authorities on watershed protection and flood prevention work.

The Mill Creek application for planning assistance under Public Law 566, co-sponsored by the Richland County SCD governing body, was approved by the State Soil Conservation Committee and D. A. Williams, Administrator of the Soil onservation Service. At the present time a staff of technicians is working in the District collecting technical data and information for consideration by the local sponsors and cooperating agencies in completing their work plan.

Six other watershed associations are in the process of completing applications at the present time.

COOPERATION

We were pleased to note that every annual report made complimentary references to the friendly and effective relationships existing among all people interested in the conservation programs of your respective soil conservation districts.

In these narratives you commend personnel of the Agricultural Extension Service, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, the State soil conservation committee, Farmers' Home Administration, Vocational Agriculture, Vet Trainers, Soil Conservation Service, Wisconsin Conservation Department, county highway commissioners, sportsmen's clubs, bankers' associations, machinery dealers, business organizations, and several other groups for the fine cooperation and contributions made to the programs of Wisconsin's 67 soil conservation districts.

Newspapers, radio, and TV have evidently given you all the space and time you can effectively use in your program.

And we do not ever want to overlook the people on the land. As previously mentioned, they hold the key to a successful program.

Insofar as the Soil Conservation Service is concerned, we sincerely thank you for the very fine tributes you paid our personnel. Were they individually acknowledging their respective soil conservation district reports, they would say about what we feel, which is: "We thoroughly enjoy having the opportunity of working with you supervisors and serving the fine farm families in the district. We will continually strive to do a better job."

YOUTH EDUCATION

Youth education in soil, water, forest, and wildlife conservation rates high in most district work plans. We still believe Wisconsin

ranks second to none in the field of youth training. In most soil conservation districts, county superintendents of schools have done an outstanding job in having courses on conservation included in the rural school curriculum. We too commend these important members of soil conservation district governing bodies on the fine program they are carrying out.

Advances continue to be made in emphasizing and improving conservation courses for teachers both in secondary schools and on the job. This program is under the capable leadership of I. O. Hembre, executive secretary for the State soil conservation committee.

Your reports point to increased 4–H Club enrollments in conservation projects. The FFA has participated in various activities.

GOVERNING BODY ACTIVITIES

We were interested in your remarks concerning activities being carried out by you supervisors. Most governing bodies meet monthly and plan their programs in advance. Evidently your field trips have proven profitable in guiding your activities. Your sponsorship of plowing matches, land judging contests, demonstrations and meetings has been very fruitful. Quite a number of governing bodies held highly successful recognition banquets for SCD cooperators. Several district governing bodies conducted tours for their county boards. From all indications these too were very worthwhile events.

A number of county boards appropriated funds to district governing bodies in amounts varying from one to several hundred dollars. This permitted you and your associates to do some of the things requiring financing that you would have been unable to do otherwise.

The Marathon County Soil Conservation District governing body won first place in the 1954–55 Goodyear Soil Conservation Awards Program. The Waupaca County SCD was runner-up.

Many district governing bodies took an active part in sponsoring Stewardship Sunday. Several reports indicated that you secured and personally presented packets of information to clergymen.

References were made to effective area conferences of supervisors and representatives of cooperating agencies. We agree with you that these are very worthwhile. Many of you also mentioned the successful State meeting held in Madison last year.

Evidently quite a number of you attended the annual meeting of the Soil Conservation Society of America held in Green Lake last September. A new national attendance record was set with over 800 people registering. The Green Lake County SCD governing body provided free cheese, crackers, and milk during the entire 3-day conference. Supervisors, their wives and others did a rushing business.

THE FUTURE

In retrospect, 1955 was the best year we ever had in our joint undertaking. Looking forward, we have every reason to believe that 1956 will surpass it.

Substantiating the above statement, we present the following data. Interpreting your total workload analyses in light of program balance, availability of equipment, size of permanent staff, etc., we estimate it would take about 195 man-years of permanent and part-time help to perform all the work you believe farmers will be ready to undertake during 1956. We figure that we will have about 160 man-years available. That leaves quite a difference. However, we believe it's better to have too much work than not enough. Then, too, we prefer being under rather than over staffed. Such conditions tax everyone's ingenuity to get the job done.

One statement common to most reports indicates that you believe all layout will be pretty well taken care of in 1956 with present staffs, provided the weather is right and adequate equipment is available. However, planning will suffer, so you say.

During 1955 we increased the number of permanent personnel assigned to districts by several new employees. We are now considering requests for additional help from a number of SCD governing bodies. We are analyzing workloads, and we do plan to fill a number of positions in 1956.

The future looks good, and through a united effort we are confident that in 1956 the bells will continue to toll for more conservation on the land for the good of its people.

THANK YOU

Extending personal regards and thanking you for the many courtesies and fine cooperation you have extended to all of us in the Soil Conservation Service, I am,

Sincerely yours,

M. F. SCHWEERS,
State Conservationist.

The Medical Library Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the New York Times on April 8, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILL WOULD BUILD MEDICAL LIBRARY—SENATE GROUP SETS HEARING ON PROPOSAL TO CREATE NATIONAL INSTITUTION

WASHINGTON, April 7.—The Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee will open hearings next week on a little-noticed bill that, it is believed, could have a big impact on the Nation's medical research.

The measure would create a National Library of Medicine to take over "the greatest collection of medical literature in the entire world." The library is now operated by the Defense Department as the Armed Forces Medical Library. The proposed legislation would transfer it to a new and independent board.

Senator LISTER HILL, Democrat, of Alabama, committee chairman and coauthor of the bill, said the library was "lost and hidden in the Defense Department. He predicted it would grow if turned into a national library.

One of the main purposes of the bill is to get a new building and adequate financing for the library. It is now housed in a 69-year-old structure that was termed inadequate 30 years ago.

Col. Frank B. Rogers, library director, said the library was "desperate" for space. It "cannot go on much longer unless the problem is solved," he added. Congress four times since 1919 has authorized the military establishment to draft plans for a new building, with no results.

The library, a clearing house for the world's medical literature, contains some 961,000 books, periodicals, pamphlets and films. It serves both the Armed Forces and civilians in every field of health. Colonel Rogers said it received 100,000 requests a year for copies of material on medical developments and research.

The library was established 120 years ago by the Army Surgeon General for military use. It has grown into "the largest and most important medical library in the world," according to a medical task force of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

No other Government medical agency "serves the future of medical research so intimately and so widely," the task force said in a 1955 report. The report recommended that the library be transferred from the Defense Department.

Senate committee aides have said the bill has widespread support in the medical profession. Representatives of many medical groups will testify Tuesday and Wednesday.

The Defense Department originally opposed the bill. It will withdraw its objections according to committee sources.

Statement in Support of Proposed Appropriations for the Soil Conservation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me in support of proposed appropriations for the Soil Conservation Service before the Senate Appropriations Committee:

The duties and responsibilities of the Soil Conservation Service are among the most essential of all Federal Government activities. In developing and carrying out a national soil and water conservation program through soil conservation districts, it is contributing immeasurably to the welfare of our great farm population and to the Nation.

A mere listing of its activities is sufficient to bring home this fact. Its watershed protection and flood-prevention projects and river-basin investigations are of inestimable benefit to all of the Nation. Reduction of flood damage in 11 major watersheds is one activity which is difficult to measure in monetary value but almost beyond calculation in actual value to those who will thus be protected from loss of property and even loss of life.

Soil, water, and range resources of our country are the foundation blocks of the structure of the national economy. It is the Soil Conservation Service which coordinates, develops, broadcasts information, and carries out many of the most effective measures for the protection of the sources of our food and much of our clothing. How well the resources of soil and water are protected and conserved and even improved will have a direct effect on our standard of living throughout the Nation far into the future.

In the short span of its history the Soil Conservation Service has rendered services of great value to us all. It would be difficult to envisage a farm economy without the vital services which it performs. In the past year, throughout the 2,700 soil conservation districts, over 1,200,000 individual farmers and ranchers were assisted in some measure. Over 4½ million farms totaling over 1½ billion acres are now organized into soil conservation districts. These districts serve as centers for sharing information with all of their members.

Ask almost any farmer and he will tell you that he has benefited mightily from the services offered by the Soil Conservation Serv-

ice. He may have had his entire farm surveyed and a plan for its most efficient utilization prepared. Such a survey would make use of the most effective conservation measures as well as means of improving the quality of the land and crops. The farmer may have been aided in application of such complex measures as drainage and water-disposal systems, farm ponds (a sight now familiar to even the city dweller), diversions, waterways, contouring, stripping, and many others. He is also constantly advised in maintaining such measures of soil and water conservation after it has been applied to the land.

A broader activity of the Service is the upstream watershed protection and flood-prevention program carried out as an integral part of the total soil and water conservation job. The Service works with local organizations that sponsor watershed projects as well as individual landowners and operators in watershed project areas. It aids in preparation of a plan for the entire watershed and helps the local interests to carry out measures found to be most effective.

We have only to remember reading in the daily press, hearing on radio and TV the constantly recurring accounts of floods throughout our Nation to realize the vital need for flood-prevention measures.

The needs of our radiply increasing population for food and raiment must be met. All we have whereby they can be met are our soil and water resources. The must be protected in every way possible. The Soil Conservation Service is rendering a vital and valuable service in so doing. It is essential that the work be continued and even expanded in the future.

Economically the farmer is now going through a period of straightened circumstances. He must be helped a little now, and he certainly deserves it. We, as a nation, owe much to our farmers in the past, now, and increasingly will in the future. So I beg of you do not stint in providing funds for one of the most valuable and essential needs of the farmer, the Soil Conservation Service.

Mr. Chairman, I especially urge you to follow the recommendations of Nolan Fuqua, of Duncan, Okla.; L. L. Males, Cheyenne, Okla.; Harral Allen, Ada, Okla., and president of the Oklahoma Association of Soil Conservation Districts, for $5 million for upstream measures on the Washita and other similar projects.

The project on the Sand Stone Creek typifies the great value of such projects and is a monument to such men as Mr. Frank Dunaway, of Jones, Okla., Dick Longmire of Pauls Valley, and Dave Vandever of Chickasha, who work without compensation, and many other civic minded citizens who realize that there is an average of only 3 inches of top soil remaining in this world and if it is not conserved, 200 years hence there will be no top soil left.

I wish to commend and compliment the especially good work done by men like Mr. Ray Walker, in charge of Soil Conservation Service in Oklahoma, his assistant, Harry Chambers, Earl Wade, and Ed McVicker of Chicksasha, and many others who are serving beyond duty.

This $5 million is for the Washita Valley Flood Control project which is 1 of 11 pilot watersheds established in 1946 by an act of Congress. I had the privilege of assisting in writing this legislation.

There are 64 substation sheds in the Washita Valley. Six or eight are completed, or nearly so. Forty percent of the Washita project is planned and 15 percent is completed.

Another $5 million is needed now, and $5 million per year for 7 years, making a total of $35 million.

There are many other projects needed in the soil conservation district—one near Waurika where we have had devastating floods recently.

A Program for Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in the May issue of the fine publication called Parents magazine, there appeared an article by Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson entitled "A Program for Children." This article, like most of Adlai Stevenson's pronouncements, is constructive and thought-provoking. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECERD, as follows:

A PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN

(By Adlai E. Stevenson)

Joy, wonder, and pride attend the birth of our children—but so does a solemn feeling of responsibility. Most Americans would agree that our society should be so ordered that every child may realize the full promise of his natural endowment. Indeed, this concept is imbedded in the very structure of our democracy, which relies finally upon the capacity of the individual.

Our obligation, then, is to guarantee all our children a good start in life and a clear field. How are we measuring up to it?

We can find much encouragement in the medical statistics. Infant mortality is steadily declining and the total life span is steadily widening. Many of the diseases that once ravaged childhood have been checked by immunization, miracle drugs and improving standards of public and private sanitation. But as we take due pride in such milestones as the conquest of polio, we must note, too, that other killers are still abroad in the land and are not yet subject to such concentrated attack as that launched against infantile paralysis by public and private agencies. Heart disease and cancer are no respecters of childhood; paralysis and crippling accidents, multiple sclerosis, muscular dystrophy, rheumatic fever, blindness and deafness take a frightening toll.

The magnitude of the health problem is variously measured, but the charts and tables tell us nothing of the human tragedy each recorded case and his family must bear. Even so, the figures are terrible enough: 8 million eye defects, a third of a million hearing defects, 1 million plastic and orthopedic handicaps, cases of heart disease and even tuberculosis still running into the thousands.

These might be called the visible parts of the record. But we have also had in recent years alarming evidence of the cumulative effect of physical deficiencies of childhood that do not always find their way into the statistics—the determination under Selective Service that barely half of our young men are physically and mentally fit for duty with our armed services. Here is clear evidence that there is much to be done despite our inoculations, vitamin pills, school lunches, and bathtubs.

The responsibility for reducing the health hazards of childhood is partly private, partly public, and there has been much controversy over the division of labor. But certainly there can be no quarrel with the proposition that our children deserve a concerted and carefully coordinated effort to make full use of the scientific tools now available to us and to find new and more effective means of controlling and combating disease.

We need, first of all, a stepped-up public education and public health program that will carry to every community and to every family health-giving and life-saving messages and services. Here we are on well-tested and firm ground. Local and State departments of health, working with the support of the National Government, can take much credit for the decline in child mortality and children's diseases.

But we also need stepped-up research programs that will take the offensive against the great killers and the great cripplers. Again responsibility must be shared. The private foundations and medical institutions will continue to contribute their generous share, but the public agencies, the agencies that must serve all the people, cannot escape their residual responsibility. And it might be noted parenthetically that a first condition of success is the maintenance of adequate safeguards around the right of free inquiry. Men and institutions must be free to push honest search to its ultimate limits; there is no other way of unleashing our Nation's productive intelligence.

EMOTIONAL HEALTH

Physically handicapped children are heartbreaking to see, but those with clouded minds and disturbed emotions are even more pitiful, for they are denied the human right to think and to be. And each retarded child represents a social problem as well as a human tragedy; his hesitant growth grievously burdens his family and his community. We must redouble our efforts to rehabilitate where possible, to ameliorate where practical, and to push forward with maximum speed those heartening discoveries which hold promise of loosening some of the cruel bonds which bind these children.

Retardation is entangled with another critical problem, that of emotionally disturbed children. There are those who would comfort us by asserting that emotional diseases are not new, that they are simply more accurately diagnosed and recorded these days. But serious students in this field see the 50,000 children (between the ages of 2 and 8) who need around-the-clock psychiatric care as a problem whose dimensions at least are new.

Indeed, the whole question of emotional health, and especially the emotional health of our children, is one of the most insistent and elusive problems of our pressured and anxious times. The field is still wide open and requires yet uncharted programs of medical, social, and psychiatric services. We are only nibbling around the edges of a field of inquiry and of treatment which perhaps more than any other is most closely related to human happiness and the full realization of the individual potential.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

This matter of emotional health ties in closely with the distressing phenomenon of juvenile delinquency. I do not for one moment believe that a whole generation of our young people is suddenly lacking in idealism, in character, or in concern for decent standards. In fact, we appear to be faced with the strange paradox that children sometimes become delinquent because they are concerned and anxious. But we cannot overlook the fact that delinquency, as measured by skirmishes with the police, is growing at an alarming rate. It has been estimated that there are over a million delinquent children, and if the current trend keeps up this number may well be doubled by 1960. Again, it would be comforting to believe that the mounting total simply reflects better police reporting or rising community standards. But no one really puts much faith in this sort of complacent reasoning, for there is little doubt that the incidence of flaunted community standards and actual breaches of the law are alarmingly in the ascendant.

But if we are uncertain as to why this is so, of what goes on in the distorted depths of wayward young minds, we are still less clear as to what to do about it. Most of us have long since discarded the outmoded notion that punishment which fits the crime can settle the matter. What we need is not retribution for past guilt but deterrents to future sins, and here we are on uncharted seas.

If we do not have all the answers, at least we know that we must explore every avenue of program and policy that offers any hope of preventing young offenders from becoming bitter, disillusioned, and antisocial adults. We know that the attack must be many-pronged and carefully coordinated. And we have more than a suspicion that much responsibility rests on careless, ignorant, or inadequate parents, on preoccupied and oblivious communities.

All of us are quick to point the accusing finger at the other fellow, but this is a short-sighted and self-deceiving approach which commits valued resources to a time-consuming, energy-dissipating merry-go-round. The deep-seated, cancerous core of this problem of juvenile delinquency has roots in every sector of our national life. It appears to grow from some inward inability to come to constructive terms with everyday problems. It is fed, no doubt, by adolescent self-doubt and yearning for the security of gang approval; but it is also nurtured by parental apathy and neglect. It derives sustenance from every evidence of adult tendencies to talk in one way about what is right and good but to act in another. And it is nourished by the materialism of a civilization that seldom pauses to ask where it is going, by a prosperity which still finds one-third of the Nation ill housed, and by civic indolence which permits millions of families to become contaminated by slum living.

In the end juvenile delinquency statistics prove only one thing: that we have all failed. The wolfpacks of the city streets are symptoms of a corrosion of public and private morals beyond the reach of police measures. Schools, churches, recreational and other child-serving community institutions, as well as corrective and disciplinary agencies, must move forward massively and together.

The juvenile delinquent, like the physically crippled child, is the extreme symbol of conditions that less visibly affect all our children. Obviously an educational system which permits a perceptible number of our young people to become active rebels against society has failed in important respects. It is, therefore, pertinent to inquire whether that same system is adequately serving the great majority who are not identified with overt revolt and therefore do not find their way into the statistics of the juvenile courts. Are these normal children being adequately prepared for the increasing complexities of our age?

MORE AND BETTER SCHOOLS

Americans have always been proud of our educational system—proud of the broad concept of democracy that underlies it, proud of the high literacy rate it has produced, proud of the scientists and technicians, professional wrokers and business leaders who are its end products. Yet anyone who has taken the time to inspect the school facilities available to his children in almost any community in America is aware that in many important respects education has not kept pace with the burgeoning growth of the postwar years.

We see now, when we go to examine it, a school system that needs 300,000 classrooms to serve its preenrollment; that needs 180,000 teachers; that confines 6 million children to buildings that actually are unsafe; that subjects a million and a half impressionable young minds to the stopgap teaching which alone is possible in double or split shifts. It is a school system that only rarely provides for the special needs of unusually handicapped, and unusually gifted children. It is a school system that usually does not pay its teachers enough and therefore witnesses an annual exodus of trained personnel to more rewarding fields—and with it a qualitative loss in the level of instruction at a rate that defies measurement by the statisticians.

Perhaps the only encouraging aspect of this picture is that, because the deficiencies of our schools are virtually universal, most Americans are aware of them and concerned about them. The worst of our schools are intolerable, and even the best are not good enough. So there is a stirring throughout the country, a demand for action at the Federal, State, and local levels that even the most complacent politicians can no longer ignore. Popular support for an educational program that will meet today's needs, and take due account of tomorrow's, is a force in being. All that is needed now is wise and effective leadership to channel that support to productive ends.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF GOVERNMENT

I have dealt here primarily with the responsibility of Government. Reduced to its ultimate simplicity, it is the responsibility for the needs of our children which will otherwise be unmet. Obviously the field is broad. Expanded public programs in health and education, as I have suggested, are in order. Moreover, the Government, through its aid to dependent children and old-age and survivors insurance programs, has assumed direct responsibility for the support of indigent children. Yet there remains a large and essential area of private responsibility which the Government, by its nature, cannot and should not invade.

Which brings us full circle to our individual obligation, not only to our own children, but to all children.

Public and private welfare programs, however forward looking, are poor substitutes for comfortable and loving homes. The support of sustained affection, experiences in giving as well as receiving, these are beyond price and beyond full substitution.

The attitudes, the values, which germinate inside the close circle of family cast lifelong shadows, and are the ultimate source of private morals and public purposes. Here concern for individual growth and individual responsibility can develop to its fullest, and here also is born the will to participate in self-government. Recent studies indicate that children who come from families that have demonstrated sustained civic concern are most likely to be willing to shoulder public responsibility. Schools, churches, other community institutions, even politics and politicians, contribute their share to shaping civic virtue—and its opposite—but the prime moving force is the family.

Every program, public or private, that reinforces individual families feeds strength into democratic processes. Much of our social legislation has this purpose as a by-product, if not as a major objective. Housing programs, unemployment and other types of social insurance, maximum hours and minimum wages, nursery schools and other aids to working mothers have all helped to stabilize families.

What the children of America need in 1956 is not bright election-year promises, lightly given and soon forgotten. They are not well served when either Government or private agencies move reluctantly, erratically, and only under the goad of crisis. For their sake we must face all the facts in all their total dimensions—including their costs—and never falter in our conviction that the welfare of children is worth whatever it costs.

The Medical Library Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Boston, Mass., Herald on March 27, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEDICINE'S WEAKENED LINK

One 3-by-5 card mailed for 10 cents can keep a team of medical researchists from needlessly duplicating a previous experiment. More, such a card can enable researchists to jump years ahead in their experiments. This is the bibliographical service of the Armed Forces Medical Library in Washington which, among other things, supplies the indispensable link in research, civilian and military, that keeps medicine moving ahead efficiently.

Yet that service and others as valuable are jeopardized by a peculiar, almost unbelievable situation.

The Armed Forces Medical Library is, by historical accident, a responsibility of the Department of Defense, although it serves civilian needs far more than military. According to a Hoover task force, it is the largest and most important medical library in the world. It holds over 650,000 bound volumes, receives over 5,000 medical periodicals and needs a mile of additional shelf space a year. Without its help, much of the research and clinical work now being carried on by the medical profession would be impossible.

Yet this irreplaceable collection is largely housed in a 69-year-old building, totally unsuitable, condemned 30 years ago as inadequate, so antiquated that its iron columns have buckled. Some of its books, charts, and manuscripts of incalculable value are stored in a warehouse in Cleveland, in danger from fire, and large numbers of volumes will soon have to be removed to highly flammable barracks.

Why has Congress let this happen? Because the Defense Department, compelled to cut its cloth to a closely circumscribed budget, has refused, and understandably, to tailor its military requirements to this mainly civilian function.

Now Congress has before it a more drastic move. A bill sponsored by Senators HILL and KENNEDY would take the library from the Defense Department and put it under an independent National Library of Medicine headed by a Board of Regents. The Board would prepare plans for a suitable new building.

This proposal is similar to the Hoover task force recommendation, except that the latter would make the library an almost autonomous division of the Smithsonian Institution, like the National Gallery of Art.

Either is a reasonable solution to this strange and little known problem. But the bill can easily be forgotten in this slow-moving, election year Congress. It needs the alert attention of the public, particularly of the American Medical Association, and the active concern of Senator HILL'S Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which now has the measure.

Strengthening the Bridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, recently Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, dedicated a new terminal building for the Military Air Transport Service at Charleston Air Force Base in my home city. For centuries Charleston has been an important seaport and Navy base. During World War II it was an important port of embarkation for military personnel being sent to overseas theaters. Now it is a great airport, and one of the main ports of aerial embarkation. Henceforth, passengers and freight will leave for or arrive from Puerto Rico, the Panama Canal Zone and South America with regularity.

Charleston Air Force Base has been approved as a permanent base and, thanks to action taken by the public spirited citizens of Charleston, is certain to be designated a permanent Air Force installation. A good many people deserve the credit for this, especially the members of the Charleston Chamber of Commerce who have been consistently interested in the defense of this Nation, and leaders in recognizing the importance of air power.

Air power is not merely bomber and fighter power; it is also, and more especially since World War II, airlift—or air transportation. It was airlift—Operation Vittles—that forced the Russians to abandon their blockade of Berlin in 1949. During the first year of the Korean conflict, our airlift of personnel, ammunition and supplies far surpassed the Berlin record. Our combat Air Forces fought and won the air war in Korea, but the air bridge over the Pacific created by our air transportation system made the victory possible.

Henceforth our air transportation system must serve as the bridge over which forces and supplies will move with utmost speed to the scene of combat in a future war. Victory may indeed depend upon the rapidity of that movement or, to continue the figure, the strength of the air bridge.

The MATS terminal at Charleston Air Force Base is one end of this great air bridge. It is important in peace. It may prove crucial in war. The dedication of the terminal and the use to which it will be put strengthens the bridge and strengthens the Air Force that guarantees our security.

Mr. Speaker, I take pride in the consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks to insert in the RECORD the address by Gen. Nathan F. Twining, which follows:

ADDRESS BY GEN. NATHAN F. TWINING, CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, AT THE DEDICATION OF MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE TERMINAL, CHARLESTON AIR FORCE BASE, S. C., MARCH 16, 1956

It is a pleasure to be here with you to participate in your celebration that marks a real step forward in air transportation. This terminal is not only a valuable addition to the Air Force; it is a tribute to Charleston and Charleston's good relations with the Air Force.

For centuries Charleston has been an important seaport and naval base. Now your city takes its place as a link in modern air transportation.

The people of Charleston can be particularly proud that this airport is much more than a center of domestic air travel. As of the first of this month, Charleston Air Force Base became one of our main ports of aerial embarkation. Here passengers and freight will leave for or arrive from Puerto Rico, the Panama Canal Zone, and South America.

As you know, Charleston Air Force Base has been approved as a permanent base and the city officials of Charleston have prepared to offer a deed to the Federal Government for the necessary property. The deed is currently being reviewed by the United States Attorney General. If the deed is approved, and we expect that it will be, the way will be open for the base to be designated as a permanent Air Force installation. The fact that Charleston Air Force Base will become a permanent base, that it has become a port of aerial embarkation, and that we are here dedicating this terminal, are not the results of Air Force decision alone. One of the main reasons behind all of these actions is the fact that the people of Charleston have taken a very deep interest in their base and in the work that the Air Force is doing here. The Charleston Chamber of Commerce has been most cooperative in making this base what it is, and I want to endorse what Colonel Wassam said in thanks to the people of Charleston.

I also want to acknowledge the fine help the Air Force has received from Congressman MENDEL RIVERS. He has been extremely interested in the defense of this Nation and has been a leader in recognizing the importance of airpower and in working for a stronger Air Force. Much of the credit for the excellent relations that we enjoy down here and for the importance of this base must go to Congressman RIVERS.

It is essential that all of us realize the importance of airpower during the days of international unrest. When we think of airpower the picture of jet bombers and supersonic fighters comes to mind. But I want to emphasize how important a part of airpower our air transportation system is in the airpower picture.

Since World War II air transportation itself has grown tremendously. While growing, it has greatly increased the interchange of people, of goods and ideas.

Air transportation has contributed to peace and our security. It was the means of winning the first battle of the cold war: The Berlin Airlift. Thousands of people were kept alive by food, fuel, and medicine. Freedom was maintained by air transport alone.

Air transport won this cold war battle just as decisively as the atom bombers ended World War II. Our victory in Berlin had a profound effect on the Soviets.

Air transport became even more important in the next scene of battle against Communist aggression: Korea. The airlift of forces, ammunition, and supplies in the first year far surpassed the Berlin record.

By early 1952 military transports combined with commercial airlines to set a new airlift record—more than 3½ million ton-miles were flown.

Commercial airlines carried more than half the burden. This is an outstanding example of the operational efficiency of our airlines.

This accomplishment was capped only by their readiness to meet the emergency. Within 3 days after the Communists attacked, our private airlines had planes in the air on the way to the Korean theater.

Our combat air forces fought and won the air war in Korea—not only over South Korea, but over North Korea as well. Important in this victory was the air bridge over the vast Pacific created by our air transportation system.

This gives you an idea of the great contribution to our airpower made by the airlines pilots and the planes they fly.

Another big part of our national airpower that we should be proud of is our system of air bases and airfields. If war should ever strike this Nation again, our airfields, military and civilian, could very well be one of our most priceless assets. In an atomic war, the more airfields we have the better our chances of successful retaliation against an aggressor. More airfields mean more dispersal. More dispersal means more of our retaliatory force could survive an atomic onslaught. More airfields mean more division of an enemy's effort. More airfields would make this job tougher and our job easier.

More airfields also give us another important advantage. In case this country were attacked by an enemy atomic striking force, our airlines could very well be the only surviving transportation system. Airfields could give us the ability to sustain our Nation and to support and rehabilitate any devastated area.

You all have a share in this great airfield we see here—you also have a share in many other airfields that you do not see—the many bases of your United States Air Force. These extend three-quarters of the way around the world. From the far off Middle East through Africa and Europe, across the Atlantic to Greenland, and stretches westward to Alaska. From Alaska they reach down through the Far East to Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines.

This airfield here will be important to our security in war just as it now is important to commerce and welfare in peace.

I am honored to be present to dedicate this terminal. I feel honored also to be among those who have helped to give us strength in the air so that we can remain safe and free.

With your help and your support we will maintain our position of leadership in the air, so that this great Nation can continue to grow and prosper.

National School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me in support of the national school-lunch program before the Senate Appropriations Committee:

STATEMENT OF VICTOR WICKERSHAM IN SUPPORT OF THE NATIONAL SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM BEFORE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

From a small beginning, the school-lunch program has expanded rapidly until today approximately 10.5 million school children in the United States are participating in the program. In Oklahoma about 170,870 children were participating as of December 1955.

The National School Lunch Act, which became effective June 4, 1946, placed the school-lunch program on a permanent basis. It states that the purpose of the program is to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children by encouraging them to eat more nutritious food. In signing the bill, on June 4, 1946, President Truman commented: "In the long view, no nation is any healthier than its children or more prosperous than its farmers; and in the National School Lunch Act, the Congress has contributed immeasurably both to the welfare of our farmers and the health of our children."

Congressional discussions of the school-lunch program have generally credited it with a two-fold purpose—the use of surplus agricultural commodities, and the improvement of the health and nutrition of school children. In its early stages, the program seems to have been chiefly inspired by the surplus of agricultural commodities. School lunches were one method adopted for distributing these surpluses. But as the program has developed, the two purposes have received equal emphasis; and, particularly in educational and health circles, the greater emphasis has tended to be upon the health and nutritional benefits.

To assist the States in carrying on a school-lunch program, Federal funds are allocated on the basis of an equalization formula which takes into account the per capita income of each State and the school population. For the years 1947 to 1950, inclusive, the States were required to match each dollar of Federal funds by $1 from sources within the State. For the years 1951 to 1955, payments were based upon the condition that for each dollar of Federal funds, the State's matching requirement would be $1.50. For any fiscal year after 1955, each Federal dollar must be matched by $3 from sources within the States. However, in the case of any State whose per capita income is less than the per capita income of the United States, the matching required for any fiscal year shall be decreased by the percentage which the State per capita income is below the per capita income of the United States.

The Federal Government appropriation for the national school-lunch program for fiscal year 1955 was $83,236,197. In addition to the cash appropriation, the Federal Government donated about $70 million worth of surplus commodities to the States to be used in the program. Of the cash appropriation for fiscal year 1955 Oklahoma received about $1,228,129, and in addition to that amount received about $3.7 million worth of surplus commodities.

The cooperation of States and the local communities in the administration of this program and financial contributions in making the national school-lunch program a success is most commendable. It proves to us again that the Federal Government assistance in this program, which provides some incentive for carrying on the program, is highly justifiable. We must, however, keep the program up to date. As participation increases contributions must be increased to maintain comparable nutritional standards from year to year.

The necessity for better nutrition was demonstrated to us during World War II. The national school-lunch program is an important means of spreading knowledge of better nutrition among all people throughout the country. While results of this aspect of the program cannot be measured in quantitative terms, it may well be that future generations will look upon this basic step toward better nutrition for our children as the most important single achievement of the program.

U. S. Department of Agriculture—Agricultural Marketing Service

SELECTED STATISTICS ON NATIONAL SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM IN OKLAHOMA, FISCAL YEARS 1947–55 AND PRELIMINARY 1956

	Fiscal years									
	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956 (preliminary)
Number of schools participating	1,561	1,447	1,393	1,546	1,590	1,669	1,653	1,696	1,771	1,763
Number of children participating	117,634	107,240	115,561	129,763	139,515	145,578	145,873	154,975	163,382	168,865
Federal cash apportionment	[1] $1,400,252	$1,216,167	$1,452,971	$1,524,239	$1,508,514	$1,313,928	$1,329,151	$1,318,090	$1,228,129	$1,181,309
Value of sec. 6 commodities [2]	$123,354	$315,442	$360,736	$364,210	$419,775	$342,654	$343,459	$275,499	$240,633	[3] $149,308
Value of surplus commodities [4]	$61,714	$397,682	$632,295	$839,972	$775,815	$475,394	$1,106,714	$1,818,138	$3,700,471	[3] $843,000
Number of meals served in program	16,249,000	16,706,000	18,538,000	21,183,000	22,868,000	23,177,000	23,690,000	25,482,000	26,864,000	[3] 12,439,000
Value of foods purchased locally by schools	$2,228,350	$2,578,494	$2,691,054	$3,023,175	$3,449,072	$3,793,063	$3,812,323	$3,854,572	$4,287,895	[3] $2,230,283

[1] Does not include $210,443 apportioned for equipment.
[2] Acquired under sec. 6 of the National School Lunch Act.
[3] July–December 1955.
[4] Acquired under price support and surplus removal programs.

The Medical Library Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the New York Times on April 1, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL MEDICAL LIBRARY

The finest medical library in the world is that of the Armed Forces. It contains almost a million books, receives more than 10,000 serial publications currently and annually about 100,000 journals and monographs, and supplies medical information to every institution that wants it. For years it has been inadequately housed and supported. Yet it is an indispensable aid in medical research.

If he were denied access to its rich resources, the research clinician or biologist and public health officer might well spend weeks, months, possibly years in exploring a region that may have been penetrated by some Japanese, Russian, or other forgotten or unknown scientist. Realizing this, Senators LISTER HILL and JOHN F. KENNEDY have introduced a bill which would separate the library from the Department of Defense, convert it into a National Medical Library, provide the necessary funds for its proper accommodation and maintenance and then place it on the same footing as the Library of Congress or the National Gallery. As it is, the library is housed in quarters that were condemned over a generation ago.

The Library of Congress is a national institution which meets needs far wider than those of Congress. Similarly, the library of the Armed Forces meets far more than military needs. Besides, the time passed long ago when the library was merely an adjunct of the Army's medical service. It is time that we had a National Library of Medicine with a board of trustees and a budget of its own. Neither its present name nor its anomalous place in the administration of the Department of Defense suggests the function that the library serves in meeting the needs of medical men all over the country.

The Hoover Commission is in favor of calling the library by its right name, expanding it and giving it the status that it should have had long ago. There is no sign of objection from the Department of Defense, which would probably be glad to rid itself of an administrative burden that has no direct connection with strictly military matters. The Hill-Kennedy bill deserves the approval of Congress.

Hiss' Appearance at Princeton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter I received from a Princeton alumnus which should make interesting reading. The letter is as follows:

HARRISBURG, PA., *May 7, 1956.*

Hon. T. JAMES TUMULTY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TUMULTY: As an Orangeman with a Princeton tradition in his family background (third generation), let me congratulate a son of old Erin for lancing the boil which finally came to a head at Princeton in the Hiss invitation. Truly you Irishmen will convert an old Scotsman like me by your example yet.

The Hiss invitation is of course not an episode in Princeton's history, but the result of a trend among its administration and faculty of long standing. Numerous alumni like myself have been protesting the growth of left-wing and un-American influences at Princeton University for years, only to earn

the hatred and contempt of the administration of the university and many alumni. We have made our protest without effect, and it appears that a reform, if any, must come from outside influences like yourself.

The reaction of the majority of the Princeton alumni proves that most of them are good Americans who loathed the idea of lending Princeton's good name to a traitor.

It is to be hoped that the Hiss affair will finally arouse Princetonians to throw out a faculty and an administration which—(1) Teaches the students such things that they think it is smart to invite a traitor to Princeton; (2) teaches the students such things that they give a standing applause to a traitor; (3) lets the president of the student society who invited Hiss to Princeton off with a light reprimand, instead of a resounding and disgracing rebuke; (4) refuses to take advantage of the university rule requiring advance clearance of speakers with the administration in order to cancel Hiss' appearance, and thus connives at Hiss' appearance at Princeton.

But are the students to be blamed if they follow the example of their elders who granted an honorary degree to such Red fronters as Bishop Oxnam, Ralph Bunche, Linus Pauling, and Harlow Shapley, and whose president wrote a rave review of Elmer Davis' book, "And We Were Born Free"?

Congressman, I say give 'em hell again and bravo!

ANDREW W. GREEN,
Princeton 44.

Preservation of Remnants of an Ancient Culture on the Site of the Dalles Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and I requested an appropriation for fiscal 1957 which would enable the National Park Service to save for future generations, the remnants of an ancient culture found in the vicinity of Celilo Falls on the Columbia River—a site soon to be covered by the waters impounded by the Dalles Dam.

I mention the subject today, Mr. President, because the hours and days are few, indeed, in which the work of saving these precious remnants of an old culture may be expedited. For future generations there will be a deeper appreciation of the past if the program of preservation is supported by an adequate appropriation.

To the end that a wider understanding of the purpose of this request may generally be had, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD of an article by Fred W. Vincent, entitled "Pictograph to Petroglyph," which appeared in the Portland Journal's Northwest Living magazine of April 22, 1956. This article was called to my attention by W. S. Nelson, the dean of Oregon Chamber Managers, who serves the chamber of commerce at The Dalles, Oreg..

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed a statement by Emory M. Strong, of the Oregon Archeological Society. He speaks as a scientist keenly aware of the infinite loss which is sure to occur if there is not an immediate and sufficient effort made to save those evidences of earlier inhabitants deposited century after century at this site.

Also, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD excerpt's from a letter I received from Jimmie James, dedicated and devoted pleader for the rights of his fellow Indians. Jimmie speaks in his letter, not with anguish at what is happening at Celilo, but with a profound sorrow—sorrow for the desecration of Indian graves, sorrow for his people who must lose this intimate association with the past, and sorrow for a people who in their rush to possess the earth, rudely trespass on the chambers of the dead. And from the Fort Vancouver Restoration and Historical Society, Inc., at Vancouver, Wash., Mr. President, I submit a letter from Carl Landerholm, secretary of the society.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PICTOGRAPH TO PETROGLYPH

(By Fred W. Vincent)

"Hee-hee!" was the Columbia and Snake River Indian expression during the early days when the old Chinook jargon was the universal trade language of the Oregon country.

It meant "have fun."

And there is plenty of fun and lots of frustration too, for anyone currently attempting to discover the actual meanings of the so-called Indian "rock writings" found on Columbia River cliffs from The Dalles eastward, and also in various parts of eastern Oregon and other Western States.

High honors await anyone who can determine the when and why of these crude "writings" that were hand chipped or painted on the hard basalt rocks which line the river and its tributaries.

The writings appear in three distinct forms: The first is the petroglyph. Here the picture is carved into the rock's surface. Generally speaking the incised lines are shallow, ranging from a scratch to a quarter of an inch in depth.

The second "writing" is the pictograph. This was made with paint consisting of ocher, hematite, or charcoal mixed with animal oil and resin. Red is the dominant color with yellow, black and white occupying secondary positions.

The third "writing" employs the petroglyph with superimposed pictographs.

For more than a century, curious amateurs and expert archeologists alike have pondered them with disappointing results. Now, for the last time, men of science are bending every effort to garner first hand records of the "writings" in The Dalles district, since these specific writings along the river's shores are doomed.

Late next year the last gap in the huge Dalles Dam will be closed. The river level will be elevated 90 feet. Under the deep waters of the resulting 24-mile-long lake two of the Columbia's most spectacular sights will be submerged—Five Mile Rapids just above The Dalles, and Celilo Falls, which during ages past has been the salmon fishing grounds of Pacific Northwest tribes.

The flooding will mark the end of the tribal gathering of coastal and interior Indians for trade and intertribal festivals. Beneath the water will go still unexplored ancient village sites, the mystifying rock writings, and other rich archeological remains that might be important keys yet needed to unlock the long ago past to disclose the "who" of our prehistoric peoples; how they lived, and how they scattered to found new homes throughout our two Americas.

Bit by bit patient archeologists have located the main routes that ancient migrants followed for thousands of years as they settled a vast new world.

From excavations of primordial village sites and caves; from the recovery of stone artifacts, human bones, and from the charred wood of ancient campfire remains researchers have gained clear ideas as to how the American Indians' primitive ancestors once lived, died, roamed, hunted, spun, wove, and with tools of stone, wood, and bone tilled the soil and developed intertribal commerce.

Modern man has, likewise gained a goodly knowledge of the various cultures achieved by America's ancient settlers, including the more recent and advanced civilizations of Peru, Mexico, and Central America at a time when Europe was only just emerging from savagery.

But our scientists know there is far more to be learned; to many, important archeological questions such as, "In what part of Asia did these peoples originate?" "When did they first reach the Western Hemisphere?" "How long did the main stream of migration last?" "Did all of them migrate across the 'Alaskan bridge' afoot or did some of them take to the ocean and find their ways to warmer climates by raft and boat?"

Some of the answers, it is believed, may be found if and when the rock writings, common to both North and South America, are, accurately deciphered and accurately dated. For example, the Mayan ornate writings are fairly well dated, because Mayans of Yucatan built of stone, and developed a written language. But the crude rock writings that appear here in Oregon and in 40 of our 48 States, are dateless and lack adequate translations.

There are reasons for this. No nomadic culture can be accurately dated until it can be definitely tied to some chronology that is already known. Oregon's early inhabitants were fundamentally hunters, and as such they were nomadic in their habits. For the most part they were constantly on the move in search of game, fish, berries and roots. As a result they left behind them only legends and artifacts, such as arrows and stone spearheads and those puzzling "writings" on the rocks.

Present day Indians here in the West with very few exceptions, disclaim any knowledge of the petroglyphs and pictographs despite the fact that a number of their symbols are widely used in tribal ceremonies and rites. They are also employed as patterns for ornamentation of baskets, textiles and products.

The fact that the rock hewn or painted characters contain so many identical or similar forms, makes it clear that the peoples who lived in the rock-writing era knew what the "writings" meant. Differing techniques also indicate that the "writings" were the products of several Indian cultures, according to geographic areas.

The most common of our regional "writings" revolved around figures of human beings, game animals, reptiles, anthropomorphic characters, birds, sun rays, arrows, circles, zig-zag lines, rain signs, and a number of intricate designs which bear no apparent resemblance to any specific thing.

Elk, deer, mountain sheep and antelope are the most frequently pictured among the game animals. Lizards, rattlesnakes, and horned toads lead the reptilian category. The fact that such forms of life thrive here today would argue that climatic conditions then were not too different from those of today. Reptiles, for instance do not take kindly to cold and ice. In the Dalles region pictures of humans are extremely rare. Many however are found east of the Cascades, armed with bow, arrow and spear. In Oregon, Washington and Idaho, most of

the petroglyphs and pictographs are found close to streams, lakes and points where old Indian trails crossed each other. Aside from the Columbia and its tributaries, the greatest concentration of the writings are found in central and southeastern Oregon. They also extend into Idaho, California, Nevada and the Southwest. One of the richest finds yet is located near Long Lake, close to the California border.

The presence of the writings along the shorelines of former lakes indicate that it was well populated and was first class hunting country. Carbon 14 tests on an old pair of sandals recovered by University of Oregon's excavators, indicate that the aborigines lived there at least 9,000 years ago. Yet, says Dr. L. S. Cressman, University of Oregon anthropologist, there is no evidence, so far unearthed, that shows any relationship between that ancient stone age culture and the petroglyphs and pictographs found on the rocks.

The same holds true for the petroglyphs and pictographs in the Dalles district according to Portland Archeologist David Cole. Cole, Dr. Cressman's former assistant, directed excavation work on several ancient Indian village sites above the rapids from 1951 until 1954 when he went to Japan to serve as a United States Army consultant in anthropology.

The excavations were completed last year by other archeologists under Dr. Cressman's direction. They yielded stone artifacts which indicate that aborigines lived in the district probably 11,000 years ago.

Many geologists estimate that the last ice age that gripped North America occurred between 16,000 and 20,000 years ago. Archeologists believe that man arrived after the ice was in full retreat. There is plenty of evidence to show that man had already made his way as far south as New Mexico 12,000 years ago. If he was in Oregon at such a time, he might, conceivably, have pecked out petroglyphs with his stone chisel. However, the presence of modern animals in the writings points too strongly to post-ice age authorship to be ignored. The writings themselves indicate man's aptitude with his chisel may have developed thousands of years later. He may not even have abandoned the art until sometime after the arrival of the white man on the scene.

Support for this latter theory is given by the appearance of the modern horse in the petroglyphs. The ancient nomads were horseless. They had no horses until the early 1500s when Spanish invaders brought them to Mexico. Up to that time the Indians depended on their own two feet and on canoes or dugouts for transportation.

Here in the Northwest, the horse did not arrive until the late 1700s when Dakota and Shoshone Indians brought them into the intermountain country. When Lewis and Clark passed through our lands in 1805 the coastal Indians, from the Cascades west, had no horses and depended on their canoes to get around.

Nevertheless, "Mr. Hose" with men riding him, is found pictured at 5 Oregon sites. One site is just west of the Cascades summit. The remaining 4 are in eastern Oregon and include Long Lake, where the adventurers from Asia lived 9,000 years ago. All of which proves only one thing. A couple of centuries ago Indian artists were still chiseling out petroglyphs. But this fact does not answer the question as to when they started to make them.

Pictures of the horse are brighter, and may have been added to the original subjects, even as a pictograph depicting a buffalo has been found at the head of Five Mile Rapids. Buffalo never ranged in Wasco County.

There you have it. Pictures of things we know, and some symbols whose meanings the experts know, are included there on the rocks. But no one knows exactly what thoughts or information the pictures were intended to convey by the Indian artists who produced them.

Modern researchers do agree on some points. They know that rock writing had a real purpose. Some undoubtedly were related closely to fundamental religious beliefs in the magical powers of gods to make nature work for good or ill. Others may have been records of personal or tribal achievements. Still others may have been signs pointing to good hunting, berry patches, or water. Others may have indicated boundaries between neighboring tribes, while still others may have been related to various tribal ceremonies, such as initiatory rites of boys and girls into full tribal membership.

All of them within the reaches of a rising lake are doomed to pass from modern man's sight. With them must go two of the ageless river's greatest grandeurs, its rapids and its falls.

All that will be left will be stone artifacts, photographs and typed memories displayed in a museum which W. S. Nelson, manager of the Dalles Chamber of Commerce, is hoping the National Park Service will build nearby.

If you want "Hee-hee" so far as concerns this segment of the Indian's history make haste, next year it will be too late!

MARCH 26, 1956.

To the UNITED STATES SENATE:

There is probably no place in the United States so rich in historical and archaeological lore as the area soon to be inundated by the waters of The Dalles dam. Here is the start of the great Columbia River gorge, the only pass for hundreds of miles north and south through the Cascade Mountains. Here also are Celilo Falls and the Long and Short Narrows of the Columbia where the river, usually nearly a mile wide, is compressed into a few hundred feet and in the words of Lewis and Clark "in these narrows the water was agitated in a most shocking manner, boils, swells, and whirlpools."

The falls and narrows made ideal places for the taking of the salmon which formerly ascended the river in incredible numbers. From hundreds of miles in all directions the natives gathered here to fish, and being in the only pass it became a great trade market also as the Indians from the rain swept coast met those of the barren plains. At the head of the Narrows was the village of Wishram described at length by Washington Irving in his book "Astoria", and many others both historic and prehistoric. Early journals indicate that as many as 5,000 Indians were encamped at one time on the narrow ledges beside the falls and rapids.

This concentration of natives from many tribes greatly enriched the area in archaeological data. Buried in the depths of the occupational strata is a wealth of scientific information and a treasure of museum specimens. On the basalt cliffs surrounding the region are hundreds of the finest examples of aboriginal art in the United States. All of these things are a great cultural heritage, they should not be permitted to be lost to the public, and to the students of ethnology.

Through this pass may have come some of the first inhabitants of this continent. Preliminary excavations by Dr. Cressman of the University of Oregon and Dr. Osborne of the University of Washington uncovered occupational strata at depths of 27 and 22 feet, respectively, of an unknown culture that may have preceded the invention of the bow and arrow. The famous Wakemap Mound, a midden over 20 feet deep and indicating a succession of cultures, may hold the key to the history of early man. On both the Oregon and Washington shores are ancient sites that have never been exploited.

The petroglyphs and pictographs, or rock carvings and paintings, are a great tourist attraction as well as a valuable cultural media. Of the hundreds in the area, about 25 are of such an outstanding nature that it is unthinkable to let them be lost for all time. These are not the random markings usually associated with Indian picture writing, but true expressions of an artistic urge. Being in an inaccessible portion of the river, they are as yet little known except to the amateur and professional archaeologist.

The loss of similar but not so important historical and archaeological data behind other dams on the Columbia and elsewhere led to the formation of the Oregon Archaeological Society to assist in the preservation of these American heritages. As amateurs we are spending hundreds of days of volunteer labor in The Dalles basin but much of the scientific digging and the removal of the petroglyphs is beyond our capabilities. We ask only that sufficient money be appropriated to cut away the art specimens from the cliffs for removal by barge when the pool is full, and for the employment of skilled archaeologists for the tracing of the history of the region through excavations.

We feel that the Government, by whose hand these things are being inundated, cannot shirk its duty to preserve these valuable historical, scientific, and cultural materials.

EMORY M. STRONG
(For the Oregon Archaeological Society).

INDIAN CEMETERIES ARE JUST AS SACRED AND HAVE THE SAME RIGHT OF PROTECTION AS THOSE OF THE WHITE PEOPLE

JIMMIE JAMES,
PRESS AGENT FOR THE
YAKIMA INDIAN NATION,
April 26, 1956.

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Today, I believe I saw one of the most depressing things that ever came to my attention, and I have seen some pathetic ones. I have believed in the past that man's cemeteries were sacred, and deserved all consideration that we could give our consolation to those who still lived, no matter if it were today or yesterday—because cemeteries are memory chests where we lay away our loved ones and our heroes alike—we know they do not remain there—but we like to be able to feel they are near and cherish their memory by strolling by or leaving some token we know they most loved, and, according to our laws and customs, these places are guarded by every God-fearing person within our Nation. We have been taught this in churches and at mother's knee, and know beyond a doubt this principle is right, right for every race, no matter from where they come, nor how small their group may be. We have seen long, straight highways reaching for miles on end, with a bend in the road turning out around a small cemetery rather than disturb it, although it may be tumbled down and ill kept and stood for over a hundred years—but my belief in this principle suffered a shock and all but fell apart.

I have the word of the people who are losing cemeteries, their Arlingtons, holding their Washingtons, Lincolns, and Jeffersons, as well as great leaders and warriors who outsmarted this Nation's best, these people are again feeling the double standard they have known so long. Some say, "Their cemeteries are not marked," as the white man's are. This is, because to mark an Indian's grave is to mark a place to dig for relics.

The fiction writers, through the years, have done their job and done it well, and have made museum pieces of our dead. They term skulls and beads or anything that stands the ravages of time relics, but now our graveyards, if they stand in the way, are being considered just yardage, dug and used

for fill just like any other earth soil, or roadbeds or waste, regardless that the soil holds hundreds of bodies that have become a part of mother earth.

The churches throughout the Nation and kindred organizations must not know of this cemetery destruction that is going on so heartlessly, without consideration. When they do, pleace offer a prayer that this may stop and we may be considered people like other races and enjoy the same privileges because we have given much to mankind—although we fought like any other race to keep some of our homeland, our security, and treaty privileges.

Your attention is respectfully drawn to these facts: When the Dalles Dam is completed and the huge gates are closed against the stream—water will rise, flooding land never intended to be flooded. The water will cover many burial places, used by the Indian people, some since the beginning of time.

I have done as you suggested, gone to Celilo Falls and talked to people who are losing their cemeteries, and this is the picture I got.

The cemetery at Big Eddy on the Washington side and the burial island just above the dam as well as very ancient ones along the Columbia will be flooded. My attention was also called to the burial grounds that lie within the village of Celilo, which will not be flooded. But this is what happened as the facts were told and shown to me at the grave yard, several Indian residents varified these facts, so they are true beyond a doubt. When they moved the railroad tracks to higher ground, and built a new road to the lock house and lower administration buildings near the river, bulldozers and carriers cut their right of way through this cemetery. The railroad right of way seems to be at least 60 feet wide and 6 or 7 feet deep and the roadway is about 30 feet wide and about 5 feet deep, these cuts are through the burial ground, also there was considerable dirt removed from this cemetery all over the top, for just what reason I could not tell, unless it was for fill somewhere else. But from what I could learn, and I spent considerable time there, no one either asked or listened about this grave yard they just simply started work as on any other section, although the Indian people went to them and protested, and told them it was their cemetery. First they told the oiler, and I believe he brought it to the attention of the head engineer of that part of the project. This man came and told them the bones were animal, and just laughed and walked away. But these (animals) bodies were shrouded in buckskin and had black hair and beads, so I am quite sure I am not mistaken, all you have to do is interview the people at Celilo Falls and they will tell you more than I have.

We stop traffic for a funeral to pass, no matter if the President of the United States has to wait, so would it be asking too much to stop the construction of the dam, if need be, until the Indian people can be contacted and treated like the white skinned people, in caring for their dead, because you must remember the Great Spirit is the same as the white man's God.

Very sincerely yours,

JIMMIE JAMES.

PORTLAND, OREG.

FORT VANCOUVER RESTORATION AND HISTORICAL SOCIETY, INC.,
Vancouver, Wash., April 6, 1956.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, United States Senate Appropriations Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: The Fort Vancouver Restoration and Historical Society of Vancouver, Wash., respectfully urge the approval of the appropriation of funds to make possible the preservation of valuable archeological and other historical data which are threatened with annihilation above the dam near the Dalles, Oregon-Washington, now under construction.

Upon the flooding of the area, much of this material of great social value will, as said, be lost, unless prompt action is taken to insure its preservation.

Thanking you for whatever aid you will give to this pressing matter, I am

Sincerely yours,

CARL LANDERHOLM,
Secretary of the Society.

Improved Weather Bureau Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by Charles F. Brooks, Milton, Mass., to the editor of the New York Times, April 8, 1956.

There being no objection, the letter to the editor was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO IMPROVE FORECASTING—NEED FOR FUNDS TO EXPAND WEATHER BUREAU PROGRAM EXPLAINED

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The writer of the following letter is professor of meteorology and director of the Blue Hill Meteorological Observatory of Harvard University.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

I am pleased that your editorial of March 21 places blame for the insufficient warning of the heavy snow of the 18th and 19th not on the forecaster but on the lack of constant upper air reports and on inadequate knowledge as to how to interpret them.

As the low pressure area which developed this snowstorm approached the coast from the West there were no upper air reports at all from the Atlantic west of a line from Nova Scotia to Bermuda. The forecaster, therefore, had no knowledge of upper air currents offshore which were to change the easterly movement of the low into a northeasterly one. Upper air data every 6 hours from a weather ship at Station Hotel, about half way between New York and Bermuda (abandoned, after 12 years, for reasons of economy in June 1954) might well have given the cue.

As for surface observations, from this oceanic area of some 250,000 square miles, an area about equal to that of the Middle and North Atlantic States, there were only 2 ship reports at 5:30 a. m. March 17, 5 at 9:30 p. m., and 4 each at 5:30 and 11:30 a. m. March 18. None of these was from the same place twice.

ADDITIONAL MARINE REPORTS

The Weather Bureau recognizes the deficiency of marine reports and is using some of this year's considerably increased appropriation (made in part for the purpose) to produce more. In the western Atlantic 2 radiosonde and surface observation stations have been established on merchant vessels plying between Baltimore and San Juan, P. R., also 2 in the Gulf of Mexico and 1 in the Pacific. More are planned, including wind-aloft stations. Weather reconnaissance flights have been doubled.

As I see it, station "Hotel" should also be reoccupied. No less-expensive substitute has yet been found for providing the frequent and complete surface and upper-air data that this station used to present from this stormy area. These reports were very helpful in the forecasting for the adjacent region, which has the greatest concentration of population, property, industry, and commerce in the United States.

While the more reports over an area the better, there is additional value in reports from the same spot. The trends can be observed—trends that may mean changes in storm tracks, speeds, and intensities. The station is always there (unless a hurricane is right on top of it), which is not true of merchant vessel stations. Such ships give hurricanes a wide berth.

We should make sure that Congress votes at least the budget asked for 1956–57. This provides $30,804,600 for general weather services, $2,952,000 for research, $1,745,400 for administration, and a special $2,500,000 for meteorological facilities.

The regular budget is virtually the same as this year's, except for an increase of $1,350,000 for research. This is much needed for gaining a better knowledge of meteorology, and thereby improved forecasts. The special budget is to augment the $7,500,000 voted last year ($10 million had been requested), mainly for refurbishing and extending the network of upper-air and radar stations, to be spent over a 4-year period.

AUGMENTED BUDGET

Nevertheless, what may be possible under the present appropriations and the budget for the coming year is quite inadequate, in my opinion. There was a considerable discussion about this at a "town meeting" of meteorologists held by the Chief of the Weather Bureau in New York 2 months ago. All present seemed to agree on the desirability of greatly increased marine reports, but some considered the cost, especially of restoring station "Hotel" ($2 million or $3 million a year), prohibitive.

But is it really prohibitive to spend a few million dollars more for a probably significant improvement in storm forecasting? Is 1 cent per inhabitant of the United States ($1,650,000) prohibitive, or 2 cents ($3,300,000), or 5 cents ($8,250,000)? The total regular Weather Bureau budget is only 20 cents per person.

CHARLES F. BROOKS.

MILTON, MASS., *March 31, 1956.*

H. R. 10

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Leslie Gould which appeared in the New York Journal-American of Monday, April 23, 1956:

UNITED STATES SHOULD FOLLOW BRITAIN ON AIDING SELF-EMPLOYED

(By Leslie Gould)

The British have just taken a significant step toward ending the discrimination against the self-employed for their old age.

The move, included in the new British budget, is important for its possible effect on similar efforts in this country to end this discrimination.

There are more than 10 million self-employed in the United States. These include farmers, doctors, lawyers, accountants,

brokers, engineers, salesmen and funeral directors.

Under present tax laws they are denied a tax credit or deduction for contributions to specified private pension funds.

There is a bill before the House—it passed the Ways and Means Committee by a 16 to 8 vote last year—to accord the self-employed the same treatment as now granted employees. Employees include officers of a corporation. Also employees of a partnership—such as a law or accounting firm or of any professional person. But the partners in such a firm or individual professional people and the farmers and salesmen are now denied this treatment.

PRESENT LAW UNFAIR

This is unfair. It is discrimination never intended under the Constitution. But to date, the matter has been kicked around in Congress, getting nowhere until this present House bill.

One of the troubles is that no administration has sponsored this needed change. That includes the present Eisenhower one. The British development may help change that hands-off stand. Also, it looks like the Treasury will wind up the current year with a surplus, maybe as much as $2 billion—so the Treasury no longer has its pat argument of being against it for its effect on the budget. Regardless of its effect on the budget, the present tax law is discriminatory and it should be changed.

The British Government's proposals go far beyond the relief provided in the present House bill. The same tax break as granted corporation workers is to be accorded the British self-employed. Cost of annuities would be deductible, thus reducing the taxable net income.

RELIEF EXTENDED

This relief is to be extended by Britain to employees not now covered by their employer, whether the employer is a corporation or not.

This is part of the just announced British anti-inflation program. It is designed to encourage saving, which is what contributions to a pension plan are.

Under present American tax laws, the self-employed can only provide for his old age out of net income—that is after the high income taxes. And the taxes are high no matter what the bracket.

The proposal is so fair and equitable, that it is amazing that there should be any delays in providing this relief. It is in keeping with the basic American philosophy of private endeavor.

Miss Jane Todd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower recently announced the creation of a council on the aging, entrusted with the task of inquiring into problems pecular to our older people. This organization is particularly charged with the responsibility of seeing that the Federal Government keeps its programs and policies attuned to the marked rise in the number of older people in the United States.

Partially as a result of the establishment of this council, long overdue recognition has been accorded Miss Jane Todd. Miss Todd has for years been an advocate of greater attention to the needs of women and older people. She has led a busy and fruitful life, highlighted by numerous contributions to the Republican Party, serving as deputy commissioner of the New York State Department of Commerce, and in her present role as consultant to the Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor and member of the Department's Committee for Older Women. The nature of her work and the way she goes about it are typical of Jane Todd's kindliness and selflessness.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Christian Science Monitor of April 30, which describes Miss Todd and her work:

OLDER WORKERS HAVE MUCH TO CONTRIBUTE—JANE TODD, LABOR DEPARTMENT CONSULTANT, TELLS THEM HOW

(By Jessie Ash Arndt)

Assets outweigh drawbacks in the employment of the older woman worker, says Miss Jane Todd, consultant to the Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor and a member of the Labor Department's Committee for the Older Woman. The reason for such a committee is that 12 million of the 20 million women workers in the country are at least 35 years of age and of these 4 million in the 1955 labor force were from 35 to 54.

Miss Todd, who initiated New York State's small business program for women as deputy commissioner of the department of commerce under Governor Dewey following World War II, is now translating the successful business clinics she held in New York State into a Federal project for the Department of Labor.

THINGS TO LEARN

Older women who are seeking jobs often have things to learn, Miss Todd pointed out. Sometimes they need a refresher course in the field in which they have worked in previous years or a training course in some other field before they apply for a job. But one important requirement is that they delay their application until they have equipped themselves to fill a given job whether part or full time.

Too often, the older woman may want work of some kind but fails to get it. First, because she is in need of some brushing up of skills; second, because she asks for work without a clear idea of what she is fitted to do; and third—or should this have been first?—because she does not give attention to her appearance when she makes application.

These details will be discussed at an all-day earning opportunities forum in Boston May 10 at the Community Service Center, to which women job seekers listed with the State employment service will be invited. Miss Todd has been in Boston 3 times within the past few weeks for meetings with a planning committee composed of civic leaders, representatives of labor groups, and industrial leaders. Miss Pauline Mandigo, also a consultant to the Women's Bureau, has assisted her.

BOSTON FORUM

There will be discussion of job opportunities and job requirements at the May 10 forum from 10 to 12 a. m., and 1:30 to 3:30 p. m., with a period for personal interviews following each session.

"It is only fair that those who are familiar with the technique of employment and training share their knowledge with those who are preparing to secure gainful employment for the first time, and with those who need job training," said Mrs. Alice K. Leopold, Assistant to the Secrtary of Labor for Women's Affairs, in a message of appreciation to the citizens of Massachusetts planning the Earning Opportunities Forum.

The whole purpose of the program is to bring jobs and much-needed workers together, and to open doors which have been closed to the older women in the labor market.

Miss Todd has been consultant with the Women's Bureau—which Mrs. Leopold heads—for the past year and has already conducted a pilot project in Baltimore. There a public forum for job seekers was held the end of January with almost 300 registered, many of whom wanted part-time work.

Dean M. Marie Mount of the University of Maryland, who served as chairman of the Maryland committee which sponsored the sessions in Baltimore, has kept her committee together as a clearinghouse for applications and information. Often older women do not know where to get job information, Miss Todd stated.

The Baltimore YWCA is so much interested in the project that it is conducting a survey as to women wanting jobs and the job opportunities available in that area.

Dr. Francis M. Froelicher, assistant superintendent of schools in Baltimore, in charge of adult education, has set up evening training courses which will be given in the public schools as part of the program. Twenty-three enrolled in the initial one offering training for office skills.

This program, Miss Todd explained in an interview when she was in Boston preparing for the meeting planned here, has the twofold purpose of opening greater opportunities for older women and helping to meet the shortage of teachers, nurses, stenographers, and other office workers. The Boston forum will serve as a pilot project for the New England States. The next program will be instituted in New Jersey.

It is in line with President Eisenhower's recently announced plan calling for designation of a representative from each of a dozen Government agencies to form a council on the aging, charged with seeing that Government programs and policies keep pace with the needs presented by the marked rise in the number of older people in the population of the United States.

NO MORE ABSENCES

Statistics show that the older woman is not slow nor is she more frequently absent than the younger worker, said Miss Todd. On the contrary, she has proved to be steadier, more reliable, and to have a better attendance record than her younger colleague.

The older employed woman is neither concerned with dates and parties after work, nor young children at home. She is settled, and stable, and usually devotes herself to her job with genuine interest.

Often she prefers part-time to full-time work and one of the problems is to help employers see the advantage of making use of her for the number of hours she can give to a job. On the other hand, Miss Todd remarked, the woman who wants part-time employment must make adjustments in home duties to fit the employer's needs and not expect him to turn his shop or office upside down so she can run her home or her usual schedule.

IN SMALL BUSINESSES

Miss Todd plans to devote some time at the Boston forum to discussion of small-business enterprises which women can set up in their homes, marketing products which they make themselves. Women who have made a success of such endeavors will be on the program.

There is a warm kindliness about Jane Todd which finds practical expression in the program she is now carrying on. Her own hair is a little gray, her cheeks are ruddy—perhaps from gardening at her home in Tarrytown-on-the-Hudson—and she is full of encouragement for those who need ideas and direction in earning extra dollars.

She got into public life by working in the Republican Party as a volunteer after women won suffrage in 1920. Her first political office was as vice chairman of the Republican Committee for the town of Greenburgh the first time any woman living in Tarrytown had held such an office.

Then, in 1937, she became New York State's first woman vice chairman of the Republican Party. She has served ever since and has also served 10 years as a member of the State legislature.

When she got out of the State assembly in 1944, she decided to retire from public life. But at the end of World War II, Governor Dewey was concerned about the women coming out of the service and their being able to get civilian jobs. Miss Todd was called to the State department of commerce to help them in the readjustment. However, the women veterans were so well trained they had no trouble getting jobs, she said, so attention was turned to older women and the small-business program.

ON NATIONAL SCALE

Now, under Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell and Mrs. Leopold—who is the first woman to serve as assistant to the Secretary of Labor—recognition is being given to the need on a national scale, and Miss Todd is in the midst of the new program.

When she is not busy in this or in work for the party, she is glad to be at home in the four-room colonial house she built after she and her brother sold the family home which her grandfather had established in Tarrytown. There she cooks delicious meals for weekend guests and delights in digging in her garden.

Someday she may retire to her home, her garden, her cookstove, and view of the Hudson, but that time is not yet. There are still too many people who need the kind of help she can give, so her job is cut out for her and she's one of those steady, reliable workers who like to stick to it till it's done.

Fifty Years of Forestry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Oregon is blessed with the greatest forests in the United States. The State's greatest industry, Mr. President, is the billion-dollar lumber industry. This industry, begun in Oregon 120 years ago, nearly 20 years before Oregon became a State.

It was very natural under such circumstances that Oregon State College would become famed for the teaching of forestry. In the April 1956 issue of the Oregon Stater, the official organ of the Oregon State College Alumni Association, there appears a splendid account of the development of the School of Forestry under the title of "Fifty Years of Forestry." Dean W. F. McCulloch, Donald W. Pitts, and Henry Clepper, the executive secretary of the American Society of Foresters, contributed to this able account.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIFTY YEARS OF FORESTRY

(It has been 50 years since the first 4-year course in forestry was established at Oregon State. Prior to 1906 the forestry courses were taught along with botany and horticulture. In this half-century of OSC forestry, bachelor's degrees were granted to 1,367 and 93 foresters have been awarded advanced degrees. The college's forestry alumni are working in nearly every State in the Nation and in many foreign countries. The School of Forestry has tradition, excellent faculty and students, and a world-wide reputation. The following articles will show you how the School of Forestry got that way).

AIMS OF FORESTRY SCHOOL

(By Dean W. F. McCulloch)

The first forestry at Oregon State was taught as part of a botany course by Moses Craig in 1892. A forestry course as such was given in 1896, and in 1904 the department of botany and forestry was established. In 1906, forestry became a degree-granting department on its own. This was a little optimistic since the entire staff consisted of one man, Edward Lake. In January 1910, the first professional forester joined the Oregon State staff in the person of George W. Peavy, later to be dean of forestry and president of the college. At this time, the professional flavor of the school was so soundly established that it still persists.

George Peavy was a dynamic individual, full of fire, with a great zeal for forestry and a great interest in foresters. In the days of small enrollments, he knew each student thoroughly, regarded him as a personal friend. "My boys" he called them. The friendship with "his boys" endured throughout George Peavy's life.

This fine relationship between school administrator and students naturally spread to other staff men as new instructors were engaged. Through the years a high degree of understanding developed. School affairs, instructional as well as extracurricular, became cooperative ventures between students and staff.

This program worked well for forestry, for the graduates, and for the college. Leaders in forestry today look back on their formative years and ascribe much of their success to George Peavy's emphasis on the development of men and to the friendly way in which he did it. The worth of graduates determines the worth of a school program. Since the Peavy formula has worked so well, there seems no need to change it. The aim of the school today is the development of men, citizens, and foresters, in that order. In keeping with the best traditions of the school, the friendly relationships of the early years are maintained. Students and staff are on a first-name basis; students participate in school programs such as orientation of new men; staff members participate in forest club activities; and a fernhopper forum comprised of student leaders and staff advisers coordinates the interest of both.

To achieve the aims of the school an intensive personal program is carried on including a yearly followup of graduates for 5 years after graduation. Staff members are active professionally not only for their own development, but to maintain contacts which will aid in the career development of students. The school's standard of performance is clearly stated to each new man: "The school expects every man in every class every day with every lesson prepared—and with the right attitude toward the profession and his fellow man." Those who cannot or will not meet this standard are advised to leave promptly, because anything less than this will not enable them to become foresters. The basic purpose of the combined academic and personnel program is to better forestry by developing better foresters.

THE M'DONALD FOREST STORY

(By Donald W. Pitts)

North of Corvallis about 6 miles and just west of Highway 99–W lies the McDonald Forest. It is an essential part of the school of forestry. Generations of fernhoppers have studied and played here.

The McDonald Forest contains 6,761 acres. All types of wildland cover are found on the forest but the area is largely second growth Douglar fir. Experimental plots, the dean's cabin, the forestry club cabin, and recreational areas are found within its borders.

The forest is not used by foresters alone. The Sulphur Springs area has fireplaces and tables. It is used by the public and campus-living groups for picnics.

The first steps toward acquiring the forest were taken in 1923 when Dean George W. Peavy sponsored an arboretum committee to raise funds for purchase of land for a school of forestry arboretum. In 1925, the first land was purchased. Through the years, land has been added by purchase and donations to bring the forest to its present size.

The forest is named in honor of Mrs. Mary J. L. McDonald, the principal donor. She was born in 1850 in Illinois. She came to California in 1855. Her husband was a wealthy mining engineer and lumberman from San Francisco. Mrs. McDonald died in 1936. She felt the moneyed people of Oregon had neglected the State college. She wanted to help a school that taught the practical courses of everyday living, rather than the fine arts. By her contributions she hoped to influence others to donate to Oregon State.

Mrs. McDonald first met Dean Peavy about 1929 when he was called in as a forest consultant on McDonald lands in California. She determined to help him realize his dream of making Oregon State School of Forestry second to none. In 1930 she made her first donation of $3,000. The donations made while she was alive and the provisions of her will account for 5,075 acres, or 75 percent of the present forest areas. To honor her, the Oregon State Board of Higher Education officially designated the area the McDonald forest in 1932. She also contributed many rare books and furnished the McDonald rare book room in the college library.

The forest is used today as a training ground to give students practical experience in surveying, cruising, and other forestry subjects. Because the forest area is so close, the forestry school does not need a summer camp to give students field training, as is done at many other forestry schools. OSC foresters get their field training in the forest during the regular school year.

In addition to McDonald forest, the school of forestry owns several other tracts of land. They are the Peavy arboretum, 181 acres, the Spaulding tract, 160 acres; the Blodgett tract, 2,400 acres; and the Adair tract, 4,000 acres.

The forest has two cabins, the club cabin and the dean's cabin. The dean's cabin was built for Dean Peavy by forestry school alumni as a place where he could relax from his duties. The forestry club cabin is the place where foresters hold the club meetings, steak fries, and dances.

HISTORY OF SCHOOL

1892: First forestry taught in a botany course by Moses Craig.

1894: Hough's Elements of Forestry used as a text.

1896: First forestry course taught in botany department by Edward R. Lake.

1904: Department of botany and forestry established.

1906: Four-year undergraduate and 1-year graduate program in forestry established.

1908: Department of forestry established.

1910: George W. Peavy appointed as professor and head of the department of forestry.

Girst class of forestry graduates: Harold D. Gill, Thurman J. Starker, Jack F. Pernot, Sinclair A. Wilson.

1913: School of forestry established with Peavy as dean; department of logging engineering established in the school.

1917: Forestry building constructed.

1920: Annual cruise founded.

1921: Graduate work in forestry authorized; Master of Science, Master of Forestry, and Forest Engineer degrees.

Forest land acquisition program inaugurated. Peavy aboretum and Spaulding tract acquired.

1925: First forestry club cabin built on McDonald Forest.

1927: Third major field of study, lumber manufacture, introduced; later changed to wood products.

1934: Dean Peavy appointed president of Oregon State College.

1935: Dean's cabin presented to G. W. Peavy by old graduates.

1936: Minor fields of study in forestry introduced: Forest recreation, fish and game management, grazing management, soil conservation, forest pathology, forest entomology, science, pulp and paper, and business administration.

1940: Dr. G. W. Peavy appointed dean emeritus and president emeritus. Professor E. G. Mason appointed acting dean.

1941: Oregon Forest Products Laboratory created in cooperation with the school of forestry.

1942: Paul M. Dunn appointed dean.

1946: Student personnel program adopted with staff man as head counselor.

1947: Three major curricula revised and names changed: Logging engineering to forest engineering; technical forestry to forest management; wood products to forest products.

1948: Forest manager for the school's forest properties appointed.

Short courses in cooperation with industry and public agencies introduced.

1950: Present forestry club cabin constructed.

1954: Forest experiment station established.

1955: W. F. McCulloch appointed dean.

1956: Fiftieth anniversary of 4-year program.

FORESTRY EDUCATION

(By Henry Clepper, executive secretary, Society of American Foresters, Washington, D. C.)

Technical training in forestry had been offered at certain European universities for more than a hundred years before the establishment of the first American school of forestry. Lectures on forestry and tree culture however were given in at least 22 land-grant colleges in the United States during the last quarter of the 19th century. This instruction was not professional in character; it was mainly for students of agriculture.

Generally, the lectures were given by teachers of botany and horticulture, and emphasized tree planting, farm woodlot management, and the influence of forests on climate and streamflow. The availability of such lectures, however, indicated a growing interest in forestry education; still, no body of courses was offered anywhere in America to prepare workers for careers in forestry.

But the advent of professional training was not far distant. In 1898 forestry instruction began at Cornell University, the first institution of collegiate rank to develop a forestry curriculum, and at the Biltmore Forest School in North Carolina, which offered a 1-year course in applied forestry. Both schools were subsequently discontinued.

Yale oldest

Yale University set up a full forestry curriculum in 1900, and now enjoys the distinction of having the oldest forestry school in continuous operation in the Western Hemisphere. Other colleges and universities followed rapidly.

In 1903 the University of Michigan and Michigan State University established forestry curriculums, as did the Pennsylvania State Forest Academy at Mont Alto, the University of Maine, and the University of Minnesota.

In 1904 three additional institutions set up courses: Iowa State College, Harvard University, and the University of Nebraska, which offered forestry instruction in connection with horticulture, then later dropped the work. In 1905 Colorado College started a course, but discontinued it in 1934.

In 1906 Oregon State College and the University of Georgia began training in forestry, but the latter institution was not very active during its first two decades.

In 1907 professional instruction began at Penn State, the University of Washington, and Washington State College. In 1909 the University of Idaho set up its forestry work.

Work increasing

In short, up to the period of the First World War, 24 schools had been established in the United States, and 20 were still in operation: Most were in land-grant colleges and offered a 4-year undergraduate curriculum. Yale had the only wholly graduate school. Manifestly, increasing employment opportunities in Federal and State forestry work and the attraction to young men of forestry as a career, were creating demands for professional education that the colleges and universities were not reluctant to fulfill.

Although the first two American schools (Cornell and Biltmore) were headed by German foresters, professional forestry education in the United States was characterized from the start by a typically fresh and independent outlook. With the primary aim of training men for the practice of a profession just coming into existence, the early schools were quite different in certain aspects from their European prototypes. The entire conservation movement, including education, was influenced by the crusading zeal of Gifford Pinchot and Theodore Roosevelt. An essential purpose was to reverse the trend of forest destruction and bring about the management of many million acres of publicly owned woodland that had been acquired and was being acquired by the Federal Government and the States. Forest educators entered into this program with fervor and serious intent.

Accordingly, during the early decades of professional education there was a marked shift in emphasis from subjects originally adapted from European training to those that better served American needs. A major influence on all schools was the character of the examinations given by the United States Civil Service Commission to recruit junior foresters for positions in the Federal Government. Forestry education, from a virile seed of indigenous origin, was growing into a lusty tree typically American in root, stem, and branch.

Study made

With the creation of so many new schools so fast, some leaders in the profession became apprehensive about the maintenance of professional standards. During the 1920's several prominent educators proposed that a study be made of "the education of men preparing for the profession of forestry."

This study was made possible by a financial grant to the Society of American Foresters from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. It resulted in the book Forest Education by Graves and Guise, published in 1932 by the Yale University Press.

Using this study as a foundation, the council of the society next authorized an examination of each school to determine the minimum standards of training essential to qualify graduates for membership in the society in the junior professional grade. This examination, started in 1933, resulted in a list of 14 approved schools. Six additional schools were declared eligible for approval provided certain standards were met. Thus the principle of accrediting was first applied to professional forestry education in America.

Accrediting has continued as a permanent activity of the Society of American Foresters. The work is carried on by the Committee for the Advancement of Forestry Education. In order to simplify accrediting procedures and reduce the cost to and workload of the institutions evaluated, the Society, along with other professional organizations, now undertakes its accrediting activities cooperatively with several regional associations of colleges and universities.

Thirty-six schools

As of December 1955, 36 colleges and universities in the United States offer instruction in forestry at the professional level. Two of these—Duke and Yale Universities—offer graduate degrees only. Of the 36 institutions, 26 are accredited by the Society of American Foresters. The remaining 10 have not yet met the standards for accrediting.

Since the first forestry degree was awarded in 1900, the schools have granted (through 1955) approximately 23,400 bachelor's degrees, and 4,300 master's degrees. Probably 90 percent of the degrees were in general forestry, the remaining 10 percent in such fields as wood technology, range management, wildlife management, forest recreation, and general conservation. The exact number of doctor's degrees awarded during the past half-century is not known; such statistics as are available indicate a total of about 400.

Perhaps the most serious threat to the establishment and maintenance of high educational standards in forestry is the constant possibility of new schools inadequately financed and inadequately staffed. Since World War II certain college presidents, including presidents of teachers colleges, have proposed establishing curriculum in forestry with little or no conception of what such curriculums on the professional level involve in cost, manpower, and facilities.

SUFFICIENT CAPACITY

Because of this possibility, and in some cases actual proliferation of weak forestry curriculums, the Society of American Foresters flatly recommends against the establishment of new schools for professional training in forestry unless adequately financed, staffed and housed from the start. In any case, the existing schools have sufficient capacity to supply the demand for professional foresters, which currently totals about a thousand each year.

In truth, the major problem in forestry education—a problem that appears to be general in education for the professions—is how to strengthen the weak institutions. Forestry cannot advance on a progressive educational front with one-quarter of the professional schools unable to meet the standards of accreditation, standards which in the opinion of many forestry educators are already too low.

Now, what of the future? Forestry education, like other aspects of the profession, is peculiarly influenced by nature, the outdoors, and living things. Because it is dynamic, it has been subject to continuous development and study. Expanding employment since the end of World War II constitutes a promise of continued educational growth. To be sure, changes in the character of forestry education are inevitable. But reviewing its

history up to this point, we have every reason to assume that most of the schools will continue to meet the greater demands of technical practice and broadening employment in the years ahead.

FROM THE PRESIDENT

The dominant characteristic of the school of forestry throughout the 50 years of its existence has been its ability to impart a lasting morale in its students—a zeal for work, a spirit for service, a hope for a broad acceptance of sound conservation ideas, and a confidence in their own ability. To accomplish this through the years has required great strength of leadership and the example of a devoted staff.

It may be that such is easier of attainment in the field of professional forestry than in other lines of work. There is something about trees that is poetic and to which man's better nature readily responds. At least a strong case for that idea can be made from even a brief survey of the profession in America and Western Europe. However, it wasn't always so and the history of man's wanton disregard of one of nature's greatest gifts is a sad one indeed. It's only in modern times, almost limited to the span of life in our school of forestry, that vision has replaced perversion and intelligent use has overcome profligate waste.

One of the miracles of our time is the acceleration that has taken place in the conservation and utilization of our forest resources. This has come about through persistent application of the scientific approach to forest problems. The school of forestry has played an important part in this notable development.

OREGON STATE COLLEGE,
A. L. STRAND, *President.*

A Tribute to Hon. John Taber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Binghamton, N. Y., Sun on Monday published an editorial tribute to our good friend and colleague, JOHN TABER. I am sure that all of us echo the sentiments expressed in the concluding paragraph of the editorial which reads:

We add our warm congratulations to the deluge of messages he received on this 76th birthday, with the earnest hope that he will have many more such good birthdays, and many more years of such immensely useful public service to his fine neighbors and to America.

The editorial follows:

THIRTY-FOUR YEARS IN CONGRESS

The enthusiastic crowd of prominent men and women who gathered in Ithaca Saturday, and the distinguished personages who sent warm congratulatory messages to pay tribute to Congressman JOHN TABER on his 76th birthday, and his 34 years of outstanding public service in the Congress of the United States, did not merely applaud an able and brilliant man. They also applauded our political system and reaffirmed the often forgotten fact that an honest and courageous public official, once he gains the confidence and respect of the people, can be forthright and independent-minded and still be reelected to public office. To the pussyfooters, the policy-players, the timid, the expediency-minded, the doubletalking office-holders, JOHN TABER is a towering and irrefutable rebuke.

For 34 long years in Congress he has lived, worked, and won reelections by his very simple philosophy that a proposed step in public business is either right or wrong—it is either good for the public or not good. And if it is right and good, to fight vigorously for it; if it is wrong and not good, to fight just as vigorously against it. In his long years of service on the House Appropriations Committee, he has become a veritable human encyclopedia on Government operations. He knows just what should be good housekeeping in every Federal bureau and agency as well as a housewife knows the rooms of her own house.

His name has become a legend in every nook and corner of Federal Government—an emergency brake on any bureaucrat who might seek to spend recklessly, foolishly, or needlessly. They not only fear his sincere devotion to public economy but also his uncanny budget knowledge and accurate information. As a powerful and active force for good government, JOHN TABER has become a national, and highly valuable, public institution. He has saved the taxpayers countless millions in public funds. He has worked intensely, faithfully, modestly, never seeking the headlines or public praise.

Inevitably he has made enemies among the forces of special privilege, selfish interests, and various pressure groups. But the citizens of the Nation and the voters of his own congressional district know JOHN TABER well, and they hold a wholesome respect for his rugged integrity, and the sincere honesty of his forthright opinions. His whole public career is a forceful refutation of that glib, unwarranted wisecrack heard too often, that in our America a politician cannot be trusted. For JOHN TABER, the most unpolitical chairman the House Appropriations Committee ever had, one of the most unreachable powers in Congress, a dedicated enemy of any form of political corruption, the man whom no one would dare approach with an offcolor proposition, is himself a high-quality product of our political party system.

He started in politics as a Republican county committeemen, became the county chairman and served in that capacity for many years, always scrupulously following the simple rule that honesty is the best policy, good government the best politics, truth and frankness the best practice.

JOHN TABER has earnestly and unselfishly made public service his life work, and he has indeed made a tremendous success of it. The whole country, along with his congressional district, can well be mighty proud of Congressman TABER.

And we add our warm congratulations to the deluge of messages he received on his 76th birthday, with the earnest hope that he will have many more such good birthdays, and many more years of such immensely useful public service to his fine neighbors and to America.

Problems of a Small Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time a sample of a letter which is self-explanatory and which I am receiving hundreds of from my district.

This gives you some idea of how Mr. Benson is helping the little farmers.

MANSURA, LA., *May 5, 1956.*

Hon. GEORGE S. LONG,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: As I have done and tried everything I can to get a few acres of cotton to plant has failed, what I cannot understand is how will my family of 4 dependents live and survive on 1½ acres of allotted cotton to plant on the land I am cultivating. Being a farmer all my life and this year allowing me to plant only 1½ acres of cotton. I know it could be worked out better than that, but the committees out here have failed to help me out. Why is it so unjustly divided? I know in my own heart they could have helped me out, but have failed to do so.

This is my reason for writing you, so please with God's words, try to help me out, as this is the only cash income from crops I get, and I know with that very small amount of cotton to plant I cannot survive. Please tell me what to do to get more, and please help me out.

I thank you.

Very truly yours,

SAM LABORDE.

The American Legion "Get Out the Vote" Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we hear so much partisan political talk from all sides, it is reassuring to hear an occasional voice raised to urge the American people simply to make use of their right to vote.

A fine address along these lines was recently delivered by National Commander J. Addington Wagner of the American Legion. In it he emphasizes the Legion's excellent 1956 slogan: "Vote as you please, but please vote." Commander Wagner's speech was broadcast over the facilities of the American Broadcasting Co. and reprinted in the April 19 issue of the National Tribune.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this keynote of the Legion's most worthy "Get Out the Vote" campaign:

"For God and country, we associate ourselves together."

So reads the opening sentence of the American Legion's constitutional preamble. That we may worship God according to our respective beliefs, it is necessary that we remain a free country. It is for this and our many other freedoms that Legionnaires have fought in three wars.

FREEDOM THREATENED AGAIN

Now, once again that freedom is threatened by the forces of a godless Communist conspiracy. This is truly the crisis of our time—not a political or economic crisis, I submit, but one that is moral. This greatest of all struggles is a contest between our hard-earned Judean-Christian civilization and Soviet materialism and barbarism.

In our country, the individual is infinitely important. To the Kremlin, the individual is but a number—just a number to use in the building of a soulless, atheistic society.

It seems most fitting that in this election year our attention be directed to one of our most cherished and prized freedoms, the freedom of the ballot.

This coming November 6 we will be able to cast that ballot and it will be in secret, with no hammer and sickle to coerce us.

Of all American special days, that day will have the least fanfare. Yet, of all it should have the deepest and closest meaning to every adult American. Let us not be deceived by the casualness of that day, for it may be the most important day of our generation.

The continuing apathy of a shockingly large segment of the American public to avail themselves of their vote is indeed to be deplored. Just imagine how those poor, hapless creatures behind the Iron Curtain would appreciate that freedom of choice in their government.

PRIVILEGE OF TWO BALLOTS

Actually, we Americans are allowed the privilege of two ballots. Besides the vote we may cast for a candidate for any office, each citizen has another vote which he cannot help but cast. His other vote is the fact that he did or did not vote. It is often the most important possession of the individual. When election day is over, each of us is inescapably counted among either the voters or the nonvoters.

It is safe to say that most of the nonvoters assumed that their failure to vote made no difference. Clearly, even if one vote does not make much difference in the naming of candidates to office, the only way millions of votes can be thrown away is one by one.

Every year a few more people peek under the surface and come up with the fundamental secret of democratic government that every politician knows: Nothing encourages poor government more than the failure of eligible voters to cast their votes.

It has been said that a light vote is a loyal party vote and compels the party to emphasize party interest. A heavy vote is a public vote and compels emphasis in the public interest. It has also been said by the experts that rain on election day makes for a light vote. The men who signed the Declaration of Independence pledged in time of great peril, "their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor" to give us our election day. How cheaply or how dearly do we hold the lives, the fortunes, the honor and the blood that bought for us and insured to us election day? Will rain or any other obstacle bring a light vote this year? Will we again reveal to the world the spectacle of nearly 50 million eligible Americans ignoring the duty on which rests all our claims to an enlightened free world?

This year, perhaps as never before, we are striving for a united community effort to bring our national vote up to its original purposes and tremendous potentialities, to the end that our American Government will continue to be the envy of all nations, no matter which party wins.

To this end, then, American Legionnaires across the Nation will urge you again to adopt our slogan: Vote as you please, but please vote.

Vast Load of Responsibilities Is Placed on Our Congressmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, during the short time that I have had the honor of serving in Congress, I have often heard various colleagues deplore the apparent lack of appreciation which the daily press has for the arduous duties involved in representing the people of our respective districts in the Halls of Congress. In many instances I feel that this type of remark is well justified. However, on Monday, May 7, 1956, there appeared in one of the fine dailies of my district, the Birmingham News, an editorial dealing with some of the problems with which we Representatives are continually confronted. A member of the editorial staff of this particular paper visited Washington several weeks ago and the editorial was written as a result of the impressions the writer obtained while observing the proceedings in the House of Representatives.

It is indeed rewarding for us in Congress to realize that we do not go entirely unappreciated and it is, therefore, my pleasure to include the editorial in the RECORD under leave to extend my remarks:

Not many Americans, we suppose, nowadays think of Congressmen as having a nice, easy time of it, just voting out of infinite knowledge and wisdom on whether bills and other proposals are good for the country, meanwhile drawing good salaries and enjoying the pleasures of life in Washington.

But, relatively speaking, not many citizens either, we take it, have a full awareness of the tremendous load of responsibilities, the enormous demands on their time and efforts, confronting our national lawmakers.

One recent visitor in the House, while debate was proceeding on the President's veto of the farm bill, was impressed anew with the complexities involved in consideration of such legislation. Here was a subject that a competent student might easily spend full time exploring without exhausting the subject. Yet this was only one of a great number of difficult problems before Congress.

Of course, no Member could possibly master all subjects and questions coming before the lawmakers. Under the committee system study and consideration are divided among groups whose members may become specialists in their particular fields. But even these committees are loaded down with numerous proposals.

And though their reports naturally carry much weight with other Members, the individual Representative or Senator still faces the duty of making up his own mind on the basis of as sound a grasp of the issues as possible.

Commerce Clearing House, a national reporting service on tax and business law, in a late April release, pointed out that despite a backlog of more than 9,000 bills from the first session of this 84th Congress, new proposals were being presented at a brisk pace. This session is facing more work than did the previous session.

Comparing the first 15 months of the 83d Congress with the same period of the present Congress, Commerce Clearing House reports that in this session House bills introduced numbered, respectively, 8679 and 10,330; Senate bills introduced, 3,235 and 3,547; House joint resolutions introduced, 489 and 597; Senate joint resolutions introduced, 144 and 158; rollcall votes in House and Senate, 170 and 224; public bills approved by the President, 324 and 460. All along the line, it may be seen, proposals and action increased.

But committee on floor work is not all that demands time and effort of Congressmen. There are visitors to be seen, public activities to participate in, visits home to be made—and many other calls upon them.

How does a conscientious Congressman get through it all? We don't know. Yet we are confident that there are great numbers of such Congressmen who devote steadfast and valiant endeavors to their jobs.

Good heart and strength to them. They deserve public understanding and appreciation. They deserve, too, among themselves and on the part of the public more of direct and thoughtful effort not to pile up the loads of work uselessly or carelessly.

The Meaning of UNICO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in these times of industrial expansion, increase of scientific interest, and proposed voyages into the stratosphere, we are prone to lose sight of the down-to-earth activities daily carried on by the many benevolent service groups, whose volunteers aid worthy local and national projects ranging from family aid to the endowment of cultural interests.

In 1922 Dr. Anthony Vastola, an American of Italian heritage, gathered together 14 fellow citizens from Waterbury, Conn., and formed what is known today as UNICO National. This organization whose membership is now over 2,500 includes men of business and professional interests in some 50 cities throughout the United States, has had the singular honor of establishing 6 new chapters during the past 5 weeks. The name UNICO, based on the Italian word meaning unique, derives its form from the first letters of unity, neighborliness, integrity, charity, and opportunity. These five meaningful abstractions are the core of the Unican's creed which each member learns and aims to exemplify.

Over 1,000 students have studied or are now studying on UNICO scholarships. The Don Gentile scholarship fund alone has contributed over $25,000 to the assistance of worthy students. UNICO National is currently engaged in a program to raise money for the costly medical care of an Italian youngster stricken with a rare malady. UNICO is also raising money to provide a room in the International College of Surgeons. Of international interest UNICO is currently engaged in its most extensive financial participation. I am referring to UNICO's effort to raise generous donations for the erection of the Pius XII Library on the campus of St. Louis University. There in mid-America will be erected a great center of research which will house the treasured microfilm collection of the entire manuscript section of the Vatican Library in Rome. The completely functional building, the last word in modern library science, will include the name of UNICO among its founders.

While the national fund-raising campaigns are in full force, the many local philanthropies of the UNICO chapters

are still continued. Add to these hundreds of local projects, the half-million dollars raised for Italian relief and the generous thousands given to Boys Town of Italy, and we realize how completely philanthropic this society of Americans of Italians extraction has been.

In order to invite the deserved attention of what this growing organization is doing, I respectfully request that this tribute be recorded in the RECORD of this date.

The current president, under whose dynamic leadership the expansion program has made such rapid strides, is Alphonse A. Miele, businessman. President Miele himself represents the ideal Unican and has cast his ideals into action since he was elected to office, August 1955.

Requests for UNICO chapters have come from dozens of cities in all sections of the country. So inspiring has been the story of UNICO National that sincere tributes have been offered by civic leaders and church dignitaries in each city which is privileged to have a UNICO chapter.

The Importance of the United States Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. W. Lyle Bull before the New York chapter, Alumni Association of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps, at the Downtown Athletic Club, New York, on Friday, May 4, 1956:

ADDRESS BY W. LYLE BULL BEFORE THE NEW YORK CHAPTER, ALUMNI ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE CADET CORPS, AT THE DOWNTOWN ATHLETIC CLUB, NEW YORK, MAY 4, 1956

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and members of the New York Chapter of the Alumni Association of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps, by your invitation to address you this evening, on this happy occasion, I feel that you have honored me beyond my merits. A simple thank you seems hardly adequate; yet, there are no other words that express more deeply the sincerity of my appreciation.

Your testimonial to the distinguished legislators who carried the fight so successfully to bring about the statutory recognition of Kings Point as a permanent Federal Academy is, indeed, most appropriate. At best, however, this tribute is relatively small recompense for the many months of work and effort they devoted to the cause held dear by most of us in this room.

I wonder, frequently, whether the average citizen has even a vague conception of the demands made upon the time of our Senators and congressional representatives. In general, they seem to be considered as capable of being all things to all men and the workers of miracles. They become the repositories for the most astounding variety of problems and, when they fail of solutions satisfactory to the appellants, they are exposed to possible retaliation at the ballot box.

One has to be associated with a Government agency in Washington for a better understanding of the extent and nature of the appeals made to Members of the Congress. Sometimes I feel about Congressmen like I do about Ogden Nash's Purple Cow: "I'd rather see than be one."

I have a purpose in mentioning the arduous and complex burdens of the individual legislator. It is to emphasize the real measure of the debt owing to the distinguished gentlemen you are honoring here tonight and to those of their colleagues whose generous contributions of time and energy made possible the happy result you are celebrating.

The bill these kind friends guided, with such skill, through the tortuous legislative channels of both Houses, has brought new hope and encouragement to many more than the alumni of Kings Point; or to the students now enrolled; or to the administrative staff and faculty of the Academy.

It has restored the confidence of the countless thousands who adhere to the advocacy of a strong, modern and vigorous merchant marine as essential to our national welfare.

The Kings Point bill has told these people, in effect, that the Congress meant what it said when it incorporated, as a preamble to the act of 1936, the declaration of our national policy to foster and maintain such a merchant marine.

It has assured them, further, of congressional recognition of the often overlooked fact that more than just ships alone are needed to produce and successfully maintain a merchant marine; that a paramount requirement is for men of the highest order of technical proficiency and demonstrated leadership qualities—and with a sense of dedication to the best traditions of the maritime profession.

Shipping is about the oldest of our industries. It is also one of our most complex. While operated as a private enterprise, shipping is not a business in the usual sense of the word. So far as the United States is concerned, it is an instrument of national policy, maintained, in large measure, by public funds to serve the needs of our commerce and defense. The appropriations for Kings Point and the four State academies are a part (albeit a relatively small part) of this Federal support.

Unfortunately, this industry-government partner relationship is not sufficiently understood by the great mass of the public. The farther inland we get from our seacoasts the less it is understood.

To the great majority of people, if they think about it at all, the American merchant marine is something that operates in faraway places. Its problems, its work, and its service to our industry and agriculture are remote things that are of little interest and miles removed from their everyday affairs.

Because of the diverse activities and opportunities in this broad land of ours, and the comparatively few directly engaged in, or affiliated with, maritime affairs, we are not a ship-minded people in the sense that the British and Scandinavians are. Mother Necessity compels their understanding that their entire economies depend upon the ocean highways and that they must own and operate ships to survive.

It is evident that in the attempt to sell our merchant marine to the American people, the proper approach has not been found. Or, perhaps, the same old record has been played so often that the sense of the message it attempts to convey has been entirely lost.

Later this month we will observe Maritime Day. There will be gatherings in many cities throughout the country where countless speakers will orate on the poor old *Savannah* as the first steam-powered ship to make an Atlantic crossing. This happened 137 years ago and, if the truth were told, the *Savannah* covered a much greater distance under sail than by steam power. Others will hold forth on the glories that were ours in the so-called golden era of the clipper ship. When I listen to these things, year after year, I instinctively liken them to the reminiscences of an aging theatrical star while reviewing the yellowing, dog-eared press notices extolling her conquests and triumphs of the past.

There is no doubt that these historical facts are of interest and are things of which we should be proud, but I question their effectiveness as propaganda to win friends and supporters for the merchant marine of the 1950's. It seems to me we have available much more convincing material for this purpose.

Except for those directly connected with the industry, there are few people who appreciate what real progress has been made during the past few years toward putting our merchant marine on a firmer footing.

The more tangible evidences of this are the new construction programs of the Moore-McCormack and Grace Lines; the "Mariner" conversion programs of the American President and Pacific Far East Lines; and the projected revival of the Oceanic Steamship Co.'s passenger service between our west coast and Australia for which two "Mariners" are being practically reconstructed. At present the United States Lines is negotiating for the acquisition of 8 "Mariner" ships and the American President Lines for 2 in addition to those they have. It appears that the remaining "Mariners" of the original 35 completed within the past 4 years will soon be in private hands.

These are but the initial steps in the programs of replacement tonnage to which several steamship companies are committed to implement over the next 10 years.

There is talk now, too, of the possible building of a sister ship for the SS. *United States*.

As to tankers, the trade-in-and-build law has stimulated much new construction—and of tankers of much greater tonnage and higher speeds. The Navy, through MSTS, is aiding private industry in this field, by its program for the construction by private interests of 15 25,000 deadweight tons, 18-knot tankers to be chartered to MST for 10-year terms as replacements for equivalent tonnage in Government-owned T2-type tankers now in operation.

Perhaps the most significant development in new building—and to my way of thinking, one of the most encouraging—is the planned construction of several so-called roll-on-roll-off ships for the carriage of loaded truck-trailers. These will be employed, primarily, in our coastwise and intercoastal trades which are sadly in need of rejuvenation. I believe the Pan Atlantic Lines has plans for 7 and the American-Hawaiian Lines, some of 6 or 8. For some of these ships, speeds of up to 25 knots are being discussed. In addition, the Alaska Steamship Co. has in contemplation two ships of this type as combination truck and rail car carriers, while only last week it was announced that certain Hawaiian interests have plans for the introduction of ships of this type into the west coast-Hawaiian service.

The thing that impresses me most about this new type of ship is that we are finally doing something constructive toward improved means of handling cargo. We are finding that there are ways of doing the job other than by the old "block-and-fall" method handed down to us from sailing ship days.

All of these things are products of the industry/Government partnership to which I have referred. And the encouraging part of it is that they are progressing without the whiplash of the stress of war, which has been the principal motivating force over the past 40 years, insofar as our merchant marine is concerned.

It seems to me that our Congress has rarely displayed such a keen and continuing interest in our maritime affairs as during the past 2 or 3 sessions—and nothing but good can stem from this.

I know, of course, that you consider the passage of the Kings Point bill the most important of their accomplishments, but there have been other things. The extensive hearings and the prolonged debate on the so-called 50–50 law is a case in point. It is beyond my poor comprehension to understand why there should have been so much opposition to the provisions of this bill, seeking, as it does, to reserve to American shipping, only 50 percent of the movement of cargoes owned and/or financed by our Government.

Another accomplishment, and the one with, perhaps, the most far-reaching effect, is the comprehensive review of maritime labor and management relationships developed in the hearings conducted by the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee under the chairmanship of Congressman BONNER of North Carolina.

While no new legislation has resulted from these hearings, it is my conviction that, notwithstanding occasional flashes of acrimony, they were of real benefit to both labor and management in promoting a better understanding of the problems and aspirations of each. Mutual respect and understanding in this area is a prime requisite for the successful fruition of our maritime endeavors and, day by day, this is developing in a most encouraging way.

I have tried to give you tonight, an outline of the sort of sales talk, I think, should be adopted to let the American people know about our merchant marine. Let us get away from reliance upon flag waving and emotional appeals. These sort of things lose their effect almost as soon as your listeners' blood pressures return to normal.

Present the merchant marine to our people as a dynamic, progressive undertaking that, for their economic well-being and own best interests, deserves their enthusiastic support. People have a peculiar, but natural, concern for their pocketbooks. Give them assurance that they are getting value received for the tax dollars used for shipping subsidies. And don't be apologetic about such subsidies.

"Subsidy," nowadays, is not the dirty word it once was. While, actually, the subsidy idea has been a part of our economic structure for years, through tariff applications, land grants, farm aid, and other means, the subsidy concept has come to be generally recognized as essential to maintaining the high living standards with which our country is blessed. And, speaking of farm aid, I suggest that, except for nudging Congress once in a while, when dealing with the public we get away from that time-worn comparison between amounts appropriated for shipping subsidies and those for Cheddar cheese.

You will have sensed, by now, that I am assigning to you Kings Pointers, the job of "selling" the merchant marine. Of course, this has been your mission since the day you entered the Cadet Corps. It is now an even more serious obligation as a part of the debt you owe our congressional friends to justify their confidence in having made Kings Point a permanent institution.

You can do the job, I know. Your salesmanship qualities have been demonstrated amply by the untiring devotion displayed and the hard work done by so many of you in "selling" Kings Point to the Congress.

I realize it is dangerous for me to single out any one individual for special mention in this regard, but I cannot refrain from suggesting that particular thanks are due to Joe Baker, whom I well remember as a bewildered "plebe." Were I to expand the list, I would be here for hours, but those of you who gave your time, and refused to acknowledge frustration, may carry on with that most comforting inner satisfaction that comes from the knowledge of a job well done.

As a matter of fact, I hold to the belief, very strongly, that a Kings Pointer is capable of doing about anything he sets his heart and mind upon—and doing it well. My duties during the past 5 years or more have necessitated a lot of traveling—over our own country and to places abroad. At practically every place I have visited, I have encountered Kings Pointers—as officers on merchant ships—as naval officers on active duty—as responsible officials of steamship companies—in Government departments—as students in my classes at Georgetown—and in a variety of other endeavors. I have never met one without experiencing an inner welling of pride and admiration. And I have heard many flattering things said of Kings Pointers by senior naval officers and shipping executives.

I consider myself fortunate to have had the opportunity to observe so many graduates in action, afloat and ashore, in so many diverse locations. Their generally fine performance is rather convincing evidence to me that the Kings Point concept of merchant marine officer training is basically sound in principle.

Such was the belief of Admiral McNulty when, over 30 years ago, he conceived the idea of a Federal academy for maritime training and, thereafter, expended unwavering devotion to bring such an institution into being.

Although the concept may be basically sound, this should not be taken to mean that it is not susceptible of refinements and improvements, and subject to prompt adjustment to adapt it to the necessities of whatever changes may arise in the industry's operating techniques.

To me, the academy at Kings Point is something more important than just a group of attractive buildings and a beautiful campus. It has the potential to be something more than just a place of instruction. It holds marvelous possibilities as a national center of research and experimentation in all fields related to the maritime industry and its problems. I earnestly hope these possibilities will be explored thoroughly and that full advantage will be taken of all that Kings Point has to offer.

I have studiously avoided any reference to the vital importance of our merchant marine to our national security, or as an auxiliary to our Armed Forces. My purpose in this deliberate omission is to emphasize the economic considerations, because I believe it is on the basis of such considerations that our merchant marine should be sold to the American public.

To me, our need of a thriving merchant marine as an essential instrument of national defense is so self-evident as to require no discussion. Our experiences in two world wars and the recent Korean incident have pointed up this fact in a manner much more convincing than any words of mine might convey.

As most of you know, I am connected with the Military Sea Transportation Service—probably the least understood of any of our defense activities—and, also, one of the most consistently badgered on all sides by legislators, shipping-industry associations, and labor representatives alike. It is usually described as a Government-maintained competitor of the American shipping industry. Actually, it is the best customer-shipper most of the lines have.

The misunderstanding about MSTS stems principally, I think, from a lack of knowledge or appreciation of the scope of our present-day international commitments, and the extent to which we are maintaining military installations in the far-flung reaches of the world, from the Arctic to the tropics. These commitments and the uncertainties of the existing world situation make it mandatory for our security that the Department of Defense have under its direct control, and immediately responsive to military authority, ships of appropriate types in sufficient number to meet minimum logistic needs in the event of sudden emergencies and as a base for prompt expansion under conditions of war.

In the more than 5 years I have been with MSTS, I have become firmly convinced that while the private shipping industry can serve the ocean transportation needs of the Department of Defense to a substantial degree under present conditions, it has definite limitations. Certainly, it is to be hoped we may look forward to an easing in world tensions and the full resumption of normal channels of trade sometime in the future. In anticipation of such a happy state, the shipping industry cannot, or should not, relax in continuing concentration on the maximum commercial utilization of its fleets if we are to attain and retain that place in world shipping to which we all aspire.

Well-Deserved Honors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure to join in the sentiment expressed in the following editorial entitled "Well-Deserved Honors," which appeared in the Independent Press of Bloomfield, N. J., on May 3, 1956. It is a fitting tribute to two fine men whose unselfish devotion to community affairs, whose keen interest in civic problems and sincere desire to be of help to their fellowman, has made those around them aware of the fact that they are truly outstanding people. To each of them, may I wish many more days on this earth with the same happiness and joys that they have spread to others:

WELL-DESERVED HONORS

Testimonial dinners, like cherry blossoms, seem to pop out the first week of May and Bloomfield has two of unusual significance this week. On Tuesday night 450 turned out to honor Paul S. Procissi, retiring GM executive and civic leader, and an equal number or more will fete William Foley, retiring football coach and BHS athletic director.

Both of these men richly deserve this kind of tribute from their fellow citizens although they served their town in different ways. Procissi was a humanitarian, charity worker and civic leader; Foley, a gruff individualist who made sportsmen and fine athletes out of adolescent material. Although their fields of service were far apart, both served the community faithfully and well.

Procissi was a soft touch for anybody with a cause. Year after year he volunteered to head this drive or that and raised hundreds of thousands of dollars in our industrial districts for Community Chest, Red Cross and other causes. His scope was not limited to charity, however, as he served as Civil Defense Director and on a number of advisory town boards. As a successful businessman, he gave freely of his time and wisdom because, as he pointed out Tuesday night, "I like working with people."

Foley on the other hand was scarcely a soft touch for anybody. A tough, outspoken,

"diamond in the rough", Foley brought fame to Bloomfield gridirons more times than we can count. His teams made Bloomfield a place on the map and his coaching fame was known throughout the Nation. Sportsmanship and good physical conditioning were his aims and generations of Bengal athletes found them to be valuable possessions in later life.

It would be hard to find two men of such different natures yet impossible to discover 2 who are more deserving of these honors. It may be said that they have become a symbol of Bloomfield and the good works they leave behind them will have a salutary effect on this community for many years to come.

It can be said without question that both have earned their distinctions honorably and proudly. We join with the community in paying our respects to two outstanding citizens.

America and the Irish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. James A. Farley at the annual banquet of the American Irish Historical Society held at the Hotel Biltmore, New York City, on May 5, 1956. At the banquet, Mr. Farley was presented with the Society's Medal "in tribute to his personal integrity and distinguished public service":

AMERICA AND THE IRISH

You do me much honer in presenting me with the Medal of the American Irish Historical Society. This honor and this society, I am sure, will endure forever. I am pleased and happy to have my name listed for all time among that distinguished number of men and women who have received this award before me. My heart wells with many emotions. I am grateful, because it is so high an honor; I am humble, because I cannot help but wonder whether I deserve such recognition; I am proud that my family and so many of my friends are here to share in my moments of triumph; I am sorry that many who really earned this honor for me—one in particular who was at my side in my most need for so long—are not among us to share my joy, and I am delighted at receiving recognition from my fellowmen, especially men of the same racial stock. Because we trace our roots to common soil, you will understand, I know, that I accept this medal, with its flattering inscription from my old and valued friend, Robert F. Wagner, with that mingling of joy and sorrow, in mysterious blend, which marks the mystic and romantic Irish in their finest hours. While I count myself one member of the human race and one who truly loves all his fellowmen, I must confess I have a weakness for those from the isle of a people stern in their faith and merry in their fortitude. Like all of you, I have a heart that loves laughter and a soul that is eager for sentiment.

It is particularly pleasant to me that this honor comes, almost to the day, on the 50th anniversary of my setting out in this city to make my way in the world. I will not dwell on my early steps and struggles, as happy as they have become in recollection. My struggles were by no means against fearful odds and my triumphs were modest, indeed, but all have come to be pleasant in retrospect down the corridor of the years. What concerns me here is that the half century of which I speak has been an eventful one for the world, rather than for me. I count myself fortunate to have been around in this fruitful and eventful period. In my time the airplane was developed from the flimsy craft which I first saw hovering uncertainly over the Hudson River to the mighty machines which today span oceans and exceed the speed of sound. Surely no less miraculous has been the capture of man and music from flickering film and scratchy records to the amazing perfection we know today in film and television, and record and radio with their living fidelity and color. The automobile, the telephone and thousands of other inventions have eased our lives, added to our comfort and multiplied our knowledge.

In the 50 years, man learned more about himself than he had known in all the syllables of previously recorded time. Man began conquering his dreaded enemy, disease, by improved medical techniques and patient research, which worked wonders. Man has not and never will conquer death, but he has driven him back to insure many children, especially in our land, of a safe journey to maturity into adult life, and he has added years to the lifespan of the mature. The half century has seen pheonominal growth in education—in and out of classrooms. Today college is open to almost any child, who is willing, where 50 years ago only a few fortunates were able to attend college. Avenues for learning are open to all in the press and on the air. The vista of professions and careers has widened to limitless horizons. Ingenuity, determination, and perserverance have added to our comfort and our daily fare in various profusions. Truly, we have been fortunate in many ways during these 50 years.

Unhappily, man has not learned to control himself as well as he has learned to harness the bounties of nature. Within that half century, of which I speak, there have been two terrible world conflicts, which took frightful tolls in lives, destroyed staggering totals of property and culture, and wasted many gifts of nature. Out of these conflicts were born such fearful engines of destruction that it would seem that man's greatest progress has been toward his own destruction. During the last world struggle we evolved the tremendous and awesome destructive force of the A-bomb and since the struggle we have graduated to the H-bomb, weapons which contain the potential of obliteration of civilization as we know it. I am not one to despair over the arrival of the atomic age. Rather, I look about it as another of man's bright dawns. I am mindful that the mysterious and deadly force we know as electricity has been bent to man's will and is now an integral part of his daily life.

Electricity is accepted as our friend. The friend bears watching at times, yet it is mastered by children almost from their first toddling steps. Electricity has become perhaps our most valued servant. It is not too much, then, to expect that in time we will just as certainly and just as happily master atomic power and make it serve us. I am confident that we will someday bestow upon it as much affection as we now give to electricity and, when we do, it may be that man will have learned to conquer himself. It could be that the next half century will see this greatest of victories, along with tremendous strides in convenience and comfort, that will outmatch the accomplishments of the half century of which I am so proud to have been a part. I truly hope so.

My half century, if you will let me call it so, has been eventful, indeed, in man's relations to his fellowman. It has been an unhappy time for kings and tyrants, although dictatorship is not yet dead. However, it will surely die. Freedom and justice are on the march and, under God, will surely triumph because they are the way of morality. Without morality there can be no purpose or dignity for man. At times things may look dark and clouds of tension may appear to be lowering over our heads but the darkness will be pierced and the tensions will lift, I am certain.

In my half century, man's advances were not confined toward ending political tyranny alone. There was a revolt against economic tyranny, which brought a better and more equitable distribution of the fruits of labor. Some might say much of the world is in the grip of a more ruthless tyranny than the world knew 50 years ago, but it must be recognized that millions upon millions have won measures of independence and others will throw off fear and terror in time, as certainly as day follows night. I do not say the situation economically is perfect any more than I would say that it is perfect politically. The world is full of tensions, which could provoke a conflict more terrible than any we have known, and the world abounds with slavery as bleak as any we have ever known. Our country is under stress of forces which might, if carried to extreme, stifle initiative and enterprise and even freedom. It is possible that pendulums have swung too far and too rapidly in a number of directions. Nonetheless, I am not one to despair and look back on older days as better than those we know. I am confident that men of good will can work out conflicts and adjust differences. I am certain that men of initiative and industry will continue to climb toward new levels of performance and production which will advance the fortunes of men while preserving their freedom.

It is in this field of man's relations to man that I concerned myself over most of my half century. For some years I saw and was a part of it all. I was most fortunate in that, for the last half of those 50 years I have known personally and even intimately many men who have made history. It has been said that I have made a little myself. I like to think so. However, I do not propose to dwell on my deeds, nor even on my associations with the doers of deeds. I have had my part in history, for which I am humbly grateful. For me, my years in public service have had a million warm recollections, a million laughs, a host of friends and almost no regrets.

My half century has ended. My generation is passing. I say this without discontent. It was a wonderful half century in a wonderful world. There was hardly a dull moment in it. If I had it all to do over again I would try to end up with a million pleasant recollections, a million laughs, a host of friends and no regrets. It may be that I may still be able, with the help of my guardian angel, to erase my regrets. It may be those of my generation, who knew this half century as I do, did not solve our problems any too well. The problems were many and tangled and we were but humans and prone to err. We made many errors. We carried the torch of progress as best we knew how, however. Our steps may have faltered and the torch may have flickered but we did not let it go out. The light of freedom still shines, an inspiration for all the world.

Other generations may carry the torch higher and more steadily. Of this I am confident. I am not one who sighs for the olden days. The world today is a better and more comfortable place than when I entered it and, I am sure, it will grow more so. In this improvement I am sure men of Irish descent will play a major role, as they do today. I am aware that at the gatherings

of your society there is a tendency, born of pride and sentiment, to dwell on the glories of the Irish heritage.

This heritage is part of me. The Irish traditions have been part of my life since my earliest childhood. My father's parents migrated from Castletown, County Meath. My mother's parents came from Ireland about the same time in 1847 or 1848, being like my father's parents ambitious to improve their economic condition, and inspired with the hope of a new life in a new world. I was raised on tales of heroism and patriotism in the "Ould Country". I know of the great contributions of those of Irish origin to the military, political, cultural and economic development of this country.

No one is more stirred by pride in this contribution. I am proud of the Irish blood in me. I have made my pilgrimage to the land of my ancestors. I have walked the scenes they knew and breathed the air into which they sang their songs. No sentimental journey was more rewarding. Yet, I am not here tonight to dwell on the Irish heritage but on the American heritage, under which the Irish spirit blossomed and received its highest expression.

America owes a debt to the Irish, but the Irish owe a greater debt to America. Here was the Irish faith and fortitude fashioned in the forge of freedom to inspire the Irish to fight for freedom around the world and to win ultimately freedom for themselves at home. We must not forget that it was the free air of America that made possible the great and lasting contributions of the Irish to American life and culture. Ireland gave America fighters for freedom and America in turn contributed the fire of independence which set Ireland free.

Men are given to exaggeration of the merits of their birthplace, yet I know that mine had a profound influence on my life. I was born and raised at Grassy Point, in the town of Stony Point in the lower reaches of the majestic Hudson River Valley. I count it among my good fortunes to have been born and to have grown to manhood in this history-drenched area. Stony Point is, as you know, the scene of General Anthony Wayne's stirring victory over a superior British force during a crucial period of the Revolutionary War. This exploit made a vivid impression on my youthful mind. So much so that I have always taken a personal pride in "Mad Anthony's" triumph. The historic Treason House which was located nearby never failed to give me a thrill when I was in its neighborhood. Tappan, 15 miles away, the scene of Major Andre's trial and execution, was imagination stirring, for it was also 1 of General Washington's headquarters, secondary, of course, to Newburgh. And, I must add that I was the more pleased when I learned that the rosters of the forces which fought for and won independence were heavily sprinkled with Irish names.

From this area I absorbed a strong and abiding love for my country and its institutions. Although my roots go back to Ireland by a distance of more than a hundred years, that rooting is largely sentimental. My actual roots are American, like those of most men of Irish blood in this country; so much so that I have always thought of the Farleys and the Goldricks, my mother's name, going back not only to the times of the Revolution and the Colonies, but even back to the days of the early Dutch settlers.

So it is with all of us who trace kinship back across the sea to Ireland. If we come from New England we think of ourselves going back to the farmers who fired the embattled shot heard round the world and even further back to that brave and hardy band who trod on the rock at Plymouth. If we come from Virginia, we stir to the echoes of "Give me liberty or give me death" and we go back even further to the men who founded Jamestown. If we come from Pennsylvania, we share the suffering at Valley Forge and we quicken to the peal of the Liberty Bell. So it is with all of us from each State and each corner of the State whether the waves pound the shore, the sun rises over mountains or wind ripples its grain.

This comes not only from pride in the Irish blood that was spilled so that our freedom might grow, but it comes from true patriotism. Much as we love Ireland, we love America more. For America enabled us to give expression to the best within us. In America the Irish learned to be good neighbors. They knew what it was to be scorned. In time they were not without scorn themselves.

But out of the warmth of their hearts they learned to accept others. They are good neighbors now with those who held them in scorn and with those whom they scorned. Differences and difficulties were buried or subordinated among the greater and wider problems and interests of America, which was a haven and a home to all peoples. If we need proof of what good neighbors we have become we need only go back to last St. Patrick's Day to remember that on that great day everybody wants to be Irish and we welcome them into our family. There's a welcome for all friendly souls at all times.

By sharing Ireland with the peoples of other nations we share America the better with them. We all become kinfolk of those who crossed stormy seas to build on savage shores; those who fought in rags with eyes lifted to the horizon of freedom; those who answered calls for surrender with the shout "We have just begun to fight"; those who sanctified a Texas mission by choosing death to surrender; those who hallowed ground with the blood of brothers in the conflict that split the Nation but only for 4 years; those who dug for gold, and those who sought land. All these and many more went into the making of this country. Some were Irish and some were not, but all were Americans and our heroes, for they helped to make us what we are as surely as Wolfe Tone, Robert Emmet, Padraig Pearse, Daniel O'Connell, Charles Parnell, and all of those who came after them in succeeding generations.

No man thinks more highly than I do of the Irish that is in him. No man thinks more proudly of the accomplishments of the Irish among us. I glory in the abilities as well as the patriotism of the Americans of Irish descent. Yet, when we dwell on the Irish contribution I think that we have neglected the American heritage, partly fashioned by the Irish, which made the Irish contribution possible. There were days when the hand of oppression rested heavily on Ireland. In those dark days restless sons of Ireland came here and joined other restless sons of other lands to fight for liberty. By helping to enkindle that precious flame here they helped to light it around the world.

Since that sacred fire was struck on American soil, men of Irish blood have carried it around the world. Irish voices were raised for liberty in every quarter of the wind and Irish blood has been spilled on every continent to advance the cause of independence. As it has been so will it always be.

Massive Fiction Versus the OTC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the Roscoe Drummond column which follows appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of Monday, May 7, 1956. Mr. Drummond is to be congratulated for his concise statement on this important issue now before the Congress.

WASHINGTON

(By Roscoe Drummond)

MASSIVE FICTION VERSUS THE OTC

The Eisenhower administration is going to have quite a fight on its hand to win one of its main objectives at this session: Congressional approval for United States membership in OTC—Organization for Trade Cooperation.

This is no big headline-making issue. Win or lose, it won't carry a doubtful State or lose a doubtful district. But OTC is the symbol of everything the United States has been trying to do for years, including the Eisenhower years, to expand the channels of profitable trade throughout the free world.

It is the strong conviction of the President:

That American labor, agriculture and business will be benefited by what OTC can do in expanding world trade.

That OTC cannot function effectively without the United States.

That America would be abdicating its world leadership and would be virtually conceding the field to the Soviets if we decide that OTC isn't worth the effort.

The congressional outlook is not as good as the 18 to 7 vote of approval which the House Ways and Means Committee gave to OTC. While the Democrats voted overwhelmingly, 14 to 1, for United States membership, the Republicans voted substantially, 6 to 4, against OTC. Obviously the President will have to do a lot better than that with his own party if he is to win.

Second, the House Ways and Means Committee voted strongly for OTC because its members have come solidly to grip with the facts and know that most of the arguments used against it are fabricated eyewash.

Things bring us to the oddly revealing circumstances that almost the whole opposition to OTC rests upon the most egregious charges which have not the slightest relationship to reality.

One can honestly argue—though I happen to think mistakenly—that we ought to dump the Reciprocal Trade Act, turn our back on the effort to build freer multilateral trade and put further subsidies on the American consumer to protect the prices of American industry.

But for particular industries, which don't want the hot breath of world trade to force them to be more efficient and more competitive, to argue that OTC puts the Nation's economy into international bondage, scraps the authority of Congress over tariff policy, sinks American sovereignty, and undermines United States industry is adulterated buncombe.

It does none of these things. The bill which would put the United States into OTC guards against all these things. There is no factual basis for such contentions.

The fact that the charges are being made and blandly circulated to Members of Congress suggests that the arguments against OTC are so weak that its opponents dare not use them. They are erecting instead a massive, miasmic wall of fiction which they hope will confuse those who haven't laid hold of the facts.

OTC does not involve any new tariff reduction authority, does not change any United States law, does not affect Congress' authority to legislate, does not give the President any additional powers, does not touch the safeguards of the Reciprocal Trade Act like the peril point, and the United States retains a veto over any action which affects American policy.

You wouldn't get Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks or Cola G. Parker, president of the National Association of Manufactur-

ers, to support OTC, as they do, if it did any of these things.

OTC is made up of 35 countries which do 80 percent of the trade of the free world. It would be the administrative instrument to carry out existing trade agreements and iron out trade disputes within the framework of existing policy. It would play a big role in preventing other nations from discriminating against United States exports.

Secretary Weeks is no pie-in-the-sky visionary. His report to the Cabinet on OTC was: "With Soviet economic activities on the increase, the United States must strengthen its cooperation with free nations in the trade field. OTC is essential to this end."

Possible Cancer Hazard Presented by Feeding Diethylstilbestrol to Cattle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following paper, prepared by four distinguished physicians and presented at the Symposium on Medicated Feeds held by the Food and Drug Administration on January 24, 1956.

Considering the already widespread and increasing use of diethylstilbestrol in cattle feed, this paper should interest everyone concerned with the public health. According to the authors of this article, estrogens implanted in poultry and fed to cattle may not be as harmless as the public has been led to believe.

This article presents another instance of the necessity to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act so as to provide for the safety of chemical additives in food.

H. R. 4475, which I introduced in February, 1955, would give this protection.

POSSIBLE CANCER HAZARD PRESENTED BY FEEDING DIETHYLSTILBESTROL TO CATTLE

(By Granville F. Knight, M. D., president, American Academy of Nutrition; W. Coda Martin, M. D., vice president, American Academy of Nutrition; Rigoberto Iglesias, M. D.; William E. Smith, M. D.)

Introduction of the powerful drug, diethylstilbestrol, into the Nation's food supply prompts consideration of the actions of this compound. It is known to induce cancer (1), (2). It has also been found to stimulate weight gain. For the latter reason, there has developed a practice of administering this drug to poultry and beef cattle in the United States (3).

It has been estimated that more than 30,000,000 chickens per year are implanted with pellets of diethylstilbestrol, and that approximately half of the feedlot cattle in the country are now given feeds to which this drug has been added. In poultry, the pellets are intended to be inserted at the base of the skull on the supposition that this part will be discarded and not eaten. But among nine lots of poultry coming into the New York market and examined by inspectors of the Food and Drug Administration, about 35 percent of the birds were stated to contain such pellets in the neck. Similar findings emerged from subsequent investigations, and the residual diethylstilbestrol was reported as 3 to 24 milligrams per bird (4). It has been claimed that no appreciable quantities of diethylstilbestrol can be demonstrated in the tissues of cattle fed this drug (3), but this claim may convey a false sense of security for reasons subsequently given in this presentation.

Diethylstilbestrol can be made under conditions involving exposure to a temperature of 428 degrees Fahrenheit for several hours (5). The temperature recommended for roasting chickens is 350°. Temperatures of only 140° to 180° are found in the interior of roasts of beef (6). From these figures, it is apparent that diethylstilbestrol would not be destroyed by cooking, and could be conveyed to consumers of meat containing it.

It thus seems pertinent to review the effects that this compound can exert. Administration of estrogens, among which diethylstilbestrol is one of the most potent, has led to a wide range of pathological changes in human beings and in animals. In mice, rats, or guinea pigs, estrogens can induce polyps, fibroids and cancers of the uterus, cancers of the cervix, cancers of the breast, hyperplasia of prostatic stroma and of endometrium, tumors of the testicle and hypophysis, and leukemias (2).

In the experience of one of us (R. I.), uterine tumors have frequently been found in guinea pigs given as little as 1.5 milligrams of diethylstilbestrol or other estrogens in subcutaneously implanted pellets (7), (8). Indeed, tumors have resulted in guinea pigs exposed to as little as 8 micrograms (eight-thousands of 1 milligram (of diethylstilbestrol per day (7). Lower dosage levels have not yet been tested in guinea pigs, but in current experiments a pellet removed from a guinea pig 1 year after implantation has been found to retain sufficient activity to induce a tumor upon reimplantation into another animal.

Investigators at the National Cancer Institute have reported that cancers of the breast can be induced in mice by as little as 0.07 microgram of diethylstilbestrol per day (9). This dosage sufficed to induce breast cancer in about 50 percent of male mice, who do not develop such tumors in absence of exposure to an estrogen. A total dose of 30 micrograms was effective in these experiments, in which the drug was administered in a subcutaneously implanted pellet. These and other investigators found that diethylstilbestrol also induced tumors readily when given to mice by mouth.

Normal mice excrete between 0.05 and 0.1 microgram of estrogen per day (10). So delicate is the physiological balance that exposure to an approximately equal additional amount (0.07 microgram) of estrogen (diethylstilbestrol) per day suffices to induce cancer, as mentioned above.

From the above findings, it is obvious that the cancer-producing dose of this drug approaches the infinitesimal. Claims that no appreciable quantities of it can be demonstrated in tissues of cattle to which it has been fed must therefore be carefully scrutinized as to the sensitivity and accuracy of the test methods. An equally cogent consideration is that the fundamental mechanism of cancer induction by diethylstilbestrol is not understood. Many tumors are known to be caused by viruses (2). In mice, cancer of the breast has been traced to a virus. But, for its cancer-producing activity, this virus is dependent upon stimulation by estrogens, such as diethylstilbestrol. This virus remains in the tissues and exerts its neoplastic effects long after cessation of administration of estrogens. Absence of detectable estrogen in the tissues of animals treated with or fed such a substance thus offers no assurance of the absence of a cancer hazard in such tissues.

A great body of evidence shows that cancer-inciting chemicals can exert their effects in catalytic quantities, inducing changes in cells which are mediated by unknown substances transmitted from cell to cell long after the original cancer-inciting material ceases to be demonstrable in the tissues (2). No assurance of the absence of such substances can be offered consumers of tissues from animals treated with or fed a carcinogen, such as diethylstilbestrol.

In human beings, a variety of pathological changes have been found to follow administration of estrogens. In women well past the menopause, the course of breast cancer is slowed by estrogens, but in somewhat younger women it is accelerated (11). There are claims for primary initiation of cancer in women by estrogens (12), but these have been few in contrast to the great number and diversity of tumors following estrogenic treatment of animals. Now it has been found from animal experiments that the spacing of doses greatly influences the yield of tumors. Most important, it has been learned from animal work that intermittent administration of very large doses of estrogens is far less effective in inducing tumors than is a continuing exposure to an extremely minute dose. This phenomenon has been repeatedly observed by one of us (R. I.) in experiments conducted over a period of nearly 20 years in the laboratory of Professor Lipschutz (7). It is a continuing exposure to extremely minute doses that is to be feared from the introduction of estrogens into the food supply.

A prime consideration is the long period of time that elapses between first exposure to a carcinogen, such as diethylstilbestrol, and eventual appearance of a tumor. In animal experiments, exposure is customarily begun early in life and the majority of tumors arise when the animals are old. Experience in the results of administration of estrogens to human beings has been largely limited to treatment of conditions arising fairly late in life. By comparison, the majority of human beings thus far exposed would complete their life span before passage of sufficient time to observe a carcinogenic effect of estrogens. The introduction of estrogens into the food supply, however, presents the problem of exposure of human beings from birth onward.

That human beings are not immune to the cancer-inciting action of estrogens is shown by the fact that there are on record some 17 cases of cancer of the breast in men given estrogens, including diethylstilbestrol (13).

Yesterday, figures were presented to this symposium (14), which, according to our understanding, represent the finding of about 1 microgram of diethylstilbestrol per pound in the tissue of a steer given the prescribed amount (10 milligrams) of this drug in feed. One pound of such tissue would thus contain about 14 times the amount of diethylstilbestrol needed as a daily does to produce cancer in mice, for, as stated above, 0.07 microgram of diethylstilbestrol per day sufficed to elicit cancer in 50 percent of mice. Furthermore, claims for the absence of diethylstilbestrol in tissues have been based on a method whose limit of sensitivity (3), is, according to our calculations, in the range of 1 microgram per 1.1 pounds. This means that a pound of meat, certified as free of diethylstilbestrol, could contain nearly 14 times the amount of this drug necessary to induce cancer by a daily dose to mice. In the case of market poultry found to contain up to 24 milligrams of diethylstilbestrol per bird (4), one is dealing with an amount roughly equivalent to 342,000 times the daily dose necessary to produce cancer in mice.

It would therefore seem prudent that further careful consideration be given the matter of adding to the cycle of food supply a drug known to initiate or aggravate a serious disease.

REFERENCES

1. Hartwell, J. L., Survey of Compounds Which Have Been Tested for Carcinogenic Activity. (U. S. Public Health Service Publication No. 149. Washington, D. C., 1951, p. 583.)
2. Homburger, F. and Fishman, W. H., the Physiopathology of Cancer. (Paul B. Hoeber, Inc., New York, 1953, p. 1031.)
3. Fournier, W. C., New Hormone Drug Fattens Cattle Quicker. (The Wall Street Journal, Sept. 9, 1955, p. 1.)
4. Wickenden, L., Our Daily Poison. (Devin-Adair, New York, 1955, p. 178.)
5. Twombly, G. H., Tissue Localization and Excretion Routes of Radioactive Diethylstilbestrol. (Acta Union Internationale contre le Cancer, VII, No. 5, 882–888, 1952.)
6. Farmer, Fanny, The Boston Cooking School Cook Book. (Little, Brown Co., Boston, 1944, p. 824.)
7. Lipschutz, A., Steroid Hormones and Tumors. (Williams and Wilkins Co., Baltimore, 1950, p. 309.)
8. Lipschutz, A., Iglesias, R., and Vargas, L., Uterine and Extrauterine Localizations of Experimental Fibroids Induced in Guinea Pigs by Prolonged Administration of Estrogens. (Pro. Soc. Exp. Biol. and Med., 45: 788–792, 1940.)
9. Staff of the National Cancer Institute, U. S. Public Health Service; A Symposium on Mammary Tumors in Mice. (American Association Advancement of Science, Publication No. 22, 1945, p. 223, reference especially to p. 97.)
10. Aub, J. C., Karnofsky, D., and Towne, L. E., Sex Hormone Excretion Rates in High and Low Tumor Strains of Mice. (Cancer Research 1: 737 1941.)
11. Escher, G. C., Hormone Therapy in Advanced Mammary Carcinoma. (Medical Clinics North America, 36: No. 3, 681–688, 1952.)
12. Novak, E., Relationship of Endometrial Hyperplasia and Adenocarinoma of the Uterine Fundus. (Journal American Medical Association, 154: 217–220, 1954.)
13. Hueper, W. C., Recent Developments in Environmental Cancer. (Arch. Path., 58: 475–523, 1954.)
14. Gossett, F. O., The Feeding of High Levels of Diethylstilbestrol to Beef Animals. (Symposium on Medicated Feeds, Food and Drug Administration, Washington, D. C., 1956.)

Another Mississippian Honored—Mississippi 4-H Girl Represents United States Youth at International Teen-Age Conclave in Paris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I seriously doubt that among all of the 48 States of the Union there is another State that compares favorably with my native State of Mississippi in its contribution to leadership in the various segments of the society and economy and the Nation. Surely, there is no other State in our glorious union of States which furnishes more national leaders on a per capita basis. From time to time I have called the attention of this body to instance after instance where an outstanding Mississippian has been chosen in national competition over other Americans. For instance, there was Sgt. Jake Lindsey, of Lucedale, Miss., who, during the last months of the recent World War, was selected as the outstanding hero to receive the 100th Congressional Medal of Honor for valiant service rendered on the battlefield of France. Sergeant Lindsey enjoys the unique distinction of being the only recipient of that highly coveted honor to receive the Congressional Medal of Honor at the hands of the President of the United States in a joint session of the Congress.

Some 2 years ago when Boys Nation and Girls Nation held their national convention here in the Capital City of Washington, an outstanding Mississippi youth, Eddie Perry, of Bay St. Louis, Miss., was selected as president of Boys Nation, and, believe it or not, at the same time Miss Jerolyn Ross, of Meridian, Miss., was chosen as president of Girls Nation. This was indeed an unusual situation of an outstanding boy and an outstanding girl being selected to head up these two splendid youth organizations both from one State, the great State of Mississippi. I doubt, Mr. Speaker, if a parallel situation has ever existed or for that matter ever will again.

Only last week the Honorable A. Boyd Campbell, of Jackson, Miss., an old schoolmate of mine, retired as president of the United States Chamber of Commerce after an outstanding year's leadership of that great organization.

Other instances of Mississippi's contribution to the leadership of the Nation could be mentioned. But, Mr. Speaker, my purpose this morning is to call the attention of the House to another star that has been added to the galaxy of the crown of Mississippians' achievements.

Mr. Speaker, Miss Marilyn Graves, 19 year-old 4–H girl of Jones County, Mississippi, has just returned from Paris where she represented United States youth at an international teen-age conclave.

The Mississippi girl was one of 40 young women—20 from France and 20 from other countries around the world—who took part in a two weeks' conference to discover how teen-agers in many nations live, think, and feel.

Other countries represented were: Germany, Australia, Belgium, Argentina, Cameroons, Brazil, French Northwest Africa, Egypt, Spain, Denmark, Great Britain, Holland, Greece, Italy, Japan, Portugal, Sweden, and Switzerland.

Host for the meeting was a French magazine, Elle, and each delegate was selected by a leading publication in the country she represented. Miss Graves was chosen to represent the United States by the magazine, Seventeen, which reaches about 2½ million teenagers, and which last fall featured her in a magazine article as "Miss Young America in 4–H."

Commenting on Miss Graves' selection, Mrs. Enid A. Haupt, publisher of Seventeen, said: "It is a great responsibility to select a girl who will represent America's 8 million teen-age girls at a foreign conference. We are especially pleased that Marilyn is so active in 4–H work—because we feel this is such a typically American activity. Marilyn to us represents the best type of American girl because she has truly kept her 4–H pledge to use the 4–H's—head, heart, hands, and health—for her club, community, and country.

An outstanding member of this organization of farm youth, Miss Graves has traveled through the 4–H Club program to Minnesota, Chicago, New Orleans, and Washington, D. C.; given 230 speeches, and appeared on television and radio as a representative of the organization.

Miss Graves lives on a 260-acre farm with her parents and brother. They raise beef cattle and grow corn and cotton. A graduate of Jones County Agricultural High School and Junior College, she is now working for a degree in home economics at Mississippi State College for Women.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, another Mississippian has been honored and has received national recognition.

Statement in Support of Appropriations for the Rural Electrification Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by me in support of appropriations for the Rural Electrification Administration before the Senate Appropriations Committee:

The city dweller first know the blessings of electricity as early as 1882 when Thomas A. Edison built his famous Pearl Street plant in New York. The rural dweller had to wait many years to realize these benefits. During the three succeeding decades the farmer waited, more or less patiently. Electric utilities, public and private, for a long time ignored him. Farmhouses were thought to be too far away from generating plants and were too far apart. There could be no profit in serving them.

Eventually the transmission lines crept out into the country from the cities, slowly and painfully. By 1935 only 10 percent of the Nation's farms were electrified and prospects of this percentage increasing rapidly were exceedingly dim in the midst of a period of depression. It was then that the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 was passed. The Federal Government then assumed the responsibility of bringing the blessings of electricity to the long-suffering farmer. Today over 94 percent of farms throughout this broad land are electrified. There are now over 1,000 REA financed sylstems, owned by the farmers themselves, which maintain 1,300,000 miles of line serving over 4½ million rural consumers. This is a truly remarkable achievement.

By means of electricity it is certain that many lives have been lengthened and made more complete. Productivity of the farm has attained heights unknown elsewhere in the world, due largely to the coming of electricity to the farm.

Over $3 billion has been authorized for loans. It is significant to me that repay-

ment of loans and of interest is almost 100 percent perfect. At the first of the year only 15 of the borrowers were delinquent more than 30 days and the amount overdue was less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the amount billed. Few businesses of any kind can boast of such a record.

The strength of the Nation is its people. Americans have become strong by accepting responsibility, demonstrating initiative and perseverance. Nowhere has this been better proven than in the Rural Electrification program. Once given the opportunity our rural dwellers have shown that they are mature and self-reliant. Today the financial position of the program is sound.

Every 7 years the farmer has been doubling his use of electricity. He has come to consider electricity as an absolute necessity, and it is resulting in a need for increasing the capacity of many REA systems. For that reason, and for the development of new sources of energy it is essential that more funds be made available to maintain efficiency and expand capacities of many REA cooperatives.

It is essential that the program be carried on, both for the purpose of improving and expanding existing systems and to reach the few remaining farms not yet served with electricity.

In 1949 Congress belatedly recognized an anachronism. Many farms, even in this modern age of electronics, had no telephones. It then authorized the REA to extend its lending services to interests, public as well as private, who would extend telephone service to those needing it, or to improve existing but poor service.

The first telephone loan was made in February 1950, at a time when the United States census showed only 38.2 percent of all farms had telephones. Variation was extremely wide in separate areas. By December 31, 1955, 415 borrowers had sought $273 million and already over 15,000 miles of lines had been constructed to reach 286,000 subscribers. This is a remarkable record for so short a time and deserves to be encouraged by all means. Authorized totals would include, at the end of 1955, 86,543 miles of line on 246 systems.

The activity of the REA rural telephone program has stimulated activity by all operating in the field. The job of getting modern telephone service on every farm in the United States is not REA's alone. All units of the industry are working toward that end.

In my own State I have witnessed the remarkable growth of these two programs. In 1935 only 2.6 percent of Oklahoma's farms were electrified when the first loan was approved. On January 1 of this year, 90.8 percent were electrified. Farms so served had increased from 5,648 to 108,079. Loans have been made totaling over $120 million, which will eventually result in nearly 62,000 miles of lines to serve over 151,000 rural consumers. I am proud to say not one of the 28 borrowers in my State are delinquent in repayment of their obligations.

In 1940 only 18.1 percent of Oklahoma's farms had telephones, and when the REA telephone program began only 1 out of 3 farms had phones. By the end of 1954 this had been increased to 44.8 percent, or 53,299 farms, served by 2,368 miles of line. REA rural lines have brought new service to 3,107 and 3,521 are benefiting from improved services. The nearly $3 million in loans to 9 borrowers is being well used.

The American farmer has little to cheer him in these days of surplus crops and depressed prices for farm products. But we must not forget that he has been a stalwart pillar of strength throughout our history, and he will be needed more and more in the future. Our increasing population will demand an ever-increasing amount of farm products. The health, happiness, and productivity of our farm population must be preserved. The REA programs of electrification and telephone service are essential to the farmer's efficiency and must be continued until there is no penalty to the rural dweller from the fact of living in the country. The farmer is entitled to the full use of electricity and of communication with his fellow no less than the city dweller. For these reasons, I appeal to you to grant the full amount sought by the REA for continuing unabated its useful and valuable program.

Kansas City, Kans., Armory Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, the following news story from the Kansas City Star, of Sunday, May 6, 1956, relates the events of a historic day in Kansas City, Kans., when the city's new million-dollar National Guard armory was dedicated.

As you will see, the story gives short excerpts from talks given by Gen. Williston B. Palmer, Army Vice Chief of Staff; former President Harry S. Truman; and myself:

LINK IN DEFENSE: THE NEW KANSAS CITY, KANS., NATIONAL GUARD ARMORY IS DEDICATED AS DETERRENT OF WAR—REPRESENTATIVE SCRIVNER SAYS THE FACILITY IS EVIDENCE OF THE WILL TO FACE ENEMIES

In a ceremony replete with military honors and traditions, the new National Guard armory in Kansas City, Kans., was dedicated yesterday before 2,000 persons.

The event drew to the city former President Harry S. Truman, 18 generals, including the Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, Gen. Williston B. Palmer, and other Midwest military and civilian leaders.

Special tribute was paid to Col. Mahlon S. Weed, station commander, for his work of more than two decades to provide the city such a facility. Colonel Weed's reply was a simple "Thank you," and words of praise for the citizens of the community who made the million-dollar project possible.

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL WEED

ERRETT P. SCRIVNER, Representative in Congress from the Second Kansas District, who served as a lieutenant under the colonel when he was Captain Weed, paid this tribute:

"It is more than a building we dedicate today. It is a dream come true, a testimonial to the vision, tenacity, and faith of one man, Col. Mahlon S. Weed."

The Representative recalled the history of the Guard in Kansas City, Kans., pointing out such inadequate facilities of bygone years as a laundry converted to armory use, storefronts, and the basement of the Memorial hall.

"Today you see the culmination of years of effort," SCRIVNER said. "On this ground stands, by your efforts, this magnificent armory, in which the youth of today and tomorrow will receive training * * * that may some day not only save their own lives, but may very well save your country and your life."

HISTORIC ROLE BY CITIZEN

The speaker added that tax dollars for the armory are as a premium on an insurance policy for national security. He recalled the efforts of the citizen-soldier called to arms in all of America's wars and pointed out that the National Guard and Reserve forces furnish the major share of military manpower when war comes.

"With these marvelous modern facilities, our men will be far better prepared than they could have been otherwise," SCRIVNER said. "Even so, I am sure you join me in the prayer that even though prepared, they will never be called upon to serve in time of war. With them, let this be your slogan, 'Keep your guard up'."

The importance of the civilian components in the Nation's military picture also was stressed by Gen. Williston B. Palmer, Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, who was representing Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, the Chief of Staff. General Palmer congratulated the citizens of Kansas City, Kans., for their efforts in providing the facility.

A PREPAREDNESS SYMBOL

"In generously providing this building," the general said, "the people of this city and of this State are to be commended. This is visible evidence of your determination to deter war, and the national guardsmen here are likewise dedicated to this purpose. The significance of this ceremony is that we are dedicating not merely a shrine to memories of past wars, but also a building to house the strength with which to boldly face our enemies, and which by its readiness will prevent conflict.

General Palmer was introduced by Maj. Gen. Joe Nickell, the adjutant general of Kansas.

Truman recalled his early days in the guard, telling of the payment of 25 cents a night to rent a dance hall as a drill hall, and providing a uniform.

The country has found out that the National Guard and the Reserve must be maintained," Mr. Truman said. "I am very much interested in what you are doing here. It is necessary that the country understands that its welfare depends on the civil population."

A WORD TO GUARDSMEN

Turning to the guardmen the former President counseled the men they should appreciate the facility they now have.

"Keep up the good work," he said, "you're the only safety this country has."

Beaming, Mr. Truman remarked as he finished: "I want to come back in about 20 years when I'm 90 to review you and see if you have shown any improvement."

In presenting the armory to the State, Mayor Paul F. Mitchum said it was a real pleasure for him to represent the citizenry of Kansas City, Kans., in the task. Gen. Calvin E. Berry, Topeka, a member of the State military board, accepted the facility and said:

"I express the deep appreciation of the Kansas Military Board to the citizens of this community for their untiring devotion to our national defense."

Brig. Gen. Frank Dunkley, Topeka, formally commissioned the armory as a military facility. Accepting the responsibility of the building for Colonel Weed, the station commander, was Lt. Col. John W. Breidenthal, executive officer of the station.

The Political Mill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM COON
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, there has been much talk from certain politicians

about giveaways by the Eisenhower administration and former Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay.

I now see in the column The Political Mill, by Gould Lincoln, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, that Mr. Rex Ellis, a well-known farmer and legislator who served 16 years in the Oregon Senate, has offered $1,000 if these gentlemen can substantiate their giveaway charges. It will be interesting to see how soon any of them collect the $1,000.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a portion of Mr. Gould Lincoln's The Political Mill column, as follows:

Former Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay gave up his Cabinet post not long ago to run for the Republican senatorial nomination in Oregon. If he wins the primary election May 18, he will be Senator MORSE's opponent. The Oregon Senator has attacked President Eisenhower and Mr. McKay frequently, accusing them of giving away natural resources of the country to private interests.

A Pendleton, Oreg., rancher, Rex Ellis, has deposited a certified check of $1,000 with E. C. Sammons, president of the United States National Bank in Portland, to be given to anyone "who can prove by due process of law that the President of the United States or Douglas McKay has committed fraud in any transaction or ruling made by the President or by the Secretary," giving away any part of the public domain.

Mr. Ellis said he was making the offer in the interest of fair play—and that he did not consider the charges made against General Eisenhower and Mr. McKay fair play. He wants Senator MORSE or any one else making these charges to prove them "or admit they have been making false and malicious statements."

The Federal Civil Defense Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, last October, I attended in Boston the national conference of the United States Civil Defense Council, which is composed of city and county civil defense officials. At that time, I became impressed with the difficult job faced by some 400 State and local civil defense directors at the conference and by the overall responsibility of the Federal Civil Defense Administration.

In order to help civil defense, and particularly its education and training program, which is of interest to all Americans, I introduced H. R. 10432, which will help develop national civil defense training schools. The following facts are of interest by way of background:

The Federal Civil Defense Administration expects to offer a graduate course during the coming months for civil defense command and staff personnel. Completion of this course will prepare a graduate to function effectively in an operational capacity during a civil defense emergency, natural or manmade. The course will be about 3 months in length.

Experience with the 1-week courses which have been conducted since 1951, have shown that many civil defense officials at the State and local levels who should attend such courses are not able to do so because of their budgetary limitations. Passage of this bill will enable more State and local officials to attend, thus assuring a greater uniformity in organization and training in civil defense throughout the Nation. If this bill is not enacted, most civil defense officials who so badly need this training will be unable to attend and the civil defense effort will be seriously handicapped.

The bill recommends payment of travel expenses and per diem allowances in accordance with Government travel regulations. Enactment of the bill would result in no additional increase in the Federal Civil Defense Administration's budget as the cost of the program would be absorbed in FCDA's 1957 appropriation.

Address of Allen W. Dulles, Director of Central Intelligence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a speech by Hon. Allen W. Dulles, Director of Central Intelligence, before the Los Angeles World Affairs Council on April 13, 1956. Mr. Dulles' excellent and expert analysis of the recent change in the Communist Party line is worthy of careful study.

The address follows:

PURGE OF STALINISM

(Address of Allen W. Dulles, Director of Central Intelligence, before Los Angeles World Affairs Council, April 13, 1956)

There is never a dull moment in my job as Director of Central Intelligence. Events which seem to defy analysis happen somewhere in the world every day. Few trends seem to follow a predictable course.

These last few weeks there have been developments in the Soviet Union which have puzzled all the experts who generally have ready answers—sometimes more ready than accurate—to explain Soviet conduct.

Just at a time when some are saying that everything is going wrong with foreign policy in the free world countries but that everything in the Soviet Union is progressing according to some great master design, the Soviet collective leadership, as they call it, comes forward to beat their collective breasts and indulge in the most extreme self criticism.

The men in the Kremlin now tell us that all they said earlier about events in the U. S. S. R. during the 20 years preceding Stalin's death is quite wrong; that in fact this was an era of infamy, crime, and shame. They admit that their past adulation of Stalin was based on fear not on fact. The man they themselves used to call the "glorious Stalin, genius of mankind" is now being publicly accused of "grave errors" and privately described as a malicious monster.

The Soviet leaders do not very clearly explain why the new collective leaders waited for 3 years after Stalin's death to tell it to their people. They do not make a very satisfactory showing as to why they themselves sat acquiescent in the seats of the mighty during all the period of Stalin's dictatorship, exercising great powers as members of his inner circle.

Possibly, as Khrushchev is reported to have admitted, the price of nonconformity was a bullet in the head. This is a very human excuse but a poor qualification for high office on the part of those who now assert the rights and prerogatives of leadership. In the free world, where we aspire to build on the great traditions of the past, not to repudiate them, we revere as our heroes and leaders those who refused to conform, whatever the risks, when the principles of liberty were at stake.

In the U. S. S. R., evidently, acquiescing in crime as the price of simple survival under a political tyrant is sanctioned as legitimate conduct. As they put it: "The point was not to save one's own life; the point was to save the revolution."

Before going further into the details of this strange development in the Soviet Union it may be worth while to review briefly what had been taking place there during the years of Stalin's power. Here we may find clues as to why the men in the Kremlin now take the serious risks of repudiating their late hero for having put the individual above party and substituting a personal dictatorship for a collective one.

Stalin himself ran through a series of revolutionary combinations, somewhat akin to collective leaderships, during the 1920's. For example, in 1924–25 he combined with Zinoviev and Kamenev against Trotsky. From 1925–27, a new alliance between Stalin, Bukharin and Rykov was formed and routed a Trotsky-Zinoviev-Kamenev combination. And finally, from 1927–29, Stalin worked with Molotov, Voroshilov, Mikoyan, and others to crush Stalin's recent allies, Bukharin and Rykov.

It was during the 10 years which preceded Russia's entry into World War II that Stalin completed the consolidation of his control over the Communist party machinery. By that time he had placed his loyal stooges in all important positions of authority throughout the Soviet Union and the Army was brought under political control.

Among the major charges said to have been leveled against Stalin by Khrushchev is the charge that in the late thirties he deliberately liquidated Marshal Tukhachevsky and thousands of the best officers in the Soviet Army, presumably to insure his political control of the military apparatus. Certainly today there is good reason to believe that Marshal Tukhachevsky was falsely accused of conniving with the Germans. There is some evidence that there was a clever German plot to discredit Tukhachevsky, which happened to fit in with Stalin's own plans.

We do know that during and after the war there was burning resentment among the Soviet's professional soldiers at Stalin's interference in the conduct of the war, his unjust and capricious belittling of heroes such as Zhukov and his arrogant claims to personal credit for Soviet victories. A senior Soviet general, for example, is recently reported as having privately branded their so-called documentary film, "The Fall of Berlin," which shows Stalin as the great military master mind, as a "tissue of lies."

Today the collective dictatorship is assiduously repairing the injured dignity of the military and incorporating its leadership into Communist Party membership. They must realize that, following the usual pattern of revolutions, the military leaders might tire of being the pawn of dictators, whether individual or collective.

But whatever the faults of Stalin in the prewar decade, one can harly ascribe them to his old age or senility. Stalin was then in his prime. Furthermore one can hardly believe that the acts of the dictator in a war from which he emerged as a hero are the motivating causes for the present attempt to liquidate his memory. In fact, the most recent Soviet pronouncements are tending to refer to "good" and "bad" Stalin eras. Naturally, there is no desire to repudiate such measures as farm collectivization and the rapid industrialization under the Five Year Plans, which are so closely associated with his name. The beginning of the 'bad" period was in 1934 when the great Stalin purges began. If they denounce his war record, the purpose here must be to eliminate him from the hero class and to give the military some of the credit he had arrogated to himself.

But to find the real reasons for the de-Stalinization campaign, we must, I believe, look to the more recent past, particularly to the hard autocratic period during the last 6 or 7 years of Stalin's life. Here we find two major motivations for cutting away from Stalin worship.

Internationally, from about 1947 onward to the time of his death, Stalin's often bellicose policy in the international field had been a failure and had tended to unite the free world against international communism. Domestically during this period his police state was meeting ever-increasing disfavor, not only with the helpless people, but with the top politicians, generals, and industrial managers who were essential to the working of the Soviet system. This began to create problems for the regime.

First, let us look at the international picture. In the immediate postwar era, riding the crest of the common victory and maintaining military strength and power, Soviet policy had notable successes. It consolidated the grip on the European satellites and helped the Chinese Communists to victory.

But beginning with about 1947 in Europe, somewhat later in Asia, the free world at last began to realize the implications of the forward drive of international communism and started to take countermeasures, and the tide began to turn.

What happened in these years? The Marshall plan, which Stalin and Molotov indignantly rejected and tried to defeat, was put into effect and Europe was saved from economic chaos. In Greece, the Soviet effort to take over by guerrilla tactics was thwarted.

When the Soviet attempted to take over Berlin and destroy this outpost of Western freedom, the Berlin blockade was frustrated by the airlift and West Berlin remains a showwindow of what the free world can do. Tito survived his ejection from the Cominform and the wrath of Stalin and struck back with telling criticisms of Stalinist policy—almost identical with what Soviet leaders are now themselves saying.

Later the North Atlantic Alliance was organized and despite Soviet threats the way was opened for Germant rearmament in close union with the West.

Thus frustrated in the European field Stalin turned to the Far East and, working with the North Korean and Chinese Communists, attempted to take over Korea as the first step toward driving America from the western Pacific. Again the Communists were blocked and, most important of all, an alarmed and awakened American public opinion proceeded to the defensive rearmament of this country. Our nuclear power was vastly increased.

It is understandable that Stalin's successors should have found it convenient to place upon him the blame for Greece, Berlin, Korea, Yugoslavia, German rearmament and the like, and in particular, for the generally hard Soviet line which has led to the buildup of American defense forces and NATO. It was these successes which led the Soviet Union to conclude that a peace treaty with Austria was necessary to build up their badly shattered reputation as peace mongers and to prepare the way for a summit conference, their pilgrimage of penitence to Belgrade, and their effort to line the Socialist parties into new popular fronts.

But the foreign scene, alone, by no means explains the urge the present Kremlin leaders felt to break with the hard Stalinist past. They were already making progress in allowing the memory of Stalin to fade in international recognition and prestige without going to the extreme of total destruction of the Stalin myth with their own people. Thus the clue to their present policy lies more in the internal Soviet situation than in the requirements of their foreign policy.

Domestically they have been caught in a dilemma. In order to compete with the western world in the fields of science and industry which was vitally important for their economic growth and their rearmament program, it was essential for the Soviet to speed up the education of their people, especially in the scientific and technical field. After Stalin's death the regime encouraged more objectivity in scientific inquiry, and put on the shelf some pseudo scientists such as Lysenko. After all they had found out early in the game that in the present nuclear age one could not fool around with scientists who tailored their art to the whims of Marxism.

Obviously, the Soviet leaders could not limit their educational processes to the scientific fields and more and more young men and women are graduating from schools, which correspond to our high schools and colleges, and are taking advanced degrees comparable to our degrees of master of arts and doctor of philosophy. Even with all the indoctrination in Communist teachings which they give to their young students it is impossible to prevent education from developing the critical faculties which every thinking human being possesses.

Furthermore, as part of their new campaign of sweetness and light, they have found it wise to take down some of the bars which have impeded travel between the Soviet Union and the free countries; and while the Iron Curtain still remains and there is a careful selective process as to those who are permitted to leave the Soviet Union or to visit it, it is obvious that today there is far more contact between the people of the U. S. S. R. and outside countries than at any time in recent years.

All this has tended to build up pressures upon the Soviet rulers to create an impression not only internationally but also domestically, that a dictatorship of the Stalin type was dead forever.

The Soviet leaders are trying to meet their external and internal dilemmas by finding a convenient "devil" which they can use to explain away past Soviet sins to the world abroad and to their own people as well as to demonstrate that the present rulers of the Soviet are different mentally and morally than they were under Stalin. Thus they hope that their own people will accept their protestations that the days of government by arbitrary policymaking, secret trials, deportations, and prison camps are over. Furthermore, they are again promising that they will do something to raise the standard of living so that the promise of individual freedom will be seasoned with a greater share of consumers goods and a more abundant life.

The extent of the opposition to the Stalinist type regime must have been gaged by the Kremlin as far stronger and deeper among the Russian people than we had dared to hope. Nonetheless, the destruction of the Stalin myth carries with it a very real threat to the internal discipline and unity of the Soviet Communist Party and the international Communist movement.

That calculated risk must have been taken deliberately by men who knew they had to have a scapegoat, if they were to hope to preserve the dictatorship on which their own power and very survival rested. By attacking the personal symbol of Stalin and the worst excesses of his rule, they hope to be able to preserve many of the essentials of the Stalinist system, now labelling it Leninism, the monopoly of all power by a single party, the complete subordination of the courts and individual rights to arbitrary party decree, the governmental control of the press and of all organs of public information.

This basic structure is meant to be preserved intact. Already the regime has publicly warned that some rotten elements have taken the de-Stalinization campaign too literally and are "trying to question the correctness of the party's policy." This, Pravda thundered, is "petty bourgeois licentiousness" of a kind the "party has never tolerated and will never tolerate." A dead and dishonored Stalin, therefore, is likely to be merely a device—here possibly a Trojan corpse rather than a Trojan horse—with which the long-suffering Russian people are, I fear, to be deceived in their expectation of a freer and better life.

Obviously the Soviet rulers concluded that it would take something more than a mere repetition of the old clichés to have any effect. Apparently the necessity was deemed to be urgent and impelling. They had tried to do the trick with the liquidation of Beria, but the secrecy surrounding his execution was hardly a persuasive bit of evidence of a new dawn of liberty. It was in the worst tradition of the Stalin era, and he, after all, generally gave his victims at least a drumhead public trial.

When the present Soviet leaders took the risks involved in their present policy, they must have carefully weighed the consequences. They must have realized the grave issues it would raise in the Communist world outside of the U. S. S. R., among the party faithful in every free country, and among their own peoples.

Abroad they probably hoped there would be some counterbalancing advantages. If it would bring about a feeling of relaxation in the free world, defensive rearmament here and among our allies might slow down, defensive alliances might tend to weaken, the possibility of peaceful coexistence, for which everyone yearns, might be more and more accepted. All this they hoped would give them time to build up their own strength, economic, and military. If we are naive, then the Soviet Union may get some international benefits from their present tactics.

But there is another side to the picture which bears pondering. The Soviet leaders may have had no real alternative and took the course which they felt held out the best chance of keeping their own power. The Kremlin leaders, as I mentioned, were under heavy domestic pressures to do something to persuade their people that a new era was in the making. During recent years the leavening process of education has developed the critical faculties of millions of Russians. The Kremlin can no longer sell the old line to all of their people. They must now rewrite not only the history of Stalin but rewrite the story they have been telling their people about the outside world.

These leaders—Khrushchev, Bulganin, Mikoyan, Kaganovich—have got over the hump of Stalin's death without losing their grip on his power. They profess a great deal of confidence in their ability to perpetuate the system of collective dictatorship they have instituted by basing it more broadly on the top layer of elite party managers, generals, engineers, and intellectuals who have a stake in the Soviet regime.

Only time can tell whether the present leaders with their past close association with Stalinism really can do this and make the

Soviet dictatorship work without going much farther and giving their people something more than mere lipservice in the direction of the right to free speech, free worship, and protection for the individual from arbitrary action.

Possibly what we are seeing will end up as a temporary period of attempted fraud on the Russian people, a cloak to sell them a collective dictatorship as against a personal dictatorship. Possibly it is a first hesitant step toward giving a greater number of the Russian people a chance to share in the decisions which shape their destinies. I am sure the Russian leaders themselves do not know how their effort to "de-Stalinize" the Soviet Union will turn out. I am also sure they would be dismayed if they thought they were paving the way for the establishment in Russia of what we could call a decent and responsible government.

The Communists, despite their self-confidence, do not and will not control the fate of mankind. In the face of firm free-world resistance to their international barbarities and exposure of their political frauds and malpractices, at home and abroad, and under the pressure of their own people, there may be a gradual move toward more normal modes of life and behavior. If so, then hopes of world peace will be given a mighty impulse forward. This possibility the free world must watch prayerfully, alert to opportunities for peace provided by progress in this direction. We must be equally alert to perceive and denounce the dangers implicit in the fraud of a mere attempt to bury a shabby past.

Should Recipients Have More Say in Our Foreign-Aid Programs?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have an abiding and continued interest in the success achieved by our foreign-aid programs, particularly as they relate to the vital area of the Far East.

Recently my attention has been invited to a thought-provoking article appearing in the Washington Sunday Star on May 6, entitled "Should Recipients Have More Say in Our Foreign-Aid Programs?" Its author, J. A. Villamor, is a native of the Philippines but a naturalized American citizen and a lieutenant colonel in our Air Force Reserve. Colonel Villamor knows whereof he speakes. His record is an illustrious one, beginning with the days in 1936 when he was the first Philippine cadet to graduate from Randolph Field and continuing through the battles of the Philippines down to the present day.

As commander of the Philippine Pursuit Squadron, he was one of the few Philippine field officers evacuated with General MacArthur to Australia. Later by direction of General MacArthur, he was sent back to the island of Negros by submarine where he led the first small American party through Japanese lines to set up an allied counterintelligence network which coordinated all guerrilla activities in that area. His military missions in the South Pacific continued throughout the war and, after the liberation of the Philippines, he served in several important roles, both in the United Nations and as head of the Civil Aeronautics Bureau of the Philippine Government. Colonel Villamor found himself in the United States at the outbreak of the Korean conflict and volunteered his services to the American Government which accepted him as a lieutenant colonel, in which capacity he was sent to Saigon in 1951. Colonel Villamor spent more than a few years in Indochina and other vital areas in the Asiatic world where he viewed firsthand the incessant struggle between the forces of communism and democracy, which are seeking to win the bodies and souls of these unfortunate people.

Colonel Villamor is in a unique position to appraise our efforts, to properly influence peoples with whom he has a common bond of heritage and a deep understanding of their aspirations and desires. As a good American and one who loves this country, I believe his views are both timely and worthy of deep consideration:

SHOULD RECIPIENTS HAVE MORE SAY IN OUR FOREIGN-AID PROGRAMS?

(By J. A. Villamor)

Something has gone wrong with our foreign aid policy. I think many Government officials would agree with this appraisal.

But too many of the critics tend to blame our failures—whether they are large or small needs yet to be determined—on the recipients of our aid. "They are inexperienced and emotionally unstable," some will say, "and this naturally makes them gullible for Communist appeals." Others will claim: "They are just stupid, that is all."

The more kindhearted may say: "The Communists are only taking advantage of Asians' childish sentiments, something we cannot do."

But how many will say, simply, "it's our fault"? I, for one, believe the fault is primarily ours. Here is why:

A substantial portion of American efforts in Asia can be compared with the efforts of a brave, noble fellow who, with a brick in one hand and a pistol in the other, is determined to save a man who is dying of hunger and malaria and who lies prostrate in a room that is full of mosquitoes.

WRONG TOOLS FOR THE JOB

We are using the wrong tools for the job at hand.

It has become almost trite to say that the American emphasizes military aid too much. This, nonetheless, is the major problem.

Before we make our proposals we neglect getting answers to these vital questions:

Do the peoples we are trying to help want to have such a large military force as we think they should have?

To what extent must the national economics be adjusted to pay for these military forces?

Will these soldiers—usually the cream of the youth of these lands—be more valuable as soldiers or will it be better all around for them to be students, farmers and laborers?

Will these people have something to fight for besides having something to fight against when the time comes?

These questions ought to be explored in great detail before aid programs are decided upon. This should be obvious. But it is my experience that the answers are usually taken for granted by American administrators. Usually it has already been concluded by someone that "for their own good, they must have an army."

DO THE PEOPLE BENEFIT?

Economic aid programs are also charted with the wrong aims in view. Often the improvements we insist on do not truly raise the standards of living of the people—although they may make a great show of industrial improvement.

It happens even with strictly philanthropic programs, where the intentions of the donors are not open to question. There was a time last year when CARE packages arrived in Saigon with butter and cheese for people who did not have even rice—let alone bread—to eat with such delicacies. The cheese and the butter ended up in the black markets.

Many times the failures of our foreign aid have been due to our own unrestrained, let's-go spirit; our we-know-what's-good-for-you-better-than-you-do approach; our heavy dependence on material things to answer needs that are often largely spiritual; and, worst of all, perhaps, our tendency to forget the human problems—of peoples with hearts, minds, and souls, as well as stomachs, just like the peoples of the West.

In my opinion, our foreign aid ought to be directed more to the needs of the underdeveloped peoples as they see their needs, not as we see them.

True, we often do know what is best for these people more than they know themselves. But unless they can be convinced—and we do a very poor job of convincing them—our forcing on them what is good for them achieves us less than nothing.

THE NEED FOR DIGNITY

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles found on his last trip to the Orient that "there is throughout the Asian peoples a desire for Western recognition of their dignity." Other have mentioned the need for recognizing the Asian's dignity, but too few have stopped to think what this really means.

Another point which our foreign-aid administrators often miss: Asia is sick and tired of soldiers, diplomats, and merchants who, in spite of their good intentions, approach the problems of the poor from a special point of view. Asians respond, however, to the nonprofessional like President Ramon Magsaysay of the Philippines, an amateur (guerilla) soldier, an amateur diplomat, and an amateur politician fresh from the Filipino villages.

AMERICAN UMBRELLA?

Secretary Dulles reported, on his return from the Far East recently, that "the clearest single impression I received" was that "uniformly * * * the Asian leaders * * * desire the United States to be strong and that that strength should continue to be a sort of protective umbrella over other free nations."

I venture to suggest, however, that many have misjudged the Asians' desires. What they were probably saying was that they wanted the United States to be strong militarily, but not they themselves.

Asians, in other words, think the United States should be willing to play big brother, respecting a very delicate set of international Marquis of Queensberry rules. This Asian attitude is admittedly selfish. But we ought to be clear that this is their attitude, and that they are not ashamed to ask us to protect them, no questions asked.

The importance of paying attention to the attitudes of the people of Asia cannot be overemphasized. To ignore their attitudes, to interpret them only by western standards, to base policies and programs on one-way precepts—this is just about the fastest and surest way to bankrupt American policy in Asia.

Extracts From Address Delivered by Adlai E. Stevenson at Miami, Fla., on April 12, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD extracts from an address delivered by Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson at Miami, Fla., on April 12, 1956.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXTRACTS FROM ADDRESS OF ADLAI E. STEVENSON AT MIAMI, FLA., APRIL 12, 1956

Eleven years ago today a very great man died at Warm Springs, Ga. He had given greatly to this country, to this century, yes, to civilization. I wonder sometimes what America would be like today if it hadn't been for Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

President Roosevelt was at Warm Springs as he had been so many times before because of the cross he had to carry through the last 24 years of his life. For he was a victim of crippling infantile paralysis.

And today on this anniversary I want to pay my respects to the memory of this beloved man by talking with you for a few minutes about this matter of disease and sickness, of our war as a people against the killers who strike inside our bodies, of what we are and should be doing on this human battlefront.

We have within the past 2 years made dramatic and almost unbelievable advance against the particular enemy that attacked Franklin Roosevelt. But the plain facts are that we are doing pitifully, inexcusably little about finding answers to the other cruel mysteries which cause human misery and untimely death.

With 10 million American men and women suffering from heart disease, we spent last year only $16 million on research in this field or $1.60 for each person presently afflicted.

One of every seven of us as things are will die of cancer. Yet we spent last year on cancer research only $25 million—15 cents apiece per person.

With mental illness costing incalculable suffering and almost $1½ billion a year, we are spending $11 million less than 1 percent of that cost to combat it.

Last year we invested about a penny a person for research on arthritis and rheumatic diseases, cripplers of 10 million Americans.

The pennywise policies of the present administration so far as medical research is concerned are a shameful cost of what they call a businessman's government. A man wrote me this in a letter the other day: "Where cancer and heart disease alone killed more Americans under the age of 65 last year than were killed in the Armed Forces of this Nation during the Second World War and the Korean war together, it would seem that we should spend substantially more than we are to stop this toll upon life." I agree.

I am here asking your support in my candidacy for the Presidency of this Nation. I have refused in my campaign to make promises as a candidate I couldn't keep as President. I say to you that if I am elected to this Office I propose to use the powers and resources of this Nation to cut down killing and crippling disease with all the vigor we use to stop the killing and crippling which comes from war. A healthier nation is after all a stronger nation.

There are other things which must concern us if we are to fight back effectively against sickness and disease.

Roughly, a million American families will have to spend over half their income this year for medical care. In over 500,000 cases catastrophic accident or illness will consume the entire family income. And today there are 8 million American families in debt for medical care with much of this borrowing being at high interest rates from personal finance companies. In too many American homes a parent at some time or other looks down at a sick child, knows that something should be done and that there just isn't the money. It is high time that we advise a positive program to enable everyone who wants to have protection against the sudden and devastating costs of illness.

I have never proposed to socialize medicine and I am not in favor of national health insurance. There are other alternatives which are workable and in my opinion preferable.

Three out of every five people in this country are now enrolled in voluntary private prepayment insurance programs which cover health. Yet studies show that this membership includes mostly middle and high income families and all too few of the low income families who need it most.

I believe that these private insurance programs can be developed further so they will be attractive and within the reach of an even greater percentage of our people. And I urge further consideration of governmental programs to provide long-term low-interest-rate loans to groups which are organizing prepayment insurance plans and perhaps other forms of financial assistance to help to cover the initial costs of setting up such plans.

And surely the social-security program should be revised to provide that its benefits shall be paid in cases where covered employees become completely and totally disabled before reaching the usual retirement age. These are the cases of catastrophic illness in which the cost burden falls most heavily and often on those least able to carry it.

It is time, too, that we really do something about the shortage of doctors, particularly in some of the rural areas. There are today fewer doctors in proportion to the population than there were a hundred years ago. And there are fewer medical school graduates today than there were half a century ago.

We ought to take immediate steps to expand assistance to medical, dental, and nursing schools so that enrollments can be increased and standards still maintained. Legislation is now before the Congress providing for Federal aid for the construction and expansion of medical schools. The present administration opposed it last year. Now in election year the administration has seen the light of day and has come out for a program of Federal aid for medical training. But its program is wholly inadequate to meet the critical shortage of medical personnel. There is ample basis in immediate need to support the Democratic proposals now before Congress which call for the appropriation of $340 million over a 5-year period to assist in the construction of medical schools and for more adequate teaching and research facilities.

We must also speed up our hospital construction program with particular emphasis on building more hospitals for mental patients.

I know the complaints of the businessman's government now in Washington. This all costs too much they say, adding that it isn't really the Government's business anyway.

Well, I say to you that the one thing this great Nation can't afford is to let people die or suffer when it could be prevented.

And as for whose business it is, I say it is ours and that the Government is our servant.

It was Ralph Waldo Emerson who said that "humanity asks that government shall not be ashamed to be tender and paternal." And it was Woodrow Wilson who added that "you will notice that whenever the United States forgets its ardor for mankind it is necessary that a Democrat should be elected President."

Resolutions Adopted by the Midwest Federation of College Republican Clubs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, it is my pleasure to submit herewith for the RECORD resolutions which I have received from the Midwest Federation of College Republican Clubs which met at their annual convention in Topeka, Kans., on April 14, 1956:

RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE MIDWEST FEDERATION OF COLLEGE YOUNG REPUBLICAN CLUBS MEETING IN TOPEKA, KANS., ON APRIL 14, 1956

Whereas the United States has a severe farm problem today what can only be solved by nonpartisan action rather than a political vote-getting maneuver; and

Whereas it is surpluses that are creating much of the price suppression today and it is economically impossible to have price supports without surpluses; and

Whereas the problems of today cannot be solved by a program that has not only failed before, but also created the farm problem; and

Whereas much of the trouble lies in the Democratic 52-percent dollar which has not devalued further under the Republican administration; and

Whereas anybody who takes credit for high farm prices during the war had better take credit for the war also: be it

Resolved, That we endorse and fully support the administration farm program as presented by President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson and especially the soil bank plan and flexible price supports; and be it further

Resolved, That since the Congress has passed a farm bill contrary to the Eisenhower-Benson plan and since this bill would render the administration plan unworkable, we urge the President to veto said bill.

Be it resolved, That we commend President Eisenhower on his program and actions of the past 3 years and wholeheartedly commend him on his decision to run again for election.

Be it resolved, That we favor the further strengthening of the United Nations as an effective instrument for promoting peace.

Be it resolved, That we strongly urge our Government to make a strong effort to alleviate the Arab-Israeli conflict by mediation and planned resettlement of the Arab refugees, and be it further

Resolved, That we commend the administration's present policy in the Middle East as the one most likely to bring peace to that troubled area.

Be it resolved, That the United States should make a special effort to promote mutual understanding between the American and Russian people and should promote further cultural and educational exchanges with Communist nations.

Be it resolved, That the United States should continue to provide aid to free countries to promote the greater strength and solidarity of the free world.

Be it resolved, That the United States continue to support collective security in Europe through NATO and continue to support the Western Europeans in their efforts to unite economically, politically, and militarily.

Whereas the citizens of the United States between the ages of 18 and 21 are better educated and better informed than ever before in history; and

Whereas these citizens are wage earners and taxpayers without representation; and

Whereas these citizens provide more than 40 percent of the Armed Forces to defend their Government but are denied the right to help select this Government; and

Whereas today's decisions affect these citizens who are tomorrow's leaders: Be it

Resolved, That we recommend and endorse to the Congress of the United States an amendment to the Constitution lowering the legal voting age to 18 years.

Be it resolved, That we heartily commend Vice President NIXON on his excellent discharge of the Vice Presidential duties during the past 3 years.

Whereas education is the foundation of America's freedom and superiority; and

Whereas many college students and their parents are financially handicapped and often can't attend schools best suited to their needs to train them for their contribution to society: Be it

Resolved, That we recommend to the Congress that college tuition be a deductible expense from the income tax of the student or his parents.

Be it resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent by the chairman of the federation to the chairmen of the Republican House and senatorial campaign committees and that they be urged to insert them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or otherwise bring them to the attention of the Members of Congress.

Respectfully submitted.

J. ROBERT BARR,
Chairman.

Spanish War Widows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include the lead editorial of the issue just out of the National Tribune, as follows:

PASS THE O'HARA BILL

We quote the following: "I shall be 83 years of age on August 2, and I have been in poor health for some time. Fees for my doctor and oculist, and the prescriptions each requires that I use, take up almost my entire pension, and I have left little indeed for clothing and other necessities. Fortunately, I have a son and a daughter, both employed, and I have been living with my daughter and her husband. Of course, they pay rent, and everything we eat and use they have to buy. This places quite a burden upon my children. In addition to the fact that I am unable to help them appreciably, if I should require the service of a companion or nurse, neither I nor my children could afford it."

That extract is from a letter received from the widow of a veteran of the Spanish-American War who is now receiving a dependent's pension of $54.18 per month. We already have received scores of similar ones since the so-called Bradley Commission made its report. Few of the writers have the good fortune to have the loving care of children, and the fear they express at the possibility of losing the meager monthly payments they now receive makes most pitiful reading. We quite well realize that there is no need to quote from them, and we have no desire to resort to tear-jerking. The situation that results from the release of the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions constitutes a close approach to indefinable barbarism, especially as it applies to aged widows of veterans. We have, therefore, chosen to picture the reaction of one who finds herself in the most favorable position of any of our elderly war dependents; we leave to the imagination of our readers the situation faced by those who have no assistance whatever beyond their all too insufficient monthly pension checks.

No word of any kind having come from the White House since General Bradley submitted the findings of his Commission, we have no means of knowing whether or not the President had given any thought to what might become of the widows of deceased veterans when he called upon the Bradley group more than a year ago to examine and report on the treatment of the veteran class. He must have known that they have their individual worries and that they face specific problems, but he did not differentiate between them and veterans when he named the investigators and told them what they were expected to do. We have, therefore, searched the Bradley philosophy and recommendations more painstakingly for an answer to what probably should be the most human of its studies and findings and we were astounded to find that less than three pages covered what might conceivably be referred to as non-service-connected death pensions. Apparently the Commission was up against the bumpers on the whole question, and, if we can correctly interpret what must be considered at best as most confusing language, it just left widows and minor children in that overall group that must show "need" and be covered into social-security provisions, without defining just how this will be accomplished, and that they must also go off the public payroll if they should remarry.

We mean no discourtesy to General Eisenhower or to General Bradley when we point out how both here enter into the cruelest sort of conspiracy. Both have called upon the Senate to approve as soon as possible the Hardy bill that was passed last summer by the House of Representatives. That measure is entirely purposed to be magnanimous to survivors of members of the regular Armed Forces who die either in wartime or peacetime, making no distinction between the two but basing widows' payments on rank and length of service. The Bradley report says that all society should share the expense of this program as part of the risk of a public enterprise and it states that some beneficiaries now get too much in benefits and others too little. The enactment of that bill would provide, if the two Generals were to be considered still in service, that both widows would receive a minimum of $242 a month. And yet in another recommendation of the Commission, it is proposed that survivors of those who served in the ranks should not receive more than the base pay of the soldier except that food, clothing, and other costs should be valued as part of the pay. We presume that all of this discussion is just as confusing to the reader as it is to those of us who are attempting without much success to make some sense out of the report as a whole, and we admit that the more we study it the more confusing it gets, excepting as line by line and page by page it spells out more and more that the 96 percent of veterans who fought and won our wars, unless they suffered appreciable service-incurred disabilities, must be thrown upon the economic scrapheap, and the dependents of their dead with them, while the 4 percent of Regulars, whether they served in peace or war, should be given the red carpet treatment. Suppose, for instance, the widow of a Spanish War veteran were to have that yardstick applied to her—she would be allotted from $9 to $13 a month, or perhaps a few pennies more if some value were attached to stolen pigs or chickens foraged for the company cook. And their public enterprise happened to be a shooting war. It is all unimaginably silly, this Bradley report, unless one looks at it alone from the standpoint of the big brass. If there is one thing above all others that is deliberatedly emphasized in the entire study, it is the attempt to show that the professional serviceman is the salt of the earth and that those who left civilian life to fight our wars are still, if they were lucky enough to come home, nothing more than any other civilian. The more one reads this thing, the more it smells. Again we must insist that if the Congress accepts the Bradley recommendations, its members cannot realize what they are doing.

We began this comment by quoting from a letter written to us by an elderly Spanish War widow. Back in her younger days it was considered almost a sin for a wife to go out to work. Her place was in the home as the homemaker, and woe be to her man if he failed to provide for her. She earned no social-security credits, nor did her veteran husband who was 60 or more years of age before that law was enacted. We have searched the Bradley Commission report in vain to find where any consideration whatever is given to this situation. There is the suggestion that a delay of a year might be proper in adopting its proposals and that age 65 may be considered as a time of presumptive need for unremarried widows, but that income standards should be employed for them exactly as they would be for veterans and that they should lose such income as is derived from sources in excess of amounts underwritten by the Government. Then it is said, in the analysis, that the same social-security standards should be applied as they are to veterans. These references serve only to indicate additional commission confusion with respect to what it had in mind with reference to the veterans and dependents of wars preceding World War I who are on the pension rolls.

Spanish War veterans are not asking anything for themselves from this Congress, but they are requesting that the base pension of $54.18 monthly allowed to their widows be hiked to a minimum of $75 just in order to give these little old ladies half a chance to live in comparative decency. Few have those children about whom our friend wrote and who are paying all but her medical expenses, and, after all, there are only about 80,000 survivors. The cost of increased legislation would be minor and would decline rapidly, and to give them the added amount will not add to the appropriations for the Spanish War group because the veterans, paid at a higher rate, are rapidly meeting their maker. It is inconceivable to us that the Congress

would even consider offending the national conscience by placing these good people under any form of old-age assistance. Therefore, while those on Capitol Hill who are responsible for veterans' legislation try with us to read some sense into the Bradley report, we appeal to them to show their good faith by reporting now the O'Hara bill, H. R. 2867, that would not only relieve the fear under which our Civil War and Spanish War widows are living but would also give them the little added security they are entitled to have.

Reaching the Hearts and Minds of Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress devote much time and effort attempting to reach the hearts and minds of men. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address given by an authority on this subject, the Honorable James A. Farley, together with editorial comment which appeared in the Pottsville (Pa.) Republican on April 21, 1956:

REACHING THE HEARTS AND MINDS OF MEN

(Address by Hon. James A. Farley)

Because of our relationship with our fellow beings, I am going to talk to you on the subject of Reaching the Hearts and Minds of Men. I have spent many years of my life in activities in which that was the major objective. I have kept before me this major purpose.

Of course, in politics, to which I devoted a good many years, the major purpose is to reach the hearts and minds of men. To be successful, the man in politics must gain the confidence of enough voters to persuade them to vote as he suggests. His entire life is devoted to an effort to please and to persuade. Sometimes, of course, he must, if he is honest, temporarily at least say some plain and unpleasant things. But in the long run, unless he does win and hold the confidence of people he cannot be accounted a success.

But all of us are working toward this objective, whatever may be our mission or profession. If we are selling goods we must win confidence. The person who is in business is in a sense like the candidate who is running for office, only the businessman must go to the polls every hour and every day. Whether he succeeds or not will be determined by the number of customers who vote for him. His purpose in advertising is the same as the purpose of the candidate for office—to keep his name or the name of his product before the people. There is also the problem of keeping people who are voting for you in business kindly disposed toward you. That is what is called good public relations.

If we are teaching the young we are directly reaching the hearts and minds of men, and our skill as a teacher depends upon our capacity to open those minds and hearts to what we have to impart in the way of knowledge and principle.

If we have authority over others we must win their respect and confidence before we can expect obedience.

If we are managing a ball team we must deal not only with the players but with the public, for without a favorable public there would be nothing with which to pay the salaries of the players.

In fact, if we want to have a happy life as well as a profitable one we must have friends, and the way to have friends is to reach their minds and hearts. I sometimes think that Thomas Jefferson meant by "the pursuit of happiness" the winning of friends.

This winning of the hearts and minds of others has been a recognized art for a long, long time. There were books written about it more than 2,000 years ago by the Greeks. Aristotle's great book on Rhetoric is a discussion of how to use words to win the confidence of others.

Of course, it is hard to put into exact form just how this art can be pursued most successfully. However, I can do nothing more helpful than to draw from my own experience some of the lessons I have learned about this art. And in doing so I will discuss a number of important points to remember.

In the first place, a person who is concerned in persuading other people to do something or buy something or just to be friendly and helpful must have what I shall call good manners. Now good manners is something more than knowing how to hold your soup spoon or how to dress when you go to a church wedding. It is much more than a capacity to say the pleasant but insincere thing. It is much more than mere tact. It is to feel and, above all, to show that you have a genuine concern in others. It means caring for people, respecting them, treating them as equals and sharing their fears and earthly concerns and their ideals. When these matters are felt and shown there need be no fear about winning confidence and winning friends, for this attitude will make itself known in a hundred ways.

Closely associated with good manners is what we call good humor. And I am not now talking about ice cream, with which my own product is a close competitor. What I mean is the manifestation in all outward dealings with the public of a calm and friendly disposition. This is especially true in politics. We have learned in that very complex art that the most certain way that a man can defeat himself is to get angry. People are not interested in other people's angers. Anger does not attract, it repels. It causes the victim to say and do things that he would not otherwise say or do. He loses his balance of judgment. He makes mistakes. He reveals defects in his own personality and in his own ideas. He lays himself wide open for debate. Sometimes it is not easy to maintain a calm attitude, but success in life, in any profession, and success in attaining our own peace of mind is only gained by meeting situations with a smile, by turning aside criticism and the ill-natured attacks of others with calmness and courtesy.

I have spoken of good manners and of good humor. And now let us consider another tribute—one for which I have acquired some slight reputation for excellence—a good memory. It is true that I have a pretty good memory for names and faces, and I have met a great many people in my life, all over this country and all over the world. I can get along all right without any special aids to memory but I do not always trust my memory alone—that is too risky. I have, throughout my life, made it a habit not only in politics but in business and socially to help that memory by keeping a brief memorandum of anything which seems important, and at the same time incomplete and unfinished. I keep that memo until the matter is closed. It is simple, easy way to stay abreast of responsibility and pending situations. Let us call it a profitable bit of detail.

I would like to add something at this point. It is not a manifestation of good manners for a person to go up to another and challenge him by saying: "Do you remember me?" That puts you at a great disadvantage if you happen to have forgotten. I have found that the best way to meet that situation when the challenge comes and when I am unable to remember is to answer frankly that I do not. Such an answer is not always pleasant for me but it is a good reminder to the other person that he should be tolerant and not expect too much of other people's memories. Of course, in my experience that has not happened too often and I am glad that it hasn't; but when I meet it I meet it frankly.

Another good rule in politics, business and daily life is always to keep in mind the fact that the other fellow is deeply concerned with himself. There is a lot of unselfishness in this world, but there is an awful lot of selfishness, too. Our own problems seem to us to be more important than anything else in the world. We want to hear about them; we want to have the other person address us in terms of our own needs and aspirations and ideals and desires. One of the greatest mistakes a candidate for office can make is to ask people to vote for him because of something that he himself wants or that he himself feels or that he himself has offered. When the public meets that sort of appeal it is most likely to turn away and say, "Well, we have troubles of our own. We will let you take care of yours." That brings me to what might be called the personal note in addressing other people. The most successful appeal that we can make is, figuratively at least, to sit down with them, listen to them, ask them about their problems, manifest an interest and, above all, talk to them in terms of their own lives and their own understanding. By that I don't mean talking down to people, for that is the most offensive thing that can be done. It is not a bad idea to go on the assumption that the other fellow knows more than you do. Maybe he does not, but you can be certain that he doesn't think so. A bit of humility is never out of place.

What I am trying to say is well illustrated by the changes that have come over the techniques of advertising and selling in the last 20 years. Advertising used to be mainly boastful or catchy—full of slogans, pictures of factories or of business executives. Today its chief aim is to try to be helpful and its keynote is service. It talks not so much about what a product is but about what it will do for you.

Many of you may have on different occasions noticed the various advertisements run by General Mills, showing a lot of quaint old trade cards which were the rage years ago. The ads have explained why they had discarded them in favor of Betty Crocker. The answer is that for all their appeal these old ads didn't help the customer, whereas Betty Crocker helps women to a better life.

The same thing is true in other products. Our own product Coca-Cola began to assume greater importance and greater significance when it became part of people's daily existence through The Pause That Refreshes. The Pause That Refreshes with Coca-Cola is successful because it enters into people's daily lives and renders them a welcome service.

This technique of being helpful can be applied to any problem of selling, whether it is political or material, whether we are trying to reach the hearts and minds of men for an idea or a product.

In initiating any campaign, whether it is political or selling or educational, it is very important to take note in the beginning of what might be called "the public mood." The public mood changes. In the campaign of 1932 Mr. Roosevelt and the others who were helping him had to keep in mind that the people were weary, fearful and discouraged. They were in the midst of a great depression, and poverty stalked on every side. Their purpose in that campaign was to offer something cheerful and hopeful. There come other times when the public is exalted by the appearance of prosperity, when it has forgotten its fundamental prin-

ciples. Those are times when the public needs to be reminded of the more serious aspects of life, when it needs to be checked in its enthusiasm. There are other times when a deluded public is in need of harsh reminders of solid truths. Grover Cleveland was the greatest exponent of straightforward truth-telling not only when he was Governor of New York State but when he was President of the United States. Sometimes he made enemies, but in the long run the American people have gained more and more respect for him and his simple honesty.

Now, I would like to say something about words and language. As the Bible says, "In the beginning was the word." And we might add, for the purposes of reaching the hearts and minds of men, that not only the beginning but the end is the word. There are all sorts of ways to tell the truth.

That reminds me of a story I heard sometime ago. It seems that a painter was employed to paint the walls of one of the large rooms in an insane asylum or, as you would say, a home for the mentally deficient. He was standing on the ladder painting, and a great many of the inmates came in and sat around watching him. After a while one of them arose and said, "A–11." They all burst out laughing at that. Later, another member of the group arose and said, "B–5." Whereupon there was a roar of laughter. At noon the painter asked one of the people what that meant. He was told that these people had heard their own jokes so many times that they had decided to number them and spare the trouble of telling all the details. In other words, these two numbers represented jokes which they all knew and enjoyed. In the afternoon the painter was again working and was being watched by the same congregation of people. At one point he turned around and said, "A–11." There was no laughter, no response. Later, he used the other number, "B–5," and again there was no laughter. After working hours he asked the same man who had told him the explanation before why they didn't laugh. The answer was, "It makes all the difference in the world how you tell the joke."

The fact is that the use of words has become so important in economics and politics and in other fields that they have invented a word to describe it, "semantics." When I was in Washington I used to hear a good deal about semantics, and I used to hear a good many people who were expert in it. Sometimes I thought they were using long words to say very simple things. That was especially true among the many economic wizards who came down there. In any event, this much-abused practice has a solid truth behind it. It must be realized that there are all sorts of ways of expressing a thought and that you can elicit a totally different response from your audience in accordance with the choice of words you use. In politics we call our machine "an organization," and we call the other fellow's organization "a machine."

Many movements in politics have been carried through to success on the basis of a single phrase. Oftentimes a phrase will convey a volume of meaning. Take, for example, the "good neighbor" policy. This phrase was carefully selected by people who helped Mr. Roosevelt as a means of expressing the right relationship between a big country and more or less distrustful and fearful little countries. When the words "New Deal" were put together the authors scarcely realized the importance of what they had created. But the press took up the phrase and carried it on as the description of a new political program.

Another thing that is important to remember is that people forget easily and it is essential to repeat and repeat. The name of a candidate must be kept constantly before the people, just as the name of a product. The company that I am with is not wasting its money with the innumerable signs that it puts out advising you to drink Coca-Cola. I assure you that we are not in the business of throwing away money. We are in the business of selling the product and in selling the product it is essential to keep repeating the advice.

And now I want to speak seriously about the most important way of reaching the hearts and minds of men. It should always be remembered that men do not live by bread alone. Our appeal must be constantly to what is noble and idealistic and unselfish in men. I mentioned earlier the fact that we must remember that a man is concerned with himself. I did not mean by that that his personal concerns are wholly materialistic.

We are hearing today altogether too much in politics about what this or that party or this or that policy has to give toward the material needs of citizens and voters. I have heard and read speeches in the last several years in which farmers, workers, and others were addressed as if they had no concern in the world other than better prices and higher wages. I think the people who are doing that have lowered their sights too far. People are concerned with the fine objectives of human life, with spiritual values such as patriotism, the love of home and the love of God.

In fact, I deplore the cynical attitude which frequently prevails in high political spots in this country and in others. We are told that if the act of a public official is not illegal that it is necessarily proper and always excusable. We are told that there is a fundamental difference between what is illegal and what is improper. I do not see this difference, because what is illegal is merely one of the improper things that happens to have been the subject of legislative action. We have got to pass judgment against, and so far as we can eliminate, the improper as well as the illegal in our public life.

Our public servants elected to high office have a duty far greater than that of merely enforcing the law and collecting taxes and spending our money. They have the duty of moral leadership in the country. For if they do or condone or permit things that are improper they are destroying the very fabric of public morals, and the poison moves down into all the ranges of our population. When men in high places make hundreds of thousands of dollars through their improper acts it is a hard thing to maintain purity and integrity in the sports of boys in college and on the sandlots of the Nation.

Behind all of our relations with our fellow beings there must be a common faith—faith in the fundamental integrity of man, in his constant effort to realize his highest ideals and his essential nearness to God.

It is that faith that in the last analysis moves the hearts and minds of men. It is the faith that makes great people and a great nation.

[From the Pottsville (Pa.) Republican of April 21, 1956]

EDITORIAL MUSINGS

(By Frank Toohey)

ANGER A HABIT FOR DEFEAT

The hearts and minds of men are the factors which bring them to ultimate success or doom them to failure. So says James A. Farley, former United States Postmaster General, who was a featured speaker at the annual meeting and dinner of the Greater Pottsville Area Chamber of Commerce a few days ago.

How true this is. Each of us, if we examine our thoughts, our plans, our movements can readily understand how our heart and our mind are actually in control. Human nature is a wonderful thing and what an attribute it is for a man to possess a kind heart and alert mind in his everyday life.

Farley declared that the winning of the hearts and minds of others has long been considered one of the greatest arts of man. Greeks wrote books about this subject more than 2,000 years ago. Aristotle's great book on rhetoric actually is a discussion of how to use words to win the confidence of your neighbors and those with whom you enjoy social life or do business day after day.

In an interview, Farley spoke of his early childhood life, how he was taught to respect the wishes and thoughts of others. Where he did not heartily agree, he found a way to tactfully sidestep the issue by turning to another subject of conversation or by extending compliments (not appearing willfully or with the obvious attempt to ignore what the other person said) and in almost every case, such a course prevented a controversy, perhaps a heated argument that may have resulted in the loss of a friend.

Farley said that he had made several visits to this section of the country and to the stranger, it is quite evident that everyone here was everyone's neighbor.

He said that one of the easiest ways for anyone to defeat himself or herself is to get into the habit of becoming easily angered. Anger, he said, does not interest other people and it only tends to lower the person so easily often angered in the eyes of his neighbors and friends.

Everyone makes mistakes, for it is human to err, Farley said, but if a person succumbs to anger frequently he is bound to reveal defects in his own personalities. An angered person lays himself open for unpleasant debates.

Farley pointed out in his interview with this musing that it is not always easy to maintain a calm attitude but he said success in life, in any profession and success in attaining our own peace of mind is only gained by meeting difficult situations with a smile, by turning aside criticism and the ill-natured attacks of others with calmness and courtesy.

Farley said that the Bible teaches "In the beginning was the word." He said to this could be added, for the purpose of reaching the hearts and minds of men that not only the beginning but the end is the word. He said there are all sorts of ways to tell the truth and to become known as one who is truthful is a great asset to any person.

Farley recalled when he was here years ago to officiate at the cornerstone laying at the new Pottsville post office at Second and Norwegian Streets. He said that this was "a great gift from the Democrats" and the other evening when he was here, he walked over to see it.

"Well the cornerstone at which I officiated is still there," he said laughingly.

Salute to the Commemoration of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege at this time to place in the RECORD the following resolution which was unanimously adopted at a mass meeting commemorating the 165th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, held at the

Polski Home in Lackawanna, N. Y., on Sunday, May 6, 1956:

Whereas the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, was the most liberal and democratic document of its day, proclaiming respect for the human rights and the lofty aspirations for freedom of the individual; and

Whereas Russia has seized and still subjugates the Polish soil and other lands; and

Whereas this unfortunate example of Polish imprisonment by Communist Russia should stir and awaken our Government to fuller defenses against the evils of the Russian Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we as Americans wholeheartedly dedicated to our freedom, feel dutybound in the name of justice and equality to pledge loyalty and allegiance to our great and beloved United States of America; be it further

Resolved, That we as American citizens of Polish descent, hereby repeat our pledge of loyalty and allegiance to our great and beloved United States of America; be it further

Resolved, That we appeal that our great Republic of the United States of America, which guarantees freedom and liberty to all, do everything in its power to restore those blessings of liberty to millions of enslaved Poles who are now suffering political, religious, and economic persecution in their land; be it further

Resolved, That by this resolution we show a formal protest against the existing conditions in Poland; be it further

Resolved, That the infamous articles of the Yalta Conference pertaining to the betrayal of Poland and other subjugated nations be further denounced by our Government; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States of America, Dwight D. Eisenhower; to the Vice President, Richard M. Nixon, President of the Senate; to the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles; to United States Senators Irving M. Ives and Herbert H. Lehman; and to United States Congressmen John R. Pillion and Edmund P. Radwan.

Resolution committee:

WALTER J. LOHR, *Chairman.*
JOHN F. ASZKLER,
STEFAN GUZ,
JULIA MOLENDA,
JOSEPH F. KLJ, M. D.,
WILLIAM M. STYPOWANY,
Secretary.

Cold War Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the time has come to give an accounting to the American people on the various phases of foreign aid since the inception of this program. Bureaus have been set up to administer the different programs and then they have died and others have come in their place. In my opinion, it has reached the point where the average American has no conception of what is being spent and by whom.

I would recommend the appointment of a commission along the lines of the Hoover Commission—nonpartisan with representatives from the House, Senate, administration, and citizens from private life. The commission would make a detailed study of all that has been spent and what we have received for our money.

This, I believe, would be helpful to all of us and would give us a better perspective as to what should be done in the future.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial of May 8, 1956, from the New York Daily News:

COLD WAR'S COSTS

President Eisenhower yesterday gave Congress its regular semi-annual report on Uncle Sam's so-called mutual security. During the past 6 years, he said, United States taxpayers have given more than $12.4 billion worth of planes, tanks, guns, and other military hardware to free world countries.

Ike believed that much of this military muscle had served its purpose in helping overseas friends face up to the Communist menace. He is convinced that North Atlantic Treaty Organization forces in Europe, including Greece and Turkey, look healthier now, thanks.

Altogether, the ex-general testified, countries receiving United States assistance now have a defense potential equivalent to "more than 200 divisions, over 2,000 naval ships and about 300 air squadrons." Those figures, though, include not only such genuine allies as South Korea and Nationalist China but neutrals and Tito's Yugoslavia. Thanks to us, Tito now has a streamlined modern army, to use as his Communist conscience may dictate.

Right now, and no surprise, the question—Are these gifts necessary?—is boiling up a vigorous debate in Washington.

Cocking a cynical eye at foreign giveaways in general, Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, Democrat, of Georgia, suggests firmly that a competent committee be appointed, to look into this one fast. How much benefit is the United States taxpayer getting from his enforced generosity? Are we actually helping our overseas chums as much as claimed by the bureaucrats in charge of our Santa Claus programs?

HOW MUCH GOOD IS DONE?

Senator GEORGE wants a committee—perhaps a reputable, nonpolitical outfit such as the Brookings Institution—to probe into the very fundamentals of our charity programs. Secretary Dulles, on the other hand, insists that giveaways, as such, are fine, period. He wants the surveyors to confine themselves to the technical questions of aid. Should it be a loan or a gift; should we hand out the stuff ourselves or let U. N. do the shipping and get the credit? And so on.

We're for GEORGE's complete, no-gobbledygook look-see into this costly and apparently never-ending program. But, most important, let's get on with that scrutiny fast. The American citizen, after all these years, certainly is entitled to a straightforward report on what results, if any, his tax money has been buying.

Steel Companies Raise Prices Now for Wage Increases Next July

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter I recently received from Mr. Edwin C. Kraus, president, Big Stone Canning Co., of Ortonville, Minn. The letter has reference to the fact that the steel companies have already raised their prices to their customers in anticipation of wage increases expected next July.

It was not too long ago, Mr. Speaker, when the officials of the steel companies went to the bargaining table prepared to negotiate with employee representatives. Today, if this letter is any example, they surrender months in advance and simply pass on the pay raises to the companies they supply with steel products. If that is collective bargaining, I do not understand the meaning of the term.

Just the other day we learned that United States Steel had reported earnings at the greatest rate in its history. I question their use of that word "earnings" for they surely have not yet earned the increased prices on their products to defray wage raises not yet in effect.

My correspondent is engaged in one of the most highly competitive fields of American industry—the merchandising of foods processed in his canneries. Like the farmers from whom he buys his commodities for canning, he has little or no voice in the prices he must pay for his supplies such as tinplate.

This is just one more of many examples we have seen of the cost-price squeeze that is being applied to our agricultural economy. Everyone else is making more money while this canner of quality products for American housewives and the farmers producing the vegetables for processing are squeezed still further. I hope that every Member of Congress, whether he represents producers or consumers of agricultural commodities, will thoughtfully read this letter from Mr. Kraus and then support us in our efforts to correct some of these conditions in rural America.

The letter follows:

BIG STONE CANNING CO.,
Ortonville, Minn., April 19, 1956.

Hon. H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CARL: I am attaching a copy of the letter that I received from John Kraemer who is the president of the Mammoth Spring Canning Co., of Sussex, Wis., in which the problem confronting the canner is very ably set forth. I heartily subscribe to the statement that there should be an investigation of this situation.

I might add for your information a few observations that have been made since this raise has been announced. It is the position of the steel companies that the raise in steel prices was made so as to provide for increased wages to steelworkers in July which is the date that their contract expires. There likewise was one other reason given and that is that more money was needed by the steel companies in order to further expand. Certainly both of these reasons are flagrantly inflationary.

I know that some of you are aware that there has been much concern about the increased cost of living and there has even been some agitation for an investigation of the disparity that exists between what the producer receives and what the consumer pays. The canning industry is one that can be proud of its record for it has held the line to the point that it is now my personal

opinion that an increase must be made in order for the canner to survive. At the present time, and this is the result of a survey that was made by the Minnesota Canners Association, both canned corn and canned peas are selling for less money than they did either in World War I or in World War II or the Korean conflict. As a matter of fact the records of my company indicate that back in 1918 cream style corn sold for $2 a dozen f. o. b. Ortonville whereas today you can buy all the cream style corn you want for $1.50.

While I do not subscribe to the theory that mere bigness in itself is monopolistic, I do believe that the fair test is whether or not actual competition exists. I am sorry to report that real competition is lacking among the majority of our suppliers.

Yours very truly,

EDWIN C. KRAUS,
President.

Correspondence Received Expressing Opposition to Fluoridation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD letters which I received from citizens of my district requesting that their letters in opposition to fluoridation be placed in the RECORD:

NORTHAMPTON, MASS., *May 4, 1956.*

Hon. EDWARD P. BOLAND,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please oppose $3 million appropriation requested by Public Health Service to be used in combating dental disorders presumably by fluoridation which we know to be harmful.

DOROTHY AND PIERRE DREWSEN.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS., *May 3, 1956.*

Hon. EDWARD P. BOLAND,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I am writing to protest the granting of $2,971,000 to the United States Public Health Department to combat "dental disorders."

So-called scientific evidence is based on unwarranted conclusions and constantly repeated unproven statements. The Public Health Service limits reports to data favorable to fluoridation. I am asking Congress to analyze the Public Health Service statistics, especially the inadequate controls with the aid of independent, well-qualified statisticians. I protest the use of Public Health funds to propagandize the so-called benefits of fluoridation.

I ask that this letter be read to Congress and inserted in the RECORD.

Respectfully yours,

LEON E. BOND.

FLORENCE, MASS., *May 3, 1956.*

Hon. EDWARD P. BOLAND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Congress has been asked to appropriate $2,971,000 for the United States Public Health Service to use in "combating tooth decay."

I wish to protest against this appropriation.

Judging from the past, the Public Health Service would probably use a large part of it to further the promotion of fluoridation of public water supplies.

This is mass medication which is justifiable only for the prevention or control of a contagious disease, and tooth decay is not contagious. Such mass medication is a violation of constitutional rights, for no one should be compelled to take medicine for a noncontagious disease that he does not have, yet fluoridation of a public water supply makes it unavoidable.

May I suggest that you ask for a joint congressional investigation by competent disinterested parties on the constitutionality of fluoridation of public water supplies, and also for a scientific study of incidence of disease and mortality statistics in areas already fluoridated since the reports given out are often so at variance.

It is fantastic economy to medicate the water supply of an entire city when 99 percent of the water goes down the sewers and into commercial uses, while less than 1 percent is used by the small children it is supposed to benefit, and those children who may need or wish it, can obtain the treatment as easily as any other medication.

This is a very serious matter, and I object to its being promoted by a Federal bureau using Federal funds.

Very truly yours,

LOTTIE S. CORBIN
Mrs. Walter E. Corbin.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS., *May 7, 1956.*

Hon. EDWARD P. BOLAND,
United States Representative,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ED: The enclosed newspaper clipping from the Springfield Daily News of February 8, 1956, will give you some of the background of my interest in fluoridation of the public waters. It is our understanding that Congress has been asked to appropriate almost $3 million for the use of the United States Public Health Service in combating "dental disorders." Before Congress passes upon this appropriation it would appear to be very much in order to request a joint congressional investigation by an independent committee to ascertain just how much of this money would be used for the engineering of consent in favor of fluoridation of public waters.

Such a joint congressional committee should examine carefully the following points of interest with reference to said fluoridation:

1. Possible unjustified invasion of liberty guaranteed by the United States Constitution and by State constitutions.

2. Possible violation of civil rights by suppression of news in regard to scientific data offering evidence against fluoridation, and unauthorized propaganda issued by the Publis Health Service to promote so-called benefits of fluoridation.

3. Lack of dissemination of information in regard to mortality statistics and high disease incidence in fluoridated areas.

4. Lack of analysis of Public Health Service statistics, specially with reference to inadequate controls.

I recommend to you for reading the November 1953 issue of the Dental Digest, which includes an article by Dr. Charles Dillon, entitled "The Bio-Chemistry of Florides." See also The Fluoridation Issue in Its Broader Aspects, by C. F. Eicher, doctor of philosophy, herewith enclosed.

An editorial in the Springfield Union, Saturday, April 28, entitled "Dangers in Democracy," concludes: "With all its imperfections, democracy has worked. It has maintained the necessary minimum of law and order with less cruelty, tyranny, and oppression than any alternative system. But the fact that Communist states often call themselves 'people's democracies,' is a warning signal. It should focus attention on the elements of check and balance, of scrupulous maintenance of personal and property rights which are the assurance that democracy will not degenerate into tyranny, first of the mob, then of some dictator."

It is my hope, Ed, that you will consider this matter seriously and perhaps read this letter to Congress and, if it is comprehensible, insert it in the RECORD.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. AUCHTER,
Attorney at Law.

Home Mortgage Debt Is Not Inflationary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following release issued by the Dime Savings Bank of Brooklyn:

The $88.7 billion which American families are presently carrying as their home mortgage debt is a vital support to the Nation's economy and is not an unsound factor, it was asserted today by George C. Johnson, president of the Dime Savings Bank of Brooklyn.

"Actually, this $88.7 billion is an investment in America's future, and it will grow larger as the Nation grows larger," he declared. "The mortgage debt is neither inflationary nor beyond the ability of those borrowers to pay.

"It is only 11.2 percent of total personal savings, and is only 22.3 percent of the present rate of gross national product," the banker continued. "Creation of this home mortgage debt has added perhaps twice as many billions of dollars of real wealth to the Nation's economy, and it has developed for American homeowners a form of enforced, systematized saving which is one of the strongest supports of the economy we have."

Asserting that the home mortgage debt is sound and anti-inflationary, Mr. Johnson declared:

"Home buyers are decent, fine American families who are improving their living conditions because steady employment and good wages enable them to do so. They do not regard themselves as statistics.

"My 40 years experience with thousands of home-buying families prove to me that they consistently will meet their obligations.

"In all those years, I have never seen home buyers make a more careful study of what they can afford than at present. They are extremely well informed as to the carrying charges of a home and the relation of these charges to their incomes.

"Furthermore, no intelligent banker will allow any family to buy a home it cannot afford. Likewise, the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans' Administration have established and insist on sound credit standards.

"People are not beguiled by liberal mortgage terms. They are buying homes to improve their living standards only after careful and intelligent consideration.

"Amortized mortgages and liberal terms, soundly based on the borrowers' ability to pay, enable increasing numbers of families to attain their longing for homeownership without hardship."

Mr. Johnson said his comment was inspired by "recent assertions from some quarters" to the effect that home mortgage debt is too high.

"These alarmists simply will not or do not examine the truly important economic factors involved," he asserted.

The principal factor overlooked is that millions of American families have shifted from the status of rent payers to the status of home buyers, according to the man whose bank originates and holds more home mortgages than any other savings bank in the world.

Mr. Johnson explained the situation thus:

"Those who claim that home mortgage debt is too high apparently overlook the fact that some 15 million families have ceased being rent payers and have become home buyers in the past 15 years.

"This is the real and basic reason why home mortgage debt has risen $71.4 billion since 1940. Almost all of the total rise is simply the substitution of mortgage payments for rent payments.

"The obligations assumed by rent payers have not and cannot show up in any mortgage debt studies, which only measure the obligations of homeowners. But rental obligations are just as much a part of the overall economy as mortgage obligations.

"So far as I can learn, relatively few economists have analyzed and reported on that fact, except the people in our own statistical and economic section and Nathaniel Rogg, chief economist of the National Association of Home Builders.

"From these sources I find that in 1940 the home mortgage debt amounted to $17.3 billion. It was carried by 11 million families, which meant an average indebtedness of $1,573.

"Today, the home mortgage debt of $88.7 billion is spread among more than 26 million families, so the average indebtedness is $3,412 per family.

"However, it must be remembered that since 1940, personal income has more than doubled. Therefore, in relation to 1956 income, the average home mortgage debt per family is less today than it was in 1940.

"Furthermore, nearly 3 of every 5 families in the United States today own or are buying their homes. In 1940, the situation was almost exactly reversed. Fifteen years ago, approximately 3 of every 5 families were living in rented quarters, and they had nothing to show at the end of the year except a dozen rent receipts.

"At least $7.8 billion each year is now being added to the savings of home-buyers today as they make payments on the principal of their mortgages.

"What this all adds up to is that home ownership and home buying makes a better and more stable national economy.

"I believe that President Eisenhower's economic report to the Congress 2 months ago summarizes the situation completely, when he said: 'A nation in which so many millions of families have growing investments in their homes and neighborhoods is likely to be governed by a high sense of responsibility.'"

Address Delivered Before the Sixth Washington Pilgrimage by Executive Director Theodore A. Distler, of the Association of American Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing an address by Theodore A. Distler, director of the Association of American Colleges, delivered before the sixth Washington pilgrimage on April 28, 1956:

Fellow pilgrims, we are now gathered in a place that is the very center of our national life.

Under our incomparable Constitution, each of the three branches of the Federal Government has a vital role to play in preserving for Americans those rights of freemen which are proclaimed by the Declaration of Independence to be the whole end of government. But neither the President of the United States, as head of the executive branch and Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, nor the judiciary, as interpreter and guardian of our Constitution, stands so close to the daily life of the ordinary citizen as the two Houses of Congress. Senators and Representatives reflect—State by State and district by district—the hopes and fears, the interests and aspiration, of their fellow Americans. In debating issues of public policy and in making the laws by which our lives are regulated, they strive to take account of our hopes and fears, to balance our interests, and to satisfy our aspirations. Here in the United States Capitol is expressed and distilled the consent of the governed.

"The voice of the people is the voice of God," said a scholar and statesman of the Middle Ages. In these words Alcuin anticipated by nearly a thousand years the basic principle of modern democracy: that every individual man, being made in the image of God and endowed with his own spark of the Divine Wisdom, is entitled of right to an equal share with his fellow men in determining the destiny of the society in which and through which they live.

But I do not think that Alcuin meant to suggest that the people were infallible, any more than our Founding Fathers conceived of the Republic as an infallible form of government. As a Christian, he knew that the children of God may betray the divine spark that is in them and sever themselves from their Father. He knew that God acts through us only insofar as we seek to know His will and subordinate our own wills to it. So too the Founding Fathers, while erecting in the Constitution every imaginable bastion of liberty, made provision through a careful system of checks and balances for the only certainty in political affairs—the certainty of human error. Again, Abraham Lincoln proclaimed that our Nation might win a new birth of freedom by the sacrifices of the War Between the States, but only under divine guidance. It has been the mark of the greatest statesmen down the ages to recognize with humility that "the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God."

At no time in history has this confession of human inadequacy been so urgent as in our own day. The quarrels and rivalries with which the human race has tormented itself from its first begininngs have been magnified into a demoniac menace by the growth of populations, the improvement of communications, the ever-accelerating development of physical sciences divorced from spiritual values, and the emergence of ideological conflicts on a worldwide scale. It is just a part of this awesome picture—but a part of portentous significance for Americans—that the old wistful dream of safe and dignified isolation has faded forever. There is no room for self-righteousness. No nation can shield itself any longer from contact with the rest of the world with a curtain of any material whatsoever. Whether we like it or not, our own problems have been immensely complicated by the changes that the world has undergone in our lifetime. And it must be said that our record in coping with them offers little ground for reliance on mere human wisdom.

We know from our own experience that the inescapable duty of every citizen to form his own judgment on these complex issues is a heavy burden. How much heavier is the burden we impose on the men and women we elect to represent us here and to take in our name decisions on which the life of our Nation and the peace of the whole world may depend. To an extent unmatched by any similar body in the world, they bear the weight of the world on their shoulders. They are answerable, not only in the formal sense to the electorate, but morally to the whole of humanity. This is a responsibility that calls for more than human wisdom.

I imagine that some such thought must have been present in the mind of Senator MONRONEY when he said to Representative BROOKS HAYS: "Don't you think it would be a good thing for us to have a place at the Capitol where we might meditate and pray, where the mood of prayer could be encouraged?"

Under the inspired leadership of these two men, both Houses of Congress, by unanimous vote, resolved to establish a room for prayer and meditation. Its purpose is twofold. First, it bears renewed witness to the historic conviction of the American people that this Nation is founded on trust, not in human wisdom, but in divine providence—and this in the spirit of religious tolerance embodied in the first amendment of our Constitution. Secondly, it offers our chosen representatives the opportunity of refreshing their minds and spirits in calm and quiet and, if they so desire, of seeking that divine guidance the need for which they have solemnly acknowledged.

You and I cannot normally enter the prayer room, for it is essential to its purpose that it should be reserved for Members of the Congress. But we know it is here, in the heart of the Capitol—at the center of the center. With that knowledge, you can go back to your own communities at the end of this pilgrimage and testify of the Republic: "God is in the midst of her; she shall not be moved."

Commissioner E. M. Webster's Views Opposing H. R. 4090

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I urge Members of the House to oppose H. R. 4090, which was reported out by the Rules Committee yesterday. The bill would require the installation of an automatic radio alarm system on United States cargo vessels of 1,600 gross tons or more carrying less than 2 radio operators. If Members will read the 130 pages of testimony, it will be apparent to them that the issue here is not safety at sea.

The Commerce Department report recommended against enactment of this legislation. The Federal Communications Commission's report stated there was no justification for making the device mandatory.

It is important to note the comments of Commissioner E. M. Webster, not only because of his position as a FCC Commissioner, but because of his vast

experience in maritime radio safety matters. Commissioner Webster presented the FCC position on this legislation, the technical aspects of which were based upon laboratory tests of the proposed device. The Commission's comments were supplemented by personal views of the commissioner.

The gist of the FCC position was that ships on the high seas must operate under a common international formula for safety radio purposes; that so far as is known the present formula functions effectively; and that such formula had been reexamined and confirmed as recently as 1948 internationally, and 1954 domestically. The proposed requirement would superimpose upon this international system an additional procedure of ship alerting applicable to United States flag vessels only. The situations to which the additional procedure would apply were found either not to occur often enough to be a problem; to duplicate a present function, or to cause unnecessary and widespread alerting.

In addition, the Commission found from its laboratory tests that the device does not meet the requirements of the bill from the standpoint of its false response performance. Further, that various additional regulations involving transmission speed of radio signals, the standardization of signal characteristics and so forth, or the compulsory installation of ancillary automatic devices would be required in order to create conditions such that the true response performance would be sufficiently reliable.

On his own behalf, Commissioner Webster stated:

> I feel duty bound to tell you what I think based upon that experience and background. * * * All of these conferences, treaties, meetings, and legislation have had the one objective of producing a workable radio safety system which will be uniform all over the world. * * * Only through an international common standardized system can this be accomplished.

Commissioner Webster then listed five reasons why he opposed the legislation and concluded by stating:

> Drawing on my experience and knowledge, I cannot help but conclude that it [the call selector requirement] is unnecessary and premature.

Briefly summarized, the five reasons advanced by the Commissioner were that: First, there can be no assurance of operational reliability since there are no international criteria nor is there uniformity among radio operators in the way they send dashes and dots; such criteria have not even been discussed on the international level; second, no device should be made compulsory until after there has been sufficient experience and acceptance upon which to base an intelligent evaluation and decision; third, that whatever merit there is to the proposed devise, the features are those of convenience and should not be required as part of the safety program; fourth, the additional cost would discriminate against our merchant marine and cannot be justified as part of the safety system; and fifth, that the present international radio safety and distress system is performing its job satisfactorily.

The American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable James A. Farley at the pathways-to-understanding dinner of the Golden Slipper Square Club, held in Philadelphia, Pa., on April 9, 1956:

THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

(Address by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp., Golden Slipper Square Club, pathways-to-understanding dinner, Bellevue Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, Pa., April 9, 1956)

We have heard a great deal in these past few years about the American way of life. I certainly have no quarrel with those who have so ably and eloquently discussed that subject. But I have wondered sometimes if in our glorification of the American way of life we have not forgotten that a way of life is, in the last analysis, the product of human beings. It is not a social or a political philosophy that someone has thought out and handed to other people as a guide for their activities. It is, rather, a name that we give to the habits and methods and characteristics of men acting in their relation to other men. In short, the American way of life is the product of a human being which we call an American.

I would like to consider for a moment that average American who has created the American way of life; who, in doing so, has built a great Nation and, in the name of that Nation, is impressing his character upon a wide and distracted world.

It took a good many things to create the average American. In the first place, he was the product of a problem that may be with us as long as men live upon this earth. He was the product of a continent called Europe, which has suffered for centuries from the fact that it could produce more people than it could feed. In these days, as we get into the habit of looking at the map of the world, we see in true perspective exactly what Europe is. It is a peninsula thrust out to the west and the south of a great continent. In many places its land is poor and its capacity for the production of food is low. Its natural resources are, and have always been, scarce and of doubtful value. For the most part, its coastline, especially in the north, is forbidding and in many months of the year almost inaccessible. Its rivers, in spite of the exalted songs and stories that have been written about them, are not great rivers. Its mountains, with a few exceptions, are not supremely great mountains. But its population has, at least in modern times, been excessively great. That population has been stricken time and again with indescribable calamities. It has been ravaged by disease; it has been beset by hunger. And because of these factors of inadequate resources and superabundant population, it has been cursed with the most bloody and continuous wars that have marked the history of the earth.

Those who made America were the product of that background. They left that barren and unfruitful continent for many reasons; some because they were hungry; some because they sought religious consolation; some because they disagreed with the political life of Europe; others because they sought adventure; and still others because for many reasons they were persecuted and injured at home. They came to America at various times, in various ways and for various purposes. Here they found the answer to the bitter necessities that they had experienced in Europe. They found that while there were hardships in the wilderness, those hardships were nevertheless capable of being surmounted by courage and hard work and fortitude and patience. Unlike those of Europe, our hardships in America were not man-made. Nature in America, while it exacted a price, was an honest merchant because when men invested their labor and their courage nature paid them a fair and ample wage. This was all early Americans asked for, and this they were able to get. They brought with them the elements of culture and constitutional government and the instinct of workmanship and technical skills, for in spite of its limitations, Europe at least provided that much for its children.

But Americans found it possible, because they were in the land of promise, to build upon these beginnings and to build better than they had known before. The culture that they imported expanded in America. Constitutional government found new ways of enabling men and women to live together. They multiplied their technical skills because they found ample resources to which they might apply that skill. And in the long years after they had founded a civilization upon the narrow ledge of this continent they discovered that whenever the curse of overcrowding impeded their movements they could move farther into the continent and find freedom all over again. And so the growth of America for 4 centuries was a process of endless new discovery. They went west because the west eternally satisfied their necessities.

It is out of great experience that great men are born, and it is out of great enterprise that a great people is born. As the boundless vistas of American opportunity opened and the population grew and prospered, so did each individual expand in his own views. For, in the last analysis, America was built upon individual men and women. They found in the beginning, as they struggled for self-determination and independence, that in spite of the fact that they had sought refuge from the jealousies and conflicts of Europe, that the source of those jealousies and conflicts had, like evil angels, preceded them to this continent. They found, even before national independence was created, that greedy empires had sought through military power to preempt the great American dominion, and that on the south and the west and the north and in the great seat at the east, they were surrounded by the encircling armies of European imperialism.

One of the most heartening things that we can recall, as in World War II we were beset by aggression on the east and aggression on the west, is that when we were, so far as population is concerned, only a fraction of what we are now, we were beset by the same dangers. In spite of our precarious position, we fought and won a war for independence. We established ourselves as a Nation, 13 States, in total area only a fraction of what we are now, by uniting in a desire to be free. By the courage of our men and women, by our enterprise, by diplomacy, by our power to expand, by purchase, and when all else failed, by war, we set about the task of freeing this country of the threat of foreign dangers. From the Thirteen Colonies, American moved to the west and crated new States out of the wilderness. They skillfully played the ambitions of the French, the Spanish, and the English in such a manner as to acquire a vast territory beyond the Mississippi. And as they acquired territory, unlike the practice of

imperial Rome, they made each acquisition of territory truly their own by settlement and development. These were not men who made compromises with forces that threatened them. They were men who destroyed those threats by their own indomitable strength and courage.

If the American Nation has, in its resources, in its political institutions and in its culture preeminence in the world today it is because strong men found three circumstances that favored the growth of a great nation.

The first of these circumstances was the great area of the country and the richness of its resources. No nation, truly great in every way, can be created without natural circumstances that favor its growth. There have been nations great in a spiritual sense which have grown in a small area and with a small population, but from time to time they have been the prey of physically stronger neighbors. The United States avoided that eternal threat of danger by the happy circumstance of its own position and size.

The second circumstance that favored our growth was the wise policy, inherent in the pioneers who settled this country, of creating, as they grew, political institutions that preserve individual freedom while they offer the broadest protection from selfish influences. They created a constitution sufficiently flexible to afford for all generations to come the possibility of change and growth.

The third circumstance that favored the growth of a great civilization was the fact that America was a meeting place of many cultures, many ideals and many diversified points of view. It has been the genius of Americans to accept immigrants of many sorts, to permit them to make their contribution to our common life, and at the same time to assimilate them and their descendants in a truly unified American tradition. We have stretched out our hands to the unhappy people of Europe. We have offered them opportunity for a better life than they had at home, and all we have asked is that they have strong hands and loyal hearts.

In the course of our growth we have, in general, avoided interference in the affairs of other countries. We have not been anxious to make others as we are. We have generously contributed whenever we could to permit other countries to live their own lives, to be free of oppression, and to grow as God and nature intended that they should. But we have not sought to impress our own culture upon others. We have learned this hard lesson from our own experience, because as we grew as a nation, we asked no help from others; we merely wanted the privilege of freedom to grow as we could.

A few years after the establishment of this Nation as an independent Republic, our statesmen conceived that our duty, in fact, that our safety, demanded that we, as the strongest Nation in the Americas, should assert leadership in the two Americas in permitting other small republics to grow as we had grown. Out of this arose the most specific American statement of foreign policy that we have ever created, the Monroe Doctrine. The development of this policy with reference to the Western Hemisphere required, on our part, not only great strength but great forbearance, for we did not conceive it to be the destiny of the United States to create an empire in the Western Hemisphere. The wisdom of our policy of living at peace with our neighbors, while at the same time we offer them the broad protection of our power, is witnessed by the fact that in World War II we had the friendship and solid support of almost all those countries.

But all of this national greatness comes back fundamentally to the American as an individual. Only sound men can make a sound nation. It has been the habit of pessimistic people to speak of the distintegration of American character. When at times we have seen evidence here and there that wealth and security have made people careless and pleasure loving, there have been those who have claimed that the fiber of America has become soft and that the inner integrity of our people has been destroyed. But these evidences of weakness were, after all, superficial and passing. Fundamentally, the American remains as he has always been. In the last war we had the proof of this inherent soundness. It is not alone that Americans in uniform upheld in every corner of the world the finest traditions of courage and skill. It was also a fact that on the home front Americans maintained order, willingly accepted supervision and turned with incredible industry and skill to the task of production.

There have been nations, like Germany and Japan, that exalted their efficiency. But the tests of 1943, 1944, and 1945 showed that efficiency is not created by the mere proclamation of an intention to be efficient. Efficiency rises from the strength of free people. In spite of many unfortunate failures of foresight, our American industrial life added glories to its achievement. American women in the homes, on the farms, in the factories, in the hospitals and in the Armed Forces proved themselves to be the worthy successors of those women who stood loyally beside their kin in Washington's army. American states and cities made their contribution to the national effort. Everywhere we found a spirit of cooperation and loyalty.

Our task, as we look to the future will be, in spite of the suggestions of those who have formulas for security and happiness, to bear in mind that the United States was not built upon formulas; it was built upon the individual. We shall retain the power that is essential to the maintenance of America's responsibilities in the world only so far as we retain the spirit of the pioneer in each individual American. The door of opportunity must be kept open. The American boy must be taught from experience that whatever he attains depends upon his own inner integrity. We have won the past by hard work and honesty and self-reliance. There is no better formula through which we can win the future. The greatness of the past, in its achievements, lights the way for progress that is assured if no man-made shadows blur the road. It is for us to preserve for our posterity what our forefathers created for us, a Nation of free people, ever helpful to others, but always selfish for the continuance, within our own domain, of the American way of life.

Despite our errors of omission and commission we remain steadfast in our Americanism. This is a great country. The greatness of our people today indicates the greatness we can attain in the future if we keep our feet on the ground and our eyes straight ahead toward the victory that is inevitable and the harvest it must produce.

Today America is confronted with our present peacetime's darkest fears, which could test our very endurance. Here we are now safely out of shooting wars and we are confronted with the foreboding shadow of a struggle even more terrible and deadly—the race for atomic arms supremacy. This threat to peace is none of our making but springs from the unholy ambition of one power, Soviet Russia, to dominate every way of life in every place in the world. We escaped one form of totalitariansim, fascism, to be confronted with another red fascism, perhaps more dangerous than the vanquished form.

It is my solemn conviction that the world will survive as a family of nations. The family bonds may be tightened in the four corners of the world after the manner of our sisterhood of states or within a worldwide family. The framework is not as important as cooperative achievement of law, justice, and peace. The alternative in this atomic age is an ever increasing race for armaments with its constant threat of common ruin. Without the shadow of a question, our civilization is indeed on trial.

In this time of anxiety, I am supremely confident that the destiny of this great Republic still lies before us, that our horizon is not a whit less limitless and not a shade less promising than that which lay before our forefathers in the blackness which followed the war for independence. We must not forget we are still a youthful Nation, as the world goes. Our strength and our talents will stand us in good stead. We are the hope of ourselves and of the world. We are certain to survive to bring lasting peace.

The Strategic Air Command

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the following 44 questions were asked by Senator SYMINGTON'S subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Forces and were answered as indicated by Gen. Curtis E. LeMay in open hearings on April 30, 1956:

1. What is SAC?

SAC is the long-range atomic striking force of the United States, responsible to the Joint Chiefs of Staff through the chief of staff, USAF, as the executive agent.

2. What is the principal responsibility of SAC?

The mission of Strategic Air Command is to train and maintain an effective and secure nuclear air offensive force to conduct strategic air warfare. The objective of this mission is to become and remain sufficiently strong to deter aggression during a cold war and in cooperation with other United States and allied forces, to win the decisive airpower battle in a general war should it occur.

3. What are your views as to the best defense against a strategic atomic air attack?

Total defense is secured through two functions: First, through active and passive defense; and second, the offensive strike capability. All responsible airmen agree that it is impossible to provide an airtight defense against a well-coordinated and properly executed atomic bombing attack. Attrition will vary, depending upon the relative capabilities of offense versus defense, but a substantial part of the offensive force will always get through the defense. Therefore, the primary defensive force becomes the offensive atomic strike capability of sufficient effectiveness to provide a deterrent force. A deterrent force is an effective nuclear offensive force which is secure from destruction by the enemy regardless of what offensive and defensive action he takes against it. The striking force is considered effective if it can still inflict unacceptable damage on the enemy.

4. If two countries have the same relative scientific and military airpower, such as the United States of America and the U. S. S. R., is it in your opinion possible for one country to have purely defensive forces and measures adequate to effectively stop a strategic atomic air attack by the other country?

I think I have just answered that question by saying that it is the opinion of all responsible airmen, and the experience of all nations in wartime, that a purely defensive force cannot effectively prevent a substan-

tial portion of a properly coordinated and appropriately executed bombing attack from getting through.

5. Against what must SAC's required combat effectiveness be measured?

SAC has a double role under present national policy. First and foremost, it must possess sufficient strength and readiness to deter open aggression against the United States and its allies. Second, in the event such aggression does occur, SAC must be capable of immediate and decisive attacks against the enemy's warmaking capability. All modern military men, whether they be airmen, soldiers, or sailors, agree that no surface military tasks can be undertaken until air superiority is achieved. Therefore, the first thing that must be done in modern war is to win the airpower battle. Our required combat effectiveness must therefore be measured against this task.

6. Has SAC's combat effectiveness been adequate to enable it to discharge its responsibilities since World War II?

Yes; SAC has been maintained, as a matter of top priority, in a high state of combat readiness for immediate air offensive operations as required. It is considered that this readiness capability has provided the free world with its most effective deterrent to general war.

CHURCHILL. "The United States Strategic Air Command is a deterrent of the highest order and maintains ceaseless readiness. We owe much to their devotion to the cause of freedom in a troubled world. The primary deterrents to aggression remain the nuclear weapon and the ability of the highly organized and trained United States Strategic Air Command to use it." (April 1955 in a Parliament debate on airpower.)

7. Does SAC now have combat effectiveness sufficient to enable it to discharge its principal responsibility?

Yes; at the present time and in spite of recent Soviet gains in aircraft and weapons technology and production, it is considered that SAC continues to maintain sufficient advantage over the Soviet offensive capability to enable accomplishment of its primary roles. We must recognize, however, that a new factor has entered the equation, and that is that the Soviet Union has a long-range attack capability that it did not have 5 years ago. This factor creates the possibility of an initial surprise attack upon SAC which in turn would reduce its deterrent power and retaliatory capability. However, under any reasonable set of assumptions we believe we now have the capability of winning any war the Soviets might start. We are not capable of winning it without this country receiving very serious damage. Five years ago we could have won the war without the country receiving comparatively serious damage.

8. Is SAC stronger than the Soviet long-range air force?

At the present time; yes.

9. What are the three principal elements of SAC's combat effectiveness?

Aircraft and other equipment, weapons, a base system that is adequate for the support of the equipment, and skilled technicians, and professional people to maintain and operate the aircraft and other equipment.

10. How many wings are there now in SAC?

Fifty-one.

11. What different types of aircraft are there in these wings?

B–36's, B–52's, B–47's, RB–47's, F–84F's, RF–84F's.

The B–36's and B–52's are long-range heavy bombers. The bulk of our force is composed of the medium jet bomber, the B–47, which with sufficient refueling is capable of intercontinental operations.

12. When was the plan for the present number of SAC's combat wings established?

It was established in 1953 in connection with the 137 wing program which the Air Force is now concluding.

13. Has there been any change in this plan since it was established?

Yes; there have been minor changes, but none of consequence.

14. Has Russian offensive and defensive airpower increased more since the plan was established than we thought it would?

Yes; we did not think that some of the improvements the Soviets have shown would occur as soon as they have.

15. Are there any present plans to increase SAC's combat wings beyond those called for by this plan?

No; not that I know of. However, certain changes in the internal composition of the strategic force have been made and further changes are under consideration in recognition of the increasing requirement for heavy jet bombers with an intercontinental capability.

16. Is SAC's combat effectiveness in comparison to that of the Russian LRAF growing, remaining the same, or weakening?

Based on present programs known to me and the accepted estimates on what the Soviet program is, SAC's relative strength is expected to decrease.

17. If no changes are made in the present plant and programs for SAC, will SAC's power to discharge its responsibility weaken between now and the period of 1958–60?

The present plans for SAC will insure an increase in combat capability between now and 1960. However, in spite of this increase, if our estimate as to what the Soviet production in the long-range bomber field is correct, SAC's relative power to discharge its responsibility will decline during the time period.

18. What will be the effect upon SAC's power to discharge its principal responsibility by the period 1958–60 if SAC's combat effectiveness is not increased beyond present plans and programs?

As the relative strength of SAC and the Soviet Long Range Air Force changes in their favor, our ability to carry out our primary mission is lessened.

19. Could the United States be taking measures not now planned or programed to maintain strategic air superiority against the Russians?

Yes. There are measures not now planned or programed that could be taken to improve our future strategic air position.

20. What different kinds of long-range bombers do we now have in operation?

B–36's; B–52's.

21. Which is becoming obsolete?

The B–36.

22. What different kinds of long-range bombers do the Russians now have? Which of these is becoming obsolete?

The Soviets now have the Bear, which is a turbo-prop aircraft; the Bison, which is a jet-powered aircraft comparable to our B–52. These are new aircraft and neither is obsolete.

23. Is it not a fact that the quality of Russia's modern long-range bombers (Bison and Bear) is comparable to that of our own aircraft of the same type (B–52)?

If our estimates as to the performance characteristics of the Bison are accurate, then it is comparable to our B–52. The Bear, while a long-range bomber, is a turbo-prop powered aircraft and therefore its performance is greater in range but less in speed and in altitude than that of the B–52.

24. Is it not the fact that Russia is now producing its two types of modern long-range bombers at a combined rate higher than our present production of the B–52?

If our estimate of Soviet production is accurate, then they are producing Bears and Bisons at a combined rate substantially higher than we are producing B–52's.

25. Is it not a fact that we do not now plan to increase our rate of B–52's to a point it will equal the Russian rate of production of their two modern-type bombers?

The Air Force does not now plan to increase the rate of production of B–52's to a point where it will equal the estimated combined rate of production of their two modern-type bombers.

26. Is it not a fact that the Russians now have in their Air Force more modern long-range bombers than we have?

I assume you do not consider the B–36 as being a modern bomber. We believe they have more Bisons and Bears in their inventory than we have B–52's.

27. Assuming no change in our present plans and programs what, in view of our estimate of Russian production, would be the approximate relationship between our modern long-range aircraft force and that of the Russians by the period 1958–60?

At the period 1958–60 and under the assumptions stated, the Soviet Air Force will have substantially more Bisons and Bears than we will have B–52's.

28. Is it not a fact that, unless there is a change in our present plans and programs, the Russian Long Range Air Force will have greater striking power than SAC by the period 1958–60?

It is very difficult to answer unequivocably a question dealing with striking power during this time period. Striking power is a function of aircraft, weapons, bases, refueling capabilities, maintenance and training. Under the assumptions stated in the question, the Soviets will enjoy a numerical advantage in long-range bombers in the period 1958–60. We would be foolhardy to assume they would not also provide the weapons, bases, refueling capability, maintenance capacity, training and professional personnel to support this numerical superiority in aircraft. I can only conclude then that they will have a greater striking power than we will have in the time period under our present plans and programs.

29. Is it not a fact that under our national policy of peace and nonaggression, we must have an air force adequate to meet a surprise attack?

Yes.

30. Does this not mean that we should have a long range air force that, from the standpoint of striking power of its aircraft, is considerably stronger than that of Russia?

If we suffer a surprise attack, it is reasonable to assume that we will suffer losses to our force. The remainder should be strong enough to inflict damage on the enemy that will be unacceptable to him if we are going to succeed in deterring an attack in the first place. It is then reasonable to assume that the original force without losses should certainly be initially stronger than the Soviet force.

31. Will we, by 1958–60, have such a long range air force under present plans and programs?

I have already brought out that the Soviets will have a numerical advantage in long-range bombers during the time period, and again assuming they will provide bases, weapons, maintenance capability, refueling capacity and training to support this numerical advantage then we will be inferior in striking power to the Soviet long range air force by 1958–60.

32. Do you think there should be an increase in the number of B–52 bombers presently planned for SAC?

Yes, I believe that we should maintain the deterrent position that we have had over the past 10 years. I think this means an increase in the planned number of B–52's. Our force should be equipped with modern equipment, in sufficient quantity, at a rate that can be produced by our industry and absorbed by our units, and supported by our

base structure without unacceptable dislocation of industry and the national economy.

33. Under present programs and procedures, will SAC's bases be adequate by 1958–60?

In general terms the plan for expansion of the Air Force has developed ahead of the base structure to support it. The building of the bases has lagged behind the production of airplanes to form the wings; this has resulted in a shortage of bases and a crowding up of units and aircraft on bases. During the 1958–60 time period, the overseas base structure will generally provide an adequate capability for the Strategic Air Command. There will still exist some shortage of Z. I. bases. This will be overcome to a degree by the expeditious construction of additional bases that are currently programed. However, this will still not provide the desired degree of dispersal and will not give the desired base posture.

34. If changes are made in present programs and bases immediately, will it be possible to have an adequate base structure by the period 1958–60?

Changes in present programs and bases would permit an early beneficial occupancy date for some Z. I. bases, but because of the short construction season in the northern regions, would not insure a completely adequate base structure by the 1958–60 period.

35. Why has the provision of bases generally lagged behind the provision of aircraft?

As a general rule it is easier to obtain money for airplanes and equipment than it is to get public works funds for bases, including housing.

36. Is it necessary for the three elements of SAC's combat effectiveness that you have mentioned to be in balance?

Yes. The effectiveness of the strategic bomber offensive will be directly proportional to the availability of modern aircraft, manned by highly trained personnel, an adequate air refueling force, and properly dispersed and protected bases.

37. What is the significance of a proper ratio between jet tankers and jet bombers?

The ratio of jet tankers to jet bombers takes into consideration the range of the bomber itself, the bases from which they will operate, and the targets against which those bombers are directed. A bomber is not very useful unless it has the range to go from its base to the target. The present state of the art requires that tankers be provided in some cases to obtain this range.

38. Why is the jet tanker more valuable to SAC than the piston-prop tanker?

The slower conventional tanker, in order to make proper contact with its bomber, must depart up to several hours before the bomber. The bomber, forced to wait on the ground, is then exposed to enemy attack. The airplanes we are now refueling are jet airplanes. A jet tanker has the same general performance characteristics as the bomber and, therefore, can accompany the bomber, eliminating the rendezvous problems. In addition, the performance of the jet tankers is such that the refueling altitude is at a height above most of the weather, eliminating weather problems and adds to range because the bomber does not have to descend to piston-engine altitudes to receive its load of fuel.

39. How would you describe the situation that will exist under present programs as to the ratio between jet tankers and jet bombers by 1958–60?

The ratio of tankers to bombers that we now have programed is the best compromise we could come up with at the time the program was laid down. However, we could increase our intercontinental strike capability considerably from our planned base structure and with the same size of bomber force if we had more tankers than we are now programed to have.

40. If present plans were changed to establish an adequate ratio between jet tankers and B–52's, would this require the acquisition of substantially more jet tankers than is now planned?

Yes; this would require substantially more jet tankers.

41. If the decision were made promptly to acquire these additional jet tankers, could a satisfactory ratio be established between now and the period 1958–60?

Yes. If prompt action were taken now, I believe that the desired jet-tanker force could be provided by 1960.

42. Are your maintenance and operations funds adequate?

In the 1956 budget appropriations, Strategic Air Command lacked $36 million having sufficient M. and O. funds to purchase support equipment, to maintain our real estate, and to purchase other operating supplies. However, the lack of this $36 million has not, at the present time, reduced our combat effectiveness. If, however, it is not made up in the 1957 budget, it will reduce our combat effectiveness. We have included in our 1957 budget the additional $36 million, but Congress, of course, has not acted on this budget.

43. Is is not a fact that Soviet defensive capability has greatly improved in the last 5 years?

It is reasonable to assume that they would progress in their defensive capability and I believe they have.

44. What is your view of the relationship between long-range bomber force and the inter-continental ballistic missile?

The ICBM has a potential of being a good weapons system in the future. We should, by all means, press forward with our research and development program to produce this weapon at the earliest possible date. However, there are many difficult problems in this program and I believe that the first model of the weapon, both ours and the Russians', will be less efficient than the manned bomber. As time goes on this efficiency should increase and the weapon become more reliable and useful. I think it reasonable to say that the first ICBM will augment the manned bomber force, and at some later date will supplant a portion of the manned bomber force. But I do not believe that in the foreseeable future the ICBM will replace all of the manned bomber force.

Mr. Speaker, the following concluding statement was made by Gen. Curtis E. LeMay before Senator SYMINGTON'S Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Armed Forces at open hearings on April 30, 1956:

Mr. Chairman, I request the privilege of making a closing statement for the record in hope that I may further clarify to some extent our air-offensive requirements. I think I should insure that certain aspects of the problem be made as clear as possible.

For the time period we have had under discussion—that is, for the next few years—I believe that your questions and my responses have made it clear that, in my opinion, our offensive capability in terms of a long-range strategic Air Force could be improved considerably by the following actions if they are promptly taken:

First, the selection and retention within the force of highly skilled technicians and professional combat crews.

Second, the provision of an adequate base structure and other required facilities to permit the force to assume a more effective defensive and offensive posture.

Third, the provision of additional equipment, including long-range jet bombers and jet tankers to expand the force into as nearly certain a deterrent to war as it is possible to attain.

I am fearful, though, the impression might prevail that if these requirements were to be met in the next few years, we will have reached a point where we could face the future with some degree of complacency. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Meeting the requirements for skilled personnel, professional combat crews, necessary facilities, adequate bases, and a satisfactory defensive and offensive posture within the next few years is only an interim measure we are able to take with corrective action that is practicable now.

The problem of security is a dynamic one. The rate of progress achieved by the Soviets in the past few years demonstrates this. There is no indication that their rate of progress will not be sustained. It might even be accelerated. As their appreciation of the significance of air offensive power grows our efforts to retain the deterrent advantage must be continuous. This means that research and development for the weapons system of a few years from now must receive increased emphasis and vigorous attention today.

I have previously stated my views on the ICBM and the requirement for hastening its operational date as a matter of first priority. I also stated that in my opinion the manned bomber will be used by us as a primary means of long-range weapons delivery for several years to come. Therefore, it is most important that we address our efforts and our scientific and production capabilities to the development and production of the manned bomber "follow-on" our successor to the B–52/KC–135 combination, at the earliest possible date. We must have a modernized force in being to meet each new threat as it develops. Attempts to catch up once we have been overtaken can only result in keeping us off balance and in surrendering our ability to deter.

Finally, no military force can be any more effective than the logistic system which supports it and the physical plant which sustains it. There must be continued modernization of our logistic system to keep it abreast of our force modernization. And last but not least, if we are to derive a full measure of security from each dollar we invest in the force, there must always be provision of sufficient funds for the maintenance and operation of our physical plant, our aircraft and our supporting equipment.

Where's the Taxpayer's Surplus?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, last month's issue of the U. S. News & World Report, in an article entitled "United States Treasury Strikes It Rich," tells us that for the year ending June 30, 1956, the Government's cash budget is to show a surplus of about $4,300,000,000.

The Wall Street Journal published on the same day as that article says that the Federal surplus will be only $2 billion.

Edward L. Dale, Jr., of the New York Times, quoted Mr. Eisenhower as having estimated in January of this year that the budget barely would be in balance, with a surplus of less than $250 million.

Before this so-called surplus disappears entirely, let us do something with it.

My first choice would, of course, be to use the major portion of any surplus revenue toward a reduction of our na-

tional debt, which is presently in the neighborhood of $280 billion. The administration seems very much in favor of this course.

Some Treasury officials are very proud of our military cutbacks even if we are dollar rich and security poor. Some people could sleep better with less of a cash surplus and, instead, an Air Force second to no other power on earth.

Let us not fool ourselves. There will be no large-scale reduction of the national debt. This so-called big surplus in the cash budget is quite different from a surplus in the regular budget, for it includes surplus income of social-security payments and other trust funds and excludes certain noncash transactions.

What does all this mean to John Q. Public who has a real tough time with his budget and somehow never has a surplus after he pays his taxes? It means he might stand a little consideration, also.

It is not demagogic to speak of tax reduction. Scientifically, taxes where necessary should be based on the ability to pay. Taxes and the basis for their imposition must be fair. Just as our people demand morality in domestic government and morality in international dealings, taxes must have a morally acceptable basic justification. People in the United States pay very high taxes because they have faith in the justice of their imposition. Heaven help the government whose people heed the anarchistic rantings and ravings of a demogogue such as France has had visited upon her in the person of the infamous Pierre Poujade.

I must stand opposed to tax reduction which has no moral or scientific justification. It is "Poujadism" to reduce taxes just because this is the year of a great national election.

If we have a surplus and taxes can be reduced safely and in good conscience without impairment of our national strength and essential governmental services, then Congress has the responsibility and, indeed, the duty to reduce them. I insist, however, that the reduction should be scientifically and fairly arrived at.

The reduction should be first and foremost for those upon whom the burden of taxes falls most heavily and cruelly. Our primary consideration must be for the man whose major problem is to make both ends meet, the taxpayer who labors under the greatest hardship and has the least ability to pay. Certainly we should eliminate for him any tax which is unfair or unjust before we do anything else in the field of tax reduction.

As a beginning, it occurs to me that a breadwinner must go to work every day. To do so, he requires transportation. This is an essential without which he not alone would be unable to support himself and his family, but likewise, which he would not be able to earn any income upon which our Government might expect him to pay a tax. The average large business enterprise is permitted deduction from its taxable income of legitimate travel expense. Our Federal Government does not permit deduction of transportation costs from the home to the place of business or employment, in fact, it does not even allow for travel expenses incurred in a journey to another city to accept or seek employment, and I maintain that this poses a classic example of unreality and unfairness in our tax laws and regulations.

Transportation to and from work is a vital item of a man's business expense.

Ordinary public transportation costs for the average citizen are a not inconsiderable amount directly and intimately connected with the business of earning a living or holding a job.

Whether a breadwinner daily travels to his job or place of business by train, bus, trolley, subway, or car, the expense for him in employing these essential facilities has doubled or tripled in recent years. For him, these truly necessary business or job costs are an increasingly heavy burden.

Is it fair, is it morally justifiable that our tax laws and regulations should refuse to allow these expenses as a proper business deduction? With the expenditure of transportation money from home to job, would there be a job to produce income?

In New York City a working man pays a minimum of $75 a year just to get from his home to his job and back each working day. This essential outlay is the very minimum he must pay. Many taxpayers are required to pay several times this amount. Commuters living in outlying districts and coming to a city to work each day are spending vastly more. It is sheer hypocrisy on the part of our tax regulations to characterize these sums as "living or personal expense"; they are in truth and in fact, job or business expenses. Why should not this taxpayer's legitimate business expense be deductible? Is not this morally right? Is not such an allowance fair play?

This seems to me to be far more scientific than some of the proposed across-the-board cuts. An increase in dependency exemption is urged by many as being logical, but the present dependency exemptions, in the light of existing living costs, are so unrealistic that a modest increase in the amount of such dependency allowances, which is all that could be expected, would not bring us very much closer to the all important goal of the just and equitable tax base.

I have recently introduced a resolution to study the efficacy of this proposal, its impact and its reasonableness, in the hope that we can approach the question of tax relief morally, scientifically, and fairly—not politically. This is, I think, all that our people ask for and certainly what they have a right to expect of us.

Heretical Orthodoxy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, Dr. William W. Adams, of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary at Louisville, Ky., is one of the foremost teachers of the New Testament. In January of this year it was my great honor to hear this outstanding teacher deliver one of the most stirring addresses I have ever experienced. His title was "Heretical Orthodoxy." I obtained permission from this distinguished teacher to place this outstanding work in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include, herewith, a letter under date of March 23, 1956, from Dr. Adams, along with this masterpiece on the New Testament. I commend it to every Member of the Congress:

THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Louisville, Ky., March 23, 1956.

Congressman MENDEL RIVERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RIVERS: A few statements are in place, as I send to you the material which you had every right to expect weeks ago.

1. Your request to make further use of my message, particularly my second message during the institute here in the seminary, was and is a needed encouragement to me. For it is most urgent that we do something besides talk about this matter. And no one person, or a few persons, can effect the needed action.

2. This message deals with highly explosive materials. There is more than dynamite here: it is atomic in nature. It cuts the foundation from under much of our denominational hierarchies—Roman Catholic, and all the others. And not one is guiltless. Even we Baptists who boasts of our democracy, our congregational and local church control, have plenty of popes in spirit and divisiveness, all to the incalculable losses to Christ's cause.

3. Jesus went to the cross as much for contradicting the claims of the religious, authoritative leaders of his day as for any other cause. I challenge anyone to show a case in history where ecclesiastical leaders (also political and economic and other leaders) ever surrendered their thrones or prerogatives, without a fight. Not all the "blind leaders of the blind" died in the first century. If you publish my message, it will be either ignored, or misconstrued, or contradicted in every possible way.

4. I have, accordingly, made a complete restudy of much of the Old and all of the New Testament, along with all pertinent known history down to A. D. 300, double checking every point, solely in the interest of accuracy and effectiveness. I was already heavily loaded with off-campus obligations when your request came. I have burned the midnight oil in producing what I am now sending you. The work is there, although it may not show in the article itself.

5. This further research on my part has served to prove to me that my message is not only basically true; it is undergirded with a mass of sustaining evidence. The proof is overwhelming. I have used only samples of it. I could only hint briefly near the end of the article at the perversion of this Biblical truth, as can be clearly shown in history, down to A. D. 300.

6. I wish you yourself would make an experiment, knowing that it will take some time. "I wish you would read this article slowly, studying each Scripture passage referred to, as you come to it. You are at liberty, of course, to decide that I do not prove my case. If that is true, you should discover it before you publish it.

7. If you decide to use this article, I hope you will insert early in the article something like this. "It will be worse than use-

less to read this article, unless you are willing to open your Bible and study for yourself each Scripture referred to, as you come to it. This article is designed to serve only as a guide to your study of the Scriptures for yourself. To substitute the reading of this article for the study of the Scriptures is unfair to all concerned."

8. If we could get this truth out and put it to work, I'm willing to say that it would result in a reformation that would reduce Protestant Reformation of the 16th century to a mere skirmish in the fight needed to uncover the true Christ and Christianity of history, without whom and which world chaos has only begun. Regardless of what you do, I am not through with this New Testament fact.

9. Genuine, effective, worldwide ecumenicity is impossible until our denominational leaders become willing to come down off their ecclesiastical and theological stilts, constructed largely of bunk and heresy, in a willingness to substitute Biblical and orthodox ideas, programs, and actions for mere traditional, pious platitudes.

10. We shall never enlist laymen properly in the work of our churches, until we show them from the Scriptures that they are not laymen—that they are ministers.

In length and content this article is almost exactly what I gave in my message to you men. I have not prepared a different message, I have just doublechecked all details.

I thank you most sincerely for giving this idea some consideration beyond the Saturday morning when you heard me discuss it in our Seminary Chapel.

Cordially and sincerely yours,

WM. W. ADAMS.

HERETICAL ORTHODOXY

(By Dr. W. W. Adams)

Yesterday our subject was Jesus Among Men. I had planned to continue today with a study of Jesus Among Men in the Person of His Disciples.

I have changed that plan for two reasons: One, the messages that have been brought to use here since I spoke yesterday morning, highlighted by what Billy Graham revealed to us regarding world conditions today. No normal person can hear those messages and forget them. Two, a question which many of you have been discussing among yourselves, and some of you put directly to me. "What can we do when we return home, more than simply report that we have attended an Institute? Is there anything we can do that will lead our churches to begin to do what will meet the needs of our day?"

I have taken your question seriously. When normally I should have been sleeping, I was praying and wrestling with your question. What I have decided to do today may miss the mark; but at least it does not deliberately dodge the question.

At this point we face what may prove to be insurmountable difficulties. One, the Bible and the Christian life, in their full dimensions and significance, lie beyond the reach of any one person. No one can accurately, completely and with perfect balance comprehend all that is involved. Two, in the centuries since Jesus was among men, so much human tradition, totally or partly false, has come into being, has been given Biblical and practical sanctity, and has been ensconced in our religious institutions and programs, that one wonders if we can ever uncover God's Word, so that its simple teachings can possess our minds and guide our actions. Three, we are not always willing to obey God's Word, even when we see its meaning. It will do no harm to admit the truth: ignorance of God's Word is not the only reason why we fail to apply God's remedy to our ills. Four, many times when we seek to explain something and we think we are enlightening our hearers, we only confuse them. At the beginning of a new school year, a rather large number of students enrolled in a certain class. After the second meeting of the class, one student did not return. Unable to learn anything about the student, the professor drew a line through his name. At the end of the semester, an assistant gave the examination. When the professor was reading the papers, to his surprise, he found a paper from the student who had been present only twice. Out of curiosity he read the paper. It proved to be the best of the entire lot. The professor had to search for an excuse to grade the paper down to 99. Completely baffled, he sent out an urgent call for a conference with the student. When the student arrived in the office, the professor stated the facts in the case and said: "You were present in the class only twice; you had no right even to take the examination. And yet I gave you a grade of 99; I positively do not understand it." The student replied: "I know you do not understand it; but I think I can explain it. You see, those two times I was in your class, I got confused; otherwise I believe I could have made 100."

We are all disturbed and largely for the same reasons. One, chaos is spreading and deepening everywhere. The forces of evil, disunity and disintegration are on the march, are more aggressive and effective today than are the forces of righteousness. It requires no prophet to see that, unless we can change this situation, some kind of horrifying world explosion seems to be inevitable in the near future. Two, we sense the gross disparity between the power of Christianity, as presented in the Bible and in our sermons, and the power actually manifested in our lives today, individually and corporately. The present demonstration of power in dealing with individual, group and world problems falls so short of what we say the Bible teaches and what we claim for the Christian faith that the masses of people today are not at all impressed with our claims.

It is in place to be a little more specific. In 1913, soon after I was licensed to preach in Liberty Baptist Church, Shelby County, Ala., our pastor, Rev. I. Y. Inzer, made a simple request of me. "W. W., I want you to find out why it is that, here in our church, with a membership of about 200, we can fill this large building twice a day during our annual revival in August, baptize from 1 to 3 dozens of members, and then, during the other 51 weeks of the year, I cannot find more than 50 or 60 members who will vigorously and persistently throw themselves into the church's program." In the 43 years that have passed since 1913, I have made contacts with ministers and other church leaders in all parts of our country. I make it my business to get the facts regarding our churches. A church with a membership of 100 will do well to average for the year 40 to 60 in the morning service; 25 to 35 in the evening service; 15 to 30 in prayer meeting (if any). For a church of 300, the average will be about 130 to 150; 75 to 100; 25 to 50. For a church with 1,400, the figures may be about 600, 250, 85. A church boasting 3,300 will be considered a success if the attendance averages 900, 350, 125. And it makes little difference where the church is located—in the East, the West, the North, the South. Nor do a few splendid exceptions to these averages change the national picture. We must remember also that those who do attend church services regularly may fall far short in putting Christianity into practice in all areas of life.

If we were not so accustomed to this situation we should be so frightened by it that we could not even think of living normal lives again, until we find the explanation and the remedy. It requires no intellectual acumen to draw the right conclusion: either what we claim for Christianity is not true, or somewhere in our individual lives and in the programs and activities of our churches, there is something basically and fundamentally wrong.

But what is it? Dare we even try to find it? Even if we should find it, are we willing to face it and do something about it?

I am not naive enough to believe that I can point out 1 or 2 weaknesses in our churches, the correcting of which will completely change the situation I have been describing. Of course it is not that simple. Nor can I expect in a speech of 30 minutes to convince all of you of the reality and importance of the causes I shall mention.

I am now ready and willing to point out to you what, as I see it, are the two most damaging heresies among our church people today. They are the dividing of the world and life into the secular and sacred; and the classifying of Christian people into laity and clergy. Does it shock you to hear me say that the Bible knows nothing about secular and sacred, laity and clergy; and that all things are sacred and all Christians are ministers? That is exactly what I am saying. If we could end these heresies and get our people to be Biblical in these matters, it would result in a reformation more dynamic and extensive than anything known in history since Jesus was on earth. You men have asked for something to do when you return home that will enable our churches to minister to the world of our day and to master the forces of evil. I am now answering your question.

First, go back home and lead your church people to recognize and to put into action the Biblical point of view; that all of life and all things are sacred; that the only sinful thing in existence is the wrong use of life and things, the substituting of ourselves and things for God, the creator of both.

We have been taught that some things are "secular" (Latin, saeculum, a race, age, the world); temporal, profane, worldly, because of their association with this age, this world; and not spiritual, eternal, ecclesiastical. Other things are "sacred" (Latin, sacer, sacred, holy, dedicated, devoted to God, religion, the church); to be hallowed, reverenced, respected, because of their association with the divine.

I challenge you to open your Bibles and study each of the following passages and see for yourself that:

1. Genesis 1: 31: Everything God made "was very good." That should not surprise us: anything that God makes is good, sacred. The wrong use of God's good earth has misled us into believing that somehow it is no longer good, sacred; but is secular, evil, unholy. The Bible's repeated and emphatic warnings against worldiness, using life and things as ends in themselves, and not for the good of mankind and the glory of the Creator God, has blinded us to the fact that all that God made—and he made everything except our misuse of what he made—is sacred and holy.

2. Exodus 20: 9: That "6 days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work." God would not command his people to do that which is evil, profane, less than sacred. Work is, therefore, of God, and is good, sacred, holy. No later revelation changes this fact.

3. Matthew 6: 33: That life is a unitary thing, not to be divided into two spheres constitutionally different in nature and value; that if we put God and his kingdom and righteousness first, "all these things will be added." Anything that God will add to those who practice the righteousness of his kingdom, and thus becomes a part of his kingdom, is not less or other than holy, sacred. Otherwise God's kingdom becomes a mixture of the good and the nongood, the holy and the unholy. Because some things are of secondary or tertiary importance does not justify their being classified as other than sacred.

4. Romans 11: 36: The universe ("all things," ta panto, the totality of things) is divine—"of him, through him, and unto him": it comes from God, through his creative action, and serves his purposes. Total and eternal glory, therefore, belongs to him. Everything God made, including us who live in and of the world, is designed and we should use it to contribute to God's glory.

5. John 1: 1-3; Colossians 1: 13-18: The Logos, God's Son, our Savior and Lord, is the one in and through whom, as intermediating agent, God created the universe, "all things"; "without him nothing was made that has been made"; he makes all things a cosmos, universe, and not chaos (in him "all things consist," hold together); and he is the end or goal of all things ("unto him"; all things are designed to further and perfect his universal and cosmic purpose).

6. Hebrew 1: 2: The Son is "heir of all things;" the Father projects himself into the future and will complete and consummate his eternal purpose in and with the universe through his Son, his heir.

7. Ephesians 1: 9-10: According to his eternal purpose and plan, the Father has come into our world in the person of his incarnate Son, to complete his program in all previous times, by heading up, bringing under one headship, one king, "all things"—in heaven and earth.

8. Romans 8: 15-17; Ephesians 1: 11-14: We, God's redeemed in Jesus Christ, are his joint heirs—to help him complete his ministry, which is as comprehensive as the universe and the human race; for the Father's plan is "to reconcile all things unto himself * * * on the earth, * * * in the heavens," through his Son; Colossians 1: 20.

9. I Corinthians 8: 6: The Creator God, his redeeming Son, we the redeemed, and the universe ("all things") are bound together in an eternal and sacred purpose and plan which only our rebellion can disturb. Our sin, which disturbs this divine and eternal oneness, is the only nonsacred thing we know anything about.

10. Romans 8: 19-22: All creation, now groaning under the load of vanity (emptiness) which is hers by virtue of having been placed involuntarily under sinful humanity, longs for and will share in the final liberty and glory of God's sons.

11. Our bodies are sacred. I Corinthians 6: 19-20: The body of each of you "is a temple of the Holy Spirit which is in you, which ye have from God; and ye are not your own; for ye were bought with a price: glorify God therefore in your body." I Corinthians 3: 16-17: Collectively, "ye are a temple of God, and the spirit of God dwells in you. If any man destroys the temple of God, him shall God destroy." It is logical, therefore, that Paul, in I Thessalonians 5: 23, should pray, "And the God of peace himself sanctify you wholly; and may your spirit and soul and body be preserved entire, without blame at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." This rating of the body as sacred, along with spirit and soul, is confirmed in John's prayer, Third John 2, "I pray that in all things thou mayest prosper and be in health, even as thy soul prospers." Romans 12: 1-2: We are, accordingly, "to present our bodies living sacrifices to God, holy and acceptable".

12. Therefore, it is high time that we recapture the Biblical message regarding the unitary nature and comprehensiveness of life. I Corinthians 10: 31: "Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." Colossians 3: 17: "And whatsoever ye do, in word or in deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God the Father through him." I Thessalonians 3: 9-12: Do "your own business, and work with your hands * * * that ye may walk becomingly (and so win to Christ) toward them that are without, and may have need of nothing." I John 2: 15-17: Instead of satisfying our lusts in the world, and so substituting the world for God, let us love the Father by doing his will, including using all that He created for His glory.

Be done with the heresy that some things are to be hallowed and respected, because they are devoted to God, religion and the church; and substitute the Biblical message that all things are God's, intended to be used for His glory, and are, therefore, sacred. Ponder what it would mean if we could lead all our people to consider and to treat the totality of life and things as being sacred; that all time, material resources, and ourselves, including our bodies, belong to God and are to be dedicated to His glory and the highest welfare of humanity; that true Christianity cannot be confined to Sunday, and to church and to certain phases of life and relationships; but comprehends God, humanity, the universe, time and all of life! Then all of life would glow with a sacred and divine holiness, so that all people who are genuinely Christian would become a vital and active part of the church of the living Christ, who is in our world to "head up all things * * * in Heaven and earth."

If you men want something all-absorbing to do when you return home, here is one day's work for you.

Second, go back home and lead your church people to recognize and to put into action the Biblical message: that all Christians are ministers, and that, therefore, the most colossal and destructive heresy ever generated by the determined enemy of Christianity is the dividing of believers into laity and clergy. To call attention to all the scriptures that bear on this question would require hours. Here are some of the more important facts.

1. Judaism failed primarily because the Jewish people became so absorbed in their heirarchical, institutional life, and so devoted to the formalistic, ritualistic observances of their religion, that they lost sight of and failed in their one mission—to serve as God's priestly nation, in mediating God to all the nations (Genesis 12: 1-3; Exodus 19: 4-6). Through Amos (Amos 5: 21-24; cf. Isaiah 5: 1-7) God actually commanded the Hebrews to stop their entire temple (church) services, which had been substituted for practicing justice and righteousness.

2. The world into which Jesus came was overlaid with hollow, ritualistic, legalistic religion, under the supervision of authoritative leaders who constituted a highly organized religious order, binding heavy loads bear them (Luke 11: 46; Matthew 23: 4). Almost every vital phase of their religion had been covered over under a mass of human traditions: God's commandments (Mark 7: 5-13); the Sabbath (Mark 2: 23-28); genuine charity, prayer, and fasting (Matthew 6: 1-16); the primacy of right relationship with others (Matthew 5: 23-24); practicing justice, mercy, and faith (Matthew 12: 7; 23: 23); and striving for inward purity (Mark 7: 18-23). Jesus came to minister, as well as to die for men (Mark 10: 45). This led Jesus to break through the religious and social customs of the day that separated the leaders from the masses. He went to the people, wherever they were—in their homes, places of business, and religious and social gatherings, and in the open spaces. Jesus avoided and separated from nobody, unless he was first rejected. Moreover, he ministered to all the needs of people. There are no known exceptions. This comprehensive ministry, ignoring all divisions among the people, more than any other one factor, put Jesus on the cross. For the religious leaders, wedded solidly to their religious hierarchy and prerogatives, saw clearly that, if Jesus' spirit, example, and teachings should prevail, their entire profession, institutional program would collapse (John 11: 47-48; Luke 23: 2).

3. Jesus persistently sought to create a spirit of complete unity, equality, mutuality, and cooperation among his disciples; refusing to give priority to one person or group of persons, or to one ministry; always rebuking any manifestations of spirit and any move that would even suggest divisions or gradations among his followers and workers. His actions and words correspond; Luke 22: 27: "I am in your midst as one that serves." Disciples should pray that the Lord, not some ecclesiastical agency, will send forth laborers, not authoritative officials, into his vineyard (Matthew 9: 38; Luke 10: 2). Without any public ordination, and with no hint of any clerical orders, giving special authority and duties to no one or several individuals, Jesus appointed and sent out the 12 (Mark 3: 14; Luke 6: 13), and the 70 (Luke 10: 1-24), with one purpose only—to help him minister to the people.

What appears, at first sight, to be a special and authoritative office and function for Simon Peter, in making him the foundation of the church and the sole possessor of the keys of the kingdom, disappears completely, when all the facts are considered (Matthew 16: 13-20). The church is not founded on the man Peter (petros); it is not founded on any one person, not even Christ, or idea or experience. Jesus began his church when one person apprehended and was ready to confess and act upon the Father's revelation, that Jesus is more than man—that he is "the Christ, the Son of the living God"; that is, the Jesus is the Messiah, the King, the key to the kingdom, the one who has "the keys of death and of Hades" (Revelations 1: 18). The church is founded on the union of the Father and his redeemed sons, in the person of his redeeming Son. "My Father revealed this to you * * * and thou art Peter (petros), and upon this rock (petra, a mass of rock, a unity of persons, experiences, and actions), I will build my church." "Peter, through you, I shall now unlock other hearts and give to them the truth, the secret, the keys. Thus you will be building and loosing, determining the eternal destiny of men." Later on, exactly the same authority, responsibility, privilege and function were placed upon the church, all disciples, the total body of the redeemed (Matthew 18: 15-20; John 20: 19-23). Every believer strengthens the foundation of the church, and shares in the work of binding and loosing, unlocking or closing men's hearts to the redeeming, forgiving Christ.

Imagine the idea of an order of clergy, graded in offices, authority, and powers, surviving in such experiences as the following: Mark 9: 33-37; 10: 35-45: greatness, exaltation, and places of honor belong only to those who humble themselves (Luke 14: 11), becoming servants and ministers of all, even as Jesus came "to minister and to die for all"—the complete antithesis of the kingdoms of the world where rulers, exercising the authority and power of their high offices, lord it over their subjects. John 13: 1-20: Jesus, our Lord and Master, earned the right to say: "If I * * * have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet." Neither Jesus, nor Peter, nor the other disciples knew anything about the primacy of Peter or anybody else. In the face of the example, spirit, and teachings of Jesus, only those who are strangers to Him could contemplate or tolerate the idea of gradations and divisions among believers.

Later on, Jesus sought to reclaim Peter, after his defection in denying his Lord, and to make of him a dependable shepherd in tending and feeding the sheep, rather than creating for him an authoritative office over the church. Jesus would be pleased to make of Peter a worker on the level with other disciples: (John 21: 15-19).

Unity among Christ's disciples and workers reaches its climax in Matthew 23: 1-12. I quote this passage in part. "But all their works they do to be seen of men: for they make broad their phylacteries, and enlarge

the borders of their garments, and love the chief place at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogues, and the salutations in the marketplaces, and to be called of men, Rabbi. But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your teacher, and all ye are brethren. And call no man your father on the earth: for one is your Father, He who is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters: for one is your master, the Christ. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant. And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be humbled; and whosoever shall humble himself shall be exalted."

You are all brethren. You differ only in ministries rendered, serving as undivided witnesses and workers under your one and only Leader and Master, Jesus Christ. It is fitting, therefore, to hear Jesus pray: "that they may be one * * * perfected into one" (John 17: 22–23).

4. Jesus commissioned and empowered His disciples to continue and complete what He had begun. John 20: 21: "As the Father has commissioned me, so send I you." I am sending you in a way that corresponds to (as, according as), and will continue the commission my Father gave to me, in all essentials. These essentials must include Jesus' purpose, spirit, program, and methods.

If we consider all the commissions Jesus gave to His disciples (Luke 24: 13–49; Matthew 28: 16–20, cf. First Corinthian 15: 6; John 20: 19–23; 21: 15–23; Act 1: 3–8), we discover that He commissioned the 11 apostles, along with many believers. This is further confirmed by the fact that Jesus empowered at least 120 disciples (Act 1: 15; 2: 1–4) for witnessing, including "the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and his brethren" (1: 14). Power for ministry was given to all believers, and was not limited to a small, clerical group.

5. Jesus' disciples were true to their commission. From Acts to Revelation, the records are uniform: the disciples never betrayed their Lord. They held steadily to His purpose, spirit, program, and methods.

More specifically the disciples knew nothing of laity and clergy: all were ministers in one Chrstian body, whose head was Christ, and whose life, inspiration and guide was the Holy Spirit. Among these ministers (all believers), there was no gradation of officials, no order of clergy, placing one group over against and in control of other ministers, or the church as a whole. They differed only in the types of ministries rendered. Christ calls every one to salvation and ministry. The New Testament knows nothing about calling one to salvation and not to ministry also.

Since the universe and all of life are sacred, and every believer is dedicated to his Lord who commands him to "be perfect, as your Heavenly Father is perfect" (Matthew 5: 48), all things must be done in the name of the Lord Jesus, and to the glory of God the Father. Some ministries are more conspicuous, strategic, significant, and essential than others. This makes it imperative that Christ's followers have leaders, and that they lead, oversee, administer, and guide in the interest of the unity, health, growth, and ministry of the body. The spirit endows each believer for the ministry he should perform, for the good of the body. And so we find believers with gifts for guiding the disciples in fulfilling the worldwide mission of their common Lord.

But this can never mean that some believers are ministers (clergy, called) and others are something else, laity, for example. Nor does this mean that some ministers (disciples) are lifted above others in office, authority, powers, and dignity. They are distinguished only by the types of ministries performed, within the one united Christian body. For "ye are brethren"; "he that humbles himself shall be exalted"; "I am in the midst of you as one that serves"; "if I, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also should wash one another's feet"; "he that would be first and greatest among you shall be servant (slave) of all"; "follow thou me."

The early Christians followed their Lord. That these things are so is the uniform teaching of the New Testament. Here are a few samples.

A. In the Book of Acts:

Acts 2: 17–21, 39; cf. Joel 2: 28–32: The Holy Spirit is available to you and "to your children, and to all that are afar off." The Spirit's mission is to prepare all believers to prophesy—to minister for Christ.

Acts 2: 43–47: Here all believers, including the apostles, live and work together in perfect unity—in the home and in the temple, encompassing all of life—all possessions, day by day.

Acts 4: 23–31: Apostles and the company of believers prayed together, and were all empowered for further witnessing. There was no division of ministers here—no laity and clergy.

Acts 8: 14: "The apostles * * * sent * * * Peter and John" to Samaria. Peter was servant, not head of the apostles.

In Acts we find many trusted and effective leaders: Peter, John, Stephen, Philip, Barnabas, Paul, and others. Each was free to go and minister as the Spirit guided him, without apostolic or ecclesiastical control. The Lord's angel and the Holy Spirit, not Peter or a bishop, directed Philip; Acts 8: 26–29. What bishop or church authorized Ananias to minister to and to baptize Saul? Acts 9: 10–18. Paul was free to see that the new converts were baptized, even at night, without a directive from the bishop; Acts 16: 33.

Acts 11: 22: The church, and not Peter, and not the clergy, sent Barnabas to Antioch.

Acts 15: 1–29: The apostles, elders, and all the multitude of brethren (verses 2, 4, 6, 12, 23) shared in the discussions and conclusion of the great Jerusalem conference.

Acts 6: 1–6: The apostles and the multitude of disciples worked together in choosing and ordaining the first deacons. This was not elevating disciples to an office, with authoritative, ecclesiastical powers over others. It was only a commonsense division of labor, dedicating these men to a special and urgent type of ministry—serving tables, attending to certain business matters. The seven were pastors' assistants. And neither the apostles nor the deacons, nor both together, constituted a clerical group, in control of and over against the laity. Apostles and deacons were servants, not masters of the body of believers.

Acts 13: 1–3: Barnabas and Saul were not ordained to the ministry. They had been ministering for years (Acts 9: 20–30; 11: 22–26, 30). Nor did this ordination exalt them to an ecclesiastical office. It was a simple act of recognition, commendation, and cooperation with reference to a special ministry of missions, under the Spirit's (not apostolic or ecclesiastical) direction.

Acts 20: 17, 28: Among the best known ministers among early Christians were elders and bishops. But there was no gradation, placing one group over the other. Bishops and elders were interchangeable (see Titus 1: 5–7), neither was subordinate to the other.

B. In Paul's writings:

Galatians 2: 11–14: "Paul resisted Cephas to the face, because he stood condemned"; and this was done publicly—"before all." Was not Paul a little rough on the first Pope? Or had Paul, along with the others, never heard of Peter's headship over the apostles, bishops, and elders?

I Thessalonians 5: 12–22: Note the long list of duties and ministries in which all the Thessalonian believers shared, under the direction of their leaders.

Colossians 1: 18; 2: 19; Ephesians 1: 22; 4: 15; 5: 23: "Christ is head of the body, the church."

Colossians 3: 15; I Thessalonians 4: 7: Christ who had already called them to salvation calls them also (all the members of these two churches) to sanctification and a life of peaceful cooperation among the members of the one body: all are called to be good ministers within the one Christian body.

Ephesians 4: 1–16: Paul says, "I * * * beseech you (Christians in Ephesus) to walk worthily of the calling with which ye were called." All the believers, not a limited group, are called. Verses 4–6: They must keep, never break, the unity which they share as members of Christ's body—"the unity of (created by) the Spirit." The heart of this unity is the Trinity: One Spirit, one Lord, one God. Verses 11–16: The victorious Christ gives gifts to men; so that some disciples, ministering within the body, as apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers, seek to "perfect the saints unto the work of ministering." Some specially gifted ministers so lead that all the saints will share in the work of ministering. Some ministers help all the saints to be good ministers, with the end in view of building up Christ's body, so as to effect unity of faith and knowledge, the maturity of all believers, after Christ's example, and under his headship.

This one passage makes it completely impossible to divide believers into laity and clergy (called, ministers).

Ephesians 4: 11; I Corinthians 12: 4–31; Romans 12: 3–8: One wonders if we can ever get our people to comprehend and to practice what is contained in these passages. Paul states categorically (I Corinthians 12: 4–6) that there are "diversities of ministries and workings." He proves his point. Taking these passages together and in order, here are some samples of diversities of ministries: apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers, wisdom, knowledge, faith, healings, miracles, powers, discerning of spirits, tongues, interpretation of tongues (I Corinthians 12: 28) helps (assistants), governments (counsels or managers). These lists are not intended to be exhaustive; they only illustrate the fact that, within Christ's body, many ministries are needed and provided. In I Corinthians 12: 12–27, Paul makes his climatic argument: God has "tempered the body together" (verse 24); and the life and health of the body requires that every member of the body perform his ministry faithfully and in full cooperation with all other members.

We find here perfect mutuality, interdependence and unity, calling for full cooperation within the Christian fellowship, as planned and projected into the future, through His disciples, by Christ, the head of the church.

C. In Peter's writings:

There is time to discuss only one—and it is enough.

I Peter 1: 1; 2: 1–10: Note that Peter is speaking, not to a limited group, but to all believers, "sojourners of the dispersion." They are to get rid of all sins, and participate fully in the life and ministries which Christ provides for and expects of His disciples. It is a mutuality of life, privilege, responsibility, and services. It is like a house filled with dynamic, cooperating, active people. In this house, Christ the Lord (not Peter) is "the chief cornerstone, elect, precious." Around this Christ all believers "are built up a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ." Others have rejected this Christ, the chief cornerstone, but God made Him the head of the corner. In contrast to those who were disobedient, "ye (all believers, and not a limited, clerical group) are an elect race (a race is a unit, not divided,

and you are elect, chosen), a royal priesthood (priesthood of all believers, to serve the king, in his kingdom), a holy nation (a 'nation' is a unit, not divided, and you are a holy, dedicated unit), a people for God's own possession" and purposes. God called all of you (not a clerical group) thus to live and minister together, with the purpose of "showing forth the excellencies of him who called you to share this united and universal priesthood of all believers."

Peter is completely unaware of any primacy for himself, or for anyone else.

D. In the Book of Hebrews:

Hebrews 7: 26–27; 13: 15: We, the disciples of Christ, minister under the one high priest, Jesus Christ, who has sacrificed himself "once for all," and so is not repeated. Our high priest "makes intercession for us," even as the Holy Spirit does (Romans 8: 26, 34). The sacrifice for our sins is complete, never to be repeated. It is expected that we "offer up a sacrifice of praise to God."

E. In John's writings:

Only one passage is needed.

Revelations 1: 5–6: Christ our Redeemer "made us a kingdom, priests unto his God and Father." Exodus 19: 5–6: God made Israel to be His priestly nation, through which He would bless all the nations of the earth, as He had covenanted with Abraham to do (Genesis 12: 1–3). Israel failed in that mission. John now declares that Christ's followers (all of them) take Israel's place as priests through whom Christ will win his kingdom.

The priesthood of all believers who are Christ's ministers. All are priests, ministers, workers, under the one high priest and leader, Jesus Christ.

In the New Testament, neither the Father, nor the Son, nor the Spirit, nor Peter, nor John, nor any and all believers knew anything about the priority or headship of Peter, nor of any other believer or believers; nor had they any knowledge of the colossal heresy of dividing believers into laity and clergy. They were all loyal to Him who said: "Ye are all brethren."

THE PERVERSION OF CHRISTIANITY

Here is a summary of this tragic story. Any group of people living and working together must have leaders, overseers, administrators—various functionaries. The early church had them. There were "apostles"—trusted, influential, personal witnesses and interpreters of Christ. Administrators were called "elders" or "bishops" (the words were interchangeable). "Bishop" (overseer) was not the title of a church officer; it was simply the description of one function of elders or leaders. "Deacons" were assistants to pastors and other leaders.

But these ministers were not a clerical, official group of church rulers. The total body of believers, the people, were the determinants in their Christian fellowship and ministries, including their leaders. The people, all believers, constituted the church; and the leaders served the people, rather than the other way around.

The perversion of Christianity is not difficult to explain. The church needs and the Holy Spirit provides able, qualified leaders. It is both natural and easy for effective leaders to enlarge their prerogatives and powers, especially in times of crises. In the second and third centuries, many such crises arose, such as what books to include in the Canon; and how to meet and master dangerous heresies. Strong administrators were needed and provided. Some of them abused and violated their trusts, gradually making themselves more powerful. Despite protests from the discerning, by the end of the third and the beginning of the fourth centuries; the perversion was well near fixed, especially in Rome. The "clergy" were strong enough to silence the protesters.

These rulers, designating themselves "the called" (kleros, called, clergy) seized upon another Greek word to refer to those not called—the word laos, people: laos, laity.

The final result is too apparent to need extended comment. We call a minister to our church and, in effect, we say: "You do the ministering; we are not ministers, we are laity." We lose over half our members (ministers), our churches accomplish a small part of their potentialities, society rots, chaos deepens, and the devils in hell have fun.

I challenge you men to do three things. One, create a committee to produce a reading list of pertinent materials and, believe me, it is ready for you. You must first get the facts. Two, see if you can make a beginning in your local churches to correct this rankest of heresies. Three, return here next year for another institute, but give it a title that is not totally false: not "laymen and world evangelism"; but "ministers and world evangelism."

Interest Rate on United States Savings Bonds Should Be Raised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial by Mr. Leslie Gould, which appeared in the May 4, 1956, issue of the New York Journal-American. Although Mr. Gould advances some cogent reasoning for raising the interest rate on Government savings bonds, I doubt whether this administration will do anything about it. These are the bonds the little fellow buys.

HIGHER RATES ON SAVINGS PUT QUESTION MARK ON E BONDS

(By Leslie Gould)

There's not much point in a person buying the Government's savings bonds as long as the current interest rate and the method of calculating it holds.

The question of patriotism no longer is involved. They are just another investment, and interestwise not such a good one.

A person can do better currently buying in the market another piece of Treasury paper. Treasury notes can be bought in the open market below par, thus giving an interest return of better than 3 percent.

Mutual savings banks in New York are paying 3 percent, some from the day of deposit and others from the first of the month of a dividend period even if the deposits are made on the 15th. So, the rate is slightly better than 3 percent. Where the banks compound the interest quarterly or semiannually the rate is even better.

The savings bonds—designed for the little investor—yield nothing for the first 6 months and if cashed in at the end of the year, the fellow gets only 10 cents interest for his $18.75. If he had the $18.75 money in a savings bank he would receive close to 60 cents.

NEARLY 10 YEARS TO CATCH UP

Taking an easier "deposit" figure of $75, if this sum were invested in a savings bond the buyer would get at the end of 5½ years $86.40. But if he had put his $75 in a savings bank, he would have $88.88—or $2.48 more income.

It is not until the maturity date—9 years and 8 months after purchase—that the bond interest catches up with the 3 percent return on a savings account.

When savings bank interest was 2½ percent, it took 7½ years for the savings bond to come even on investment return, and when the bank rates were 2 percent it took 6½ years.

There is this to be said for the savings bonds, the interest doesn't fluctuate, as it can for banks.

A DIVERSIFIED INVESTMENT

When a person makes a deposit in a savings bank, he is making an investment in Government bonds as well as in mortgages and other types of securities, including bonds of corporations and municipalities and revenue agencies, like the turnpikes.

This money goes to work and the bulk of it in the community where the depositor lives. It helps finance homes, and in doing so makes for local work.

The interest on the savings bonds is taxable, as is also interest on bank deposits. The British exempt the interest on their savings bonds, and also the prizes on their new "lottery" savings bond. The interest on the United States savings bonds should be at least 3½ percent.

Legalized Tax Evasion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an article from the February 24 issue of the U. S. News & World Report. This article carries an eye-opening account of the methods being used by high income bracket business executives who earn a fat salary with many fringe benefits which, apparently, is tolerated under our present tax structure.

Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that the appropriate committee of the House should investigate the system being used by these tycoons to the end that existing loopholes might be plugged so that these people would pay their fair share of the income tax burden as it was intended when the income tax laws were passed by Congress. The lower income groups who do not have access to such harmless-sounding methods of tax evasion are certainly paying their fair share. This practice, approved by the present administration, has the effect of destroying the intent of our income tax laws. It also discriminates against the white-collar employee and the industrial workers. When wage increases are granted to our low-income workers, they willingly pay the additional amount in income taxes. There is no reason why industry should grant raises which are supposedly tax proof as these people are in a much better position to pay the additional taxes than the low-income families.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues, I am including this article:

HOW TO BE WELL PAID IN SPITE OF TAXES—MORE AND MORE FIRMS GIVE INCENTIVE EXTRAS TO EXECUTIVES

With income taxes what they are, a salary increase doesn't mean much to a highly paid executive any more.

So business firms are devising new methods of paying their executives. Aim is to give the executives more money, the tax collector less.

Official records show how some big corporations are managing to do this.

All over the country, corporations are finding new ways to raise the pay of business executives.

Simple boosts in salary are losing favor. Instead, you find executives getting such things as stock options, installment bonuses, profit-sharing plans, retirement guarantees, life insurance policies, deferred benefits of all kinds—and big expense accounts.

It's getting so you can't tell how much an executive really makes by merely looking at his monthly pay check.

The reason for all this is to be found in the high income-tax rates. Those rates range up to 91 percent in the top brackets of pay. At such rates, an ordinary increase in salary is turning out to be of little value to an executive who already is highly paid. He finds the Government takes most of the increase away from him in the form of income tax.

Corporations, as a result, are finding it harder to keep a topflight executive. One of the highest-paid film executives in Hollywood, for example, recently gave up a salary reported to exceed $500,000 a year. He plans to start producing pictures for himself. The idea is that he can make at least as much money that way—and keep more of the money he makes.

If the executive is able to take advantage of the capital-gains tax instead of the high rate on regular income, he will pay only a 25 percent tax on the profit he makes from his pictures.

To match such advantages, and to hang on to executive talent, corporations are devising a variety of pay plans. The purpose of all the plans is to give company officials more money that they can keep for themselves—in other words, to protect them against the tax collector.

To find out what pay plans are being used, and how they work, members of the board of editors of U. S. News & World Report talked with experts, checked the reports filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission by scores of corporations.

This survey shows that hundreds of business executives now are managing to build up sizable estates, despite high-income taxes.

One executive, for example, received total salary and bonus of $108,000 from Continental Can Co. in 1954. The company, in its report to the SEC, estimated that he had only $50,010 of this left after income taxes. But that turned out to be only part of his total compensation.

The company set aside $21,733 in cash and 380 shares of stock to be paid to the executive after he retires. The stock, valued then at $20,710, is now worth about $30,000.

During the year, this executive also exercised a stock option to buy 10,000 shares of Continental Can stock at $35 a share, on which the paper profit is now more than $400,000. In addition, he has the company's guaranty to pay him $30,000 a year for life after he retires, on the condition that he is able and willing to render advisory and consulting services to the company.

Here, in the case of this executive, you find several of the pay plans now being used to save taxes.

Earn now, collect later, that's the key to most extra-pay plans. The idea is to postpone the actual payment of the money until such a time as the executive's income drops and he can receive the deferred payment at a lower rate of income tax.

When payments are deferred, conditions usually are attached. To collect the deferred payments, an executive may be required to remain with the company for a fixed period, or agree not to work for a rival concern if he does leave, or to hold himself available as a consultant.

These conditions are designed primarily to qualify the benefits for favorable tax treatment by demonstrating that the executive has not really earned the benefits until he actually receives them.

The conditions, however, also serve another purpose. They bind the executive to his corporation with golden chains. A man will think twice before taking a job with a competitor if it means giving up a small fortune in accumulated benefits for the future.

Tax status of some of the extra-pay plans has yet to be legally clarified. One plan, however, has a clear and approved status in law. That is the stock option plan, which is gaining widespread use. It works like this: An executive is granted the option of buying a specified number of shares in his company's stock at a fixed price.

The executive may buy this stock at any time during the life of the option, which may run 5 or 10 years. And the price to him remains the same, even though the market price of the stock may rise substantially.

Then, when the executive sells that stock, he pays only the 25 percent capital-gains tax on the increase in the stock's value, instead of the higher income tax that would apply if he had been given a similar amount in salary.

The way in which stock options must be handled to qualify for capital-gains tax instead of income tax has been clearly spelled out by law.

Huge profits on stock options have been realized. SEC reports show, for example, that an executive of the Columbia Broadcasting System in 1954 picked up options to buy 17,000 CBS shares at $24.75 a share, and 33,000 shares at $38.25 per share. The stock later was split 3 for 1. At present market prices, the paper profit on these stocks amounts to more than $2 million.

During that same year, an executive of the Aluminum Co. of America exercised his option to buy 18,900 Alcoa shares at $58.75 per share. A 2-for-1 split in 1955 converted them into 37,800 shares now worth $2 million more than the purchase price. This same executive, in 1954, was paid $200,000 in salary and was voted $50,000 additional to be paid after he steps down. He is also eligible for $45,471 in annual retirement benefits.

The retirement-pay idea is now being used for many company officials. This not only means security for the future, but is also another way of postponing payment to save on income taxes, if certain conditions are met. The executive gets his pay increase, in effect, after he goes off the payroll, and drops into lower tax brackets.

Reports to the SEC list one executive who has a contract with Federated Department Stores calling for "an allowance of $55,000 a year for life upon termination of his active employment." If he should die before collecting 10 installments, his family would get the payments until 10 installments had been paid. So this provision amounts to an estate of at least $550,000.

Such allowances as this can be in addition to a company's regular retirement program for all employees.

Life insurance policies, with the company paying all or part of the premiums, also are used to provide future rewards for executives.

Thrift plans provide another way to reward executives at lower costs in taxes. Standard Oil Company of New Jersey puts up an amount equal to 1 to 3 percent of an employee's annual pay toward annuity purchases. The percentage varies according to the employee's own thrift payments—and the company's contributions are substantial in the case of an executive in the upper brackets. One executive of Standard Oil, for example, received credits of $13,225 from the company in 1954 under the thrift plan, in addition to his salary of $195,000.

The company expressly states that its thrift contributions are not considered as current pay—and hence not subject to personal income tax in that year, because the employee "receives no benefits unless and until his annuity payments commence."

Installment payments of many kinds are employed to soften the tax collector's bite. A big bonus, for instance, which normally would be paid at the end of an unusually profitable year, may be split into several installment payments. One idea here is that part of this bonus, at least, may fall into a year when business is bad and no bonus would normally be paid. Or, in some plans, payment is postponed until the executive retires.

Either way, the tax bite is smaller because the executive's total income in the year when he receives the money is less and his tax rate lower.

Conditions generally must be applied to the eventual collection of deferred payments to qualify them for tax benefits.

SEC records show numerous examples of such installment payments.

E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. spreads its bonuses over 4 years. Top bonus award in 1954 was $400,000—in addition to the $169,000 salary paid to the executive who got that bonus. Nine other Du Pont executives were awarded $250,000 bonuses, also in installments.

Radio Corporation of America spreads its "incentive awards" over five annual installments. Incentive pay to executives of General Electric Co. is divided into two equal parts. One is payable in cash at the time of allotment. The other is converted into GE stock which, with accumulated dividends, is paid in 10 to 20 annual installments after the executive retires.

Profit-sharing benefits also are being paid now on the installment plan. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. pays them in the form of company stock in 10 to 15 annual installments. P. Lorillard Co. pays profit shares in cash—but part is held until retirement.

Expense accounts, to escape income taxes, must be justified as "ordinary and necessary." In these days of aggressive selling, however, large expenditures are often accepted, especially in entertaining potential customers.

One publicity executive in New York, although a bachelor, maintains a big home in the heart of Manhattan where he entertains business prospects—and the cost of the home is charged off as business expenses to his client. Many companies also maintain yachts, private planes, resort homes, or other luxuries which can be charged off to company expenses because they are frequently used by business associates.

Tax rules can be tricky. Some extra-pay plans may not achieve the results intended. But the idea of paying executives in other ways than salary is spreading. And, often, substantial tax savings result.

This Man Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, "This Man Nixon" is the title of an interesting and informative article on the Vice President appearing in the May issue of Town Journal The article was written by Ray Henle, one of our best-informed

Washington correspondents, and I believe Mr. Henle lays to rest many of the strange and unwarranted criticisms of the Vice President that have been circulated in recent months. Under leave to extend, I include the article as part of my remarks:

When Election Day 1952 rolled around, vice presidential candidate RICHARD MILHOUS NIXON was tired. The young Californian had in 4 months traveled 67,000 miles. He had made 286 speeches, more than Ike and more than either Democratic candidate.

"We've done all we can," he told Bill Rogers, his youthful campaign adviser and close friend. "Let's drive down to Laguna Beach and relax."

They bought a football and down on the sand passed it back and forth. Three Marines coming down the beach saw them and got into the game.

At one point, both the vice presidential candidate and a young Leatherneck dived for the ball. For the first time, the Marine saw NIXON close up. "Gee," he exclaimed, surprised but puzzled, "aren't you some kind of celebrity or something?"

Today, millions of Americans are like that young Marine. They study Mr. NIXON'S face and actions carefully—and they aren't quite sure about him. What kind of man is he, really? What is his actual political stripe? Judging by what he has done up to now, what could we expect of him in the future? Is he a man of caliber or a shrewd opportunist? Could we trust him? It's important to know, for he will almost certainly be nominated for a second term as Vice President—and will, because of Ike's heart attack, be sized up as a possible President.

It will take a shrewd voter to pierce the fog of accusation, rumor, and praise and come up with a fair decision. His enemies contend that he is a brash, ambitious "Tricky Dicky" bent on winning the Presidency by fair means or smear. He rouses more ire among liberal Democratic leaders than any other Republican. Yet, by the political rule book he would seem an ideal candidate on anybody's ticket.

Let's see what Mr. NIXON has working for him:

A. His is the traditional American success story. As a schoolboy, he helped in his Quaker father's general store in Whittier, Calif. He had to pass up the chance for a Harvard scholarship; not enough money. Instead, he went to Whittier, a local college, graduating second in his class in 1934.

At Duke University Law School, he graduated third in the class of 1937; he had a scholarship and kept his expenses down by living in a farmhouse.

A World War II veteran (he started as a Navy lieutenant (j. g.) and wound up as a lieutenant commander); he spent 15 months in the South Pacific (including 28 nights under bombardment at Bougainville).

He has a charming wife and two uninhibited children. Mrs. Nixon, like her husband, came up the hard way; orphaned early, she worked in hospitals and department stores to put herself through the University of Southern California. She met RICHARD NIXON in a little theater group in Whittier (where she taught at the high school).

In 6 years NIXON rose from an unknown small-town lawyer to Congressman, to Senator, to Vice President.

Politically, can you beat that?

B. His conduct last fall, when no man could say the President would live, was faultless; and no one has had more opportunities to make a mistake. To many, it stamped him as a man of restraint, good taste, and propriety.

C. Add to this that Mr. NIXON is young (43), a notably effective speaker and tireless campaigner, and possesses an outstanding record as an investigator of Communists, and you have the composite of what a campaign manager would dream about.

Yet this does not jibe with what many people visualize. As a Washington-based reporter, I have made it a practice to ask "NIXON haters" to tell me:

"Just what, exactly, do you have against NIXON?"

In many cases, they answer simply, "I don't know—there are some people you just dislike—he's one." Sometimes, they get more specific:

1. "He always looks like he needs a shave, seems scowly and jowly, like Russia's Gromyko."

2. "He doesn't stand for anything; he sacrifices principles to expediency."

3. "He was corny and emotional in that 1952 telecast; that 'Checkers' dog incident gagged me."

4. "I hear he's anti-Semitic."

5. "He ran a dirty campaign against his opponents in California."

6. "He called Democrats 'traitors'."

7. "He's an opportunist."

8. "Too young. Inexperienced."

There's a ninth reason—one never stated. He put Alger Hiss in jail—and in doing so embarrassed many liberal columnists and Fair Dealers who labelled as "red herring" Republican attempts to expose Communists in Government. Such public humiliation is hard to forgive.

Moreover, the known fact that Mr. NIXON was in 1952 "acceptable as a Vice President to the right wing of the Republican Party" did not endear him to the so-called liberals.

But back to the eight charges:

The first one sticks. Mr. NIXON does have a dark, heavy beard; and if that's a disqualification, he's a goner. He must shave twice and sometimes three times a day. Actually, he is exceptionally neat and tidy. His clothes are skillfully tailored, and he wears them with more ease than most men. He is clean and wholesome looking.

The "jowls," too, have been a target. One California farmer wrote him after a 1953 telecast: "Was it mumps or was it chewing tobacco? I say it's mumps. Joe says it's chewing tobacco. Please settle our bet."

The scowl, I challenge. Even senior colleagues on the Hill who eye his rise with jealousy regard him as "a regular guy who hasn't taken on any airs." On the occasions when I have talked to him, he always had a ready smile.

In public, the Vice President appears serious much of the time. "If you want to know why," a Cabinet aide told me, "you ought to know the state secrets he's carrying around in his head. It's a wonder he dares talk to anybody. Also, don't forget that, as a young man, he's better off with a restrained manner." Certainly he makes a sharp contrast with the Alben Barkley jovial Veep. "But," say his friends, "what's worse than a young clown?"

The second allegation, that Mr. NIXON revolves as the Republican wheel revolves, is partly true, partly false. Senator KARL MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, put it this way: "I would expect DICK NIXON to vote with the Republicans for a limited concept of Government, a balanced budget, strong national defense, curtailment of the Communist conspiracy at home, and a return to private industry of tasks it should perform. He would be against expansion of socialism." In this respect, he is a party man.

As a freshman Congressman, he voted with most GOP Congressmen 83 percent of the time. But in the Senate, his party-loyalty record dropped to only 70 percent. Mr. NIXON on one occasion refused to go along with labor legislation more restrictive than the Taft-Hartley Act. He worked energetically for Marshall plan aid for Europe; voted for Greek-Turkish aid.

As one White House assistant put it to me: "NIXON'S outlook in both domestic and foreign affairs, as I see it in Cabinet meetings, is as close to President Eisenhower's as anyone's in the administration."

We move on to the Checkers broadcast. It certainly contained poltical "corn"; however, President Roosevelt used his own dog Fala on occasion, but with his customary Shakespearean flair. The one was "finished Broadway"; the other, Whittier little theater.

Nevertheless around 2 million people—an unprecedented number—wrote or telegraphed their approval of the Checkers telecast. Telegrams alone ran to 125,000.

The comment that Mr. NIXON is anti-Semitic presumably stems from his campaign for the Senate in 1950 against Mrs. Helen Gahagan Douglas. Mrs. Douglas did not call NIXON anti-Semitic, but somehow it got whispered.

In this same campaign his manager and close friend, Murray Chotiner, was of Jewish faith. The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith came to his defense. But the whispers persisted.

I myself have never heard Mr. NIXON utter a word, in private or public, which could remotely classify him as anti-Semitic or anti-Negro. His Quaker faith would form a natural, fundamental birthright of revulsion to such.

What about these "dirty campaigns" in California House and Senate races?

Well NIXON is a campaigner. He confronts his opponents with embarrassing but indisputable facts. No doubt he'll campaign with the gloves off again. Voters seem to like it; he swamped Mrs. Douglas by a 680,000 vote margin.

Did he call Democrats "traitors"? I examined the speeches he made during the 1952 and 1954 campaigns and couldn't find where he did. So I asked the Democratic National Committee to document the charge, and was given a four-page fact sheet. Here was the most damning statement I could find:

On October 18, 1952, in Utica, N. Y., Mr. NIXON said: "I charge that the buried record will show that Mr. Truman and his associates, either through stupidity or political expedience, were primarily responsible for the unimpeded growth of the Communist conspiracy within the United States. I further charge Mr. Truman, Dean Acheson and other administration officials for political reasons covered up this Communist conspiracy and attempted to halt its exposure." He made ungentle statements but never charged "treason."

Is Mr. NIXON an opportunist? Well, I know from personal knowledge that he has twice offered to remove himself as a candidate—first during the "NIXON fund" charge in 1952, second a few weeks back. He said he wouldn't want to be a liability. Would he be?

The answer, I think, lies primarily in the voter's reply to the question, "is he too young and inexperienced?" not for the Vice Presidency but possibly for the Presidency.

There's no doubt but that he's pulled boners in public, but he's learned by his mistakes and has matured fast.

Mr. Eisenhower has described him as "the best prepared Vice President in American history." That's quite a statement.

Mr. NIXON presides over Cabinet meetings in the President's absence; is the first Vice President to preside over the important National Security Council. He spearheads liaison with Congress (and is generally credited with bringing Democratic Senator WALTER F. GEORGE into the President's confidence on foreign policy). He relieves the President of many tiring social engagements. And he has represented the President as a good will ambassador in the Far East and Latin America. What he learned there has exercised a profound influence on policy.

He left an enduring friendliness with the Indian people. Evangelist Billy Graham, recently returning from his own India tour, told Mr. NIXON: "In contrast to some of the other representatives we have sent to India, you won friends."

In Washington, the National Security Council was impressed, too—by the Vice President's penetrating analysis of the Far East and its problems. "He spoke for more than an hour, extemporaneously," recalls an official who attended the meeting, "and when he had finished the Council stood and applauded. It was the first time that hard-boiled crew ever did that for anyone to my knowledge."

How come Mr. NIXON engenders such respect from associates? For one thing, as a good lawyer, he does his homework. Most men would relax in a plane flying from one capital to another. Not Mr. NIXON. Before he visited any city on his Far East tour, he arranged for a United States Foreign Service officer stationed there to join his party and fly in with him. That gave him valuable counsel on local customs and problems; he arrived primed.

Of one presidential candidate in recent years it was said, "you have to know him to dislike him." It seems to work just the opposite with NIXON. He doesn't display it in public like Ike does but he has warmth.

During his 1952 campaign, the commercial airline pilots flying Mr. NIXON became admirers, even passed out campaign literature for him on their days off. His train crew, expecting a bawling out one day for almost backing into a crowd, heard him say instead: "Forget it. We all make mistakes. You've done a fine job." They'd have flown the train after that.

There's little doubt that the Republican National Convention, meeting in San Francisco's Cow Palace on August 20, will renominate DICK NIXON for Vice President. It is true that the President asked him to consider whether that would do the most for his political future. The Vice Presidency, traditionally, is a poor steppingstone to the White House unless the President dies in office. No second-term Vice President has ever been elected President.

However, I believe that DICK NIXON, with full knowledge of these facts, will go for the Vice Presidency again. He lacks administrative experience and he knows it. On the other hand the highest Cabinet job available to him (Secretary of Defense) is a thankless headache. And the California governorship isn't available. His best move, his friends believe, is to rely on the growing role of the Vice Presidency.

Moreover, Republican Party leaders don't give him much choice. Some of Ike's original Citizens for Eisenhower advisers did suggest that Mr. NIXON is "too controversial, has too many enemies"—but none will admit it now. In contrast, Republican leaders have set up a virtual "we want NIXON" chorus. GOP Chairman Leonard Hall said flatly that "it will be Ike and DICK" again. Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND, who inherited the Republican right wing, discounted talk that he is anti-NIXON. The still-powerful Thomas E. Dewey has publicly praised the Vice President.

Republican voters, too, rose to his support when some 23,000 in New Hampshire wrote in his name for Vice President in the presidential primary. It apparently was a spontaneous voter reaction to the "dump NIXON" talk.

At the Democratic National Committee, opinion is split. Some think NIXON would draw effective fire that cannot be directed at Ike. Some remember his vote-getting ability and hope the Republicans nominate someone else.

As to NIXON's friends, they say simply: "A lot of people have thought they had DICK NIXON out on a limb—and have themselves ended up on the limb with NIXON using the saw. It could happen again."

American Legion's Reply to Report of President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, under consent granted by the House, I am including a statement in the RECORD on behalf of the national executive committee of the American Legion, which is in answer to the report by the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions. The statement follows:

REPORT OF NATIONAL COMMANDER'S SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE BRADLEY COMMISSION

APPOINTMENT OF PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON VETERANS' PENSIONS

On March 5, 1955, the President of the United States appointed a Commission on Veterans' Pensions, with Gen. Omar N. Bradley as Chairman. By letter of the same date from the President to General Bradley, the President endeavored to outline generally the need for, and the scope of, the investigation to be made by that Commission which we shall refer to as the Bradley Commission. Although stating that he was in full accord with the policy of having the Nation respond generously to the needs of the veteran, including the awarding of pensions and other benefits, the President pointed to certain changing conditions in our economy and society and concluded from this that the time had come for some agency to assess the structural scope, philosophy and administration of pension, compensation and related nonmedical benefits furnished to the veteran and his family, together with the relation between those benefits and others, such as social security, which have been provided to citizens without regard to their status as veterans.

A staff was assembled to assist the Bradley Commission. After analyzing the President's basic directive, the staff concluded that it should study the following general subjects which, for convenience, may be divided into three major groups, as follows:

1. Pensions and the effect which the development of social security legislation has had upon the need for them.

2. Disability benefits, the establishment of service connection, whether by presumptions or otherwise, rating schedules, statutory award, rehabilitation, and readjustment programs, and education and training programs.

3. The authority and effectiveness of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

APPOINTMENT OF NATIONAL COMMANDER'S SPECIAL COMMITTEE

National Commander Collins was deeply conscious of the fact that, under the slogan of "efficiency and economy in government," there had been previous and substantial assaults upon the structure of veterans' programs. He correctly diagnosed that the activities of the Bradley Commission, even though dressed in the robes of presumably advanced social and economic thinking, could easily produce an equal and similar assault on those programs by branding them as inconsistent with recently developed concepts of social planning and advancement, and economic orderliness and well-being. He believed that the American Legion should prepare itself in advance to receive the results of the Bradley Commission's studies. He believed that the American Legion had an obligation to make an objective survey of its own program in the light of modern conditions. He believed it essential to determine whether there could be merit in the proposition, rumors of which had already been heard, that social progress made anachronistic the 150 years of legislation by the Congress acknowledging that a special obligation was owed to those who had served and saved the Nation in time of war.

On April 4, 1955, National Commander Collins appointed Carl J. Rees, Deward H. Reed, and Donald R. Wilson as members of a special committee and charged them with the responsibility of reviewing the veterans' program as it had developed and of placing it in proper perspective with reference to the welfare of society as a whole.

The tenure and function of this special committee were continued by National Commander Wagner.

This special committee was authorized to employ a research specialist and other personnel and to conduct its activities within a budget of $12,000. It was also instructed to work closely with those divisions of the American Legion whose principal area of concern might be embraced within the scope of the Bradley Commission's activities.

Bertram G. Davis, of the legislative division, was employed as the special committee's research expert.

The committee, as such, has met eight times. In addition, individual members of the committee, of its staff, and of the Legion staff in general, have met with the staff or individual members of the Bradley Commission on numerous occasions.

The committee's expenses to date amount to $5,976.78.

At this juncture, the committee wishes to pay its respects to Mr. Davis's outstanding performance as research specialist. It is the belief of the committee that his work which is embodied in comprehensive memoranda setting out the facts adduced by research and the tentative conclusions to be drawn therefrom is of permanent value to the American Legion and will serve the American Legion well, long after the Bradley Commission's report has been forgotten.

In addition, the committee wants to express its appreciation to Robert M. McCurdy, the chairman of the rehabilitation commission, and all the members of the rehabilitation staff for the cooperation which has been extended, for the guidance which has been given, and for the depth and precision of the knowledge which has been made available.

Other divisions of the American Legion, such as the American Legion Magazine and the chairmen and staffs of other commissions within the American Legion, the staffs of several departments, such as the Department of New York, and a host of individual members of the American Legion, have contributed immeasurably to the activities of the committee.

PRELIMINARY COMMENTS ON BRADLEY COMMISSION REPORT

On April 23, 1956, the Bradley Commission transmitted to the President its final report, setting forth its so-called findings and recommendations.

The report is 410 pages long. It is divided into 2 parts, 1 of which deals with the highlights of the Commission's findings and recommendations, and the other of which purportedly sets out in detail the Commission's findings and 70 separate recommendations.

We are not unaware of the fact that the membership of the Bradley Commission as such was made up of many fine and intelligent gentlemen who approached their assignment with the utmost earnestness and sincerity. We have no reason to question their integrity or the sense of responsibility which motivated them in their deliberations. Without casting any reflections upon them, we must express our regret at the end-product of their labors. Perhaps the scope of their inquiry was too great to permit its successful accomplishment within 13 short months. Perhaps the hampering influence

of a staff somewhat brash but unskilled and lacking adequate background in the field of veterans' affairs contributed confusion instead of clarity and thus failed to serve the true and honorable needs of the individual members of the Commission.

However well intended, the Bradley Commission's report comes to us filled with clichés, self-contradictions, inaccuracies, looseness of expression, non sequiturs, statistical monstrosities, and thrilling discoveries of the obvious. It is a disappointing piece of work. It is tragically preoccupied with extolling the virtues of the goddess of social security, not for what it is but for what it may be at some indeterminate time in the future. It is on this altar that the veteran is to be stripped of the dignity of a special status which throughout the history of our country has always been accorded to him. Now, under a new concept, arbitrarily and unnecessarily announced by a mere commission of the executive branch of the Government, the veteran is told that since he performed no special service, the Government owes him no obligation in his declining years other than to give him a general right, if properly employed, to buy and pay for social security like any other citizen.

The presumptuous nature of the Bradley Commission's pronouncements is practically an insult to the Congress of the United States, the consistent guardian of the welfare of the veteran. The Bradley Commission, with only the wisdom of 13 months of activity on the part of governmental theorists, has concluded that the Congress, which has had 150 years of experience in developing the veterans' program and in keeping that program intact and progressive while at the same time legislating for general social needs, doesn't comprehend its full responsibilities to all the people, including the veteran, and that by discharging one of its responsibilities it must forget that historically it has an additional responsibility to the Nation's defenders. The report is discouraging and dangerous—discouraging because it belittles the contribution of the veteran to his country; dangerous because by stealth cloaked in compliments it exalts the welfare state and denies that there is any room in such a state for, according to the veteran, a special dignity because of service to country.

MAJOR AREAS OF CONCERN

Your committee does not conceive that it is its function to give to the national commander and the national executive committee a point-by-point analysis of the recommendations of the Bradley Commission. It is the belief of your committee that this is a project which can more successfully be discharged by the duly constituted commissions within the American Legion and their respective expert staffs. Nonetheless, the special committee does believe that it has the obligation of pointing out and establishing, as a possible guide for further work, a general frame of reference within which specific comments on specific recommendations may be fitted. The accomplishment of this task can best be achieved by a consideration of the following major questions:

(a) Is there, at present, any clear national philosophy of veterans' benefits?

(b) Does the concept of social-security benefits preclude the orderly and economic development of pension benefits to veterans?

(c) Has the program of disability, rehabilitation, and readjustment benefits been reasonably effective in serving the ligitimate needs of the qualified veteran?

(d) Has the Veterans' Administration been reasonably successful in the performance of the functions for which it was created?

We believe that the report of the Bradley Commission, as well as the conclusions to be dawn from the research of your special committee, may be properly embraced and considered within these four questions which will be discussed in the order in which they were stated.

(a) *Is there, at present, any clear national philosophy of veterans' benefits?*

The Bradley Commission arrives at the astounding conclusion that because the present structure of veterans' programs, like the common law, is only an accretion of laws based largely on precedents built up over 150 years of piecemeal development, there is, therefore, no national philosophy of veterans' benefits. Starting from that premise, the Bradley Commission then indulges itself in a peculiar form of self-aggrandizement and proudly announces that it, by its own labors, has developed, apparently for the first time, a philosophy whose guiding principles can enable the Nation to discharge its obligation to veterans generously. If this announced accomplishment were true, we would all be eternally indebted to the Bradley Commission for its contribution. Unfortunately, for the Bradley Commission, its philosophical creation is composed of the body of philosophical principles evolved over the course of our country's history, but emasculated or distorted by the introduction of some new and dangerous concepts which would destroy the philosophy of veterans' benefits as it has evolved and substitute in its place a set of sociological principles not particularly related to the peculiarities of the veterans' problems.

The Bradley Commission's most radical departure from the existing philosophy of veterans' benefits (a departure which will be considered in greater detail later in this report) is to be found in the statement that military service in time of war or peace is merely an obligation of citizenship and should not be considered inherently a basis for future Government benefits. It continues by stating that our national survival requires that every citizen do his part and make whatever contribution is required of him. It is apparently in the making of this statement that the Bradley Commission feels that it has made a major contribution to the philosophical concept of veterans' benefits. It is in the making of this statement that your committee feels that the Bradley Commission has cruelly departed from the philosophy of veterans' benefits and has laid the foundation for a wholesale assault on the veterans' program.

We take it that the history of aid and benefits to the American veteran which has evolved out of the constant concern of the Congress is a record of general devotion to the welfare of those citizens who have had to give up their normal civilian activities in order to defend the country in times of war and danger to our national safety and security. Veterans' benefits have come to be regarded, therefore, as special, and as benefits to be added to those benefits which the veteran may obtain as a citizen alone. We are not unaware of the current encouragement which has been given to the argument in many quarters, even on the part of some of the members of the American Legion, to the effect that being selected or volunteering for service to the country in war is merely the discharge of one of the duties of citizenship. The argument continues that, by virtue of having done only what is required of a citizen, the veteran cannot logically consider himself to be a member of a special group of citizens. We would acknowledge the validity of the argument up to a point, but we would demand that the argument be carried to its only logical conclusion. It is true that one who serves in the Armed Forces of this country is discharging an obligation of citizenship, but the fact which has escaped the Bradley Commission and others who pause at that point is that there are some who discharged this obligation of citizenship and some who failed to discharge it. It is not sufficient to gloss over the disparity between the discharge of these obligations of citizenship by saying that in modern war all people are subjected to hazards. So long as we maintain our Armed Forces, so long as we call them defenders of the country, and so long as we subject them to the necessary disciplines and deprivations which an adequate military establishment must demand, we have created for them special obligations, duties, hazards, or responsibilities which set them apart from the role which they would play as citizens alone. By reason of their peculiar sacrifices and hazards, they become a class of citizens select in nature and distinguished by peculiar service. No governmental commission, no amount of sophistry can deprive them of that special status. Your committee is strongly of the opinion that the claim of special status for the American veteran is an eminently sound and valid claim, and your committee points out that if the American Legion ever abandons that belief and belittles the distinctive character of that service, it will have played false, not only with well-established historical precedent but also the very reason for its being.

Acknowledging that historically the veteran has been regarded as a special class, we may also further conclude from the study of the history of veterans' benefits that the Congress has, through legislation, further subdivided the veteran class into those who are disabled as a result of their military service and those who merely by virtue of their military service are entitled to recompense. The Congress has consistently endeavored to maintain an equitable ratio between compensation payments and pension payments. At the same time, the line between service-connected and non-service-connected benefits and pensions has moved steadily in the direction of more inclusive benefits for a larger proportion of all veterans. A liberalization of benefits has almost inevitably followed every war as the needs of veterans increased. These obligations assumed by the Government throughout our history have never been limited to mere recompense for physical loss or suffering because of military service, nor have they been limited to men who actually were in the battle line.

It is through the establishment and refinement of principles such as the above that our present veterans' program has evolved and developed. If the Bradley Commission would depart from this history and this experience, it must carry the burden of proving conclusively that the departure which it recommends is not only necessary, but that it will not do violence to the moral obligation which the Nation owes to its defenders. It is the opinion of your committee that the Bradley Commission has failed to carry this burden of proof, that it has contented itself with the pronouncement of platitudes in justification of a radical departure from acknowledged and well-established practices.

(b) *Does the concept of social-security benefits preclude the orderly and economic development of pension benefits to veterans?*

Much of the Bradley Commission report is a concentrated effort to establish a preconceived notion that the social-security program has become an adequate substitute for veterans' pensions. This is a significant and hostile part of the report. It reflects little sound or honest thinking, but it does mirror the antagonism long noted in certain sections of the administrative branch of the Government toward veterans' pensions. Successive studies by the executive branch of the Government under both major political parties have attempted to find rationales for justifying the elimination of pension benefits.

The most noteworthy predecessors of the Bradley Commission report were the two Hoover Commission reports of 1949 and 1955. Both of these had the flavor, not of objective studies but of planned attacks.

The sections of the Hoover Commission reports dealing with veterans' benefits were so obviously biased and malicious that no firm platform was established from which an attack could be launched that would convince the Congress. Antagonism in the Hoover reports ran high, but the arguments were weak and specious and obviously labored.

Even before the failure of the second Hoover report, busy brains in some branches of various Government agencies were casting about for a new device that could be used to provide a more successful platform from which to destroy large segments of the veterans' program which Congress had labored so hard to establish. Several years ago, someone in the Government conceived the idea that it could be argued that the social-security program should make a splendid rationale for finding that veterans' pensions and some other veterans' benefits are no longer necessary. Where the idea began is not certain. It was put forth clearly in the "Hughes" study made by the Bureau of the Budget in 1953. The thought was quickly parroted and gained great currency in the executive branch of the Government, particularly in several agencies that do not deal intimately enough with veterans' affairs in their day-to-day operation to have a clear notion of what the veterans' programs are and how they operate in detail.

About a year and a half ago, the notion that social security is today an adequate substitute for veterans' pensions was worked into a public statement of the President—not, we believe, by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, but by someone closer to the President than to the veterans program. At that time, August, 1954, President Eisenhower grudgingly signed a bill increasing by a small amount some of the existing monetary payments to veterans and their dependents. He stated, as he signed it, that he did so reluctantly and that it was his opinion that such benefits were probably no longer necessary because of social security and other general welfare programs of the Government.

He said that he would appoint a committee to look into this matter and to study the whole structure of veterans' pensions and compensation. Thus was the Bradley Commission born.

It should be noted that the theory that general welfare programs have, or should be considered to have, displaced veterans' pensions had not in any way been demonstrated. No specific conflict between the veterans' pension program and the social-security program had been pinpointed. No facts had been arrayed which clearly showed that social security was, in fact, serving the purpose which veterans' pensions previously had served. The idea had merely been deliberately repeated with increasing frequency, but always without clear demonstration. In view of this history of events that led up to the creation of the Bradley Commission, it is not surprising that the Commission apparently viewed it almost as an instruction from the President to find a rationale for affirming that pensions are now antiquated because social security has taken their place. In any event, the final results of the Bradley Commission report affirm that it struggled to justify this concept.

However, the Bradley Commission has been able to do no more than simply to repeat the thesis again. It does repeat it and states affirmatively that it is its opinion that the advent of general welfare programs, and social security specifically, has brought about a new era in which pensions for veterans are no longer necessary. It specifically says that all pensions should be tapered off and eventually eliminated. This is a softer and, on the surface, a more friendly approach than the one taken by the Hoover Commission. It has much more molasses and less vinegar than the Hoover reports. That is, it says "Let's taper the pensions off and complete the elimination at some time in the future." In other words, let's not hang veterans' pensions at daybreak, let's strangle them slowly.

Only one thing is needed to convince the American Legion, and veterans generally, that veterans' pensions can be ended and social security can be accepted as the perfect modern substitute; that is, to demonstrate clearly and factually, rather than merely make unsubstantiated claims, that without damaging the contractual rights of its present participant, social security, in its actual workings and design, is in fact a program that would and does offer to the Nation's veterans—in recognition of their war service—the same security and the same special consideration for special services rendered to the Nation in time of national danger that the pension program has provided.

Unfortunately, the Bradley Commission has been unable to carry this burden successfully.

Undoubtedly, the Commission would have given a clear demonstration if it had been able to. It is to the discredit of the Bradley Commission that it continued to advance and strengthen the argument by repetition in the face of a patent inability of establishing the point with a factual demonstration. On page 133 of its report, there is a passage headed "Need for a Factual Approach." The Bradley Commission, under that heading stresses that "Our national policies must be developed in the light of a full factual picture." We commend adherence to that thought to the Bradley Commission. We search the report in vain for the facts that permit the identification of social security as a substitute for veterans' pensions. None are offered. Actually, no factual demonstration is possible, for the reason that social security is not and cannot be a substitute for veterans' pensions. If an attempt were made to make it so, it would work mischief not only to the veterans' pension program, but to the social-security program as well.

Social security is based upon a tax placed upon some, but not all, individuals, in the form of a compulsory insurance premium, based upon the amount of money earned in certain not all-inclusive private employments. When its benefits, not always the maximum, are paid, the amount of the benefit is in substance based upon the length of time worked in such private employments as may be covered by the law and the amount of money earned during that time. These are the essential facts of social-security coverage and benefits.

The Bradley Commission ignores these facts. It philosophizes that the veteran is not entitled to a preferred status. Then, on the basis of its disregard for the facts and its enunciation of a radical and unacceptable change in our basic philosophy, it states, as a supposedly constructive conclusion, that veterans must be rewarded for their war service in times of personal need by merely paying to them an amount based upon what they earned, provided they worked in private employment covered by the Social Security Act, and like all other citizens in such employment, paid the tax levied upon them during the years that they were so employed.

The substitution of social-security benefits for pension benefits is subject to numerous and logical objections. There are such vast differences between the two programs that it is ridiculous to envisage the abolition of the pension structure. For example, social security is merely a form of compulsory insurance to which one who is employed, with certain exceptions, must contribute. It is, in essence, an insurance contract whereby, for a stipulated payment, one party is obligated to compensate the insured upon the happening of a contingency. Veterans' pensions are not based upon a contractual relationship with the Federal Government. They are based upon the performance of duty in defense of one's country in time of war. They are not payable to all veterans but only to ones in need.

Your special committee takes the position that, as a form of compulsory insurance, which was never intended to meet even the minimum needs of its beneficiaries. Social security cannot be considered as a substitute for veterans' pensions, but must continue to occupy the role originally intended for it, namely, that of providing a base upon which can be erected other benefits.

The veteran who, as any other citizen, has fulfilled his social-security contract is entitled, as a matter of law, to receive the benefits of that contract. It is a tragic error, however, to say that he is entitled to nothing more. The ingratitude and contempt which produced such an error are emphasized by the basic factual differences between the two programs. Social security and pension plans are completely dissimilar. Veterans' pensions are payable by reason of honorable wartime service, with the basic criteria for payment predicated upon unemployability due to a prescribed degree of disability. Unemployability, without more, will not establish entitlement to pension. The additional requirement of a prescribed degree of disability is a necessary factor in showing entitlement. Under social security, unemployment is only a determinant in arriving at a figure that will eventually be paid. Unemployability is not a factor. Under the pension program, age is not a prerequisite to the payment of benefits. It is a factor for consideration with respect to pensions. Under social security, age is a definite requirement.

Under the veterans' pension program, there are income limitations which must be met. This factor insures that only veterans in financial need can receive a pension. Under the social security program, income is a factor only if earned and derived from employment covered by the Social Security Act. Because payment under social security is a right based on monies contributed, benefits are not confined to the needy as such.

These are only a few of the irreconcilable differences which may be enumerated between the veterans' pension program and the social-security program. When you add to these factors an acknowledgement that social security was never intended to meet even the minimum needs of its beneficiaries, it becomes all the more impossible to reconcile the establishment of social security with the proposition that it should supplant all other benefits. Such a substitution would leave untouched and uncared for the vast numbers of those who, prior to age 65, because of prescribed degrees of disabilities making them unemployable, are in need of financial assistance. It would deprive them of the dignity of claiming such assistance as a gratuity from a government which they had well served.

Thus, if you want a blueprint for creating mischief, we can think of no better means than to adopt a national policy that would attempt to make social security serve the very different function of veterans' pensions.

The Bradley Commission professes that there is at present an overlap or conflict between veterans' pensions and social security. It does not pinpoint any such overlap or conflict beyond these general terms.

What is the relation between the two? The fact is that social-security benefits bear neither more nor less relation to veterans' pensions than any other income a veteran may receive. Social-security benefits are so much money in the veterans' pocket. The money is no different from money he may re-

ceive as pay for working, as dividends from stocks, as retirement pay from an employer or as proceeds from an annuity. Any conflict or overlap between the pension program and the social-security program can be no different from any conflict or overlap created by any other income which the veteran may receive.

Is there an overlap or conflict between any of these sources of income and the pension program? It is almost tragic that the Bradley Commission is unaware that by long-established law, an overlap that it conceives to exist does not exist at all. Except for the Spanish War veterans, who would never come under any of the proposals of the Bradley Commission, one of the conditions which a veteran must meet today in order to qualify for a pension is that his income from other sources must meet a needs measure, prescribed by establishing levels of other income which—if the veteran is over them—will disbar him from receipt of a pension.

Thus, all income which a veteran may receive is now, and has been for some time, considered to contain the germs of overlap or conflict with the pension program. The overlap was removed by laws which are today, and have long been, part of the existing veterans' pension legislation. Social security benefits are, under today's law, included in that income which would disbar a veteran from a pension if it contributes to raising his nonpension income above the income levels stated in the law. It is this automatic check that prevents any overlap which appears to be utterly unknown to every spokesman of Government agencies and every adviser to the President who professes that there is conflict between social security and the veterans' pension program.

Believe it or not, on page 18 of its report, the Bradley Commission recommends a change in the law by which the receipt of social-security benefits would be considered as income that would count in determining a veteran's need, for pension purposes.

It is not funny that a distinguished commission proposes that the law be changed to make it what it already is.

Summing up this preposterous mess of argument over nothing, the factual approach so strongly urged by the Bradley Commission yields just this:

1. Social security cannot be made to serve as a veterans' pension program without doing mischief to both programs.

2. The only possibility of an overlap or conflict between the veterans' pension program and any source of other income including social security benefits has long been properly taken care of by provisions of the veterans' pension laws.

Your special committee can report very briefly regarding this matter of social security.

First, the committee warns that the argument repeated by the Bradley committee will continue to be used—in the same specious form as in the past—in the hope that more and more repetition will persuade more and more people—so that this pure figment of a hard-working brain on a predesigned project of the Bureau of the Budget may create a chink in the armor of veterandom through the "big lie" technique.

Second, your committee advises that when the day comes that social security provides security to war veterans sufficient to replace veterans' pensions, that will be taken care of automatically. When social security benefits actually do that, such assistance which will carry all veterans over the income ceilings prescribed in the present pension laws will make itself known by the workings of the present law. On that day, the Veterans' Administration will report that it is paying no pensions, because other programs have carried every living veterans' income over the needs ceilings defined in the pension laws. According to the figures of the Veterans' Administration, that condition has not arrived yet, in spite of the apparent belief of the Bradley Commission and others that it has.

(c) *Has the program of disability, rehabilitation, and readjustment benefits been reasonably effective in serving the legitimate needs of the qualified veteran?*

Primarily, the Bradley Commission approves of the program of disability, rehabilitation, and readjustment benefits which has been developed for the American veteran. It finds that we have developed reasonably successful methods for meeting the needs of our veterans. It asserts that the service-connected needs should be accorded the highest priority among the special programs for veterans and that service-connected compensation and death benefits should be liberal and even generous. It further states that the rehabilitation of disabled veterans and their reintegration into useful economic and social life should be our primary objective.

We cannot and do not take exception to such laudatory and sound statements. Nonetheless, we do have serious questions regarding the approach which the Bradley Commission employs toward the problem of improving the services which are offered to the service-connected class of veterans and to the rehabilitation and readjustment phases of the veterans' program.

We, of the American Legion, would certainly be the first to concede that none of these programs are perfect. We recognize now, and have recognized throughout the course of our existence, that there is constant need for change. We cannot concur, however, in some of the radical, unrealistic and ridiculous suggestions adopted by the Bradley Commission.

1. Presumptions

As illustrative of the type of improvement which the Bradley Commission suggests, and of the viciousness of it, we mention its recommendation that the presumption of service-connection for chronic diseases, tropical diseases, psychoses, tuberculosis and multiple sclerosis should be withdrawn. The Bradley Commission goes even further and states that there is otherwise in the law sufficient protection for the veteran to establish service connection of any and all diseases, and that accepted medical principles can reasonably and accurately establish the onset of a disease and the disability process.

It is apparent from a recommendation such as this that, while the Bradley Commission pays lip service to the duty owed to the service-connected, it would destroy the ability of large numbers to establish service-connection. It has a vastly overrated regard for the extent of medical knowledge. It credits the field of medicine with an omniscience which most doctors wish that they possessed.

Then the Bradley Commission compounds this offense by completely disregarding the fact that the question is not entirely a medical one. It is also in part a legal one. The purpose of a presumption is to free the veteran from carrying an unconscionable burden of proof in the establishment of the service-connected origin of a disease or a disability. As a part of the theory that the veteran should be given the benefit of the doubt, the principle behind the granting of a presumption says to the American veteran that it would be unfair in some cases to require him to prove medically that a given disease or disability did in fact have its inception during the course of his service, or resulted directly from that service. It states in substance that, in those instances in which it would be unfair to impose such a burden upon him, he is entitled to a presumption that the disease or disability did emanate from his service. This is a rebuttable presumption. It imposes upon the Government the burden of going forward with the evidence. It enables the Government, if medical knowledge is what the Bradley Commission says that it is, to rebut the presumption and to deny the veteran his service-connected status.

It is the opinion of this special committee that until American medicine has reached a point where it can determine with more than a reasonable degree of accuracy whether in fact certain types of diseases did or did not have their inception during the course of a man's service, the veteran should be entitled, in the areas of doubt now listed, to the presumption that his disease or disability, within reasonable periods now or to be specified, was a result of his service. Even if medical knowledge ever reaches the point where it can definitely establish the onset of a disease, there would still be no vice in continuing the presumption so long as we made it a rebuttable presumption. The knowledge that would eliminate the necessity of a presumption in favor of a veteran would also enable the Government to rebut the presumption.

The inclination of the Bradley Commission to reach absurd results at the expense of the veteran makes many of its recommendations suspect and belies its announced motives.

2. Rating Schedule

The Bradley Commission is dissatisfied with the present rating schedule. We of the American Legion are also dissatisfied in some particulars with the rating schedule. As a matter of fact our rehabilitation commission has for a considerable period of time constantly suggested changes in the rating schedule and is now ready, when the time comes, to suggest specific improvements in connection with it.

We do not object to a review of the rating schedule, nor to a revision of it. However, we want to know, with more than a reasonable degree of certainty, the basis upon which the review is going to be conducted, and the basis upon which revisions are going to be made.

Our present rating schedule is founded upon the theory of the average impairment of earning capacity. We all acknowledge that, as an average, it is not an absolute guide in the individual case, but we also know from our experience that we cannot administer any program which is geared solely to the individual case. So we have accepted the best standard we were able to find.

The Bradley Commission, by its research and in some of its charts, has established that, for the most part, the average-impairment-of-earninng-capactiy theory has done a remarkably wonderful job. The Bradley Commission's charts show that in most categories of disability the amount of disability compensation drawn by the disabled veteran—when added to the amount which he is able to earn from whatever job he holds—is remarkably close to the average annual income of the nondisabled veteran. It is apparent, therefore, that the average-impairment theory has been a reasonably successful standard.

The Bradley Commission is concerned, however, with the establishment of other factors which might be worked into a rating schedule. It is concerned with compensating a veteran for pain and suffering, for social inconvenience, for the increased mortality, and so forth. If the Bradley Commission wants to add a figure which will take into account these factors, in addition to the figure established to compensate the veteran on the basis of the average impairment of his earning capacity, we certainly would have no objections to such a review. However, we do not dignify even the average-impairment theory by calling

it a scientific formula. It is merely a guide. It is one of the best guides that could be worked out under all circumstances. We would not want to have the Bradley Commission or anyone else think that you could reduce either the impairment of a man's earning capacity, or an evaluation of his pain and suffering, or his social inconvenience, or his increased mortality to a final and absolute and completely compensatory formula. We believe that such an approach is highly egotistical. We are willing and anxious to have the service-conected disabled veteran compensated further than he is now, but we caution against leading the American public to believe that this is being done in accordance with an absolute, compensatory formula.

Nonetheless, we believe that a new rating schedule should be promulgated. It has been 10 years since the promulgation of the 1945 schedule. The comments and disability evaluations contained in the present schedule represent the consensus of medical opinion of a period sometime prior to 1945. The nine extensions to the 1945 schedule have led to some confusion and have made the use of the present rating schedule unwieldy, thereby decreasing its efficiency and accuracy, and there are other contemplated changes which, if incorporated into further extensions of the 1945 schedule, will further complicate that schedule.

It is our belief that a new rating schedule could be made to represent the sum total of medical and technical knowledge of the Veterans' Administration, the major veterans' organizations, and the medical profession acquired in the years since 1945—all of which would tend to produce evaluations that would be more compatible with present medical knowledge and experience.

3. Ten-Percent and Twenty-Percent Ratings

Perhaps no area of the Bradley Commission's report more glaringly demonstrates duplicity and factual inaccuracy than the section on 10 percent and 20 percent disability ratings.

First of all, the Bradley Commission is shocked by the fact that there are over a million veterans in this disability area. The Bradley Commission now finds it wrong that there should be so many such veterans, and because of their numbers proposes to eliminate them.

The Bradley Commission attributes the large number of awards in this area, in part, to the alleged fact that there is a requirement that no future examinations are scheduled once the veteran's disability reaches the prescribed minimum rating for his condition. This is a flagrant misstatement of the Veterans' Administration's requirements. On this erroneous basis, it proposes to meet its commitment to deal liberally, even generously with these service-connected cases by reducing or destroying the entitlement of the largest single group of disabled veterans. It questions but does not refute the medical soundness of these ratings and then proposes to settle these so-called medically unsound ratings by an immediate outlay of money. In other words, it wants to buy off claims which it thinks are invalid even though many of the 10 percent or 20 percent disability ratings today can turn into the 100 percent service-connected disability ratings tomorrow.

The Bradley Commission's treatment of this sensitive and important segment of disabilities is confused, distorted, inconclusive, and unconvincing; even so, it is presumptuous enough to ask the Congress to buy this package, the contents of which are not known even by the Commission.

4. Statutory Awards

The Bradley Commission is apparently deeply disturbed over the existence of statutory awards. It has recommended in substance that consideration should be given to incorporating statutory awards within a comprehensive rating scale that will encompass economic, physical, life-impairment and other factors.

Your special committee is inclined to wonder whether the Bradley Commission gave any attention whatever to the development of statutory awards. Statutory awards were a part of the American scene as early as July 1864. From a historical standpoint it can be said, therefore, that the Congress of the United States has, for almost a century, recognized and shown concern for the problems of those who have lost their limbs, or their ability to see, or who are otherwise seriously disabled.

This solicitude has been outwardly manifested by successive Congresses through the passage of laws designed to benefit the group under discussion. A study of the history of statutory awards will reveal that the Congress has long been of the opinion that the same criteria cannot be employed in evaluating the disabilities of the group which is the subject of statutory awards as that employed in evaluating the disabilities of those less obviously disabled.

We cannot understand what objection the Bradley Commission has to the exercise by the Congress of a power which the Congress obviously has to legislate certain so-called statutory awards. We must conclude that the Bradley Commission has 1 of 2 objectives in mind. Either it wants to save money by abolishing statutory awards, or it wants to tell the Congress how to legislate statutory awards, not by special legislation, but by incorporating them into a basis for a rating schedule. If the Commission's objective be the latter of these two, then the recommendation is senseless, because it would be condoning statutory awards in effect, but merely stating that they should be part of the rating schedule. It should make no difference to the Commission how the Congress accomplishes its legislative purpose. We are driven therefore to the conclusion that the Commission has in mind the ultimate abolition of these additional awards which the Congress has always thought to be meritorious.

This is merely another instance where the words of the Bradley Commission tend to cover up what must obviously be its real motives.

5. Education, Training, and Readjustment Programs

As to education and training programs and readjustment assistance programs, the Bradley Commission seems to be of the opinion that they have been properly devised and used; that they must be recognized as the best way of discharging the Government's obligation to the nondisabled; and that such programs not only benefit the veterans, but contribute materially to the stability of the society in which they live.

We are, of course, inclined to agree with these general statements. We have long been aware that no piece of legislation, nor its administration, can be entirely perfect. We are aware of certain abuses which occurred under the GI bill, but we are also familiar with the fact most of the possibilities of abuse were cured when the time came for the enactment of a Korean GI bill. We, of the American Legion, have every reason to be proud, first of all of our leadership in the establishment of the original GI bill and of our further leadership in supporting the Congress in correcting abuses which have arisen under it in time to incorporate those corrections in the Korean GI bill.

We are even now suggesting additional improvements in connection with the administration of these programs and have manifested our continuing concern and constructive contributions by various resolutions passed at our national conventions and by legislation now pending before the Congress of the United States.

We are not persuaded, however, that the Bradley Commission is completely in accord with the proposition that these education and training programs and readjustment assistance programs are primarily the function and the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration. We detect in certain of the recommendations of the Bradley Commission an effort to disestablish some of these programs from the Veterans' Administration and to turn the administration of those programs over to other agencies. We are deeply disturbed by any such effort on the part of the Bradley Commission or any other agency of Government. We have fought too long and too hard for the establishment of a separate Veterans' Administration and for the establishment of the concept that the affairs of the veteran should be treated as a separate entity by a special branch of government.

As illustrative of the type of encroachments which we believe the Bradley Commission would make upon the integrity of the veterans' program, we refer to its attitude toward the housing problem.

It is well known that the American Legion has asked for an extension of the home-loan guaranty program from its expiration date in 1957 to 1960. We are aware that this was necessarily a program which was slow in starting. Now that the veteran has had an opportunity to establish himself in the community and to take up the reins of his profession or business, he is in a better position to consider taking advantage of the assistance offered by that program. This will have a tendency to result in confusion created by the considerable influx of veterans' applications for home loans immediately before the expiration date of the benefits. We believe, therefore, that the program should be extended.

The Bradley Commission, however, speaks of phasing out the program by merging it into FHA. This is the same general attitude as was adopted by the Hoover Commission, it would tend to destroy the integrity of veterans' housing; it would eliminate an important function being performed by the Veterans' Administration; and it would not be in the best interest of the American veteran. The ultimate effect would be to destroy the entire concept of veterans' housing. The immediate effect would be to place the veteran in competition with the nonveteran for housing. It was exactly this which the original act was intended to forestall.

This type of proposal and those constituting a wholesale attack on veterans preference and other proposals which would eliminate or curtail veterans' benefits make the Bradley Commission's entire report suspect. Words of praise are so frequently followed in the report by suggestions which would dismember and destroy the veterans' program.

(d) Has the Veterans' Administration been reasonably successful in the performance of the functions for which it was created?

On this question, the Bradley Commission concludes that, on the whole, a reasonably effective job has been done by Veterans' Administration in furnishing veterans with the benefits intended by Congress.

We are in accord with this general conclusion.

The Bradley Commission is concerned, however, with clarifying the mission of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reflect his positive responsibility for the comprehensive analysis of program and long-range policy development, including the function of advising the President. The Bradley Commission suggests further that the Administrator's personal staff should be augmented to include the highest caliber of professional advisors in such fields as economics, statistics, public administration, and sociology. The Bradley Commission further recommends that the research and statistical re-

sources of the Veterans' Administration departments should be strengthened. It suggests that serious consideration be given to making the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs a member of the Cabinet, and that, in any event, the President should establish a Cabinet subcommittee on veterans' affairs, with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs as a special member.

Your special committee cannot object to proposals such as these. We are aware, of course, that such professional personnel as have been suggested may possibly, with charts and graphs and statistics and statistical projections, submerge the Administrator and overburden him with that type of detail which is so dear to the heart of the average governmental researcher and statistician. Nonetheless, a reasonably strong Administrator of Veterans' Affairs should certainly be able to discharge more fully his obligation to the veteran and to the country by a proper analysis of the material which could be prepared for him and upon the basis of which he could provide a greater degree of leadership in the field of veterans' affairs than he now does. In this connecton, we would suggest that no real leadership in the field of veterans' affairs is possible until the complete dominance of the Administrator by the Bureau of the Budget is relieved.

There are other suggestions made by the Bradley Commission in connection with the office of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. One of these is that an additional limitation should be placed on his authority by more precise requirements and definitions and that the rules to be promulgated by him in large matters affecting and eligibility of veterans for benefits or involving changes in program objectives should be made subject to advance notice to and advance review by appropriate agencies of the Government.

So long as such a recommendation does not interfere unduly with such independence as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has been able to salvage, we would see no serious objection to the recommendation. As a practical proposition, any reasonably responsible Administrator would in all probability make it a point to discuss his major objectives with responsible officials in other areas of the Government which might be affected by one of his pronouncements. However, we would strenuously object to the elimination of the authority of the Administrator by making him subservient to, or dependent upon, the approval of other agencies of Government prior to taking a proper action in the field that is exclusively within his own domain. If we were to condone any such result as that, we would in effect, be depriving the Veterans' Administrator of all of his functions and turning those functions over to other agencies of Government. This has never been, and is not now, the intention of the American Legion or of any major and responsible veterans' group. We have fought too long and too hard for the establishment of a separate department to be concerned with veterans affairs now to abandon that concept and turn it back to the same confusion from which it was once salvaged.

The Bradley Commission also suggests the establishment of a central administrative review, without affecting the ultimate finality of decisions by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Your committee sees no great vice in the establishment of such a central administrative review. It is true that it might well result in a standardization of decisions in different sections of the country. It is an additional expense; it is an additional step in the prosecution of a veteran's claim. We suggest that such problems as have developed might be just as ably handled by the present Board of Veterans' Appeals.

Finally, the Bradley Commission suggests that the laws affecting veterans should be codified and that in that process of codification, emphasis should be placed on simplification with mindfulness of the direct personal impact of the statutes, and that similar treatment should be given the related regulations.

Certainly, your special committee has no objection to making veterans laws and regulations more simple in language and in clarifying and codifying those laws and regulations which govern such a large segment of our population. We warn however, that such a project of codification and simplification could easily be turned into the vehicle for the embodiment of such changes as have been suggested by the Bradley Commission. The House of Representatives recognized such a danger as we now point to and specifically provided in the bill which it recently passed that the codification which it authorized be not used to change existing law.

CONCLUSIONS

The Bradley Commission and its staff have labored mightily and expensively to bring down a very small bird. In spite of the presumed omniscience of the governmental employees of the staff of the Bradley Commission, we of your special committee are disposed to place the fate of the American veteran where it has always been—in the hands of the Congress of the United States. The Congress has developed and will continue to develop a clear national philosophy of veterans' benefits. It will continue to relate those benefits properly to the other areas of legislation with which the Congress concerns itself for the social betterment of all the people. It will insist upon protecting the veterans as a class to which it acknowledged, during periods of war, a special obligation. It will not abandon that special obligation by substituting for it, as suggested by the Bradley Commission, the opportunity to participate in social-security benefits which as citizens we are already entitled to do and for which, if we participate, we will have paid monetarily. It will continue to work effectively and constructively to take care of the demonstrated needs of the disabled veteran. It will protect him from overly egotistical individuals who would misrepresent the breadth of medical knowledge and destroy the veterans' capacity to obtain the benefit of presumptions in establishing his service-connection. It will protect its right to concern itself with special classes of disabilities which it believes may best be handled by the use of statutory awards. It will preserve the integrity of the rehabilitation and readjustment benefit programs, protecting them against absorption by agencies of Government which believe that the veteran is owed no special obligation and which would seek to build little empires of their own at the expense of the best administration of the veterans' program.

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, if a courageous and independent individual, will be able to administer the program that the Congress has defined for him, recognizing that he is a member of the executive branch of the Government and having due respect for the remaining members of the executive branch of the Government and the programs which they administer.

We must reluctantly conclude that the Bradley Commission, in its report, has demonstrated that it bears close resemblance to the previous Hoover Commission. It is another step in a little understood effort to represent the veteran as the creator of large problems adversely affecting the rest of America, who must be chastened, reduced in dignity, and made to forget that at one time he was assured of the gratitude, respect, and continuing regard of all.

We do not know how many dollars have been spent in these efforts to diminish the statue of the American veteran, but whatever dollars have been spent have been wasted. We suggest that the time has now come to stop these senseless investigations of the same subject over and over again. The Congress is a capable body, aware of its legislative enactments in their entirety. It is accountable to the people. It is aware that many of those people who elect it and support it are veterans to whom pledges were made and will not be broken.

The American Council for Judaism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the New York Board of Rabbis is an association of Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform Rabbis in New York and vicinity.

It represents Judaism, protects religious rights of Jews, encourages Jewish education and philanthropy, and is a force for civic betterment. It conducts a chaplaincy program in 160 hospitals, prisons, mental institutions, youth shelters, and homes for the aged, ministering annually to 250,000 men, women, and children.

On Sunday, May 6, it issued a release, as follows:

ONE THOUSAND THREE HUNDRED RABBIS DENOUNCE COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM—JOINT DECLARATION OF RABBIS OF THREE BRANCHES OF JUDAISM CHARGE ANTI-ZIONIST GROUP WITH DISTORTING PRECEPTS OF JUDAISM—SCORE GROUP FOR ATTACKS UPON U. J. A. AND ISRAEL BONDS—ACCUSE COUNCIL OF MISREPRESENTING THE JEWISH PEOPLE BEFORE BAR OF PUBLIC OPINION

NEW YORK.—One thousand three hundred Rabbis representing all three branches of American Judiasm—Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform—in a joint declaration issued today, denounced the American Council for Judaism, asserting that this group has "consistently misrepresented the Jewish people before the bar of public opinion." The Rabbis also charged that the American Council of Judaism "has consistently maligned and impugned the integrity of Jewish institutions, organizations, and causes, and has consistently distorted the precepts of Judaism which it purports to serve."

This declaration and the names of the signatories were made public today by Rabbi Emanuel Rackman, president of the New York Board of Rabbis which had circulated the statement in the wake of attacks made upon Israel and Zionism by the American Council for Judaism at its convention in Chicago last week.

The joint declaration severely reprimanded the anti-Zionist organization for what it termed "slanders" against American Jews "who adhere to the ideals of Zionism," and also charged the council as being "neither American nor Jewish in spirit or in concept."

Although many individual American rabbis and rabbinic organizations have assailed the American Council for Judaism in the past, this is the first time that so large a segment of the American rabbinate has united in a public declaration of such severe criticism against the organization. It was issued, the rabbis said, "only after search-

ing our conscience," and with the realization of "the full implication of our words."

The declaration also dealt with the council's attacks on the national fund-raising institutions in behalf of Israel in this country. "We view with contempt the council's attempt to dissuade Americans from helping their fellow Jews and the State of Israel through contributions to the United Jewish Appeal and the Israel bond drive," the rabbis stressed in their declaration, adding: "If the council is unwilling to aid in the rescue and rehabilitation of harassed Jews, let it at least not frustrate the efforts of those who would."

Concerning the council's professed brand and interpretation of Judaism, the declaration stated:

"We assert that the council is neither American nor Jewish in spirit or in concept. We call the attention of the American public to the fact that this group represents numerically an infinitesimal fraction of American Jewry. It has been repeatedly repudiated by the great Orthodox, Conservative and Reform communities in Jewish religious life. It has been repudiated by all major Jewish organizations.

"Judaism, we believe, has sufficient breadth and depth to embrace a wide range of varied points of view, but we declare that there is no room in Jewish life for Jews whose words and acts would result in the destruction of the State of Israel and in incalculable harm to the Jewish people."

The signatory rabbis further served notice that "as loyal Americans interested in the survival of a dynamic democracy in a backward part of the world, we, the undersigned, will not be deterred from speaking up on behalf of Israel or of any other nation when we feel that principles of justice and morality have been violated."

The declaration further emphasized that "in doing so, we are in the mainstream of the finest American tradition. We will not be deflected from exercising this right by a small minority, however vociferous, that finds evil in the honest expression of this anxiety."

Asserting that the council's "real goal is the complete disappearance of the Jewish people," the declaration charged that "in pursuit of this aim the council not only attacks Judaism but America herself."

The declaration concluded:

"For in its incessant drive for soulless conformity, in its hysterical compulsion to efface what is distinctively Jewish from Judaism and what is permanent in the people of Israel, the council seeks a monolithic America in which all cultural and spiritual variations are obliterated. This drive, which stems from insecurity and tragic self-hatred, does as great an injustice to America as it does to Judaism."

Following is the full text of the declaration issued by the American rabbis, as referred to in the release:

STATEMENT ISSUED BY AMERICAN RABBIS

We, the undersigned, members of the American rabbinate, wish to make the following observations with respect to the organization known as the American Council for Judaism. We do so with reluctance, and only after searching our conscience: but we do so in the conviction that we would be derelict in our high duty in the calling we follow if we failed to make the truth known.

Realizing the full implication of our words, we state unequivocally that the American Council for Judaism has consistently misrepresented the Jewish people before the bar of public opinion; it has consistently maligned and impugned the integrity of Jewish institutions, organizations, and causes; and it has consistently distorted the precepts of Judaism which it purports to serve.

We assert that the council is neither American nor Jewish in spirit or in concept. We call the attention of the American public to the fact that this group represents numerically an infinitesimal fraction of American Jewry. It has been repeatedly repudiated by the great Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform communities in Jewish religious life. It has been repudiated by all major Jewish organizations.

Judaism, we believe, has sufficient breadth and depth to embrace a wide range of varied points of view, but we declare that there is no room in Jewish life for Jews whose words and acts would result in the destruction of the State of Israel and in incalculable harm to the Jewish people.

Most reprehensible of all the council's slanders is the charge that American Jews who adhere to the ideals of Zionism are guilty of "dual loyalty." This is a lie which has long been the tool of anti-Semites; with contempt we see it revived today by those who call themselves Jews. It is not difficult to understand why the American Council for Judaism has received commendation for this vilification from Gerald L. K. Smith, Conde McGinley, Merwin K. Hart and others long identified with anti-Semitic movements in America. Every fair-minded American knows that American Jews have but one political allegiance—and that is to the United States.

As loyal Americans interested in the survival of a dynamic democracy in a backward part of the world, we, the undersigned, will not be deterred from speaking up on behalf of Israel or of any other nation when we feel that principles of justice and morality have been violated. In doing so we are in the mainstream of the finest American tradition. We will not be deflected from exercising this right by a small minority, however, vociferous, that finds evil in the honest expression of this anxiety.

We view with contempt the Council's attempt to dissuade Americans from helping their fellow Jews and the State of Israel through contributions to the United Jewish Appeal and the Israel Bond Drive. If the Council is unwilling to aid in the rescue and rehabilitation of harassed Jews, let it at least not frustrate the efforts of those who would.

As religious leaders, we cannot find in the Council's activities or in its statements, any indication that it really represents Judaism. The Council's philosophy is one of complete negation: it denies the existence of the Jewish people, rejects traditional Jewish religious ceremonies, the Hebrew language, and Zion itself.

The council's real goal is the complete disappearance of the Jewish people. In pursuit of this aim the Council not only attacks Judaism but America itself. For in its incessant drive for soulless "conformity", in its hysterical compulsion to efface what is distinctively Jewish from Judiasm and what is permanent in the people of Israel, the Council seeks a monolithic America in which all cultural and spiritual variations are obliterated. This drive, which stems from insecurity and tragic self-hatred, does as great an injustice to America as it does to Judaism.

I am not burdening the RECORD with the full names and residences of each of the signatories but I have on file in my office the complete list of the 1,300 rabbis who signed the statement. I shall be happy to make it available to any Member who is interested. These rabbis reside in cities and States from one end of our country to the other.

A New England Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I insert an article that appeared on the editorial page of the May 3 issue of the Houlton Pioneer Times, a weekly newspaper in my congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, all of New England has been disheartened by the unfavorable decision rendered by the Civil Aeronautics Administration with regard to the petition of the Northeast Airlines to extend its services south from New York to Florida.

The Northeast Airlines has appealed for a reversal of the negative decision, believing that the examiner was not keenly conscious or adequately appraising of certain beneficial factors in Northeast Airline's favor.

All of New England and all of Maine are ardently hopeful that this adverse decision will be reversed, thereby granting to Northeast Airlines the opportunity of extending its services to a greater number of our American communities.

The newspaper article follows:

A NEW ENGLAND ISSUE

The entire New England State area has an interest and a concern in the outcome of the appeal made by Northeast Airlines to have set aside the adverse decision of a CAA examiner on its petition to extend its service southward from its present New York City terminus, to Miami, Fla., and to substitute therefor affirmative action on its original application.

This interest and concern has nothing to do with any bias in favor of air carriers as opposed to other means of transportation. Rather, it should be, in our judgment, construed as an objection to what appears very much like discrimination against the New England States. Most of us will now agree that airlines, as a factor in the transportation of humans as well as freight, are here to stay.

Northeast is the only airline that serves all of New England. As such, its successful operation and the reasonable expansion of its services can have a considerable influence on the economy of this area as well as being incidental to the normal industrial and commercial progress of these six States.

One of the exhibits which might well have been given more consideration than it apparently was was the fact that Northeast, of all the airlines petitioning for the Florida run, was the only line which had ordered a large fleet of airplanes especially for use on this extended run. This should have been taken as convincing evidence of the determination of the carrier to give the utmost in service to its patrons and its willingness to back up its confidence to compete successfully, with the investment of a staggering number of dollars.

The seasonal factor was another sound argument which seemingly received little attention. Northeast operates on a peak schedule basis during the summer months but its loads per plane are considerably smaller in the winter season. Extension of

its lines to Florida would have enabled the line to achieve greater operating stability by being able to shift planes from southern runs to northern runs, and vice versa, when the demands of the season dictated. The effect on net earnings of such an arrangement is obvious.

As we understand it, Northeast, like many other airlines, is the recipient of substantial Government subsidy, probably through mail contracts. Its limited operation thus far has made this necessary in order to maintain its service in its area of origin. If it continues to be confined to that same area, it is evident that subsidy will also have to be maintained. However, it is reliably reported that the extension of its line to Florida might be expected to make a material difference in its overall financial picture, with the result that the subsidy might possibly not be needed.

There were many other angles to the appeal which it is hoped will induce the entire CAA board to reverse the decision of its examiner and award the franchise to Northeast who, in our opinion, of all the petitioning carriers, made out a stronger case. This, of course, in addition to the normal desire to see New England fairly treated and not either bypassed or ignored.

Annual Pilgrimage to Old Stone Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, 350 years ago this year, a little band of pioneers set said from Blackwall, England, in three small sailing ships, the *Susan Constant*, the *Godspeed*, and the *Discovery*. These are the people who, after a harrowing, 5-month-long journey, landed in what was later known as Jamestown in the sovereign State of Virgina—my State.

Across the river there was later established the little town of Smithfield, a pioneer in another notable way, in the production of unique food products which have become famous the wideworld over.

And this month, the month of May, is the time of the annual pilgrimage to Smithfield for the benefit of the Old Stone Church in Smithfield, St. Luke's Church, the oldest known church still in existence. This old church was first built in 1632, a year before the first record of the settlement as a port for tobacco export, 120 years before the formal establishment of Smithfield as a town in 1752.

An important part of this annual pilgrimage in honor of olden times, is the serving of famous, unique Smithfield ham sandwiches. No other spot in the country can produce Smithfield hams. They have been shipped overseas for about 200 years. There is, on record, an invoice for the year 1779 for hams shipped to the West Indies. And one for the 19th century for ham shipped to Her Majesty, Queen Victoria.

But, gentlemen, there is another unique food product which originated in this colonial settlement, that is the now-popular barbecue. Yes, gentlemen, though other parts of this great country claim the barbecue, the Encyclopedia Americana will tell you that the word was in use in Virginia prior to 1700. It further states that the institution of the barbecue is of southern origin. And in a cookbook from Colonial Virginia, printed in 1742, there is a recipe marked "old recipe from Toano, Va.," for "barbecued squirrel."

Now, when we are marking with due respect the establishment of the colony at Jamestown, the building of a church at Smithfield, the development of the famous Smithfield ham, I believe that we should, at the same time, honor the pioneers who first prepared meat in a savory sauce by open-kettle simmering, even as it is still done today in Smithfield, Va. For the barbecue, one of this age's most delicious heritages, is but one more of the wonderful gifts handed down to us by those valiant pioneers of two centuries and more ago.

Charles Cotesworth Pinckney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herewith a treatise on the distinguished South Carolinian, Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, one of the coauthors of the Constitution.

This thesis was prepared by Miss Martha Richards Robeson, daughter of our distinguished colleague, EDWARD J. ROBESON, JR., and was her term paper at William and Mary College.

Miss Robeson has done a commendable piece of work on this famous South Carolinian. Her paper demonstrates excellent research and excellent factual information on this great American:

CHARLES COTESWORTH PINCKNEY

"My heart is altogether American, and neither severity nor favor nor poverty nor affluence can ever induce me to swerve from it." [1]

On the 25th day of February 1746, in Charleston, S. C., an aristocrat was born. Webster defines an aristocrat as "one who has the sympathies, habits, and temper of mind" common to the aristocracy, "those regarded as superior to the rest of the community as in rank, wealth, or intellect." [2] The aristocrat was Charles Cotesworth Pinckney who fulfilled this definition so completely that it might well have been written to describe him.

Born of a fine, old, established South Carolina family, Pinckney carried the spirit and ideals of Southern aristocracy with him throughout his life. His father, Charles Pinckney, was prominent in colonial affairs during his lifetime, and at one time was chief justice of the province in which Pinckney was born. His mother, Elizabeth Lucas Pinckney, was a celebrated woman planter in her own right, having developed and promoted in her State the cultivation of indigo, a product which greatly enhanced South Carolina economy during the colonial period.

Footnotes at end of speech.

The Pinckneys could well afford to give their children the best of schooling. Charles Cotesworth Pinckney was educated at Westminster, at Oxford, and read law at Middle Temple in London. In 1769, he returned to Charleston to practice his profession, establishing his residence, "Belmont," at East Bay in Charleston. Although not a brilliant lawyer, Pinckney was "learned and essentially sound, possessed of some commonsense" [3] and had a large practice.

"He was of an imposing figure, genial, full of fun and humor, liberal in opinion, dependent and penetrating in his judgment of men and movements, universally trusted and admired, constantly engaged in public undertakings." [4]

These public undertakings consisted of a variety of political activities. The year of his establishment as a lawyer in Charleston, Pinckney was elected to the provincial assembly. In 1773, he was appointed acting attorney general for three areas in his State: Camden, Georgetown, and Cheraw. Two years later he was elected a member of the First South Carolina Provincial Congress, remaining a member of the lower house for 3 years. In 1779, after his election to the upper chamber of the legislature, he served as its president.

Perhaps the most important contribution that Pinckney made to his State, and the one to which he devoted himself the most energetically, was not in the field of politics but in that of the military. While serving in the Provincial Congress, Pinckney was a member of a special committee charged with local defense. In 1775, as a captain, he commanded the first regiment of South Carolina troops, and the next year he was made a colonel in the South Carolina militia. A short time afterward, he began his active participation in the Revolutionary War. Following his engagement in the defense of Fort Sullivan, Pinckney left his regiment and moved north to aid Washington at Brandywine and Germantown because of his eagerness for action when hostilities were temporarily ceased in the South. In 1778, again in command of his troops, he participated in the Florida campaign and in the siege of Savannah. During the attack on Charleston, Pinckney was in command of Fort Moultrie, and at the fall of the city he was captured. While a prisoner of war for 2 years in Philadelphia, from 1780–82, certain British officers sought to detach him from the colonial cause. To them he gave memorable answers attesting his loyalty:

"If I had a drop of blood that could flow dishonorably, I myself would let it out.

"If I had a vein that did not beat with the love of my country, I myself would open it." [5]

Although these statements seem today to be rather effusive and perhaps a trifle vain, there can be no doubt that they mirror the intense devotion of a man proud to serve his country.

When Pinckney was released in 1782, he was commissioned a brigadier general. Fifteen years later, when the stress of feeling produced by the revelation of the famous XYZ affair seemed to indicate that preparations should be made for war, Washington selected Pinckney for the rank of major general. Washington had hesitated at length in giving Pinckney a lower rank than Hamilton because of the former's place and influence in the South.[6] When his attention was called to the fact, Pinckney turned to Hamilton and said this:

"Let us first dispose of our enemies. We shall then have time to settle the question of precedent." [7]

Pinckney was primarily a soldier, but he was not limited to rendering military service only. John Danvers has observed in a

Footnotes at end of speech.

pamphlet on this man that he was "a soldier, statesman, and friend of his country." [8] In 1788, Charles Cotesworth Pinckney journeyed from South Carolina to Philadelphia to assume the duties of a delegate to the Constitutional Convention.

"Having aided in the establishment of our independence, he was appointed one of the convention for forming a constitution for the government of the Union, and there distinguished himself by a strenuous support of that constitution." [9]

The attitudes that Pinckney evidenced at the Convention were rooted in his ancestry, his environment, his training and experience. He was dedicated to the support of these principles which he believed were for the best interests of the people of the new Nation and particularly the people of his State and other States sharing the same problems that faced South Carolina. He was described by an observer at the Convention in the following manner:

"Charles Cotesworth Pinckney is a gentleman of family and fortune in his own State. He has received the advantage of a liberal education, and possesses a very extensive degree of knowledge. When warm in a debate, he sometimes speaks well, but he generally is consideerd an efficient orator. Mr. Pinckney was an officer of high rank in the Army, and served with great reputation through the war. He is now about 40 years of age." [10]

At the Convention, Pinckney was known as General Pinckney, since he held the rank, in order to distinguish him from a younger cousin bearing the same first and last names, also a delegate from South Carolina. Because of his interest and experience in military affairs, he embraced definite ideas on the manner in which the military department of the new Government should be organized and administered. Even though he joined delegates from other States in desiring that the individual States retain a large share of power, Pinckney was firmly convinced that there were certain spheres of authority which should rest solely with the supreme government. The military was one of these. Pinckney believed that the States would never keep up a proper discipline of the military and it was essential, because of this, to place the entire control in the National Government. "For a part to be under the general and a part under the State governments would be an incurable evil." [11] He, therefore, thoroughly agreed with George Mason who presented a motion for "a power to regulate the militia," [12] for he thought it necessary to give the direction of the militia to the responsibility of the general government. In proving that uniformity was essential, he cited several instances during the Revolutionary War in which dissimilarities in the militia of various States produced serious difficulties.[13] Pinckney was appointed a member of the grand committee to consider Mason's motion on the subject of the regulation of the military forces, which committee decided to give the general government the power of regulation.

A zealous member of the Church of England, Pinckney was, however, aware of the prejudice and danger to the political institutions of the country that a religious qualification for office could produce. He secured the insertion of the clause in the Constitution stating that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." [14]

Two serious debates in the Constitutional Convention centered around the slaves of the South. Pinckney, as an aristocrat, born and raised in this area of the country, keenly perceived the significance of the place of the southern slave. The time and effort spent by the people of the South in training the slave race, the immeasurable value of the slave to southern economy, the worth of the slave as property—these Pinckney recognized as matters that must be protected if the Constitution were to receive any measure of support from the delegates of those States involved. Pinckney, himself, for example was not satisfied with the provision for "privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States." He appeared to lean toward the position that some provision should be included in favor of property in slaves.[15] Consequently, one of the most prominent stands that Pinckney assumed at the convention was that which he took in regard to the slavery issue.

He declared it to be his firm belief that, if he and his colleagues from other Southern States were to sign the Constitution, and in order to secure its approval, support it in their respective States, the problem of slaves must be seriously studied. During the discussion of the importation of slaves, Pinckney stated his position in the following way:

"South Carolina and Georgia cannot do without slaves. As to Virginia, she will gain by stopping the importations. Her slaves will rise in value, and she has more than she wants. It would be unreasonable to require South Carolina and Georgia to confederate on such unequal terms." [16]

He continued his argument by contending that the importation of slaves would be for the interest of the Union as a whole. He proceeded to point out the economic importance of the continued importation and use of slaves:

"The more slaves, the more produce to employ the carrying trade; the more consumption also; and the more of this, the more revenue for the common treasury." [17]

Pinckney conceded that, to place a duty on slaves as on other imports, would be acceptable as reasonable. He made clear, however, that such action could be considered as an exclusion of South Carolina from the Union.[18] On the matter of Congress' right to control commerce, either interstate or foreign, Pinckney's views may be stated thusly, as found in the records of the convention.

"It was the true intention of the South to have no regulation of commerce; but considering the * * * interest the weak Southern States had in being united with strong Eastern States, he thought it proper that no fetters should be imposed on the power of making commercial regulation, and that his constituents, though prejudiced against the Eastern States before he came here, would acknowledge that he had found them as liberal and candid as any men whatever." [19]

When the commerce problem resolved around the sensitive subject of the importation of slaves, the debate became heated. The tension between the Southern States, attempting to preserve the institution of slavery, and the Northern States, in favor of abolishing it, grew. When the convention finally decided that the importation of slaves must be stopped, the date 1800 was selected as the year for the cessation of the slave trade. Pinckney, however, moved to strike out the words "the year 1800" as the year limiting the importation of slaves and suggested that "the year 1808" be inserted in its stead.[20] This 8-year extension allowed 20 years for the accomplishment of this purpose. "This was one of the most conspicuous and important compromises of the convention." [21] Although the Northern States had won a victory, the Southern States were more reconciled to the condition by the advantage of a few more years in which to reduce and finally stop the importations.

Pinckney's frank opinions on the subject and the part that he played in securing the compromise are summarized in the pamphlet about him, Picture of a Republican Magistrate of the New School, in an excellent manner:

"In the convention, he argued against any restriction upon the passing of navigation acts because of the liberal construction of the Eastern States toward the views of the Southern States.

"A few months later, in his State legislature, in answer to objections to the limitation of the slave trade to the year 1808, he explained:

" 'In short, considering all circumstances, we have made the best terms for the security of this species of property it was in our power to make. We would have made better if we could, but on the whole, I do not think them bad.' " [22]

The slave problem recurred during the heavy debate on representation. Pinckney, a confirmed States' righter, was joined by representatives from other States in pleading that the slaves be counted as whole persons when plans for the representation of the various States were being formulated. This was a useless plea because of the objection of many of the delegates to slavery as an institution, the jealousy of some of the Northern States of the southern economy based on the institution, and the passage by the convention of the law stopping the importation of slaves. For these reasons, a move to count the slaves in the manner that the slave-holding States wished was impossible. Pinckney proposed another compromise; according to this plan, three-fifths of the slave population would be counted for the purpose of apportioning representatives among the States. This three-fifths compromise was one of the most vital of those suggested at the convention. Although the desire of the South to protect its interest and realize the full protection of its slaves was defeated, this compromise did give some measure of consideration to this area while satisfying the other States.

During a discussion of representation and taxation based on representation, Governor Morris moved to add to a clause in the Constitution empowering the legislatures of the States to vary representation according to the principle of wealth and the numbers of inhabitants, a proviso that "the tax shall be in proportion to representation." [23] Pinckney was in favor of this idea and felt that it could not be justly objected to; however, he foresaw that the revision of the census, if left to the direction of the State legislatures, would never be carried into execution. "He thought that the rules must be fixed and the execution of them enforced by the Constitution." [24] In this instance, he desired an assertion by the National Government that this taxing could be controlled.

At another time, in order to safeguard the taxing powers of the Government, Pinckney made the following proposition: "That all duties, imports, excises, prohibitions, and restraints, laid on or made by the legislature of the United States, shall be uniform throughout the United States." [25]

Pinckney's views on taxation present a seeming contrast. Whereas in one instance he recommended control by the National Government, in another he hinted of a definite fear about too much control that might be exercised. He stated on the occasion that he was alarmed over what had been said the day before concerning the Negroes and the taxing of exports. He cited that South Carolina, in 1 year, had exported to the amount of 600,000 pounds of sterling, "all of which was the fruit of the labor of her blacks." [26] Advocating the insertion of a clause restraining the national legislature from taxing exports, Pinckney made a charge concerning his State's representation in relation to her exports and the taxing thereof:

"Will she be represented in proportion to that amount? She will not. Neither ought she be subject to a tax on it.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

"The rule of wealth ought to be ascertained and not left to the pleasure of the legislature and property in slaves should not be exposed to danger under governmental institutions." [27]

In the crisis of the Constitutional Convention caused by the struggle over representation, Pinckney's attitude again reflected his aristocratic background. "Whereas Madison and Mason championed election by the people, Gerry and the two Pinckneys were conspicuous in their support of election by the State legislatures." [28]

"An election of either branch by the people, scattered as they are in many States, particularly in South Carolina, would be totally impractical." [29]

He disagreed wholeheartedly with the delegates who thought that a choice by the people, rather than by the State legislatures, would be a better safeguard against bad measures. In order to prove his point, Pinckney cited a case in South Carolina where the people were notoriously for paper money as legal tender; however, the legislature had refused to concede to their wishes, the reason being that the legislature "had a deeper sense of character and greater wisdom, and thus were restrained." [30] He felt also that, if the legislatures were denied the privilege of electing the representatives of the States, they would be even more jealous of the National Government and more cautious in protecting their rights. If the States were granted this particular participation in the Government, the business of selecting their representatives, there would be more harmony between the States and the general Government.[31]

When a motion resolving that the members of the first branch be elected by the several States for a term of 3 years was before the convention, Pinckney moved that "instead of being elected by the people, the members should be elected in such a manner as the legislatures of the States should direct." [32] His reasons for this were concise:

"1. This liberty would give some satisfaction in that the State legislatures could then accommodate the mode to the convenience and opinions of the people.

"2. That it would avoid the undue influence of large comapnies, which would prevail if the elections were to be made in districted areas.

"3. Otherwise, disputed elections must be referred to the general Government which would be attended with intolerable expense and trouble." [33]

These opinions of Pinckney were based on his experience in the Government of his State, where he had gained a deep understanding of the feelings of the people of South Carolina.

Pinckney's second stand concerning representation concerned the members of the National legislature and centered around his opposition to payment of Senators. He moved to strike out the clause of a resolution calling for Senators "to receive fixed stipends by which they may be compensated for their services." [34] When it became evident, however, that this motion would not pass, Pinckney assumed the position that, if Senators were to be paid a salary, then the payment should be made by the State legislatures. Pinckney was attempting in this case to retain for the States a greater measure of control over their Senators, induce a greater responsibility on their part, and allow the State what he considered a fair share of power in the Federal scheme. Accordingly, Pinckney petitioned unsuccessfully for the passage of his motion, for he thought that, "if the Senate was to be appointed by the States, it ought, in pursuance of the same idea, to be paid by the States." [35]

Footnotes at end of speech.

Pinckney also proposed 4 years as a suitable term for Senators. He based his views upon this premise:

"A longer time would fix them at the seat of Government. They would acquire an interest there; perhaps transfer their principles and lose sight of the States they represent. Under these circumstances, the distant States would labor under great disadvantage." [36]

A greater evidence of Pinckney's fear of encroachment by the National Government upon the proper rights of the States evolved in his ideas on the motion to make members of the first branch of the national legislature ineligible for an office in a particular State. He moved to strike out this motion.

"He argued for the inconvenience to which such a restriction would expose both members of the first branch and the States wishing for their services.

"It would seem from the ideas of some that we are erecting a kingdom to be divided against itself." [37]

Concerning the selection of men for other high offices in the National Government, Pinckney's views caused him to urge landed property qualifications for the executive, judicial, and legislative department officials:

"The importance of the Federal judiciary would require men of the first talents; large salaries would be necessary, larger than the United States can afford in the first instance. Neither did he think that fixed salaries would answer the problem, for he doubted it would have either a good effect or a good appearance for new judges to come in with higher salaries than the old judges." [38]

Pinckney's whole attitude on the question of whether or not salaries should be paid to Federal officers reflects his aristocratic background. In the South of his day, as well as in the South of a hundred years later, it was the tradition for the wealthy to give freely of their time and abilities to the service of their community. They were well-born, well-bred, and well-educated. This group felt it was a duty to engage in public service. Confident that they were well-fitted to carry the burdens of this public service, the members of the aristocracy knew that they had the natural capacity and superior training necessary. Therefore, it was natural for Charles Cotesworth Pinckney to feel that the business of this new National Government, as established by this convention, should be delegated to men of that caliber, members of the aristocratic element in America, willing to freely serve to the best of their ability, prompted not by a desire for pecuniary reward, but by a profound interest in and a deep love for their country.

The most significant contribution of Pinckney during his entire participation in the Constitutional Convention was a move which may have preserved the convention and enabled us to be governed by the Constitution formulated by it. This move occurred during the heated debate over the Virginia and New Jersey plans which proposed two different methods of allotting representation among the several States.

Pinckney's conception of the Union was similar to the views held by other delegates whose sense of responsibility to their States was, of necessity, forced into a secondary position. As he remarked when stating his position on the payments of Senators, "I am for making the States as much as can be conveniently done a part of the general Government." [39] At one point, Pinckney even asked Edmund Randolph, who presented the Virginia plan, whether he meant "to abolish the State governments altogether." [40] The main differences were not so much produced by the delegates' wish to preserve State sovereignty completely, but by a fear that the

Footnotes at end of speech.

State would be completely destroyed, as Pinckney's query of Randolph indicated. Neither was it so much the large States versus the small States but it was the question of whether any State could be preserved in this national framework.

These were sentiments of men who jealously guarded the rights and privileges of their States. These were men who struggled to gain what they considered the best and for the people that they represented. And Charles Cotesworth Pinckney was one of them. Yet, when opposition became too strong to permit him, and other men sharing his views, to execute their desires, he sought to find the best possible education. When the entire document was finished, even though there were many parts of it which he did not wholly sanction, he bent every effort to support this Constitution which, he recognized, was, of necessity, a compromise for all. The record states that "he proposed that a committee from each State should be appointed to devise and report some compromise." [41]

Charles Cotesworth Pinckney is not regarded as one of the leaders of the Constitutional Convention. His contributions cannot be compared to those of Madison or Randolph, Wilson or Morris, but "when he spoke, it was with conviction, and what he said was listened to with respect." [42] It is significant to that Pinckney either propoesd or played a prominent part in securing the three chief compromises of the convention.

1. In the deliberation over the slave trade, he suggested the year 1808 as the year for the stoppage of the trade in order to allow a 20-year period after the writing of the Constitution.

2. In the crucial controversy over representation, he suggested the three-fifths plan, by which three-fifths of the slave population was counted for purposes of allotting representatives.

3. In the crisis of the convention, that of the problem of representation in the Congress, he prosed the great compromise, by which a way was found to combine the best points of the Virginia and New Jersey plans.

Without these compromises, the American Republic, as we know it today, would not have been possible.

"We may therefore see an interesting and illuminating example of the fact, too often lost sight of, that the sombre experiences of the weary members of the Confederate Congress had a direct and immediate effect on their work when, as members of the convention, they understood the task of constituting a new government." [43]

When a few of the delegates refused to sing the document because they were not completely satisfied with it and continued to criticize it, Pinckney made this statement: "We are not likely to gain any converts by the ambiguities of the proposed signing." [44]

"He thought it best to let the form speak the substance. If the meaning of the signers be left in doubt, his purpose would not be answered. We should sign the Constitution with a view to supporting it with all his influence, and wished to pledge himself accordingly." [45]

Pinckney fulfilled his pledge, he did not leave his work half done. After working tirelessly in the National Convention, he returned to his native State where he played a prominent part in securing ratification of the new constitution in the South Carolina Convention of 1788.[46]

The most excellent choice of words to characterize the life of Charles Cotesworth Pinckney was selected by Charles Chancey when he said this:

Footnotes at end of speech.

"His love of honor was greater than his love of power, and deeper than his love of self." [47]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Farrand, Max, The Framing of the Constitution of the United States (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1913).

Kelly, Alfred H., and Winifred A. Harbison, The American Constitution (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1955).

Prescott, Arthur Taylor, Drafting the Federal Constitution (Louisiana State University Press, 1941).

Magazines

Nott, Charles C., "Mystery of the Pinckney Draft," Nation, LXXXVIII (March 18, 1909).

Pamphlets

Danvers, John Thierry, A Picture of a Republican Magistrate of the New School (New York: printed for E. Sargeant, 1808).

Dictionaries and encyclopedias

Brown, John Howard, ed., "Charles Cotesworth Pinckney," Lamb's Biographical Dictionary, 1903, VI.

"Charles Cotesworth Pinckney," Encyclopedia Americana, 1951, XXII.

"Charles Cotesworth Pinckney," Encyclopedia Britannica, 1929, XVII.

"Charles Cotesworth Pinckney," The National Cyclopedia of American Biography, 1939, II.

Feltensten, Ronslie, "Charles Cotesworth Pinckney," Collier's Encyclopedia, 1955, XVI.

Hamilton, J. G., de R., "Charles Cotesworth Pinckney," Dictionary of American Biography, 1934, XIV.

Wilson, James Grant, and John Fisk, ed., "Charles Cotesworth Pinckney," Appleton's Cyclopedia of American Biography, 1892, V.

---

[1] James Grant Wilson and John Fisk, ed., "Charles Cotesworth Pinckney," Appleton Cyclopedia of American Biography, V (1892), 22.

[2] C. & C. Merriam Co., pub., Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary (1951), 48.

[3] J. G. de R. Hamilton, "Charles Cotesworth Pinckney," Dictionary of American Biography, XIV (1934), 615.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid.

[7] Wilson, co. cit., 22.

[8] John Thierry Danvers, A Picture of a Republican Magistrate of the New School (New York, 1808), 93.

[9] Ibid., 91.

[10] Arthur Taylor Prescott, Drafting the Federal Constitution (Louisiana State University Press, 1941), 35.

[11] Prescott, op. cit., 518.

[12] Ibid., 517.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Hamilton, op. cit., 615.

[15] Prescott, op. cit., 726.

[16] Ibid., 700.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Ibid.

[19] Ibid., 504.

[20] Ibid., 703.

[21] Max Farrand, The Framing of the Constitution of the United States (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1913), 151.

[22] Ibid.

[23] Prescott, op. cit., 359.

[24] Ibid., 359.

[25] Ibid., 735.

[26] Ibid., 359.

[27] Ibid.

[28] Farrand, op. cit., 75.

[29] Prescott, op. cit., 206.

[30] Ibid.

[31] Ibid.

[32] Ibid., 210.

[33] Ibid., 208.

[34] Ibid., 414.

[35] Ibid., 755.

[36] Ibid., 258–259.

[37] Ibid., 751.

[38] Ibid., 671.

[39] Ibid., 755.

[40] Ibid., 806.

[41] Ibid., 317.

[42] Farrand, op. cit., 31.

[43] Charles C. Nott, Mystery of the Pinckney Draft, Nation, LXXXVIII (Mar. 18, 1909), 283.

[44] Prescott, op. cit., 788.

[45] Ibid., 789.

[46] Hamilton, op. cit., 615.

[47] Wilson, op. cit., 22.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.* 6 Wesley Circle.
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*.....120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.* University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Jenner, William E., *Ind*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Laird, William R. III, *W. Va*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*.....Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*.....
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*.....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*.....
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*.....
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.* Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*.....
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*.....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*.....Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*.....
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Wofford, Thomas A., *S. C*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Johnson of Texas, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, ———, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, ———, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Wofford, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Laird, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Wofford, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Laird, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Scott, Wofford, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Appendix

Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, Before Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Saturday last I was privileged to speak to the Veterans of Foreign Wars at Oshkosh, Wis. It was Loyalty Day. On that particular occasion I was given a citation by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I ask that excerpts from the address which I delivered on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY STRESSES ACTION AS SYMBOL OF LOYALTY: OUTLINES IMPROVED PROGRAM FOR VETERANS: EXPRESSES SERIOUS CONCERN OVER BRADLEY COMMISSION FINDINGS

I am happy to join you in this luncheon today to celebrate Loyalty Day.

I know that you need not be reminded of the meaning of loyalty. For who, over the breadth of our great land, knows the meaning better than you V. F. W. men who have left our shores to fight and sacrifice for life and country.

Each of us is loyal in his own way in civilian life. We obey the laws; we live decent lives in our communities, doing what is requested of us.

But real, true loyalty is more than that. It is pursuing our freedom. It is helping to develop the greatness that is our land. It is inventing and producing the good things of life. It is performing our jobs the best way we know how—whatever our station is in life.

TRUE LOYALTY IS NOT STATIC

Loyalty is not static; it is a growing thing. Out of heartfelt loyalty, we must work toward progress, and attainment of future goals—which are now only dreams and visions.

We must accept the challenges in this atomic-jet age, and create things for a better life.

ACTION, NOT WORDS

Loyalty, as you know, must be demonstrated by action.

It was so demonstrated on the battlefield by you and your buddies.

It must and will be demonstrated in the Halls of Congress, in the office, factory, farmfield, and on every roadway of American life. It must be an active, living spirit of patriotism within each of us, flaming with the fiery zeal of modern-day Patrick Henrys.

Each of us, in his own way, doing a good job at that which he knows best and does best, is the kind of all-around loyalty that needs to be demonstrated.

LOYALTY DAY CELEBRATIONS

As we celebrate, the tramp, tramp, tramp of our marching men thrills our hearts with pride.

A tramp tramp, tramp—echoing in our hearts—is also the memory of men who have given their lives for us, who have died for our freedom, who protected our land of liberty.

To the hallowed memory of these great men of our past, and to the promise of the future, we need to rededicate our efforts to preservation and improvement of our climate of freedom.

FULL USE OF FREEDOM

We must make full use of our freedoms:

Freedom to live as we choose, to open a business, to enter a profession.

Freedom to travel, to be educated, to enjoy our rich heritage of music, art, and drama, and to benefit by the tremendous technological and scientific progress of our country.

Freedom to participate, freely and imaginatively, in our future progress.

WE MUST REBUFF COMMUNISM

We must realistically acknowledge that short of annihilative war communism is with us to stay, at least, for a while.

This major evil in the world today is not an abstract, theoretical form of Government. This is a real, ever-spreading totalitarianism that uses all the methods of deceit, terror, threat, promise, and subversion to attain its goals.

COLLECTIVE LEADERSHIP—A FARCE

The recent declaration of a return to a collective leadership by the Soviets, of course, is a farce. This is a mere disguise under which the top-echelon Communists are struggling for power. Why? Because not one of them is yet strong enough to assume the ghostly cloak of Stalin as supreme dictator of the Kremlin.

But the specter of Stalinism hangs over the Communist leaders. All the crimes he is accused of will be perpetrated again by other dictators of this Soviet regime oppressing the populace behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

WITHOUT COMMUNISM WE WOULD HAVE A FREER LIFE

Without communism, we would have a freer life. We would have the opportunities to concentrate on building for a better America and a better world.

Without communism, we could apportion a greater share of our resources to feeding the hungry, sheltering the cold, and going about the tasks of enriching the earth with a better economic, cultural, and spiritual life.

As it is, we have an uneasy tension in the world. Free nations are attempting, by every possible means, to avert the capture of more innocent people by Soviet despotism, without the holocaust of a nuclear war.

Such a war, we are all aware, would destroy cities and nations. It would make the earth a wasteland in which only the mutilated escapees of atomic and hydrogen war would exist.

We must utilize every possible means, national and international, to avert such a war of human annihilation.

NATO

The recent proposals for achieving greater benefits from NATO, I believe, should be completely examined. We should weigh carefully the undeveloped idea of making the NATO military alliance, in fact, an economic and political force for peace.

As you know, Secretary Dulles is in Paris right now, together with the representatives of the other NATO nations to explore the possibility of utilizing NATO for the lessening of international tensions.

NEED OF LEADERSHIP

Our leadership, at whatever level it exists, must be constantly attuned to the progress of our times, and to the problems of our State and Nation. We must provide for the changing needs of our people and eradicate the shortcomings of existing programs.

A soldier can no longer go into battle with an old flintlock or muzzle loader; he must have modern weapons. So it is, if our country is to progress, that we must have new and modernized laws and programs to fulfill the needs of our fast-moving age.

ANTISUBVERSION

We must, of course, exert every effort toward meeting the external challenge of communism. This must be accompanied by a tough policy toward internal attempts at subversion.

The FBI has done an admirable job of keeping a finger on Communists and their activities.

As a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I, too, have had the opportunity and the responsibility to legislatively assist in this effort. I have joined in many legislative proposals to strengthen our laws.

Some of the objectives of my recent legislation are:

To toughen the penalties against seditious conspiracy and advocating the violent overthrow of the Government.

To crack down by requiring registration of Communists or other foreign agents who have been trained in espionage or sabotage.

To strengthen the antiperjury statutes, by simplifying the problems of convicting perjurers.

LAWS A-PLENTY—YET NEW LAWS ARE NEEDED

As we look at the maze of laws and statutes on the books, we might be inclined to think that enough laws have been passed to last this country for generations to come. However, this is not true. Laws become obsolete—just as guns, machinery, and automobiles become obsolete.

We are ever in need of new different laws—to cope with ever-new needs of our people:

Laws for projects like the St. Lawrence seaway, to handle the increased commerce in American products.

Laws for tax reforms, liberalizing social security, and for cultural and educational purposes.

Laws to resolve the problems of agriculture, conservation, and water pollution.

And many other refinements of laws and statutes are required to meet the needs of modern times.

These legislative acts must, of course, be in accord with technological and economic changes, as these affect our population.

INCREASE IN VETERANS

In recent years, as we are all aware, there has been a tremendous increase in the number of veterans in the United States. In 1940, there were only 4 million veterans. These, and their families, represented only 11 percent of the population.

Today, there are over 22 million veterans. These, with their families, number 75 million, and constitute more than 45 percent of our total population—49 percent, if those still in the Armed Forces and their families are included.

VETERANS' PROGRAMS ARE FAIRLY GOOD

The status of veterans' programs, on the whole, is good. Naturally, however, there is considerable room for improvement. Changes in military, economic, and social conditions have outmoded some of the early concepts of veterans' benefits. The philosophy of help for veterans must be modernized, and the whole structure of our programs brought up to date.

The objective of an adequate program, of course, is to help the veteran overcome special, significant handicaps incurred as a consequence of military service.

These programs are based on the realistic acknowledgment that (1) we owe a special debt to our ex-servicemen, and (2) our veterans face special problems arising from their adjustment to society, when they rejoin the ranks of the civilians.

IMPROVEMENT OF VETERANS' PROGRAMS

We need public acceptance of the hard facts of life that, while the threat to the free world exists, it is likely to be the continued duty of each qualified civilian to make an individual contribution to our national defense.

Meanwhile, we must strengthen, rather than weaken, our veterans' programs.

We must improve the pattern of transition from civilian to military, and back to civilian life.

We need to provide more adequate benefits for the families of veterans (especially those in remote camps and outposts), including hospitalization and medical care. For these families suffer displacement, either in surroundings or in financial circumstances, often as great as the veteran himself.

In addition, we need to:

Iron out the existing inequities in the present programs of benefits to completely disabled veterans.

Provide adequate housing for servicemen, to provide them with satisfactory standards of living.

Preserve and improve retirement entitlements.

Continue and expand efforts to rehabilitate disabled veterans and integrate them into our social and economic life.

Develop a successful Reserve program, to unite with our active Armed Forces, for the needs of national defense.

SENATOR WILEY'S LEGISLATION

As you may be aware, I have been constantly concerned with the problems of providing adequate benefits for veterans. In the 84th Congress, I have introduced legislation for such projects as:

New Veterans' Administration facilities at Wood, Wis., to replace obsolete hospital and domiciliary units.

Extension of the GI home-loan benefits. (Only 17 percent of our Wisconsin GI's have thus far utilized their home-loan entitlements. If not renewed, the opportunity expires under present law in July 1957.)

And, too, I have offered legislation for construction of urgently needed housing for personnel in the Armed Forces and their families.

I have, of course, been an ardent supporter of well-merited benefits to veterans, dating back far beyond my participation in the original GI bill of rights for World War II veterans.

WARY OF BRADLEY COMMISSION REPORT

As you know, the House Veterans' Affairs Committee is now studying the Bradley Commission findings. The consensus seems to be that there are some sound recommendations made by this Commission on behalf of the severely disabled, combat veteran.

I am, however, extremely wary and seriously concerned with some of the Commission's additional proposals—for example, those relating to service-connected disabilities. Such proposals would undermine present programs which have proved necessary and effective in benefiting the Nation's ex-servicemen.

You may be assured of my vehement opposition to efforts to undo programs that have proved both desirable and successful in providing much-needed benefits for those who have served our country.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION IN CONGRESS

There are, as you know, literally hundreds of other legislative proposals before the Congress. Consideration of these, however, has been temporarily postponed, pending review and evaluation of the Bradley reports.

These pending bills, as you are well aware, touch upon a multitude of subjects: Pensions, employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, educational benefits, and other real, significant problems facing veterans of today.

CONCLUSION

Since we are expecting a continuation—temporarily, at least—of world tensions, we must gear our veterans' programs, as our national-defense effort, to the long haul.

On this loyalty day, we must reaffirm our dedication to fulfilling the needs of those who have shown the utmost loyalty and devotion to our country.

Buoyed up by the spirit of loyalty—based on action—I believe that we shall succeed in meeting the great challenges of our times, of defeating atheistic communism, and of providing the greatest benefits for all our people.

Address by Hon. Herbert H. Lehman of New York, at Cornerstone Laying Ceremony of B'nai B'rith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered at the cornerstone-laying ceremony of the B'nai B'rith, in Washington, D. C., on May 6.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR LEHMAN AT CORNERSTONE LAYING CEREMONY, B'NAI B'RITH, 17TH STREET AND RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, NW., WASHINGTON, D. C., ON MAY 6, 1956

If we were today dedicating the cornerstone of an ordinary building, however, beautiful it might be, however, useful or even, however, helpful to the community, this would not be an especially remarkable occasion. Our Nation's capital has many such beautiful structures, and has had many such occasions. But neither this nor any other city in the land has contemplated an institution like the one which is being launched by this cornerstone laying here today.

It is fitting that a unique establishment should be sponsored by a unique organization. B'nai B'rith is unique not only because it is America's oldest Jewish organization, having been founded in this country nearly 113 years ago. It is the only group that unites Jews of different doctrinal practices of the Judaic faith, of different economic backgrounds, of different social and political ideologies, and of different views on the fate and future of our people. And B'nai B'rith unites them, more than 350,000 men, women, and young people, for common action in a constructive program on which they can all agree, to promote the welfare of those of our faith, the interests of our beloved country, and the well-being of humanity generally.

I am proud that I have long been a member of B'nai B'rith, as was my father before me.

But if B'nai B'rith is unique, so will be this building whose cornerstone we dedicate today. For in spite of the fact that Jews have been part of the fabric of America for more than 300 years, this will be the first shrine in which their innumerable and priceless contributions to our country will be dramatically demonstrated. Elsewhere there are magnificent libraries and museums of Judaica, rendering splendid service to scholars, historians, and teachers. But only on this corner, where we stand today, will there be a popularly designed exhibit for all the people, showing Jewish contributions to American democracy, in the capital of world democracy.

It has been said that the mortar of ancient Judaic tradition cemented the foundations of American democracy. What are some of the basic concepts common to our faith and to our country? I would say they include liberty under law, equal justice for all, the sanctity of human personality, and the right of all to seek a richer, fuller, and more abundant life.

And on the strong foundation of these concepts and traditions, we have built in this country the freest and most democratic society the world has known in modern days. And have here the freedoms have been developed to as great an extent as any other place on earth.

That achievement—and not merely material wealth—has made America great. And because history has propelled us into the position of moral leadership, we cannot shirk the responsibility that accompanies that leadership.

Today the challenge posed by communism to our free way of life is more formidable than ever before. The new and softer face presented by the ruling group in the Kremlin reveals no weakening of their basic determination to impose their kind of society and their view of man upon the whole world. The free world is properly concerned lest the Communist bloc, by concentrating all its human and material resources, achieve military superiority.

The Kremlin is building weapons as destructive as those we have developed. Indeed, they may be building them faster today than we are. But as long as Communist pilots, soldiers, scientists, and workers have to keep looking over their shoulders to see if they are being shadowed by their suspicious and intolerant masters, we should enjoy a clear advantage. If our scientists can work free of the restraints of serving any ideology but truth, we should not need to fear being outstripped by Communist technology. And we would have a better claim, too, on the minds and hearts of the millions throughout the world who are still uncommitted in the contest between democracy and communism.

Unforunately, we in this country have weakened our own cause by misreading the nature of the Communist threat, and the true requirements of American loyalty and security. For too many years we have lived in a fog of synthetically manufactured fear. We have treated with elaborate dignity the smears and reckless charges which in a happier day we would have recognized immediately as false. We have seen Congress permit its Chambers to be used as a privileged sanctuary for the launching of irresponsible assaults against the good name of perfectly loyal individuals and institutions.

In the last year or two, the fog has begun to lift. For this improvement, courageous

individuals, and organizations like B'nai B'rith and others, who refused to be stampeded or silenced by the political demagogues, are to be congratulated. But much remains to be done.

Only the other day the Attorney General proposed to Congress the adoption of a law that he said would permit Government agencies to retain employees against whom security charges have been filed until final adjudication of their cases. This surely is the plain requirement of American due process, and one that is long overdue in view of the hardship that has been visited upon thousands of suspended employees who were finally restored to their jobs after months of heartache.

But the Attorney General does not need this authority from Congress. The Administration today has all the power it needs to institute, by executive order, this necessary reform. The Attorney General does little to improve the climate of freedom when he shows the lack of political courage implicit in passing the buck to Congress.

Many years ago, we proudly turned to the world the face of our Statue of Liberty with words of welcome that kindled hope and enthusiasm in millions of hearts in the tired lands of the old world. But in recent years the words of welcome have been blurred by the cruel hardships and inequities we have written into our immigration laws.

B'nai B'rith, to its credit, has fought constantly to return to the American tradition of humanitarianism and equality in our immigration laws. And we have made progress on this front. Today the principal leaders of both political parties have publicly and repeatedly decried the gratuitous insult offered to seven-eighths of the peoples of the world by the national origins quota system—a system that just a few years ago was considered too dangerous even to criticize.

I assure you that it would be vastly encouraging to me to see this Congress retract the insult inherent in the national origins quota system and make honorable amends, not only for the sake of our prestige everywhere, but for the sake of our own traditions and self-respect. I pray that this culmination of our efforts will one day soon be realized.

As men and women who support the spread of democratic ideals everywhere, we are deeply troubled by the present situation in the Middle East. Today, Communist influence is strong there because of the vast quantity of aggressive armaments sold to Egypt by the Soviet bloc, while Israel's pleas for defensive weapons from the United States have gone unheeded.

We all pray that the present cease-fire, brought about by the United Nations, will endure, and ripen into real peace. But unless it does—and I fear it will not—the danger of war will continue. The best interests of our own country require a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. But peace cannot be established by merely wishing for it. It must be sought by bold and courageous action. One part of such a course of action would be to furnish defensive arms to Israel now—before it is too late.

The policy of our Government has not seemed to those of us outside the administrative branch either bold or courageous. I trust and pray that that situation is going to be remedied. I will not cease to raise my voice in protest until it is remedied.

One facet of this policy which has attracted my concern in recent months has been our Government's tolerance, and even complicity, in the intolerable discriminations practiced against American citizens by the Saudi Arabian Government and others. Once upon a time, our Government would have denounced, with fine indignation—as it frequently did in past generations—any government which sought to distinguish between one American citizen and the other on the basis of his religious faith or descent. But today, our Government actively connives with the Government of Saudi Arabia, for instance, to keep American soldiers who happen to be of Jewish faith from serving in American installations which happen to be in Saudi Arabian territory.

I know that great issues are at stake in the world today, but what greater function of American sovereignty is there than the traditional function of upholding the integrity of American citizenship? What greater obligation rests upon the American Government than the denial to any nation, regardless of the interests involved, of the right to distinguish and discriminate among American citizens on the basis of their religious faith?

I favor a policy of friendship with all Middle Eastern countries, and indeed, a policy of large-scale assistance to the Arab nations, as well as to Israel. But I place little store on relationships which are grounded on appeasement and acceptance of discriminations which are alien to every tradition we hold dear.

And so, as we glance briefly over some of the large issues that agitate our world today, we are increasingly conscious of the need for high and noble ideals that can serve as a beacon for our endeavors. Such ideals will be embodied in this new B'nai B'rith Building. They will serve their purpose well if they fill us not only with a modest pride in what people of our faith have already achieved in this blessed land, but with a firm determination to continue to be worthy of our great Jewish and American heritage.

Right-to-Work Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, yesterday it was my pleasure to address a meeting of the Young Men's Business Club of New Orleans at New Orleans, La. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER BEFORE THE YOUNG MEN'S BUSINESS CLUB OF NEW ORLEANS, NEW ORLEANS, LA., MAY 9, 1956

One fact should be made crystal clear before this discussion gets underway. I do not profess to speak for the Republican Party nor for the administration when I direct my remarks today to the subject of the right to work. I support right-to-work legislation, as do many members of the Republican Party, and, I am happy to say, also many members of the Democrat Party. I wanted to clear up this point being starting, because many times when a member of a party stands up to speak on a subject some people immediately take his remarks as being the position of his party or the administration that he represents. I do not represent the Republican Party nor the administration in these remarks any more than does Secretary of Labor Jim Mitchell when he attacks States rights. He has a perfect right to do that. I have a perfect right to defend them. The remarks that I make today, then, are my own, BARRY GOLDWATER, and mine alone.

It is time that we stop and ponder over what has been accomplished under the right-to-work laws since they were first enacted slightly over 10 years ago. Since that time a total of 18 States have seen fit to take advantage of section 14 (b) of the Taft-Hartley law and enact legislation in their States that guarantees the right of a worker to obtain and keep a job without being a member of a union; and, on the other side of the coin, to guarantee the union man the right to gain and hold a job in spite of his being a member of a union. When these laws were first enacted, in fact when the very spirit of 14 (b) was first developed, the CIO said that these would be right-to-wreck laws, they said that this section of Taft-Hartley and the subsequent enactment of right-to-work laws were destined to destroy unions. Now let's take a look at the record and see what has happened since the first enactment of these laws.

In 1945 there were approximately 54 million people in the civilian labor force and 14,800,000 of these are estimated to have belonged to unions. This means that in 1945, 27.5 percent of the civilian labor force belonged to unions. In 1955, and these figures are only estimates because the complete figures are not available as yet, we find the laboring force in the neighborhood of 64 million, with 18 million estimated to be members of unions; which would mean that 28 percent of the civilian labor force belonged to unions in 1955. Certainly, these figures do not indicate that there has been any destruction of the union movement nor any appreciable slowing down in the rate at which membership has been growing. But let's look further at what the right-to-work laws have accomplished in the 10 years that they have been in existence.

Secretary Mitchell said in Los Angeles last summer that the right-to-work laws have adverse effects on communities that adopt them. Now let's again turn to the record and see what has happened during this period. The study that I refer to will include only 11 of the 18 States that now have right-to-work legislation because only 11 of these States have had the laws a sufficient length of time to be able to base any judgment upon their experience. I want to commment at this point, also, before getting into these figures—that we cannot assume that the right-to-work law alone is responsible for the remarkable record that has been made in these various States; however, we can call it coincidence and it is still a true fact that the States that have enacted right-to-work legislation compare more than favorably with the rest of the Nation in any area we care to explore.

Total nonagricultural employment in the 11 States has risen 21 percent. During this time the total population in these 11 States has increased by 12 percent. During this same period, a 14 percent rise in nonagricultural employment occurred in the United States, while the Nation's rise in population was 12 percent. Now, going to another economic area, in the 11 States with right-to-work laws passed during the 1946–1948 period, the number of business establishments has increased approximately 24 percent while at the same time the increase nationally in the number of new business firms was only 15 percent. When we investigate the income from wages and salaries, we find that in the 11 right-to-work States that we are studying there was an increase of 69 percent, while the national income derived from wages and salaries rose just above 59 percent. While these increases were occurring, the opportunity to work was on the rise in the 11 States more than it was in the Nation as a whole. In the 11 right-to-work States we are examining, man-days idle due to work stoppages dropped 33 percent between the period of 1947 and 1953, while nationally the decline in man-days idle was 18 percent.

Surely these figures should convince even the most skeptical that the fears of the CIO that the right-to-work laws would wreck the unions and the fears that are expressed by Secretary Mitchell that these laws are detrimental to the communities that enact them are baseless and groundless. I must reiterate that we cannot say that the right-to-work laws in themselves have created these situations, but it is a peculiar circumstance that in the States in the Union that have enjoyed the most healthy gains in nearly every area of their economies, we find right-to-work legislation.

Having looked quickly at the history of the right-to-work period, I think it is well at this time that we stop and ask ourselves why this legislation became necessary and why 18 States have passed these laws and why other States are seriously interested in adopting them for the protection of their own workers and their own economy. The concept of the right to work is based upon two premises, the first of which is the freedom of the individual and the second the right of association.

Let's explore the first one first—freedom of the individual. The right-to-work bill is a civil-liberties measure. As more and more employers in the country were signing agreements with the union or closed-shop clauses, it became evident that with the arbitrary power placed in unions, a man's membership in a union was becoming more important than his rights as a citizen because his livelihood depended on maintaining his membership. The obviousness of this fact created an interest among the very workers affected in the States that have enacted these laws to the extent that sufficient interest was aroused to create their passage.

I believe that the best expression I have ever read concerning the freedom of the individual was expressed by Mr. Bennett B. Patterson in his book, the Forgotten Ninth Amendment. Mr. Patterson said, and I quote, "Individual freedom and the recognition and development of the spiritual nature of mankind are the essence of democracy; indeed, they are the essence of life itself. We believe that by nurturing and encouraging the natural development of the individual to the point that he will achieve his greatest work, society as a whole will profit in the greatest measure."

Our whole system of government and our whole system of enterprise is based upon individual rights and freedom. Our basic writings abound with the proof of this statement and we need only look at the Declaration of Independence to find the substance of all our freedom. The Declaration of Independence says, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." That is not only the cornerstone of our Republic, an expression recognizing the source of our freedom as stemming from God, it also spells out our fundamental rights. The right to work is one of our rights. It is fundamental, for without it a man cannot retain the right of liberty or the right to pursue happiness, for both are dependent on his right to work.

For years those people who now travel erroneously under the name of liberal have been stating that the right to a job is one of the basic human rights and they go further to say that our Government is not only bound to protect this right but must create it. These same pseudoliberals are highly concerned today because 18 States have passed legislation or contained these provisions in their constitutions to protect the workers from being deprived of their jobs by reason of membership or nonmembership in a union.

The question that rises at this point is this: Is the right to a job really a basic human right or is this right restricted to union members only? Actually, there is no right to a job in this country or any other country that follows our concepts of freedom. Man was created equal, our Declaration of Independence says. He was created equal because he was a free child of God, but at the point of his birth the equality ceased. The right to a job, if such a right does exist, exists only in man's determination to get a job and to keep a job, and if there are rights connected with that then those rights are wrapped up in the expressions of the right-to-work law that recognizes that a right to work, whether a man belongs to a union or not, is a basic right, expressed in our Declaration of Independence and further outlined at various places in our Constitution.

The right to work is coextensive with the right of life itself. Shakespeare said something about this, and while Shakespeare was no labor-management relations expert, nevertheless his philosophy certainly can apply. In The Merchant of Venice, he wrote, and I quote, "You take my house when you do take the prop that doth sustain my house, you take my life when do take the means whereby I live." When a man must belong to a union to obtain or retain work, then that man does not have the right to work under our concept of rights and we, in effect, if we fail to recognize that, would be living in agreement with Shakespeare's quotation, "You take my life when you do take the means whereby I live."

Let's look at the Constitution and see what the Constitution has to say about the subject of right to work and the other rights which man enjoys in connection with employment. The famous fifth amendment of the Constitution says in part, "No person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime," then it goes on to list several other exemptions and says, "nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law." Certainly, if a man is forced to join a union in order to obtain or retain employment, that action, being one of compulsion without the process of law, violates that part of the fifth amendment. Likewise, if a man were denied employment because of membership in a union, that action would be in similar violation of this amendment. Quite similar language is contained in the 14th amendment which says in part, and I quote, "Nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law."

Thus we see in amendments 5 and 14 the clear intent of the Constitution to protect any right bearing upon life, liberty, and property and the right to work is fundamental to these rights. If a man is denied work by either nonmembership or membership in a union, then he is deprived of these rights without the due processes of law.

There is another amendment, not often referred to by students of the Constitution, or generally known by the American public, but it contains what is to me one of the basic statements about our rights. The ninth amendment says, and I quote, "The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

When our Constitution was framed, in fact when our first basic papers were written, after our forefathers began to think about our concept of freedom, all of these documents believed that our rights were inherent because these rights and freedoms came from God. They didn't believe it was necessary to outline in detailed form each and every one of these rights and that is the reason that the Bill of Rights was not written when the Constitution was first presented. It was only after these wise designers of our documents began to think that the time might come when there would be some doubt about these rights that they set them down in the first 10 amendments to the Constitution. Believing the rights to be inherent by virture of their being a gift from God, the Constitution set out to protect these rights. The 9th is a broad statement of the protection and extent of these rights. It recognizes that all the rights of men are protected. It recognizes that the individual and not the State or the Federal Government is the source and basis of our social comport. It further recognizes that sovereignty rests with the individual. The right to work is a right that must be protected if the very rights of life, liberty, and the pursuant of happiness are to be maintained in this Government of ours.

Near the outset of this discussion, I stated that there were to aspects to the right-to-work bills, one being the rights of the individual, which we have just discussed, and the second being the right of association. After having studied these laws for the past 10 years and after having watched their operation, I have come to the conclusion that the right of association is probably the heart of the right-to-work movement.

The freedom of association being an important side of the right-to-work coin, we should see what our Constitution says in amendment I about this freedom. It says, and I quote, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion," then it goes on and states, "or the right of the people peaceably to assemble." Again we get back to the freedom of the individual, for this right springs from the liberty of the individual to order his life as he sees fit, to choose where he will work, to choose his church, his political party, his lodge, his union—if he desires to affiliate with any of these. No law should compel him to join, or condemn him for joining, any organization or group. Some men want to belong to unions, some do not, it's as simple as that; but some union leaders want the right of assembly destroyed by the extension of compulsory unionism into the States where that right is now protected. There are young men who want to belong to the organization that I am addressing today, there are other young men who do not want to belong to it, and I am sure that both sides would resist any Federal law that would say that all young men have to belong to this organization. They may not want to belong because they don't like some of the members, they may not want to belong because they don't like the program; there are many reasons that would make a man hesitate at joining any organization, just as there are many compelling reasons that make men want to associate with others in the pursuance of a common objective.

Having reviewed the past history of the right-to-work movement, and having refreshed our minds on what I consider to be the two important points involved in any argument for a right-to-work law, let's look briefly into the crystal ball of the future to see what might be in store for those States who have, by an expression of their citizenry, adopted these laws.

There are several bills in both Houses at the present time that would destroy section 14 (b) of the Taft-Hartley. As is to be expected, the pseudo-liberals of today, blinded by their devotion to the doctrines of Walter Reuther, are the ones who have introduced and who are pressing for this legislation. One of these individuals is a Member of Congress by the name of JAMES ROOSEVELT. Mr. ROOSEVELT said on March the 15th of this year, and I quote, "I am sure he," referring to his father, "would have been horrified at the so-called right-to-work laws and would have done everything he could against them." Now again, in an effort to keep the record perfectly clear, I would like to remind the son of our former President of what his father once said on this subject, and I quote, "I tell you frankly that the Government of the United States will not order, nor will Congress pass, legislation ordering a so-called closed shop. It is true that by agreement in many plants of various industries the closed shop is now in operation. This is a

result of the legal collective bargaining and not of Government compulsion on employers or employees. It is also true that 95 percent or more of the employees in these particular mines belong to the United Mine Workers Union. The Government will never compel this 5 percent to join the union by Government decree. That would be too much like the Hitler methods toward labor." Now if the remarks of the senior Roosevelt do not refresh the memory of the son, I would like to refer JIMMY to what his mother once said in her column My Day, "I do not believe that every man and woman should be forced to join a union."

I inject the Roosevelt name at this point only to show the extent to which some of the younger generation of the pseudo-liberals will go in order to confuse the issue. While both President Roosevelt and Mrs. Roosevelt were strong advocates of strong unions and both did a lot to help in these movements and both provided constructive thinking to the progress of these organizations, both of these liberal-minded people recognized that compulsory unionism has no place in America.

It is difficult to understand why there exists here in America, the land of the free, the desire on the part of some people to force a man to join a union in order to gain and retain employment. There are unions in other parts of the world, successful unions, there are countries that are far more unionized than the United States, so with this in mind I obtained a report from the International Labor Organization and there are some interesting revelations in that report. Seven of these countries have compulsory unionism in some form but none of them have compulsion by law. The others prohibit, except in some rare cases, and these cases by collective agreement only. The most unionized group of countries in the world, the Scandinavian countries, prohibit compulsory unionism by law—it is not allowed—and yet, in spite of that, we find a greater percentage of the working people belonging to unions in these countries than in any other countries in the world. Universally, compulsory unionism is frowned on. Leaders across the world recognize that in compulsion you also have the seeds of destruction, but allow a man the freedom to join or not to join and when a man does become a union member after exercising his free right to determine this choice, he becomes a good union member and an asset to his organization that only can strengthen that group.

Maybe in this country Walter Reuther is afraid of free men's choices. Perhaps he doesn't recognize that free men recognize the need and the value of unions; that free men will join unions when the unions show free men that they are better off belonging to them than not belonging to them. Perhaps he doesn't recognize that Americans do not like coercion, that Americans do not like to be told what to do or when to do it, or to have to pay for a right to do it. Perhaps Mr. Reuther is not aware of the fact that many members of his union and many people who do not belong to unions do not like the way that his union has violated the desires of the minority group of his organization.

I speak now of political freedom and in this I speak for the President and for the Republican Party, for Ike told the AFL–CIO merger convention last December that "The rights of minorities holding differing social, economic, and political views must be scrupulously protected and their views accurately reflected."

And I speak of the forgotten civil-rights problem, I speak against the use of compulsory union dues for political purposes, and in that I feel sure that I speak for a strong minority of the union movement and for a great majority of the workers who are nonmembers of unions. Mr. Reuther's reply to the President's request that these rights of minorities be protected was merely that his unions would spend more, that they would destroy the Republicans, and that somehow they would get around the law, which they are doing today.

Here is a civil-rights violation that crosses both racial and political lines, yet it is being ignored by these same pseudoliberals. I am not talking about a mere handful of individuals, although I would stand up for the rights of any individual American. I am talking about some 8 million Americans who have become second-class citizens as a result of the merger of the AFL and the CIO.

These second-class citizens come from both sides of the political fence. They are Republican workers who are forced to pay compulsory union dues, part of which are used for candidates whom the workers personally vote against. But they are also Democrats who find these compulsory union dues used to influence Democrat primaries. And you in the South know that this primary is the equivalent of the general election in the North.

I say to you in all sincerity that this is not a labor-relations problem—it is a civil-rights problem since it amounts to nothing less than nullification of the vote of an individual American, and I am sure I don't have to explain nullification to southerners.

Now what can you and I do, people who are interested in this right-to-work move, to protect it, to see that the Federal statutes remain on the books, that allow the several States to have these laws. I think you and I have to engage in a program of education. This program of education does not entail a bitter fight with some leaders of the union movement, it entails explaining to the working man what we mean when we talk about the right to work. If this is done, not only with the working man but with management itself, then I feel that a free expression of the people of the States will be heard by the State legislators and that the legislators assembled will act in accordance with the wishes of the people.

This is a matter of freedom that you and I are discussing today. It is a matter of nothing else. It is not wrapped up in economics, it is not wrapped up in the social problems of America, it is wrapped up in the basic freedoms of America and as Americans you and I have a duty to see that those rights and freedoms are observed and protected.

Florida and the Creation of a United States Fisheries Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have recently introduced a bill, H. R. 10874, to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the fisheries to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; to strengthen the fisheries segment of our national economy and to provide aids and studies, all being provisions contained in a "National Fisheries Act of 1956."

Under this bill there would be established a Commission, under the Department of the Interior, bipartisan in nature, to attend the problems of an industry that is of great importance to the Nation as well as the State of Florida. The Sunshine State has long ranked as one of the Nation's greatest sea-food producers. Annually Florida landings have amounted from 7.1 percent to 10 percent of the national output. Florida fishermen, operating from the most extensive coast possessed by any State, in addition to producing a high proportion of the national output of fishery products, also lands more species of fish than any other part of the country. In 6 of its 8 most valuable fisheries, Florida has continued to be the principal United States producer and in the past few years has moved into the fore as a shrimp producer. Economically these products are of great importance to my State and nearly a $100 million annual retail value is placed on Florida production.

Because of this and my general interest in fish and wildlife, I am most concerned with the careful study and conservation of our resources and the orderly marketing of these products. Under such a Commission as I have proposed, greater facilities for study and resource programs could be carried out. The economy of the industry could be protected from ill-advised practices and the promotion of sales and introduction of new merchandising and packaging methods and studies connected therewith would be of prime importance.

This is not an individual effort on my part but part of the effort of many Members of the House who believe such an important issue should be brought to the attention of the entire country and through the introduction by many Members of identical bills, point out the need for this Commission. Through their trade organizations, the fishing industry has fully discussed the many problems facing them today and endorsed such action. Through this long term discussion and by hearings and studies in the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee where a committee print of the bill has been presented, it is believed that this bill, identical with many others introduced to this session of Congress, is a practical and workable method of gaining unanimity in the efforts to revitalize this industry.

As a benefit to all the industry throughout the Nation and particularly to this important segment of Florida's commerce I shall vigorously endeavor to obtain passage of this measure during the 84th Congress.

Under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I include the following article prepared by Dr. Carter C. Osterbind which outlines very well the importance of the fishing industry and the need for further research in Florida:

A SHORT REPORT ON FLORIDA'S COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

(By Carter C. Osterbind, associate research professor; and Elise C. Jones, assistant in research, Bureau of Economic and Business Research)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This article is based upon the recently published book entitled "Florida's Commercial Fisheries—Markets, Operations, Outlook," State Economic Studies No. 7, which may be obtained from the Bureau of Economic and Business Research, College of Business Administration, University of Florida, Gainesville.)

Commercial fishing is one of Florida's oldest industries, and through the years this State has ranked high in the production of fishery products. The latest data giving both the pounds and value of landings by States

are for the year 1952. In that year Florida ranked fourth among the States and Alaska in value of landings and sixth in volume of landings. California, Massachusetts, and Alaska ranked, in that order, as the three leaders in the value of landings. Florida was exceeded by these three areas also on a volume basis. Louisiana, falling only slightly below Florida in value of landings, ranked third among the States on a volume basis, while Maine fell in fifth place.

VALUE OF FLORIDA'S CATCH

Florida not only has ranked high among the coastal States in pounds and value of fish landed, but the value of these landings to the fisherman has been a substantial percentage of the total value of the fish catch in the United States and Alaska. In 1953 the aggregate value of Florida landings for the year reached an alltime peak of $31.5 million. This amount was 9.7 percent of the $325 million combined value of landings for the United States and Alaska. At the end of 1954, however, Florida's annual landings had dropped in value to $24.5 million, or 7.1 percent of the value of landings in the United States and Alaska.

Florida fishermen, operating from the most extensive coast possessed by any State, in addition to producing a high proportion of the national output of fishery products, also land more species of fish than do the fishermen of any other part of the country.

In the United States, Florida, the sole producer of sponges and the principal producer of red snapper, mullet, pompano, and a number of other varieties of seafoods has recently moved to the fore in the landings of shrimp.

In 6 of its 8 most valuable fisheries, Florida has continued to be the principal United States producer. In 1951 this State produced 93 percent of the Spanish mackerel, 82 percent of the grouper, and 79 percent of the mullet landed in the United States. In addition, Florida producers accounted for almost 20 percent of the shrimp catch. Among its eight most valuable fisheries Florida may be considered as a relatively minor producer only of menhaden. A comparison of the remainder of the Florida fisheries to those of the United States and Alaska reveals that for a very large proportion of the species landed in Florida, the State's fisheries are the sole or principal producers.

In recent years Florida's most valuable group of fisheries has been shellfish. The importance of shellfish is shown by the data below giving the pounds of fishery products landed in Florida, their total value, and their value per pound to the fisherman, by major groups of fisheries, for the years 1953 and 1954.

1953

Group	Pounds	Total value	Value per pound
Finfish:	*Thous.*	*Thous.*	*Cents*
Edible	65,445	$8,181	12.5
Nonedible	70,413	746	1.06
Shellfish	70,987	22,464	31.6
Miscellaneous	42	131	314.4
All groups	206,887	31,522	15.2

1954

Group	Pounds	Total value	Value per pound
Finfish:	*Thous.*	*Thous.*	*Cents*
Edible	64,571	$8,180	12.7
Nonedible	42,458	521	1.2
Shellfish	63,686	15,789	24.8
Miscellaneous	21	51	243.3
All groups	170,736	24,541	14.4

The average value in 1953 of 31.6 cents per pound of shellfish was a primary contributor to the highest total value of landings in Florida's history. In both 1953 and 1954 the shellfish group, made up principally of shrimp, spiny lobsters, and blue crabs, was Florida's most valuable fishery. In spite of the sizable decrease in 1954 of the value of shellfish landings, which is accounted for by the decrease in the per-pound value as well as the decrease in the landings of shrimp, the shellfish fishery was more valuable to Florida than all of the State's other fisheries combined. An expansion of the shrimp fishery and the other principal shellfish fisheries could quickly raise the value of Florida landings to new levels. The high value per pound for the miscellaneous group was attributable in both 1953 and 1954 to the per-pound value of sponges. This once very important fishery has suffered from a depletion of beds and study is now underway to see what may be done to restore the source of supplies as well as the market for the sale of sponges.

To appraise further the value of Florida's fisheries the values of fishery products at successive levels of distribution are included. Although statistics on the margins of processors, wholesalers, and retailers are not available, estimates have been made to show approximate values. According to estimates for the year 1953, Florida landings at the processor level had a value of $53 million; at the wholesaler level, $75 million; and at the retailer level, a value of $98 million.

Having examined the value of fishery products produced in Florida, and their relative importance it is appropriate to consider some other aspects of the economic importance of Florida's fisheries.

PRODUCTION FACILITIES, EMPLOYMENT, AND FISHERMEN'S INCOME

Production facilities in the fisheries consist, in general, of boats and vessels, fishing gear, and equipment, and fishhouse facilities for packing, processing, freezing, and storing. The last census of these facilities was taken in 1950. At that time the Florida fisheries were using 5,820 boats, 872 vessels (crafts of 5 or more tons) with a tonnage capacity of 11,726, and gear having an estimated value of $2.3 million, with the estimated total value of these facilities ranging from $8 to $15 million. Since 1950 many large shrimping vessels have been added to Florida's fishing fleet and a number of these vessels, equipped, have a value of $40,000 or more each. Although the total investment in fishhouse facilities is not known, the Bureau's survey in 1953 revealed that on the average the investment per firm was not large. Only 7 percent of the reporting firms had plants valued at more than $50,000, while over 46 percent had plants valued at less than $10,000.

Although the fishery employment figure is not strictly comparable to the other employment figures because of differences in the definitions of employment, it will serve for general comparisons.

Employment in Florida in 1950

Employed labor force	1,009,100
Employed in agriculture	123,000
Employed in manufacturing	108,300
Employed in wholesale and retail trade	240,400
Employed in construction	90,600
Employed in fisheries	10,300

Of the 10,300 people employed in the fisheries, 1,600 were classified as casual fishermen—those whose principal business was something other than fishing and who received less than one-half their annual compensation from fishing. Thus, in the summary statistics some individuals are counted as being employed in two industries. Although the number of employed fishermen did not exceed 1 percent of the employed labor force in Florida in 1950, in certain areas the importance of fisheries as a source of emeployment is much greater than this percentage would suggest.

Fishermen ranged from less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the employed labor force in Broward County to 35 percent in Franklin County. In 12 counties fishermen were over 5 percent of the employed labor force; in 7 counties, over 10 percent; and in 3 counties, over 20 percent. In all of these counties fishermen were clearly an important component of the total employed labor force. In 2 counties, Monroe and Collier, there were more fishermen in the labor force than either farm laborers or manufacturing employees. As would be expected, in the counties having the largest total labor force—Dade, Duval, and Hillsborough—the number of fishermen constituted a relatively small proportion of the total. The 3 counties leading in number of fishermen in 1950 were Monroe, Pinellas, and Franklin. The relative importance of fishermen to the employed labor force in these three counties, however, was very different. In Franklin County, as previously noted, they constituted 35 percent and in Monroe, 17 percent, while in Pinellas they were only 1.5 percent.

Employment conditions and the quality of workers in the fisheries have long posed problems to the industry. Some employers believe that the fisheries do not attract young men because of the long hours, the irregular seasonal nature of the employment, and the low wages. According to the 1950 census of population, the age distributions of employed oystermen and fishermen and of the total employed civilian labor force were not significantly different. In comparison to specific types of employment, however, differences may be found. For example, a larger proportion of those employed as operatives and kindred workers in manufacturing fall in the age range from 14 to 34 years than do those employed as oystermen and fishermen. Conversely, a larger proportion of oystermen and fishermen are in the age group of 45 years and over.

According to the 1950 census, the median income of oystermen and fishermen in Florida, based on the 1949 income received, was $1,239, which was considerably below the median income of $2,122 for those in the male civilian labor force. A comparison of incomes received by fishermen and oystermen with incomes received by manufacturing operatives and kindred workers and by all male workers in the experienced labor force in Florida reveals that a much larger proportion of the fishermen and oystermen fall in the low income classes of from $1 to $999 and from $1,000 to $1,999 per year.

Although the low level of income in the fisheries definitely contributes to the labor problems of the industry, it should be remembered that there are a number of factors contributing to this level of wages which are controlled by the skill and initiative of the individual fishermen themselves. In 1950 over 51 percent of the oystermen and fishermen were self-employed. Those who were not self-employed were compensated in most cases on the basis of a rate per pound or on the basis of a fixed proportion of the value of the catch. Thus, for most fishermen compensation was directly tied to the volume of landings and to the price paid per pound for the fish. This raises the significant question of the possible relative effects of production and market influences on the earnings of fishermen.

VALUE OF FISHERY PRODUCTS MANUFACTURED IN FLORIDA

Nonedible finfish landed in Florida are processed both in and out of the State and a very large proportion of Florida's edible finfish and shellfish is sold to out-of-State buyers without being canned or packaged.

Similarly, a large proportion of Florida's seafoods going into the local retail markets is not canned or packaged. However, canning, packaging, and processing are becoming more important in Florida, and the growth of these activities may have an important effect upon the future of Florida fisheries. In 1953 the total market value of Florida's production of packaged and canned finfish and shellfish products and byproducts was $4,090,299.

The production of breaded, cooked, and peeled shrimp has increased greatly in the past few years and has become the most valuable processed and packaged fishery product produced in Florida. The aggregate sale of this product in 1953 was valued at $2,239,383. On the basis of average producer's margins it is estimated that the above production represents a value added of $1,659,843.

FLORIDA'S OUT-OF-STATE MARKET

An assessment of the value of Florida's fisheries reveals that, although the amount invested and the number of people employed are comparatively small, this State accounts for a substantial percentage of the total value of seafoods landed in the United States and Alaska. Florida's relatively high position in production makes it appropriate to consider some characteristics of the market for these products and some of the factors influencing this market.

Producers in the Florida fisheries are in substantial agreement that out-of-State wholesale buyers constitute their best market outlets. In a survey in 1953 by the Bureau of Economic and Business Research the Florida producers were asked to specify in the order of rank their five most important out-of-State market outlets. Their responses revealed a market of considerable scope. Indicated as falling within these ranks of importance were 69 cities located in 24 States and the District of Columbia.

New York, though more remote than many of the States named as important, was ranked first by more producers than was any other State. Three nearby States—in order, Georgia, Alabama, and Louisiana—followed in the number of rankings. Among the important market States were included such States as Nebraska, Iowa, Illinois, Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. The inclusion of wholesale buyers in these States, in the producers' listings of their most important market outlets, indicates not only the scope but also the consumption potential of the area served by Florida producers.

The wholesaler, however, is only the first link in the chain of distribution and the full scope of the market necessarily looks to the location of ultimate consumers. Consumer studies by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service have revealed that Florida-type fish and shellfish are used and identified by consumers located throughout the Nation. The studies indicate that although the market has national characteristics, very little is generally known by consumers about the major varieties of Florida finfish while a great deal is known about the major varieties of shellfish. This is an indication of the need to develop a better marketing program in the distribution and sale of Florida finfish. The preferences of consumers and the regional differences in these preferences point to both a changing market and a great potential market. Factors such as these make it evident that improved marketing practices by producers will have a considerable bearing on market participation in the future.

The volume figures of commercial fish landings in the United States and various other parts of the world show that, over long periods, as population has increased the landings of fishery products have also tended to increase. It may be deducted, therefore, that demand has been a dominent influence in determining the quantity of landings. On the assumption that this influence will continue and that supplies of seafoods from all sources will not suddenly fail to meet the demand, the expected continued growth of the Nation's population and the relatively stable per capita consumption of fishery products become valuable guide lines in appraising the future national market for seafoods.

The latest population projections by the United States Bureau of the Census indicate that by 1960 the population for the Nation is expected to be 16 or 17 percent greater than it was in 1950, and that by 1965 it will be 23 to 25 percent greater. In rough terms these figures give an indication of the potential percentage growth of the demand for seafoods if the per capita consumption continues to be fairly stable. In the national market supplied by products from American fisheries as well as by imports from other countries, domestic per capita consumption averaged about 9.8 pounds in the 10-year period from 1939 through 1948. From 1949 through 1954, the average was approximately 11.0 pounds—a significant increase in the total market picture. With improved facilities for better distribution and marketing, and with greater selling efforts, it is possible that there will be a further increase in the per capita consumption of seafood products.

Since population projections and per capita consumption figures both point to an increasing demand for fishery products in the national market, in general it may be said that there will be a good demand for Florida fishery products if the Florida producers can meet the conditions of the market. Even in this favorable market climate, there are several serious problems common to most Florida fisheries which must be solved before the Florida producers can improve—or even maintain—their position as suppliers in the national market. To meet this situation, attention must be given, among other things, to the cost of production.

HIGH COST OF PRODUCTION

One of the most serious threats to the Florida producers' position is the growing competition from low-priced finish from other parts of the United States, as well as from foreign countries. One obstacle basic to meeting this competition is the Florida producers' high cost of production; for, despite the low average wages received by Florida fishermen, the relative cost of labor per pound of fish landed is high.

The high cost of labor per pound of fish landed is probably due to the manner in which the fisheries have developed.

The nearness of the fishing grounds to port and the type of boats and gear effective in landing such important species as mullet and Spanish mackerel have made entrance into Florida fishing industry relatively easy, as well as attractive to many with limited investment capital. As some of those who entered the business prospered, they were able to enlarge their operations by adding small boats to their existing fleets. Since the method of fishing was such that the large producer had little opportunity to reduce his operating costs as the size of the operations increased, it appears that the greatest advantages emerging from large-scale production were in marketing rather than in production. These advantages consisted mainly of better market contacts and a broader knowledge of the southeastern market for fresh unprocessed fish. In recent years, however, as the large firms have found their market position challenged by fishery products from sources other than Florida, the type of operation which has proved advantageous over a long period is now presenting problems that permeate all phases of the industry.

Although the precise average profit or loss from Florida boat operations cannot be ascertained because of incomplete cost data, results from a survey of Florida fisheries by the Bureau of Economic and Business Research provide cost data on a limited number of producer-owned boats. Although these data purport to show no more than the reported cost experience of the number of boats designated, they do give an indication of the relative importance of the main elements of cost and the magnitude of the cost per pound of fish landed. Cost data were obtained on only three types of boat operations, but these three types accounted for approximately 80 percent of the value of marine fishery products landed in Florida in 1951: (1) mullet and Spanish-mackerel fisheries (gill nets); (2) red-snapper and grouper fisheries (lines); and (3) shrimp fisheries (otter trawls).

Mullet and Spanish mackerel boat operations: Figures on the average cost in 1952 of 21 mullet and Spanish-mackerel boat operations show that although the average fisherman's wage was only $1,413 for the year, the average labor cost per pound of fish landed was high. With the exception of expenditures for gas or fuel, the average operating costs per pound of fish landed were approximately the same for both mullet and Spanish mackerel boats. For these 21 boats the reported major costs plus the estimated depreciation actually exceeded the value of their gross receipts. With a labor cost of 5.9 cents per pound, in addition to the other out-of-pocket costs amounting to 4.6 cents, there was little margin left; when the depreciation was taken out, the producer actually had incurred a loss. These figures are for the year 1952; it should not be inferred that these producers operate at a loss in every year.

Given this cost situation at the production level, the existing transportation rates, and the customary markups at the various levels of distribution, it is estimated that fresh Florida mullet and Spanish mackerel moving through the New York wholesale market (an important market for Florida producers) will require an average retail price of from 29 to 36 cents per pound. This is the price for fish in the round—not drawn or dressed. If mullet and Spanish mackerel are drawn or dressed the required price will be from 39 to 48 cents. If the two varieties are filleted by the retailer, the required price per pound would be from $1 to $1.20. If mullet and Spanish mackerel are filleted, packaged, and frozen before distribution, it is estimated on the basis of an average price of 10.8 cents per pound paid to the fishermen, that the required minimum retail price would be 94 cents. As used here the term required price indicates the estimated price which results when the customary margins and transportation costs are added to the average price paid to the fisherman plus any processing costs that may have been incurred before distribution. The actual market price on some occasions is higher or lower than this average estimated price depending on the particular conditions of the market. However, use of the estimated required price makes it possible to appraise the approximate price results of production costs.

Snapper and grouper boat operations: Boat operation cost figures for snapper and grouper fishing are based on the operations of 9 Florida boats ranging in size from 29 to 40 feet—with the majority from 34 to 38 feet. With the exception of one which reported only grouper landings, all boats landed both grouper and snapper. The average wage of the fishermen on these boats was $2,150 for the year while the per-pound cost of labor was 9.2 cents. The very manner in which certain costs, such as labor, groceries, bait, and fuel, are incurred causes them to be high or low per pound of landings depending on the average value of landings

per trip. Maintenance and depreciation per pound, on the other hand, will be high or low depending on the total number of pounds landed during the accounting period. Thus, those snapper and grouper boats operating only a few months out of the year had a higher depreciation and maintenance cost per pound of fish landed than did the boats operating a greater number of months, whereas their respective costs for labor, groceries, bait, and fuel, per pound of fish, did not show the effects of the short operating season. Labor and groceries, which are by far the greatest expense items, equalled 68 percent of the value of fish landings.

On the basis of the average price of 16.6 cents per pound to the fishermen, the estimated required retail price of grouper in the round moving through the New York wholesale market would be approximately 35 cents per pound. If drawn, the estimated required price would be around 47 cents; if in steaks, around 70 cents; and if filleted, around $1 per pound. These figures are based on the customary margins and average weight losses experienced in the various types of processing indicated above.

Shrimp vessel operations: Since vessel operations and fishhouse operations are often integrated in the Florida shrimp fishery, it was necessary to apportion the aggregate returns between the two operations to derive the gross margin on shrimp vessel operations. On the basis of the method of apportionment applied, the average gross receipts to 22 shrimp vessels was $26,900—an average of 48 cents per pound of headless shrimp.

The per-pound costs are high in comparison to the two other types of fishing operations examined, and the percentage distribution of expenses differs in that the nonlabor costs account for a much greater proportion of the total expenses. Even so the labor costs were 18.2 cents per pound of shrimp landed. Based on the average costs and margins found for shrimp vessel operations and the corresponding margins for fishhouse operations, it is estimated that headless shrimp moving through the New York wholesale market would require a retail price of at least 97 cents per pound.

At times the shrimp fishery has been one of Florida's most profitable fisheries. The high returns to producers, both in the aggregate and on a per pound basis, and—in comparison to other fisheries—the high return to labor, suggest that downward movements in prices may be absorbed with less difficulty by this fishery than by other fisheries in Florida.

On the basis of the cost figures shown for the three types of fisheries and the estimated price effects of these costs, it seems evident that if Florida is to compete effectively in the national market the cost of production per pound of fishery products in the two finfish fisheries must be reduced. Whether the high per pound cost of production—a major problem in the mullet and Spanish mackerel fisheries—stems mainly from curtailment of production attributable to market forces, or whether it is due to method of fishing or type of gear used, is a question that needs to be answered.

CONCLUSIONS

Florida's commercial fisheries are an important component of the fisheries of the United States and Alaska, and the State's fisheries have, because of the rapid increase in the value of its shrimp fishery, attained an even greater relative importance in recent years. The market served by the Florida fisheries is extensive in scope and has possibilities of further growth if producers can meet the increasing competition in the national market. The high cost of production in the finfish fisheries poses a real problem—one that requires a reexamination of both production and distribution practices.

Apparently, then, there is no easy solution to the production problems of the Florida producers of edible finfish. While it is not outside the realm of possibility that technological innovations may bring about profound changes throughout all industries—including the production and marketing of seafoods—in looking ahead to the next decade, it seems more likely that any pronounced changes in fishing operations and marketing practices will involve only a greater emphasis on processes and methods already known or in use.

Summer Camps Run by Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article on summer camps run by Communists, which appeared in the Manchester Union Leader for April 6, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN CONWAY LAST SUMMER—REVEAL FELLOWSHIP SPEAKERS CLOSELY LINKED TO COMMUNISTS

(By Reg Abbott)

CONCORD.—It can now be revealed that at least two of last summer's speakers at World Fellowship, Conway, have extensive records of fraternization with Communists.

They are William Hinton, of Putney, Vt., and Mary Jane Keeney, of the U. N. staff. Their Red-associated backgrounds are matters of public record.

The fact that they were here in New Hampshire sharply illustrates one angle of the State's antisubversive investigation. Namely, that the probe keeps tabs on many known Reds and—as an incidental result—helps keep Communist activity here at a minimum.

It is this aspect of the antisubversive probe carried on by Attorney General Louis C. Wyman and his staff which would be first to suffer if the recent United States Supreme Court decision against the Pennsylvania statute were to halt State investigations.

This is one thing Wyman is seeking to protect in urging congressional action to restore State authority in Red hunting.

World Fellowship and its director, Dr. Willard Uphaus, have been a special subject in Wyman's probe from the start. A major issue between them has been the attorney general's attempts to obtain, through court action, the complete list of speakers and guests at the fellowship center in 1954 and 1955.

OUT ON BAIL

Uphaus, as a matter of fact, is now on $1,500 bail pending decision on an appeal to the State Supreme Court, after he had been found guilty of contempt, in January, in refusing to furnish the lists.

Wyman warned, in his 1955 legislature report that "substantial activity at World Fellowship the last two summers should not be overlooked. Individuals with records of both Communist Party membership and lengthy records of pro-Communist affiliation have come to World Fellowship from all over the United States to engage in discussions."

REVEALED IN PAMPHLET

The fact that Hinton and Mrs. Keeney were at Conway was revealed by Uphaus himself, in a pamphlet just at hand called World Fellowship. Edited by Uphaus, the publication says of Hinton that "he * * * has recently lived and worked with Chinese farmers * * * told how they were organizing and their cultural and productive activities in the new order."

Mrs. Keeney was listed as an "authority on Germany." She was at Conway in July, is listed as an economist and foreign affairs analyst.

One other speaker of interest to New Hampshire is mentioned in the Uphaus publication. This was: "Prof. Gwynne Daggett, professor of English at the University of New Hampshire, described the situation with respect to civil liberty in that State and illustrated by an account of New Hampshire Attorney General Wyman's attempted interference with his free exercise of teaching."

Professor Daggett, it will be recalled, was in charge of a UNH class before which Paul Sweezy of Wilton delivered a lecture March 22, 1954. The Supreme Court ruled early this month against Sweezy's appeal from a contempt finding in superior court in this case. Sweezy has now challenged the legality of the New Hampshire antisubversive law.

HINTON RECORD

Hinton appeared before the Senate Internal Security subcommittee chaired by Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER early in March, this year. It was not his first such appearance. This time, the committee wanted to know more about his experiences in China after the Reds took over that nation. And they also wanted to know more about a trunkful of documents allegedly belonging to him, seized when he slipped back into the United States via Moscow—in 1953.

From the record of the JENNER committee meeting in Washington, September 27, 1954, it appears that JENNER told the committee that Hinton, an ex-newspaperman, had been farm manager at the Putney school, run by his mother. Owen Lattimore was once closely associated with the school, the committee was told.

JENNER said Hinton was sent to China near the end of World War II by the United States Office of War Information. He returned home in the spring of 1946 and became organizer for the National Farmers' Union. He returned to China for the U. N. Relief and Rehabilitation Administration in 1947.

ON RED PAYROLL

Senator JENNER, in the RECORD, then went on: "When the Moscow-armed Chinese Communists took over the Chinese mainland in the fall of 1949, this man Hinton remained as an employee of the Communist government." JENNER added: "Since his arrival in this country, he has been propagandizing on behalf of the brainwashing, soul-killing Red Chinese, whose soldiers were torturing and slaying Hinton's fellow Americans at the very moment he was on Red China's payroll."

Mrs. Keeney was listed by Uphaus as having discussed: "The attack on civil liberties of people in the United Nations."

Records here show that she was convicted on a contempt of Congress charge in the United States district court, after she had refused to answer questions about who had aided her in getting a U. N. job. That decision was reversed on a technicality in 1954.

MRS. KEENEY 'EXPERT'

Here is a summary of her background, contained in the court record: "The jury has been told that appellant had been very closely associated with important members of the Communist underground and overground, that she and her husband became close acquaintances and fraternized with one Silvermaster and one Ullman who were well known as alleged espionage agents working for the Russian Government in obtaining secrets from our Government, that she has

been active in the Institute of Pacific Relations, whose ramifications were to undermine the security of the United States and to accomplish certain activities of the institue in foreign affairs that would 'line us and them up with the Soviet Union'."

Both Nathan Gregory Silvermaster and Capt. William Ludwig Ullman have been identified by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover as spies. Both once worked directly under the late Harry Dexter White in the Treasury Department.

Brazil in the Future of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Brazil in the Future of America," delivered by Mr. J. Peter Grace, president of W. R. Grace & Co., delivered before the Executives Club of Chicago on April 20.

Mr. Grace is a dynamic leader of our new generation of top business executives, but he speaks against a background of more than a century of experience which his firm has had in Latin America. In addition to his business duties, Mr. Grace has devoted considerable time and energy to various Government advisory groups seeking to encourage and develop the further growth of United States private investment in Latin America.

The address given before the Executives Club of Chicago is one of several made by Mr. Grace in recent months calling attention to the great contribution which American businessmen and investors can make in developing the economies of the Latin Amercian Republics. I highly recommend its reading to Members of the Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRAZIL IN THE FUTURE OF AMERICA

(By J. Peter Grace)

Mr. Chairman, to be invited to lunch at all by the Executives' Club of Chicago is a distinct privilege. But to be invited to be your speaker is an honor which should belong to a much more learned man that I. I gratefully acknowledge your generosity in selecting me—only, however, in my capacity as the representative of the 45,000 men and women in 21 countries who really constitute W. R. Grace & Co. On their behalf and on my own, I thank you for this privilege.

Although W. R. Grace & Co. has more recently become known primarily as a United States chemical company, it has its roots deep in Latin America, and the lessons we have learned during more than a century in that rapidly developing part of the world will always remain a basic part of our business philosophy.

On various occasions in the past I have referred to the importance of Peru, where our company was founded more than a century ago, and of the vital role of Chile, Venezuela, Colombia, Mexico, and other Latin American countries in the history which is being written in our time.

Today I should like to discuss with you the significance of a Latin American country which is perhaps more vital to the future of our Western World than any other. I refer to Brazil.

This vast and dynamic nation is now within striking distance of its manifest destiny of economic and political greatness, and I should like to discuss it from the point of view of a businessman. But before going any further, I should emphasize that 20 years of training in the Grace organization have taught me that no North American should think of a Latin American country purely as a business proposition. Latin America has a vital part in our present and a much more important role in our future. The point is that we can engage in business there, earning a profit for our stockholders, and at the same time contribute to the future security of the Western Hemisphere.

Although our main Latin American interests have been concentrated in the west coast countries of South America, still the Grace organization has been active in Brazil for more than a half century in trade and commerce. From our long experience in Latin America we are convinced that, for massive growth potential, the opportunities in Brazil are unmatched in the world. I hasten to state that our own knowledge of the industrial field in Brazil is by no means as profound as that of many American concerns whose headquarters are right here in Chicago. In fact, Chicago is a really great center of knowledge in this country regarding Brazilian and other foreign business.

When this country needed an Assistant Secretary of State for International Economic Affairs, it turned to the First National Bank of Chicago to select Herbert Prochnow. A Chicago firm, International Packers, in partnership with the Kleberg family of the King Ranch, is revolutionizing the cattle-raising industry in central Brazil by introducing the Santa Gertrudis breed. This has enabled an English beef type of cattle for the first time to resist the local ravages of hoof and mouth disease and climate. In addition to highly efficient management of its 40,000 head of cattle and 155,000 acres of land, this company has also won the praise of Brazilians for its modern techniques of land clearing and development. The first survey for this project was made by a Chicagoan, A. Thomas Taylor, together with Robert J. Kleberg of the King Ranch. In two small Beechcraft planes, they covered the entire Matto Grosso territory, the Grand Parana, and explored the Brazilian interior to the Paraguayan and Bolivian borders. There is no question that Tom Taylor and Bob Kleberg know more today about the great potential of the interior of Brazil than any other Americans.

To those who would regard Chicago as something less than internationally minded, I would like to mention International Harvester, Sears Roebuck, Fairbanks Morse, Armour, Swift, Wilson, Abbott Laboratories, Quaker Oats, Pullman Standard—just to name a few of the many great Chicago companies doing business in Brazil. Despite the already great economic stake we have in Brazil, I am sure that all of you will agree with me that we have not even begun to begin the job of developing the United States-Brazilian economic relationship to the fullest. This I think is one of the most important elements in our economic foreign policy for the second half of the 20th century.

Today we have already made a good start in this direction. Total United States direct private investment in Brazil at the end of 1954 amounted to $1.1 billion. Excluding the $1 billion of United States capital invested in the petroleum industry in Venezuela, Brazil has more United States direct private investment than any other Latin American country. Equally impressive is the fact that, during the 8 years from 1946 to 1954, total United States direct private investment in Brazil increased 225 percent and manufacturing investments, where our best opportunities lie, at an even greater rate—325 percent.

Soviet Premier Bulganin's recent economic manifesto to Latin America indicates that there is danger of a vacuum in economic leadership in the Western Hemisphere. The United States must assert that leadersip, and to do so it must work particularly closely with Brazil.

The challenge as it pertains to Brazil is not one of political cultivation, for our countries have been friends for generations, even before Brazil declared herself a republic and adopted a constitution modeled after our own. Rather, the challenge is an economic one.

You will all recall that Brazil's dynamic new President Kubitschek made a special trip to the United States just before his inauguration last January. He invited American businessmen to bring their talents and their experience to his country. The question now, therefore, is whether American private capital is going to increase substantially its investment in Brazil, working with Brazilians in developing their tremendous natural resources and their huge industrial potential.

To start off with, I would like to give you a few highlights on Brazil. First of all, Brazil is big—both in area and in population.

In area Brazil accounts for half of South America. To make an even more pointed comparison—and I hope that some of my Texas friends may hear this one—Brazil is bigger than Texas. As a matter of fact, it is bigger than Texas plus all the rest of the United States, including Texas—and that is big in anybody's book.

Brazil's population presently stands at 58 million people, which is just under one-half of South America's total of about 122 million. This country's vitality can be further appreciated by the fact that its population is increasing at the amazing rate of 2.4 percent a year—or at a 30 percent faster rate than in the United States.

To put it another way, Brazil's present population is greater than the United Kingdom, and four times that of Canada. By the end of 1980, its population is estimated to equal over 105 million, or 60 percent of the present population of the United States.

Equally impressive as the vitality of the Brazilian people, is their quality and character, one of the nation's greatest assets. They are by nature a kindly, pleasant, cooperative people. They have unusual patience and sense of humor blended with quick intelligence and great common sense. They are working with missionary zeal to develop their country to take advantage of the opportunities now opening up for them and their children to get ahead. The street cleaner sees his son go into factory work earning good wages. The mechanic's assistant today opens a one-man repair shop tomorrow. The small-business man firmly expects to make a million before he quits.

We know, this exciting story very well because this is the way the United States grew in economic strength. A strong middle class with increasing purchasing power is rapidly developing in Brazil. This opens up promising new economic vistas in an area which is big, in a market that is growing and in a country that wants American capital.

In the lifetime of many of us here, Brazil has turned itself from an agricultural country which imported just about everything, including ice, to the most highly industrialized nation in Latin America. In the 10-year period from 1940 to 1950 alone, Brazil almost doubled the number of her industrial establishments from 49,000 to 89,000 and they are estimated at 115,000 today.

Today Brazil is manufacturing an increasingly substantial part of its own needs including railway equipment, radios, refrigera-

tors, machine tools, precision instruments, diesel motors and many other products.

In 1938, Brazil's crude steel production amounted to only 101,000 tons. By 1954, its production had risen to 1,292,000 tons, an increase of 1,200 percent. During this same period, crude steel production in the United States rose from 32 million tons to 88 million tons, or by 175 percent.

Brazil produced 109,000 tons of paper other than newsprint in 1938 and, by 1954, 298,000 tons, an increase of 175 percent. In the United States, the production of paper excluding newsprint increased from 5.4 million tons to 11.8 million tons, 120 percent.

In the 1920's Brazil had only 1 cement plant. Today it has 31 and the industry is planning to spend $50 million in expansion to meet demand. Since 1938, Brazil's cement production has risen from 681,000 tons to 2.7 million tons, or by 290 percent, about twice as fast as the 150 percent increase in the United States during this period.

In 1946 electric refrigerators were mostly imported and were only for the wealthy. Today Brazil produces 100,000 units a year and production is scheduled to be doubled within the next 2 years. Before the war all window glass installed in Brazil was imported. Today four large modern plants are supplying the ever-growing market.

Undoubtedly, the greatest symbol of Brazil's economic growth is the dynamic area of Sao Paulo. Fifteen years ago the Sao Paulo area was important principally as a coffee, cotton and textile center. Brazil accounts for 51 percent of the total cotton spindles in all of Latin America, 45 percent of which are located in Sao Paulo. Exports of cotton and coffee from this area account for 46 percent of all of Brazil's exports. Furthermore, the Sao Paulo district today represents the largest concentration of industrial strength and potential in Latin America and accounts for the following:

Forty percent of Brazil's total industrial establishments.

Forty-five percent of the installed electric capacity.

Thirty-five percent of the railway mileage.

Sixty-five percent of the petroleum refining capacity.

Twenty-five percent of the steel and laminated products output.

At the end of 1954 it is estimated that about $600 million of United States direct private investment—60 percent of the total for Brazil—was concentrated in the Sao Paulo area. This amount is greater than for any of the other Latin American republics with the exception of Venezuela, Cuba and Chile.

A visitor to Sao Paulo today can practically see this growth taking place with his own eyes. Back in 1949, he would have seen only three skyscrapers being constructed. Last year he would have seen 47 new skyscrapers being added to Sao Paulo's rising skyline. In the urban area of Sao Paulo, new buildings are being started on the average of one every 18 minutes. As a further indicator of the tempo of activity, there are approximately 40 round trip flights daily, excluding international flights, between Sao Paulo and Rio. Excluding in-transit passengers, air traffic through Sao Paulo has increased from a total of 264,000 passengers in and out during the year 1946 to 997,000 passengers in 1955, an increase of some 277 percent.

Belo Horizonte is another example of a Brazilian boom town. Fifty-eight years ago it was staked out for a population of 200,000 as a capital for the mineral-rich state of Minas Gerais and laid out like Washington and Paris. Today it has over twice that many people—440,000. An industrial area outside the city limits has been filled and a new one is being planned. A German firm has set up a 96,000-ton rolling mill. RCA is building an assembly plant for tubes and electronic parts. Some 12 other plants are either being built or already in operation. Population is increasing at the yearly rate of 5.4 percent, or over twice the rate of the entire country. Fifty-five flights a day are handled by the city airport. Belo Horizonte, in short, has all the sounds and sights of a first-class industrial boom town.

In specific industries the names that lead the industrial fields throughout the world are far from strangers in Brazil.

In chemicals you will find Du Pont, Solvay of Belgium, Koppers, Union Carbide, Imperial Chemical.

In pharmaceuticals, Squibb, Eli Lilly, Parke Davis, Pfizer, Merck, Bayer, Ciba, Geigy.

In tire production, Firestone, Goodyear, Goodrich, Dunlop, Pirelli of Italy.

In automotive assembly, Ford, GM, Chrysler, International Harvester, Mercedes-Benz, Fiat and Volkswagen. Supporting this mushrooming automotive industry are more than 800 independent plants, supplying parts and materials to the assembly lines.

This impressive array tells a dramatic story of Brazil's industrial boom. It is the story of an economy expanding at a remarkably rapid rate.

During the period 1946–1954, Brazil's gross national product increased at an average annual rate of 7.5 percent, the highest of any country in Latin America. This compares with an average annual rate during the same period of 3.2 percent for the United States and 4.4 percent for all of Latin America—Brazil included.

In terms of volume, the gross national product of Brazil in 1954 amounted to $13.9 billion. This was 30 percent of the total gross product of all Latin America.

One of the most attractive features of the Brazilian economy is the tremendous growth potential of its consumer market. Today only 20 million, or approximately one-third of its 58 million people make up the consumer population, thus leaving two-thirds yet to be brought in.

I am sure that many of you are wondering how United States companies have fared in Brazil in the past. The answer is that despite political unrest, exchange difficulties and inflation, American business has done exceedingly well in Brazil. Just as a few examples, I cite the following:

American Home Products' investment in Brazil has increased 270 percent since 1950 and its sales volume, 375 percent.

Sears, Roebuck opened its first store in Rio in 1948. To this it has added 2 in Sao Paulo and 1 in Santos. Practically everything Sears sells is manufactured in Brazil by Brazilians according to its own specifications.

The Lone Star Cement Co. established a Brazilian subsidiary in 1933 with a capacity of 800,000 barrels a year. Today its capacity has been expanded to 3.6 million barrels.

Ford has found in Brazil a major export market. Through its Brazilian subsidiary, Ford has sold some 130,000 vehicles there in the period since the end of World War II. By 1948 Ford became so convinced of the great potential of the Brazilian market that it decided to replace its old assembly facilities with a new $14 million plant, which was completed in 1953, with a capacity of 125 cars and trucks a day.

Ford's local purchasing program, started in 1949 and aimed at helping Brazil conserve foreign exchange and develop local industry, is an excellent example of how foreign capital can assist in strengthening a nation's economy. Today Ford purchases about 3,000 different items locally and the percentage of local material used in a Ford truck has risen to approximately 32 percent by weight.

We definitely think the Brazilian investment climate is good. Brazil is eagerly seeking and needs foreign investors, but she wants and obviously requires the kind that will stay on for the long pull and help in her industrial and economic development. I think it is a serious mistake for any of us to insist that Brazil conform to our every possible request before we consider investing. Real partners who come to stay will prosper in Brazil.

Brazil is understandably sensitive and has little regard, as we do, for the Monday morning quarterback. To our advantage her people, plainly and simply, like Americans and they say so. Our own Washington and Lincoln are great political heroes there. Brazil has stood by us in war. She is sending us her students and engineers and doctors for study. Last year alone, 507 of her students and 88 of her doctors were being educated in the United States. Dr. Milton Eisenhower, on his memorable Latin American trip, noted Brazil's interest in American tradition and history. President Kubitschek is in the best American tradition of the self-made man. He worked his way through medical school and fought his way to national leadership, rising from such poverty that he wore his first pair of shoes at the age of 11. President Kubitschek's administration already reflects this same drive and energy.

I do not venture to predict that the dilemma of coffee prices which has plagued Brazil's export trade and her exchange position will soon be solved. I would urge, however, that as friends of Brazil we take a more sympathetic attitude toward her need for a fair return on coffee, her largest export. After all, she is not asking for a handout and every dollar she gets for coffee comes back to us in the purchase of United States goods.

I will, however, venture one prediction, and that is that Brazil in the very near future will take affirmative steps to solve her petroleum problem in her own way. Today Brazil is spending almost one-third of her dollar earnings on oil imports and there appears to be no doubt that President Kubitschek is determined to bring about a speedy solution to this vital problem.

Gentlemen, Brazil offers an opportunity for United States private capital unique in our times. This great nation has a definite and important place in the future of America. With much of Brazil's economic potential yet to be developed, our dependence upon Brazil in the years to come will constantly increase. American technology may substantially change this situation but for the long run we must assume, I feel, that Brazil will be one of our most indispensable economic allies. We should sow our confidence in this country now, for what we do today in Brazil will determine in the years ahead what Brazil will do for us.

In the future Brazil will take her rightful place among the leading industrial nations of the world. For those of us who go into Brazil now and work with the Brazilians in developing their country at this very time when they are growing and seeking our help, the returns over the years should be eminently rewarding. Therefore, it is to our own interest as well as to hers that we accept the invitation now being offered us to share in Brazil's destiny.

The Pius XII Memorial Library

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to be a member of UNICO, a national organization of Americans of Italian heritage whose aims are signi-

fied by its motto, "Service Above Self." This organization is designed to encourage and foster Americanism and at the same time to preserve the love for the ancestral land and culture of the membership. UNICO members are asked to make great sacrifices, not for any personal gain, but for the happiness found in service to others. UNICO, which derives its name from the first letters of the words unity, neighborliness, integrity, charity, and opportunity—has carried out an impresive program of philanthropy since its founding in 1922, both on a local and national scale. Thus, the members of UNICO show their gratitude to America which has enabled them to give expression to the best within them.

Of the countless civic and humanitarian activities of the UNICO chapters throughout the country and of UNICO national, perhaps the most unusual is the currrent effort to raise donations for the erection of the Pius XII Memorial Library on the campus of St. Louis University. Under the able leadership of National President Alphonse A. Miele, of Bloomfield, N. J., and Dr. Nicholas S. Vitale, a national vice president, this unique project is making admirable progress. President Miele delivered a most interesting address on the subject at a sectional meeting of UNICO for the State of Pennsylvania groups at Wilkes-Barre on March 24, 1956. I know that the membership will enjoy reading President Miele's speech which follows:

INFORMATIVE TALK BY PRESIDENT MIELE

Dear fellow Unicans, when our beloved founder, Dr. Anthony Vastola, and his 14 fellow citizens and Waterbury, Conn., founded Unico in 1922, they envisioned the growth of chapters both in number and in prestige. Today that realistic dream is being fulfilled. Unico currently is enjoying an era of high civic reputation in 18 States across the Nation, because its name has become synonymous with civic and national projects ranging from aid to local charities to founding memorial units in the International College of Surgeons and in the Pius XII memorial library to be erected on the campus of St. Louis University. It is about the latter subject that I would like to talk to you tonight.

Among the treasures preserved in the Eternal City of Rome is a vast collection of precious manuscripts which have been kept for centuries in the Vatican library. Realizing the danger of earthquake, fire, or (God forbid) even atomic attack, several of the literary and scientific treasures of the world would be lost, for there has been no duplication of these documents. A singular event took place on November 1, 1950, when, at St. Louis University in St. Louis, Mo., a history scholar and the college librarian won the permission of the university president, the Very Rev. Paul C. Reinert, S. J., to petition for the privilege to microfilm the manuscript collection of the Vatican. Six weeks later Father Anselmo Albareda, chief librarian of the Vatican, granted the unique request. For 25 years other institutions had sought this permission. St. Louis, however, the industrial center of our country and equally strategic location as far as safety is concerned, seemed a likely repository for the Vatican papers. Following this permission came the almost insurmountable task of choosing material to be microfilmed. It meant two trips to Rome, the acquisition of highly technical equipment, a series of conferences with learned librarians, both at home and abroad, and the finding of a donor who would pick up the check for the microfilming process currently costing around $300,000. Since this was during the Korean War, microfilm equipment was hard to come by, but with technical counseling from such able consultants as Edward Freel of Remington Rand and Mr. M. B. Brand of the Graphic Microfilm Co., the university authorities were led to sources whereby the project could get under way. The United States Air Force also released an additional film developer. This particular machine, costing $15,000, in one thermostatically controlled process develops, washes, dries, and winds the film as fast as the cameras can use it. To the assistance of the two priests in charge came the Knights of Columbus Foundation for the Preservation of Historic Documents, which agreed to pick up the check for the cost of the microfilming. Dr. Carl Rossi, chief technician of the Vatican microfilm laboratory, organized a team of camera technicians and since 1953 the process has been a reality.

Among the documents being reproduced are manuscripts in Greek, Hebrew, Sanskrit, and Oriental tongues. The majority of the volumes, however, are in Latin, Italian, French, German, or Spanish. The manuscripts cover a broad subject matter with no particular emphasis on eccleciastical matters. Scholars from all over the Western World, regardless of creed or nation, will be welcome at Saint Louis University to engage in investigate research. Their effort will give a new quality to American culture and a rich refreshment to American scholarship. Requests have already come from hundreds of institutions for information of the microfilm that has already been received. Currently the precious film is being stored in the Vatican Room of the general university library. So great was the attention given the project that the university authorities, foreseeing the need for a greater service to scholars and an increased need of facilities for the university student body of some 12,000 students, proposed a new, spacious, and serviceable library which would become a new home for the Vatican documents and be supplemented by the 800,000 volumes now in use in the university's central library. At this point in the project the university president, Father Reinert, requested permission of the Pope to name this great center of research in honor of His Holiness Pope Pius XII. This extraordinary permission was granted in the form of a letter to Father Reinert, signed by the hand of the Pope on January 2, 1953. Since then all roads of interest led not only to Rome but to Saint Louis, U. S. A., which is destined to become a mecca for American scholars.

UNICO is privileged to lend its united interest and philanthropic prestige in the promotion of this program. Dr. Nicholas S. Vitale, a well known Saint Louis physician and a graduate of the university, as well as a national vice president of UNICO National, is spearheading UNICO's effort to be identified in a fitting memorial with a program which is so near and dear to the interests of the Supreme Pontiff.

As Farther Reinert recently said, "As history cannot be denied, we also know that the nature of men does not change. As it was the voluntary action of the Italian people throughout the centuries to recognize and preserve the great works of scholarship and the fine arts, so we know today that American citizens of Italian heritage will be equally alert to support and perpetuate the same treasures of the ages."

These few facts, I feel, will give you a preview of our most important undertaking for the years of 1956 through 1958. As president of UNICO, I have found the interest high among our membership and having myself been close to this project (in fact having accepted the honorary chairmanship) I know that you will share with me the extreme pride that comes to every Unican when he feels that he and his organization have contributed both spiritually and materially to the transporting of these ancient literary and scientific treasures from the banks of the Tiber to the shores of the Mississippi. Possibly you and I, certainly our sons and daughters, will profit by the advent of this rich plasma to American education.

Freedom Crusade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, the continued imprisonment of 13 American citizens by the Chinese Communists is rapidly becoming a national disgrace, mostly because of the apparent lack of concern on the part of the American people over the plight of these people.

Recently the Very Reverend Harold W. Rigney, S. V. D., who was a prisoner in Red China for 4 years and 2 months, came to Washington and together with several Members of Congress, I had an opportunity to talk with him and to hear his dreadful story at first hand.

While Father Rigney was confined, his friends in the United States worked tirelessly for his release through written petitions and prayer.

Since his return to the United States, Father Rigney is doing all that he can to see that those who are still imprisoned in Red China are released.

Father Rigney and his friends have organized a nationwide freedom crusade, in which millions of Americans will be asked to write and petition for the release of our 13 innocent American citizens.

I am particularly interested because John Downey, of New Britain, a resident of my district, is under a life sentence on the usual trumped-up Communist charges.

I ask that every Member of Congress help us in this crusade and I insert herewith a copy of the circular which is being distributed by those who are active in this patriotic and humane movement:

DIVINE WORD MISSIONARIES, TECHNY, ILL., FREEDOM CRUSADE

Question. What is it?

Answer. The Freedom Crusade is a nationwide letter-writing campaign to Chairman Mao Tse-tung, head of Red China's Government, politely petitioning the release of 13 Americans still held prisoners by the Chinese Reds. This crusade has been launched by Father Rigney and is being conducted with the cooperation of the Back of the Yards Council, Chicago.

Question. Who is Father Rigney?

Answer. Very Reverend Harold W. Rigney, S. V. D., is a Divine Word Missionary, whose 10-year prison sentence in Red China was cut down to 4 years and 2 months by prayer, publicity, and letter writing.

Question. Will it work?

Answer. The letter-writing campaign will work because the Red regime in China is very sensitive to publicity. Moreover, the communistic rulers of China will be more in-

fluenced by letters from laborers, farmers, and labor unions than by requests from our industrialists and politicians. Letters of children will also exert a great influence.

Question. Where was it conceived?

Answer. The campaign was conceived in those dreadful prisons in China by Father Rigney, who felt that just such a campaign was needed to free him and all other Americans rotting in Red prisons.

Question. What is the address?

Answer. The address is simply: Chairman Mao Tse-tung, Peking, China. There is no need to give your return address.

Question. What do I say?

Answer. Your letter should contain three points:

1. Give your name, your occupation (this is most important), the name of your union, if any, and—if married—state the number of children, if any.

2. Then courteously remind Mao Tse-tung that his Government promised in September of 1955 to free the 13 American prisoners still held in China. Say that you would like to see him carry out this promise. And if you have time, list the 13 prisoners.

3. Conclude by saying you hope to see Mao Tse-tung demonstrate the policy of leniency which he professes toward violators of the law, by applying leniency in full to these 13 American prisoners.

Question. Why use airmail?

Answer. The misinformed Chinese will be astonished to see that American laborers can afford airmal. In Red China a carpenter must work several hours to purchase an airmail stamp. Airmail postage to Red China is 25 cents per half ounce. Ten-cent air letters and eight-cent letters via ordinary mail can be used but are less effective.

Question. Will a count be kept?

Answer. Keeping tally of the number of letters sent to Mao Tse-tung is most important for publicity reasons on a national and international basis. Individuals and groups should immediately report the number of letter they have written by sending a post card to: Father Rigney, Chicago, Ill. The tabulating will be done by Chicago's Back of the Yards Council.

Question. Who are the 13 prisoners?

Answer. They are businessmen and missionaries, Protestant and Catholic: Rev. John William Clifford, Jesuit, San Francisco, Calif.; John Thomas Downey, New Britain, Conn.; Richard George Fecteau, Lynn, Mass.; Rev. Fulgence Gross, Franciscan, Omaha, Nebr.; Rev. John Alexander Houle, Jesuit, Glendale, Calif.; Paul J. Mackensen, Jr., Lutheran missionary, Baltimore, Md.; Robert E. McCann, Altadena, Calif; Rev. Charles Joseph McCarthy, Jesuit, San Francisco, Calif.; Rev. Joseph Patrick McCormack, Maryknoll, Palmyra, N. Y.; Rev. Thomas Leonard Phillips, Jesuit, Butte, Mont.; Bishop Ambrose Henry Pinger, Franciscan, Lindsay, Nebr.; Hugh Francis Redmond, Yonkers, N. Y.; Rev. John Paul Wagner, Franciscan, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Question. Give a sample letter.

Answer. The envelope address: Chairman Mao Tse-tung, Peking, China.

The letter:

DEAR CHAIRMAN MAO TSE-TUNG: I am John A. Brown, a carpenter, a member of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters. I am married and have five children.

In September of 1955 your Government promised to release all Americans, and today 13 are still in prison. I would like to see you carry out your promise. The names of the prisoners are (here insert the names if you have time):

I have heard of the policy of leniency which you profess toward violators of the law. It is my fond wish that you carry out this policy of leniency by applying it in full to these 13 American prisoners, releasing them from prison and helping them to leave China and return to their homes.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. BROWN.

Question. Are more circulars available?

Answer. More of these circulars can be obtained by sending your address and stamps to cover return postage to: Father Rigney, Chicago, Ill.

FELLOW AMERICANS: I know what prison life is in Red China, a veritable hell of mental and physical tortures. I am sure these 13 prisoners are going through the same or similar tortures I endured. If your letter helps reduce even to a small extent the imprisonment of these fellow Americans, it will be well worth while and they will be eternally grateful to you as I am to the tens of thousands who wrote letters in my behalf.

Sincerely yours,

Father HAROLD RIGNEY, S. V. D.

Keep Your Guard Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 5, 1956, in my home town of Kansas City, Kans., a million-dollar National Guard armory was dedicated.

It was my honor and privilege, not only as a Member of the United States House of Representatives, and a member of the Defense Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, but also as a former National Guard man for many years, to be selected to deliver the address of dedication.

That address follows:

I am happy to be home—home in a city whose citizens, not looking with outstretched hands to Uncle Sam, voted to spend their own money in building such a splendid armory, the most practical, usable armory I have ever seen. Quite frankly, and honestly, it is a much better, more practical and beautiful armory than you would have had if Uncle Sam had been mixed up in its construction, telling you how to build it, and what you could or could not incorporate in it.

I am happy to be here, in my official capacity as a Member of the United States House of Representatives, and of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations which provides the funds, not only for our regular military services, but also for the United States National Guard. I am proud of my nearly 20 years of service in the National Guard, both as a member of the 35th Division in World War I and later years after I made Kansas City, Kans., my home.

I am not here as a recruiting officer for the National Guard, but if I were here in that capacity, I would point out that despite the cynical smiles and sweet talk we now receive from Red Khrushchev and his Kremlin crew we must face the hard, inescapable fact that as long as Soviet Russia remains a menace to the peace and security of the world—including the United States of Amerıct—we must maintain a strong national defense, of which the National Guard is such an important part.

For this reason young Americans face an obligation of military service for the next 10, 20, 30, perhaps 50, years.

I would point out that in the local units of the National Guard young Americans can serve with men of their acquaintance and from their community—serve, and continue their studies—serve and work on their jobs—serve and live with their families and friends.

National Guard service, in peace or in war, is an honorable service, in which any American can take great pride. It is an important part of our national defense. That importance is recognized by the Regular Army—as proven by the message of Gen. Maxwell Taylor, the Army Chief of Staff, and the presence of his Vice Chief of Staff, General Palmer.

Audie Murphy, of whom you have heard or read, is recognized as the outstanding hero—the most decorated American soldier in World War II. Audie Murphy, holder of the Congressional Medal, is again serving his country—not in the Regular Army—but in the United States National Guard. If National Guard service was not an honorable and important service, service in which any soldier can take pride, do you think for a minute that Audie Murphy—hero, soldier that he is—would be in its service? The question answers itself.

I am happy, too, to be here on this occasion, upon which we dedicate this building, for another reason. It is more than a building—it is a dream come true—a tangible testimonial to the vision, tenacity, and faith of one man, Col. Mahlon S. Weed.

Years ago, as a 1st lieutenant, Company G, 137th Infantry, I listened long hours to the "Skipper," for he was then Captain Weed—draw his word picture of what we needed to properly train troops.

At that time, the National Guard armory—called that for lack of a better name—was the old theater, now the site of a laundry, at 15th and Central, just around the corner from here.

Offices and supply rooms were in small, insecure storerooms, with no heat in winter and no ventilation in summer. A side street was our drill field.

Later on the armory site was the basement of Memorial Hall—where units during drill had to dodge countless 36-inch square pillars; where classrooms were inadequate; where all other activity had to stop if any practice firing was to be done.

Even so, the National Guard units that trained there were well-trained and the men who were trained in those units went into World War II and made outstanding records, earning high awards and battlefield commissions—all trained under the leadership of officers like Captain Weed, Capt. Leo Swoboda, Capt. Harry Lyon, Captain Adams, Lieutenant Starry, Major Gloyne, and ever so many others, citizens of this community who saw and shared Skipper Weed's vision.

World War II found our National Guard units ready to answer the call to service from that inadequate memorial basement armory—these units were under the station commander, the late Lt. Col. C. P. Barshfield.

Company G, 137th Infantry, Capt. Mahlon S. Weed, commanding.

Second Battalion Headquarters Company, 137th Infantry, 1st Lt. Don A. Starry.

Medical Detachment, 161st Field Artillery, Maj. Louis Gloyne.

Band, 127th Field Artillery, W. O. Charles M. Nixon.

Thirty-fifth Signal Company, Capt. Clyde B. Adams, and 2d Battalion Headquarters Batteries of 127th Field Artillery, formerly 114th Cavalry, commanded by Capt. Leo Swoboda and Capt. Harry Lyon.

After World War II was ended, most of these men came home. Some had died in combat. National Guard activities were renewed in the basement of the Memorial Building, old units were revived, new units were organized. Today, in Kansas City, Kans., we have 8 units: Company F, 137th Infantry; Company G, 137th Infantry; Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 2d Battalion, 137th Infantry; 2d Battalion Platoon Medical Company, 137th Ifantry; Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 197th Transportation Battalion; 137th Transportation Truck Company; 42d Army Band; and 772d Engineer Company.

In addition, facilities are provided for the administrative headquarters, 137th Infantry,

and the three Regular Army advisers stationed here to supervise and assist with training.

These new units, with the advance of military science, demonstrated the need for new facilities. Many plans were developed and discarded.

Finally, with the bond election almost unanimous, the way was clear. Today you see the culmination of all those efforts. On this ground stands, by your efforts, this magnificent armory, in which the youth of today and tomorrow will receive training from experienced, dedicated men, noncommissioned, as well as commissioned, officers, training that some day may not only save their own lives, but may very well save your country and your life.

The history of the National Guard of the United States is part of the history of this Nation. Militia, it was called in the early days, but militiamen have made history in every war from the minutemen of Concord and Lexington, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, the Mexican Border War, on through St. Mihiel, and the Argonne of World War I, to the steamy, slimy islands of the Pacific and the battlefields of north Africa, Italy, France, Belgium, and Germany in World War II—men who made history in the grey dawn of Omaha Beach, at St. Lo—right up to the very gates of Berlin—after bitter battling at Bastogne through that cold, cold Christmas of 1944.

In World War I over one-fourth of the troops in Europe were national guardsmen (including the 35th Division). World War II saw 9 National Guard units fight in Europe, and 9 in the Pacific. All turned in magnificent records, just as they did later in Korea.

And speaking of Korea, there are many interesting facts not generally recognized or appreciated by the general public. One of them is that Korea was not a so-called brushfire war. It was a war of considerable magnitude as demonstrated by the fact that nearly 2 million more men served during the Korean conflict than in World War I, and we World War I veterans thought that was a big war.

The other fact is that, in that conflict in faroff Korea, again it was civilian soldiers that carried the greater part of the burden.

As may be expected, in view of the almost overnight suddenness with which Korea began, the first ground troops in action were those hastily assembled Regular Army forces then on duty in the Far East. As the war progressed the ratio of Regular to non-Regular decreased so that in December 1951, 2 out of every 3 enlisted soldiers were civilians: National Guards, reservists, and selectees.

In the ranks of officer personnel, Army—and this was generally true of the Air Force, and the naval aviation—from the very beginning 4 out of every 5 officers engaged in the Korean conflict were reservists—non-Regular Army officers.

What was true there and in other wars will always be true. This Nation is not a military nation. Military service is not overly welcomed as career. We have never maintained a large peacetime military force until now. When, in this period of uneasy peace, we have just under 3 million men in service, a Regular Army of over 1 million, nearly a 1-million-man Navy, and almost a million-man Air Force.

Even so, when the "chips are down," "when the bell rings" when another war comes upon us, the major portion of our military manpower will, as it has in the past, come from our civilian soldiers such as the men in these and other National Guard units—and the Reserve components.

Today, as we sit here, Air National Guard pilots in jet planes, such as those participating today, are on the end of runways—on active duty—ready to answer any scramble warnings, as an every-day integral part of our air defense command—minutemen in every sense of the word—on the alert 24 hours each day—in the service of their country for its security.

We used to hear the phrase "A million men spring to arms overnight." That never was true, and it is further from the truth today than ever before.

The science of war, while basic, is ever-changing. The bow gave way to gunpowder, used in the early day, ineffective, highly inaccurate matchlock weighing nearly 20 pounds. These gave way to our effective, accurate, light-hand weapons of today. The pike gave way to the bayonet, which, incidentally, was originated in Bayonne, France, where it got its name when it was but a short sword or pike point to be inserted in a gun muzzle to make that early day doughboy a pikeman as well as a musketeer. Horse cavalry grudgingly gave way to tanks. Hand semaphor has been replaced by radio. Runners save their lives and legs by walkie-talkies. Television today shows a commander what goes on up front. Trucks, jeeps, helicopters and one-man "flying platforms" take the place of "shank's mare." Recoilless weapons, rockets, and missiles of many types displace some of the old artillery. Electronic devices of amazing complexity are just short of miraculous.

We sing in our national anthem about "the rockets red glare; bombs bursting in air." From those rockets used in the War of 1812, the new honest John is a far, far cry; and when it comes to the puny pop and flare of those bombs—as compared to our A and H bombs—there really is a change. Antiaircraft artillery is being superseded by Nike and other guided missiles, which can seek, track, and strike enemy planes.

The old Jn—the early days Army "Jenny"—has been surpassed by jets, fighters and bombers, and guided missiles—pilotless bombers—in effect.

Our new modern Army, of which the 27 divisions of the National Guard and 27 Air National Guard wings are such an important part, needs new modern training facilities. Here in this modern building, which you have given them, your citizen-soldiers will learn about these modern weapons, radio, radar, electronics, the new as well as the older weapons of war. The faith and confidence you have shown in them will be returned to you a thousand-fold in the years to come.

After all, these young men are your sons; the pay they receive, and it amounts to one-half million dollars per year, is spent right here in their home community, which means that this is not only an investment in the future security of our Nation, but looking at it from a selfish angle, it is also a good business investment, because each one of those dollars turns over seven times before it leaves the community.

You have given a modest sum in your tax dollars, a premium on your insurance policy for national security. These young men who train here will give of their time—time taken from pleasurable pursuits, time taken from their families, time taken from vacations, perhaps they may even give their lives, all in order that you and the Nation may sleep better tonight and every night.

No one knows when they may again be called upon for peacetime duty, just as they were on black Friday, July 13, 1951, when the biggest flood of all times hit our homes.

No one knows when these units will be called into Federal service. Maybe tomorrow, perhaps never. Yet with the advent of atomic power, with Russia a menace to world peace, when it is possible, though not probable, that nearly any part of our Nation might become a target, the National Guard becomes more and more an integral part of our national defense system.

So it is with great pleasure that I share with you the joy you have in dedicating this building to the service of your community, your State, and your Nation, to be used in the training of your youth for service in time of war or peace. These young men serving in the units which will use this armory, I am sure, will in the future, just as their fathers did in the past, serve with skill, courage, and loyalty—serve in such an exemplary manner that they themselves, and you, will have great pride in their service and exploits should the call ever come.

With these marvelous modern facilities they will be far better prepared than they could have been otherwise. Even so, I am sure you join me in the prayer that, even though prepared, they will never be called upon to serve in time of war.

With them let this be your slogan, "Keep your Guard up."

At the conclusion of these remarks, and as a part of this dedication ceremony, I will present to Col. Mahlon Weed, station commander, this United States flag, which at my request was flown over the United States Capitol on the 5th day of August 1953, an anniversary of the 5th day of August 1917.

That date of August 5, 1917, does not mean much to today's generation, but to us older veterans of the National Guard it was a momentous day in our life.

That was the day when all of the National Guard units in the United States were mustered into Federal service for World War I.

Among those guardsmen was our guest, former President Harry S. Truman, who entered service as captain of Battery E, 129th Field Artillery; another was your host, then Sergeant Weed, Company H, 137th Infantry; Pvt. Errett P. Scrivner, later Pfc., took his oath along with others in Battery B, 129th Field Artillery.

Many of the leaders of this city, Kansas City, Kans., ceased being civilians on that day when their units were also mustered into service:

Company A, 137th Infantry.
Battery E, 130th Artillery.
Company B, 110th Engineers.
Company C, 110th Engineers.
Two ambulance companies, 110th Sanitary Train.
A section of ammunition train, 42d Division.

All of us—all of them—are proud of their service—which we will never forget although others may. Our service helped bring victory—just as National Guadsmen always have and always will.

We were proud to serve under our country's flag then—just as we are proud to live under it today.

This flag is more than mere threads of Red, White, and Blue. In its folds are contained all the glorious history of the past, and the hopes of the future of this great Nation.

And, as Francis Scott Key said, about the Star Spangled Banner, in those closing words of our national anthem:

"Long may it wave o'er the land of the free, and the home of the brave."

And it will wave long, because this Nation is—has been—and will be the land of the free because it is the home of the brave.

Brave because they have faith—
Faith in themselves—
Faith in their country—
Faith in its future.

An above all because they have an abiding faith in God—the Divine Providence—that has guided and guarded our beloved Republic for nearly 200 years.

Confident Public Keeps Spending at High Rate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, many Members of Congress are wondering about the confidence of people generally in our economy. Recently, the Federal Reserve Board in cooperation with the University of Michigan conducted a survey of the consumers' view for 1956. It indicates a high rate of spending for the remainder of 1956. This is the most hopeful sign for the continued prosperity of our economy. A résumé of this survey was reported by the columnist, James E. Roper, in last Sunday's Washington Star, and it is herewith appended.

THE CONSUMER: CONFIDENT PUBLIC KEEPS SPENDING AT HIGH RATE

(By James E. Roper)

Consumers, their confidence in the future strong, will be pouring dollars—their own and borrowed—into the economy at a brisk clip come election day. Their spending may be slightly above that of last fall.

That is the opinion of a number of economists who study consumer habits. They hasten to qualify it, however, with the warning that the American housewife—the No. 1 consumer—is an extremely volatile person and that her responses, however whimsical, to events can change the outlook completely.

But putting aside the intangibles, the economists find several reasons for expecting high spending for food, clothing, housing, automobiles, entertainment, and the other consumer items.

THE CONSUMERS' TALK

The consumers' own expression of what they intend to do is reflected in a survey conducted by the Federal Reserve Board in cooperation with the University of Michigan.

The survey, made early this year, found that consumers view their current financial situation favorably, are optimistic about their own income prospects, and are very optimistic about prospects for business generally.

Compared with a survey a year earlier, the Reserve Board said, about the same proportions of consumers reported plans to buy new and used automobiles, other durable goods, and new and used houses, and to undertake home improvement and maintenance.

The Federal Reserve Board found that two-fifths of the consumers felt they were better off early this year than at the beginning of last year, and less than one-fourth felt they were worse off.

As for the future, nearly two-fifths of the consumers interviewed said they expected to be making more a year from now. Less than one-tenth said they expected to be making less.

WORDS OF CAUTION

Having said all of this, however, the Federal Reserve Board cautions:

"Consumer plans to buy, expressed early in the year, should not be taken as a forecast of what consumers actually will buy during the year. Many factors, some of them impossible for consumers to know in advance—such as changes in prices and credit availability, attractiveness of new products and models, and changes in general business conditions—will influence consumer buying during the year."

In examining the probable outlook for this fall, therefore, it is advisable to examine not only what consumers say they will do, but what they actually have done so far this year.

On balance, they have spent a little more than they did a year earlier. It is true that automobile sales have lagged so badly that production is running 25 percent or more below a year ago. Housing starts show a 20-percent decline.

These declines, however, are below the record-breaking figures for 1955. By almost any other comparison, the activity this year is encouraging.

STORE SALES UP

Consumers are spending liberally on soft goods, too. For the Nation as a whole, department store sales so far this year have been running about 6 percent above a year ago. In Washington, they are running closer to 10 percent. Most store owners see the trend continuing.

Debt is mounting. At the end of February, installment debt—on such things as automobiles and other durable goods—totaled $27.7 billion—$5 billion more than a year earlier. Mortgage debt and installment credit are up, too.

This reflects the country's enthusiastic confidence in the future. But it makes the consumers more sensitive to any changes in the business outlook. If the consumers—with or without reason—suddenly lose confidence in the future, they could cut back their spending so sharply that the whole economy would be jolted.

This is a danger that causes some economists to keep their fingers crossed. But so far, the consumer—as buoyant and well-heeled as ever in the history of the United States—seems intent on spending freely and confidently.

Philadelphia's Position in East Coast Cab Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which has jurisdiction over the work of the Civil Aeronautics Board and which originates all legislation dealing with aviation matters, I have never believed in having the committee intervene in pending cases. I think all of my colleagues on the committee would agree with that point of view.

On the other hand, as a Member of Congress from Philadelphia, I believe it is my right and my duty to make sure that my city's position on aviation route matters is clearly brought out.

There is now pending before the CAB an important case involving east coast routes, a case in which some of my New England colleagues have evidenced strong interest. There have been a number of statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD bearing on the case and on the examiner's report.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am herewith inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for the information of all those interested and concerned, the position of the city of Philadelphia, jointly with the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, on this matter.

In this connection, I include an article from the February 23d issue of the Chamber of Commerce News of Greater Philadelphia entitled "Chamber of Commerce Pushes for O. K. of New Flights to South America," an article from the same publication of April 19 entitled "CAB Examiner's Report Reviewed; Chamber of Commerce Urges Fourth East Coast Carrier"; and, following that, the statement of exceptions of the city of Philadelphia and the Chamber of Commerce of Philadelphia to the initial decision of Examiner Thomas L. Wrenn in the case known as the New York-Florida Proceeding, Docket No. 3051, et al.

The material referred to is as follows:

[From the Chamber of Commerce News of Greater Philadelphia of February 23, 1956]

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE PUSHES FOR O. K. OF NEW FLIGHTS TO SOUTH AMERICA

The chamber this week endorsed an application of Pan American World Airways, Inc., before the Civil Aeronautics Board which would give the International Airport here its first 1-carrier, 1-plane service to Caribbean, Central and South American areas. The city administration joined with the chamber in asking for CAB approval of the proposed service.

At the same time, the 60-man board of directors of the chamber also favored the authorization of Northeast Airlines, presently operating between New York and New England points, to extend its service as far south as Philadelphia.

PROPOSED BY MILLER

The board took the action after hearing the resolution proposed by Walter P. Miller, Jr., chamber president, which said in part:

"Philadelphia, the third largest city and the second seaport of the United States, has a substantial community of interest with other Atlantic coastal area cities and all Latin American and European countries * * * (but) to and from Latin America there is no single carrier, one-plane airline service and the existing domestic and trans-Atlantic services are not adequate to meet the needs of the business and commercial interests of Philadelphia."

SERVICES JUSTIFIED

The resolution also noted that the "community of interest" between Philadelphia and many points in New England justified the authorization of single-carrier, single-plane services between the two areas.

In the case of Pan American World Airways, the action before the CAB proposes to serve Philadelphia with 3 nonstop daily flights to Miami, Fla., 2 of which would continue on to Latin American points, giving the city its first 1-carrier, 1-plane service to that part of the world.

WOULD BE BOON

In commenting on the board action, Miller pointed out that the proposed single carrier, one-plane service to Latin America points would be a "boon to the fast-growing industrial and commercial links between our area and our good friends in South and Central America. It would be a tremendous stimulant to trade relations, as well as facilitating the travel of businessmen and tourists between the two areas."

Miller pointed to an obvious need for additional service to Miami, Fla., in view of an increase during the first 6 months of 1955 compared to the first 6 months of 1954 in travelers between Philadelphia and Miami from 32,914 to 48,045 or a gain of 46 percent. He compared this to an increase of only 21.6 percent in travel between all east-

ern cities and Miami during the same period.

NEW YORK BOTTLENECK

"There is also," said Miller, "a steadily growing need for additional 1-carrier, 1-plane service to New England, particularly such as Northeast Airlines would provide, by-passing the bottleneck caused by stops at New York."

[From the Chamber of Commerce News of Greater Philadelphia of April 19, 1956]

CAB EXAMINER'S REPORT REVIEWED; CHAMBER OF COMMERCE URGES FOURTH EAST COAST CARRIER

(By Samuel H. Williams)

Civil Aeronautics Board Examiner Thomas L. Wrenn has issued his report and recommendations in the important east coast route proceeding. It is in this proceeding that the chamber and the city of Philadelphia are endeavoring to have the CAB establish 1-carrier service between Philadelphia and important Latin American areas by authorizing Pan American World Airways to operate between Miami, its present Latin American terminal, and Philadelphia.

Although the examiner does not recommend that Pan American be selected as an additional carrier in this route, now served by Eastern and National, he recommends many changes in the Philadelphia east coast air transport pattern that, if approved, will be of substantial benefit to Philadelphia. Among his recommendations was that Delta Air Lines be awarded a route between Philadelphia and other northeast cities and Miami, with service to many intermediate points.

FOURTH CARRIER URGED

The chamber and city will, however, urge upon the CAB that a fourth carrier should be authorized to serve this important route and that this carrier should be Pan American, which could provide the Philadelphia area with sorely needed Latin American passenger and cargo service. Such additional service will be urged in exceptions to be filed to the examiner's report and oral argument thereon.

Furthermore, the chamber and city will urge that, while the examiner recommends substantial improvement in Philadelphia's New England service with respect to certain cities, there is a need in the public interest for the authorization of a carrier that can serve other and smaller New England points by overflying New York.

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

The authorizations recommended with respect to New England include the removal of a route restriction that precludes Eastern Air Lines from providing Philadelphia with service to Boston, Providence, Hartford, Springfield, and New Haven, except on flights originating or terminating south of Richmond, Va. or Charleston, W. Va. Furthermore, National Airlines' route would be extended so that it could provide Philadelphia with service to and from these points.

In addition, United Air Lines and Trans-World Airlines would be authorized to provide Philadelphia with service to and from Boston on the north and Washington on the south, serving the intermediate points of Hartford, Springfield, and Baltimore.

WANTS RESTRICTION REMOVED

The examiner recommends that a route restriction precluding National Airlines from handling local traffic between Philadelphia and New York-Newark be removed.

Capital Airlines would be authorized to serve Norfolk and Newport News, Va., without making a stop at Washington as is now required.

WOULD PERMIT DIRECT SERVICE

Eastern Air Lines would be permitted to provide Philadelphia with direct nonstop service to and from such west coast Florida points as Tampa, St. Petersburg, and Clearwater, without making a stop at Atlanta, Ga., as now required.

The Delta authorization recommended would provide Philadelphia with new service to many other points in addition to Miami, including Tampa, St. Petersburg, and Jacksonville, Fla., Augusta and Brunswick, Ga., Columbia, S. C., and Fayetteville, Greensboro, Winston-Salem, and High Point, N. C.

IN THE MATTER OF THE NEW YORK-FLORIDA PROCEEDING—EXCEPTIONS OF THE CITY OF PHILADELPHIA AND THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF GREATER PHILADELPHIA TO INITIAL DECISION OF EXAMINER THOMAS L. WRENN BEFORE THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD, WASHINGTON, D. C.—DOCKET NO. 3051, ET AL.

To the Civil Aeronautics Board:

Comes now the city of Philadelphia and the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia, and through their counsel of record, hereby respectfully except, pursuant to the instructions of the hearing examiner herein and rule 30 of the Rules of Practice of the Civil Aeronautics Board, to the examiner's initial decision herein, served on April 3, 1956, as follows:

Exception is taken to the failure of the examiner to find that single carrier service between Philadelphia and New England points other than Boston, Hartford, Springfield, and Providence is required by the public convenience and necessity.

Exception is taken to the examiner's finding that the extensions of United's route No. 1 and TWA's route No. 2 should be subject to long-haul restrictions insofar as service terminating or originating at Philadelphia is concerned.

Exception is taken to the failure of the examiner fully to recognize the needs of the city of Philadelphia for 1-plane, 1-carrier service to the Caribbean area and South and Central America.

The city and chamber, however, specifically concur in the finding that additional service between Philadelphia and the Florida area is warranted as well as the recommended certification of Delta to give direct service between Philadelphia and United States points south thereof. In addition the lifting of the several restrictions on National and Eastern, the extension of route No. 51 of Capital from Norfolk to Philadelphia and the extensions of United's route No. 1 and TWA's route No. 2 are concurred in.

In support of their exceptions the city and chamber rely on the entire evidentiary record, prior board policy decisions, and matters of which official notice may be taken.

The city and chamber will not file a brief in support of their exceptions but seek permission to participate in any oral argument which may be had before the board in connection with this proceeding.

Respectfully submitted.

JOSEPH J. O'CONNELL, JR.,
ROBERT REED GRAY,
Attorneys for city of Philadelphia and the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia.

APRIL 19, 1956.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

It is hereby certified that a copy of the foregoing exceptions have been served on all parties of record in this proceeding by mailing a copy thereof properly addressed and postage prepaid.

ROBERT REED GRAY.

APRIL 18, 1956.

H. R. 10765, a Bill To Amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, the occupation of longshoremen is arduous and dangerous.

There has been reported out of the Committee on Education and Labor and is at present in the Rules Committee, H. R. 10765, a bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to provide increased benefits in cases of disabling injuries and for other purposes.

The necessity for this legislation becomes more obvious when one reads the excellent description of a longshoreman's daily routine as portrayed by Jacques Nevard in a feature article in the New York Times of Sunday, May 6, 1956, which I have the pleasure of presenting at this time:

(By Jacques Navard)

More than 24,000 longshoremen worked approximately 945,000 man-hours last week to produce the continuing marvel of cargo handling that has kept the Port of New York the preferred gateway for the Nation's export and import trade.

During the 7-day period, the port handled about 615,000 tons of foreign commerce and 970,000 tons of domestic water-borne freight. This was just part of the work that has maintained the port in the top position despite unfavorable publicity in recent years.

The men who loaded and unloaded a substantial portion of this cargo are members of the International Longshoremen's Association. The union was expelled from the American Federation of Labor in 1953 for failure to rid itself of criminals and racketeers in high posts. But many of the rank-and-file members have taken personally all references to the union's ills ever since.

A reporter who roamed the piers last week was regarded with suspicion by many of the men, some of whom were pungently vocal. Their belief was that newspapers have given too much emphasis to waterfront crime and that no reporter would visit the piers unless it was to do a story "knocking the longshoremen."

WE'RE NOT MURDERERS

When it was explained that the purpose of the visit was to see what working longshoremen do and how they do it, there were still reservations. One man declared:

"I don't care what you say about us, as long as you put in that we're not murderers. Some of my kids' friends don't even talk to them since they found out that I'm a longshoreman."

The dockers are not talkative as a group. But they were quick to say that their work was hard, occasionally unpleasant and sometimes dangerous. Indicative of the hazards is the fact that the workmen's compensation premium rate for longshoremen is higher than for any other industrial category in the Nation.

A wide variety of crafts are covered by the general term longshoreman. There are holdmen, deckmen and dockmen, and those are, strictly speaking, the longshoremen.

But generically the term longshoreman also includes extra pier labor, checkers, clerks, shenangos, sweepers, coopers and carpenters. In addition there are the tractor drivers who man the "hi-los," cranes and mules that scuttle along the piers.

The term "longshoreman" does not include stevedores, who are, in the Port of New York at least, the individuals or companies that employ the various categories of longshoremen.

MORE THAN MUSCLE NEEDED

The work of longshoremen is the unloading and loading of ships. The efficient performance of this work requires familiarity with the multitude of items that can be crammed into the holds of a merchant vessel. But operating staff personnel on piers maintain that the work is not in the skilled classification.

They admit, however, that they would rather have experienced gangs than inexperienced ones.

"Just watch two old timers stowing bags of coffee," one cargo manager said. "Each bag weighs 154 pounds and the men can heft them without working up a sweat. If we had two younger men who didn't know how to handle freight, they would be exhausted in an hour."

And cargo still is a standard employer argument against a rotary hiring system.

General cargo ships are loaded and unloaded by longshoremen who are organized into 20-man gangs. Eight men work in a hatch of the ship. Four are on the deck to handle the winches that raise and lower the cargo. Eight are on the pier at the big door nearest the hatch being worked. In addition, there is the foreman, or hatch boss, by whose name the gang is usually known, and two tractor drivers.

In unloading operations involving bags, boxes, barrels or similarly packaged freight, the holdmen usually place the cargo on large wooden platforms, or pallets. The deckmen then hoist the cargo, now called a draft, out of the hold and onto the pier where the dockmen receive it and remove the rope, or sling, by which it has been lifted.

A tractor driver then lifts the draft on the prongs of his fork-lift truck, or hi-lo, and moves it to the growing stacks of cargo that await loading onto trucks or floating rail equipment.

General cargo loading is handled in reverse fashion, with tractor drivers bringing the freight to pier doors for transfer to the vessel.

For special types of cargo the procedures vary. Coffee is sometimes shipped on pallets, permitting the use of a hi-lo in unloading the vessel's hold. With 12 to 15 bags of coffee, the pallet can thus be moved directly under the hatch opening to be lifted onto the dock.

Bananas present problems of their own. The fruit is not only fragile, but many longshoremen fear being bitten by tarantulas and other bugs that sometimes ride the fruit ships from the tropics. At present many shippers put bananas, by individual 75 to 90 pound stems, into polyethylene bags to minimize these dangers.

In addition, various forms of mechanical equipment are used. The United Fruit Co. employs huge conveyor belts to move the stems from the holds through hatches to its shore-side banana facility. Grace Line uses a conveyor belt system that brings the fruit from the holds through side ports in the ship to the dock and waiting truckmen.

All the complexity of cargo is not on the inbound side alone. Export shipments of big pieces of industrial and transport equipment present their own special handling problems. Sometimes giant floating cranes are used to lift such freight from railroad barges, or lighters, but often ship's gear, operated by longshoremen, is utilized.

Frequently if the piece is excessively bulky, special "cradles" must be built by longshore carpenters to hold the shipment securely in place while the vessel is at sea.

Although longshore work is not considered skilled, the prevailing rate of pay in the New York port compares favorably with that of many skilled and semi-skilled occupations.

Golf Therapy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the two veterans' hospitals in New Jersey is located at Lyons in the Fifth Congressional District. The services provided there to our hospitalized veterans have been substantial. Under the management of the late respected Dr. Crawford Baganz and now under Dr. A. E. Trollinger, the staff has done fine work. So, too, have the devoted and all but anonymous volunteers at the hospital.

I should like to include in my remarks an article from the New York Times of May 4. This describes an unusual, but successful, activity conducted at Lyons by the American Women's Voluntary Services:

GOLF THERAPY

(By Frank M. Blunk)

Those who return from war whole in mind and body melt into lives of peace and happiness and forget, for the most part, the horror that, by some miracle, passed them by. It is only natural that they should try to erase those memories.

The men who can't forget are those who did not return unmarked. Those are the countless thousands that fill the Veterans' Administration hospitals throughout the Nation.

Never before in American history have our wounded and ailing war veterans been cared for so well. Every medical and surgical aid known to man is provided. The finest minds in the healing sciences staff the modern hospitals in which they wait and hope.

Beyond this there are many voluntary organizations—of women and men—who have dedicated themselves not to forget. In addition to the various national organizations of veterans and their auxiliaries, there are groups whose sole purpose is to bring to hospitalized veterans the reminders of home and family that physicians and surgeons cannot provide.

The programs of those organizations are wide and varied. The main idea is to keep morale at a high point. But in some instances the voluntary groups—whose activities are now coordinated by the Veterans' Administration Voluntary Services—go beyond the regular program and assist hospital staffs with recreation activities of a high therapeutic value.

TWO THOUSAND PATIENTS IN LYONS

An instance of signal success in such activity is provided at the Veterans Hospital at Lyons, N. J. It is in the hands of a group of women who form a unit in one of America's leading veteran-aid organizations, one that made its mark in World War II—the American Women's Voluntary Services. Mrs. Hans Springorum of Cos Cob, Conn., is the national president.

The hospital at Lyons is for mentally ill veterans of all wars. There are more than 2,000 housed in its 60 buildings. It lies on gently sloping ground at the foot of the Watchung Mountains in Bernard Township, Somerset County. There are more than 850 acres in the hospital plot.

An extensive part of the acreage, facing the main building, has been made into a nine-hole golf course. And that is the key to a therapeutic recreation that the hospital staff and the Lyons-Fairway Golf Unit of the AWVS speak of with pride.

For it has proved to be one of the most effective of all the remedies employed in the rehabilitation of Lyons' patients. No mental patient is incurable, experts say. But many factors enter into the curing program. One of those factors, and perhaps one of the main ones, is to bring the patient "out of himself." Once he regains interest in the things and the people about him, he is on the road to recovery.

The late Leo Diegel, one of America's really great golf professionals, was the first to promote the idea of golf for mental patients. He started the first experiment at the Valley Forge Hospital in Phoenixville, Pa. It was a success and Diegel enlisted other pros to carry on the work.

Jack Fox, pro at Glen Ridge, N. J., and the late Harry Nash, a golf writer for the Newark Evening News, started a campaign to raise funds for a links at Lyons. Robert Trent Jones designed the nine-hole course, which was opened in 1947.

Members of the Women's New Jersey Golf Association began to assist by sending members to the hospital to teach and play golf with patients. The response was exceptional. Then the AWVS unit of women's golfers for Lyons was organized under the direction of Mrs. Homer Lichtenwalter of Baltusrol.

ALMOST A THIRD DISCHARGED

The membership of the Fairway group grew with the success of the project and in 1954 and again last year a weekly schedule for the season was made up, with more than 60 New Jersey women golfers participating.

In 1955 a total of 257 patients took part in the golf program. Before the season was over 83 had been discharged as cured. The percentage was 32.2. Dr. A. E. Trollinger, manager of the hospital at Lyons, says that result is one of the most gratifying in his career.

On a recent golf day at Lyons, a delegation of women players led by Mrs. Springorum appeared on the hospital links. Some of the patient-players turned out with new sets of clubs carried in shiny new golf carts. The play started and in 5 minutes a large crowd of nonplaying patients had formed a "gallery."

"Nothing we have here has created as much general interest," said Dr. Trollinger. "The men will talk about this for days. And talk is the finest medicine I can think of."

Also in that group of women players was Mrs. John Farrell, wife of the former National Open champion who is now the top pro at Baltusrol. Mrs. Farrell is chairman of the Lyons-Fairway unit of A. W. V. S. Also at hand were Mrs. Philip Cudone of Montclair, women's metropolitan and New Jersey champion and a member of the 1956 Curtis Cup team; Mrs. James Beckett of Baltusrol, secretary of the Lyons-Fairway unit; Mrs. Lichtenwalter and Maureen Orcutt of White Beeches.

The weekly golf schedule at Lyons will continue through September 17. On several of the days some of the better-known men pro-

fessionals will give exhibitions and instruct patient-players.

The Lyons-Fairway unit is only one of the kind operating at various veteran hospitals throughout the Nation under the aegis of the American Women's Voluntary Services.

One of the patients at Lyons said: "It is wonderful to know that we are not forgotten. We are trying hard to get well. With such kindness from such nice people we'll be returning home in time."

The Incentive of Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my own remarks and to include extraneous material, I wish to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial from the pen of Mr. Graham Patterson, publisher of Town Journal, appearing in the May 1956 issue. This editorial on the Incentive of Competition is, I believe, a very good analysis of the subject of competition between private business and the Government. The editorial follows:

THE INCENTIVE OF COMPETITION

Among the reasons for America's growth and prosperity and its high standard of living is the freedom of our business organizations to compete for the favor of the public. This competition is the lifeblood of our economic strength, for it serves as a constant spur to better products, better service and lower prices, with resulting benefits to the people.

There are certain fields of industry, however, where competition is controlled by legal restrictions. One of these is the shipment of goods by various means of transport. Many years ago, when competition in this field was largely limited to that among railroads, it became so intense that Government regulation was necessary to prevent unfair competitive practices, and the Act to Regulate Commerce was passed in 1887.

Since then, however, conditions have changed radically. Billions of dollars have been spent on building and improving waterways, and more billions have been spent on improved highways. Today the shipper of goods can choose between railroads, motor trucks and waterways. Each has natural capabilities and advantages in service, or cost, or both, but Government regulation often prevents the public from gaining the benefit of these advantages. If the railroads, for instance, propose to reduce freight rates on certain products in regions where their natural advantages permit them to operate at lower costs than other modes of transport, permission to do so has often been refused because the reduced rates would be lower than other modes of transport offered. Such action has more of the aspects of allocation of business than regulation.

It is not the prerogative of any Government agency to decide how much or how little business any industry or firm may do. That is something that should be decided by the public, whose decision would be based, of course, upon the quality and price of the product or service offered.

The function of Government is to see that there is competition, full and free, not to see that there isn't. The Government's responsibility is to prevent unfair practices and keep services vital to the public interest in existence, but its responsibility should end there. If fair competition for the public's favor is permitted to work, prices invariably take care of themselves. And the quality of services and products does likewise.

Unfortunately for the public as well as for business, Government with its regulations—too often unrealistic—seems to be usurping power it does not and should not have, to the point where it can control prices, instead of permitting normal and natural competition to exert its beneficial force.

The horse and buggy and the horse-drawn wagon gave way inevitably to the automobile and motor truck, because they provided the people something better. All through the history of our Nation are countless examples of products and services being supplanted by others that offered better service or lower price. Our country was built on competition, not on Government regulation. With greater freedom in competition among the different types of transportation, the same as in any other field of business, with each user free to choose that which best meets his needs, the real gainer in the end would be the consuming public.

The Passing of Attorney Patrick J. Flannery, Outstanding Member of the Luzerne County, Pa., Bar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Record of Tuesday, May 8, 1956, which lauds the outstanding legal career of the late attorney Patrick J. Flannery. Mr. Speaker, Attorney Flannery was a long and honored friend of mine and his sudden passing leaves a void in the ranks of the legal profession in my district, Luzerne County. He was a member of a well-known and highly respected family. His brother, Judge J. Harold Flannery, served with distinction in the United States House of Representatives as Representative of the 11th Congressional District. My deepest sympathy goes to his widow and members of his family.

The editorial is as follows:

ATTORNEY PATRICK J. FLANNERY

Luzerne County Bar lost a foremost member of better than 27 years' standing when death came with shocking suddenness to Attorney Patrick J. Flannery while he was engaged in the trial of a civil suit in Judge John J. Aponick's courtroom yesterday. Attorney Flannery was a lawyer's lawyer in the sense that he had the abiding respect of his associates for his ability and for his conscientious regard of professional obligations to his clients. Colleagues attest that a minor matter or a humble client received as close attention as a major issue or a client of high consequence.

A graduate of Wyoming Seminary, Cornell University and Dickinson School of Law, he was admitted to the county bar on February 5, 1929, and had maintained officers in Pittston with J. Earl Langan and in Wilkes-Barre with William J. Davis, Edward D. Morgan and John F. Boyle. No one could hold him in higher esteem for his professional standing than his immediate associates who knew him from day to day and could appraise his character at its true worth.

He was the studious type and unassuming in manner. Possessed of a subtle and dry sense of humor, he was a bright and delightful companion. A home-loving man, he was devoted to his wife and four children. A communicant of St. John the Evangelist Church, Pittston, he was affiliated with many of its organizations. His part in civic and welfare affairs included the promotion of a comparatively new project, the Greater Pittston Ambulance Association, which he was serving as president.

His family, church, community and profession have lost a member who served earnestly in many useful ways.

Four-Point Plan To Get Scientists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by James R. Killian, Jr., the president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, appearing in last week's Life magazine. I believe this is a matter that all Members will want to read and consider:

A BOLD STRATEGY TO BEAT SHORTAGE—MIT PRESIDENT PRESENTS FOUR-POINT PLAN TO GET SCIENTISTS

(By James R. Killian, Jr.)

The current scarcity of scientists and engineers has become one of the best advertised shortages of our time, thanks to eager recruiting by employee-hungry companies and the intelligence that the Soviets educational output in these fields is larger than that the United States industrialists, educators, and public officials are ringing the alarm, and we are flooded with diagnostic studies seeking to explain the shortage. So far, unhappily, the diagnoses have been fine but the remedies few—and ineffectual.

It would be folly to suggest that we can find a sovereirn remedy for the inadequacies of our educational output of scientists and engineers. We can't. Because we believe freedom of choice more fruitful in the long run, not only for human dignity but for excellence, we cannot do as the Soviets do and tell our young people what to study and what careers to choose. If there are deficiencies in the attitudes and performance of high-school students, we cannot change them by fiat. We must use incentives instead of directives. We must marshal public opinion to deemphasize the hot-rodders among our youth and to encourage hot mathematicians.

If there are no easy short cuts to the education of more and better scientists, there is an opportunity for bold action. We need a national program. We need to turn from assigning blame for our educational and manpower deficiencies and to concentrate on the tactics and strategy for strengthening our manpower resources.

There are certain things that we should not do. We must not allow the pressure for scientists and engineers to obscure the need for first-rate talent in other professional fields. We should not let ourselves be bemused by numbers, especially numbers across the sea. We should not engage in an academic numbers race with the Soviets or even with ourselves. We can win through enterprise, efficiency, unexcelled quality, fully mobilized and motivated intellectual resources.

We must not throw standards out the window in order to handle numbers; our shortage is one of quality, properly educated, even more than it is of numbers.

Having noted some of the traps we should avoid as we seek to meet our shortage of scientists and engineers, let me urge four positive moves (a) to get us off dead center now and (b) to develop a grand strategy for the future. So far, remedial efforts have been too piddling and piecemeal, too lacking in boldness to get large results.

First, the Nation should establish several thousand more scholarships to help gifted but needy high school graduates go to college. I would prefer this increase to be financed by private funds as, for example, through a concerted effort by foundations and corportions. But if private funds cannot be marshaled in adequate amount, then I urge a short-term (5-year) federally financed program.

To underline the need for such a program, here are some very rough and very rounded figures. Of the top third of our high-school graduates (about 300,000) only about a third go on to get college degrees and thus qualify for the professions. A third apparently do not want to go to college. A third cannot afford to go. The Nation cannot afford for them not to afford or want to go.

The scholarship funds provided by colleges, corporations, States, and foundations now total between $50 and $60 million annually. Increasing this by 50 percent now would be a great boost. Doubling the present total in 2 or 3 years, quadrupling it in 5 would begin to bring our national student aid resources to the level our growing needs require.

I advocate that we start now by establishing about 9,000 competitive, annually awarded, 4-year Federal scholarships, these scholarships to be of three kinds: (1) 3,000 scholarships earmarked for those of high ability who wish to study science and engineering; (2) 3,000 for high ability high-school graduates who need not designate in advance a field of study; (3) 3,000 to be awarded to students who have taken enough advanced work in high school to have mastered there such freshman college subjects as calculus, physics, and English, in addition to meeting other high-school graduation and college entrance requirements. The need for this third kind of scholarship to give recipients advanced standing in college was recently proposed in a discussion of the Science Advisory Committee of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

Women should be encouraged to compete in each category since there has been a high loss of exceptional talent among girl high-school grduates. We need to encourage more able women to major in science and mathematics, particularly women who are willing then to become science or mathematics teachers in secondary schools.

Such a program would dramatically highlight the need for a lifting of sights in our schools and for more adequate opportunities and rewards for gifted students. It would help to encourage better and more advanced teaching of science in high schools. It would enable students of ability to cover more ground in college.

Such an augmented scholarship program would be a pump-priming, booster effort to break out of our present stalemate. Let us meet immediate needs with a Federal program with the hope and plan that private funds will be adequate to carry the need after 5 years.

Second in my suggested list of remedial measures would be a concerted effort to revitalize the teaching of science and mathematics in the secondary schools. My associate, Professor Jerrold R. Zacharias, has suggested one approach. Let a group of the best physicists in the country come together in a special study group to plan a whole new approach to elementary physics education. Let them set the new goals demanded by modern physics, design new courses, visualize fresh experiments and imaginative demonstrations. Let these plans be reduced to reality by a working group which will design and direct the making of, say, 90 professionally executed movie shorts of 20 minutes each with the necessary accompanying manuals and texts. In this way let us capitalize on the resources of visual technology, the imagination, understanding and zeal of great physicists, to give to the secondary school-teacher a fresh and powerful teaching aid and a new reach. A million-dollar project of this kind might well infuse new life and great teaching art into the teaching of science in thousands of schools. It is my hope that such a project may serve as a pilot plant for lifting the teaching of the other sciences to a new level.

Third on my list of needed actions is a national forum like the recent White House Conference on Education to throw a spotlight on ways whereby the Nation can educate more and better scientists and engineers. The Nation's technological work requires a broad spectrum of abilities and skills, ranging from the technician, who does not need a degree, to the creative scientist or engineer whose education has carried him through the Ph. D. or even postdoctoral study. Men are in short supply throughout the entire spectrum, but our greatest current shortages are at the extremes: we need more technicians to back up the professional scientist and more 2-year terminal programs or technical institutes to train them. At the other end of the spectrum we need more graduate education and more graduate study opportunities to make this possible.

Engineering education, it is felt by many industrialists and educators, is in need of revitalization. Should it not contain more basic science if it is to educate men with the power and versatility required by the growing complexity of our technology, our rapidly advancing science and the growing scope and rigor of the engineer's responsibilities? Do we not also need a new breed of engineer, competent to design and manage great engineering systems and skillful to handle the human problems involved?

Such questions need to be examined and discussed in a national forum where they can be illuminated for the public at large. Either of two committees recently appointed by the President, one on education beyond high school and the other on development of scientists and engineers, might plan and sponsor such a forum.

A GRAND STRATEGY

Fourth and finally, I suggest that we formulate the outlines of a grand strategy for maintaining our technological advance in the United States. We need such a plan if we are adequately to advance our educational and manpower programs.

I recall the great influence exerted by the President's Air Policy Commission through its notable report, Survival in the Air Age. Scientists and engineers advisory to the Government are organizing a comparably thorough report to chart our technological progress in the years ahead. Not only should it deal with manpower and its education, it should look also at the utilization of manpower and the personnel policies in Government, industry, and elsewhere which affect its efficient use and conservation. It should probe for soft spots in our research and development. Is there now too much loss of time between discovery and application? What are the elements of technological strength in the Russian system which hold lessons for us? These are but a few of many questions which could be fruitfully examined in the context of a high-level study devoted to survival in the age of technological contest.

And now one note of caution. While the rising long-term need for scientists and engineers is certain to continue, we may expect to witness adjustments in the current demand, particularly an increasing selectivity and discrimination in employment policies. A slackening off in the feverish, indiscriminate scramble we now are experiencing could, in fact, be beneficial and a relief all around. There is danger that some young graduates in this boom market will acquire an inflated view of their importance and will conclude that the normal rules of competition, compensation, and accomplishment have been permanently suspended in their behalf. I am sure they haven't. There is always the risk of a boom creating distorted values, and this is especially dangerous when the commodity is our young men. But even though the current feverish employment efforts may slacken, this will not mean that long-term supply and demand will have been balanced. We may experience a dropoff in the need for the foot soldiers of technology but the need for flag officers will always be high.

I have been through the experience at MIT of seeing its enrollment nearly double in a decade. I know, therefore, something of the huge new investment of men and money required to expand while at the same time we were seeking to raise standards and keep pace with the explosive development of science and engineering. The question as to whether MIT will expand still more is yet to be decisively settled, but I am glad that MIT already is tooled up to make a greater manpower contribution to the Nation in this critical period and that much of this increase has come at the graduate level where the need is greatest. I am glad that we have been moving steadily toward greater stress on fundamentals and on new fields of technology. But what of the future?

Further expansion means new investment at the rate of about $50,000 per additional student in endowment, buildings and equipment. To this must be added the high cost of all the new instruments, facilities and men required to keep up with technology and industry and to avoid obsolescence. We will have this cost even if we do not add a sinigle additional student. But cost is not the fundamental question, nor should it be the controlling factor in reaching a decision whether to expand. The real problem is to find enough great teachers; the real question is whether or how we can expand without damaging the quality of our education and research.

These are the factors and responsibilities which are being weighed in private scientific institutions across the country. In the exciting atmosphere of rapid discovery and intellectual ferment, of mounting demands for men and ideas, the decisions which are being made require sober and thorough debate, for they affect the future productivity, creatively and intellectual climate of America. It is the glory of American education that these decisions can be made freely, institution by institution, and that out of the diversity of views can come a consensus, wiser because it is unregimented.

It is the faith of America that such free discussions and decisions are the best means for insuring that the education of our scientists and engineers can be made fully equal to the needs of the Nation.

Investigation of Defense Establishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial en-

titled "Applause From All United States Is Due Air Arm Inquiry," published in the Chicago Daily News of Saturday, May 5, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The editorial is signed by the publisher of the Chicago Daily News, Mr. John F. Knight, who is also publisher of the Detroit Free Press, of a Miami newspaper, and of a newspaper in North Carolina.

The editorial reprimands the administration for its alleged negligence in not building up air power, and praises the work of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] in conducting a fearless and nonpolitical investigation of the state of the Air Force.

This editorial is all the more remarkable in view of the fact that Mr. Knight is a leading Republican. His statement is a tribute both to him and to the Senator from Missouri.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPLAUSE FROM ALL UNITED STATES IS DUE AIR ARM INQUIRY

(By John S. Knight)

It was natural that an investigation of our Defense Establishment would be launched in a presidential election year.

There is a dearth of good issues and the chairman of the Senate investigating committee is Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, our first Secretary of the Air Force, and a man frequently mentioned as the logical compromise candidate for the Democrats.

Having said this much, all Americans who value their skins should arise and applaud the investigation without regard for its political overtones.

For some years now, Senator SYMINGTON has been telling everyone who would listen that the United States was falling behind Russia with respect to certain types of airpower.

At the Chicago Executives Club last fall, he flatly charged that reassuring public statements by Defense Secretary Wilson did not square with testimony given before the Armed Services Committee of the Senate.

The Missouri Senator was accorded a polite hearing, received a good round of applause, but no one looked worried on the way out.

"After all," they may have been thinking, "Ike is President and he must know a great deal more about national defense than some of these guys we listen to on Friday noon."

But developments are proving SYMINGTON to be right.

FACTS DON'T MATCH ROSY REASSURANCES

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, head of the Strategic Air Command, has testified that—

1. Russia has more than 100 intercontinental jet bombers compared to America's 78, and produced them in much less time.

2. Of our 78 B–52's, costing $8 million each, only 47 have been accepted by the Air Force. The other 31 were rejected because of a serious component failure" which is being corrected.

3. The present United States aircraft program will leave this Nation "inferior in striking power to the Soviet long-range air force by 1958–60."

In describing the steady growth of Red air power, General LeMay said "We believe * * * we can win any war the Soviets might start * * * but not without this country receiving very serious damage. Five years ago, we could have won the war * * * without serious damage."

This candid presentation of shocking facts by our top air strategist is very grim news indeed.

The question immediately arises: Why, considering the billions we have spent annually for defense, is the United States failing to keep pace with Soviet air power?

Why do we get rosy reassurances from Secretary Wilson and other Defense Department officials when the facts seem to be to the contrary?

These are pertinent inquiries which concern us all, and they demand straight answers.

SECRETARY WILSON OWES THE COUNTRY FRANKNESS

It is to be hoped that the Republicans, in their zeal to defend administration policies, will not permit their partisan ardor to becloud the issues nor dismiss the investigation as a mere political maneuver.

To Secretary Wilson's credit, General LeMay's testimony was cleared in advance by the Pentagon, even though Wilson commented that the Pentagon was "erring" more on the side of giving "aid and comfort to a possible enemy * * * than on the side of trying to suppress information."

This is clearly no time to conceal the facts nor evade the truth. Our national security is at stake. Whatever defects exist in our defense program must be corrected, and without delay.

General LeMay, a blunt, hard-hitting airman whose B–29's reduced Tokyo to a shambles, has spoken his piece without pulling any punches.

Secretary Wilson, when he takes the stand, owes it to his country to be equally forthright.

In the past, we have had too much double-talk from the Pentagon, and not enough information upon which to base sound conclusions.

Meanwhile, the country is indebted to Senator SYMINGTON for alerting us to the dangers we face, and the persistence with which he is following through with his investigation of our lagging strength in airpower.

Brief Respite in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the May 4, 1956, issue of the New York World Telegram alerts us to the plain fact that the recent Middle East mission of the United Nations Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold "did not even scratch the surface of the real Arab-Israeli problems."

While the editorial states that "minorities on both sides shout for war," it is also clear that such minorities, so far as Israel is concerned, do not speak for the Israeli Government which wants only the right to live peaceably alongside her Arab neighbors. On the other hand, the warmongering minorities in the Arab countries are the leaders of the Arab Governments. They, rather than the Arab people, are the belligerents.

The editorial follows:

PROSPECTS STILL GRIM

The unconditional cease-fire agreements between Israel and her Arab neighbors offer the Middle East a brief breathing spell—but no more. United Nations Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold carried out his difficult mission successfully.

But it would be foolhardy to believe anything more than a brief respite from strife has been won. Mr. Hammarskjold would be the first to admit that what he accomplished did not even scratch the surface of the real Arab-Israeli problems.

The Arabs have newly acquired military strength and are rattling the saber. That increases Israeli fears that the Arabs will try to fulfill their propaganda threats to wipe out Israel.

The Israelis continue a major program of Jewish immigration into their tiny, overcrowded state. That increases Arab fears that Israel will have to expand for living space—at Arab expense.

Back of this is what seems to be an implacable hatred between Arab and Israeli—the Arab believing the creation of Israel was a crime and grievous wrong; the Israeli fearing the Arab never will settle for anything short of extermination of Israel.

Minorities on both sides shout for war.

For 8 years emotions have overruled common sense on both sides. It would be naive to expect the new cease-fire arrangements to withstand long the day-to-day tensions unless there are new peace efforts.

An overall settlement is not in sight—and maybe there isn't any real cure for a wound that has festered so long. But there is a moral duty to try again. To dillydally as has been the custom for some years might be fatal.

Order in the Courtroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article in the May issue of Harper's magazine which describes the career and accomplishments of the chief justice of New Jersey, Arthur T. Vanderbilt.

Judicial reform is an urgent need in many States. I am proud and happy that my own State, which until fairly recently, had one of the most outdated court systems, now has the most modern court system in the country, and that litigants are being served efficiently, speedily, and justly. The story of court reform in New Jersey is well worth emulating. Because I believe that this article can do great good in alerting people in other parts of the country to this problem, I am inserting it, in its entirety, although it exceeds the usual limit.

The article was written by Jerome H. Spingarn, who is a native of New Jersey, and a practicing lawyer in the courts of New York and the District of Columbia, and is as follows:

ARTHUR T. VANDERBILT: ORDER IN THE COURTROOM

(By Jerome H. Spingarn)

Many lawyers have told their clients that it is cheaper to suffer wrongs and avoid court proceedings than to endure the cost, irritations, and complexities of a trial. New Jersey's Chief Justice Arthur T. Vanderbilt, on the other hand, is one lawyer who has devoted himself—with considerable suc-

cess—to the task of making the path to justice smoother, cheaper, and simpler. In addition to a distinguished career as a courtroom lawyer, he played an outstanding political role in his community—until he became a judge. He did more than any other individual to build up New York University's law center, which now bears his name. He has carried the message of better court administration all over the country and worked to improve law codes. And he was the leader of a popular movement that reformed New Jersey's courts—until 1947 the most flagrantly unsatisfactory in the Nation—and, incidentally, gave the State a new constitution.

The story of the New Jersey courts is a good illustration of the thoroughness of Vanderbilt's achievements. In prereform days the State had 17 different kinds of courts, most of them dating back to Colonial days, all maintaining their own rules and traditions. A litigant waited several years to get into court and sometimes several years after the trial for a decision. There was one vice chancellor who ran an even 5 years behind schedule on his decisions.

Today, thanks in large measure to Vanderbilt's leadership, New Jersey courts are the most efficient in the Nation. There are only 7 courts, headed by the Supreme Court which has the power to promulgate rules for all, and a basically uniform system of procedure throughout the State. A victim of an automobile accident in New Jersey can have his trial before 6 months have passed. Across the river in New York County, a 39-month wait is average, and in nearby Queens County, New York, it is 44.

When Vanderbilt plunged into the battle for court reform, he was, among many other things, the busiest courtroom practioner in New Jersey. His colleagues could never fathom why he was so singlemindedly bent on the destruction of a system under which he was prospering so handsomely. But they overlooked two things: His Methodist impatience with timewasting, and his sublime confidence in his own ability to succeed under any ground rules. Nothing in his life had given him any occasion to doubt either.

He began to harness his energy constructively as far back as his college days at Wesleyan. In 4 years he completed the requirements for both the B. A. and M. A. degrees while he was working his way through as fraternity steward and newspaper correspondent, editing the semiweekly college Argus, managing the football team and the debating council, and ending up as president of both the student body and the senior class. One of his fraternity brothers remembers asking him how on earth he did it.

"Self-discipline," Vanderbilt replied instantly. "A man can do half a dozen jobs at once if he has proper control of time."

From Wesleyan he went on to Columbia Law School to which he commuted daily from Newark where he was teaching 4 evening high-school classes. After Columbia, he took a job as law clerk in Newark in the office of Frank H. Sommer, the leader of the progressive wing of the Essex County Republican Party and a professor and later dean of New York University Law School. Sommer helped Vanderbilt get a teaching position there during his first year of practice and also offered him some memorable advice when, later on, Vanderbilt expressed an interest in entering politics.

"Arthur," he said, "do you know how many people there are in Newark?" Vanderbilt correctly quoted the 1910 census, around 300,000.

"No," said Sommer. "There are just about 300 people in Newark. If you're going into politics, your job is to know them well. They're from different walks of life and different social groups. But these few people are the ones who mold public opinion in this town. Your problem is to find out who they are and to know them."

In 1913 Vanderbilt was admitted to the bar and immediately opened his own offices. A year later, largely on the strength of his $1,400 lectureship at New York University, he married a high school classmate, Florence A. Aithen. Since his bride was musical, he bought her a baby grand piano, leaving the young couple about $100 in cash.

"I should hate to tell you," observes Vanderbilt today, "the sum on which she ran the house each week, but she claims now that she had more money then than she has now."

In any case, by 1920 Vanderbilt had seven lawyers on his staff and counted among his clients banks, insurance companies, and large corporations, enabling him to provide comfortably for the five children who eventually came along. (Appropriately enough, all but one of the children have grown up to have an intimate concern with the law. The twin boys, who are the youngest, are today lawyers in their father's old firm, and each has served in the New Jersey General Assembly, one from Essex County, the other from Union County. The oldest girl practiced law until she married a lawyer and devoted herself to raising a family. The second girl also married a lawyer. Only the youngest girl strayed out of the fold to marry a mechanical engineer.)

As the years went on an increasing part of Vanderbilt's work consisted in trying difficult cases and appeals for other lawyers, who were often former students. He also found time to represent Roger Baldwin of the American Civil Liberties Union in a famous New Jersey civil-liberties case.

In the years following World War I, the Republican Party in Essex County was in disrepute and disrepair. Vanderbilt took on the job of building a new Republican organization—discovering at the outset of the twenties what most politicians have just been learning in the fifties: that the suburban vote must be wooed in an entirely different way from the big-city vote. While Republican and Democratic machines fought each other in the traditional way in the Newark wards, Vanderbilt appealed to the commuters who lived in the Oranges and Montclair. Bypassing the precinct-worker approach, he relied on encouraging newspaper editors to expose graft in their papers and persuading established leaders of the community to accept nominations for office. The formula worked. Vanderbilt's group won 2 of 3 vacancies on the county board in its first fight in 1919.

When the holdover majority of the board still voted to go ahead with some of the very contracts the Vanderbilt group had condemned in the campaign, Vanderbilt countered with a successful taxpayer's suit which stopped the project, saved the county between three and four hundred thousand dollars, and kept the issue on the front pages of the local papers for several months. At the next election, Vanderbilt's "clean-government" league gained control of the board and Vanderbilt became county counsel.

POLITICAL BATTLES

Vanderbilt's bitterest political battle was with a fellow Republican, Harold Hoffman. When Hoffman was governor, Vanderbilt once visited him with the intention of making peace. But after a short talk he ended up by assuring him irritably that there was nothing wrong with him except that he had "no judgment and no character"—an observation confirmed after Hoffman's death when a posthumous investigation revealed he had stolen over $300,000 from the State government.

When Hoffman sought a second term, he was defeated in the primary largely because Vanderbilt, as Essex County Republican chairman, turned in an unprecedented majority of 45,000 votes for his opponent, Driscoll. In 1,100 personal telephone calls, Vanderbilt obtained the pledge of every county committeeman to get out a bigger vote than ever before.

Vanderbilt was always an oddity in New Jersey politics because he was not dependent upon politics for a living and had other claims to local and national prominence, and because politics, even during a campaign, seldom took more than an hour or two of his day. The best five hours of his day were always spent in court. He soon found that political chores took less brain power than any of his other tasks, so he used to reserve the late-afternoon hours for political conferences; telephoning; working on press releases, speeches, and platforms; or attending meetings. At 7, during the law-school year, there would be a hurried meal and a rush to the station two evenings a week. Then, after 2 hours of law classes and 10 minutes of after-class questions, a rush back to the tubes.

At the same time he was active in State and national law associations, and in 1938 he became president of the American Bar Association. He immediately organized seven committtes for court reform and himself made a cross-country tour to preach the gospel of better court administration. And he took a trip to England to visit British courts. In 1941, Chief Justice Hughes appointed him chairman of a committee to draft rules of procedure on criminal cases—which were approved in 1945—and in 1946 he was chairman of a committee which revised the methods of military justices.

REFORMING THE COURTS

The campaign for New Jersey court reform actually began in 1930 when Vanderbilt was appointed first chairman of the New Jersey Judicial Council, an organization of lawyers and judges which was created to keep the courts up to date. Vanderbilt rapidly convinced his colleagues that New Jersey procedures were not susceptible to slight annual improvements and revisions—the fabric was far too threadbare to hold patches. Accordingly the council advanced proposals for constitutional amendments looking toward fundamental reforms. The chief obstacle was Jersey City's boss, Frank Hague, who relied upon the existing rules to protect his power. He exerted enough pressure in 1941 to block Vanderbilt's reappointment to the Judicial Council. But the idea of reform once born could not be quashed so easily; it bounced back the same year in the form of a Constitutional Revision Commission on which Vanderbilt was again the moving spirit. In 1943 the commission's proposals were submitted to a vote of the electorate—unfortunately not until the legislature had so watered them down that no one wanted them.

The proposals were defeated, and the defeat became the signal for an all-out effort by Vanderbilt and his associates. With the help of Democratic Gov. Charles Edison and a Republican successor, Governor Driscoll, and using the familiar Vanderbilt tactics, they lined up the press, the women's clubs, the unions, the employers, the butchers, the vegetarians, and every conceivable group that believed the State should have a court system that could act promptly, fairly, and understandably. In 1947 a constitutional convention met at Rutgers University to adopt drastic court reforms and sweeping changes in the State government organization. And this time, despite the open or covert opposition of lawyers, judges, and Hague, the new constitution was passed by the voters in a landslide majority of 3½ to 1.

Vanderbilt's association with the new constitution made him an issue in the campaign, and a week before the voters went to the polls Governor Driscoll announced that Vanderbilt would be chief justice under the new constitution. Since this meant that he must

be a sitting judge at the time the constitution was adopted, Driscoll forthwith appointed him to the circuit court, and Vanderbilt passed from the arena of partisan politics.

The new constitution set up only the broad outlines of the new court system, delegating the rulemaking power—upon which the system's success or failure would depend—to the supreme court. As chief justice-designate, excused from courtroom duties, Vanderbilt devoted himself to the task of formulating these rules during the 10 months preceding the new courts' opening.

Like many other law teachers, he had covered the ground of ideal court rules many times in the classroom, in articles, and in speeches—had, in fact, as president of the American Bar Association, appointed committees which had worked out minimum standards of judicial administration. His problem now was one of human adjustment—to get the other New Jersey judges and lawyers to accept the spirit as well as the letter of the new rules. With this in mind, he invited a large number of them to assist in the planning and drafting and took great pains to keep the public informed. He also wrote the chief justices of every other State, asking them what they would do if they could start their court systems afresh.

One of Vanderbilt's primary time-saving notions was full use of pretrial conferences at which the opposing parties and their lawyers meet with the judge in open court and, before the trial begins, go through the papers in the case, obtain admissions, and limit the issues. It was also a notion which met with considerable reluctance from both lawyers and judges. To persuade them to give it a fair test, Vanderbilt invited Chief Judge Bolitha J. Laws of the District of Columbia and a team of lawyers to come to New Jersey and demonstrate, in a kind of playlet, how the pretrial conference worked. The audience was sufficiently impressed to give the conferences a try. They soon discovered that by clarifying the issues, eliminating courtroom tricks and surprises, and letting the judge study the documentary evidence in advance, the conferences enabled cases to be tried in one-half to two-thirds the time they took under the earlier system, and there were fewer appeals. They have indeed worked so successfully that only last year Vanderbilt suggested that wider use of these conferences, rather than additional judges, might be the answer to increasingly heavy court calendars, and appointed a committee of trial judges and lawyers to work on perfecting them.

Vanderbilt's changes started in the lowest courts, which deal with the largest numbers of people. A municipal court replaced the justices of the peace in the country and the police courts—which sometimes used to be held by the clerk as an "acting judge" without any authority in law—in the city. All courts were held in public buildings; the wearing of robes by all judicial officers was encouraged. And New Jerseyites, accustomed to long waits in the courtroom for the judge to arrive, noticed particularly that courts opened promptly at 10. (There was muttering over this in the robing rooms, but the Supreme Court set the example.)

Vanderbilt emphasized these superficial changes because he felt they would help him meet a difficult challenge: the new constitution directed him to create a new court system based upon service to litigants, but it also provided that it should be manned by judges carried over from the old system—many of whom considered a judgeship a reward for past accomplishments rather than an active job. The robes, the courtrooms, the time schedules were outward symbols of a new perspective. Along with them went constitutional assurances of tenure, rigid prohibitions against political activity, and rules against taking time off for such activities as pallbearing and speech-making. Previously the New Jerseyite who was carried to his grave without at least one judge to do him reverence was poor indeed. Now judges are excused only for funerals in their own family.

In spite of the fact that it inherited congested calendars and many cases where decisions were long overdue, the new system promptly brought all courts in the State up to date. Special teams of judges were sent in to clean the dockets of courts that were particularly far behind, and when a court began again to fall behind in its decisions, judges from less busy courts were shifted to it. To help it assign judges to where they were most needed, the supreme court required weekly reports from every judge in the State, telling how many hours he sat, how many cases he heard, how far behind he was on decisions, and how many cases were waiting for trial. To many of the older judges, this filling out of a time sheet was the ultimate degradation. To win them to his side, the new chief justice had to exert all of the persuasiveness that had helped him build a political organization, attract clients, and convince juries. And within a few years he had established a new morale. One of the judges who liked him least at the start has become an ardent admirer, and describes him with the profane yet begrudgingly respectful language a marine might use about an exacting battle commander.

Vanderbilt had considerably less difficulty winning over the public. One of his most significant innovations was a rule of court establishing uniform, nonfixable traffic tickets made out in four carbons with each ticket stamped numerically and strictly accounted for. Its effect was immediately apparent. In Newark, during the first quarter of 1948, before it was introduced, there were more than 16,000 unaccounted-for tickets; during the corresponding quarter of 1949, there were only 600, all of them issued to out-of-State drivers.

According to Vanderbilt, "the elimination of the killing of tickets has been the greatest single factor making for increased respect for law in this State. Many times I have been thanked by political leaders of both parties for sparing them the thankless work of killing tickets. The effect on judges has been as great as it has been on litigants, witnesses, and spectators."

He has also made it possible for citizens to complain about judicial shortcomings, at the administrative office of the supreme court. New Jersey is the only State in the Union where one can complain about a judge as easily as about a bus driver. All complaints get a patient hearing. And in 9 cases out of 10, it is possible to convince the complainant that he really got a fair deal.

During the new courts' first year, in 82 percent of the cases, the lawyers' briefs failed to cite all of the necessary precedents, and the judges had to do their own research. An in-job training program in appellate argument—under which Rutgers University, the courts, and the senior members of the bar cooperate in giving a course which includes classwork, brief writing, and actual argument before judges—raised the standards. Today a lawyer may call himself counselor (which in New Jersey is higher than attorney) and appear in appellate courts only after he has passed the course.

One of the bugaboos against which Vanderbilt still inveighs is the appellate court which is multijudge in name only. In such courts, before a case is argued it is assigned to one judge for opinion writing. Free of further responsibility, the other judges pay little or no attention to the argument and vote for the opinion, when written, as a matter of course.

In the New Jersey Supreme Court, by contrast, Vanderbilt has done his best to get maximum participation, by every judge in every decision. Each member of the court is required before hearing argument, not only to read all the briefs, but to come to conference with his own typewritten notes on them. The chief justice is thus able to inform lawyers at the outset of oral argument which points the judges consider most crucial. In the conference following argument, the cases are discussed, and only then are opinions assigned. The opinion writer has the final decision as to whether or not he will accept any suggestions made to him; the other members of the court have a like decision as to whether or not they will vote in favor of the opinion. Supreme court decisions are issued a month after argument.

Aware that he is sometimes criticized as a worshiper of promptness for its own sake, Vanderbilt points out that, he would prefer a slower decision if it better served the ends of justice. But he thinks a prompt decision is usually a better decision: "A judge will never know the case better than he does immediately after he has read the briefs and heard the arguments—it will only grow dimmer in his mind and the opinion become more difficult to write as the weeks go by."

Furthermore he knows that some delays in themselves, create injustice. Shortly after it began to function the new supreme court refused a statewide increase of streetcar and bus fares. Immediately after the court adjourned and the judges scattered on their vacations, the transit company filed an application for a rehearing. Under the rules, such an application automatically stays the judgment until the court disposes of it—which normally would have meant that trolley and bus riders would have continued to pay higher fares until the court convened in September. As a result, each commuter would have been out of pocket about $15 which he could, as a practical matter, never recover. The judges were in Maine, the Adirondacks, the Poconos, on the Jersey shore, and the high seas,, but Vanderbilt, himself in Maine, immediately arranged a special court session by telephone. In this long-distance conference, the court considered, and denied, the application for a rehearing.

The next day a map of the world with the supreme court's telephone circuit was on the front pages all over the State. It demonstrated as nothing else could, that the new court meant business.

BUILDING A LAW SCHOOL

Yet even the titanic labor of reforming New Jersey's courts never took all of Vanderbilt's time. At the peak of his efforts in 1943 he was made dean of the New York University law school and turned his simultaneous attention to a new set of problems. The school's enrollment was at a wartime low ebb and its diploma had no glamor for the large law firms. Characteristically, Vanderbilt wanted to do something to improve the situation at once, and he decided sprucing up the old quarters was a logical first step. So he set out to raise $200,000 among the alumni. At the end of the year, response had been so poor that he realized that a drive to paint and plaster an unattractive building for an unimpressive school fired no one's imagination. What was needed was a new school in a new building.

Accordingly he raised the ante to 5 million, fired the professional fund raisers and took over himself, hiring five young veterans who were recent graduates to help him, got architect Otto Eggers to design a neo-Georgian building to overlook Washington Square, and made plans for a first-rank national law school (now the Arthur T. Vanderbilt Law Center) which would be a center of graduate scholarship and applied legal research to draw students from all over the world.

The first large contribution came from a Vanderbilt client—Davella Mills Foundation, for whom Vanderbilt had won an important case. He asked the trustees for a gift to NYU instead of a fee and received $500,000 on condition that an equal amount would be raised during the year and that the university would contribute the land. The two strings enabled Vanderbilt to put pressure behind his drive. Next he acquired several business corporations for the school, including the Mueller Macaroni Co., whose income the school enjoyed on a tax-free basis—a coup so brilliant that it was instantly copied by schools all over the country until Congress plugged up the loophole in the tax law which allowed charities to enjoy tax-free income from nonrelated activities.

Now one of the best housed in the country, the NYU law school has begun through a scholarship program to attract outstanding students from each of the Nation's 10 Federal circuits. It brings teachers, judges, and practicing lawyers to numerous conferences on legal problems, and graduate students to such institutes as the Inter-American Law Institute for Latin American students, the Institute of Comparative Law for Europeans, the Institute of Judicial Administration for improving the work of the courts, and the Citizenship Clearing House for acquainting the best men in the best colleges and universities with their responsibilities as citizens. It probably has the largest publication program of any law school in the United States.

THE JUDGE'S DAY

Today, at 67, Vanderbilt is still intensely active. He leaves his country house in Short Hills, N. J., at 7 a. m., and drives his 1939 Cadillac coupé to the station.

"I can get a day's work done between 8 and 9 in the morning," he explains, "because there are no interruptions."

His Newark chambers look north to the Oranges and east to the towers of Manhattan. There he busies himself with correspondence—all letters are answered the day they are received, and he has thoughts to communicate with judges and friends all over the world.

On 3 days a week, when he finishes his mail he begins his opinion writing and brief reading. On Mondays and Thursdays he catches the train to Trenton, where he is met by a State trooper and driven with two of his colleagues to the State House Annex. In the pleasantly furnished courtroom the judges' dais is not perceptibly raised and the lawyers sit in comfortable leather chairs arranged in livingroom fashion. Vanderbilt's good-humored courtesy and casual manner reinforce the impression that lawyers and judges participate together in the judicial function.

Like many other law teachers who have ascended the bench, Vanderbilt tends to be impatient with legal pedantries and artificialities. In one case, he joined with his colleagues in striking down an ancient bar against suing one's wife in order to permit a husband to collect unemployment compensation: his employer was his wife. He also avoids pomposity on and off the bench—his clothes tend to be soft and gray rather than stiff and black. He gives the impression of an important and successful man, but not necessarily a Chief Justice.

Recently he has become concerned with the threat to New Jersey's natural beauties and has written a series of opinions enabling New Jersey municipalities to prevent undesirable developments and preserve the character of the State's suburbs and farmlands.

But with all his legal activity, he takes care not to get out of touch with current culture. In 1938, when he was visiting the chambers of British judges, he was astonished to see large piles of new books in colorful paper covers, obviously nonlegal in nature. These, he learned, were being accumulated for vacation reading; and he began to contrast this with the narrow interests of American lawyers and judges who seldom bother with nonprofessional literature. Some years before, he had been forcibly struck by his own illiteracy. During a vacation voyage with his wife, he started to read The Green Hat, then a best seller, and was so shocked by its frankness that he decided he had been given a piece of pornography by mistake, and threw the book overboard. His wife, aghast, assured him that the book was a best seller and that everybody was reading novels like it.

Since that day, a trunkful of current books—mostly biography, history, and essays—has always accompanied Vanderbilt to Maine for his summer vacations, and during the winter he attends the theater in New York frequently.

of the family take out 1 of the 2 family house at North Harpswell, overlooking Casco Bay, three-quarters of a mile away from their nearest neighbors, is a rigidly kept feature of Vanderbilt's year—the one period in which he religiously abstains from office work. Instead, while his wife occupies herself in the garden, and the younger members of the family out take 1 of the 2 family boats, he reads, relaxes, and gets to know his 13 grandchildren.

In 3 more years, according to the words he himself wrote into the New Jersey constitution, he will retire from the Supreme Court. A study in the Arthur T. Vanderbilt Law Center is awaiting him. On a large yellow foolscap pad is a long list of projected books and articles he is eager to start working on—at 8 in the morning the day he steps down from the bench.

Failure of Our Foreign Policy in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be permitted to appear before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on May 8, 1956, and present my views to that distinguished committee on the question of the failure of our foreign policy in the Middle East. My testimony on that occasion was as follows:

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman and members I appreciate the opportunity of coming before you again and voicing my opinions for whatever aid they may be to you in connection with the pending bill.

While I appreciate the world-wide importance of the provisions of the bill, and that it does cover many areas of the world, I would like to address myself primarily to the bill as it affects the Middle East, or the Near East, as it is often referred to.

May I by way of preliminary indicate to the committee, that I appreciate that in viewing the testimony of any witness you have the right to ask yourself, what is his background and does he have any prejudice or bias in connection with the subject on which he speaks.

When anyone of the Jewish faith addresses himself to the Middle East, you have a right to take that into account. I want to assure the committee at the outset that my first and primary interest is the same as that of every member of this committee, that is, world peace and the security of our own country.

I hope that in assessing the value of my testimony, you will have in mind not only my religious background but also that I was among the first to look with favor upon restoration or resumption of diplomatic relations with Spain. I think that I can justifiably say that my personal report to President Truman late in 1949, after a visit to Spain, together with the information brought back from there by other members, had at least some bearing upon what I think everybody admits today is a desirable result of resuming diplomatic relations with Spain.

I was among the early advocates of help to Turkey, which, as you know, is a 98 percent Moslem country. Despite the fact that it is quite unpopular among many of my constituents, I have taken the position that the interests of our country require if not a full fledged Ambassador or Minister at least a special representative at Vatican City.

With those preliminaries, let me address myself to the Middle East situation.

Chairman RICHARDS. May I add that I can testify to the correctness of the gentleman's statement on those matters.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I trust that the members of this committee will not think that I usurped or impinged upon their authority when during the last recess I made a trip into various countries, and more particularly into the Middle East, where I visited in Lebanon, Egypt, Turkey, and Israel.

I think that we can all agree that the overall problem is the establishment of peace in that area and that anything short of full-fledged peace is obviously a threat to our own security and to world peace.

I think we also agree that the subsidiary problems are the resettlement of the refugees, the lessening of the existing tensions and an agreement about the boundaries.

I think with a period of 8 years of experience behind us now there must be a complete revision of our policy in that area, with much more firmness than has heretofore been shown in our treatment of the peoples throughout that area, or more accurately, our treating with the leaders of the governments there.

The tensions have gotten worse and more bitter. We have had no real negotiations which would lead to peace.

You may recall that as early as 1948, before there was a State of Israel, I said that the only way we will have peace in that area is if we go in there and help all the peoples of that area, the Arabs who are living there, as well as the Jews, to help them to rehabilitate themselves and to improve their economic conditions there.

That directly relates to the refugee problem. We are told time after time that there are 900,000 refugees outside of Israel who must be rehabilitated and must be resettled.

The Arab position has been they will not talk peace until all of those Arabs are returned to the State of Israel. That means never. I think it should be perfectly obvious to anybody and everybody familiar with the situation that you couldn't possibly resettle those 900,000 Arabs in the little State of Israel even if you were going to take all the State of Israel and give it to them.

Before they left there 90 percent of them were living in poverty. The average annual income was from $15 to $30 per year. Thirty dollars per year was high income for 90 percent of the Arabs living in that area.

To take them and send them back there would be utter folly—how are they going to live? Obviously these people must be resettled in places where you can give them a piece of land or an opportunity to earn themselves a livelihood that doesn't even begin to approach our standards, but which will at least improve their prior standards or give them an opportunity to live, if not

decently as we know it, at least better than they had lived when they were unable to eke out a living for themselves and their families.

Today in these refugee camps they are being supported mainly by the bounty of the United Nations and this country, which supports or gives to that fund most of the money that is being used for that purpose.

Why haven't they been resettled? They haven't been resettled because the Arab leaders have refused to permit them to be resettled.

In that connection, our policy must be changed, and I think it must be a condition of further aid going to that area, that something must be done about that situation.

We have talked and talked to the Arab leaders, and we have run up against a stone wall. They will not move in that direction. I think it is high time that our Department of State changes its policy in that regard and makes it known in no uncertain terms that this problem must be solved, that we will no longer continue to permit the Arab leaders to use this as a political problem and to keep those refugees stirred up emotionally against resettlement.

I might say that I have been in that area three times—I was there in 1948, 1949, and again in 1955. After each of my visits there I have been visited at home, unsolicited, by Arabs, Moslem Arabs, and Christian Arabs, indicating that much of the story we get out of there about the unwillingness of the Arabs to be resettled is the talk not of the Arab refugees themselves, but of the leaders of the Arabs.

If we can let those leaders know in no uncertain terms that this problem must be solved, you can begin to move those Arabs out, not en masse, but family by family and resettle them. We will then get rid of this emotional problem that has kept that area stirred up all through the years.

You will find back in December 1947 and January and February of 1948 I was urging things such as, as I called it at that time, a Middle East TVA. I had in mind things like the Aswan Dam that they are talking about on the Nile. I had in mind things like the Jordan Valley project that Ambassador Eric Johnston has done so much to bring almost to the point of closing.

Secretary Dulles told the Senate committee in February that all of the details had been worked out except the political agreement. In other words, every last item had been agreed upon, between Syria, Jordan, and Israel, as to how it would be financed, what would be done there, where the power would go, where the water would go, the division of water between Syria and Jordan and Israel. The only thing that stops the project from going ahead is political agreement or assent politically by Syria and Jordan. Both are pressured by the Arab league not to agree politically.

Israel has indicated here willingness to go ahead. She is ready to execute the formal documents. The Arabs refuse. Israel has several times indicated that she would go ahead without the Syrian and Jordanian consent. Of course, each time she has been persuaded that that is not the thing to do.

I say the time has come when our Government must say, and this is probably the place for it to be said, in this bill, or in the report on this bill. Lay down the policy that if the Arabs will not go along with those projects, Israel will be permitted to do it herself, that there will be no aid to that extent to Syria or Jordan as such, but as long as Israel will make the commitment, the firm commitment, that the power and the water generated there will go in agreed portions or ratios into Syria and Jordan, when they are ready for it, that Israel may go ahead and do the job and we will help her do it.

I think if we took that firm attitude the Arabs would have no choice in the matter but to say, "Let's go ahead."

I was told, as your study mission was told, as evidenced by their report that was submitted to you under date of March 14, 1956 (I met with some of the members of that study mission while we were in that area), that a lot of the tension there was caused by the Baghdad Pact.

The surprising thing is that we were told by Arab officials our American diplomats tell them that the United States did not bring about the Baghdad Pact. Why they should have been told that, I don't know. But it only irritated the situation rather than help assuage their feelings.

There is no doubt but the fact is, and Secretary Dulles has taken credit for and has claimed it was his idea. He says he started some three years ago to set up this Baghdad Pact as a northern tier or frontier as a defense measure against possible invasion of that area by Soviet Russia.

I sat down in this building, in the old Supreme Court room, with General Bedell Smith, who was then Under Secretary of State, and with Ambassador Byroade, who was then our Assistant Secretary of State in charge of the Middle East, when we were talking about this plan three years ago.

I said to them, I think there were several of the members of this committee, I said to those two gentlemen, that you are wasting your time and your energy and money in that kind of venture, because if Russia decides to move in there, all of the money that you are now spending for military aid and economic aid, if it was all used there for military aid, you are not going to stop Russia from moving into that area, when she decides to move.

I didn't anticipate that Russia was going to jump over the northern tier once it was set up. She has done that and moved in, Communist arms having been going into the Arab States for years. Something now must be done to strengthen that whole area. We are not going to strengthen it by sending arms into Egypt in competition with Russian arms. I don't know how much of the facts on that question have been stated to you——

Mr. VORYS. You don't mean into Egypt.

Mr. MULTER. Into Egypt.

Mr. VORYS. By sending arms into Egypt in competition with Russia—I thought you meant into Israel.

Mr. MULTER. Into Egypt, in competition, because the record is clear that for some time Egypt has—it goes back, I think, to 1952, when Egypt first sought arms from the United States.

She has gotten small quantities through the years from the United States. But when she sought large quantities of arms, she was asked to sign the usual agreement, that she would not be an aggressor, not use any of these arms as an aggressor against any nation. She refused to do that. Then, as you recall, in the summer of last year the Secretary of State pretended to be very much surprised with the fact that a deal had been consummated between Czechoslovakia and Egypt for the sale of jets and large armaments. Ambassador Byroad told me in Cairo in November 1955, that he had known of the Egyptian negotiations with the Communists for arms for more than a year before the deal was announced.

I think it should have alerted our State Department to the fact that any country that is looking for arms and will not sign an agreement that those arms will not be used as an aggressor or for aggression, doesn't mean well, but intends to be an aggressor.

Let's analyze that a little further. I understand Secretary of State Dulles said to the Senate committee in February of this year, when he was there, that he didn't know what arms had been sent into Egypt by Czechoslovakia.

When I was there last year, it was known in Turkey, it was known in Israel, and it was no secret to Egypt. I am now talking about November 1955 when she had already received at least 40 jets and 6 submarines. She has today, I believe, 18 battle cruisers. Where will these battle cruisers and these submarines be used, and against whom will they be used? We are told the only fleet in that area is the United States 6th Fleet. Russia has no fleet there, and Russia is not going to supply Egypt with any of these submarines if they are to be used against Russia. Against whom will the submarines be used? Against Israel? Israel has no navy.

What about this preventive war talk we hear? I say to you in all earnestness it has been stirred up in large part by representatives of our State Department, this talk about a preventive war by Israel against her neighbors. Let's analyze it.

The little country of Lebanon to north of Israel is smaller in geographic size and has a population of about a million people, which is just about half of the nimber of people in the State of Israel.

They say that Israel can muster an army of 250,000 men. Lebanon, when I was there in November 1955, could muster a total police force and army of 5,000 men. If Israel had any intentions to move on her neighbors, I think everyone must concede, that Israel could move in on Lebanon and take it over overnight, if she had any desire to wage aggressive war against her neighbors. She has not done it and has no intention of doing it. Of all her borders the Lebanese borders have been the most peaceful.

Most of the border incidents coming from the Lebanese side of the border can be traced to infiltrations from Syria and Egypt.

Persons who have had the same advantage as I had of having been in that area as late as 1949, returning again in 1955, are impressed by the fact that Lebanon is making comparatively the same progress as Israel. Her people are prospering, their standards are improving, and they want nothing but to be left alone. Cross the borders into the other Arab countries and you find that they are practically in the same degraded and degrading conditions as existed all through the years up to 1949. There has been little or no improvement in their methods, their means, their standards, or their opportunities to earn a livelihood.

I was interested to find out where this talk about a preventive war by Israel comes from. I noticed that Secretary of State Dulles indicated in his testimony before the Senate committee that he believed that there was such talk in Israel of a preventive war against her neighbors.

I found in our Embassies in Lebanon, in Egypt, and in our Embassy in Israel, the talk came from our American officials, that Israel might indulge in a preventive war.

I know that Ambassador Lawson in Israel had no such idea. On the other hand, I know Mr. White in that Embassy made it known to anybody who would listen to him that it was his idea that there will be a preventive war by Israel, and to bolster his position wherever possible he would put you in touch with that minority, that small group in Israel who have been yelling all through the years for such a war and for enlargement of the State of Israel.

That definitely is a very small group in Israel. The large majority of the people, and all the responsible officials in government in Israel, will say that they know that, if they were to start any kind of war upon any of her neighbors, they would immediately turn world opinion against them, that

they would be cut off from all assistance of any kind from this country and from our allies, and that, while they might win the first battle, they would have to lose such a war.

In our Embassy in Lebanon, the same talk was going on. In Egypt I confronted our Ambassador, Ambassador Byroade, with the same matter and I asked him pointblank: "Do you think there is a single Arab leader who believes that Israel will wage a preventive war," and Mr. Byroade said, "They don't believe it, but I, Hank Byroade, believe it."

It is that kind of preachment going on by our American officials there that is keeping this pot stirred up.

Unless our State Department is going to do something about it, to stop it, we are going to have more and more trouble in that area instead of less and less.

You will probably recall that Mr. Dulles has been taxed many times with the situation in that area, and has been asked to give his reasons as to why something can't be done about it, particularly with the situation in Saudi Arabia, where they refused to permit American Jews to serve as part of our Armed Forces. There is nothing wrong with the provision in any of these agreements that anyone objectionable to a local government should not be permitted to remain in that country.

That has been the way of governments ever since we have had civilized governments. Today, in the United States, if our Government finds a diplomat here from a foreign country who is objectionable, we send him home. We never find anybody objectionable because of his religious beliefs. When the attempt is made to relate Judaism or the Jewish religion to Zionism, then you get this very fine difference that is drawn by the Arabs and by the Moslems, which even our Secretary of State, however, does not try to draw.

They will tell you, the Arabs, the Moslems, that the Jews are our cousins. They say: "We are all Semites. We have all been persecuted together and we want to live peacefully together." "But," says the Moslem, "while I do not oppose the Jew, I am opposed to the Zionists, and the Zionist is the fellow who wants a Jewish state."

That cannot be an excuse to our State Department for saying that any American Jew in the armed services of our country may therefore be deemed objectionable to Saudi Arabia or to any of these other countries.

Whether you go to Lebanon or go to Turkey or go to Egypt, you will find that there are Jews living there, and living there peacefully with their neighbors. True, they make no attempt to espouse the Zionist cause in the Arab countries or the cause of an independent state of Israel. But all this destroys the substance of the charge that the basic difference in that area is a religious difference.

These people can live together and will live together, and will trade together, and prosper together, if given the opportunity.

I think it is up to the Congress to write the directives into a bill such as this, so that our State Department representatives will do the right thing. They talk about trying to establish peace in this area and couple it with talk about the fact that the boundaries must be agreed upon first.

I say to you gentlemen that if our State Department said to the Arab states: "We will not stand for aggression from either side. We will not permit aggression by Israel against her neighbors. We will not permit aggression by the Arab states against Israel," this problem can be settled. It cannot be settled by saying: "We will guarantee your borders if, as, and when you will agree upon the changes," because that may never come. Unless and until we take the firm position that these boundaries will be changed only by agreement or by arbitration (and there is a method of arbitration) we cannot impress upon both sides the imperative need for them to sit down and agree upon a change of boundaries.

But we must first say, "You are not going to fight about these borders and boundaries." Then if they won't sit down and agree upon it, there is a way of making them go to the World Court and submit the matter there.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Haven't we said that?

Mr. MULTER. No, sir; we have not. Mr. Dulles has repeated time and again that we will guarantee these borders and boundaries if, as, and when they agree upon them.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. The State Department made a statement about aggression, and offered their services, the United Nations, and so forth, to work this thing out; didn't they?

Mr. MULTER. They have not taken the firm position I advocate. There have been intercessions, but there has been no firm statement of that policy by our State Department to this day.

Israel asked for a mutual security pact, and in asking for it she suggested for each of the Arab States the same security pact that she asked for. This, too, is a method of smoking out the evil intent of a potential aggressor. Such a nation not only will not ask for, but will reject such a pact.

The State Department has not seen fit to give, to even negotiate with the State of Israel about such a security pact.

Chairman RICHARDS. ABE, where did you place the line? There is a dispute about the line.

Mr. MULTER. You say to all sides: The lines remain precisely where they are until you sit down around the peace table and agree upon a change, and if you can't agree, then either you are going to appoint arbitrators, and if you don't appoint arbitrators, you go to the World Court and let the court decide. When the court makes the decision, it will be binding upon all sides.

This is an international dispute. It is a proper subject to come before the World Court. It is high time that we as leaders of the world will say that we will stand for no fighting about things of this kind which can be settled either by agreement or by a court decision.

In my opinion, we must take that kind of firm position, and if we did we could very quickly settle these problems in that area. If we don't take that firm position, then we are bound to have trouble there. These people will continue to snipe at each other, and it doesn't matter who is responsible for the first sniping. A shot from one side brings forth two from the other side. It doesn't matter whether it comes from Israel or the other side. As long as you have these people stirred up, they will be sniping at each other. The only way to handle it is for us to take this firm position. I do hope that this committee will, as a part of this bill, say that we want to give aid, economic aid, to all of this area but peace, true peace, is the price they must pay.

You have heard many times from our Secretary of State that he hopes this issue of the Middle East will not be made a political issue in this year's election campaign, because it will stir up the Arabs into again voicing the opinion that in this country we depend on Jewish votes and therefore we are more favorably disposed toward Israel than we are to the Arabs.

I was surprised to learn when I met with the Arabs throughout this area, that not one had ever been told that the Jews in this country are a minority, that in the Senate with 96 Members we have only 2 who are Jews, that of the 435 Members of the House the maximum we have ever had is 11.

As I pointed out to them, in the membership of the study mission that was there representing this very committee, not one depended on a Jewish vote in his home district to get himself elected; that this was not a Jewish problem, nor a Christian problem, nor a Moslem problem, that this is a problem of doing the right thing the humane thing and making people behave and not fight with one another.

When you talk to some of our Arab friends over there, you find the unfortunate part of it is that our American diplomats have never once taken the trouble to tell these Arab officials that this is not a Jewish problem at home.

They talk here at home about making it a political issue, but they never tell the Arabs it is not a political issue, that neither party needs Jewish votes to elect our President, or our House or our Senate.

The shame of it is that our State Department has not taken the forceful unequivocal position and said to these people, "You are wrong. This is not a political problem at home."

The same thing goes for the way that they handle some of these other problems there. You travel through the Middle East and you are told by some of the Arabs that we should stop the Jews raising funds here in the United States and sending them to Israel. They don't understand that charity drives are conducted here without the aid or interference of Government.

Not once has an American diplomat said to the Arab leaders that the Jews have said time and time again in the United States that they will go out and raise as much money to rehabilitate the Arab areas as they raise for Israel, if only there can be peace there; that if the Arabs will sign a treaty, Americans of all faiths will do the same for the Arabs as they are doing for the Jews there.

No one knows better than we people here at home, Jew and Christian alike, that you can't have prosperity in one little corner surrounded by poverty, without creating antagonism in the poorer areas. You have to build up the whole area and give them all an opportunity to live.

Mr. VORYS. Along the line you just mention, on that matter, on August 26, 1955, in an important statement by Secretary Dulles, he said, with reference to the plight of the 900,000 refugees:

"Compensation is due from Israel to the refugees. However, it may be that Israel cannot unaided now make adequate compensation. If so, there might be an international loan to enable Israel to pay the compensation which is due and which would enable many of the refugees to find for themselves a better way of life.

"President Eisenhower would recommend substantial participation by the United States in such a loan for such a purpose."

What do you think of that statement?

Mr. MULTER. That is directly in line with what I have in mind. The Israelis would like to have that. Every right-thinking person would like to see that done, and the only reason it isn't done is because the Arab leaders sit back and say, "We won't let you resettle these refugees anywhere except in Israel."

Mr. VORYS. That is not my understanding.

Mr. MULTER. I would like to suggest that if you would give me, Mr. Chairman, an executive-session meeting I will bring to you Arab-Moslems who will tell you that when you go into these refugee camps you will be permitted to meet only with the leaders. They will tell you how terrible the situation is, how the people in the camps will not be resettled except in their homeland. These witnesses, I can bring to you, will tell you that is not so, that the Arab refugees are willing to be resettled, that they want to be resettled. There have been negotiations time and time again between some of them——

Chairman RICHARDS. I would like to say, Mr. MULTER, that we started a little late. Mr. MULTER told us beforehand that he had a meeting with the Banking and Currency Committee, and he has a notice to inform him that they are going to take the matter up.

Mr. MULTER. I will take just a few minutes more. I would like to answer any questions that the members care to address to me either this morning or at any other time you will invite me back.

Mr. VORYS. As you know, the United Nations resolution said it was the duty of Israel either to compensate or repatriate the Arab refugees. Both of those alternatives are open to Israel.

As far as I know, there has never been any offer by Israel to repatriate——

Mr. MULTER. The 900,000—you are right. As I indicated before, it would be an impossible task to try to repatriate them in Israel. They have taken Arabs back into Israel. There has been some 100,000 families that have been reunited within Israel, people who had been outside Israel and permitted to return.

Israel has always indicated her willingness to compensate the Arabs for their property that was left behind. She has unblocked the funds within Israel that were left behind by the Arabs. They have made that available to them.

I was about to say, as I got this message, that I can bring to you Arabs, Christians, and Moslems who left Israel, who negotiated with the State of Israel for compensation, and when the Government of Syria and Jordan, where they were living, found out that the negotiations were being consummated, stepped in and threatened them with annihilation if they dared to go through with the agreements or to accept any of the money offered by Israel.

There isn't any doubt that people who are entitled to the money, if they are left alone, will be fairly compensated and will get the compensation that they are willing to accept, if the leaders of their home governments would let them take it.

I am prepared to bring to you, Mr. Chairman, persons whose names must be protected because their families are still over there and who would be annihilated if it were known they were testifying here. I will bring you Arabs who will testify under oath that what I say to you is the fact.

Mr. VORYS. The home government of the Israeli-Arab is Israel, the refugee. We all joined in the desire of the Jews to go back to their homeland. The homeland of these Arab refugees is not some other country; it is Israel.

Mr. MULTER. How many of these 900,000 fled from Israel?

Mr. VORYS. I don't know. A lot of them have been born in captivity——

Mr. MULTER. Many of them were born in the refugee camps. You will find that in the Arab refugee camps outside of Israel, among the 900,000, you will find thousands and thousands of them who were poor nomads roaming the Arab lands, eking out a living from the countryside, who moved into these camps because there they are supported by the U. N. and the contributions of the United States to the U. N. instead of continuing to roam.

I don't care how they got there. They are human beings, who should be rehabilitated. They are human beings who should be given an opportunity to earn a livelihood. Something has to be done for them. But it is impossible to take the 900,000 whether they were ever in Israel or not, and move them into Israel, certainly not until there are firm peace treaties entered into between these Arab countries and the State of Israel.

If the peace treaties were consummated, then you might be in a strong position to say, "Those who came out of Israel have a right to return to their homeland."

But as long as they are at war—as late as January 16, Mr. Nasser said, "From the Atlantic to the Persian gulf there is but one Arab nation which no one will succeed in dividing again. After World War II part of the Arab heart was snatched from the Arab body—meaning the State of Israel. Today Arabs from the Atlantic to the Persian gulf will coperate in restoring that part," restoring Israel to the Arab lands.

As long as that condition exists, as long as the Arab leaders join with Mr. Nasser, as they are doing in saying that, surely no one believes that bringing those 900,000 Arabs or any substantial part of them into Israel is going to make for peace.

Chairman RICHARDS. Mrs. KELLY.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment my colleague from Brooklyn for his appraisal of this Middle East situation.

Is there any question in your mind, Mr. MULTER, that if we could get the representatives of these countries to a peace conference that Israel wouldn't be willing to settle every issue, including the return of a number of refugees, repayment for their land and return of their bank accounts, as was done for Israel refugees who came there from other countries?

Mr. MULTER. Mrs. KELLY, there isn't a doubt in the world that the Israeli Government and their officials will sit down at the peace table and talk about all these problems and try to arrive at a solution of them.

But let's be practical about it. As of today, the Arabs will not sit down with the Israelis face to face. But that doesn't mean that you can't commence these negotiations.

As a matter of fact, word was sent home at my instance to the Secretary of State. I know it was received here. I know it was received in our Embassy in Israel I know it was received in our Embassy in Egypt, that the Arab leaders were ready to sit down and talk, not face to face with Israel, but with American representatives, with United States representatives about the settlement of all of these problems, if the United States will take the initiative and say, "We insist that you sit down and talk about these things."

You could keep the Arabs on one side of the barrier, the Israelis on the other. The United States representative could talk first to one group and then to the other group, and finally consummate an agreement and bring them together to sign it.

It was going to be done, and word was sent back that it would be done, not on the basis of the 1947 partition resolution but on the basis of the 1949 resolution. There is a difference, because now the Arabs say they want to roll everything back to the 1947 boundaries.

The 1949 truce agreements recognized the boundaries set up at that time as armistice boundaries, subject to revision. That word came back, was received here in Washington, was received throughout the Middle East, with the exception of our Embassy in Turkey.

Within 5 days thereafter, Prime Minister Eden of Britain issued the statement that he would be the arbitrator between Israel and the Arabs on the basis of the 1947 partition resolution.

It was an attempt by Mr. Eden to reestablish British prestige in that area. Whether or not he knew that by talking about the 1947 resolution he would blow up the possibility of these negotiations, I don't know, and I won't make that charge against him.

The Arabs sent word that they would talk about the 1949 borders. He wanted to talk on the basis of the 1947, and the whole thing blew up.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I was going to ask this: I can't understand how there would be any considerable portion of people of Israel that would advocate a preventive war, because if they fight a preventive war they are going to have to fight the very war that they are going to try to avoid.

It is a good deal like a man committing suicide because he is afraid to die. That would be the case if you fight a preventive war; no one would win.

There is one question that you didn't comment on, and perhaps you didn't do so because you didn't desire to raise that issue; if you do not, do not answer my question.

Do you advocate the United States sending arms to Israel?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, I do, sir. I disagree with Mr. Dulles that to send arms at this time into Israel would be creating an arms race. The arms race is on.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Do you think it would be provocative of war?

Mr. MULTER. No; it would not be. I think it would be preventive of war. I think it is much better to do that than send in 1,800 marines from the 6th Fleet. As Prime Minister Ben Gurion said, "Don't send your boys over here; send us arms so we can fight your battle." As long as Israel is strong——

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I heard Churchill made that statement.

Chairman RICHARDS. And Roosevelt, too.

Mr. MULTER. I am against an arms race. The State of Israel is against an arms race. I think every sensible person is against an arms race. But I think you must keep these parties on an even balance. If they know that to fight one another, will be to annihilate one another, they won't fight.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. We have a status of forces agreement in all of these countries. We can't make it public, but we do have that information.

Mr. BURLESON. As our able colleague always does, he makes a splendid case, but he starts with the present-day conditions, and I think that many people do, most people do, in justifying a great many things, and it makes an attractive thing, because it is a humane appeal.

But the humaneness is exactly the reason that Israel was created in the first place. But there were some conditions in the Balfour Declaration that we forget a great many times.

There is no need for anyone, the Arabs or this country, to think or to believe that Israel is going to be driven into the sea or to say that it is not a nation and that it is not going to endure from now on. Certainly I have no idea about that, no such concept that Israel will not endure.

Of course, it will. But, nevertheless, going back to the historical facts under the Balfour Declaration, finally when the British threw in the sponge and said, "We will turn this into a trusteeship," which was our policy, and then we abandon that policy.

In the declaration were safeguards for the Arab majority. The great majority were Arabs in the country at that time. There was only 50,000 Jews, or something like that, with hundreds of thousands of Arabs. It was agreed that their right should be protected.

It was also agreed that no people of the Jewish faith would be bound by the Zionist concepts to the State of Israel outside of the State of Israel.

That leads me to say this to the gentleman, when he speaks of Israel as related to Zionism: Would you contend, Mr. MULTER, that there is a distinction, that Israel is not a Zionist state? Do you attempt to set one apart from the other as a political party, or something of the sort?

Mr. MULTER. I think you will concede that Israel, like our country, guarantees freedom of religion. I think you will agree that Israel, like our country, guarantees every one of its citizens the right to vote and to hold office.

There are Arab-Moslems and Arab-Christians in the Israeli parliament. The point I tried to make is that while most Jews are Zionists, not every Zionist is a Jew. There are many Christians who are Zionists. Zionism is the political concept of a Jewish state. Every Jew is not a Zionist.

You probably know that we have in this country a so-called American Council of Ju-

daism. They have been bombarding the Congress with literature for some time. Actually, they represent less than 2 percent of the Jews of this country. But they were against the establishment of a State of Israel.

Mr. BURLESON. If you will allow me to interrupt, they have vehemently denied that they are opposed to the State of Israel.

Mr. MULTER. They may take the position now that they are in favor of the State of Israel. They were not in favor of its originally. They were bitterly opposed to its coming into being.

After it did, they accepted the fact, but in accepting the fact they do everything they can to dissuade Christians and Jews from sending money to Israel or aiding it in any way. They are doing what they can to help destroy Israel.

They take the position that we must lean over backward in favor of the Arabs and against the State of Israel, which I say is not good policy. It is not American policy.

I don't say that we should be anti-Arab. My argument all through the years is that we must be just as pro-Arab as pro-Israel. You have to be fair and impartial to both of them.

Mr. BURLESON. Is that not the announced policy of the State Department today?

Mr. MULTER. It may be the announced policy, but they are not doing anything to effectuate that policy. They are doing much that is contrary to that policy.

Mr. BURLESON. In connection with the funds, let me ask the gentleman, do you agree that contributions, and you reminded me of this, to the United Jewish Appeal Funds for the State of Israel, do you believe that those funds should be a deductible item on the tax account of the American taxpayer as a philanthropic contribution to the State of Israel?

Mr. MULTER. To the same extent that they are deductible for the support of the American University at Beirut, to the same extent as they are deductible to help people who are in distress anywhere in the world, to the same extent as they are Red Cross and the like.

Mr. BURLESON. Do you know of any other instance or any precedent where any contribution by United States citizens to any political entity of a foreign government is deductible for income tax——

Mr. MULTER. These funds are not made available to a political entity.

Mr. BURLESON. But I disagree with the gentleman—I don't throw this out as such a challenge that it could not be refuted, frankly, I don't know, but my information is that the funds collected by the United Jewish Appeal for the State of Israel goes into a common fund and it can be used for any purpose in the world.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. BURLESON, I most respectfully, but just as strongly, disagree with you. The evidence is overwhelming that not a penny of that money goes into the coffers of the State of Israel. Not a penny of that money is disbursed by the State of Israel. Every dollar of that money is used—that which goes into the State of Israel; not all United Jewish Appeal money goes to the State of Israel—that which does go in is used for philanthropic purposes, rehabilitating people, making available to them the means for agriculture, to learn to farm, to learn skills for industry, for hospitals, and the like.

There isn't a dollar of that money that is administered by or paid to the State of Israel.

Mr. BURLESON. Our State Department people were very definite in 1954 in saying that those funds collected went into a common fund in the state of Israel, and the expenditures were not traceable, that they could not give us any assurance that tanks, planes, guns, public housing, health, or anything else were not purchased, that it was administered by the Israeli Government.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. BURLESON, were they referring to the United Jewish Appeal funds or to Israael bonds?

Mr. BURLESON. They lumped them all together.

Mr. MULTER. You can't lump them together, because the United Jewish Appeal money is not money that is used by the government or administered by the government, while the Israel bonds is a bond issue of the State of Israel and the proceeds go to the State of Israel.

Mr. VORYS. And you pay tax on them?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, you pay tax on the income.

Mr. VORYS. And they can't deduct it?

Mr. MULTER. There is no deduction for the purchase of bonds or the income therefrom.

Mr. VORYS. I found that out recently at home.

Mr. BURLESON. I know that is true of the bonds.

Mr. MULTER. I assure you, Mr. Burleson, if any such proof were available, our Treasury Department, the Internal Revenue Service would immediately revoke the tax exemption that is accorded to those gifts.

Mr. BURLESON. They first decided it was not deductible, and then later on they decided it was under an appeals court decision.

Mr. MULTER. I am not familiar with any litigation involving the matter.

I do know very definitely, I have been active in those matters for a long time, on a high level, and I know there isn't a dollar of United Jewish Appeal money that goes to the Israeli government.

Mr. BURLESON. I hope the gentleman understands I was inquiring.

Mr. MULTER. For more than 50 years the Jewish National Fund, an American organization, has been raising funds here and buying land in Israel, which is then leased on long-term leases, to anyone, to any Jew in Israel who wants to occupy the land. That has been going on for 54 years, to be exact.

Chairman RICHARDS. Abe, what is your recommendation about this legislation, that we do not include any money for help to any Arab state unless what?

Mr. MULTER. Unless they will in good faith enter into peace negotiations, either directly or through the United Nations or an agreed intermediary.

I am not so foolish as to think that you can force these Arabs to sit down face to face with the Israelis. But certainly good faith negotiations should be entered into without delay through an appropriate intermediary.

The United Nations would, of course, be the best intermediary. There are antagonisms there, too. Possibly they could agree upon some other intermediary, who could bring them to the peace table where they could sign the peace agreement.

It is not going to be an easy task. And it will not be accomplished overnight or in a day or week. Certainly we ought to say, very firmly, "This is the time to do it."

Chairman RICHARDS. That you have to do so and so or else.

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Chairman RICHARDS. If they don't do what we say, that is——

Mr. MULTER. We will know where we stand. We will know whether or not we ought to send in any training tanks to Saudi Arabia at a time when there are reserve tank battalions in this country which haven't been able to get a single tank for training purposes.

Chairman RICHARDS. They agreed in writing to provide those tanks, did they not

Mr. MULTER. They made the agreemnet to purchase the tanks in September 1955, and payment was made in November 1955. You and I sitting there would certainly have said, "Well, now, this is not the time to make that kind of delivery."

Mr. JUDD. The basic agreement was made in 1951 that they could buy weapons and training tanks, and so on, in this country?

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Multer, is your suggestion only to this one area or is it your intention that we include such a provision for every area where there is a dispute? For example, would we withhold any aid to Greece or Turkey, for that matter, or Britain, India, Kashmir, or to Korea?

Mr. MULTER. I say, once you find that the parties refuse to sit down and negotiate in good faith——

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Who would adjudicate the situation as to whether the parties are sitting down in good faith?

Mr. MULTER. Don't you think that the question answers itself, when 8 years have gone by and the parties have not yet sat down and consummated an agreement? Isn't that long epough to determine that they are not trying in good faith to arrive at any agreement?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. No, because you would have to withhold, because there is not a settlement over 8 years, aid from both countries, Israel and the Arab States.

Mr. MULTER. That might be the necessary thing. It might be necessary to say to both sides, "You are both intransigent. Neither will talk. We can help neither one of you from here in."

It might be necessary to come to that position. I don't think it will be. But, it may be.

I would like to stay on, but if it is agreeable, I will come back at any time you suggest. I must get to my committee, which is in executive session.

Chairman RICHARDS. Thank you, Mr. MULTER.

It's a War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "It's a War," written by David Lawrence, and published in the U. S. News & World Report of March 23, 1956. This editorial presents the basic fact underlying all news of Communist activities.

The editorial is particularly pertinent in connection with the information—which I recently inserted in the RECORD—on the murder of exiled Rumanians who took advantage of the amnesty of last summer, and the protest—inserted herewith—by the Poles and other exiles in London against the grand tour of Krushchev and Bulganin in England.

I echo Mr. Lawrence's question, "When will we wake up?" When will we recognize that the best defense of our country is constant pressure to make the Communist rulers disgorge the satellite nations which they have ruthlessly incorporated into their military machine?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S A WAR

(By David Lawrence)

When the Communists stir up terrorism in Algeria and cause French divisions to be diverted to north Africa from their primary function in the defense of Western Europe, it's a military maneuver. It's the strategy of war.

When the Communists stir up the people of Cyprus to rebellion so as to wrest from the British their most important military base in the Mediterranean, it's the strategy of war.

When the Communists weaken the ties between Jordan and Britain and help to bring the Arab nations together in an antiwestern combination of states, it's a military maneuver. It's the strategy of war.

When the Communists spread their terrorism through north Africa, using Egypt as a base of operations, and when Egypt herself, succumbing to Soviet influence, enters into an agreement to buy arms from one of the satellites of the Soviet Union, it is the strategy of war.

When the Communists deliberately undermine the French Republic as well as the Italian Republic, gaining a foothold in the Parliaments of both—unmolested by any effective restriction upon subversive activities—the objective is to weaken and detach two important allies from the West. It's the strategy of war.

The Communists are infiltrating on every front in Europe, north Africa, the Middle East, and Asia.

Are we in the United States immune? The Communists are striving to break down our security system, to exploit racial disputes, and yet to obtain from us technical information and as much goods as will help them build up their military armament. It's the strategy of war.

The Communists are helped inside the United States by unwitting persons, influential in the formation of public opinion. Many of the so-called liberals, obsessed with an academic argument about the right of dissent, are singularly indifferent to the safety of the Government itself. As Judge Learned Hand once pointed out, there is no right of revolution against the state.

The war in which we now are engaged is a different kind of war from any the United States has ever faced. It resembles the "fifth column" war of 1938 and 1939 that paved the way for the fall of France in 1940. Only this time the operation is masterminded by ruthless Communists instead of skillful Nazis.

Since we are at war, why do we not resist at least by financial and economic means? Why do we sit by while our allies send strategic goods to the enemy and while the Soviets transmit their gold rubles to hidden espionage centers behind our own lines in north Africa, in Asia, and in Europe?

The usual argument made is that our allies must trade to make a living. But we are spending billions for military equipment to aid these same allies. Why should we not indemnify our allied friends for their losses in trade, if necessary, but still keep machinery and other strategic articles from being shipped to our enemies?

We hear colonialism denounced by unthinking spokesmen in America of various causes and groups who parrot the Communist line on the same subject.

Eighteen United States Senators called last week for the liberation of Cyprus from British rule, but the same Senators are not so solicitous about those who once had their independence and now have been deprived of it by the Communists—the people of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, East Germany, Bulgaria, Rumania, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.

China, too, has lost her freedom—enslaved by Moscow-trained tyrants. In the face of this, there are Americans who advocate policies that would virtually disband the army of 1 million men now on our side in the Far East. For if Red China's gangsters are seated in the United Nations, we shall demoralize the armies of Nationalist China and of the Korean Republic. That's a military maneuver of the highest importance to Soviet strategy.

We are being lulled into inaction on the Communist front by appeals for economic aid to questionable neutrals. Billions of dollars will not instill morality or courage in the minds of those who cringe already before the Communist threat.

When will we wake up? When will we recognize that war now is enveloping us on every side? When will we fight back?

When will we mobilize our moral as well as our material strength and accept the challenge the Communists have thrust upon us? Or must we wait until our allies have been debilitated one by one and then try to battle communism by ourselves?

It's a war—now, in 1956—as it has been for more than 10 years. It is not less dangerous because it is euphemistically called a cold war. It is a war of infiltration and encirclement—a precursor to military conquest.

It's time to recognize the realistic facts as they are and to act in self-defense. It's a war.

Statement of George J. Burger, Vice President, National Federation of Independent Business, Before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on May 4, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD heretofore granted, I am inserting as a part of my remarks the excellent statement made on May 4, 1956, before the House Foreign Affairs Committee by Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business. The subject of Mr. Burger's statement was "Foreign Aid":

I am George J. Burger, vice president and Washington representative of the National Federation of Independent Business. I am appearing here solely for the membership of the federation.

We represent independent business and professional people in all vocations from all parts of the country. We have the largest directly supporting membership of any business organization in the country.

Our position on legislation is dictated directly by our membership. We poll our members on all important issues, and are committed by their majority vote. No officer or group of officers is permitted to speak or act officially for the federation until our entire membership has been polled.

Our members were polled through mandate No. 216 (official publication of the federation) on the question: "Are you for or against maintaining foreign aid as a permanent feature of our Nation's foreign policy?"

It is to be noted on the mandatae the instruction is given to the members: "Before voting—see arguments for and against."

The argument for:

"In the political cold war, foreign aid almost certainly saved Western Europe from communism. Europe doesn't need more aid, is now expected to help the United States in aiding Asia. Stout defense of United States at Bandung last year is proof that mutual assistance helps can work there, too. Militarily, the United States with annual expense of a few billion has made possible creation of allied forces equal to nine times our ground forces, twice the number of air squadrons, equivalent of our naval forces. Economically, aid has helped sustain the United States economy. Over three-fourths of funds have been spent in the United States. More, the 1954 rise in exports helped float the United States economy through the recession."

The argument against:

"Since July 1, 1945, Unite States taxpayers have pointed up about $69 billion for foreign aid. While the program was 'temporary' at first, it is now on a permanent basis. Meanwhile our Nation has gotten the highest deficit of any country in the world. Those who espouse aid forget that you can't finance or buy friendship. Consider, in Korea the United States bore almost 90 percent of the burden. Where were our European allies? Now the switch is to Asia. But India, an Asian country which has taken foreign and, is flirting with Communist China. Indonesia which would get aid, has indulged in ventures sure to wreck its economy. Question here is just who is kidding whom?"

The result of this poll, as it appears in mandate No. 217 shows 16 percent for, 80 percent against, and 4 percent no vote.

As a matter of record, I request the privilege of having made a part of the permanent record of this hearing, mandate bulletins Nos. 216 and 217 as they refer to our action on the foreign-aid program.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as these expressions come from what can properly be termed the "grassroots" of our Nation, we believe it should be of importance for the committee and the Congress in shaping future action on this major subject.

It has been reliably reported, as late as April 26, over one-half of the present Fedeal public debt can be traced directly to involvement in foreign wars and the extension of aid to foreign governments and peoples.

It is also reported that the worst feature of our foreign-aid programs is the fact that during periods of deficit financing, we have put the American taxpayers deep in debt by borrowing money for the foreign-aid programs. This has cost another $18 billion plus and the interest on the interest of this borrowed money added more than $8 billion to the total of the foreign-aid programs since the end of World War I.

It is to be noted in a recent report appearing in the New York Times of April 21, it says: "NATO costs so far set at $312 billion," and further quoting from the Times: "Seven-year bill for United States alone is $252 billion. Thirteen other lands contributed the balance."

In my executive position with the federation, and in my travels throughout the Nation meeting with the average independent businessman, the question is put to me time and again: "When is Congress going to call a halt to the giveaway program before it wrecks the economic structure of our Nation and breaks the backs of its people?" Mr. Chairman, this is an actual, truthful statement presented to me time and time again, nationwide. I answer: "The question must be answered by the Congress of the United States."

I think it can be said that the public at large is well aware of the fact of the constant inspired, alarming statements used by the various administrations as to the peril we face unless this foreign aid of all descriptions continues. It is my belief that the public now believes that most of these statements are merely smokescreens in an attempt to justify the continuance of this giveaway program.

Mr. Chairman, I have tried to keep this statement as short as possible and, at the same time, present to the committee what could be called "Mr. Citizen speaks."

The argument is now being used for the continuance of foreign aid to combat reported, alleged aid from the Soviet Government. It's beyond me to understand how that government could make good or deliver foreign aid in the same capacity as our own Government has done—where, on the other hand, it is a matter of public record that the Soviet Government has yet to make its adjustments on the lend-lease arrangement our Government so graciously extended during the critical days of World War II. It is my belief, judging on performances, that any pledge made by the Soviet Government can be looked upon as merely piecrust.

Just recently, to my surprise, and it happened within the past 60 days, I found that an American citizen returning from the Middle East after a year or two stay, remarked: "If you want to see some evidence of appreciation of our foreign-aid program, look at what is stamped on the currency of that country, 'Yankee Go Home'."

I wonder how many other recipients of aid from this Government share the same lack of appreciation, all at the expense of American taxpayers. From authoritative reports we are receiving, it is a safe conclusion that this must be happening, either directly or indirectly, in the case of many other recipients of our foreign-aid program.

It is interesting to note in the international section of the New York Times of Wednesday, January 4, 1956, it said: "Booming Europe forced to slow industrial gain—struggle to keep prosperity from inducing inflation believed won in 1955." So there is justification for the Congress to "Stop, Look, and Listen" before continuing this obviously unneeded foreign-aid program.

It would appear to small business generally that the continuance of such extensive foreign-aid program may be a smokescreen to further the best interests of international business corporations—all at the expense of the American taxpayers and small business of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I have in my possession a wealth of material taken from the press in recent months to conclusively substantiate the position the federation members have directed be taken as to the discontinuance of the foreign-aid program as it has heretofore existed.

In conclusion, solely in the interest and welfare of our own Nation, and in behalf of the people we represent, independent business and professional men, nationwide, we say: "The time for Congress to close Uncle Sam's international gift shop is now."

Small Business, Not Big Companies, Are Hurt by Tighter Credit Curbs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a credit study just issued by the Standard Factors Corp. cites another example of how small business is steadily being pushed to the wall. The study, issued April 24, 1956, covers 727 manufacturers in 33 major industries, and 127 banks in all parts of the country.

According to the report, as bank credit tightened, the largest borrowers have supplemented their bank credit by selling commercial paper, or borrowing from insurance companies or the public. This avenue, on the other hand, has been closed to the smaller and medium-sized manufacturers. Companies with a net worth of $5,000 to $25,000 have lost their bank lines during the past 12 months because of tightening bank credit, as well as about half of the companies in the $25,000 to $100,000 group. Companies in the $500,000 to $2,500,000 category were virtually unaffected, 98 percent having bank credit on March 31, or only 1 percent less than a year ago.

Small business could get no relief from the commercial finance companies which also operate with bank credit. These companies operations were also strapped by the tighter controls on loans.

The report concludes that the Federal Reserve System might reconsider whether the country can afford to maintain uniform credit controls which affect industry members so differently and which bankers themselves do not like.

The report follows:

ONE YEAR'S EXPERIENCE WITH CREDIT CONTROLS

The latest move of the Federal Reserve System in raising the rediscount rate to 2¾ percent (and 3 percent for Minneapolis and San Francisco) is the fifth such increase since April 1955. Its avowed object is to hold back the inflationary pressures in our economy. With steel, non-ferrous metal, rubber, and other basic producers working at 100 percent capacity, any further rise in industrial activity would scarcely produce any more goods but merely increase prices, with the inevitable consequences in new wage demands, higher costs, etc. Hence the rise in the rediscount rate which will tighten money still more and slow up the industrial parade, somewhat.

However, since this is the fifth increase within a year, we have been able to gage how credit restraint affects the different segments of business. Since April 1955, when the first rediscount raise was set into motion, until April 1956, when the fifth raise was announced, Standard Factors Corporation has queried 727 manufacturers, and 127 banks. These manufacturers are located in every major city in the country; the banks are equally well distributed through the 12 Federal Reserve bank districts.

Despite the apparent fairness of the Federal Reserve banks' method of holding down credit expansion, we have found that the tightening of the money supply has not affected all businesses in the same fashion. Smaller business has felt the tightness worst; medium-sized corporations have been next in complaining about the money situation; large business has had little to worry about. While it is obviously not the desire of the Federal Reserve managers to discriminate among industrial and commercial borrowers, the net effect has been that as bank credit tightened, the largest borrowers have been able to supplement their bank credit by selling commercial paper, borrowing long-term funds from insurance companies or from the public. The smaller and medium-sized manufacturers, on the other hand, have had to contend with a more desperate loan situation. This situation is clearly evident from the reports to this Standard Factors' survey.

WORST IN CERTAIN INDUSTRIES

This situation, according to our reports from 727 manufacturers, is found to be worst in the following manufacturing industries; machinery (nonelectrical); food and beverages; petroleum refining and chemicals; fabricated metals; transportation equipment; textiles and apparel; electrical machinery; stone, clay, and glass products. Many other manufacturers report the same state of affairs, but the above named industries show probably the worst effect of the uniform tightening of bank credit. In those industries, the smaller manufacturer has been virtually squeezed out of bank credit, while the medium-sized producer has had his line curtailed. Details on these companies are cited below.

On the banks' side, the reports from 127 banks show the utmost good will, and a keen desire to satisfy all their customers to the banks' best abilities. However, while banks are anxious to help all customers, there is a tendency for most of the pressure to work its way down to the smaller customer. For this there is evidently an economic reason: it takes almost as much personnel time and expense to administer a $10,000 line of credit as it does to administer a $100,000 line. Similarly, it take no more time and personnel effort to administer a $1 million line of credit than it does to watch over a $100,000 line.

True, bank rates on small loans are higher than on larger loans. This must be so, because the bank cost of administration (and risk) is higher with the smaller credits. The cost of keeping track of smaller loans and investments in smaller business is high, and even going interest rates on smaller loans do not always cover the expense to the bank. But since lendable funds and bank personnel are at a premium—and since the risk on one $1 million account is less than the risk on one hundred $10,000 accounts—banks tend to hold on to their biggest and more stable customers.

COMMERCIAL FINANCE

The commercial finance industry has endeavored to take up the slack through accounts receivable financing, but even their resources are insufficient to help all the small and medium-sized companies which are worthy of credit. Moreover, since commercial finance companies are themselves in good part dependent on bank lines for their resources, they cannot expand their lending in the face of tightening bank credit.

According to the reports from the 727 manufacturers to this standard factors' survey, we find that prior to the first Federal Reserve Board hike in rediscount rate (April 1955), 89 percent of the companies were regular borrowers from commercial banks. Today, only 53 percent have bank lines. In terms of net worth, here is a breakdown of the experience:

Net worth of companies	Percent of companies with bank lines March 1955	Percent of companies with bank lines March 1956
$5,000 to $25,000	53	18
$25,000 to $100,000	82	44
$100,000 to $500,000	94	79
$500,000 to $1,000,000	99	98
$1,000,000 to $2,500,000	99	98
Over $2,500,000	99	99

It is interesting to notice that the smaller companies (under $25,000 net worth) had felt the most severe effects of the tightening bank credit. Slightly more than half of these companies had bank lines in March, 1955. These lines were used to discount bills, carry inventories for processing or for sale, or to take care of payrolls or current operating bills until payment had been received from sales. While only 53 percent of these smaller companies had bank lines when the credit squeeze began, only 18 percent of these companies were left with bank lines a year later. Loss of bank lines often puts the smaller businessman at a fatal disadvantage.

NEXT IN LINE

Looking at the small-medium companies ($25,000 to $100,000) net worth, the drop here was from 82 percent with bank lines, to 44 percent a year later. Almost half the companies in this category lost their bank lines. This, of course, is not as large a drop as in the smallest class, but severe enough.

When we come to the medium-sized company ($100,000 to $500,000 net worth), the drop is much smaller—from 94 percent to 79

percent. Above the $500,000 net worth class, there is virtually no change in bank credit. The minute shift in the larger companies was due to public financing, or long-term loans from insurance companies to replace bank borrowings.

What did the companies do to replace bank accommodations? Many of them went to* commercial finance companies and accounts receivable financing. But here too they met the other side of the tightening bank credit situation. Since commercial finance companies operate on the basis of their own capital plus bank lines of credit—and tightening bank credit affects commercial finance, companies also—the finance companies could not begin to accommodate the demand. Their own resources were squeezed by tighter bank credit—and only those larger commercial finance companies which have access to public financing, to direct placement loans from insurance companies, and to the commercial paper market, were able to make some semblance of meeting the demand.

BANKS LIKE SMALL BUSINESS

As far as the 127 banks are concerned, their confidential replies to this survey indicate that far from shying away from small business, the average bank is, in itself, small business and is largely occupied with small-business loans. Nationally, most banks are small business, but many of these banks participate in larger loans through larger banks in the major commercial centers.

However, with the loan demand rising all over the country, many of the smaller banks have been withdrawing their deposits with larger banks, and using these funds for their own loans. In addition, all banks have met the expanding demand for loans by reducing their investment portfolios. This they have done by selling their Government securities. This sale has been proceeding (in 1956) at an average rate of about $200 million a week. Sale of investments on such a scale is indicative of a strong pressure of loan demands, for the sales involve losses which banks are naturally reluctant to take. Yet they do take them, in order to be able to accommodate customers.

But when it comes to determining what customers should be satisfied first, bankers (apparently like everyone else) must look to the customer which gives them volume, to the customer most apt to be around the bank in the years to come, and the customer which involves (for the bank) the least risk of the depositors' money. Volume, continuity of business, and least risk, characterize the larger corporations.

While the reports from banks show that bankers lean over backward to continue serving their smaller commercial customers, nevertheless the reports also indicate that when the question of renewal of 30-, 60-, and 90-day commercial loans or notes arises, the decision is apt to be far more severe and critical in the case of the smaller and medium-sized business, than when the corporation is larger.

Whether the country can afford to maintain uniform credit controls which affect the different segments of industry so differently, and which bankers themselves do not like, is something which the Federal Reserve System might reconsider.

The manufacturing industries covered in this study of 727 companies are: agricultural implements; automobile parts; bedsprings and mattresses; breweries; chemicals; men's and women's clothing; confectionery; cloth mills; drugs; electrical machinery; electrical parts; electronics; foundries; fruit and vegetable canners; furniture; hardware and tools; hosiery; lumber; industrial machinery; meat packers; metal stampings; paints and varnishes; paper; paper boxes; petroleum; plastics; radio and television; shoes; soft drinks; steel and metal fabricators; stone, clay and glass products; and transportation equipment.

Behind Courts Racial Ruling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. FORRESTER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 30, 1956, page A3481, contains my remarks that day on the usurpation of powers by the United States Supreme Court. As a part of my remarks on that occasion, I said:

I have the idea that the press and the public intend to do something about it.

On May 5, 1956, Hon. George Todt, editorial columnist, Valley Times, a newspaper covering the entire San Fernando Valley in California, wrote me that he had read my remarks and that, pursuant to my statement that "the press and the public intend to do something about it", he was sending his contribution. That contribution was an editorial dated May 3, 1956, appearing on page 10 of the Valley Times and reading as follows:

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION—BEHIND COURTS RACIAL RULING

"The highest duty is to respect authority."—Pope Leo XIII.

Of even greater significance to the American people than the Supreme Court's dynamite-laden ruling on segregation in the case of *Brown* v. *Board of Education* was the means which the high court used in arriving at its decision. It was a decision based on certain controversial emotions instead of legal precedents. Of the latter, there were none.

In fact, the 9 justices modestly overturned 59 State court decisions, 13 Federal court decisions, and 5 decisions previously made by the Supreme Court itself in favor of the separate-but-equal doctrine. This turned into scraps of paper no less than 77 judicial decrees, all of them hitherto considered valid and lawful precedents in any court of jurisprudence throughout the land, at a single stroke. Incredibly enough, 8 of the 9 justices involved—excepting only Mr. Chief Justice Warren—had all participated in the decisions rendered by the Court in those cases decided less than 5 years before. And with the exception of Mr. Warren, all the others were New Deal appointees, appointed by former Presidents Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman.

What is at issue here is not the merits or demerits of segregation as such. What we are examining is the manner in which the Supreme Court, as presently constituted, decided arbitrarily to overthrow the legal precedents contained in the principle of stare decisis. This means simply that once a decision has been made, it shall not be reversed—except in the case of war, legislation, or a constitutional amendment. Until the event of *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, the principle of stare decisis had been held inviolable in American jurisprudence. It was the heart of our concept of a government of laws instead of men.

Now what was it which the nine Justices substitute for the principle of stare decisis in their controversial decision which has since evoked thunder over America? Strangely enough, while the unanimous decision cited no legal authorities or decisions to justify it, the Court said: "Whatever may have been the extent of psychological knowledge at the time of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*, this finding is amply supported by modern authorities." The Court, in a footnote, indicated some of these modern authorities by name—and they are shocking.

On May 26, 1955, Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, of Mississippi, presently chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, stunned the Nation by exposing the records of the modern authorities referred to by the Supreme Court in its decision on the floor of the Senate. Copies may be obtained by writing the Senator at: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C. Every thinking citizen should examine these charges without prejudice—and commence to ask some questions.

First cited as a modern authority in this judicial-history-making-without-legal-precedent was K. B. Clark, a Negro, so-called social-science expert, employed by the NAACP—which was the principal litigant in the case. Another was Theodore Brameld, and this modern psychologist was cited by Senator EASTLAND as having been a member of at least 10 organizations declared to be communistic, Communist dominated, or Communist fronts. Likewise, E. Franklin Frazier, psychologist, whom Senator EASTLAND indicated had been cited 18 times by the House Un-American Activities Committee for connections with Red causes in the United States.

Most astonishing of all, the Court stated in the same footnote: "And see generally Myrdal, An American Dilemma, 1944." And just who was Dr. Gunnar Myrdal? Was he an American? Was he qualified to pose as an authority for the United States Supreme Court? Well, consider the facts: Dr. Myrdal, who called himself a social engineer, was hired by the Carnegie Foundation—under Alger Hiss, I believe—to make an investigation of race relations in this country. He was a Socialist who had served the Communist cause.

He admitted he had no knowledge of the Negro question in the United States. He had utter contempt for the principles upon which the United States was founded and for the political system to which the people adhere. One of the most revealing statements of Dr. Myrdal's book is this authority's blasting our Constitution as "impractical and unsuited to modern conditions" and that its adoption was "nearly a plot against the common people." This is hogwash.

Here is the crux of the matter: how in the name of reason and commonsense could the Supreme Court bring its prestige to the level of such "modern authorities" and thereby nullify the doctrine of "stare decisis" at a single stroke? Has this doomed our traditional concept of American jurisprudence based on law and legal precedent? Does it mean that our Constitution is only what the judges may arbitrarily say it is at any given moment? If this is indeed true, then we are actually at the mercy of the whim or caprice of a judicial oligarchy. It is time to ask questions in the highest places.

I reiterate, Mr. Speaker, that I have every confidence that when the press and the public are informed, indeed they intend to do something about it. I have an abiding faith in the people of our 48 States.

Iron Curtain Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein a very interesting article by Bernard N. Rossiter

relative to expanding United States trade with the Soviet bloc.

Even a cursory glance at the list of commodities that has been cleared for Soviet trade indicates unquestionably that most of them would definitely increase the war potential of the Soviet Union, since the list contains rubber products, drugs, fiber products, wood, electrical appliances, refrigerating equipment and other articles of clear, obvious value to an economic system gearing for war.

It is stated this list is designed to create conditions which will encourage nations to increase their exchange of peaceful goods throughout the world—an admittedly lofty aim provided that we determine that the goods exchanged are definitely peaceful, and will be used only for purposes of peace and not for war. That is the great question here. The American people would like to have an affirmative reassuring answer. They are entitled to it.

The article follows:

NON-STRATEGIC—700 ITEMS FREED FOR RED TRADE

(By Bernard N. Rossiter)

The Government yesterday took a modest step toward expanding East-West trade, freeing 700 non-strategic goods that United States exporters may sell the Soviet bloc without a license.

Since March 1948, shippers have had to get Commerce Department approval on virtually everything sent to the Russian world.

Trade exports predicted the license-free roster would stimulate only a "marginal" increase in trade. And an analysis of the list shows only a small proportion of goods the bloc bought here last year were freed. Licenses are still required for 6 of the 7 major commodities purchased.

CALLED INITIAL LIST

Commerce officials, however, stressed that this was an "initial" list. They said it would be expanded. Moreover, the volume of licenses approved this year was another sign that curbs are being eased.

In 1956's first quarter, approved applications reached $8.8 million, up more than 75 percent from the $5 million in the first 3 months last year and more than 5 times the $1.6 million in the last quarter of 1955.

Commerce Secretary Sinclair Weeks said the free list "is designed to carry out the Government's objective, first announced by President Eisenhower at Geneva last July 'to create conditions which will encourage nations to increase the exchange of peaceful goods through out the world.'"

Every item on the roster, the Department said, is one that would have been approved for export licensing, and no changes were made in the list of banned strategic goods. The complete embargo on exports to Communist China and North Korea still stands, and shippers must stil get licenses for goods to North Vietnam. "Communist-controlled areas" in Laos and Russia's Far East seaports.

The list covers goods to the rest of the Soviet Union, Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Outer Mongolia, Poland, Danzig, and Rumania.

Among the freed commodities are some beverages, rubber products, drugs, fibers, wood, paper products, glass, clay products, cutlery, electric household appliances, commercial refrigerating equipment, office machines, dyes, paints, soil-improvement compounds, soaps, photographic equipment, plumbing fixtures, optical goods, musical instruments, toys, jewelry, lamps, beauty and barber supplies, and dental equipment.

FARM ITEMS OMITTED

Notable omissions were farm commodities and agricultural machinery. Both bulked large in the first-quarter jump of licensed goods, accounting for $7.3 million of the $8.8 million approved.

Commerce officials conceded that the list was inconsistent and omitted goods that have been freely licensed.

One aid said, "This is the smallest possible grouping. We left out any item on which any question had been raised."

Last year United States exports to the bloc were $7.2 million compared to $6.1 million in 1954. Wool rags, corn, and cattle hides accounted for more than half this trade and all remain under license. Of the top 7 only pencil slats, with sales of $350,000, was freed.

The new order will cut redtape for exporters and possibly promote some untapped markets.

A big question mark hangs over farm goods. No surplus commodities are on the roster, in part because the administration still hasn't decided what can legally be shipped.

Regulation of Bank Proxies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, permit me to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following article by Mr. Lewis D. Gilbert, which appeared in the April 1956 issue of the Investor. Mr. Gilbert in the article points up the need for regulating the solicitation of proxies in connection with the operation of our banks.

I am certainly in accord with the views expressed in the article. In this regard on August 2, 1955, I introduced in the House H. R. 7853, which would authorize the Comptroller of the Currency to regulate the solicitation of proxies for voting shares of stock of national banks.

The article follows:

ROUNDUP OF NEW YORK BANK MEETINGS

(By Lewis D. Gilbert)

Leading New York banks, such as Chase Manhattan, First National City, Bankers Trust, and Chemical Corn Exchange, now send out postmeeting reports as a matter of good stockholder relations. They recognize both the basic right of owners to full disclosure and the fact that general press coverage cannot be as detailed or informative as a postmeeting report.

There are still three New York banking institutions which, by neglecting to send out postmeeting reports, refuse to build up an informed electorate among their stockholders. They are Guaranty Trust Co., Manufacturers Trust Co., and Empire Trust.

This year, once again, the writer moved from the floor of the annual meetings that such reports be prepared. Until such time as solicitation of proxies for bank meetings comes under SEC regulation, the vote is of necessity a token one, representing only those few independents actually present at the meeting. In direct contrast is the voting at large corporation meetings already under SEC rules where independents now receive the votes of hundreds of thousands of shares on proposals they introduce.

Fortunately, we are beginning to see proposals for legislation bringing banks under the SEC proxy rules. First to introduce such a bill is Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York, an active and vocal member of the House Banking Committee. We hope that Representative MULTER will continue his efforts and that a companion bill will be introduced in the Senate.

Let us now examine the issues covered at those banks which refused to impart the details of the annual meeting to their stockholders. Were there things they did not want the stockholders to know?

DISSATISFIED WITH DIVIDENDS

Perhaps President Henry C. Brunie, of Empire Trust, wanted to withhold the fact that we registered a strong protest against the continued inequitable and arbitrary dividend policy of the trust company. In 1954 earnings were $12.23. Dividends were only $3 a share. In 1955 earnings rose to $14.71 and still only $3 was paid out to owners. Moreover, the management made no attempt to pay a supplementary stock dividend. As we pointed out at the annual meeting: Is it any wonder that the number of stockholders of Empire Trust declined in 1955?

The need for the right of cumulative voting at State banks (national banks already have it) is well demonstrated by the situation at Empire. If it existed, the owners who agree with the writer that larger dividends should be paid, would be represented in at least a minority position on the board of directors. For example, at Denver National Bank this year, thanks to cumulative voting, Maurice Brody, the investment economist, was finally elected to the board despite the opposition of management, thus assuring proper representation for all segments of stockholder opinion. An Empire director, similarly elected, would be able to learn the nature of the investments of Empire Resources Corp., wholly owned subsidiary, which has securities with a market value of $564,000. Mr. Brunie declined to furnish this information at the annual meeting.

Naturally Empire management annually opposes our proposal to allow cumulative voting and demand for the end of the stagger system of electing directors. It opposes them by voting all the proxies, except those in our possession, against the floor proposals. President Brunie claims his views on the dividend question have the support of the majority of the shareholders. We remind him at each session that as long as he refuses to send our postmeeting reports, he cannot properly judge the extent of dissatisfaction among owners.

LOSS OF POSITION

Let us move on to Guaranty Trust Co. In 1940 this bank was third among the leading banks of the country. Today it has slid to seventh place. We asked why this had occurred, and had a postmeeting report been sent out, stockholders all over the country would have been able to read Chairman J. Luther Cleveland's answer to this vital question. The question of why the chairman's son had been appointed a vice president was also raised by the writer, and, of course, there was a floor resolution on the subject of establishing cumulative voting and ending the stagger system.

By not sending out a postmeeting report, the management of Manufacturers Trust actually does itself a great injustice because in many ways this bank has been most progressive in its stockholder relationships. Its meetings are democratic and the chairman leans over backward to see that free speech and shareholder rights are upheld.

HOTEL STOCKS UNDER FIRE

The principal difference of opinion at Manufacturers Trust revolved around the question of what should be done with the Hilton Hotel stock the bank had acquired

as a result of its interest, in former years, in the New Yorker Hotel. Several owners urged the bank to dispose of it while the country is enjoying prosperity. (At this point only 400 shares of the preferred stock have been sold.) Horace D. Flanigan, bank president, presented some valid reasons why the board of directors hesitates to dispose of all its holdings and we personally feel that a case can be made out either way. A postmeeting report would have aired this, and other questions, so that all owners could comment intelligently when returning future proxies.

As we can see from this brief roundup of bank meetings, the issues discussed are important to the owners so the shareholders are entitled to postmeeting reports.

Statement by Hon. William A. Dawson, Republican, of Utah, on Legislation To Correct an Injustice in Present Child-Care Deductions for Income-Tax Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention recently that certain provisions of the new Income Tax Code are working to defeat tax relief for many divorced or widowed mothers who have to work to support their families. The 83d Congress, wisely, I think, recognized that providing child care during working hours placed an unfair burden on divorced mothers, widows and widowers working to provide for their children. As a result, the new income-tax law provides that the cost of child care, up to a reasonable maximum, is a deductible expense for income-tax purposes.

There is a hitch in the law, however, which prevents it from benefiting many mothers whom, I believe, Congress intended it should benefit. I refer to divorced mothers whose former husbands contribute something to the support of their child. There are many instances where these contributions enable the husband to claim the child or children as his dependents for income-tax purposes. The contributions, however, are not large enough to permit the mother to remain at home. In order to supplement the support payments, she must work and while working must pay for care of her children.

As the law is now written, she is not entitled to the benefits of the child care provisions because the children are dependents of her former husband in the eyes of the Internal Revenue Service.

I have today introduced legislation to correct this injustice. Its only effect would be to make divorced women, widows and widowers eligible for a child care deduction despite the fact that another contributor to the support of the children is entitled to claim them as dependents.

This is meritorious legislation. It will create no new discriminations or injustices. It will remove a hardship caused, I believe, by some unfortunate wording in the present law.

The Agricultural Revolution: Who Will Win It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL M. HARDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, for the better part of the past 2 years, Congress has been engaged in almost ceaseless debate over the form and content of the new farm program. It now appears hopeful that the next few days will see enactment of a soil bank bill which meets most of the objections cited by President Eisenhower in his veto of the omnibus farm bill last month. I certainly hope this is the case, for I believe the soil bank holds great promise for solving the surplus problem.

Yet, it seems to me that the soil bank is at best but a temporary solution. The real solution lies not in decreasing production but in increasing consumption of agricultural products. Only when we do this can we claim to have solved the agricultural problem.

How do we increase consumption? There are several ways, but there are two major methods which hold out real hope for the future of American farming. Expanded trade is one and the present administration is making real strides in finding greater overseas markets for the products of our farms. We need to make greater progress and I am sure we will.

Another means of increasing consumption lies in finding new uses for agricultural products in American industry. Along with several of my colleagues, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 10123, which establishes within the Government an agricultural research agency. This agency would be obligated to develop new uses in industry for the products of our farms. The program makes sense to me, for the long-range solution to the farm surplus problem must lie in new industrial uses for our constantly expanding farm production.

Recently I had occasion to read a speech delivered by Wheeler McMillen, vice president of Farm Journal magazine. Mr. McMillen, a native of my hometown of Covington, Ind., is a recognized expert on agricultural affairs. In addition to his position with Farm Journal, he is chairman of the board of directors of the Council for Agricultural and Chemurgic Research. He has for many years urged increased emphasis, both by Government and private enterprise, on research aimed at developing new uses for farm products.

In his speech entitled "The Agricultural Revolution: Who Will Win It?" Mr. McMillen describes the great changes taking place in American agriculture and the great challenge faced by agriculture now and in the immediate future.

The speech, which is reprinted below, is one which I hope will be read by each Member of this House.

THE AGRICULTURAL REVOLUTION: WHO WILL WIN IT?

(By Wheeler McMillen, vice president, Farm Journal, Inc., and chairman of the board of directors of the Council for Agricultural and Chemurgic Research, before the opening luncheon of the 21st Annual Chemurgic Conference, Congress Hotel, Chicago, April 10, 1956)

One does not apply the term "revolution" lightly. It signifies the complete turn of a cycle, something which is not accomplished in a vast industry by 1 invention or by 1 discovery. Yet no one can question that a revolution is taking place in agriculture. The slow beginnings appeared in the first half of the 19th century. The reaper was its Concord and the steel plow was its Lexington.

Almost without hesitation, invention and science continued to progress. Within the last decade the revolution has sharply accelerted. Engineeirng and scientific developments and their widespread adoption have changed the whole manner of agriculture. Today no man can farm exactly as he did even a quarter of a century ago.

The revolution goes on. Farming has changed, farm living has changed, farm services have changed, and farmers have changed. We have witnessed revolution in machinery, revolution in science, revolution in agricultural education, and revolution in rural ways of living.

Like most revolutions, this agricultural revolution is a hard period for those most directly affected as they struggle through its changes. Because the farm revolution, like a military action, has advanced unevenly, with some salients far ahead of others, the present generation suffers from the economic distortions which have appeared. The production salient has advanced more rapidly than the marketing salient, and far faster than the utilization salient. Unless markets and uses catch up closer to production, the present generation of farmers can lose this revolution.

Industry can lose it, too. Few need to be reminded that unhappy effects can follow behind a continued curtailment of buying power in rural America. When business feels hurt in the countryside stores and banks the pain is bound to reach into city streets, through factory gates and into the payrolls of labor. The countryside half of the Nation will not suffer alone. Industry and commerce and labor can all be losers if farmers lose.

What is the character of this revolution? Obviously it is not reactionary. On the contrary, it is progressive. Improvement, advancement, and efficiency have been its manifestations. Farmers have gained permanent new ground on the production front. They have been winning that battle, but there are others to fight.

It sounds of paradox to speak of anyone losing a progressive revolution. The explanation is fairly clear. Production has been stimulated by war, by price supports, and by innumerable advances that have made it easy to produce more. Meanwhile, new scientific knowledge of nonfarm materials has developed synthetic competitors for farm products. By adoption of American farm production methods foreign competitors have become more formidable. Caught in an uneven complex of progress, enmeshed in a tangle of distorted economic forces, many American farmers look to their immediate future with a degree of apprehension.

For three decades Government has been making a series of legislative attempts to assure agriculture a full share of the national prosperity. The principal result of these efforts has been to demonstrate their distressing futility. Economic puzzles do not accept political solutions. Meanwhile, the misleading myth of a political farm problem has become all too well established in the public mind.

The revolutionary advances in production, the disproportionate lag in uses and markets for the resulting output, the vast changes in nonfarm business, all have combined with other factors to confront agriculture with new obstacles, and with new opportunities as well.

These obstacles cannot be dissolved by political management. Political approaches may be expected to lead to worse farm legislation, more regimentation, higher taxes, and to deeper distresses in agriculture. Their eventual threat to individual liberty in America may be distant, but it is genuine.

The political approach has been essentially negative and defeatist. It has said to agriculture: "Retreat. Reduce your acres. Produce less. Go backward."

No American industry has ever advanced by going backward. Neither will agriculture. Americans have always gone forward. If one route ahead proved to be impracticable, aggressive leadership has found or created other routes.

Farmers themselves as independent Americans have by their actions repudiated the policy of retreat. When limitations have been imposed upon acreage they have increased their yields. Many have taken advantage of new efficiencies to enlarge their farms. Through organized efforts they have battled to work out better ways to sell their output. They have refused to retreat.

The political approach, too, has tended to proceed on the incorrect belief that there exists some single, massive dragon which can be described as "the farm problem." Actually the farm problem is many things—many crops, many products, many regions, many conditions and situations, many farms, many people. Because it is so many things, we do not have to deal with one great and mysterious hobgoblin. We face, rather, a variety of realities—some large enough, no doubt, others not by themselves too formidable.

Because these parts are real, and because they are separable, divisible, and identifiable, they can be handled by the habitual American methods. They can be worked out one or two at a time.

The great advances on the production salient appeared one by one. Nearly every one of them came by the efforts of private enterprise. All were the consequences of research and development.

The tractor for universal use, rubber tires for farm machines, hybrid seedcorn, the soybean crop, chemicals to control insects and diseases in plants and animals, nitrogen fertilizers, antibiotics and hormones, continual improvements in applications of power—one by one all these have contributed permanent gains to agriculture. They have helped to lessen the costs of production, to enlarge the output per man and per acre.

Unfortunately, while enlarging also the total national output they have not in all cases been accompanied by enlarged markets and by new ways to utilize the larger output.

Among the inevitable consequences has been so large an increase in the capital requirements for farm operation that the traditional agricultural ladder—from hired man to tenant to farm owner—no longer reaches. The opportunity for farm-loving farm youth to reach independent farm ownership has diminished. The statistics of output per farm in various classes indicate that a million or so farm families will likely have to find other means of livelihood. These are among the less desirable effects of the imbalance between production and effective demand and, to an extent, of the policy of retreat.

The fact that there is no one solution, and that however glibly one may speak of them there are no easy solutions, does not mean that no solutions exist. Each phase of the situation is a separate challenge, and for each challenge there must be a possible answer. Aggressive effort by many people, each in his own field, will find many of the answers; and, in the American fashion, they will be profitable answers.

For the problems which have arisen because production has overreached demand, practical techniques for finding answers are well known. They have worked when they have been applied. When as much research and as much intelligent energy have been exerted in marketing and utilization as have been expended to increase production, the backward salients will catch up.

Processing and salesmanship may find ways to induce people to buy more of the product, or to induce more people to buy it.

Science may find new uses for it.

Research may find means to lessen further the costs of production so that prices can be more attractive.

Economies may be developed in the costs of distributing the product.

The margin of excess production may be prevented from appearing by providing farmers with new, different and more profitable crops to grow.

No industry or business can fail to find in this constructive and typically American approach at least some points at which it can contribute and by contributing can profit. The primary job of this Council is to keep bringing specific points into view. We have here a common platform where agriculture, science, and industry can compare notes to individual and to mutual advantage.

For two decades, as the National Farm Chemurgic Council, this organization has operated usefully as such a common meeting ground. It has worked, with widespread effect, particularly to encourage new nonfood and industrial uses for farm-grown materials. A compilation of such uses made 6 years ago by competent authority indicated that at least one and a quarter billion dollars in farm value at that time went into industrial uses. The figure may by now have reached $2 billion. With the soybean most notably, but progress also with castor beans, tung oil, sesame, and others testifies that the work with new crops has demonstrated the need for immensely more research in this direction. Corncobs and other farm residues have found markets that formerly did not exist.

Now, under the broader name of The Council for Agricultural and Chemurgic Research, we seek to enlarge and intensify the effort toward a prosperous agriculture and sound national economy.

With the volunteer participation of large numbers of individuals, and with increasing support from many industrial groups, we are beginning to seek out and identify specific situations, to publicize particular challenges, and to set them out in the light where industry and science can estimate the opportunities they present.

Among other steps we have begun the selection of a series of separate product and commodity committees. We have called them "imagineering" committees. Members will include farmers, scientists, manufacturers, processors, distribution experts, and other persons with creative and inquiring minds who will raise questions and suggest new approaches. The Hog Committee, for instance, may find questions to raise that concern breeding, feeding, health, housing, marketing, packaging, nutritive values, possible new uses for pork, products, or questions of still wider range. When a question is good enough to be insistent we may hope that research and ingenuity will find an answer. Then, by that much, the so-called farm problem wil lhave been reduced. The more such answers can be found, the more the problem will diminish.

By working in these directions, searching out new facts to answer questions, inviting those who can profit to seek and apply answers, by using government in its proper functions as a valued servant, I am confident that measurable progress can be achieved.

We expect to pass no miracles. Whatever gains are made will be permanent gains, nonrepealable, nonpartisan, profit-making, tax-paying gains accomplished in the American spirit.

Man has no more than begun to find the uses to which he can put the inexhaustible, ever-renewable abundance which the land can produce. He has as yet hardly glanced at the innumerable plant species growing over the earth's farflung wildernesses from which science will discover new things to sell. Agriculture needs new products and new models in order to avoid producing recurrent surpluses of the old crops.

Aggressive efforts can work out new markets, new uses, new crops, new economies. Let's not retreat. Let's expand. Let's make greater use of our God-given natural and human resources.

A dynamic agriculture can reach out for recovery of balance between output and markets. It can make places in farming and in the related industries for rural youth. It can, we may hope, improve economic opportunities for the smaller farms and thus encourage the family farm to hold its competitive place in a stable America.

The clock will not turn back. The calendar will not reverse itself. Agriculture's true concern is not merely too much of the old; rather, it is not enough of the new.

The agricultural revolution will not be stopped. We must work harder in order to even up its progress. We must apply American energy and commonsense and our capacity for cooperative effort toward guiding this revolution.

Let us endeavor that neither this generation nor any generations of farmers shall lose by it. Let's work together so that industry and labor and the whole Nation's economy shall not lose by it.

Let us not leave the situation to politics nor permit the revolution to be won by socialism in government.

The agricultural revolution can be won. Let's carry it forward in the American way—the only way that will permit everybody to share in the victory.

Marxist Trade in Western Hemisphere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks I include therein a recent article from the New York Times indicating the growing economic penetration of Latin America by the Soviet Union.

This Congress should note the reasons for this ominous development, some of which are economic and some ideological. Higher price levels, less favorable credit terms, quick deliveries, crop and agri-

cultural surpluses, favorable Soviet exchange rates are among the principal economic causes.

It will be noted that many goods, tools, and machines similar to those made in this country are on the list now being exported from behind the Iron Curtain, and distributed in Latin America by the Soviet. There is also multilateral trade involving the products of other countries.

The area is apparently well infiltrated with Russian salesmen who, unlike diplomatic agents, can move around with great freedom and probably acquire much accurate information as well as increased business.

Under economic law, inflated price levels in the United States as opposed to the much lower price levels at which Soviet goods are exchanged, is a great factor encouraging expanding Soviet trade with Latin America. As this trade grows and more Russian and Iron Curtain goods are brought into that area, more Russian salesmen and businessmen visit the area and thus, not only mercantile, but cultural, ties are established, nourished, and increased.

In view of the ideological penetration that has been visited upon many South American nations over a rather long period and is still continuing, this Nation has reason to be concerned about its future relations with our South American neighbors. We are losing valuable trade links, but we are also losing vital strategic and cultural advantages which could have very serious effects upon us in more ways than one. This is a problem which requires the early, most earnest consideration of this Government at the very highest level.

The article follows:

SOVIET BLOC GAINS IN LATIN AMERICA—OUTBUYING AND UNDERSELLING UNITED STATES—NEW POLICY FOUND DANGEROUSLY SUCCESSFUL

(By R. Hart Phillips)

HABANA, April 30.—The new world peace policy of the Soviet Union has been preceded by a program of economic penetration of Latin America. And many here believe the new policy is more dangerous to the United States than the former bellicosity of the Russians.

The Soviet Union is already stepping into the vacuum created by the inability of the United States to purchase the mounting quantities of raw materials in Latin America and the inability of the Latin Americans to pay the high prices for United States exports. Latin America is a price market and will buy the cheapest product, particularly when the seller is also the buyer of its raw materials.

Cuba, faced with a world surplus of sugar and the continual efforts of United States producers to cut Cuba's sales to the United States, was highly pleased to sell half a million tons of sugar to the Soviet Union in 1955. This year Cuba expects to sell a larger quantity of sugar to the Soviet Union. This situation is being repeated in various Latin American countries, according to commercial reports.

SOVIET BLOC GOODS ON SALE

A walk through Habana's streets reveals where some of the money obtained from the Soviet sugar sales is going. One can buy in the shops Pilsener beer, ham from Prague or Hungary, sausages from Poland, caviar and vodka from the Soviet, tiles and light bulbs from Czechoslovakia. The motorcycle market in Cuba, formerly held by the United States and Britain and later shared with West Germany, is being rapidly captured by Czechoslovakia. The new Skoda automobiles, which recently arrived, are being viewed by the surprised Cuban public.

What makes the business so attractive to the Cubans, are the quick deliveries and long-term credits offered, particularly on machinery, in contrast with the system of advance irrevocable credits placed in New York for purchases from United States exporters.

Not a week passes but that salesmen, engineers, and technicians from countries behind the Iron Curtain arrive in Cuba. These men give the impression of carefully avoiding any contact with Cuban Communists and on the surface are interested only in business. They offer the most attractive prices and terms for the growing exports from satellite countries of tractors, bicycles, machine tools, machinery for manufacturing plants, fertilizer, cement, agricultural and mining machinery, and many cheap industrial products.

The same thing is happening in other Latin American countries. Recently, it is reported, a successful trip was made by a commercial mission from East Germany to the Argentine and to Chile.

These salesmen and technicians easily obtain and take back with them much information that it would be difficult for a Soviet agent to obtain. With a sufficient number of commercial agents traveling throughout Latin America spreading the propaganda of economic coexistence and collecting information, it is plain that the Cominform is no longer needed in this part of the world.

THE AGRARIAN SCISSORS

Some years ago a Russian economist, Eugene Varga, predicted the shift in Latin America toward economic coexistence with the Soviet Union based on a chart that he called Agrarian Scissors of Latin America. He showed the line of the upward trend of inflated United States industrial prices crossed by the descending ine of agrarian prices in Latin America. He pointed out that as the blades of the scissors opened wider, so in the same proportion did the chances of Soviet coexistence with Latin America become better.

Fluoridation of Municipal Water Supplies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, at the request of a resident of my district, I am inserting a letter I received recently for the information for other Members of Congress. The letter follows:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DAWSON: Congress has been asked to appropriate $2,971,000 to the United States Public Health Service to combat dental disorders. Most of this money would be used by the United States Public Health Service for the engineering of consent to persuade city governments to add fluoridation to municipal water supplies. Whether adding an inorganic fluoride compound to drinking water would be beneficial or would have harmful cumulative effects is a highly controversial issue with eminent authorities on both sides. To use public funds to promote one side of a controversial issue is not good.

Government in the ideal state should gradually wither away, but our Government is not withering away; it is getting bigger and bigger and more expensive. Our Government seems to be whittling away our free agency a freedom at a time. To use the police power to force fluoridation of municipal water supplies over the strenuous protest of those who feel it would harm them is a totally unjustified attack on our freedom to choose what we take into our bodies.

The problem arises partly because food processing and handling methods remove vitamins and minerals, including fluorine, from many foods so they will keep better. If fluorine is important for healthy teeth, then so are others. A better use of that money would be to help educate people to choose better quality, natural, unprocessed foods which are rich in vitamins and minerals, including fluorine.

There are several methods of obtaining the benefits of fluorine about which there is no controversy. There is the topical application of a fluorine compound by the dentist; there are fluorine toothpastes such as Crest; drugstores can supply fluorine tablets which are very inexpensive; certain foods are rich in natural fluorine. The person who is concerned has many choices, you see. Many people are exercising their right to choose the best way. To deprive these people of their right to choose the best way, to force them to take fluorine in their drinking water when they believe it would harm them, is a totally unjustified invasion of our fundamental freedom as guaranteed by our Constitution.

We urge you to use your influence to fight this appropriation for the Public Health Service. I would like to have this letter read to Congress and inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

TED J. PARKINSON.
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

Will Water Become Scarce?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I hold in my hand the text of an interview entitled, "Will Water Become Scarce?" The interview is with Lt. Gen. Samuel D. Sturgis, Jr., Chief of Engineers of the Army. The Government Printing Office has estimated that printing the interview in the Appendix of the RECORD will make 6¼ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and will cost $500.

This important and informative article appeared in the U. S. News & World Report. The distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] desires to have the article appear in the RECORD, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD notwithstanding its estimated cost.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILL WATER BECOME SCARCE?

(Interview with Lt. Gen. Samuel D. Sturgis, Jr., Chief of Engineers, U. S. Army)

Is lack of water a real threat to the United States? Are dust bowls coming back?

What, actually, lies behind the growing concern over water supply?

What about all the floods? Why can't floods be stopped? How much protection will people have against floods this spring?

Answers are given now by the country's top authority—the Chief of Army Engineers.

Interviewed in the conference room of U. S. News & World Report, Lt. Gen. Samuel D. Sturgis, Jr., describes water troubles and the reasons for their upsurge.

General Sturgis explains why a thousand cities were compelled to restrict the use of water by their residents in 1953, why salt water crept up the Mississippi River in 1954, why floods did so much damage in 1955.

Question. Do you foresee a time when we will run out of water, General Sturgis?

Answer. Well, it is fast becoming possible if we don't act. Some two years ago, having looked at our whole national program and having visited so much around the country and talked with people—hundreds or thousands of people, leading citizens, farmers, everyone—I couldn't help but feel the crescendo of interest in this field of water supply and water use.

Question. Were people finding shortages?

Answer. Oh, yes, there were shortages in a great many places. For example, the United States Geological Survey found in 1953 that there were a thousand cities, of fairly good size up to big municipalities, that actually had to go on a very restricted use of water.

Question. Is water supply as big a problem now as flood control?

Answer. I would say "No," not at the present, but it is looming very seriously; and, if something is not done now, then 20 or 25 years from now it may be too late.

Question. Are the big dust storms, like those in Texas, part of the water-shortage picture?

Answer. Yes, definitely. These storms generally follow a period of sparse rainfall in a region, and that produces dry soil and water shortages there. Of course, the variation of rainfall is tied to the general question of weather cycles, so you can't know for sure how long these dry periods will last.

Question. Is the water table—supply of water in the ground—getting lower all the time?

Answer. I'm not particularly an expert on that, but I do know from my military water investigations—because I have to supply camps and so forth—that in the Southwest the water table has just gone way down. It is very ominous in some places. We're worried about some of our military installations down there on account of the future of the ground water supply.

Question. What about the rest of the country?

Answer. The water-supply table is certainly lowered, due to overuse, in many cases; in other cases, I understand, underground supplies haven't been seriously depleted.

Question. Is this mostly out West?

Answer. Oh, no. For example, the only thing that kept the Ohio River in the summer of 1953 flowing with enough water so that it was deep enough for navigation and to prevent the water from becoming dangerously polluted—so dangerous that the city purifying agencies would not have been able to safely reduce the bacilli—was the availability of conservation pools in our flood-control dams which had been built up to that time. Now, those are less than half of the dams that were authorized for the Ohio after the 1937 flood disaster.

Question. You mean the Ohio would have been unfit for navigation?

Answer. It would have been dangerous for domestic water supply, depending upon the efficacy of municipal plants, and there would not have been enough water for navigation to permit passage of barges over the lock sills.

Question. Where was the Ohio's water going in 1953?

Answer. There were two factors. Of course the river was not flowing as much, due to drought. And I think the important thing to recognize is that over the long swing we do have to make allowances for these droughts as they come along, but they all don't occur at the same place in the United States at the same time.

Coupled with the recurrence of another drought was the tremendous increase in consumption. Now that, of course, comes from such factors as the increase in population and the large increase in per capita consumption. And we should have water supplies which are increasing at least on a straight-line basis as compared with the population increase, not only from the viewpoint of expanded municipal needs but, even more importantly, the expansion of all uses—agricultural, industrial, and all other.

Question. Do we have such an increase in our water supply?

Answer. No, we don't. The population in 1900 was 75 million. It is now 165 million. In 1975 it's predicted to be 200 to 221 million, and in the year 2000 it's predicted to be 285 to 300 million.

Question. What will we do for water for those people? Will they be short of water?

Answer. Well, if you're talking about all uses of water, for agriculture, for industry, for domestic purposes, and so forth, I'm afraid the answer is "Yes," unless something is done about it now. I think many people feel that way.

Question. Can't something be done about it?

Answer. Oh, yes, and we'd better start doing it now. In general, we are going to have to develop more water-conservation storage on our streams—bring these streams under better control so we might save the water and have it when we need it—and incorporate measures to achieve that with plans for flood control and other water-resources development.

Question. We have never had a national water policy, have we?

Answer. We've never had a national policy, but let me hasten to say that I think one is now being provided. The Department of the Army has been one agency—rather, I should say, the Department of Defense, but the Army has been the operating agent for Defense—which, together with the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Interior, has been recently developing a policy.

These three agencies have been operating under a directive of the President to establish the President's Advisory Committee of Water Resources Policy. We participated during 1954–55 in the formation of a policy and a recognition of what the problems are, and I think it's been a very fruitful effort. We all don't agree on every detail, and, I think in general, we couldn't be expected to, but there's been a surprisingly high degree of cooperation and agreement, as to the problems that have been worked out.

Question. On the Ohio River in 1953, if those people hadn't had water, what would they have had to do? Would there have been a crisis?

Answer. There would have been a very serious crisis.

Question. If you hadn't had those flood-control and storage reservoirs?

Answer. That's right. You understand, a flood-control reservoir is normally kept empty. But in many cases we provide a small, permanent conservation pool for fish and wildlife recreation and that sort of thing. The water zone between the top of the conservation pool and the top of the flood-control pool must, of course, be kept empty to wait the next flood, but the conservation pool provides a source for use in emergency to augment low flows, and this was done in 1953–54 in the case of our Ohio reservoirs.

I can give you other illustrations. For example, the Fort Peck Reservoir in northeastern Montana helped us meet a crisis on the Mississippi.

Due to the low flow in the Mississippi in 1953 and 1954—which were among the driest years that the Mississippi Basin has ever had, due to the whole central part of the country being dry in those years—the salt-water flow—or wedge, as we call it—came up from the Gulf of Mexico underneath the fresh water flowing into the Gulf below New Orleans. In other words, there wasn't enough fresh water coming down the river to push back the salt water and keep it out of the river. So the result was that, as the fresh-water flow in the river grew less and less, the salt water came up the stream and actually was within a couple of city blocks of the intake for New Orleans.

And New Orleans would, no doubt, then have been in a very serious situation, because they would have had salt water up to their intake. This would not only have jeopardized the city supply until rains fell again and the Mississippi rose, which might have been many months, but you can see the effect of salt-water seepage into the mains.

MONTANA FLOOD CONTROL HELPED OUT AT NEW ORLEANS

Question. What would it have done in the mains? You couldn't have drunk it——

Answer. No.

Question. Would it have done chemical damage?

Answer. It would have corroded the mains. Salt water and iron or steel, and so forth, don't mix very well.

So what we did to meet the situation, brought to our attention by the alarmed city, was to discharge water from the Fort Peck Reservoir in northeastern Montana—some 2,500 miles away—28,000 cubic feet per second of water, running it down the Missouri and into the Mississippi, in order to push this salt-water wedge back down and benefit the city's water supply.

Question. How long did it take that water to get down there?

Answer. It took about 6 weeks.

Question. How long did you have to keep that up?

Answer. For about 3 months.

Question. And that was when?

Answer. That was in 1953 and 1954. Only in 1954 there was this difference: It was deliberate in 1954, but in 1953 we had, I think, heavy rains—as you'll recall—up there in Montana, and we had to let water out for the flood-control purposes, to lower the pool in Fort Peck, so it automatically was available to help out downstream.

But in 1954 we very seriously reduced the Fort Peck pool, which was something we would have preferred not to do, for the reason that we wanted to store as much water in the Fort Peck pool as possible, so that when Garrison Dam was closed we could start filling Garrison from the surcharge of flood waters in the Fort Peck pool.

Question. You created a new problem, didn't you, in taking care of the New Orleans problem, down river?

Answer. Well, I would say, not too serious a problem. In other words, we may have delayed the filling of Garrison Reservoir, which we had originally calculated would take from 5 to 10 years, depending upon the amount of rainfall in the upper Missouri Basin. Well, where the rain might have been sufficient to fill it in 5 years, it will now take 6.

Question. Are there other cases of that type?

Answer. I've used that purposely as an extreme case, because it shows the interrelation of distant water resources and the importance of broad controls. Fort Peck was never

designed, of course, to do such a thing. But by having that water available and controlled, it shows the tremendous things that can be done on the spur of the moment, even though you have not even planned for them.

Question. That also helped your pollution problem along the Mississippi——

Answer. Oh, yes; it all worked out well during those dry years. Around the Kansas Citys it tremendously alleviated the pollution situation there, too.

Question. Were they in danger of pollution there?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Are they still?

Answer. The situation has changed now because of the large dams on the Missouri.

Question. But it can get bad again——

Answer. Yes. We don't have too much water in the Fort Peck Reservoir now, but I believe, even without the Missouri dams up to normal pool elevation, we could prevent any critical situation from developing downstream. When I was out there, Fort Peck Reservoir contained as much as 17.5 million acre-feet out of a capacity of 19 million. Well, we've pulled it down now to around 5 or 6 million acre-feet.

Question. So that a solution such as you used in the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers is not always on tap?

Answer. Certainly not in many other river basins. That's what I'm pointing out, that the more reservoirs we have the more tremendous advantages we have for use in emergencies.

ONE BUSHEL OF WHEAT TAKES 7,500 GALLONS OF WATER

Question. General, what changes should we make to avoid increasing water shortages as population grows?

Answer. Well, may I give you some incidents and figures—I'll remember that question, but I would like to finish, if I could, what I started out earlier to say about the water-supply situation.

During research of recent water-requirement and supply statistics since I have been Chief of Engineers, I was greatly surprised at what I found and it may surprise you. But one bushel of wheat takes 7,500 gallons of water; 1 ton of finished steel takes 65,000 gallons of water to produce; 1 yard of woolen cloth takes 500 gallons, and a pound of rayon takes 100 to 200 gallons of water.

WE CAN'T AFFORD WASTE

Question. And that water is gone——

Answer. That is not entirely correct. But I am glad you asked that for the reason that there has been no real investigation made on the part of the Federal Government with industry, or by industry itself, as to just exactly what the future water problem is with industry. But something should be done, because in some industries water is economically used and re-used. In other industries it's just taken in and it flows right through the plant but with considerable net loss. Now, the point is we just can't afford to waste water in that way.

Question. General, when that water flows through the plant and it has been used and polluted, it goes back into the river and eventually evaporates and comes back in rainfall. You don't really lose the water, do you?

Answer. You lose some of it, but what I'm saying is that we want to find out more about these losses. There are, no doubt, some isolated studies that have been made by industries that have been extremely farsighted, but the studies aren't readily available and they are too narrow and restricted to deduce the broad elements of the problem.

Therefore, I think that a broad investigation in the nature of our original "308 reports" (flood-control investigations) is one of the things that we should do, because the industrial water requirement is getting to be enormous. Moreover, as modern technology develops you can easily discern the trend of requirements for water. Take the introduction of rayon, for example. Its process consumption of water is getting terrific. New requirements are similarly in constant demand.

When I was a student at the University of Minnesota, before going to West Point, we were taught to design a domestic water supply for a city on a requirement of 50 to 75 gallons per day per capita. After World War I and before World War II, this trend jumped up to, say, 75 to 125 gallons per day. After World War II, it has been running from 125 for smaller cities to larger cities like Chicago with 225 gallons per capita. Thus, there's another increase besides the population increase, which is this greater per capita consumption. But that does not include industrial water, which, of course, is also moving up, as I indicated, for new industries.

Question. Can't you use some water both ways: First, for industrial use, and, later, for consumption?

Answer. Certainly, there could be a great deal of reuse—that's right. In fact, that is what happens today. Industry dumps the water and it goes downstream for further industrial and domestic withdrawal.

Then you've got the problem of pollution. Now, I'm looking at the problem of pollution in a long-range way by saying that I think like the Public Health Service. And I think I'm quoting them correctly when I say that they believe ultimately in complete primary and secondary treatment, so that eventually pollution will not have to be considered as another factor infringing on our water supply.

So I'm saying that there's got to be, I think, a sound, progressive and authoritative plan for universal treatment over a reasonable period of time. This, of course, is a responsibility of the Public Health Service, with whom we work very carefully, and we know they are doing a great deal in this direction, for which they deserve more public recognition and support. While it is a Public Health Service job—educating and assisting the States and industry—I think pollution is a State problem primarily. But certainly the Public Health Service has the Federal leadership.

But while I say that full treatment by industry will ultimately have to be provided, it doesn't mean it's not already a problem on many streams, so that treatment must be accelerated right now. Because pollution is getting to be such that even industries can't use the water and reuse the water again in many cases.

Part of the problem also is the heat of the water discharged by industry. I can't give you any figures, but I do know that the cost per degree of cooling water by furnishing additional supply in the Pittsburgh area is something fabulous.

Question. You mean that water heats up as they use it?

Answer. Water heats up very measurably, which has an adverse effect mechanically on the use of water by industry downstream as well as adding to the pollution problem.

Question. Then, is the whole idea to use the water, clean it up, and put it back in the river so somebody else can use it?

Answer. Yes. Of course, there would still be some losses, but in industry, as I said, we don't have much information and we need to know a lot more. For example, let's take irrigation: In irrigation, I understand, the amount of water that is first diverted to the land, and later returns by drainage and percolation to the source of withdrawal, is as low as 30 percent, depending upon the soil. If it's soil which drains very well, the return flow may run up as high as 60 percent.

HOW MUCH WATER IN THE UNITED STATES?

Question. What should we do to increase our water supply?

Answer. Well, there are many things, I think, that can be done, and I'll go to that if I may point up one more thing:

Actually, on the 3-million-square-mile area of this country, there's an average rainfall of 30 inches, which produces rainfall amounting to 4,300 billion gallons per day. Now, of that 4,300 billion, something in the neighborhood of 3,000 billion goes back by transpiration and evaporation into the atmosphere, leaving a total amount running off in rivers and streams or percolating into the ground of 1,300 billion, which is the ultimate limit of supply.

I emphasize that this is the top limit available to our country. And yet, today, we are consuming about 200 billion gallons. So there is a finite limit, and I believe most of us have never thought before that it was finite and limited. We've always assumed that the supply of water is more or less infinite. But it isn't. Specifically based on the above figures, we are consuming today 15 percent of the maximum available supply.

Question. Of the total available water supply—

Answer. Yes. In 1957 we'll use 350 billion gallons, or 27 percent. So, you see, we're actually approaching inexorably that 100 percent, or 1,300-billion-gallon maximum, as our population rapidly increases and our per capita consumption skyrockets simultaneously.

However, that doesn't represent the true picture in each region of the country, because that's averages I'm talking about. Now, out of the 1,300 billion, roughly 1,100 billion runs off and the other 200 billion percolates into the ground. And of that 1,100 billion—to show you the very important differences in amounts of water that are running off in different parts of the country—in the North Atlantic States, the rivers carry 191 billion, but in the basin of the Red River of the North in Minnesota and North Dakota, which is about the same area, it's only 4.5 billion. So, you see, you've got a tremendously unequal distribution.

So when you say, "Well, it looks like we're not too badly off because in 1975 we're only going to be using 27 percent," that isn't true. They're already running short in some areas, and that's what we are hearing about and will continue to hear ominously in years to come. And that's the trouble: They're constantly going through the ceiling of available average supply in a number of regions and we are going to be increasingly going through the ceiling unless we do something effective—and soon.

CROPS AND POWER COMPETE

Question. In what areas are we going through the ceiling?

Answer. Well, naturally, the areas that are going through the ceiling first are many parts of Texas, Oklahoma, the great basin of Utah, and spasmodically parts of the Plains States and several Western States. I have been told that a Utah utility had to quit generating power from his hydroplant at times when they would like to use it to meet peak demands, and were now only using it occasionally because their customers downstream needed and called for the water more urgently for irrigation.

That type of pressure is building up all the time. We have recently encountered it in our own reservoir operations; that is, pressure to keep reservoirs full for downstream low-flow regulation instead of using the storage for meeting power peaks in accordance with project design, and emptying flood-control pools as required to prepare for future flood threats.

THE WATER SHORTAGE IS MOVING EAST

Question. Is the water shortage moving east?

Answer. Yes; it's moving east. For example, on the Ohio River in 1953–54—because it was a dry year—a lot of new water losses in the Ohio came from withdrawals for sprinkler irrigation, which we always had learned in the past applied principally if not solely to the western usage.

Question. But now irrigation is spreading to the East, isn't it?

Answer. Yes, sir. And the reason it is spreading——

Question. They're using sprinkler irrigation on Long Island now——

Answer. Oh, yes. Well, the reason, as I understand it—and I'm no agronomist—is that it is providing the crops with water at the right time and that really increases the yield and quality.

Now, by sprinkler system they can do that. You know, I've been a western boy, and out there in Minnesota or particularly in Kansas—I've spent a lot of time in Kansas—when a dry summer comes the corn dries up, and there you are. No matter how much water you had in the fall or how much water in the spring, when you need that water you don't get it.

But if you're in reach of a steady flow in a creek or river, by the sprinkler system you can apply water to crops as they need it. Sprinklers are coming into the East now, and they're getting some wonderful crops, greatly increasing the acreage yield. So there's another demand on water in the Central and Eastern part of the country on top of population and enormous industrial requirements.

Question. General, is the water shortage caused entirely by the increased use of water? Is it correct that the natural supply of water isn't diminishing?

Answer. I don't believe that the supply of water is diminishing. I think the United States Geological Survey probably could give you a better answer than that, but I've never heard them say so. But I've lived and worked in different basins of the country, like the Missouri Basin, New England, the Ohio, the Lower Mississippi, and so forth, and I've been generally familiar with the long-range rainfall records. I am also somewhat familiar with the tree-growth records, and nobody has ever found a definite cyclic difference over a long period of years. Inevitably, drought and—

Question. The alternating wet and dry cycles are generally very orderly——

Answer. I think it will even up. Of course, there are going to be droughts at different times in different areas—for instance, like a shift to Texas from the southern portion of the Missouri Basin, which was frightfully dry in 1953—but they had lots of water up there in North Dakota, which was one of the worst dust-bowl States in the '30s.

So I think that precipitation will even up, generally, all the way through the country. But you are going to have droughts here and there.

INDUSTRIES WITH A THIRST

Question. Won't industry tend to move where water is?

Answer. Yes, industry is moving. For example, on the Ohio River, which normally does have a lot of water—I was down there as a captain in 1937, and I never saw so much water in my life. Therefore, when I went back there as Chief of Engineers and found a shortage of water, it was rather amazing.

But there have been 7,000 industries located in the Ohio Valley since about 1940—right along the river. Navigation has played a big part in that, of course, by providing cheap water transportation for bulk goods. But I think the availability of the water supply now is fast becoming a problem for the future, and the people in the Ohio Valley already are really worried now about their water-shortage problem. One of the reasons they want the flood-control dams built is not only to prevent the recurrence of the 1937 flood disaster—and less than half of the required and authorized dams are built now—but for low-flow regulation as well.

Back in 1937, everyone was enthusiastically backing flood control for the Ohio. But a war comes along and a new generation, and people forget. Now the people of the Ohio and their leaders have begun to pick up again and see what the story is, and they're going out for dams for water supply as well as flood control.

In fact, one of the main reasons behind this second awakening is because they want their conservation storage for low-flow regulation, realizing the industrial requirements for the water, as well as their own health and domestic purposes.

WE CANNOT RELY ON UNDERGROUND SOURCES FOR THE FUTURE

Question. Coming back to the question of water supply in the ground: How is that water stored? Is it down in the bowels of the earth?

Answer. Yes, there's a previous layer of earth bewteen two impervious or watertight layers, like clay, and it has contact with or is intercepted by a river, lake, or some other source. The water thus enters this gravel or sandy section or it may percolate directly, as in the Nebraska sandhills, down to the lower impervious layer, and then it's stored there.

Of course, if it's constantly tapped by too many wells, the withdrawal is greater than the replenishment and, therefore, the level of the ground water goes down. For example, in an area of reasonably abundant rainfall, like the Chicago area, in about the 1850's or sixties there were artesian wells flowing, I'm told. Now those wells are not only not under pressure enough from adjacent areas to flow freely at the surface, but wells are being sunk 500 and 600 feet deep.

Question. In order to get water——

Answer. In order to get water, that's right.

Question. General, how much of this anticipated need for water would be met by the dams for flood control that you are building?

Answer. Well, since we cannot generally rely on our fast-diminishing underground sources to meet future needs, it seems apparent we must store and conserve the surface water in our streams and rivers. That means dams and reservoirs. In many, many places, flood-control and water-supply storage can both be accomplished by one properly designed dam. So I think a main solution to our water-need problem is to be found in an expanded reservoir-building program, in which all interests must take part.

But there are many facets to the problem. First of all, we really need data. We have got to have information, from people who are not just engineers, on the growth of industry, and what is going to be required in the way of accelerated production, and its nature.

Of course, we can predict more closely the population increase. But there are going to be additional per capita requirements. The standard of living is going up and up, and, as has been evident in the last quarter century, there is more and more water used domestically, and industry will require more for the production needed to meet popular demands.

LAWS ARE INCONSISTENT

Question. Why hasn't the Government done more to control floods?

Answer. I might say that there is a vast growth of public understanding and interest in our flood problems on a national basis, as compared to long-standing interest and knowledge in particular localities and regions, betwen the early 1940's, when I was district engineer at Vicksburg, and today—particularly beginning after World War II. That's reflected, I think, even in the last 5 years, between the Hoover Commission findings and recommendations in the report of 1950, and the Hoover Commission's recommendations of 1955.

There are some very significant differences between those two reports. And I think that the significance is that the 1955 report does not dwell on the foibles, if you want to call it that, of the public departments, but on the fact that the real conflicts and basic problem are caused by conflicting and inconsistent laws, the lack of a comprehensive policy, and the absence of uniform governmental guidance for those departments of the Government charged by law with development of the different aspects of water resources.

I'm not in any way saying that the operations of our Department and other departments couldn't have been improved—and I can assure you they have been, enormously, over the years. But the onus of all the blame and everything you can name in the field of water resources was formerly put on the Government agencies, and that's not true in the present Hoover report.

In fact, this Commission points out this conflict of legislation, and this conflict of public interests which is behind the conflict in legislation arises sometimes from honest differences and sometimes from selfish interest.

For example, in the upper part of the Missouri River Basin the people honestly and naturally feel that the Missouri's water should be developed primarily for irrigation and hydropower. But, in the lower part of the river, they need water equally badly for navigation and water supply. That's a perfectly honest difference, and the problem is to reconcile that difference, which is being done by the present comprehensive program known as the Pick-Sloan plan.

And there are a great many other conflicts of interest. For example, that part of the so-called upper-watershed programs providing for the construction of small upstream dams does not do very much for alleviating floods downstream.

SMALL DAMS NOT ENOUGH

Question. Small dams are not the answer to flood control, then?

Answer. No, not by any means, and I think the Department of Agriculture will be the first to tell you. But they do furnish substantial flood reduction well upstream, whereas the downstream dams preventing or ameliorating floods, like the recent disasters in New England and California, obviously can't affect the upland tributaries.

But there's also this conflict: While watershed programs provide a certain amount of water and percolation down through the ground for the farmers, the people downstream—say, in Texas and other semiarid regions—find that water stays in the dams and evaporates, which reduces the amount that can come downstream and sink into the soil and charge the earth downstream—recharge the water that has been taken out by pumping, or that provides steady surface-stream flow. I'm only giving you that as an example of the conflict of interests.

Now, it's that sort of basic conflict that led to laws, which laws were executed by various departments of the Government. But even if my corps had responsibility for administering the reclamation law, instead of the Interior Department, we would still have had the problems of conflicting laws to reconcile, because we'd be operating under one set of laws for navigation and another set for reclamation, which were mutually inconsistent. So that has been the really basic cause.

Question. How much progress have you made in controlling the major rivers? Do you need more reservoirs along the Ohio and Missouri, for example?

Answer. Yes, in the case of the Ohio, but the upper part of the Missouri is very well protected. For instance, the flood that occurred in 1952, which is the greatest flood of record, was 17 miles wide from bluff to bluff. It was even greater than the flood of 1844, which is the flood of previous record and which, I gather from talking to the grandsons of old French trappers, also stretched from bluff to bluff.

Question. At what point of the river was that?

Answer. That was about 50 miles above Omaha. However, the flood of 1952, if it occurred again today, would not be even overbank, because the upper part of the Missouri is controlled.

Question. With the Garrison and Fort Peck reservoirs?

Answer. Garrison, Fort Peck, and Fort Randall.

Question. Those dams weren't in operation in 1952, were they?

Answer. No dam except Fort Peck was in operation in 1952. And, of course, some critics of the Pick-Sloan plan said that it wasn't worth anything. That was criticism just as if you'd dug the Panama Canal half way and somebody said, "Well, it's no good. You can't get any transportation through it."

That's the upper part of the river. Now, the lower part of the river—we've had a terrific problem down there. You may have heard of Tuttle Creek Dam, where the farm and small-town population of the Blue River Valley has been up in arms. Now, as far as the Corps of Engineers is concerned, I knew very well that situation and we stayed out of it. We said it's something for the people to settle among themselves. We're just engineers and economists, and we're not going out and plug this thing at all.

However, we were and are absolutely convinced of its necessity and we gave all the facts to both sides when asked. So they finally did get together—I don't mean to say that the opposition has been eliminated; I think there are still some people bitterly opposed—but the majority was awakened by the 1951 flood.

TWELVE-INCH RAIN IN 24 HOURS

Question. You mean around Kansas City?

Answer. The Kansas Cities, the Kansas or Kaw Valley, and the Missouri Valley below Kansas City. The Tuttle Creek Dam is on the Blue River, which flows southerly into the Kansas River at Manhattan, and it's the Kansas which produced that perfectly terrific flood where it rained for 30 days and culminated in a 12-inch rain in 24 hours. It centered right on the Kaw River.

That overtopped the levees at Kansa City and deluged the lower Kaw cities like Topeka, and rich bottom lands. Now, of course, theoreticaly, these levees at Kansas City shouldn't have been built until we had built the reservoirs. That's one of the things we often are pressed to do pending reservoir construction, and all you do is just put people in false safety.

They always want the levees built because it protects them against most floods, and for lesser floods these levees had done a fine job. Probably a dozen floods could occur—maybe 50 floods could have occurred—and those levees would have protected the Kansas cities without being overtopped. But this one flood overtopped the levees because the reservoirs on the Kaw, including Tuttle Creek, had never been built—they were all opposed by a vocal minority. Now that's been changed. This minority had certainly their own interests to protect, but, as I have said, it is an honest conflict in which the general interest should prevail.

Question. Are they built now?

Answer. Not yet. But Tuttle Creek is now underway again. You see, it was started, then it was stopped by the opposition, and now it's been started again.

Question. Do you try to build to protect against a flood of that proportion? I think that was the kind of flood that comes only about once every 50 years——

Answer. We estimate that it was greater than a 50-year flood. But, to answer your question, we just don't blindly go in and protect against every conceivable flood in every locality. It all depends upon the local factors. For example, if we have a small dam located in an isolated area where the failure to provide complete protection might occur under some superflood that nobody could ever conceive of, we use a lesser factor of safety than we would up in New England, say, above the town of Waterbury, Conn., where thousands of people are involved, not only in Waterbury but downstream.

So in levees we use a freeboard, sometimes only 1 foot for the flood that we think is the maximum that will occur. Sometimes we use 3 feet. If it's a small agricultural area not highly populated and developed, then we use maybe 1 foot. But if it's a town or city or down on the Mississippi where a breach in the levee can flood—as it did in 1927—areas as big as the States of Massachusetts and Connecticut combined, then we use 3 feet superelevation against the project flood.

Question. Those are levees?

Answer. Those are levees, yes; or flood walls.

THERE ARE FOUR MAJOR WAYS TO TAKE CARE OF FLOODS

Question. But those aren't a solution to the flood problem?

Answer. Levees and flood walls are only one means of solving the flood problem—but a very important means in many cases. Actually, there are 3—or 4—major ways in which floods can be taken care of. Two of them are almost the same.

One is by reservoirs. Two is by levees and/or flood walls. In other words, use the levee where you've got the room, but where you haven't got the room, as in a congested city along the river, you put up a flood wall, a vertical concrete wall. The third method is channel rectification, that is, by cutting through bends in the channel you naturally increase the velocity of the water and therefore the quantity of flow, because the water on a sinuous bend is on a flatter slope than water cutting straight across.

Question. Is that called a "spillway"?

Answer. No, a spillway is part of a dam or diversion works, technically.

HOW SPILLWAYS WORK

Question. Well, down on the Mississippi they built spillways, they built the Atchafalaya spillway—

Answer. Well, yes, but that is a diversion floodway, which is another way of controlling floods in the field of improving channel capacity. That's simply where, when the water gets to a threatening height, you spill it over into another channel.

For example, let's say the Mississippi gets full, and it's about to threaten the levees above New Orleans. We open the Bonnet Carre spillway gates and it goes down a floodway to Lake Pontchartrain and then out to sea. Or the Atchafalaya, you were speaking about: We get to a certain height where it begins to threaten the levees in the vicinity of the Red River and we have a freeboard of only 1 foot left. O. K., we open the Morganza spillway and spill flood water through their floodways into the Atchafalaya Basin, and the excess water goes to sea a hundred miles west to New Orleans. That's diversion, or floodways controlled by spillway gate structures.

And then there also is zoning. We've been criticized a good deal for not zoning more. That involves taking bottom land out of use for homes, businesses, or plants, to provide greater flowageway between flood walls or levees, because you can build the levees and flood walls just so high without risk structurally. By zoning, it is possible to provide a greater channel capacity and lower levee heights, so some people say, "Well, just zone it, keep people out of that area which is the river's natural old ground to wander in. Why build on it?"

Of course, obviously, that's an easy thing for theorists without responsibility to say, but anybody who tried to take the stockyards out of Kansas City—and one fellow did, somebody who was getting up a new plan out there——

Question. And there are the railroads along the river——

Answer. Yes, and you can't put the railroads back on top of the hills. And then you have, at the confluence of rivers, several railroads coming together down the river valleys. That's the heart of the city, and it's physically what permits the interchange of goods from car to car and from car to boat and from rail to truck, and so on. It's very easy to say, "Let's just zone all that," but not many chambers of commerce would enthusiastically support the idea. In some cases, however, zoning may offer the best solution, and we do give it careful study.

Question. Don't these floodways or spillways sometimes accentuate your downstream problem?

Answer. That is correct. And that's a very good question, I may say. Suppose we provide the floodway land and levees for the Kaw River, and no reservoirs. Now, that means that all that flood water, as it falls, is going to peak down there. Now, let's assume it passes the Kansas Citys successfully because we took the stockyards and we took the railroads and put them up in the hills, so you have this big area in which this flood peak can pass——

Question. Right now, doesn't that crest pass more swiftly down the Missouri River than it used to?

Answer. Can I answer that in just a second? I'd like to say that as long as that flood crest passes the Kansas Citys, it floods rich areas for hundred of miles that are not protected below the city, whereas if there were reservoirs, you'd let it out gradually.

With the reservoirs, we would know that the flood waters would be detained and let out gradually in less than bankfull amounts. In other words, our flood-control tunnels and gates for releasing water from behind a dam are so designed that we can discharge through them just as fast as we possibly can without the water going overbank.

HAVOC IN NEW ENGLAND

Question. You've had this same problem up in New England?

Answer. In New England—of course, last year's flood disaster was different in many respects from other floods; not totally, but in the major respects in that it was dynamic in nature. In other words, the rain fell in not much greater quantities than it has fallen in previous storms, but it fell in a much shorter time, which naturally meant that all that water tried to get out at once. And, therefore, it piled up in enormous heads.

Thus, high velocities had the dynamic effect of completely taking houses and everything else and tearing them away from their foundations and smashing them against bluffs, bridges, and dams. Whereas most floods, like on the Mississippi, are inundation-type floods, namely, you have water standing up to around 4 or 5 feet and you suffer a lot of damage, but you don't have the total building taken away and smashed. That's the difference.

Question. Couldn't that damage have been avoided in New England by flood-control projects?

Answer. A great part of it could have been if we had gone ahead with the flood-control plan. That was a $331 million program, of which only 72 million had been spent—and

had been appropriated. And that is not, believe me, any criticism of Congress. I personally feel that Congress has gone ahead on flood control quite fast and they're pushing faster. But the trouble is that in some cases the projects proposed and studied are not economically justified by flood records of the past.

In other words, in probably 25 percent of the cases when we worked out the economics of finding a suitable site, the annual costs exceeded the benefits. Relocating the railroads and the highways—which is a greater cost in highly populated areas than elsewhere—plus the normal taking of reservoir land, and the construction works involved, comprise the principal elements of the total project costs. The annual costs are obtained from amortizing that total amount at 2½ percent interest over the 50 years we give as the life of the project, plus the annual operation and maintenance cost. If this annual cost is more than the annual benefits, the project is not recommended. The annual benefits are obtained by calculating the average annual flood damages prevented, based on such factors as estimates of experienced flood damages, reservoir-operation studies, and the frequency of occurrence of various sizes of floods.

OPPOSITION WASHED OUT

Question. Wasn't there also some opposition to flood control in New England?

Answer. Yes, by far the largest percentage of projects not undertaken in the past was due to local opposition—which, I might say, has practically vanished today. There isn't any that I know of, and if there is, it's completely underground.

Question. Will it slow your program in other parts of the country if you concentrate on New England's problems?

Answer. Well, we are going to have to call on other parts of our organization throughout the country for help, because the engineering force up there in New England is not big enough. We will decentralize to other divisions some of that design—we'll farm it out. Now, I would say that it won't throw us behind elsewhere, for the reason that we're taking those district offices where we would have had to reduce our engineering force and giving them work for New England for which New England does not have the capacity personnel-wise.

Parenthetically, of course, you know our greatest problem is one of engineering personnel—engineering and science these days, it's terrific. But I would say "No," it will not interfere with the New England program.

Question. How about California and Nevada and Oregon?

Answer. I don't know of any new emergency programs for those areas, but there is tremendous pressure from out there, as well as from New England.

Question. Why wasn't anything done in that area, on the west side of the Rocky Mountains, earlier than this?

Answer. Well, we have our active program out there of about $400 million total in the flood area of California, of which——

Question. West of the mountains?

Answer. Oh, yes, in the San Joaquin and Sacramento valleys.

Question. Well, I mean up in Oregon—those rivers that cross——

Answer. Oh, yes. You mean also in the Klamath River in northern California?

Question. Where the recent floods occurred——

Answer. We have certain authorized projects in northern California and Oregon that have not been started. That is the only area in which we feel that the program may not be sufficient.

Now, the reason why that is so is this: The population up there in those mountainous areas, and even along the coast north of the San Francisco areas, is not very large—nothing like the Central Valley of California, where the floods also raged, as you can appreciate. So there just were not enough benefits to justify more reservoirs than we had in the plan. However, by no means had all of the recommended and authorized work been built in California.

Now, since the flood that has occurred in California shows additional damages of a very great nature, like the one in New England, then, as in New England, it indicates that we should reexamine our determinations of annual project benefits in the light of present-day conditions and get enough average annual savings to justify the costs. Because the benefits, which means the damage you save, must be greater than the costs——

Question. Why is that formula applied?

Answer. We are directed by Congress that the benefits must exceed the costs—"the benefits, to whomsoever they may accrue, must exceed the costs." That is provided in the 1936 General Flood Control Act.

COUNTING THE DAMAGE

Question. How do you determine the damages?

Answer. By damage surveys, I thought perhaps you might ask me for a figure for the west coast.

Our first estimates show damages of about $150 million, but they are not final. Those damages are in California, Oregon, and Nevada.

Now, I can illustrate from New England. In New England, the first figures on damages coming out were $1.6 billion, which were the local estimates of the governors and the civic leaders and businessmen of the towns, who were naturally overwhelmed at seeing such destruction of their own or colleagues' businesses and homes. And a terrifying experience for them that never had occurred before.

Actually, the damage is usually less than it first appears, but still a very great sum.

Question. Assuming that, from year to year, until the plan is completed, you're given all the money you need to go ahead as rapidly as possible, how long will it be before you get everything taken care of up in New England, to the extent possible?

Answer. You appreciate that's a hypothetical question?

Question. That's right. But just assuming that you can go ahead as you want to and need to, how long will it be?

Answer. I would say about 6 or 7 years to do it economically. You could push it faster and make a crash program out of it, but that, we think, is not wise, as we keep learning from experience all the time. However, that's on the assumption that we would get all the money we need, we would get all the people we would need, and so on.

Question. But, in another 6 or 7 years, New England should have all the flood protection that is economically feasible?

Answer. Under the present authorized plan. Now, that is not true as far as the extra money we would need to take care of Diane-type storms, because we are making a survey on that storm. Last July, Congress passed a resolution, which resolution asked us to review Diane as to rainfall, just as we were studying all hurricanes as to their tide, wave, and wind effects along the shores. It will take about 2 years to get that report in. And then it will have to be authorized. And only then—when it's authorized—can appropriations follow. So I would say 10 years, including protection from storms like Diane.

Question. Applying the same assumptions to California, what period of time will it take to get that in hand out there?

Answer. Well, I am guessing in this case, but I would say those are bigger dams out there—those are big multipurpose dams. New England dams are essentially single-purpose, flood-control dams. Multipurpose dams run into a great deal more time, and I would say, since it's a very big program, too, it would probably be 10 to 15 years.

SAVING: 90 MILLIONS

Question. Don't you already have something on the Sacramento Valley that showed its worth in this California flood?

Answer. The biggest saver of damages out there was the levees, which saved about $90 million worth of damage.

Question. How about the Folsom Dam and the Shasta Dam?

Answer. Shasta was a Bureau of Reclamation Dam and did a wonderful job, and Folsom Dam, built by the Corps of Engineers, did too—both of them. I can give you the statistics on the Folsom; I don't have them for Shasta.

Question. Would the damage have been about twice as bad if it hadn't been for these dams?

Answer. Perhaps not that much. As far as damage is concerned, it would have been enormous without the dams and levees. The damage actually prevented was about $116 million. Now, there are still authorized dams that could have been built that would have added $22 million savings. All we need is appropriations. If they had been built, a total of $138 million worth of damage would have been prevented.

Question. Can you see the time when there will be no major floods?

Answer. Oh, yes; no major floods. Excluding the year 1955, which was certainly a flood year, and not counting those damages yet, the average annual potential of flood damages, as of 1954, was estimated at $911 million a year.

Now, the amount of that estimated potential damage eliminated by completed flood-control works, like these that we've been talking about, and others throughout the country, is $491 million annually. Which means that about 55 percent of all potential damage has now been prevented by completed works. Projects under construction and those not started, when completed, will add $220 million more of annual damage prevented.

So, if you take the $220 million and add it to the $491 million, you get $711 million, which is around 78 percent of the potential damage each year. That leaves about $200 million worth of damage for which there is nothing authorized now in the way of preventive measures. Of course, these potential damage estimates may have to be revised upward as a result of recent flood experience. Furthermore, these estimates are based only on areas we have studied along main rivers and major tributaries.

But that doesn't mean that more is not preventable as time goes on. For instance, in our resurvey of the Klamath River, we may find projects that, because of the damage that has occurred, now can be justified and built. I don't know what the irreducible minimum is, but I feel certain all major disasters are preventable.

Question. General Sturgis, this long-range program of preventing floods, getting it so that we can be reasonably sure that we won't have these great disasters—what would that kind of program cost? Does anybody have any idea?

Answer. Yes; we have some statistics. I might give you our total for all types of projects of the corps, river and harbor, multipurpose, and everything else. The multipurpose projects would have hydropower, navigation, and other purposes not counted, of course, in the cost of flood control.

The total number of projects that we have are: completed, 2,294; under construction, 304; authorized by Congress but not yet started—awaiting appropriations—610; for a total of 3,208.

Then we have the estimated costs: completed projects over the past 125 years, $3.4 billion; under construction, $7 billion; au-

thorized but not built, $5.6 billion—roughly, $16 billion is the total cost.

Appropriations, so far, against that $16 billion, have been $6.9 billion, of which $3.4 billion has been for completed projects, and $3.5 billion for projects under construction, which still require $3.5 billion to finish. Then, for those authorized but not started, we've spent various minor amounts of money—largely on planning, $21 million—still leaving about $5.6 billion required to complete authorized projects not started.

Or, breaking down the $16 billion total cost in another way: 6.9 billion have been appropriated and 9.1 billion have not. That means they're still to come.

Now, there are authorized, in addition to that, about $2.5 billion worth of projects, but we have screened those out. In other words, we had about $11.6 billion of projects authorized by Congress to be built. And, when I took office, one of the first actions taken by my office was to screen out those poor projects that were either out of date, uneconomical, objected to by people, or needing further study—even though authorized by Congress.

Pulling all of these out left solid projects which were badly needed from a technical viewpoint and desired by a majority of the local people, and which enjoyed much more than a marginal justification, from an economical viewpoint. Thus, we still have $9.1 billion to complete authorized projects now underway, and those highly deserving projects for which construction funds have not yet been appropriated.

Question. Those are projects already authorized, aren't they?

Answer. Yes. Also, in the flood-control field, additional projects have been authorized whose cost runs about $1.9 billion as part of an inactive group of $2.5 billion of projects which we have recommended should not be built, after screening them. We've either made them inactive or deferred them for further study because we are not sure they're sound at this time.

Question. Will the Army engineers ever work themselves out of a job?

Answer. Well, not in my time, anyway, but I don't think that's important. What is important is a water-resources program to fit the present and future needs of this country, no matter who builds the projects.

Question. A moment ago you spoke of these projects having a 50-year life. Does that mean these big lakes behind the dams are going to fill up with silt within 50 years?

Answer. No, it does not. But, from a bookkeeping and cost viewpoint, we have to cut off a project's life somewhere. We merely want all of our projects to pay for themselves in not over 50 years. Take Garrison Dam. We've got a silt pool in that reservoir which can fill up in about 200 years, and that will not, until then, interfere or encroach upon any of the purposes of the project. In other words, we have silt storage purposefully planned.

Question. This 50-year business is just for accounting then?

Answer. Yes. In other words, a 50-year period for returning benefits equal to or greater than the cost of the project. Because you really can't see economic or physical events too far ahead. We think that that's a reasonable period. We know that the project is at least good for 50 years. A few of them, of course, we may class at only a 30-year or 40-year life. But a big dam, a concrete or earth dam—of course, an earth dam, as you know, also has an enormous amount of concrete in it in such features as the spillway, intake structure, outlet works, powerhouse, etc.; for instance, 3 million cubic yards of concrete forms part of these features for Garrison Dam—we give a big dam a life of 50 years for fiscal purposes but we know it will last perhaps hundreds.

The reason is that we provide silt storage. The amount depends upon circumstances, but we like to have storage sufficient for at least 200 years. But if the Agriculture Department gets going and constructs all the small dams needed in a watershed, does extensive contouring and all the planning and other things that they propose to do for soil conservation, then we can expect a longer life, because this will retain silt in the uplands and there will be less silt washed down against the dams.

Question. Isn't that one of the biggest benefits of upstream projects—greater soil conservation?

Answer. Yes; much the greater benefit. The Corps of Engineers, let me say, has always supported strongly this soil-conservation program, primarily because we realize the great value of the soil to the Nation and we want to keep it out of our reservoirs as well.

But in our designs we don't rely completely on that work being done. We allow for a silt pool, and anything that is done by the Soil Conservation Service is over and above that and makes the life of our silt pools longer. Consequently, it assures longer life for the dam.

Question. Whenever we write anything about the Army engineers, we are inundated with letters from people who say that if you'd just dam up every creek or every little spring on every farm you'd solve this problem. Is that necessarily true?

Answer. Oh, no; that's far from true. I believe you will find that the Soil Conservation Service itself and the Department of Agriculture do not claim that the prevention of downstream floods can be accomplished by soil conservation and other upper-watershed improvements. Rather what they say—and I have heard many official statements from members of the Department of Agriculture—is that the two programs are supplementary, neither being able to do the flood-control job of the other.

We have always agreed on this, but again the conflict is between the interests of metropolitan areas downstream and the villages and farmers who live in the upper watersheds. This conflict is based on personal interest in the relative priority in the use of funds—whether first efforts are for projects to prevent great disasters downstream, or to improve the economy upstream.

Read what Dr. Hugh H. Bennett says—a very honest scientist and an original organizer of the Soil Conservation Service—you can't possibly prevent downstream damages on the principal rivers by means of small, upstream dams.

This is the true picture, but, unfortunately, some individuals have let wishful thinking, rather than accepted scientific fact, dominate their utterances in their private interests.

Question. With regard to the future water supply, is the Corps of Engineers doing anything about cloud seeding, and making fresh water out of sea water?

Answer. No, sir; that is out of our bailiwick. We cooperate with the Weather Bureau and with the United States Geological Survey, and we're interested in watching those experiments—but I'm not an expert on that.

Question. Is there any promise to making fresh water out of sea water?

Answer. Yes; I think that's coming along; it's very expensive right now, but I have tremendous faith—I was born in 1897 and I don't think anybody who's lived in the last 50 years would say that there is anything can't be done eventually.

Question. Do you think that in our generation we'll have to break through this research barrier and make fresh water out of salt water?

Answer. I think that that may well happen, but I'm not prepared to say that it will be done in our generation or the coming generation, because I believe there as so many other feasible steps—some of which I've outlined—that can be done and must be done, that large-scale treatment of sea water won't be necessary.

CALIFORNIA'S PROBLEM

Question. Well, in California, is water going to limit their growth?

Answer. I think water is limiting their growth now, and, of course, they're pushing awfully hard.

Question. Is salt water creeping in in California?

Answer. Salt water is creeping in in California due to the fact that the fresh-water head has been reduced inland by the withdrawals from wells and that these porous strata intersect the bottom of the sea, so the sea water creeps inland as the water head inland sinks sufficiently below sea level.

Question. How far back inland is it?

Answer. Oh, it goes back, I believe, as far as the coastal range.

Question. Is there any sea water in any other part of the country?

Answer. Yes, there are other parts of the country affected, but not as yet in a major way.

Question. Is there a way you can move water from one——

Answer. From one basin to another? Well, even in a small tributary area, when you attempt to transfer water and put it over the hill into another drainage area, you run into trouble right off the bat. Everybody is beginning now to see the value of that water.

Question. Well, I did read in the paper that eastern Texas has a great deal more water than——

Answer. Yes, I have heard even that they want to bring it down from the Missouri.

Question. And you can take it out and bring it out through a dam——

Answer. Well, they want to bring it down from the Missouri—were that possible, financially. But the people in Missouri would not play, I can assure you. The people of Missouri even differ among themselves in the priority use of water, but I think the Pick-Sloan system of dams will largely overcome that.

And I might say this: The people, frankly, in the upper part of the Missouri Valley, have been much more foresighted and broader in their concepts for the common Valley welfare than at least some of the people in the lower parts. They have sacrificed a lot of the limited Valley bottomland, which is among the most fertile they had, for large reservoirs of tremendous value to the downstream people. Moreover, their upland soil is not generally as good as it is down in Missouri and Kansas. They've been, I think, very farsighted in providing areas for water storage.

FLOOD THREAT IN KANSAS

Question. They haven't resisted the way the others have?

Answer. No. At last, after much controversy, the green light was given us last year to begin again on Tuttle Creek Reservoir on a tributary of the frequently disaster-producing Kaw River.

We did build a relatively small reservoir, Kanapolis, on another tributary of the Kansas, as authorized back in 1938, but there are relatively few in the lower Missouri and the tributaries compared to what is needed. And I'm just as sure as I'm sitting here that they're going to be hit by a terrific flood on those tributaries, the Grand and the Osage as well as the Kaw, and they're going to be hit by increasing water shortages as time goes on.

I think, as a matter of fact, that the water-supply angle has resulted in more sustained pressure from the people than floods. The

floods are great disasters, not forgetting the loss of life and economic scars on the people in the valley and cities, but for most people of a region they're too soon forgotten. But the increasing impact of water shortage results in a broader and much steadier push. It's not so intense as flood pressure, but it's driving people——

Question. Why is it that Europe, with a much greater density of population, doesn't have the same problem of water supply that we have? Do they have better water-conservation practices than we have?

Answer. Oh, I think they have considerably better conservation practices, generally. After all, their population pressures have been greater than ours for centuries. Now, I think that we've made a lot of progress, particularly in the last 50 years.

I'm thinking of the forestry program. For example, when I was a boy I lived in that wonderful white-pine country in northern Wisconsin, and it was terrible to see the slashings up there of those wonderful white-pine forests. I once saw those marvelous forests of white pine standing—many townships of them—when I was young. Well, that has been all changed and we've got now a national forest up there in this lake region, and in that forest, now, some of the trees are 50, 60 years old, and coming back in wonderful shape.

So I think that we're making great progress. But I don't know that the time has come when there's enough pressure on us to do as the Europeans do, or the Japanese. With the Japanese—part of their religion is that there's a spirit in every bush. And they actually revere nature. But my point is that we shouldn't wait for necessity to compel us to act.

Some Phases of Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks I include therein a recent article from the New York Times entitled "House Group Hits United States Geneva Role," summarizing a report recently made by a House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee headed by our able and distinguished colleague, Congressman CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, and composed of other able and distinguished Members of the House.

The committee report deals with exceedingly vital problems in a penetrating and able manner. It stresses the difficulty of keeping the lines of the free world drawn firmly without a clear consistent policy applicable to all areas.

It is illogical to believe that other free nations can be expected to take a stronger position toward communism than our own. Concessions which we make by conferences, trade concessions, political agreements establish guideposts for the conduct of other free nations and undoubtedly give impetus and stimulation to feelings and policies of neutralism.

Are we being outmatched, outmaneuvered in the diplomatic game? Are we losing strength in the free world because the Soviet tactics of psychological warfare are superior and more effective? Are we losing the confidence and support of present and former subject peoples and races victimized in the past by corrupt, despotic, colonial systems we are alleged, rightly or wrongly, to have sustained and supported?

The report appropriately notes the Marxist basis of Soviet world policy and its determined, unceasing campaign to conquer the world for communism.

The question might well be asked "How can there ever be even a pretext of peace in the world so long as one group of nations is conducting an aggressive campaign against the government and the governments of all other nations, and endeavoring to bring them under its authoritarian rule?"

This Nation has discovered by now, I think, that foreign aid does not insure loyalty to our cause, and that military assistance does not necessarily strengthen free nations that do not possess the "will" to be strengthened. Insofar as the battle against communism is tied in with national security, it is clear that only those nations can be depended upon to remain firmly on our side who are truly determined and possessed of the will to defend their own birthright. Those nations who are receiving our economic and military aid and sitting on the fence practicing neutralism while waiting to see which way the struggle for freedom is going, can hardly be depended upon to be strong, loyal allies. These nations merely weaken the integrity and solidarity of the free world. Another group of nations which, in effect, says to us, "Give us economic aid or we will go Communist," is even more harmful to our cause because they are practicing a form of international blackmail and can hardly be counted upon at any time to stand behind our side in the world struggle.

The problem of helping undeveloped nations also confronts us with most challenging problems. We are facing the prospect of competing with the Soviet in assisting certain countries which, it is clear, will finally line up on the side which helps them most. I do not accept the thesis that all nations will sell their freedom or surrender to slavery for economic aid. To the extent that communism thrives on poverty, misery, disease, and hunger, it is probably true that the alleviation of these conditions wherever they exist, would normally prevent or lessen the growth of communism.

Shall this aid be rendered exclusively by the United States, or will it be a United Nations programs? If the former, how far can we go feeding, clothing and supplying undeveloped countries; bringing up their economic and industrial potential in the competitive sense as well as their social condition without dangerously draining our own resources and creating additional difficulties for our own economy.

If this aid is to be parceled out by the United Nations with major contributions by this Nation how can we justify the Soviet Union designating the beneficiary nations and exercising its veto power over others—a privilege it might have in some circumstances. What will the effects be of these huge grants to underdeveloped nations upon our own economies and the economies of nations associated with us. These are all serious problems for discussion and settlement. They must be considered and decided not only upon humanitarian grounds alone, but upon the basis of the broad interests of this Nation. Under no circumstances should be pursue policies which will strengthen and spread communism and increase the war potential of possible enemy nations. Whatever action we take in this field should be predicated on our demonstrated capacity and the interests of freedom.

The committee has mentioned the necessity of improving our human relations in our various aid programs. That would also apply to our diplomatic policies. The human relations and the human questions are really important ones, if we hope to achieve enduring friendship with the millions and millions of people who are struggling to get out from under the heavy, oppressive blanket of imperialism that has covered and stifled them for centuries. If we would be true to our own traditions, we must not only have sympathy with their problems, but a sincere willingness to try to help them within the range of our ability, to escape tyranny and establish free institutions.

This great moral obligation is all the more pressing in the case of the free nations that have been recently unceremoniously dragged behind the Iron Curtain and are suffering denial of their traditional freedom. I refer to nations like Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Bulgaria, Rumania and others that are being held tight and fast by Soviet shackles. It is our duty to encourage the aspirations of these people for restored liberty, and render them every assistance we can, because there can be no real lasting peace so long as these nations are dominated and held in subjugation by a Marxist communism choking their spiritual existence.

The recognition of Red China and its admission to the United Nations would be a great setback to democracy and a great victory for communism, as the committee notes. The accomplishment of these aims would mean to many that the Communists had already won their struggle for world power. Let us resolutely and militantly adhere to this cardinal principle of American diplomacy—no recognition of the Chinese Reds, no admission of Red China to the United Nations.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times of May 6, 1956]

HOUSE GROUP HITS UNITED STATES GENEVA ROLE—PARTICIPATION IN PARLEY HELD BLOW TO ANTI-RED EFFORTS IN MIDEAST AND ASIA

(By C. P. Trussell)

WASHINGTON, May 5.—A House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee charged today that the United States had seriously weakened all anti-Communist efforts in the Middle East and Southeast Asia by taking part in last summer's conference of heads of government at Geneva.

The group of 3 Democrats and 3 Republicans said President Eisenhower's attendance at the meeting, in which Soviet leaders also participated, promoted a dangerous neutral-

ism and a distrust of the United States in those areas.

There was a feeling in many lands, the Congressmen added, that it was senseless for them to resist communism if the West was going to accept the Communists into respectable society as at Geneva.

The subcommittee, headed by Representative Clement J. Zablocki, Democrat of Wisconsin, issued today a 213-page report on a 2-month tour last fall that took the study mission through 26 countries from Greece to Japan. The report was unanimous.

SOME ECONOMIC GAINS NOTED

The Congressmen acknowledged they had found imposing economic progress in a number of countries, since a similar study was made 2 years ago. But they were sharply critical of the failure of the United States and the free world to establish a clear and firm policy in the winning of friends abroad.

"So long as this uncertainty and the resulting irresolution exist," the report stated, "Asian leaders cannot be expected to stand up against Communist China."

Meanwhile, the report noted, the Communists are determined and concerted for the mastery of the world, and the new Soviet drive to give economic aid to strategic areas is proving to have many attractions for peoples who in the past received many billions in aid from the United States.

The Congressmen urged a thorough restudy of United States policy with particular attention to divorcing this country from any association with European colonialism.

Referring to the Geneva Conference as a disrupting factor in the world situation, the report said:

"In this tense and critical period, the efforts of the United States to aid the legitimate ambitions of the peoples of the Middle East and southeast Asia were seriously weakened by the holding of the first Geneva Conference.

"The nations of these regions were deeply concerned about what appeared to them to be an about-face in the attitude of the Western Powers toward Soviet Russia. They were shaken by the apparent readiness of American leaders, not merely to accept 'peaceful coexistence' but to strive for friendly intercourse with the Communists."

GENEVA SPIRIT IS CITED

"The 'sweetness and light' campaign, reflected in friendly pronouncements by Americans, in the exchanges of visitors between the United States and the Soviet Union, in the relaxation of our barriers to trade with Communist countries, and in other ways, tended to weaken the anti-Communist resolve of the peoples of the Middle East, southeast Asia, and of the Far East."

Discussing the spread of neutralism, the report said:

"The combined effect of the first Geneva Conference, and of the change in Communist tactics, has resulted in the growth of neutralism in these regions. The people in many of the countries visited by the study mission were of the opinion that the United States was asking them to be more firm, more unbending in their anti-Communist stand than the American Nation itself was willing to be."

The report said the mission "must reluctantly report that it found in many countries profound distrust of the motives and of the stability of purpose of the United States."

"What many fail to realize," the report added, "is the Communist offers of assistance carry with them many expertly disguised and hidden strings intended to open the way for the establishment of Soviet influence and eventual domination over the peoples of the Middle East and southeast Asia."

There was an increasing conviction, the report contended, that in a showdown the United States and the colonial powers of Western Europe would sacrifice the interests of Asian countries "if that seems to promote their own interests and security."

Also, there exists a feeling that the United States, because of Japan's potential might, tends to put Japan ahead of other Asian countries that have "not forgotten their occupation by Japanese armies," the report added.

It stated that the very efficiency with which the United States carries out its aid programs has produced increasing irritations, even resentment.

HUMAN APPROACH HELD VITAL

"We simply will have to do a better job with our human relations in our various aid programs," the report continued. "The key thing is not the amount of aid. It is the manner. It is not enough to analyze figures; we must do a better job of analyzing people. This is where the Communists have left us far behind."

The study mission, which put in more than 2 months in the various fields, stated that the United States must refuse steadfastly to recognize the Communist regime in China and resist its admittance to the United Nations.

"Free Asia," the report said, "will crumble once it believes the Communists are winning. Recognition by the United States or admission to the United Nations of Communist China would mean to Asia, as it should mean to us, the Communists have already won."

Other members of the panel were Representatives JOHN JARMAN, of Oklahoma, and ROBERT C. BYRD, of West Virginia, Democrats; and Representatives WALTER H. JUDD, of Minnesota, MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, of Illinois, and E. ROSS ADAIR, of Indiana, Republicans. The staff consultant was Albert C. F. Westphal.

Independence for the Handicapped Through Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride today that I announce that a young lady in my congressional district placed fourth in the Nation in the 1956 National Essay Contest sponsored by the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

For the edification of the Members of Congress I am inserting the prize-winning essay in the RECORD and I want to commend Miss Sharon Borg of 605 Grand Street, Salt Lake City, Utah, for her magnificent accomplishment:

INDEPENDENCE FOR THE HANDICAPPED THROUGH EMPLOYMENT

Silence is not peaceful for the deaf mute who watches life passing like a noiseless procession; darkness is eternal for the man who sits idly by, listening to the activity of a world from which he has been excluded; movement is impossible for the useless legs of the young woman doomed to a wheelchair by the ravages of polio. Anxiety and insecurity haunt their days and trouble their nights because they are dependent on the charity of their friends, their families, and their State. Physiologically they are healthy; mentally they are intelligent; and they need and want to work to fill the void in their lives. But who has a job for a salesman who can neither hear nor speak, or for a bookkeeper who can't see the figures before him, or a model who is bound to a wheelchair? They and the 2 million like them don't want charity; they want a chance to be independent.

Vocational rehabilitation gives them the chance they seek. State-Federal programs rehabilitate about 60,000 of the 250,000 who need their services each year. Those who are rehabilitated and returned to work gain economic independence. Of the 64,0000 who were rehabilitated in the fiscal year 1954, 76 percent were unemployed and 24 percent were engaged in temporary or part-time jobs when rehabilitation began. Their total earnings rose from $17 million a year to $115 million and they will pay about $10 in income taxes for every Federal dollar spent on rehabilitation.[1]

As a result of their economic independence the handicapped are also mentally rehabilitated. Because they can become useful, contributing members of socity, they can pick up the broken pieces of their lives and find happiness and satisfaction. Vocational rehabilitation is in vain, however, unless our economic system provides jobs for these people.

Much progress has been made in the field of employing the handicapped, but there is still much more which can be done. Humanitarianism is no longer the only cause for their employment. Impaired workers are advantageous to business because they produce. By employing the handicapped, the Nation builds up its labor force, helps the relief rolls, and turns the disabled into taxpayers.[2] In a country based on the belief that each human being has the right to have the opportunity of developing his potentials, the handicapped deserve the chance to work as well as the nonhandicapped.

Regardless of these basic reasons for employment of the handicapped there are many employers who cannot accept it as a wise practice. There are those who believe that there is no place in some industries for the impaired worker and that working with the handicapped will result in unpleasantness and embarrassment for other workers.

These ideas do not hold up, however, in the face of the results of a joint United States Department of Labor and Veteran's Administration survey of 100 plants employing 11,000 disabled and 18,000 nonimpaired workers. The survey showed that impaired workers produced at slightly higher rates than nonimpaired workers on the same job; they sustained fewer disabling injuries when exposed to the same hazards; they had the same minor injury rate; they had no significant difference in the voluntary quit rate; they had about the same absenteeism records; and they had the same wide range of skills, abilities, and interests.[3]

Certainly any industry can profit by having adaptable, careful, reliable, productive, and capable employees such as these.

Although an individual is physically handicapped, he may not be a handicapped worker. A deaf mute who operates a heavy machine in a factory finds his disability advantageous because it relieves him of the stress and strain caused by the factory noise; the blind man whose highly developed sense of touch enables him to assemble minute parts in a delicate assembly job is one of the most valuable men in his plant and can work more efficiently for longer periods of time than his fellow workers, without the eye strain which plagues them; the receptionist in the doctor's office finds her lifeless legs

Footnotes at end of speech.

are no handicap in the efficient completion of her duties.

When the handicapped are trained for a job for which they are capable, they often perform their duties even better than the nonhandicapped having the same job because they are aware of their disabilities and overdevelop their abilities in order to compensate.

Many employers throughout the country have realized the value of employees who have physical disabilities. Such companies as Bulova, General Motors, Eastern Airlines, and Northrup Aviation have extensive training and placement programs.[4]

Employers of large and small concerns should follow the examples of these companies. They can do this by adopting a positive company viewpoint and by being actively interested in the problem. Careful hiring and wise placement of all workers will result in the decrease of turnover, accidents, sickness, and absenteeism, and an increase in morale.[5] Therefore the extra effort extended to make possible the employment of the handicapped will result in greater efficiency throughout the entire organization.

Silence can be forgotten by the deaf mute whose life is filled with color and activity; the burden of eternal darkness is lightened for the blind man who is a part of the sound and movement of the world; movement loses its importance to the crippled girl who is a contributing member of society. The void in their lives has been filled by economic independence.

It is the responsibility of American society to employ all who desire to work and are capable of being trained for employment. Let's give the handicapped a chance to compete. Remember, it's the ability, not the disability, that counts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Hunt, Joseph, President's Program for the Disabled, America, November 27, 1954.

Maas, Maj. Gen. Melvin, Minutes of Organizational Meeting, Employers Subcommittee, January 28, 1955.

National Association of Mutual Casualty Companies, The Handicapped Man for the Job.

The President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, Hire the Handicapped.

[1] Joseph Hunt, President's Program for the Disabled, America, Nov. 27, 1954.

[2] Maj. Gen. Melvin Maas, Minutes of Organizational Meeting, Employers Subcommittee, Jan. 28, 1955.

[3] Hire the Handicapped, p. 3.

[4] National Association of Mutual Casualty Companies, The Handicapped Man for the Job, p. 4.

[5] Ibid., p. 2.

OTC–GATT—H. R. 5550

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENDERSON L. LANHAM

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter that appeared in the New York Times, May 9, 1956, written by O. R. Strackbein on the OTC issue that is now before Congress.

I fully endorse the views and sentiments expressed in this letter and commend it to the attention of all my colleagues. The letter sets forth the hidden dangers that are present in H. R. 5550 despite the amendments attached to the bill by the Ways and Means Committee as safeguards. It shows how approval of the OTC by Congress would deliver the regulation of our foreign commerce into the hands of GATT.

The letter follows:

REGULATING FOREIGN TRADE—LOSS OF CONGRESSIONAL CONTROL SEEN IF OTC BILL IS PASSED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In an editorial of April 25 on H. R. 5550, the Organization for Trade Cooperation bill, you laud the majority report of the House Ways and Means Committee for its thoughtfulness and thoroughness and with equal fervor deprecate the minority report as mere argument, mostly unsubstantiated allegations and simple misrepresentations.

The bill at issue is the one that proposes United States membership in the OTC, which would be set up in Geneva to administer the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). This bill was reported out by the Ways and Means Committee, as you say, before the Easter recess. The majority report that so impresses you is, of course, in support of United States membership in the newly proposed international trade body.

The principal bone of contention is the allegation that such membership would largely set Congress to one side in the regulation of the foreign commerce of this country, including tariff and quota legislation. It is held that this power, bestowed upon the Congress by the Constitution, would be shifted to an international body sitting in Geneva.

SHIFT OF POWER

Your editorial, in full agreement with the State Department and administration position, seeks to brush aside this argument or misrepresentation by simply calling it ludicrous or some similar term.

You say that the United States would retain its freedom of action because no new obligation could be imposed on any OTC member unless that member agreed to accept it.

Now, it is true that so far as our membership in the OTC is concerned, Congress would, thanks to a Ways and Means Committee amendment, retain control; but please note that the OTC is not the GATT. GATT is the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. OTC would administer it and seek to carry out its purposes and objectives, whatever these are or might become in the future as a result of amendments.

It is important that it be understood that GATT, in accordance with its own article XXX, could amend itself, including the scope and range of its authority, without regard to the OTC. If it is true that it could not bind this country unless we accepted new amendments, this acceptance could be given by the State Department in the mere act of casting an affirmative vote. Congress would not be consulted.

In other words, the safeguard written into H. R. 5550 with respect to the OTC under which congressional as distinguished from State Department approval is required for acceptance by this country would not control GATT amendments, for the simple reason that GATT is not before Congress and could therefore not be amended by the Ways and Means Committee. And in any case the United States could not unilaterally revise the General Agreement.

BLANKET APPROVAL

I hope that this distinction between the OTC amending process as controlled by the amended H. R. 5550 and the GATT power of self-amendment without the consent of Congress will make it clear that Congress by passing the OTC would indeed open the door to its own loss of control—de facto if not de jure, since approval of the OTC would be regarded as approval of GATT itself. GATT would then be free under this blanket approval to go on its own self-charted course with little reason to pay further heed to the Congress of the United States. That, indeed, is and has been the State Department goal. That is and continues to be the central point of opposition.

O. R. STRACKBEIN,
Chairman, The Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy.
WASHINGTON, May 3, 1956.

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, May 10 is Rumania's Independence Day. To all true Rumanians, that day is to them what July 4 is to all true Americans—the symbol of their individuality as a nation.

The collective leadership of the Soviet Union is afraid of days which recall liberty to the temporarily subjugated European satellites. They were afraid of Polish Constitution Day, May 3. They tried to change the Polish national holiday to July 22. They tried to change the date of Rumania's Independence Day to May 9—when the Russians observe VE-day. How miserably they have failed. Rumanians, in their homeland, take new heart on May 10, remembering the impact of that day on their history, and looking forward to the time when liberty shall be restored to them.

On May 10, 1866, the first elected monarch of Rumania was inaugurated.

On May 10, 1877, while engaged in the Russo-Turkish War, the principality of Rumania proclaimed its independence from the Ottoman Empire.

On May 10, 1881, Charles I was crowned king of Rumania by the will of the people, who had chosen him to govern.

More than half a century of peace, progress, and prosperity followed May 10, 1881. It is no wonder that true Rumanians remember that date. It would be a wonder if they should ever forget it.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in Rumania twice since World War II—in 1945 and again late in 1954. I came away with a strong, well-founded respect for the unbreakable courage of the Rumanian people.

On one occasion I noticed a gang of men in convict uniform building a road. My American diplomatic escort told me that these men, guarded by Communists with machineguns, were sons of former Rumanian leaders in industry, science, and government. When the guards momentarily looked the other way, one of these men stared directly at me and raised his right hand. I recognized in that brief instant the sign of "V for

victory." He had done this at the risk of his life.

On another occasion, a Jewish rabbi—his body unbelievably emaciated from starvation and forced labor—told me in broken English, "the best way to solve the problem of too few jobs for too many Rumanians is to close the eastern border and open up the western border."

It takes the bravery of the battlefield to dare death while engaged in slave labor. It requires a crown of courage to crack a joke in the shadow of imprisonment. But that, Mr. Speaker, is Rumania.

Rumanian oil, Rumanian lumber, Rumanian farm crops are siphoned into the Soviet Union, leaving only a small percentage for home consumption. Since I represent a great oil-producing and agricultural State, Oklahoma, this was of interest to me.

I asked one of Rumania's Communist leaders how the average Rumanian was making both ends meet. He told me, with pride, that the average monthly income for workers was then about $80 per month in our money. Next, I asked him how much the average worker was paying per gallon for gas for his car. His answer was that the average worker didn't have a car. "How much per gallon if he had a car?" I insisted. He finally broke down and confessed that gasoline could be bought at $2.23 per gallon. I also learned that eggs could be purchased—at 30 cents apiece. Actually, they cost more than 30 cents apiece, for 4 out of 5 eggs sold in Rumania are not fit for human consumption.

Eighty dollars a month does not go far at such prices.

I do not know how Rumanians keep alive under such enforced exploitation. But they do. And they keep freedom alive, too.

Mr. Speaker, there is just one thing I wonder as we who are free prepare to honor Rumania's Independence Day. When I was in Rumania in 1954 there was a great deal of pointing with pride to the school, corresponding to our own West Point, that trained officers for the Communist army. It was then called the Stalin Military Academy. I wonder if it is still called the Stalin Military Academy in 1956.

It is my hope and prayer, Mr. Speaker, that on a not-too-distant May 10, we may welcome free Rumania once more into the fellowship of independent nations.

Laos Celebrates Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to felicitate the people of Laos, His Majesty Sisavang Vong, and His Excellency Ourot R. Souvannavong, Ambassador of Laos on the occasion of the celebration of Constitution Day, May 11, 1956.

For the ninth time the flags flutter high over Laos to commemorate their birth of freedom. As nationalism and anticolonialism spread throughout southeast Asia they found fertile soil in Laos. The Laotian people, fired by their own burning desires for freedom and inspired by the examples of their neighbors in the region, actively fought against colonialism and second class citizenship and thus achieved their independence.

Less disrupted by Communist aggression than some of its neighbors, Laos has consequently known a smoother transition from colonial status to independence. The Government established at the close of the colonial era was that of a constitutional monarchy with a king who is popular among his people. A constitution guaranteeing democratic freedoms to the Laotian peoples was promulgated May 11, 1947. Legislative power is exercised by a National Assembly elected by direct universal suffrage. The independence acquired has been gradually shaping up into a more concrete form and has become complete after the signature with France of a treaty of amity and association on October 22, 1953.

Laos has been active on the international scene. She has been a partner in the conclusion of agreements on American military and economic aid to the Indochinese States as well as a participant in numerous international conferences such as the Colombo plan. Laos also cooperates with several of the specialized agencies of the United Nations.

I salute Laos upon her accomplishments during her short period of nationhood and wish for the Laotian people continued success as they embark upon a new year of national life.

Statement of Hon. Augustine B. Kelley, of Pennsylvania, Regarding Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including my statement regarding the farm legislation.

This is such a vital question today, and its solution means so much to the economy of the country as a whole. No real prosperity can exist in this country unless the farmers have prosperity. It is one of the soft spots and is indicative of trouble ahead for our economic prosperity.

The statement follows:

The Congress is making another attempt at passing some farm legislation to help the Nation's badly depressed agricultural sector of the economy. When President Eisenhower vetoed the bill passed last month, it appeared for a while there would be no farm legislation. But the fact that the parity ratio—that is, the relationship of farm prices to farm and living costs—continues to hover around 82 percent, while the farm outlook remains anything but optimistic, has prompted the agricultural committees to try to get something through.

I pointed out recently that the agricultural part of the economy and the coal industry have been experiencing similar troubles—that both are now running at a little more than 80 percent of the parity level of the Truman administration. These do not constitute isolated situations. The economy is so closely tied together that when large individual segments of it run into continuous difficulties, the whole economy eventually is affected.

Some people in this administration act and talk as if it might be a good idea to help the farmer a little, this being an election year. That's why the administration apparently is so sold on the old Henry Wallace plan for paying farmers to take land out of production. They hope to be able to parcel out some of this money to the farmer between now and election day.

But there is a stronger need right now than just being nice to the farmer in an election year and helping him along a little with a handout of something. It is, rather, imperative that we get the farm segment of the economy back into balance with the rest. And we must go after other depressed segments of the economy—and depressed areas, too—and make sure they get the kind of help which will put them back on a parity basis. Otherwise, the whole economy eventually sinks to the level of the depressed parts of it.

Representative E. Y. Berry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I have requested permission to extend my remarks today in order that I might briefly outline some of the outstanding accomplishments of our colleague, E. Y. BERRY, who has so ably represented the Second District of South Dakota during his three terms in Congress. I know that you Members of the Congress who have worked closely with Congressman BERRY are very much aware of his fine service while a Member of this body, but I take this opportunity to give permanent recognition to the stewardship of our colleague by inserting the following in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Representative E. Y. BERRY has done outstanding work on his committee and has earned the respect of his fellow members on the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. He is the fourth ranking Republican of the 27-member committee.

As indicative of the work he has done, both the Republican and Democratic chairmen of that committee have paid him high praise for his endeavors. On June 15, 1954, after BERRY, as chairman of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee, had held extended joint hearings with the Senate Subcommittee, Representative

MILLER, Republican, Nebraska, chairman of the full committee, said:

I want to say at this point, for the RECORD, in my opinion the Subcommittees on Indian Affairs in the House and in the Senate have done a remarkable job of working with the different Indian problems. * * * Thank you very much (BERRY) for your effort so far, and I hope you continue with as much patience as possible because I believe you are getting results we never had before. I think the joint hearings between the Senate and House Committees have been a healthy thing. If we can work out more of these joint hearings, I think it would save much time and effort and money for the people that come into Washington to be heard on the problems.

It is not only the Republican members of the committee who have paid their tribute to Representative BERRY. At the same time, Representative CLAIR ENGLE, Democrat, California, who is now the chairman of the full Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, paid this tribute to E. Y. BERRY when he said:

May I, too, express my admiration and appreciation to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs (BERRY), who has certainly worked with tremendous diligence and perseverance on what is the most trying problem this committe has. He has demonstrated the patience of a Job equal to anything that Job suffered during his most troublesome days, and he certainly has my sincere admiration and respect and deserves the thanks not only of this committee but of all of the people of this country who are interested in getting a disposition of this Indian problem.

Western South Dakota has many interests, businesses, and resources. BERRY has been active in promoting all of these. One of the principal resources is agriculture.

FARM PROGRAM

BERRY has been an active worker for farm legislation that will give the farmer his fair share of the nationwide prosperity he has helped to create. His insistence on the importance and urgency of the passage of a sound farm bill which would increase agricultural income is evidenced by his statement on the House floor on March 26, 1956—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 4985—when he said:

Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today to demand that there be no congressional Easter recess unless and until the farm bill has been approved by both Houses of Congress and has been sent to the President.

There is nothing to come before Congress this session that is as important to the economy of the entire Nation as the immediate passage of this legislation. By fast action, the differences between the two Houses could be resolved prior to the Easter recess. If, however, these differences are not resolved, there should be no congressional recess.

Spring planting time is rapidly creeping up on the farmers all the way across the Nation. Time is tremendously important. So far as I am concerned, I, too, would appreciate a 10-day "breather" from our labors here on Capitol Hill, but I want no part of any vacation until the farm bill is passed and signed by the President.

The continued high level of the economy of this Nation rests upon the foundation of a thriving agricultural economy. If the national economy is to remain at its present level, then farm income and the farm economy must be improved. * * *

Mr. Speaker, I demand that the House and Senate withhold any plans for an Easter recess until the farm bill is passed.

SOIL BANK

In line with the President's suggestions, Representative BERRY joined with members of the House Agriculture Committee in introducing a new soil-bank bill within minutes following the vote in the House on the President's veto. BERRY has advocated the soil-bank plan as one of the ways to increase farm income without building greater agricultural surpluses and yet retain the productive areas in conservation programs for future needs of an expanding population.

WHEAT

BERRY has also vigorously urged passage of a domestic wheat plan that would provide 100 percent of parity for all wheat used domestically with the farmer having the choice of selling the surplus on the world market or storing it for sale the following year. He introduced legislation providing for such a program following the President's veto of the farm bill.

WOOL

The Berry wool amendment to annual defense appropriations acts requires the Armed Services to buy only domestic wool in all military orders and has benefited the sheep and wool industry by millions of dollars. In 1952 when Congress was considering this matter the hard-working Congressman made the following remarks:

Mr. Chairman, certainly we must protect American industry and labor through the Buy American provision of this defense appropriation bill, but we must, at the same time, protect our wool industry. The bill provides that the Army buy food and clothing grown and produced in the United States so long as it is available. This amendment simply requires that the clothing be made from domestic wool so long as that domestic wool is available. Is that not fair? Is that not just? Is that not American?

REA PROGRAM

He has assisted REA and RTA groups with loan applications and related matters. On the floor of the House he said:

Mr. Speaker * * * the Rea has done a magnificent job in our State in electrifying our farms and ranches. * * * I salute the pioneers and users, the borrowers and owners, of this vast REA program which has changed the lives and made a brighter future for every South Dakota citizen.

LIVESTOCK

The stockmen of South Dakota have been able to count on BERRY as an aggressive proponent of their best interests. One example is the establishment of a foot-and-mouth-disease laboratory at Plum Island which was championed by the West River Congressman. He helped in obtaining an increased appropriation for the control of brucellosis in the present session and has been very active for several years in obtaining effective brand legislation.

RECLAMATION

BERRY has been very active in promoting reclamation and irrigation development throughout the West. Speaking to the House in support of the small-projects bill on May 6, 1955, BERRY said:

I stated at the outset that this is a partnership bill. It provides more local autonomy in the development of badly needed and financially feasible projects. It is a move to permit the construction of many small projects which are being delayed because of the lack of local financing and which are not of enough magnitude to receive priority consideration by either the Bureau of Reclamation or by special legislation in Congress. It will provide many projects which the local people are not able to finance themselves, but which in the interests of the economy of this Nation should be constructed and can be constructed if this legislation passes Congress.

MINERAL RESOURCES—URANIUM

Last year during the first session of this Congress, BERRY introduced and succeeded in guiding to passage through the House a bill validating the filing of mineral claims for uranium ore deposits located in lignite beds on public domain lands. The bill became law and served as a key to unlocking part of the potential mineral treasure chest in northwestern South Dakota. In his explanation of the problem before the House Interior Committee on June 20, 1955, BERRY said:

Mr. Chairman, Public Law 585, enacted last year, recognized the multiple-use doctrine which would permit multiple use of these public lands in the United States, that is, the right of a mineral locator to obtain a patent to his location, but which would be subject to the reservation to the United States of all leasing materials and the right to enter and remove such minerals. * * *

The purpose of this bill is to bring these areas under the mineral location law with the right of removal upon the payment to the Government of a royalty for fuel minerals that are destroyed as uranium is extracted.

From report of proceedings, House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, June 20, 1955.

GOLD

A strong advocate of a free market for gold, on March 22, 1956, BERRY called the matter to the attention of the House, saying:

Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Government announcement yesterday that it is going on a free market places the question squarely up to the United States whether it wants to stand on the sidelines alone or whether it wants to follow the free market lead of the other nations. Those of us who are interested in domestic mineral production have been pressing for this action for some time. The present price of gold at $35 an ounce precludes the mining of any low-grade ore resulting in the wasting of our gold resources.

MICA

Western South Dakota produces many more minerals which our Nation must have to be militarily and economically strong. When the domestic stockpile program for strategic mica began to lag because of pricing and grading policies of the Emergency Procurement Service, BERRY vigorously pressed responsible officials for an equitable purchasing program that would give miners sufficient return on their investments. In testifying before the Senate Interior Committee on April 20, 1956, favoring the extension of the strategic mineral purchasing program, he said in part:

The program has been changed very little, the price has been changed none, the grading has not been changed since the beginning of World War II. The result was that miners could not get enough out of their mica to pay them and the grading process was not satisfactory. In my country, at least, there has been very little mica mined recently. But I think under the new buying program this mica is going to come in. I doubt, however, that we are going to be able to fill the stockpile needs prior to June 30 of next year. I urge that this bill be enacted.

VETERANS

BERRY has a splendid record of working for the best interests of the war veterans. He has successfully worked for the improvement of the veterans' hospitals in Sturgis and Hot Springs as well as nearby areas. He has urged increased payments under the GI bill and veterans' pensions. He has represented veterans before military appeal boards and cooperated with the servicemen's organizations.

BUSINESS IN GOVERNMENT

As a businessman himself, BERRY has emphasized the need for business practices in Government:

Mr. Speaker, while this does not involve a too great amount of money, it is, in my judgment, one of the most important bills to come before this Congress at this session because it demonstrates a trend in the program of this administration to put more business in Government and get the Government out of as much business as possible.

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 3, 1954, page 13160, 83-2.

NATIONAL PARKS

BERRY has ably represented the best interests of the national parks and monuments in his district. Supporting the Interior appropriation bill before the House on April 6, 1954, he said:

Mr. Chairman, I commend the committee for including in this bill funds for the improvement of Mount Rushmore National Park. This great shrine is one of the great inspirational spots in America. Since this appropriation will be repaid to the Treasury of the United States, it is a good investment. * * * This entire development program is the result of cooperation between the National Park Service, the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Society, and friends of this great shrine in an effort to accommodate the increasing numbers of visitors who come each year.

AIRPORTS AND HOSPITALS

BERRY has spoken out in favor of Federal-aid programs needed for the benefit of the Nation as well as his district where local communities are unable to do the needed job themselves, such as airport and hospital construction.

Mr. Speaker. * * *. Federal assistance in airport construction is one of the most important considerations due general aviation, and I hope therefore that this $22 million item will be appropriated.

And—

One of the services in which our rural communities are most deficient is adequate hospital facilities. Many of our small South Dakota towns have had difficulty interesting doctors because of the lack of needed hospitals. As you know, the authorization for this program was just signed by the President last week. It is one of the important parts of his health program.

INDIANS

The Indian people, not only of South Dakota, but of the entire Nation have never had a better friend or a more aggressive fighter for their rights than BERRY. Believing that the Indian problem can be solved only through education and trades training, BERRY is devoting much of his time to legislation to accomplish these ends. He feels that rehabilitation should be accomplished through loans to those who are able to make a success of operating ranches and livestock on the reservation areas and that a program of training for those who cannot successfully farm must be devised.

BERRY has been cooperating with the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in his effort to bring industrial plants on or near Indian reservations to provide employment. His trades training program will fit these people for such employment. His plan to incorporate rehabilitation into bills providing settlement for damages to reservation areas is a new and effective program since it is handled by the Indians themselves through a business manager with authority to handle these finance programs without the delay of going through the Indian Department itself on each loan.

BERRY has become nationally recognized for his work in behalf of the Indian people. As Mr. ENGLE, chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, has said:

He * * * deserves the thanks, not only of this committee but of all the people of this country who are interested in getting a disposition of this Indian problem.

An editorial appearing in the April 12, 1956, issue of the Rapid City Daily Journal, which is the largest daily in the South Dakota Second District, expresses some of the reasons why the people of western South Dakota appreciate Congressman BERRY's stewardship in his public trust.

The editorial follows:

NO WONDER THE WEST RIVER LIKES E. Y. BERRY

No congressional district in the United States has such a diversity of interests as South Dakota's Second Congressional District, which covers all of the State from the Missouri River west.

The West River district has national parks, national forests, a large strategic airbase, an ordnance depot, a Federal fish hatchery, two Veterans' Administration hospitals, large acreages of public lands with oil and mineral deposits, vast expanses of farm and ranch land, reclamation projects, mining, and 30,000 Indian people with the Federal Government as the guardian for their properties.

It takes a man of patience, balance, and a broad understanding of the multiple problems of this large district to represent the West River in Washington, D. C.

We are fortunate to have just that man in Congress—Representative E. Y. BERRY, of McLaughlin. Born near Philip, a lawyer and a newspaper publisher, BERRY had a fine record of public service before being elected to Congress in 1950.

BERRY'S diversified background made it easier for him to start out right in the difficult job of filling the vacancy FRANCIS CASE left when he was elected at the same time to the United States Senate. CASE was extremely helpful, of course, in briefing BERRY on the many ramifications of representing the West River in Congress. CASE continues to be a helpful colleague—the two have worked closely on legislation benefiting this region during the past 6 years. CASE and BERRY have been close personal friends for years and their association in Washington has only increased this friendship and understanding for the benefit of South Dakota.

HELLO, E. Y.!

During the Easter recess of Congress, Representative E. Y. BERRY returned to his district, where he visited with miners, Indians, Government workers, farmers, ranchers, townspeople—in short, his constituents. The people were glad to see him and to give him their viewpoints. All of us like to have personal contact with the men who represent us in Washington.

BERRY is personable and modest. There are many good reasons, aside from the point that they like him, why the people of the West River were happy to see BERRY. He has done a good job for them.

We checked BERRY's record in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and it is a record of accomplishment for the West River ever since his first term in Congress.

Perhaps you would like to review, as we did, the things BERRY has done.

BERRY BILLS INTO LAW

His bill requiring the Armed Forces to use only domestic wool in the purchase of any material containing wool has meant millions of dollars to the sheep industry during the 4 years BERRY's bill has been the law of the land.

His bill to validate the filing of mineral claims for uranium ore deposits in the lignite beds on public land opened up tremendous possibilities for northwestern South Dakota.

BERRY's bill for the Cheyenne River Indians established a new pattern for the Indian people, giving them a new freedom in handling their own affairs. For the Indians whose land will be inundated by water from Oahe Dam, BERRY's bill provides $3 million for the land plus $5.5 million for rehabilitating the displaced Indians.

BERRY also successfully sponsored a bill providing long-term leasing of Indian land for commercial and industrial purposes.

Another helpful law for the Indians was the BERRY law which authorizes the mortgaging of Indian trust property as the basis for financing Indian ranch units through regular commercial channels.

STRIKES FOR AGRICULTURE

For agriculture, still the West River's major industry, BERRY—in addition to the wool bill—cosponsored legislation which increased durum wheat production outside allotment quotas while durum is in short supply.

He cosponsored the bill which established the Foot and Mouth disease research laboratory on Plum Island—legislation of great significance to all stockgrowers.

BERRY also cosponsored legislation removing ASC acreage compliance requirements for eligibility to receive soil conservation payments.

OTHER ACCOMPLISHMENTS

And that's not all.

BERRY has consistently worked for the expansion and development of Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rushmore Memorial, our national parks and veterans hospitals in the West River.

He assisted in securing the uranium mill at Edgemont, helped straighten out the mica buying mess at Custer, has been active in promoting the Missouri River development program. BERRY successfully led the fight in Congress for increased appropriations for coyote and rodent control and for increased appropriations to curb Brucellosis in livestock.

BERRY has worked closely with REA associations, assisting them to speed up loans to expand their services in our rural areas. He is an active spokesman for Eisenhower's highway expansion program and works closely with the Indian Department in locating small industries on or near Indian reservations.

IMPORTANT COMMITTEE

There is an impressive list of bills, still pending in Congress, which BERRY introduced. All are of benefit to the people and the economy of the West River.

BERRY is the fourth ranking Republican member on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee which has 27 members. Aside from agriculture, this committee deals with all legislation vitally affecting western South Dakota. The subcommittees on which BERRY serves handles legislation concerning public lands, irrigation and reclamation, mining and Indian affairs.

While E. Y. BERRY is hired to work for all of us, it never hurts to tell an employee he is doing a good job.

Congressman BERRY, we in the West River appreciate your untiring efforts. You'll know how truly we appreciate your worth when the votes are tallied next June 5 and again in the November election.

Testimonial Dinner Honoring Paul Wooton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, seldom has Washington witnessed a testimonial dinner where there was more genuine love and affection for the honoree than the one held here at the Press Club on Tuesday last honoring Mr. Paul Wooton, long-time Washington correspondent for the New Orleans Times-Picayune, and distinguished representative of the business press of the Nation.

Mr. Wooton has exemplified in his life the tenet of the golden rule. No task has been too difficult or too burdensome, and his friendship has been freely given.

Like so many others, Mrs. Boggs and I and our family were the recipients of his hospitality when we first came to Washington in 1941. It was Paul Wooton who literally took us under his roof, found us a place in which to live, and guided us about this complicated National Capital of ours. He has similarly helped thousands of others.

It was fitting indeed that three Presidents of the United States paid tribute to him, that distinguished leaders in journalism and in public affairs gathered at the Press Club, and that his long-time associate and intimate friend, Mr. George W. Healy, editor of the Times-Picayune, came from New Orleans to make one of the finest presentations of all—a scroll signed by fellow employees of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, with service ranging from 25 to 50 years.

I include herewith, Mr. Speaker, news articles which appeared in the Washington Post and the Evening Star, and an editorial from the Post, all of May 9, 1956:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald]

Nearly 500 persons attended a National Press Club birthday luncheon yesterday for Paul Wooton, 75-year-old Washington correspondent for the New Orleans Times-Picayune.

Upward of 500 others wired or posted regrets on their inability to attend the tribute to the immensely popular veteran newsman—a bouncy figure on the local scene for nearly half a century.

Typical of the chatty birthday letters Wooton received was one from former President Harry Truman, who remarked that both he and Wooton were born on the same day.

Truman also recalled that his daughter Margaret used to rollerskate on the apartment floor directly over Wooton, who still makes his home at 3016 Tilden Street NW., but that Wooton never once complained. The former President was a Senator then.

White House Press Secretary James Hagerty read a message from President Eisenhower in which the Chief Executive expressed his "warm best wishes for the years ahead."

A third long letter came from another White House occupant Wooton had known in his long tenure—Herbert Hoover, who remarked that Wooton had been his constant friend for 40 years.

His letter also detailed at length the help Hoover recalled Wooton had given him on the post-World War I food-relief program.

The honor guest got a portable TV set from the organizations who sponsored the luncheon: McGraw-Hill Publications, Kruckman News Bureau, Chilton Publications, Simmons-Boardman Publications, Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., and Motor Age, in addition to the Times-Picayune.

A native of Indiana, Wooton went south at an early age and his early newspapering was done in that part of the country. A member and sometime officer of nearly every newspaper organization represented locally, Wooton headed the National Press Club in 1946.

[From the Washington Evening Star]

Paul Wooton, a reporter, made news, himself, yesterday.

On the occasion of his 75th birthday, the Washington correspondent of the New Orleans Times-Picayune heard himself extolled by some of the Nation's great people.

President Eisenhower sent his press secretary, James Hagerty, to read a warm letter of greetings. Former Presidents Herbert Hoover and Harry S. Truman dispatched messages of sincere congratulations.

Vice President NIXON made a special trip to the National Press Club to shake hands with Mr. Wooton. The Ambassadors of Norway, Great Britain, and Guatemala came to pay tribute.

Justice William O. Douglas of the Supreme Court and Treasury Secretary George M. Humphrey were on hand to honor the 42-year veteran of the Washington press corps.

BOSS JOINS IN TRIBUTE

Senator LONG, of Louisiana and Mr. Wooton's own boss, Editor George Healy, jr., of the Times-Picayune, joined in the tribute.

Besides these, Mr. Wooton was surrounded by a host of friends from the news professions, big names and small, who thought it fitting to salute one of their best-known associates.

Five hundred persons crowded the auditorium of the Press Club to participate in the birthday celebration. Many others who sought admission had to be turned away for lack of space.

The toastmaster, Benjamin M. McKelway, editor of The Star, said "there is no hall in Washington large enough to accommodate Paul's friends."

DEVOTED TO THOUGHTFULNESS

He described the honored guest as a man who has gone through life looking for, and frequently finding, an opportunity to do something thoughtful for someone else, especially in his own craft.

President Eisenhower, extending congratulations to Mr. Wooton on his anniversary, said it was a matter of genuine regret that he could not attend the party. Similar expressions came from former Presidents Hoover and Truman.

Mr. Wooton was showered with gifts, including a parchment scroll signed by fellow employees of the Times-Picayune, a medal sent by the Mayor and city council of New Orleans and a portable television set given by those attending the luncheon.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald]

THE MAN IN CHARGE

To Washington newsmen, Paul Wooton has been, for more years than seem probable, not merely an indispensable man but an indispensable institution. This friendly, easy-going, ubiquitous dynamo who for years has represented the New Orleans Times-Picayune and the Chilton Publications in Washington, has been at one time or another president of the White House Correspondents Association, president of the National Press Club, president of the Overseas Writers, chairman of the Business Papers Correspondents' Committee—and chairman or president of an appalling list of other groups and organizations. But he has been at all times, permanent secretary-treasurer and chief arranger, factotum and driving power of every one of them. Whenever the press corps has had work to do, Paul Wooten has done it.

So there was warm gratitude as well as deep affection behind the luncheon given yesterday in honor of Paul Wooton's 75th birthday. There is hardly a member of the press corps who has not personally felt his kindliness and generosity; and there is none at all who has not been a beneficiary of his talents as organizer of banquets, receptions and celebratory events. When visiting kings or queens or prime ministers have come to Washington, it has always been Paul Wooton who presented them to the press—and always with a simplicity and grace that illuminated the occasions. He has made a career out of helping his colleagues. We congratulate him on his birthday; and we congratulate ourselves on having him among us.

Administrative Changes In Excise Tax Structure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERE COOPER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 days the Committee on Ways and Means has been considering an important report issued by the Subcommittee on Excise Tax Technical and Administrative Problems. This subcommittee, under the able chairmanship of the Honorable AIME J. FORAND, of Rhode

Island, has made a thorough and comprehensive study of our Federal excise-tax structure. Based on that study, the subcommittee prepared a report containing 80 specific recommendations for improvements in our Federal excise tax structure.

As chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, I today issued a press release setting forth the decisions of the committee reached to date in connection with its consideration of the subcommittee report. For the information of the Members of Congress and the interested public, I will insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of that press release. The committee will continue its work on this report in executive session next Monday.

CHAIRMAN JERE COOPER, OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, ANNOUNCES TENTATIVE DECISIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXCISE TAX TECHNICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS

Hon. JERE COOPER, Democrat, Tennessee, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means announced today that the committee had reached the following tentative decisions thus far on the recommendations of the Subcommittee on Excise Tax Technical and Administrative Problems:

I. MANUFACTURERS EXCISES

1. Electric direct motor-driven fans and air circulators should be taxed only if they are of the household type rather than, as at present, if they are of the nonindustrial type.

2. The tax on television and radio components should be applied only to those suitable for use on or in connection with "entertainment type" sets rather than on all sets.

3. The tax on refrigeration components should be repealed.

4. Temporarily passed over, to permit further staff study, the recommendation that credits or refunds should be available with respect to the tax on gasoline destroyed by fire or as the result of a disaster (as so declared by the President) to the extent that the tax losses are not compensated by insurance or otherwise.

5. To remove items of little or no revenue significance, the base of the tax on sporting goods should be revised to delete: (a) curling stones; (b) deck tennis rings, nets, and posts; (c) lacrosse balls and sticks; and (d) sleds (measuring more than 60 inches in length).

6. The tax on trucks and truck trailers which are leased instead of sold should be limited to the tax due where these articles are sold. This is already true in the case of utility trailers. This treatment would be provided, however, only if the manufacturer sells (instead of leases) some of the trucks and truck trailers.

7. The tax on tires and inner tubes should be levied at the time the tire or the tube initially leaves the manufacturing plant or a warehouse within 20 miles of such plant, instead of at the time of the sale by the manufacturer in the case of sales by a manufacturer having wholesale or retail outlets.

8. Temporarily passed over, to permit further staff study, the recommendation that in the case of sales by manufacturers directly to retailers, the manufacturers' price on which the tax is computed should be based upon the price at which the manufacturer sells to wholesale distributors. This alternative to the actual price charged by the manufacturer would not be available where sales to the retailers are the normal method of distribution within the industry and would not be available where the manufacturer does not make a sufficient number of sales to independent wholesalers.

9. Temporarily passed over, to permit further staff study, the recommendation: "Present law provides that the base on which the manufacturers' tax is computed is to be constructed where a manufacturer makes a sale (otherwise than at arm's length) at less than the fair market price. In practice a sale to a selling subsidiary in such a case would be presumed to be not at arm's length. This administrative presumption should be codified."

10. Temporarily passed over, to permit further staff study, the recommendation that the status of cooperative advertising in relation to a manufacturers tax base should be clarified by a specific ruling of the Internal Revenue Service. The subcommittee has been informed that the Service will issue a ruling providing substantially as follows:

(a) The distinction between national and local advertising is abolished.

(b) Where a manufacturer's selling price to his customer contains an unsegregated advertising charge, it is a part of his tax base.

(c) In the case where a manufacturer makes a separate charge to his distributor for advertising and the proceeds are kept in a separate account earmarked for advertising, the separate advertising charge is not a part of the tax base. This separation can be evidenced by showing that the charge is either listed on the sales invoice or billed separately; the contributions from distributors are set aside as a fund to be used for advertising for the benefit of these contributors and the funds are so used, or the unexpended portion is held in trust or refunded to the contributor upon his withdrawal from the program.

(d) Where the manufacturer makes a contribution to the advertising account in the case of a separate fund, the amount of the manufacturer's contribution may not be deducted in computing the taxable sales price. However, the subsequent allowances against such contributions to distributors for expenditures by them or their dealers for advertising should be treated as readjustments of sales price.

11. For the purpose of eliminating competitive discriminations arising from the existing manufacturer's excise tax base—

(a) Gas incinerator garbage disposal units, which are in competition with electric garbage disposal units, should be taxed at 5 percent;

(b) Electric floor polishers and waxers, which are presently taxed under the category electric, gas and oil appliances should be removed from this tax base since they are in competition with untaxed vacuum cleaner attachments suitable for use in waxing and polishing floors;

(c) Tape and wire recorders should be taxed at 10 percent;

(d) Recordplayers, which are in competition with phonographs, should be taxed at 10 percent; and

(e) Tubeless tires should be taxed at a rate 1 cent a pound higher than tires requiring separate innertubes. This is recommended to preserve existing revenues from tires and tubes.

The committee rejected the recommendation that transitors, which are in competition with radio and television tubes, should be taxed at 10 percent.

II. RETAILERS EXCISES

1. Existing law imposes a 10-percent retail jewelry tax upon pearls, precious and semiprecious stones, and imitations thereof. The question as to whether or not a stone is semiprecious should not be decided until a sale occurs after the stone has been cut or polished. A cut or polished stone would then be subject to tax or free of tax, depending upon tests presently applied, such as Mohs' scale of hardness.

2. The so-called basket clause under the 10 percent tax on luggage should be removed and a longer list of articles should be specifically made subject to tax. They would be: Bathing-suit bags; beach bags, or kits; billfolds; briefcases of leather or imitation leather, brief bags; camping bags; card and pass cases; carryall bags; carrying kits; collar cases; cosmetic bags and kits; dressing cases; dufflebags; furlough bags; garment bags; designed for traveling; hatboxes for use by travelers; haversacks; key cases or containers; knapsacks, knitting or shopping bags (suitable for use as purses or handbags); makeup boxes; manicure set cases; memorandum pad cases (suitable for use as pass cases, billfolds, purses, or wallets); musette bags; pocketbooks; purses and handbags; ring binders, capable of closure on all sides, of leather or imitation leather; salesmen's sample or display cases, bags or trunks; satchels; shoe and slipper bags; suitcases, toilet kits and cases; tote bags; traveling bags; trunks; vanity bags or cases; valises; wallets; and wardrobe cases.

The chairman stated that the revenue effect of these tentative decisions will be found in the subcommittee report beginning on page 13. He added that detailed explanations of these recommendations will be found in this subcommittee report beginning on page 16.

Warsaw Katyn Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, last week, along with other members of the former select congressional committee which investigated the Katyn Forest massacre, I filed a resolution asking our State Department to forward to the Polish Communist Government our testimony and reports establishing former Premier Stalin and his Soviet leaders as perpetrators of the Katyn Forest massacre.

Reports are coming from Communist Poland that the present government is about to inaugurate a special investigation to establish whether Stalin and his coleaders murdered the approximately 15,000 Polish leaders at the beginning of World War II.

Four thousand, two hundred and forty-three of these leaders were imprisoned near the Katyn Forest and the remainder were confined to two other prisons in the western and northern sections of Russia. The bodies of the Polish leaders who were confined to the latter two camps have never been found.

The following letter by Julius Epstein which was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald May 5 sets out a timely suggestion that the American people make a gift to the Polish people in the form of a Katyn memorial to be erected in Warsaw, Poland.

If the present Communist government is so anxious to expose the international crimes of Stalin and his Communist leaders, they should not object to this patriotic gesture to former Polish patriots.

KATYN MEMORIAL

I want to call your readers' attention to the very significant fact that the Polish Government in Warsaw never dared to erect

a Katyn memorial in honor of the 4,243 Polish patriots massacred at Katyn. The reason for this negligence of a moral duty is obvious. The Warsaw Government knows too well who killed the Polish officers on Soviet soil. That government also knows that the Polish people know who the murderers of their brethren were. The unimpeachable result of the great American congressional investigation which fixed the responsibility for this crime—the greatest in modern military history—once and for all, became well known to every Pole on earth, before and behind the Iron Curtain.

I, therefore, suggest that the American people make a gift to the Polish people in the form of a Katyn memorial to be erected in Warsaw. This memorial should bear on its frontside the sole inscription:

"In Memoriam of the 4,243 Polish Patriots Massacred at Katyn."

To carry out this proposal, an "American National Committee for the Erection of a Katyn Memorial in Warsaw" should be formed as soon as possible.

JULIUS EPSTEIN.

NEW YORK.

Booker T. Washington: Builder of Good Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRADY GENTRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. GENTRY. Mr. Speaker, one of the truly outstanding men of this century was Booker T. Washington. A benefactor of all mankind, he gave the full measure of his devotion and energy to the building of our country.

Sidney J. Phillips, president, Booker T. Washington Centennial Commission, has recently written a most deserved and worthy tribute to this great American. It is as follows:

BOOKER T. WASHINGTON: A BUILDER OF GOOD WILL—HIS POLICIES, PROGRAMS, PRINCIPLES, PROCEDURES, AND PHILOSOPHIES

1. At no time in our Nation's history has there been greater need for racial harmony and sectional good will than at the present time. Booker T. Washington came upon the American scene at the time when the Civil War had left in its wake chaos, poverty, ill will, and misunderstanding among both races. The Negro race was sadly in need of guidance, opportunity, and practically all the material things of life needed to take advantage of the new life of freedom opened before them. The white group was divided, perplexed, and resentful because of the social and economic situation created by the release of nearly 4 million salves. Everywhere in the South there was intolerance and misunderstanding.

2. Booker T. Washington, with wisdom and humility far above the average, and first-hand knowledge of the needs of his people, set into motion a series of programs that made it possible to reach millions of Americans with the sound, fundamental ideas which were to bring order out of chaos, prosperity out of poverty, tolerance and Christian good will out of antagonism and misunderstanding. The effectiveness of his teachings is evidenced by the remarkable progress made by the Negro and the spirit in which the races have worked together to bring progress and prosperity to our land.

3. The recent ruling of the Supreme Court on segregation based on race, has created a situation comparable in many ways with that produced by the Civil War. Now, as then, many can be found in each group, who are filled with bitterness, tenseness, and resentment. Admittedly, there is room for the same calmness, sanity, and wisdom which Booker T. Washington exhibited and advocated at that time, and are necessary to a successful solution of the present-day situation.

4. The establishment of the United States post office at Booker Washington Birthplace, Va.; the issuance of the Booker T. Washington 3-cent centennial postage stamp; the erection of the Booker T. Washington National Monument at his birthplace, together with the proposed legislation for coinage of 100,000 Booker T. Washington centennial half dollars to provide funds for the projected year-long celebration of his 100th birthday, will reawaken the national consciousness to the value of his teachings.

5. Focusing national attention upon Booker T. Washington and all that he stood for can revive interest in the uses of his practical policies, programs, principles, procedures and philosophies as effective instruments today, which, having already proven their worth, can render invaluable service in paving the way to greater good will, greater cooperation and greater opportunity for all of the people of America.

6. Continued legislation authorizing the melting down of 100,000 Carver-Washington half dollars would place in the hands of the Booker T. Washington Centennial Commission a tool which would make possible the carrying out of the centennial program which is nationwide in scope and designed to achieve the results listed above.

Labor Is Critical

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to call attention of my colleagues to a statement just issued by the first legislative council of the AFL–CIO on the labor record of the 84th Congress.

The statement follows:

The industrial union department of the AFL–CIO, during the past 2 days, has reviewed and appraised the record of the 84th Congress and the unfinished business before it. Up to the present time, the record of the Congress has been "too little and too late" in vital areas of legislation. We are, therefore, disappointed by what we have found.

Both political parties have promised reform of the antilabor Taft-Hartley Act. There has not as yet been even so much as the lifting of a finger in this area. Instead, this already vicious law is being worsened by administrative decree of the Eisenhower Labor Relations Board.

Millions of Americans are still denied the protection of the wage and hour standards of the Fair Labor Standards Act. These Americans are condemned by congressional inaction to second-class economic citizenship. We commend action by the Congress in the last session to increase the minimum wage from 75 cents to $1 per hour, but point out emphatically that the job is only half complete. We will continue to press for labor's demand for increased coverage and for a $1.25 statutory wage floor to meet the minimal economic needs of our lowest income groups.

While the administration has finally recognized the need for Federal action to eliminate our economically distressed areas, its program is half-hearted and inadequate. Both parties are pledged to Federal action in this area. We call upon them to make good their promise with a program that will answer this problem of chronic unemployment that has afflicted thousands of American workers.

The industrial union department has special concern with the adverse effects of the Fulbright amendment to the Walsh-Healey Act. This has opened up a hornet's nest of litigation and threatens to destroy fair wage standards on Government contracts.

The American farmer has become the forgotten man of 1956 because of administration failure to formulate a satisfactory farm program. The industrial union department is especially concerned because of the continued decline in farm purchasing power. Already, far too many thousands of agricultural implement workers are unemployed and 120,000 auto workers are jobless for lack of customers.

We call upon the Congress to give immediate attention to the establishment of Federal standards on unemployment compensation. A school construction program is past due. It is time to end talk and begin action on an effective road program. There is an immediate and pressing need for a bold housing program to eliminate America's slums. America's elder citizens rightfully expect the Congress to improve our social-security laws. Now is the time for tax revision that will bring relief where it is needed—to the low- and middle-income earners of our land. We also call upon Congress to pass a safety bill for the ferrous and nonferrous mines.

The IUD extends its thanks to that small band of liberals and principled conservatives who in these trying days have fought the good fight for the American people and for all free men and women and who have refused to trade off the people's civil rights and civil liberties for political advantage.

The 84th Congress has 3 months left to go. It can still make for itself a record of which it may be proud, but it will have to work hard and with speed. The 72 affiliates of the industrial union department, having a total industrial membership in excess of 7 million, join with the national AFL–CIO in urging Congress to go forward full steam ahead. We seek those things that are good for all Americans because what is good for America is good for our members.

Opposition to Certain Recommendations of the Commssion of Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution regarding recommendations of the Commission of Veterans' Benefits which I have received from the chief clerk of the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County. I insert it in the RECORD because I am convinced after reading the report that the resolution is correct in its judgment and I am also certain that

it represents the will of nearly all veterans who have taken the time to study the Bradley report. This also gives me the opportunity of urging that the President at the earliest possible moment resolve the doubts and anxieties of many veterans who will be affected by such a program by repudiating or at least stating his complete disagreement with the findings of the Bradley report.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OPPOSING CERTAIN RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMISSION OF VETERANS' BENEFITS AND MEMORIALIZING MEMBERS OF UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND UNITED STATES SENATE WHOSE CONSTITUENTS RESIDE IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY TO URGE ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY IN THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION WITHIN LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK ALREADY ADOPTED

On motion of Supervisor Jessup, unanimously carried (Supervisor Ford being temporarily absent), it is ordered that the following resolution be and the same is hereby adopted:

"Whereas the Commission of Veterans' Benefits, appointed by the President of the United States, has made public certain recommendations by releasing its report to the press of the Nation; and

"Whereas the report of the Commission has described the system of veterans' benefits now in effect as 'weak' and 'backward looking'; and

"Whereas the Commission recommendations include the following:

"1. That social-security payments be deducted from the pensions of some veterans;

"2. That payments be based largely on need and degree of disability;

"3. That rates for compensation be geared to some average national earning figures and payments be based on loss of earning capacity, physical impairment, social inadaptability and shortening of life due to disability;

"4. That eligibility requirements for pensions to widows and children of veterans be revised and payments based largely on need or disability;

"5. That the World War II and Korean GI loan programs be transferred to the Federal Housing Administration;

"6. That a deadline would be established to determine length of time veterans with government term insurance would have to convert to permanent insurance; and

"Whereas while it is the opinion of the undersigned that efficiency and economy should and must be practiced in the Veterans Administration as it should in all branches and departments of government, the recommendations of the Commission, including those herein enumerated do not assure efficiency and/or economy not already provided in legislation and regulations governing operation of the VA without breaking faith with many thousands of veterans, widows and orphans whose very existence depends upon benefits currently in effect; and

"Whereas it was ever the intent of a grateful Nation to provide for the widows and orphans of its wartime fighting men, to provide hospitals and medical care and the subsistence of those disabled in our wars to keep this Nation free; certainly it was never the intent of our people and our Congress to make "charity cases" of these men and women who went forth into battle; and

"Whereas certain recommendations made by the Commission would, in the opinion of the undersigned, work undue hardship upon many thousands of disabled, aged and unemployable veterans and widows and orphans; and

"Whereas within the county of Los Angeles, State of California, reside almost 1 million of the 22 million veterans of this Nation, many of whom would inevitably become dependent upon county charity should certain recommendations of the Commission be adopted; Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the board of supervisors, county of Los Angeles, State of California, go on record as opposed to any recommendations of the Commission that would work hardships upon the men and women who are veterans of this county, including those recommendations herein enumerated; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the board of supervisqrs memorialize those Members of the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate whose constituents reside within the county of Los Angeles to acquaint those duly elected representatives of the action of this board, and urge said Representatives to do all in their power to bring about maximum efficiency and economy in the Veterans Administration within the legislative framework already adopted for that department of Government."

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of a resolution which was adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, on May 1, 1956, and entered in the minutes of said board.

HAROLD J. OSTLY,
County Clerk of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, and ex-officio Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of said County.
By GORDON T. NESUIG,
Deputy Clerk.

The Fight for Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1956

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks, I would like to insert this eloquent statement on natural resources given in my own State of Oregon by Adlai E. Stevenson. Because they have aroused so much interest and enthusiasm among conservationists throughout the country, I believe these remarks will be of very great interest to those concerned with protection of our natural resources:

If a man sent out looking for a laboratory in which to test the effects of conservation policies, good and bad, I doubt that he could improve upon the State of Oregon. Oregon has become a great national battleground where in the senatorial election ahead two sharply conflicting philosophies will be put to the test. In recent years you have sent to the United Senate to speak for you—and for the Nation—two men who come as close as any I know to consistently giving eloquent voice to the cause of conservation in its broadest sense. WAYNE MORSE and DICK NEUBERGER are concerned with public power, public parks, public lands—all the physical things that make up what we call our natural resources. They are no less concerned with our human resources, and they recognize the first truth that the two are really one. But there also has been another Oregonian in Washington in these past 3 years. You didn't send Douglas McKay—he was sent for by President Eisenhower. And in his 3 years as Secretary of the Interior Secretary McKay seems to have taken his stand squarely against all the things that WAYNE MORSE and DICK NEUBERGER stand for.

And now, in return for services rendered—or perhaps for other reasons—Mr. McKay has been sent back to Oregon by the Republican high command to attempt to unseat WAYNE MORSE who had the courage of his convictions to an extent that the Republican high command cannot condone. He went Democratic but I do not think anybody in Oregon has much doubt about how this challenge to a brave and gifted servant of Oregon is going to come out—with WAYNE MORSE on top.

But this context also has great significance, to you and to the Nation. For here you will see pitted the two conflicting philosophies around which revolve all the big issues of this campaign—the concept of government devoted to the service of a favored few. That's why you will find arrayed against WAYNE MORSE in the weeks and months ahead not only the Republican Party of Oregon but the Republican Party of the Nation, and behind this combination every special interest that ever made a fast dollar out of exploiting the natural resources of this country. I can tell you that getting WAYNE MORSE off the national stage is worth money, time, and effort to a lot of people who have never set foot inside the State of Oregon. And I can tell you that keeping him right where he is—right there in the national spotlight when a matter affecting the national interest is up for consideration—is a matter of great importance to many millions of us who can't vote in your election, but who are counting on you to do the right thing by us, and the country.

When the word conservation came into our everyday language the meaning was exact; to conserve for the future the national heritage that belongs to all of us.

The first objective was to save these lands from the onslaught of commercial interests, and they often lay idle. More recently, we have learned to use them wisely for the common good. Under public management millions of our people have been able to enjoy the unparalleled recreational opportunities of the national parks. And under controlled conditions private interests have been permitted to engage in selective logging, mineral prospecting, and grazing in the public forests.

The practices and the techniques of conservation have been with us so long, and have so proved their worth, that it would seem by now that this is one area of public activity that should have been removed from the political arena.

But the prizes are still tempting and men are still greedy—and, unhappily, politicians are still pliable. And so in the year 1956, we find ourselves still concerned—even as were Theodore Roosevelt, Gifford Pinchot, George Norris and Oregon's own Senator Charles McNary—still concerned with protecting the public lands against those politicians who would give away their bounty to private interests.

While I don't say that everything the Eisenhower administration has done is bad, let me review some of the things which the Eisenhower administration has done to the great natural and national resources which belong to all of us: Our rich offshore oil lands have gone to fulfill Republican campaign promises.

They have given away valuable pine and fir timber right here in Oregon's Rogue River National Forest, on the pretext that the Al Serena Co. was to mine for gold and silver.

They have given away or tried to give away other portions of our national forests for the use of private companies.

The Government's synthetic fuel and rubber plants have been sold at low prices.

The right to exploit our national wildlife refuges has been granted to about as many oil and mining companies in 3 years as in the past 33 years.

They have given away or tried to give away some precious rights of our American Indians.

They have given away one of the greatest water-power sites in the country at Hells Canyon.

They have tried to give away countless other riches which the people of this Nation alone possess—grazing rights on our public lands, Government-owned helium-production plants, and the infamous Dixon-Yates deal to give away a big profit at little or no risk to a private utility company, while at the same time striking a blow at the TVA which President Eisenhower once characterized as "Creeping socialism."

Sometimes I wonder what the great and courageous Republic conservationists like Theodore Roosevelt would say if they were alive today and could see what is happening to the gifts of providence under the regime of men who fear change, but not transfer. Aren't there any Republicans left today who will stand up and fight for our natural resources? There seem to be only 1 or 2, and they have lost favor with the Eisenhower administration. One of them is a man who was trained here in Oregon and received his doctor of science degree at Oregon State University—Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson. While I was Governor of Illinois, I called him in for a special survey of conservation problems in Illinois. He is a lifelong Republican, and his brother Guy Gabrielson was chairman of the Republican National Committee. For many years, Dr. Ira Gabrielson was head of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. Listen to what Dr. Gabrielson recently told a congressional committee: "This administration and its action on conservation matters comes nearer making a Democrat out of me than anything Roosevelt or Truman could do in all the years I worked under them."

All this is being done, I remind you, in the name of good business. Indeed, it was Secretary McKay who proudly announced when he came to Washington: "We are here in the saddle as an administration representing business and industry." I can't dispute the accuracy of that statement. It has been proved time and again, and confirmed time and again. And I say it's time for this administration to dismount and make room in the saddle for an administration which represents people.

One Hundred Sixty-Fifth Anniversary of Polish Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have the opportunity to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the noble people of Poland on this historical occasion—the 165th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791.

This constitution was greeted by the people of Poland with open arms, for its adoption brought with it tolerance, equality, and justice. The constitution of May 3, 1791, was truly a sincere effort on the part of Polish statesmen to better the existing conditions of the people by establishing a constitutional democracy. This document represented the will of the people and although it is not the law of the land in Poland today, it will never be forgotten.

In World War II, Poland, despite her unpreparedness, struck back at the overwhelming forces of the Nazis with great courage. After their nation was occupied, the Polish people attempted to do all they could to fight for the cause of freedom and the dignity of man. Polish forces were organized outside their homeland, and they fought in battles in France, Italy, Belgium, and Africa.

World War II ended over a decade ago, and the first nation to stand up to the aggressor in the global conflict still remains under the chains of slavery. I am reminded of the statement once made by Lincoln, "Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves." Poland and her noble people live under a regime that completely ignores the rights and the dignity of man. The conditions under which the Poles live today are appalling and incompatible with the principles of freedom and democracy.

Poland's hour of darkness has been a tragically long one, and today, more than ever, her people need a word of encouragement and of inspiration, to fortify them in their continuous struggle for freedom. On this auspicious occasion, we have the opportunity to tell the Polish people and others who have been enslaved, that we are not resigned to their present fate. We are confident that Poland is not lost forever and that she will again achieve her rightful position among the free nations, to contribute her efforts in the cause of peace and security.

Library Ground Breaking at Orchard Lake Seminary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, on May 6, 1956, there was held at Orchard Lake, Mich., a very impressive groundbreaking ceremony for the new Orchard Lake Seminary library building, being erected by its alumni association at a cost of $160,000.

It is noteworthy and laudable that a small group of alumni have taken steps to give this institution of learning, with a splendid record of accomplishment in its past, a new library to expand the facilities of book learning and to continue its contribution to the culture of our country.

Under leave to extend, I submit herewith the remarks made at this memorable occasion by one of its most distinguished alumni, the Honorable Frank G. Schemanske, judge of the recorders court of the city of Detroit.

The remarks follow:

We are assembled here this afternoon to witness and participate in a most significant ceremony in the history of Orchard Lake Seminary—the ground-breaking for Orchard Lake Seminary's new alumni memorial library.

To a very proud alumnus, one who has been a devoted admirer of Orchard Lake Seminary and an active participant in its affairs for more than 40 years this moment has tremendous emotional significance.

My life and my professional career have been closely linked with the development of Orchard Lake. Our beloved seminary is a part of my very being and I return here periodically for spiritual and mental regeneration and rejuvenation.

From books comes knowledge—and bear in mind that during the so-called Middle Ages, before the invention of printing, the monastic libraries and manuscript collections of our Catholic church were the sole repositories and reservoirs of Western culture and civilization.

For more than five centuries the collection and copying of books was almost entirely confined to our monasteries. Each monastery had its library—actually a book-publishing factory of monks—who painstakingly hand-copied and preserved the wisdom of the ages.

The Benedictines, the Augustinians and the Dominicans were the chief orders dedicated to this work, devoting untold thousands of man-hours to the preservation and dissemination of knowledge.

All of today's libraries of the Western World, whether publicly or privately operated and owned, had their origins in the monasteries of the church.

The dedication of any library is a momentous occasion, an event probably surpassed in importance to present and future generations only by the dedication of one of the Holy houses of our mother church.

Every phase of civilization, every facet of this world of ours, the records of our past and the hopes of our future will be found printed in the books of the library we will here erect.

The books to be found therein will be carefully selected by the wise and dedicated librarians of Orchard Lake, worthy heirs and successors to those medieval monks whose beautifully hand-illuminated and lettered manuscripts are our invaluable museum pieces of today.

Good books and the love of literature have always inspired the poets.

Longfellow wrote:

"The love of learning, the sequestered nooks,
And all the sweet serenity of books"

Wilbur Dick Nesbit told of the open door to happiness found within the covers of a book:

"Who hath a book,
Has friends at hand,
And gold and gear
At his command,
And rich estates
If he but look,
Are held by him
Who hath a book."

And in the same vein, Andrew Lang wrote:

"The love of books—
The golden key
That opens the enchanted door."

And now if you will indulge me in a bit of personal observation:

For many years my chief avocation and hobby, if it can so be termed, has been my work with the waterfront development of the city of Detroit. I have been a member of the Detroit Memorial Hall Commission for more than 25 years and am presently the president of this commission. The industrial giants of the Nation have worked with us—the Fords, the Chryslers, the General Motors executives—and this matchless beautification of Detroit River's shores is now blossoming into full fruition.

Permit me to take advantage of this occasion to make this public confession to my

friends of Orchard Lake. My personal pride in our billion-dollar Detroit waterfront development is equaled if not surpassed today by my pride in my own beloved alma mater—modest Orchard Lake—and the library we plan for this place.

Without doubt the alumni association—that great body in which the clergy and the laity work on a common level for the good of our school—is entitled to the greater share of the credit for this achievement. The standing building committee of the association assumed responsibility for the planning and the financing and we shall soon behold the material evidence of its labors.

However, we would be seriously remiss in our duties should we fail to also give a full measure of credit and thanks to the many friends of the institution and the parents of alumni who, though having no official connection, contributed liberally to make this great project possible.

Here in this beautiful sylvan setting the future students of Orchard Lake Seminary will have a magnificent library in which they will find "the golden key that opens the enchanted door" of knowledge and receive a broader vision of God's love as reflected in man's progress.

We are invoking God's blessing upon this construction in today's ground-breaking ceremony. Let us also ask for His continued blessing upon all of the activities of our beloved alma mater that she may continue to send forth her well-trained and dedicated sons to enrich our community's culture—thus extending the borders of her influence and spreading the fair fame of Orchard Lake Seminary.

Amending the Refugee Relief Act of 1953

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which is designed to amend the Refugee Relief Act by permitting 20,000 persons of Armenian ethnic origin to enter the United States under the provisions of the Refugee Relief Act.

For the past 2 years I have repeatedly urged that the total number of refugees admissible under the Refugee Relief Act should be increased substantially. The bill I have introduced today would do this very thing for 20,000 refugees of Armenian ethnic origin.

At the time the Refugee Relief Act was passed the Congress of the United States was very thoughtful of the oppressed peoples of the world who, because of political and economic conditions, became refugees. These include people from Greece, Italy, Germany, Austria, and Holland.

However, the Armenians in the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 were not included although they have been persecuted and driven from their homes during World War I and in World War II and also on many other occasions have been forced from their homes. It seems to me that their sufferings and hardships are certainly comparable to the sufferings and hardships of any other single minority group in the history of the world. That is why I am asking that Armenians of ethnic origin be included within that 1953 act.

I want to take this opportunity to point out that my bill covers those who have left the area of Turkey which was formerly Armenia either under duress, or voluntary in order to escape religious and political persecution. The coverage of the bill is limited to those who on the date of enactment are registered with a consular officer abroad for an immigrant visa. Their entry must be chargeable to a country that has an oversubscribed annual immigration quota of 310 or less. From the foregoing it is plain to see that my bill seeks to admit those who as a matter of practical fact could never be admitted under the annual immigration quotas established by the McCarran-Walter Act.

Here in the United States, a quarter of a million Armenian citizens of Armenian origin are living proof of the magnificent character and spirit of a virile race. The records show that Armenians have proved themselves worthy of being counted among the most useful and loyal racial elements of our Nation. There are many people of Armenian descent living in my Eighth Congressional District of Massachusetts and it is very true that their contributions to our economic, social, and cultural life have been most welcome and constructive.

When this proposal is enacted into law it will end the persecution of at least 20,000 of those maltreated and displaced ethnic Armenians, for whom their relatives in this country will provide homes and jobs aiding them to become useful citizens of this great country of ours.

Let's Not Be Fooled by Any Shenanigans of the New Soviet Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, the history of modern Communist dictatorship filled with repeated retractions of previous pledges and multitudinous betrayals of accepted trusts clearly warns us to beware of any real change in the Kremlin objective of world enslavement that may be implied by the newest Soviet leaders. Until they give to the world concrete evidence of the sincerity of pleas for peaceful coexistencce, we can place no reliance whatever upon their empty promises and we would, indeed, be foolish to be lulled into any feeling of security by the most recent and obvious grandstand gestures of Krushchev and Bulganin in their destruction of the myth of Stalin.

The wisdom of remaining on guard is very graphically pointed out in a most timely article entitled "Moscow Drops Stalin" which appeared in the March 20, 1956 issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram, which I am pleased to include at this point.

The editorial follows:

MOSCOW DROPS STALIN

The current attempt by the Soviet Government to de-glorify the late Joseph Stalin is a major revolution in Soviet political ideology. This campaign may involve the most sweeping readjustments of Communist doctrine to be witnessed since Stalin rewrote Leninism in the late 1920's. But it is always dangerous for us, on the democratic side of the Iron Curtain, to attempt to read special meanings into new internal Soviet policies. The danger always is that wishful thinking may lead us to see in these developments a softening of Communist theory and a weakening of the Kremlin's dictatorship. All too often the Kremlin has merely adjusted its line to fit the current situation a little better and to strengthen the grip of totalitarianism.

We must take it for granted that, despite the utmost efforts of Soviet censorship to keep the Russian people in a state of simple ignorance about the world outside the average Soviet citizen now knows more about the advantages of governmental systems in the free world than he did before World War II. We must also take it for granted that, despite the utmost efforts of Stalin's regime to deify its leader, a great many Russians maintained private reservations about the personal infallibility of that ruthless premier and the political infallibility of his version of Marxism.

As Khrushchev and Bulganin undoubtedly saw the situation they inherited, there appeared to be a great deal to gain from a program which says "let's stop kidding ourselves about Stalin." It would certainly be the kind of campaign which would make Khrushchev and Bulganin appear more plausible to the Soviet populace. The safest course is for the outside world to make no more assumptions than that.

It would be comforting, of course, to let ourselves believes that the anti-Stalin campaign means that Russia's new rulers want to see Soviet communism switch to an honest relationship with the Russian people and to proceed from here on a basis of truth and human decency. Eventually, if such were the real motives, we might expect the new Soviet attitude to carry over into Russia's relationships with the outside world. But there has been little evidence in the methods of Khrushchev and Bulganin to suggest that thy would ever consider such a departure. Until there is such evidence, the only safe conclusion is that the anti-Stalin campaign amounts to little more than routine Communist politics by a new Soviet dictatorship which does not wish to operate in the shadow of an earlier dictatorship.

Rumanian National Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, the 10th day of May is a significant one in the annals of Rumanian history. On May 10, 1866, Prince Carol was chosen to the throne of Rumania and a constitution of liberal principles was adopted. On May 10, 1877, on the eve of the war between Russia and Turkey, Rumania signed a convention with Russia which established further progress toward Rumania's freedom and self-rule.

And again on May 10, 1881, Rumania was recognized as a sovereign kingdom and proceeded to expand its ancient culture without interference from her powerful neighboring countries.

Today, 75 years later, there is little cause for rejoicing among the people of Rumanian ancestry. A government has been imposed upon that freedom-loving nation, which has practiced the most brutal acts of tyranny and despotism known to modern civilization.

Actions of that government are wholly contrary to the principles, aspirations and freedoms guaranteed by our American form of democratic government.

Voluminous testimony taken 2 years ago before the congressional committee, of which I had the privilege of being a member, disclosed vividly the firm resistance of the Rumanian people to this autocratic tyranny and their indestructible will to continue their struggle for freedom until it is fully restored to them.

The question of restoring freedom to that poor country is a problem which deeply concerns us in the United States.

The Austrian Peace Treaty, concluded a few months ago, contained provisions that within 90 days thereafter Russian troops shall be withdrawn from Austria and Rumania. The time has long elapsed and Russian troops continue to occupy Rumanian soil.

It is important for us to remember that the peace treaty provisions are guaranteed by the three great powers—United States, United Kingdom, and Soviet Russia—the treaty being a contract between those three powers and the interested countries.

Although, therefore, the violation was merely that of Soviet Russia alone, it is still the equal responsibility of all three powers to implement the provisions of the treaty.

Of course, we had no business to enter into an agreement as partners of the Soviets who had already amassed a record of breaking every treaty it entered into. But, at least, we could show our own good will by demanding forcefully that the Communists keep their pledge and withdraw the Red troops as they obligated themselves to do.

On this Rumanian Independence Day, I sincerely hope that the President of the United States and our Secretary of State reaffirm and prove our friendship to the people of Rumania and adherence to the cause of Rumanian independence, by demanding immediate action from Soviet Russia to keep the solemn pledges it had previously given.

How To Save Asia From the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include a very timely article commenting upon the attitude that should be taken by this Government toward Asia written by Mr. John Cowles, president of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, which appeared in the February 23, 1956, issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette.

The article follows:

HOW TO SAVE ASIA FROM THE COMMUNISTS

(From an article by John Cowles, president of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, who recently returned from Asia)

The American position is progressively deteriorating throughout most of Asia. If we want to be realistic we must recognize that before long we will probably face 1 of 2 alternatives:

1. Either the free world must be prepared to accept the loss to the Communist orbit of most of what remains of free Asia, and with it the tin and tungsten and manganese and other natural resources on which a substantial part of our own national security depends; or

2. We must rapidly adopt a bold, imaginative and appealing policy in Asia.

PARTNERSHIP APPROACH

It seems perfectly clear to me what our policy toward Southeast Asia should be. It is to adopt a partnership approach toward the 600 million people in the 10 new countries there that have won their independence since the end of World War II, a partnership in the cause of world peace and freedom. They have much to give. We have much to give.

Those nations in alphabetical order are Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, India, Indonesia, Laos, Pakistan, and Phillippines, South Korea, and South Vietnam. Perhaps Iran should also be included in this group. Perhaps Iran should be part of another program for the Middle East area.

Most of these countries are economically and politically extremely weak, but most genuinely want to establish themselves as independent, free, self-sufficient democracies.

LONG-TERM SECURITY

The United States, incomparably the strongest and richest democracy in the world, ought to regard it both as a necessity in connection with our own long-term national security and as a tangible affirmation of our own basic philosophical faith to help these struggling nations raise their living standards and maintain their liberties from totalitarianism.

These nations are all children of revolution. So is America. They all want to escape war, stay neutral and avoid entangling military alliances just as George Washington in his farewell address urged a then weak United States to do.

Should we criticize these politically immature and unstable countries for desiring to remain neutral as between the two colossal power blocs, the Communist world which abuts many of them on the north, and the free world, consisting primarily of the United States and Great Britain, plus a part of northwestern Europe, which is thousands of miles away?

OTHER NEUTRALS

Our own country stayed neutral for nearly a century and a half after its creation. We have learned to respect and esteem other nations which also have wished to remain neutral. Sweden and Switzerland are examples.

Instead of criticizing these new southeast Asian countries for their wish for peace through neutrality, we should give them understanding, encouragement, and financial aid, not solely for reasons of our own national security, but also because of our honest desire to see them succeed as independent democracies, and because of our deep, almost religious, American conviction that all men should be free.

Fortunately, the chance is good that if we act promptly and imaginatively and sympathetically, we can save this vital quarter of the world's population, and probably at only a small fraction of the financial cost of our Marshall plan aid to Western Europe.

WORTH SAVING

But Asia is overwhelmingly worth saving even if the cost should prove commensurate with that of the Marshall plan. Our own eventual freedom may be at stake.

Nor, in increasing our expenditures for foreign economic aid, should we reduce our expenditures to intensify our own military strength, particularly in the field of scientific research and development.

But those Americans who regard foreign economic aid simply as "giveaway programs" and glibly profess ambitions to liquidate them, should be wary that in the process they do not liquidate the whole free world.

Problems Involving Young People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, Chicago, as is true of other large cities, has faced serious difficulties in finding ways and means of resolving the many problems which arise involving young people. In April 1954 the Chicago Youth Commission was established to study the facilities available for youth services and to make recommendations on improvements to existing facilities and additional services which are needed.

The commission, through its chairman, Alderman Al Cilella, has made a very able report, and I request that its recommendations be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the recommendations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMISSION RECOMMENDS

The diverse aspects of the problem of youth in conflict with society has been the subject of research, study, and deliberation by the Chicago Youth Commission for the many months since April 1954.

Accordingly, the Chicago Youth Commission has reached certain conclusions with respect to this all-important problem and makes the following recommendations aimed at its solution:

1. That the membership of the Chicago Youth Commission be expanded to include representatives from all agencies in our community, both public and private, having as their goal the improvement of youth.

This will make possible a unified, intensified, and broadened attack upon the problem of juvenile delinquency.

The following agencies and organizations, the present commission believes, ought to be given such representation:

Association of Community Councils of Chicago.

Catholic Youth Organization.

Chicago Boys Clubs.

Chicago Council, Boy Scouts of America.

Chicago region, Illinois Congress of Parents and Teachers.

Chief Justice of the municipal court of Chicago.

Chief of Police of Chicago Park District.

Church Federation of Greater Chicago.
Citizens Schools Committee.
City Council of Chicago.
Commissioner of Police, city of Chicago.
County superintendent of schools.
Crime Prevention Bureau.
Family Court of Cook County.
Girl Scouts of Chicago.
Junior Achievement of Chicago.
Junior Association of Commerce and Industry.
Juvenile Protective Association.
Kiwanis clubs.
Lions International Clubs.
Mayor's advisory committee on juvenile delinquency.
President, board of Jewish education.
Sheriff of Cook County.
State's attorney of Cook County.
Superintendent, Chicago Board on Education.
Superintendent, Chicago Catholic School Board.
Superintendent, Chicago Parental School.
Superintendent, Lutheran High School Association.
Young Men's Christian Association of Chicago.
Young Women's Christian Association of Chicago.
Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago.

2. That police department personnel assigned to the juvenile division of the crime prevention division of the Chicago Police Department be increased to insure adequate attention to each juvenile offender; and that the training and instruction of police department personnel assigned to the juvenile division be continued throughout the years of their work in order that they may be cognizant of new practices, discoveries and developments in the field of helping the young; and that there be provided, in each police station an office or other suitable quarters in which the interviews of young offenders and their parents or guardians may be conducted; and that these juvenile officers be assigned to their respective districts on a permanent basis and that they be adequately compensated.

3. That proposed legislation be introduced in the Illinois General Assembly to fix parental responsibility for financial losses incurred through destruction of public or private property by children. This measure, it is believed, will discourage teen-age vandalism.

4. That the city of Chicago use every means at its disposal to prevent the sale and distribution of undesirable literature to juveniles; and that our city government and community agencies encourage and guide citizens in the boycott of purveyors of such reading matter; and that the censorship code, under which the Motion Picture Censor Board operates, should be reexamined with a view to the imposition of more rigid controls over the type of motion pictures which may be viewed by young people; and, further, that parents make a concentrated effort to supervise the motion pictures and television programs which their children see and the radio programs which their children hear.

5. That the city of Chicago authorize publication, through the Chicago Youth Commission, of a manual of counsel to parents on the subject of the rearing of families, prepared by recognized authorities on youth problems to be distributed without charge to all parents in the community.

6. That the authorities of schools, both public and private, institute immediate studies of the prevalence and the causes of truancy and the means whereby it can be curbed.

7. That the schools, both public and private, be urged to expand their remedial reading programs with all possible speed.

8. That all parents make a concentrated effort among their children to help restore respect for authority in the home, the school and throughout the community.

9. That the Chicago Youth Commission, in conjunction with all agencies and organizations concerned with the welfare of youth, undertake the dissemination among the clergy of the community of information relating to young people and conditions affecting them; this would enable ministers, priests, and rabbis to exert their influence, constructively and with enlightenment, upon the parents and guardians of children of their congregations.

10. That the recreational facilities, parks, playgrounds and play lots now under the separate jurisdiction of the Chicago park district, the city of Chicago and the board of education be made the responsibility of a single adminisrative body in order that unity of purpose and direction may lead to the correction of such omissions as may exist in terms of lack of facilities in highly congested areas; further, that qualified and trained personnel may be retained, under one management, to supervise and guide the leisure-time activities of children. Such a proposal may require enabling legislation, but the Commission feels the matter is important enough to warrant consideration.

11. That serious consideration be given to a return to the practice of assigning police officers to "walking the beat' wherever conditions warrant.

12. That the police forces of the Chicago park district and city of Chicago be consolidated, as has often been advocated, but pending such consolidation arrangements be concluded to effect a closer liaison and more efficient working relationship between the juvenile division of the Chicago Police Department and the juvenile bureau of the Chicago park district police department. The office of sheriff of Cook County should be included in any such arrangement.

13. That the mayor, the members of the city council, and the commissioner of police of Chicago give consideration, to adoption by the city of Chicago, if feasible, of the Police Athletic Association program with which the city of New York has experienced some success in channeling juvenile behavior into wholesome areas, and which consists in the assignment to each police district of a specially trained officer who befriends the young people of his area and guides them in games, sports, hobbies and other worthwhile pursuits thereby engendering not only respect for law and adults generally but a tendency to look upon policemen as friends and helpers rather than as enemies and persecutors.

14. That the curfew ordinance, as it now stands, be strictly enforced with all possible care being taken by the police department to inform parents of violations by their children as promptly as possible through a personal call by a police officer; this would be in addition to the written communication now required under the curfew ordinance.

15. That the Illinois General Assembly should reexamine our penal code and system with the view to determining whether or not they can be made more effective in rehabilitating juvenile offenders as well as in discouraging teen-age crime.

16. That, since the codes of conduct movement has been manifestly successful in many of our community's high schools, it be encouraged and expanded to include the elementary schools and additional high schools in order that teen-agers may be encouraged to solve their own and their contemporaries' social problems.

17. That the social service department of the municipal court of Chicago be adequately supported and given the means to increase its staff and expand its facilities in order to meet increasing demands which are made upon this all-important social agency for the rehabilitation of juveniles apprehended in the commission of crimes and misdemeanors.

18. That the Chicago Youth Commission be empowered to employ a full-time executive secretary to gather, assimilate, and transmit, immediately, such facts of juvenile delinquency as may become available; to maintain communications with other public and private agencies and organizations concerned with juvenile work; to lay the groundwork for new research; to disseminate information in the form of press releases, articles for appropriate publications and news outlets generally; to arrange for the attendance of Youth Commission representatives at meetings and conventions of groups concerned with the young at all levels; and to establish a speakers' bureau in order that all groups desiring information on the subject of juvenile difficulties may receive timely and helpful information and counsel, as speedily as possible.

19. That youth programs be developed in those areas where delinquency rates are high and increasing; or, if such programs already exist, that they be specifically expanded.

20. That our school officials give serious consideration to the immediate assignment of a larger portion of more highly trained and experienced teachers in difficult schools.

21. That a parent education program be formulated and developed coordinated with the school system and based on informal discussion groups focused on the responsibility of parents to youth.

22. That there be an annual appraisal of the year's accomplishment on behalf of youth by youth itself and the adult-dominated agencies concerned with youth's problems. An annual Chicago Youth Conference sponsored by the Chicago Youth Commission and attended by representatives from all our community's schools, by public officials and by members of all groups which work toward the betterment of Chicago, will provide a forum for our youth to be heard, lend encouragement to the young, and inspire the adults.

23. That the Chicago Youth Commission be adequately supported and given the means to carry out its recommendations and to accomplish the objectives for which it was created.

AMVETS Suggest H. R. 10469 as a Solution to the Extension of the GI Home Loan Guaranty Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John R. Holden, national legislative director of AMVETS, today informed the House Committee on Veterans Affairs that H. R. 10469, a bill I introduced April 12, is an acceptable solution to the extension of the GI home loan guaranty program.

His statements were in reference to the President's Bradley Commission report on veterans' pensions. Mr. Holden's statement follows:

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

Recommendation No. 45 advocates the transfer of veterans loan guaranty functions to FHA with an extension and gradual decrease of the World War II program over a 2-year period. We recognize the necessity for avoiding a last-minute rush and allow-

ing the orderly termination of the program. The Commission recommendation would certainly accomplish this but it is believed that there are other approaches to the problem that merit your consideration. We suggest as a possible solution H. R. 10469, which would authorize a 1-month extension for each 2 months of military service up to a maximum of 36 months. This would stagger the termination on an individual basis to permit orderly termination of the program.

The Hand That Rocks the Cradle Can Politically Rule the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include a most interesting editorial entitled "The Growing Power of Women in the Field of Politics," written by Mr. Robert C. Achorn, and appearing in the February 27, 1956 issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette.

This most competent commentator summarizes the background and development of the participation of women in politics in a very attractive descriptive manner, and I believe the content of his column deserves wide reading.

The article follows:

THE GROWING POWER OF WOMEN IN THE FIELD OF POLITICS

(By Robert C. Achorn)

Recent speculation about Clare Booth Luce as a possible candidate for Vice President provoked some opposition, as well as support.

The striking fact was this: very little of the opposition was based solely on the fact that she is a woman.

Apparently the public was willing to accept that, as it did her appointment to the sensitive position of Ambassador to Italy.

But it was not always that way.

JEFFERSON UNPREPARED

Almost 150 years ago, President Jefferson declared:

"The appointment of a woman to office is an innovation for which the public is not prepared, nor am I."

That philosophy—"woman's place is in the home"—had been brought to America by the early settlers. And it stuck until modern times.

The case of Mrs. Luce is one bit of evidence that it is breaking down.

It was only 36 years ago that the 19th amendment extended the vote to women on a nationwide basis.

It was less than 100 years ago that Kansas started the trend by permitting women to vote in school elections.

And now the ladies can carry the day—if they want to.

MORE WOMEN

The latest Census Bureau figures of persons eligible to qualify as voters show women in the majority.

The American Heritage Foundation, on the basis of special polls and studies, estimated more women than men voted for Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1952—17,600,000 women and 16,300,000 men.

Adlai Stevenson, on the other hand, had the support of an estimated 14,600,000 men and only 12,700,000 women.

There has been a gradual increase since 1920 in the number of women who turn out to vote.

In Worcester, in the early twenties, the number of men registered to vote ran well ahead of the number of women. But in recent elections, slightly more women were registered.

IN THE MINORITY

Still, women have not taken over in politics as many expected them to do once they were given the franchise.

They are in the minority by far at the national conventions which nominate Presidents.

There were only 203 women among the 1,652 delegates to the Democratic National Convention 4 years ago, and 128 women among the 1,206 delegates at the Republican convention.

No one has yet taken seriously the suggestion that one of the major parties nominate a woman for President.

Back in 1872, Mrs. Victoria Claflin Woodhull was nominated for the Presidency by a convention calling itself the Equal Rights Party. Later a party of the same name nominated Belva Lockwood.

NO ONE YET

But the Republicans and Democrats—so far—haven't found a woman even for Vice President. An effort initiated by women to promote Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine, for Vice President 4 years ago fell through. And Ambassador Luce has already disclaimed any ambition for the office in the event of an opening this year.

Three women have been proposed for the Vice Presidential nomination at Democratic conventions: Nellie Tayloe Ross in 1928, and India Edwards and Sarah T. Hughes in 1952. But all immediately withdrew their names.

Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt has been mentioned at times. But she herself has commented that women must acquire a great deal more experience before one of them will emerge with undisputed qualifications for the office of President or Vice President.

In Congress, they have done better. So far 60 have served in the House or Senate. There are 16 in Congress at the moment, an all-time high.

About half of all those who have served were first elected to fill out unexpired terms, usually of their husbands who died in office.

This at least protected the seat until the party could build up another male candidate. And some of the ladies did handsomely, becoming more prominent in Congress than their husbands had been.

MORE PROMINENT

Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Lowell, and Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio, are two examples. Mrs. ROGERS is 1 of only 2 women to have been chairman of a full committee; and she is presently ranking minority member of the House Veterans Committee.

At the State level, women have not made so much headway. Only two have been governors, Mrs. Ross of Wyoming and "Ma" Ferguson of Texas.

Out of 8500 State legislators across the country, only 300 are women. They include a half dozen in the Massachusetts Legislature.

SECRETARY OF STATE

There are 37 women currently in State elective offices nationally. Secretary of state is a popular responsibility for them. Seven States have elected women to that office.

It has become something of a tradition in Connecticut. Mrs. Beatrice Hancock Mullaney, of Fall River, was the Republican nominee for secretary of state in Massachusetts in 1952. She lost; but it seems likely that was only a temporary setback for the ladies.

President Jefferson's reluctance to appoint a woman to high position stood as the pattern for many years. The first woman Cabinet officer was appointed by Franklin D. Roosevelt. She was Mrs. Luce, Frances Willis was appointed Secretary of Labor in 1933 by Franklin D. Roosevelt. He was the first President to name women to top diplomatic posts.

Under President Eisenhower, Oveta Culp Hobby became the second woman Cabinet officer in history. In addition to the naming of Mrs. Luce, Frances Willis was appointed Ambassador to Switzerland.

LOCAL LEVEL

At the local level, women have played some part in government, particularly in school affairs. In late years, there has always been a woman on the school committee in Worcester.

But none has served in the city council since Mrs. Evelyn C. Bjorkman's term in the old 30-member common council ran out in 1947.

There are about 50 women mayors across the country. A few women have been elected sheriff and even coroner.

Someday, it seems, the hand that rocks the cradle will openly rule the world. But so far most of the ladies seem content to let the men think they are running the show.

Florida's Senator George Smathers Endorses GI Home Loan Guaranty Extension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Florida's Senator GEORGE SMATHERS too recognizes the need for immediate congressional action in extending the GI home loan guaranty program.

He has offered his assistance in obtaining favorable action on H. R. 10469 in this session of Congress.

I take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House the Senator's letter of endorsement and to urge them to make their views on this proven program known:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
May 2, 1956.

Hon. DANTE B. FASCELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DANTE: I would like to take this opportunity to commend you on introducing legislation to extend the Veterans' Administration guaranteed home loan program beyond July 25, 1957, the expiration date of the present law, on a sliding-scale basis.

Unquestionably your action will receive the full support of all veterans, veterans' organizations, and industry, for the extension of this program is of extreme importance to the economy of their respective communities.

Few of us realize that there are over 11 million World War II veterans under the age of 35, who have not used their GI home loan entitlement. Since a large percentage of these will be unable to take advantage of the present law unless it is extended, the need for this legislation is readily apparent.

There is, as you know, considerable sympathy in the Congress to extend the program, with adequate safeguards to protect the interest of the veteran home buyers.

I can assure you that I will most certainly cooperate in every way to be of assistance to you in obtaining favorable action on your bill in this session of the Congress.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE SMATHERS,
United States Senator.

The Labor Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD a reprint of a portion of a column that appeared in the Arizona Republic on May 4, 1956. This article was written by Mr. Frank Cullen Brophy, a scholar and a gentleman who has few equals in his use of English prose, and I feel this article should be brought to the attention of the Congress:

The labor problem, as I see it, is the human problem. It is the endless tragedy of man's inhumanity to man. Confucius faced it when he urged his fellow Chinese never to do unto others except as one would have them do unto them. When the Son of Man, who loved men as only God can love, came down to this earth, He simply said "Love one another." To those who could not see themselves except in the role of exploiters, He urged: "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and all things shall be added to you."

These are very unrealistic and impractical words according to the concepts of politicians, financiers, economists and labor bosses, yet they have come down the millenniums of years—challenged, but never erased. Each century has produced its little crop of politicians, demagogs, rulers, and powerful ones. Their words and pronouncements usually precede them into oblivion. They are the constant proof that the foolishness of God is greater than the wisdom of men; but, of course, the kind of men who deceive their fellow man, and thereby rise to seats of power and eminence, never admit anything so preposterous—at least in public.

The labor problem is one that touches all of us—rich and poor, fools and philosophers. Since the fall of Adam, man has been doomed to earn his bread by the sweat of his brow. The laborer does it at the end of a shovel, the corporation lawyer over a desk strewn with books and papers, the executive on a mahogany table with a mind bedeviled by doubts and hopes.

One day, I lunched with one of the richest men in America. He had a lettuce sandwich and a glass of milk. He looked as unhappy as Dives must have looked when he begged in Hell for just one drop of water. I have also lunched with a peasant on a bowl of strong soup, a hunk of French bread and a bottle of wine. He looked as happy as a king is supposed to look, but seldom does. This is the paradox of mankind. It is also the paradox of the labor problem. It cannot be solved by forcing men to join unions. It cannot be solved by strikebreakers and starvation wages. In fact, it cannot be solved—period. It can only be alleviated.

When those strong enough to maintain positions of power and trust will do for those beneath them as they would want it done to themselves were the positions reversed, then progress in easing the pain that gnaws at the heart of labor will be made. When those in authority reject the temptations of pride and greed and try to guide their actions with a spirit of fair dealing and justice, then progress in the labor problem is being made. When the man at the bottom, or in the middle, can face life with a minimum of envy, hatred, and greed, he is helping work out the labor problem though he may little suspect it. I repeat what I said in the beginning. The labor problem is the human problem, and the answer to the human problem will only be found in the mystery that lies hidden in the heart of God.

I frankly admit that my candle of vision is a tiny one; but if it has been lighted by only a spark thrown off from the mighty flame that is the Light of the World, then it will not have burned in vain.

The Agricultural Act of 1956

SPEECH
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10875) to enact the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, as one of the original sponsors of soil-bank legislation, I wish to add my voice in support of this legislation. This appears to be the sound approach to the problem confronting us today. The agriculture industry obviously is not receiving its fair share of the national economy. We are all striving to solve this problem so that agriculture can have a more equitable share of the national income. The "booming prosperity" has certainly failed to reach the farmers in my area. We are confronted with vast surpluses and are continuing to produce more than we are consuming or more than we can consume. This production must be controlled and it is obvious that legislation is necessary in this totally unorganized industry if we are to control this production. In my opinion, the soil-bank program with the conservation reserve and acreage reserve program could accomplish this goal. I am confident that this approach is correct morally as well as economically. It will permit us to conserve our natural resources by restoring our land. At the same time, it would be taking land out of cultivation which normally would be contributing to the surplus problem. In this way we would be conserving our soil for some future date when we will be consuming all we can produce—and that day is not in the too distant future. Therefore, I strongly support this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to state that I also support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], as the inclusion of grazing lands would conform with the principle of a soil-bank program. This amendment would expand the soil-bank program and would certainly have the effect of reducing the amount of meat being marketed, and, therefore, it would have a stabilizing effect on the agriculture industry. I believe that the soil-bank approach is the only means available for solving the farmers problems today with the exception of, perhaps, a direct subsidy. I have always been opposed to subsidies of any kind, and, therefore, I am not sympathetic to a direct subsidy program at this time. President Eisenhower's proposal, which is being offered in the form of an amendment, in my opinion, is a direct subsidy which is to be paid to the farmers before the money is due. In my opinion, this would be the same as paying the farmers for their grain and produce before they planted the seed. This amendment is obviously political, and, therefore, I am constrained to oppose the amendment. I do hope that the soil-bank bill we are considering is passed, as I feel it will tend to correct the problems confronting our agriculture industry today.

The Taxpayer's Burden Should Be Reduced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, it is now generally believed that the United States Treasury will show a much greater surplus at the end of the current fiscal year than that originally estimated by Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey. Last January Secretary Humphrey estimated the surplus at about $200 million. The Joint Congressional Economic Committee predicted in April a $2 billion budget surplus during this fiscal year. Our distinguished colleague the Honorable RICHARD M. SIMPSON, who is a member of the House Ways and Means Committee, has said he believes this year's surplus would be closer to $4 billion.

If the facts bear out these estimates and predictions, I think the time is propitious for serious consideration of a tax cut to benefit the low-income and middle-income sections of our population. Even if the surplus is around the $2 figure, instead of the $4 figure indicated by our colleague, it is still sufficiently large to warrant a reduction in the taxpayer's burden. Mr. Humphrey, as usual, claims it would be unwise, inexpedient, and unjustified to reduce personal income taxes at this time.

I believe the time to consider a tax cut that will benefit the lower income groups is right now, so that it can go into effect at the beginning of the next calendar year on January 1, 1957. In recent years, the low-income groups have not shared fairly in tax reductions, most of the tax benefits have gone to the big corporations, the big investors, and big business generally. The low-income and middle-income groups deserve tax relief without further delay. A tax cut for

low-wage families is desirable as a matter of equity. I fear that if this is not done in the near future, another giveaway of some kind will be found to split up this year's surplus among the rich and big business will walk off with a juicy plum at the expense of the lower-income groups.

Mr. Speaker, for this reason I am now introducing a bill to raise the existing tax exemption from $600 to $800 for all taxpayers and their dependents, including the exemption for old age and blindness. This measure is aimed to aid directly the low-income and middle-income groups by providing added income for each family. For the average wage-earner, adoption of my bill would mean about $3 more each week in his pay envelope, or about $150 additional income per family per year. Incidentally, the added income will undoubtedly augment the purchasing power of the Nation, stimulate greater consumption, help to improve business everywhere, take surplus goods off the shelves, and serve as a boon to the economy of the country.

My bill also seeks to help the taxpayer in another way. It contains an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code which provides for a deduction for parents for expenses up to $1,000 incurred in connection with the education of their dependent children. This deduction is to be in addition to the regular exemption now provided in the law. The bill requires that the dependent must pursue a bona fide course of higher education beyond the high school level, meaning at a college or university or other institution of higher learning.

Of late, we have had several surveys and reports by governmental and private agencies which indicate a growing shortage of scientists and professional people of all types. It is noted that Soviet Russia is educating young people in the scientific and professional fields at a more rapid pace than we are doing. If we continue at this rate, we shall undoubtedly fall far behind and in time endanger the national security and the social and economic progress of our country because of a lack of sufficient trained personnel.

The fact is that we are not lacking in human resources, nor does the youth of America show a lack of ambition or ability. It is simply that we are not doing enough to encourage our people, to afford them with the means and the opportunity to develop their abilities in accordance with the needs and the well-being of our country. It is generally accepted that there exists a great need for increasing the supply of our scientific and professional manpower, which is of such vital importance to the Nation in times of peace or war.

The best way to accomplish that is by encouraging larger numbers of our youth to seek a higher education. But a college education is quite an expensive undertaking these days, and in many instances it is beyond the reach of low and middle income families. The loss in such instances is not merely that of the individual concerned or his family, but it is a loss for the entire country. When added up, it might perhaps affect hundreds of thousands of young people who are denied the opportunity of a higher education, and that means a terrific loss of trained manpower at a crucial time.

For our own self-interest, I believe we ought to help lighten the burden for parents who desire to give their children a higher education. A mere $600 deduction for a dependent who is maintained at school is not a realistic approach to the problem. It costs the taxpayer several times that much to maintain a son or daughter at college annually.

In looking into the figures, I find that the United States Office of Education has made a study of tuition costs at 196 private and public institutions of higher learning and has come up with an estimated average annual tuition of $305 in the academic year 1954–55. A survey conducted by the New York Times and published in its issue of June 22, 1953, estimates the average costs of room and board at about $523 per academic year. To these costs, should also be added such expenses as books, transportation, clothing, and perhaps other expenses, all of which could conservatively be figured at about $500 per year per student. Thus, the average total expense would be around $1,300 annually. My bill, however, would allow a reduction on expenses up to $1,000, although in instances where students live at home and no expenses are involved for room or other costs the figure would be considerably lower.

What would be tax savings to parents, or the revenue loss to the Government? It is difficult to give exact figures, but a rough estimate can be made. The Census Bureau estimated the number of college students in the country through the age of 24 in the current academic year at 1,824,000. Allowing for full-time and part-time students, and also deductions for tuition paid by the GI bill and other methods, the total tuition incurred for tax purposes is estimated at $309 million. For purposes of computation it is reasonable to assume that 25 percent would be a fair tax percentage to use in this instance, yielding a total of over $77 million. This means that about $77 million would accrue to parents of college students as a saving on their taxes which they would apply to tuition.

Even if we include tax savings on room, board, and other expenses, the total loss to the Government would not exceed $200 million annually. This is not a huge sum, comparatively speaking. We shall be spending about 25 times that amount in foreign aid alone during the coming fiscal year.

From the standpoint of our Nation's needs, we must approach this problem in a more practical manner. We must give the taxpayer a fair deduction for educational expenses in order to encourage him to afford a higher education for his dependent children. The resulting loss in revenue to the Government would be made up a hundredfold in the long run and the whole country would benefit by it.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that if Congress could see its way clear to amend our tax laws in these two respects—by increasing the exemption from $600 to $800 and by providing a deduction for educational expenses—the burden of the taxpayer would be considerably reduced.

Highway Bill a Must

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, a bill to carry out President Eisenhower's $52 billion expanded highway program has been passed by the House of Representatives. That bill, however, has not as yet been accepted by the United States Senate. This greatly desired and desperately needed roads program will not be law until both House and Senate have agreed upon a roads bill and the President has signed that bill.

Giving a green light to this proposed gigantic expanded highway program is one of the musts of this session of Congress.

Traffic experts say that unless the Nation builds more, better, wider, and safer highway that by 1965 the traffic death toll will reach 50,000 a year and that the maimed and injured in traffic mishaps will total 2 million annually. The same traffic experts say that were the roads, proposed in the House bill, in existence today not less than 10 percent of these traffic deaths and injured would be prevented. In short, the roads provided for in the House bill when constructed will save not less than 5,000 lives and prevent not less than 200,000 injuries a year.

All types of safety crusades are good but the most effective safety measures of all is that of providing better roads, for bad roads are the greatest cause of death and accidents on our highways.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial on the need for highway legislation from the Aberdeen Daily World, Aberdeen, Wash.:

HIGHWAY BILL A MUST

In a year that has not yet produced much constructive national legislation, the United Seates Senate now has a golden opportunity to get things off the ground by passing the $52 billion House-approved highway program.

The measure in question would give this Nation the biggest road-building program in its history. And anyone aware of the scale of our highway problem knows that a lesser plan would be no service to the country.

Under the new program as endorsed by the House, $27.5 billion would be spent over a 13-year period to build a 40,000-mile network of superroads across the United States. The Federal Government would put up 90 percent of the cost, the States the remainder.

The other 20-odd-billion dollars would be devoted to expanding the existing Federal-State highway program under which costs are equally shared between the two levels of government.

To foot the cost the new proposal carries higher taxes on gasoline, diesel fuel, tires, retreaded rubber, and on trucks and buses—the heaviest highway users.

Broken down, it is estimated these levies would cost the average motorist another $6.50 a year, or about 2 cents a day. The truck operators properly would feel a bigger bite, some $400 a year increase for running a large truck.

As the Senate contemplates this huge measure, it has for comparison the 5-year, $18 billion highway program it approved last year. On the face of it, this latter plan is thoroughly inadequate to the kind of long-range projection the Nation's highways need.

The regular Federal-State program has been insufficient for years. The proof is in the growth of the turnpike network built by revenue bonds paid for by motorists' tolls. Drivers have been willing to pay these charges because they meant wonderful miles of express routes free of stoplights, cross traffic, side road handicaps, and the like.

It has been fairly said that with a few exceptions the turnpikes have been the only truly modern highways in America.

The question before the Senate now is whether it is prepared, as the House evidently was, to plan highways in terms as big as the problem. The Government of the United States has a responsibility for this program. Up to now it has abdicated that responsibility.

Billy Hill at 80

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, on March 22 the distinguished minority leader paid a well-deserved tribute to William S. Hill on the occasion of his 80th birthday. At that time he obtained permission for other Members to extend their remarks. This happy occasion has only now come to my attention. Belatedly, therefore, I take great personal pleasure in joining to felicitate the one and only Billy Hill.

William S. Hill—as he is formally known—has led a busy, fruitful life.

His contributions to his State, his city, and his party are unequalled. For years he has published the Binghamton Sun, and for over 30 years he served with distinction as a member of the New York State Parks Commission.

Special tribute should be accorded Billy Hill's contributions to the Republican Party. For upward of 60 years his energy and ingenuity have helped to guide the destinies of the party. His claim to the title of grand old man of the Republican Party in New York State is unchallenged.

He has led the Broome County Republican Committee in such a manner as to win unparalleled trust and confidence. Members of both political parties look to him for guidance and advice. He served from March 1919 to March 1921 as a Member of the House of Representatives, and has been a member of the New York State Republican Executive Committee, and a delegate to the Republican National Convention for many years.

Active as his life has been, Billy Hill has never been too busy to fail to win the affection of all who have come in contact with him. His integrity, wisdom, courage, and vigor are legend in New York State. In my mind I always think of him as the "Sage of the Southern Tier."

On this, the occasion of the beginning of Billy Hill's 81st year, I salute him for his varied accomplishments and wish him many more years of activity and good health.

Russian Tanks Crushed 500 Ukrainian Women in the Karaganda Slave Labor Camp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 8, 1956, the Honorable Charles J. Kersten, former Member of the House from Wisconsin, delivered a most significant address in Chicago, Ill., to the Ukrainian National Women's League of America, Inc., and Women's Organizations in Chicago. The occasion was a commemoration of the massacre of 500 Ukrainian women by the use of Russian tanks in the Karaganda slave labor camp of the Soviet Union. It will be recalled that Mr. Kersten was the chairman of the Select Committee to Investigate Communist Aggression of the 83d Congress. As chairman of that committee, he gave unselfishly of his time, his many talents, and his rare leadership. The reports of the Select Committee to Investigate Communist Aggression have become generally recognized as the most complete, authoritative, and dependable sources of information on the international Communist conspiracy.

Mr. Kersten possesses a background of experience equaled by few Americans and he has sought to put that experience to work for the safety and security of the American people. As a member of that former committee and one who has watched with intense interest the never-tiring efforts of Mr. Kersten to expose the stark and evil realities about communism, I include his address in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, dobri vachir.

At the outset I want to thank those of you here today who cooperated with our Committee on Communist Aggression in conducting its hearings in Chicago in the fall of 1954. The reports of these hearings have gone all over the world and even behind the Iron Curtain. The violent attack made upon them by Moscow is a testimony of their effectiveness.

The good people of Ukrainian origin in the Chicago area have thus delivered a blow to Moscow imperialism the full results of which the tyrants have yet to experience.

Heading the Chicago hearings was one of the country's outstanding champions of the enslaved nations; the Honorable MICHAEL FEIGHAN. His fight for freedom of the captive nations has given the Muscovites many bad moments and will give them many bad days in the future.

I want to pay a special tribute also to the excellent work in support of our hearings by that eminent citizen of Chicago, Mr. John Duzansky. He worked for more than 2 weeks, I understand, in locating witnesses of Russian Communist aggression who now reside in the Chicago area. His support of the Ukrainian cause of liberation has been a lasting one and I'm sure that he, too, is high on the lists of the Kremlin tyrants.

Today we are memorializing one of the latest known Russian Communist massacres in Ukraine. It is one of the most horrible.

While the Kremlin gangsters were making plans for their ultimate meeting at Geneva with the heads of state of the United States, Great Britain, and France at what became known as the Summit Conference, their troops were crushing the bodies of innocent Ukrainian women into the cold earth at Karaganda.

These actions are reminiscent of the line from Shakespeare, "Why, I can smile, and murder whiles I smile."

The long history of Russian Communist atrocities in Ukraine—the unparalleled forced starvation of the thirties, the Vinnitzia massacre, Khrushchev's bloody scourge from 1944–47—are now climaxed by one of the most fiendish crimes of history.

Here is the pitiful story of this latest tragedy as it came from behind the Iron Curtain:

More than 500 Ukranian women labor slaves linked hands and marched to their deaths beneath the tracks of Soviet tanks in a vain attempt to halt an armored attack on a Siberian concentration camp.

The text of the senational broadcast by Dr. Fedor Varcony, a Hungarian physician who was recently released from a Soviet labor camp, was received in New York today. Dr. Varcony's broadcast dealt with the events during an uprising in the immense Kingir camp in Karaganda Province in which prisoners sought to counter MVD machineguns with rock-filled bottle grenades. The labor slaves managed to hold their own until the T–34 tanks punched through the camp defenses. The 500 women slaves, inmates of the camp, desiring to stop the tank onslaught, formed a chain of their bodies. This human cordon did not stop the MVD, who pushed forward with their tanks and crushed these 500 women.

After the uprising had been quelled, 1,600 persons were sent to northern Siberia, some to state prisons, Dr. Varkony said. The strike was not entirely in vain, however, because the 8-hour working day was introduced, some of the invalids and youngsters were set free, and prisoners who had served three-quarters of their terms were given a conditional release. Further, the recent large-scale Soviet Government amnesty was motivated, partly by the Kingir and similar uprisings, Dr. Varkony declared.

This uprising in Karaganda proves once again the tremendous forces of resistance in the nation of Ukraine as well as in the other enslaved nations of the U. S. S. R.

When the free world fully realizes the extent of this resistance and gives it their all-out support we can then successfully cope with Red imperialism and prepare its political defeat.

The free world has no reason whatsoever to put the slightest faith in Russian Communist sincerity.

If the present Russian leaders had the slightest sincerity in their new anti-Stalin line they would denounce Stalin's proclaimed world-conquest role for the Red army as a bloody instrument of Red colonialism and they would stop the vast subversive training centers he set up in the U. S. S. R.

While they piously claim they have no intention of interfering in the internal affairs of other countries, today's Soviet leaders are carrying on full blast the subversive centers set up by Stalin at such places as the Lenin Institute, the Varga Institute, Frunze Military Academy, Voroshilov Higher Military

Academy, and elsewhere, for the training of cadres of subversive agents to take over every country to subject them to the Red Empire of Moscow.

Stalin officially and publicly described the Red forces as "an army of world revolution." Soviet military handbooks contain Stalin's statements that the Communist military machine is an international army of workers and peasants to be used for the liberation of oppressed peoples, meaning to include, of course, the people of the United States of America.

The Stalin-made Red international armed forces and their complementary vast network of Soviet trained cadres for every country are designed to establish world Communist imperialism by advanced techniques of subversion and, if necessary, by force.

These Soviet subversion schools have highly scientific courses in fomenting uprisings, development of conflicts between foreign nations, disguises, poisoning, garrotting, Lenin's tactics in seizing leadership in foreign countries, and so forth.

A special course is taught at the Frunze Academy on tactics in the U. N., designed to turn that forum into a place for Communist political warfare.

Soviet-trained cadres have been operating in the Middle East, for some time. They cover the Far East and north Africa. Cadres for South America, where they concentrate on infiltration of Latin American schools, are directed out of Czechoslovakia and they are able to send 1,500 students annually from South America to Iron Curtain countries for training.

There is really only one answer to world Communist subversion and that is the intelligent implementation of the widespread resistance among the enslaved nations of the Soviet orbit.

Nowhere is this resistance more formidable than among the 40 million people of Ukraine. Molotov in the 1920's was one of the earliest executioners in Ukraine. Khrushchev was one of the later killers in Ukraine. Between 1944–47 Khrushchev drenched his hands with the blood of thousands of his victims in Ukraine.

The screams of the dying women as they were crushed into the earth of Karaganda would not, of course, touch hardened hearts of the Kremlin gangsters. Such screams are the music of hell in which these diabolical characters take delight.

But they should touch the hearts of freemen and awaken the slumbering chivalry of the West to a realization that our lot is with the crushed nations and not with tyrants.

Needless Delay in Tax Savings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD an editorial from the New Haven (Conn.) Register of May 3 on the subject of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

It is discouraging to note that these proposals, made after months of careful study and research, do not appear to be welcomed by Congress. It does not seem likely that reductions in taxes will be brought about unless additional progress is made in cutting the burdensome costs of running our Government. Congress should give serious and active consideration to the recommendations which could bring this about and at the same time maintain the high level of Government efficiency:

NEEDLESS DELAY IN TAX SAVINGS

Ten months have passed since the Hoover Commission for Government reorganization made its report to the President. Taxpayers have heard repeatedly, from supporters of the Commission's findings, that adoption of all of the reforms urged by this group could save the country close to $5 billion.

Why, then, should the executive department and Congress postpone putting such money-saving recommendations into effect?

The proposed reforms are seldom openly criticized. Their adoption is urged by prominent Democrats and Republicans alike. James A. Farley, the former Democratic Postmaster General who served on the second Hoover Commission, is one of the more vigorous champions of early action on these dollar-saving proposals. Yet Congress itself still appears to form the biggest roadblock in the reforms' path:

Approximately half of the Commission's 314 recommendations require legislation to be made effective. Twenty-two percent of the Commission's formal proposals have been adopted thus far—18 percent by executive action and only 4 percent by congressional legislation.

It is difficult to understand this apparently lethargic attitude in Congress toward reforms which would go far toward restoring the traditional congressional control over Government's purse strings. That control has been largely lost through the years of obsolete appropriations procedure.

The Hoover Commission stresses the need for making a business-type cost accounting system effective throughout the Government. One would expect an alert Congress to leap at the opportunity to regain purse-string control by such means.

But Congress has yawned, rather than leaped, thus far.

Perhaps what's needed, among other things—and those other things might well include some prodding by the White House—is a rising clamor from the people back home, in every Congressman's district, urging enactment of the Hoover reforms.

The opportunity to save $5 billion may look like peanuts to legislators accustomed for many years past to toying with appropriations of almost unimaginable proportions.

Five billions are not peanuts, however, to the people who have to foot Government's bills. Five billions less, out of the people's pockets, would mean an appreciable lightening of the tax load—a consequent addition to take-home pay for which almost all of us could find some worthwhile use.

Comment on Statement Regarding Admiral Radford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include my newsletter for the present week regarding a statement by Admiral Radford and the press.

I think it is time cognizance should be taken that the freedom of the press should in no way be interfered with:

The newspaper editors of our country must be puzzled, indeed, by the reported statement of Adm. Arthur W. Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, that our free press is partly responsible for confusing and perhaps alienating our allies.

The admiral's position is that the free press—which he seems to regard as something of a necessary evil—digs around and comes with so much divergent and contradictory material on national policy that it is difficult, if not impossible for friendly nations abroad to follow the ins and outs of our policies. In contrast, he told the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the Communist line is more definite and consistent.

This may or may not be true as between our country and Soviet Russia. After all, the highest Communists in the Soviet hierarchy seem to have been very busy lately rewriting their own line to suit the newest conditions arising out of their devaluation of Stalin. But at least when Khrushchev puts out a policy statement, nobody else in the high command dares to dispute it.

On the other hand, we find numerous instances day after day in our own Government when one official disputes another, when one department's policy position is contradicted by another, and when the President and his Cabinet are not only disputing each other but changing their own statements in a few days' time.

This may be inefficient from Admiral Radford's point of view, but unfortunately it is the situation. What probably puzzles the newspaper editors, however, is what the admiral thinks they should do about it.

Should they edit the President's statements? Should they censor Cabinet officials who stick their feet in their mouths? Should they suppress the comments of high-ranking Government leaders just because their honestly held views might confuse people abroad?

The fact is that whenever the free press acts as if it considers itself the protector of a particular administration in office and considers its functions that of presenting the administration always in the best possible light—even to the extent of editing the President's statements, censoring Cabinet members or suppressing dissenting views of top officials—then the less it fulfills is obligations to the people of this country and to the cause of American democracy.

FAULT LIES NOT WITH PRESS

I would say to Admiral Radford that if there is confusion abroad about our policies, that is not the fault of the American press for reporting the contradictions in high policy. The fault would lie in the indecision and the wide diffusion of authority and in the lack of central direction and control over the farflung agencies and functions of government.

The Government of our country just can't be run successfully along the military chain-of-command principle. Mr. Truman used to point out, with a little slogan on his desk: "The buck stops here." It can't successfully be passed down to lesser officials. Policy must be centered at the top.

This is not to say that there should be no room for disagreement or controversy within an administration. The experts in the staff positions should certainly have an opportunity to voice their views and get them to the top through the regular channels. No one is infallible, and each high official should be big enough to listen to all the arguments—and even to pass along to the President the fact that there is disagreement on some important policy matter.

Instead, we have found by reading the resourceful American press, and through

congressional hearings as well, that the President is frequently unaware of disagreements in his official family on some of the vital issues confronting the country. Dissent seems to be hushed up and kept from him. That is a bad policy.

On the Road to World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the Chicago Tribune of May 4, 1956, entitled "The So-called Atlantic Community." Expansion of NATO can only mean, as I see it, the first step on the road to world government:

Business of very serious import to Americans may arise at the meeting of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's council in Paris this week. Secretary of State Dulles suggested at the Associated Press meeting that the time has come to "advance NATO from its initial phase into the totality of its meaning." He expanded that at his press conference a few days later by admitting he was thinking of broadening American involvement in NATO through both political and economic ties.

A couple of union-now enthusiasts have taken this up. Lester Pearson, the Canadian secretary for external affairs, stopped off in London on his way to the NATO meeting to tell the English-speaking union that NATO can become the foundation for "the Atlantic community of the future." He suggested an immediate extension of NATO's powers into the political field.

"It surely does not take much hard thinking to come to the conclusion that in their own interests nation states should work toward supranational communities," Mr. Pearson said.

In Oregon, where he is campaigning, Senator KEFAUVER, who for several years has introduced an "Atlantic unity" resolution in Congress, remarked of Mr. Dulles' proposal that "it's about time." He said that he was addressing "a challenge" to Dulles to produce "a sound transformation of the grand alliance."

The nature of this "transformation" is suggested by KEFAUVER's resolution, calling for a convention of NATO member delegates representing the principal political parties of each member country to study the extent to which the peoples of each of these countries would go in forming "a more enduring union."

What this amounts to is a proposal that the United States become a province in a super-government, along with 14 European countries. Mr. Pearson is talking about the same thing when he refers to "the Atlantic community of the future" and urges the desirability of nation states working toward "supra-national communities." And that is what Secretary Dulles is talking about, too, when he uses the same phrase—"Atlantic community" [originally produced by the New Deal secretary of state, Dean Acheson]—and says that NATO "reflects the spirit of western civilization."

We find it most peculiar that a secretary of state should so easily manage to forget the counsel of George Washington that "Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation," and that her frequent controversies "are essentially foreign to our concerns."

We find it both odd and startling that a United States Senator should seek Presidential nomination on a platform of liquidating the sovereignty of the United States, and should, moreover, be indorsed by his party electorate in more than one State.

But the fact that a variety of men of some political standing all seem to agree at the same moment that the time has arrived when it is safe to discuss the disappearance of the United States into a super-government suggests that a danger exists which is not trifling. For never since the War for Independence has it seriously been proposed that Americans might be called upon to pay their loyalties to any political entity other than their own government.

GI Home Loan Commitments May Be Stopped After January 1, 1957

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, an Associated Press news article appearing in the Washington Post last Sunday calls our attention to the possibility of a January 1, 1957, cutoff date of the GI home loan guaranty program.

Thomas J. Sweeney, Director of the VA's Home Loan Guaranty Service, says this will be an absolute necessity unless Congress acts favorably on legislation proposing an extension beyond the present July 25, 1957, expiration.

Mr. Sweeney's recommendation to Administrator Higley for cutting off commitments after January 1, 1956, should cause concern among the members. My colleagues should join in urging immediate consideration of pending legislation which would extend this program which has proven so valuable to our entire economy.

H. R. 10469, a bill I introduced April 12, 1956, would prevent this abrupt cutoff.

The Associated Press article follows:

GI HOME LOAN COMMITMENTS MAY END BY JANUARY 1

The Veterans' Administration is considering cutting off commitments for GI home loan housing after January 1 in the event Congress does not this year extend the loan program.

Thomas J. Sweeney, Director of VA's Loan Guaranty Service, informed a reporter that he had made a recommendation to that effect to Harvey J. Higley, Veterans' Administrator.

Sweeney said he is not campaigning for an extension of the program beyond July 25, 1957, adding that decision is entirely up to Congress. He explained he is looking ahead to what administrative action will be needed if Congress does not act this year.

"The VA can guarantee only those GI loans which are completed and made by July 25, 1957, under the present law," he explained. "It can only guarantee those loans closed and filed by the private lender with VA before the expiration date."

Sweeney said his recommendation to Higley was that in the event the program is not extended this year, public notice should be given all interested parties on or about January 1 that no new commitments for proposed new housing units will be made.

He explained that usually it takes as much as 60 to 75 days to get big housing projects underway after a builder seeks VA approval. Under existing law all such projects must be completed and the GI home loans must be completed by July 25, 1957, unless there is an extension of the program.

He stressed there must be sufficient time to complete such projects and process the loan before the cutoff date.

The 8-Year Campaign of Representative James E. Van Zandt, of Pennsylvania, To Increase Coal's Share of Fuels Used by the Atomic Energy Commission Is Now Producing Encouraging Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, since his election to Congress in 1938, my colleague from Altoona, Pa., Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, has been zealous in his efforts to assist the coal industry in maintaining its acknowledged position as the most dependable fuel available in any emergency from the standpoint of low cost, abundant supply, and dependable performance in supplying energy requirements.

As a member of the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Representative VAN ZANDT has directed his efforts toward increasing coal's share of the fuels used at Oak Ridge, Tenn., by the Atomic Energy Commission.

The following article from the March 1956 issue of the Coal Herald reveals the success of Representative VAN ZANDT's campaign on behalf of King Coal whose survival means the preservation of one of the basic industries of the Nation and especially of the great State of Pennsylvania:

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT'S CAMPAIGN IS PRODUCING ENCOURAGING RESULTS

The 8-year campaign of Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT to increase coal's share of the fuels used at Oak Ridge, Tenn., is now producing encouraging results, according to the Atomic Energy Commission's latest fuel-purchasing policies at that installation.

A letter from the AEC to the congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which Congressman VAN ZANDT is a member, reveals that a modification of contracts with suppliers of natural gas enhances coal's prospects to the greatest degree since 1948, when arrangements were made to bring in substantial quantities of gas. The revision sharply reduces the firm contract for gas supply, thus practically assuring a marked upturn in the use of coal.

Under the new contract, either the supplier or consumer is permitted to reduce the Oak Ridge gas commitments from 60 million to 20 million cubic feet per day. The AEC letter to the joint committee thus noted that "coal procurement will be increased as required to maintain the desired levels of operation."

Congressman VAN ZANDT said today, in making the letter public, that the change in policy had been brought about by (1) economic advantage of coal over gas in the Oak Ridge area and (2) recognition by the Federal Government of the coal industry's ability to guarantee adequate supplies.

"An economic analysis by AEC shows that revising the firm gas contract will result in lower fuel costs at the AEC facilities so long as coal prices do not exceed 35 cents per million B. t. u.," Congressman VAN ZANDT explained. "With this clause providing for such a large percentage of the gas supply to be served on an interruptible basis, the coal industry is given an opportunity to supply these energy requirements."

The Government's contract for a daily supply of 60 million cubic feet of natural gas at the Oak Ridge plant was negotiated in 1948, and Congressman VAN ZANDT registered his first objections before the joint committee a short time later. He protested that the move would create unemployment among coal miners as well as railway workers who depend upon coal traffic for their jobs.

A report on a joint committee hearing in May 1949 records this warning from the Pennsylvania Congressman:

"I think we are doing an economic harm. I am thinking of the coal miner and the railroader, and I am thinking of the taxes that are paid by them and by their employers."

At that time Congressman VAN ZANDT also pointed out that coal should be given a favored position by all Government facilities adjacent to coal areas not only because that fuel would be available in emergency periods, but because of its abundance. An AEC representative at those hearings defended his agency's position by stating that gas reserves were then set at about 30 years.

In recalling that statement, Congressman VAN ZANDT today added this comment:

"Since that day when the Atomic Energy spokesman referred to the 30-year supply of gas, almost 7 years have elapsed and the life index of natural gas has gone down to a greater extent than he had anticipated. I intend to familiarize my colleagues on the joint committee with a closer analysis of the reserves supply of both coal and natural gas, and I hope that we shall be able to prevail upon the AEC to turn to coal for an ever-increasing portion of its energy requirements.

"The Oak Ridge developments as regards fuel purchasing are highly encouraging to both the coal operator and coal miner, as well as to everyone connected with the railroad industry, and I feel that the AEC is to be congratulated for its forthright approach to the fuel supply problems under present conditions."

Federal Aid for School Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 27, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include a press release of the Independent Voter of Illinois regarding the enforcement of the Supreme Court's school integration decree in connection with the bill to provide aid for school construction:

In a letter sent to President Eisenhower today concerning the bill to provide Federal aid for school construction, the Independent Voters of Illinois called upon the Chief Executive to commit himself to withhold Federal funds from school districts not acting in good faith to comply with the Supreme Court's school integration decree.

The full text of the resolution adopted by the IVI board of directors and sent to the President follows:

"1. IVI recognizes the urgent need for Federal appropriations to aid construction of public schools throughout the Nation.

"2. At the same time we would deplore the use of such Federal aid funds to further segregated public schooling contrary to the spirit of the United States Constitution and to the substance of the recent Supreme Court decision.

"3. In view of the ruling of the Supreme Court, we ask that the President of the United States issue a statement clearly pledging that he will use the powers of his office to withhold Federal funds from any school district not acting in good faith to comply with the minimum requirements of the Court's decree to 'make a prompt and reasonable tsart' toward integration.

"4. We believe such a pledge would be preferable to, and would alleviate the necessity of, an antisegregation amendment to the school construction bill. However, in the absence of such a declaration, we would favor such an amendment."

Red China Must Not Be Admitted to the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there is a deliberate move throughout this country to admit Red Communist China to the United Nations. I do not believe that the American people will ever tolerate such a move and remain a member of the U. N.

I am inserting as part of my remarks an article by Mr. Constantine Brown, feature writer for the Washington Evening Star and which appeared on Friday, May 4:

BITTER PILL POLICY: LET'S BE REALISTS—TENDENCY TO FORGET PAST CRIMES SEEN IN TREND TO ADMIT RED CHINA TO U. N.

Ambassador Wellington Koo, the distinguished career diplomat who has held up the flag of Nationalist China for so many years in Washington, has paid his last official calls at the State Department.

He is said to have left the Department with the distinct impression that not only will Chiang Kai-shek have to bury whatever slim hopes he may have entertained of returning to the mainland, but also that it is highly doubtful Formosa will remain much longer as the beacon of the oppressed Chinese people.

There are as many ways to tell an ambassador in veiled words and by innuendoes that his country's goose is cooked as there are to skin a cat. The United States, of course, does not intend to renege on its diplomatic and military commitments to the Nationalist Government. We have a formal treaty and the Eisenhower administration would be the last to reconsider it.

But it is pointed out diplomatically that world conditions have changed in the last 2 years and there is an irresistible force in the United Nations—the supreme body on international policies—to overlook the crimes of the Peiping government and take that country to its bosom.

The vast majority of the U. N. members who joined us in 1950 to repel aggression suffered relatively little loss from the bloody Korean war instigated by Moscow and fought to a diplomatic victory by the Chinese Communists. America bore the main brunt of the losses: more than 164,000 casualties and upward of $16 billion in cash. But the feelings of the United States and its opposition to bringing Communist China into the ranks of civilized and law-abiding nations are subject these days to the will of the majority of the members of the family of nations.

Our policymakers, who still strongly oppose the impending move to take Communist China into the U. N., say we no longer have the votes to prevent such a flagrant disregard of the charter.

The decision to liquidate the irksome Chinese problem became evident with the announcement from U. N. headquarters in New York that the next session of the General Assembly will open after the American presidential elections instead of in mid-September. The official explanation is that some of the American representatives might not be able to attend because they would be busy campaigning. Actually, the British, French, and Soviet delegations intend to press this year for a vote on admission of Peiping to the assembly.

In view of past utterances that unless Communist China cleared herself of the censure voted by the U. N. 5 years ago and shows definitely that she has become a peace-loving country we would strongly resist her admission, the Republican Party might be placed in an unpleasant spot if China were cleared before the ballots are counted in November.

An unofficial survey shows that votes in favor of admitting Communist China are about 3 to 1.

In days gone by, a number of countries which have wished to win the favor of the U. S. S. R. and the Arab-Indian bloc by voting for Peiping were discouraged from doing so by the fear that under such conditions the United States might quit the U. N. Among these were Britain and France. The former has recognized Communist China for more than 6 years; the latter still recognizes the Nationalist regime. Both are now on record as favoring Peiping.

The Senate was strongly opposed in the past to the admission of the People's Republic, either in the General Assembly where the majority rules or in the Security Council where we can exercise the veto. When in 1954 the wind was blowing strongly toward admission of the Communists, a number of leading Senators of both parties told President Eisenhower that in the event the General Assembly made such a move the Appropriations Committee would cut off all funds for further American participation in that organization. There were more than sufficient votes in the Senate for that purpose. Mr. Eisenhower convinced the Senators not to use such drastic measures and assured them that the administration had mustered sufficient support from other nations to defeat any attempt to bring that officially condemned country into the society of so-called peace-loving nations.

Things have changed greatly since. The Russian smiles have affected most of the members of the world organization. The trend toward the proposed Soviet coexistence and an ill-disguised peace at any price on the part of the allies is making big strides. There is a tendency on the part of leaders of the free world to forget past crimes in the hope that there will be no similar outrages in the future. The present diplomatic slogan is "Let's be realists." And this involves realism toward the Chinese Communists. Their recent brutalities to American prisoners are for diplomatic rea-

sons kept hidden from the American public by the State Department lest the prospective rapprochement with Peiping may be disturbed.

Fluoridation of Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD a letter from Dr. Walter L. Godsell of Pontiac, Mich., in my congressional district, dated May 7, 1956, protesting an appropriation of approximately $3 million to combat dental disorders believing that a fair amount of such an appropriation would be utilized in spreading misleading information in support of fluoridation.

Dr. Godsell states that during the past several years much additional information has come to light showing harmful effects of prolonged ingestion of fluorides and that serious harm can come to certain individuals drinking water containing fluorides at even the so-called "safe" concentration of 1 part per million.

This letter should be read with care. The appointment of a joint congressional committee to make a thorough study of this item before further appropriation is made for this purpose seems feasible. Dr. Godsell's letter follows:

PONTIAC, MICH., *May 7, 1956.*

Hon. GEORGE DONDERO,
Congressman, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is my understanding that the United States Public Health Service is currently requesting an appropriation of approximately $3 million to combat dental disorders' Just what activities are financed by this money is a matter of deep concern to many Pontiac voters. From observations of United States Public Health Service activities in the past, it appears that a fair amount of this dental disorder appropriation will be utilized in spreading misleading information to support their campaign favoring fluoridation.

In the past several years much additional information has come to light showing harmful effects of prolonged ingestion of fluorides. One researcher on this subject is one of our own Michigan physicians, Dr. George Waldbott, of Detroit. Dr Waldbott is an investigator of unquestionable integrity, and one of the Nations leading allergists, as shown by having been elected vice president of the American College of Allergists.

The findings of Dr. Waldbott indicate that very serious harm can come to certain individuals drinking water containing fluorides at even the so-called "safe" concentration of 1 part per million. Amazingly enough these findings from such a reliable source as this have been completely ignored by the United States Public Health Service. In their zeal to promote their objective they are apparently disregarding any research which opposes fluoridation. Such an attitude is hardly scientific and certainly not for the good of the general health and welfare of the American people.

Because of this attitude on the part of the United States Public Health Service I have the following request: Before any further action be taken on this aforementioned appropriation, that a joint congressional committee be appointed to investigate the attitude of the United States Public Health Service in suppression of information opposing fluoridation. This committee, of necessity should be independent of any individuals interested in the promotional aspects of this program.

I would further like to request that this letter be read before Congress and inserted in the RECORD.

In closing, I would also like to take this opportunity to thank you for the many years of service you have faithfully given to the people of this country, and Michigan in particular. We shall surely miss your representation in Congress.

Respectfully,

W. L. GODSELL.

Union Leaders Do Not Control Individual Union Members' Votes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, union labor leaders would like to have the politicians believe that they control the votes of their members. This is a considerable exaggeration.

As part of my remarks, I am including a news article prepared by an outstanding and prominent newswriter in the State of Wisconsin, Mr. John Wyngaard, in which he indicates that State election results show union leaders cannot control the individual votes:

STATE ELECTION RESULTS INDICATE UNIONS CANNOT CONTROL INDIVIDUAL VOTE

MADISON.—The Wisconsin CIO council, as ardent a political pressure group as exists in this State, found the recent election returns less than happy, by its own account.

The organ of the CIO put the best light on the results when it headlined what it called the heartening vote of confidence given to Mayor Frank Zeidler, of Milwaukee, who turned back the challenge of Council President Milton McGuire and the conservatives of the Wisconsin metropolis, and was returned to the mayor's office.

But Zeidler had been counted as the favorite throughout the intensely fought Milwaukee campaign. If there was anything surprising in the vote result of the mayoralty contest, it was his slender margin of victory. McGuire, in fact, got more votes than most independent observers had reckoned.

THE OTHERS

At the same time, however, the CIO News was obliged to admit that its candidate for a Milwaukee circuit judgeship, CIO Counsel Max Raskin, was "snowed under" by his opponent, and that President Eisenhower's convention delegate slate "carried Milwaukee County and showed disturbing gains in workingclass wards."

Both of these developments probably have considerable meaning for the State at large.

Mr. Raskin, a former Socialist and a labor lawyer during an extended professional career, has sought a judgeship before. His latest failure, in a district which is as highly organized by labor unions as any in Wisconsin, and in a campaign in which the CIO and its political affiliates did the utmost in campaigning for him, perhaps shows that Wisconsin voters, whatever their ideological complexion, don't want judges to represent special interest groups.

The failure of KEFAUVER and the triumph of President Eisenhower in what the labor organ calls working-class wards was perhaps as surprising and gratifying to the Republican campaigners as it was frustrating to the leaders of the union political headquarters.

It probably shows that union political leagues are unable to get out their vote, or if they do, they cannot really rely upon the actions of the union men when they get into the privacy of the polling booths. Probably it shows a little of both.

FINANCES

The labor commanders are convinced, they have said many times, that the machinations of the Republican legislature have succeeded in crippling their political activities. They mean the new Wisconsin law that prohibits the use of union funds for politically partisan purposes—but does not prohibit the individual union member from contributing.

A university student recently put that statute into contex when he mailed a $1 bill to a Democratic candidate who had been complaining about the union spending contribution. He accomuanied the donation with the advice that the candidate could get similar contributions from union workingmen anywhere in the State. Obviously if he got even a $1 contribution from only a fraction of the union members in the State, he could raise as much campaign money as he could reasonably spend. What the situation suggests to many outsiders is that the unions cannot rely on voluntary contributions of their members for political activities, and must reach into the involuntary union contributions.

And what the Milwaukee election returns suggest, as the CIO News has so candidly conceded in its post-election account of Milwaukee politics, is that the assumptions so often and so blandly made about Wisconsin voting habits are sometimes in error.

Stonewall Jackson Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article written by Miss Mary Meares Galt, of Lexington, Va.:

May 10 is the anniversary of the death of the famous American military leader, Stonewall Jackson. Thomas J. Jackson, graduate of West Point, after the Mexican War, turned his back on the military career in which he had already achieved marked distinction, to devote himself to education. As a faculty member at Virginia Military Institute and as teacher of a class of Negro children in a Lexington, Va., Sunday School, Jackson served his fellowman in peace as he had served his country in war. When called to arms again to defend Virginia, he won immortality in military annals. His untimely death from wounds came at the age of 39, on the 10th of May 1863.

But his influence as a devoted citizen and Christian leader goes on. Today, at last, there is a national shrine in Lexington, Va., where the Stonewall Jackson Memorial Foundation has bought Jackson's own home as a museum. Open free of charge every day in the year, this shrine houses over 50 items,

furniture and other objects that belonged to Stonewall Jackson and his family, and its collection of Jacksoniana is growing all the time. Through the efforts of the Foundation, the Legislature of Virginia has given $25,000 outright to the project, and the Legislatures of Alabama and Mississippi have appropriated money for Stonewall Jackson scholarships to perpetuate among their own young people the influence of this great and godly man. So Lexington, where Jackson had his home and where he was buried, now has its Stonewall Jackson shrine, in the simple home he loved and fought for.

Doctor Shortage Called Critical

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to a news article and editorial both of which appeared in the New York Times of May 9, 1956, concerning the doctor shortage in the United States, and the suggestion made by Dr. Dominick F. Maurillo, chairman of the New York State Committee on Licenses of the Board of Regents of New York State.

I should also like to add that I am having prepared a bill, enactment of which would implement Dr. Maurillo's suggestion for the formation of a commission to study fully the problem. I expect to introduce it in the very near future, and because of the seriousness of the situation, I should like to ask for full support of the House membership:

[From the New York Times of May 9, 1956]

DOCTOR SHORTAGE CALLED CRITICAL—UNITED STATES HOSPITALS SEEK INTERNS IN ASIA AND EUROPE, REGENT OF STATE TELLS SOCIETY—FEDERAL INQUIRY ASKED—DR. MAURILLO URGES STUDY OF POLICY OF MEDICAL SCHOOLS IN LIMITING STUDENTS

Competent young doctors are said to be so scarce in this country that hospital authorities are searching Asian and European medical schools for interns.

That declaration was made here yesterday by Dr. Dominick F. Maurillo at the 150th annual meeting of the New York State Medical Society in the Statler Hotel. He is chairman of the New York State Committee on Licenses of the Board of Regents of New York State.

Dr. Maurillo said the present policy of limiting the number of students in medical schools here should be examined by Congress. He proposed that it establish a commission to study all phases of medical education.

Dr. Maurillo called the shortage of doctors in the United States very critical.

In 1956, Dr. Maurillo estimated the number of foreign-trained doctors allowed to take examinations for licenses in the entire Nation will amount to about a third of the number of doctors graduated by the Nation's 72 medical schools in the year.

THIRTY-TWO THOUSAND DOCTORS IN STATE

New York State has about 32,000 registered physicians, of whom 25,000 are in active practice. Dr. Maurillo estimated that a fifth of the practicing doctors in this State were foreign trained and a third of the doctors doing general practice had been educated in foreign countries.

The physician said American medical schools last year graduated less than 7,000 doctors, all serving internships, but leaving a shortage of 7,000 internes.

"Some hospital administrators or their representatives travel to Europe and Asiatic countries to invite doctors for the purpose of interning in their hospital," Dr. Maurillo said. "These foreign doctors work on an equal basis with graduates of our medical colleges, carry out the same duties, and have the same responsibilities."

The physician reported that some of the foreign doctors here were visitors, some arrived under the quota system, some were invited, and most of them remained here.

More United States citizens who cannot gain admittance to American medical schools are going abroad to study, Dr. Maurillo declared. He said New York State had taken the lead in setting up procedures for licensing foreign-trained doctors under the education law.

LIMITATION TO STUDENTS

"The present policy of limiting the number of students for admission to our medical colleges" Dr. Maurillo contended, "is responsible for the very great increase in foreign doctors in the United States, the 2,000 or more American students studying in foreign countries, the growing shortages of general practitioners and the discouragement of many potential medical students to study medicine.

"Congress should pass a law creating a commission of experienced persons in this field to study fully this problem and make a substantial grant of funds available to the commission. Such study should be comprehensive, realistic, unhampered, and unbiased."

—/

[From the New York Times of May 9, 1956]

THE DOCTOR TRAINED ABROAD

The only medical member of the New York State Board of Regents, Dr. Dominick F. Maurillo, presented some interesting figures yesterday. In an address to the 150th annual convention of the New York State Medical Society he said that there was now a shortage of 7,000 internes in United States hospitals, after graduation of fewer than 7,000 doctors in this country last year.

Dr. Maurillo estimated that 25,000 licensed and registered doctors were practicing in New York State, of whom more than a fifth are foreign trained. Nationwide, the number of foreign doctors admitted to examination has risen steadily in the last 5 years: 799 in 1950, 1,463 in 1953, at least 2,000 in 1955, and an expected 2,500 in 1956.

There are now about 5,500 unlicensed foreign doctors working either as internes or residents in hospitals in the United States, and about 30 percent of them are in hospitals in New York State, Dr. Maurillo reports. He adds that "some administrators and doctors who have worked with these foreign physicians and who have formed a favorable opinion as to their abilities * * * cannot understand why some States deny these physicians the right to take medical licensing examinations."

Some fairly obvious conclusions can be drawn: even with scheduled expansion American medical colleges cannot meet the demand for doctors needed or for admission of above-average students who want to study; 2,000 American students are studying medicine abroad and this source of training will become increasingly important; more States might well take a leaf from New York's book on methods used to examine foreign medical schools and to make judicious use of their product.

South Florida Home Builders Favor H. R. 10469, the Fascell Bill To Extend the GI Home Loan Guaranty Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Congress must act now.

The GI home loan guaranty program for World War II veterans must be continued beyond the present July 25, 1957, termination date. The abrupt termination will affect, not only the veteran, the home builder, the lender, and the real estate dealer, but also the furniture, hardware, electrical appliance and building industries as well.

If the program is allowed to end as is presently provided by law labor, too, would be seriously affected. Millions of veterans and nonveterans alike are currently gainfully employed in constructing, producing, manufacturing, and selling materials and household furnishings which go into the newly constructed and furnished homes.

Both veterans and nonveterans have been able to purchase a home for far less money as a direct result of this program and the mass production techniques that it has enabled us to employ.

Every American has prospered due to the benefits granted the veteran. The veterans GI home loan guaranty program has produced the greatest home, furniture, and electrical appliance buying spree that America has ever known. If we are to continue this prosperity, all of us must join in urging the Veterans' Affairs Committee to immediately extend consideration to pending legislation which would effect an extension.

The real estate editor of the Miami Herald newspaper at Miami, Fla., Mr. Frederic Sherman, recently conducted an opinion survey among the home builders in the greater Miami area. The result of this survey is included in his article which follows:

SOUTH FLORIDA BUILDERS VIEW GI HOME BILL

(By Frederic Sherman)

There's going to be some tough legislative in-fighting before Congress comes up with the answer to extending the GI housing program that expires July 25, 1957, for veterans of World War II.

The House has passed a bill that in reality gives these veterans an extra year. It keeps the deadline on applications, but gives a builder until July 25, 1958, to make a VA sale.

Only about 25 percent of World War II GIs have filed for so far, so there is a tremendous backlog of demand for VA homes.

Last week, Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE introduced a bill to liberalize the FHA program on single-family residences. The Texas Democrat, chairman of the powerful House Veterans' Affairs Committee, has made it plain from the start he is against any kind of extension of the GI bill. This despite pressure from the American Legion, the VFW and builders.

TEAGUE'S bill would allow down payments from 2 percent on FHA-backed loans less

than $10,000, to 15 percent on loans from $24,000 to $30,000.

Present FHA schedules call for 5 percent down on the first $9,000, and 25 percent on the remainder up to ceiling of $20,000.

SLASH IN DOWNPAYMENTS

If you were buying a $16,000 house now, you would need at least $2,200 as a down payment. Under Representative TEAGUE'S proposed bill, you would have to come up with only $1,120.

Despite this new proposal, it is a good bet the House will prefer to go along with a bill nearer to the one introduced by Miami's Representative DANTE FASCELL.

This calls for an extension of the bill with new deadlines depending on a man's service in uniform. The maximum extension would be 3 years.

Because this VA market is such a vital part of South Florida's economy, I asked several of our top builders for their views on the year-off deadline and the legislative battle.

BENEFIT TO THE COUNTRY

The Mackle Co. has built about 6,000 GI houses in Dade County. Sixty percent of the firm's work is VA housing.

Here's the comment: "The Mackle Co. is proceeding on the expectation that the GI housing bill will be extended. We feel sure that if the Government decides to extend it, it will do so in full understanding that the county as a whole will benefit.

"A veteran able to purchase one of our homes in Westwood Lake, for only 2 percent of the total cost as a down payment, is making an investment in the future of Dade County and in his own future financial security.

"Our mass production building methods provide inexpensive housing and are responsible in great measure for the fact Dade County in the so-called suburbs is devoid of slums. No slovenly trailers or tar paper shacks will be built as long as we can make good homes available in the wage range of the average worker."

SMALL BUILDERS EASED OUT

R & R Builders reported a very active market in VA homes. Last year the firm built 800 houses in the Palm Springs area of Hialeah, 750 of them GI.

Sales Manager Sydney Zwirm had this to say: "We really don't know what is going to happen in Washington, but we understand there will be an attempt to cut off VA from World War II veterans.

"The Government over the past year has been forcing the small builder out of the VA business in a move that seems to signal an attempt to consolidate VA and FHA housing programs.

"R & R sells in advance of construction, so we don't fear an abrupt change in demand. And there are the Korean war veterans who have another 10 years to apply for GI homes."

PLANNING AHEAD FOR 1957

Century Homes is projecting plans through this year on the premise that the GI bill will be extended.

The company has built 2,500 houses in the past 6 years and Office Manager Hartley Gilbert says at least 95 percent of them have been GI.

The company now is building out on Coral Way at 82d Avenue and has bought land for a new development in Cutler Ridge.

Because land values in Dade County are rising so rapidly, builders must gamble on what Congress will do.

PUSHED INTO A CORNER

F & R Builders figures GI housing is 95 percent of its business, Arnold Rosen says his company would like to plan ahead for 1957, "but we are being pushed into a corner not knowing what Congress will do. We have land for 400 more houses and we have an eye on 2 or 3 good pieces of property, but we can't move until we have an idea what kind if any extension will be voted.

"If the GI bill is not extended and if people are going to have to put down $2,500 down, there is going to be a considerable slowdown in house construction here in Dade County."

The firm has built about 2,000 VA homes since it started operations in 1946. It now is operating in Coral Way Village out on 84th Avenue.

A VOTE FOR LIBERAL FHA

Blue Ribbon Construction Co. has sold 3,500 houses since 1949 and 98 percent of them have been VA.

Bob Pollack reports it's hard to tell now what Congress will come up with on the GI bill extension.

"If they stop VA, they stop 98 percent of my business.

"I wish they would liberalize the FHA program. A higher mortgage and a lower downpayment, maybe 5 percent plus closing, would take care of both civilians and veterans."

Pollack says his company has some 1,800 lots now, divided among Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach Counties.

The firm expects to build about 400 houses this year, never gets more than 20 or 25 houses ahead of sales.

Radio and Television Address by Hon. Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee, Station WEAR, Pensacola, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I insert a radio and television address given by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, Tennessee, in Pensacola, Fla., on Monday, April 30, 1956:

I want to talk with you this evening about a significant new development, which is now in the process of formation in the foreign policy of our Nation.

It is important that we consider it, because foreign policy—the question of peace or war—is by far the over-riding question with which you and I are faced today or any day.

Our economic structure, our jobs, our farm income, the highways and roads that we build, the schools that we construct, our social-security system—all of these are of necessity tailored to the question of whether we are in the shadow of war or on the brink of peace.

The peace and security of your family and mine is based as much upon decisions that may be made 3,000 miles from here as they are on the decisions that we ourselves made at our breakfast table this morning.

Therefore, I wanted to talk with you about some of those decisions this evening.

Tomorrow the Secretary of State will leave Washington for Paris to attend a session of the North Atlantic Council. He has said that he has some thoughts to exchange on the question of transforming the North Atlantic Alliance into a broader association of free nations. He has said that without cutting back western military strength, the foreign-policy accent of the United States should be shifted to the economic and political fields.

My reaction is, it's about time.

This is the emphasis that I have been seeking to achieve in our policy toward the Western nations ever since I became a Member of the Senate.

It is most certainly the emphasis that I would pursue should I be chosen as the next President of the United States.

Therefore, I can wholeheartedly give my support and encouragement to the Secretary in his present mission—and say that this is at least one trip on his part which I consider is necessary.

In adopting this new attitude, it is my feeling that the Secretary of State is at long last expressing the kind of sentiments which find their birth within the mainstream of American thinking and culture. A brief review of the development of our North Atlantic relationships will, I believe, bear that out.

Five years have passed since a President of the United States who has been much abused and much criticized, but who will go down in history as a man who made the right decisions on the big issues, signed the NATO agreements. I am speaking, of course, of President Truman. This NATO agreement was a dramatic—and a highly successful—step in the effort to control and contain militant communism.

From its very inception, it seems to me, these Western democracies which entered into the NATO agreements were taking a step which inevitably would grow and develop into a new concept of relationships among nations.

In the North Atlantic Treaty itself they declared themselves "determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage, and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law."

They agreed, in article 2 of the treaty, to "contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions." They agreed to "seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies." They agreed to "encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them."

Now why was it that they could do that? The reason was simply that we are so much alike—we residents of the United States and Canada and England, and the free nations of Europe. We may have differences in accents and languages, but we are alike in our love of freedom, in our respect for the dignity of every man, in our fierce belief in democratic institutions, in our pursuit of liberty.

Basically, however, despite these larger concepts the NATO agreements were and have remained treaties of military agreements.

For a long time I have thought they should be more. You see, wars do not just occur. More often than not we stumble into them. Like all disputes, an action here, a word there, a misunderstanding, an underestimation—thee are the things of which wars are made. I therefore felt that since we were binding ourselves, one to the other, to fight one for all, we ought to have some kind of channel—some kind of arrangement—by which we could also forge common policies for peace.

Shortly after I entered the Senate, I filed a resolution which would have inaugurated the grassroots search for methods of accomplishing the kind of political and economic cooperation which the treaty envisoned and which the Secretary now seeks in his talks beginning tomorrow.

This resolution called upon the President to invite the democracies which sponsored the treaty to name delegates, representing their principal political parties, to meet with delegates of the United States in convention. There they would explore how far their peoples might go in applying the principles which our own States applied when they formed an enduring union.

I secured among the cosponsors of this resolution a broad and non-partisan backing among Members of the Senate. I am proud that so many distinguished southerners appeared on this resolution. The South has never failed in its traditional leadership in matters of foreign policy. The resolution was not adopted, however.

We did, nevertheless, maintain excellent relationships with our Western friends for the succeeding few years. Then our entire Atlantic policy went into eclipse. Why was this?

In the first place, with the advent of the Eisenhower administration, those of us who believed in an enlightened foreign policy, including the President himself, found it necessary to spend a great part of our time in a type of guerrilla warfare against powerful go-it-alone and isolationist elements within the GOP itself.

The isolationist, the go-it-alone exponents, had a curious counterpart within the Republican Party in those who preached the doctrine of preventive war. It was their influence, I feel, which contributed toward the Secretary of State's unfortunate pronouncement of the doctrine of "massive retaliation." This seriously deterred the progress we had been making in our Western relations for it understandably frightened our allies in Europe. In event of a global hydrogen war, they would stand exposed to massive annihilation.

Another great obstacle in the path of real Atlantic cooperation during those first years of the Eisenhower administration was the single-minded obsession of United States policy with the European Defense Community. It was rather obstinate on our part to try to force upon the European nations a union which many of them did not want, and which we and Great Britain would not join.

Well, the French refused to ratify EDC. We had no alternative to propose, but the British did. Through the London-Paris agreements, far superior to what was proposed in EDC, Western Germany became an equal partner in NATO, NATO was strengthened in many respects and for the first time a sort of international control over armaments was established among a group of sovereign States.

I then felt that the time had again come when we should push forward toward these economic and political goals and when the present Congress convened, I introduced again my proposal for a convention of the NATO sponsors.

The world is ready for this move. A former great Secretary of State and military commander, Gen. George Marshall, endorsed my proposal. He wrote: "There is no blinking that fact that this country now stands at a turning point in its relations to its traditional friends among the nations of the Old World."

Another great statesman, Robert Schuman, former Premier of France and the author of the Schuman plan joined the author of the Marshall plan in endorsing my proposal. He said:

"If the American Congress accepts the Atlantic proposal of Senator KEFAUVER, all the democratic European nations should be happy to accept the invitation to send delegates to such a Study Commission. Should there result from the work of this conference and from later proposals the outline of an acceptable plan of union * * * we would then certainly have made a great step toward world peace and general prosperity."

Paul-Henri Spaak, foreign minister of Belgium; Paul Van Zeeland former prime minister of Belgium; Gaetano Martino, foreign minister of Italy—all sent words of encouragement and endorsement.

Said Mr. Spaak:

"I personally hope that such discussions will take place between the citizens of the Atlantic nations very soon."

Said Mr. Van Zeeland:

"To sum up, it would be a major step toward peace and prosperity throughout the world."

Said Mr. Martino:

"I agree with Senator KEFAUVER that the peace of the world cannot be assured by methods of formal diplomacy alone."

Last year a step in the direction in which the Secretary is now going was taken. A resolution which I sponsored resulted in the United States participation in an association of NATO legislators, then being formed, which held its first successful meeting in Paris last summer, and which formed itself into a continuing body.

Therefore, I would say to the Secretary as he leaves tomorrow that he will find the ground already well-plowed for his mission. Four years ago Dwight Eisenhower, called for "bold and imaginative" steps to further develop NATO. President Eisenhower was then General Eisenhower, commanding the NATO forces. Since he has been President there have been none of these bold and imaginative steps and indeed I believe this is the first major speech on NATO. But this, it seems to me, is the President's and the Secretary's great opportunity. They can leave on the pages of history a chapter comparable to the United Nations, the Marshall plan, NATO itself.

I would commend to them the method of exploration which my resolution proposes—a convention to be attended by representatives of the people of the nations involved. I fear that cautious discussions between cautious diplomats will result in nothing if they occur in a vacuum—but coupled with simultaneous exploration on the part of the people in convention—then we might take that step toward world peace and general prosperity which we all seek.

Address by W. Lyle Bull Before the New York Chapter, Alumni Association of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps, at the Downtown Athletic Club, New York, Friday, May 4, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS E. DORN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by W. Lyle Bull before the New York chapter, Alumni Association of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps, at the Downtown Athletic Club, New York, Friday, May 4, 1956:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and members of the New York chapter of the Alumni Association of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps, by your invitation to address you this evening, on this happy occasion, I feel that you have honored me beyond my merits. A simple "thank you" seems hardly adequate; yet, there are no other words that express more deeply the sincerity of my appreciation.

Your testimonial to the distinguished legislators who carried the fight so successfully to bring about the statutory recognition of Kings Point as a permanent Federal academy is, indeed, most appropriate. At best, however, this tribute is relatively small recompense for the many months of work and effort they devoted to the cause held dear by most of us in this room.

I wonder, frequently, whether the average citizen has even a vague conception of the demands made upon the time of our Senators and Congressional Representatives. In general, they seem to be considered as capable of being all things to all men and the workers of miracles. They become the repositories for the most astounding variety of problems and, when they fail of solutions satisfactory to the appellants, they are exposed to possible retaliation at the ballot box.

One has to be associated with a Government agency in Washington for a better understanding of the extent and nature of the appeals made to Members of the Congress. Sometimes I feel about Congressmen like I do about Ogden Nash's Purple Cow: "I'd rather see than be one."

I have a purpose in mentioning the arduous and complex burdens of the individual legislator. It is to emphasize the real measure of the debt owing to the distinguished gentlemen you are honoring here tonight and to those of their colleagues whose generous contributions of time and energy made possible the happy result you are celebrating.

The bill these kind friends guided, with such skill, through the tortuous legislative channels of both Houses, has brought new hope and encouragement to many more than the alumni of Kings Point; or to the students now enrolled; or to the administrative staff and faculty of the academy.

It has restored the confidence of the countless thousands who adhere to the advocacy of a strong, modern, and vigorous merchant marine as essential to our national welfare.

The Kings Point bill has told these people, in effect, that the Congress meant what it said when it incorporated, as a preamble to the act of 1936, the declaration of our national policy to foster and maintain such a merchant marine.

It has assured them, further, of congressional recognition of the often overlooked fact that more than just ships alone are needed to produce and successfully maintain a merchant marine; that a paramount requirement is for men of the highest order of technical proficiency and demonstrated leadership qualities—and with a sense of dedication to the best traditions of the maritime profession.

Shipping is about the oldest of our industries. It is also one of our most complex. While operated as a private enterprise, shipping is not a business in the usual sense of the word. So far as the United States is concerned, it is an instrument of national policy, maintained, in large measure, by public funds to serve the needs of our commerce and defense. The appropriations for Kings Point and the four State academies are a part (albeit a relatively small part) of this Federal support.

Unfortunately, this industry-Government "partner" relationship is not sufficiently understood by the great mass of the public. The further inland we get from our seacoasts, the less it is understood.

To the great majority of people, if they think about it at all, the American merchant marine is something that operates in faraway places. Its problems, its work and its service to our industry and agriculture are remote things that are of little interest and miles removed from their everyday affairs.

Because of the diverse activities and opportunities in this broad land of ours, and the comparatively few directly engaged in, or affiliated with, maritime affairs, we are not a ship-minded people in the sense that

the British and Scandinavians are. Mother Necessity compels their understanding that their entire economies depend upon the ocean highways and that they must own and operate ships to survive.

It is evident that in the attempt to "sell" our merchant marine to the American people, the proper approach has not been found. Or, perhaps, the same old record has been played so often that the sense of the message it attempts to convey has been entirely lost.

Later this month we will observe Maritime Day. There will be gatherings in many cities throughout the country where countless speakers will orate on the poor old *Savannah* as the first steam-powered ship to make an Atlantic crossing. This happened 137 years ago, and, if the truth were told, the *Savannah* covered a much greater distance under sail than by steam power. Others will hold forth on the glories that were ours in the so-called Golden Era of the Clipper Ship. When I listen to these things, year after year, I instinctively liken them to the reminiscenses of an aging theatrical star while reviewing the yellowing, dog-eared press notices extolling her conquests and triumphs of the past.

There is no doubt that these historical facts are of interest and are things of which we should be proud, but I question their effectiveness as propaganda to win friends and supporters for the Merchant Marine of the 1950's. It seems to me we have available much more convincing material for this purpose.

Except for those directly connected with the industry, there are few people who appreciate what real progress has been made during the past few years toward putting our Merchant Marine on a firmer footing.

The more tangible evidences of this are the new construction programs of the Moore-McCormack and Grace Lines; the "Mariner" conversion programs of the American President and Pacific Far East Lines; and the projected revival of the Oceanic Steamship Co.'s passenger service between our west coast and Australia for which two "Mariners' are being practically reconstructed. At present the United States Lines is negotiating for the acquisition of 8 "Mariner" ships and the American President Lines for 2 in addition to those they have. It appears that the remaining "Mariners" of the original 35 completed within the past 4 years will soon be in private hands.

These are but the initial steps in the programs of replacement tonnage to which several steamship companies are committed to implement over the next 10 years.

There is talk now, too, of the possible building of a sister ship for the S. S. *United States*.

As to tankers, the trade-in-and-build law has stimulated much new construction—and of tankers of much greater tonnage and higher speeds. The Navy, through MSTS, is aiding private industry in this field, by its program for the construction by private interests, of fifteen 25,000 DWT, 18-knot tankers to be charted to MSTS for 10-year terms as replacements for equivalent tonnage in Government-owned T2-type tankers now in operation.

Perhaps the most significant development in new building—and to my way of thinking, one of the most encouraging—is the planned construction of several so-called roll-on-roll-off ships for the carriage of loaded truck trailers. These will be employed, primarily, in our coastwise and intercoastal trades which are sadly in need of rejuvenation. I believe the Pan Atlantic Lines has plans for 7 and the American-Hawaiian Line, some 6 or 8. For some of these ships, speeds of up to 25 knots are being discussed. In addition, the Alaska Steamship Co. has in contemplation two ships of this type as combination truck and rail car carriers, while only last week it was announced that certain Hawaiian interests have plans for the introduction of ships of this type into the west coast-Hawaiian service.

The thing that impresses me most about this new type of ship is that we are finally doing something constructive toward improved means of handling cargo. We are finding that there are ways of doing the job other than by the old block-and-fall method handed down to us from sailing-ship days.

All of these things are products of the industry-Government partnership to which I have referred. And the encouraging part of it is that they are progressing without the whiplash of the stress of war, which has been the principal motivating force over the past 40 years, insofar as our merchant marine is concerned.

It seems to me that our Congress has rarely displayed such a keen and continuing interest in our maritime affairs as during the past 2 or 3 sessions—and nothing but good can stem from this.

I know, of course, that you consider the passage of the Kings Point bill the most important of their accomplishments, but there have been other things. The extensive hearings and the prolonged debate on the so-called 50-50 law is a case in point. It is beyond my poor comprehension to understand why there should have been so much opposition to the provisions of this bill, seeking, as it does, to reserve to American shipping, only 50 percent of the movement of cargoes owned and/or financed by our Government.

Another accomplishment, and the one with, perhaps, the most far-reaching effect, is the comprehensive review of maritime labor and management relationships developed in the hearings conducted by the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee under the chairmanship of Congressman BONNER, of North Carolina.

While no new legislation has resulted from these hearings, it is my conviction that, notwithstanding occasional flashes of acrimony, they were of real benefit to both labor and management in promoting a better understanding of the problems and aspirations of each. Mutual respect and understanding in this area is a prime requisite for the successful fruition of our maritime endeavors and, day by day, this is developing in a most encouraging way.

I have tried to give you tonight, an outline of the sort of "sales talk" I think should be adopted to let the American people know about our merchant marine. Let us get away from reliance upon flag waving and emotional appeals. These sort of things lose their effect almost as soon as your listeners' blood pressures return to normal.

Present the merchant marine to our people as a dynamic, progressive undertaking that, for their economic well-being and own best interests, deserve their enthusiastic support. People have a peculiar, but natural, concern for their pocketbooks. Give them assurance that they are getting value received for the tax dollars used for shipping subsidies. And don't be apologetic about such subsidies.

"Subsidy," nowadays, is not the dirty word it once was. While, actually, the subsidy idea has been a part of our economic structure for years, through tariff applications, land grants, farm aid, and other means, the subsidy concept has come to be generally recognized as essential to maintaining the high living standards with which our country is blessed. And, speaking of farm aid, I suggest that, except for nudging Congress once in a while, when dealing with the public we get away from that time-worn comparison between amounts appropriated for shipping subsidies and those for Cheddar cheese.

You will have sensed, by now, that I am assigning to you Kings Pointers, the job of "selling" the merchant marine. Of course, this has been your mission since the day you entered the cadet corps. It is now an even more serious obligation as a part of the debt you owe our congressional friends to justify their confidence in having made Kings Point a permanent institution.

You can do the job, I know. Your salesmanship qualities have been demonstrated amply by the untiring devotion displayed and the hard work done by so many of you in "selling" Kings Point to the Congress.

I realize it is dangerous for me to single out any one individual for special mention in this regard, but I cannot refrain from suggesting that particular thanks are due to Joe Baker, whom I well remember as a bewildered plebe. Were I to expand the list, I would be here for hours, but those of you who gave your time, and refused to acknowledge frustration, may carry on with that most comforting inner satisfaction that comes from the knowledge of a job well done.

As a matter of fact, I hold to the belief, very strongly, that a Kings Pointer is capable of doing about anything he sets his heart and mind upon—and doing it well. My duties during the past 5 years or more have necessitated a lot of traveling—over our own country and to places abroad. At practically every place I have visited, I have encountered Kings Pointers—as officers on merchant ships—as naval officers on active duty—as responsible officials of steamship companies—in Government departments—as students in my classes at Georgetown—and in a variety of other endeavors. I have never met one without experiencing an inner welling of pride and admiration. And I have heard many flattering things said of Kings Pointers by senior naval officers and shipping executives.

I consider myself fortunate to have had the opportunity to observe so many graduates in action, afloat and ashore, in so many diverse locations. Their generally fine performance is rather convincing evidence to me that the Kings Point concept of merchant marine officer training is basically sound in principle.

Such was the belief of Admiral McNulty when, over 30 years ago, he conceived the idea of a Federal academy for maritime training and, thereafter, expended unwavering devotion to bring such an institution into being.

Although the concept may be basically sound, this should not be taken to mean that it is not susceptible of refinements and improvements, and subject to prompt adjustment to adapt it to the necessities of whatever changes may arise in the industry's operating techniques.

To me, the academy at Kings Point is something more important than just a group of attractive buildings and a beautiful campus. It has the potential to be something more than just a place of instruction. It holds marvelous possibilities as a national center of research and experimentation in all fields related to the maritime industry and its problems. I earnestly hope these possibilities will be explored thoroughly and that full advantage will be taken of all that Kings Point has to offer.

I have studiously avoided any reference to the vital importance of our merchant marine to our national security, or as an auxiliary to our Armed Forces. My purpose in this deliberate omission is to emphasize the economic considerations, because I believe it is on the basis of such considerations that our merchant marine should be "sold" to the American public.

To me, our need of a thriving merchant marine as an essential instrument of national defense is so self-evident as to require no discussion. Our experiences in two

world wars and the recent Korean incident have pointed up this fact in a manner much more convincing than any words of mine might convey.

As most of you know, I am connected with the Military Sea Transportation Service—probably the least understood of any of our defense activities—and, also, one of the most consistently badgered on all sides by legislators, shipping industry associations, and labor representatives alike. It is usually described as a Government-maintained competitor of the American shipping industry. Actually, it is the best customer-shipper most of the lines have.

The misunderstanding about MSTS stems, principally, I think, from a lack of knowledge or appreciation of the scope of our present-day international commitments, and the extent to which we are maintaining military installations in the farflung reaches of the world, from the Arctic to the tropics. These commitments and the uncertainties of the existing world situation make it mandatory for our security that the Department of Defense have under its direct control, and immediately responsive to military authority, ships of appropriate types in sufficient number to meet minimum logistic needs in the event of sudden emergencies and as a base for prompt expansion under conditions of war.

In the more than 5 years I have been with MSTS, I have become firmly convinced that while the private shipping industry can serve the ocean transportation needs of the Department of Defense to a substantial degree under present conditions, it has definite limitations. Certainly, it is to be hoped we may look forward to an easing in world tensions and the full resumption of normal channels of trade sometime in the future. In anticipation of such a happy state, the shipping industry cannot, or should not, relax in continuing concentration on the maximum commercial utilization of its fleets if we are to attain and retain that place in world shipping to which we all aspire.

Agribusiness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am inserting at this point an editorial from the Town Journal of May 1956, on the subject of Agriculture. This is a timely editorial and points out the extent of agriculture and its effect upon our economy:

IT'S AN AGRIBUSINESS PROBLEM

Nearly two-fifths of all business in this country connects with agriculture. That includes every enterprise that sells things to farmers and every enterprise that handles what farmers produce.

"Agribusiness" has come into use to describe this whole range of activities. It extends from iron mine to hardware store, from corn field to supermarket meat counter. Dr. John H. Davis, of Harvard Business School, formerly Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, has invented this useful word.

Dr. Davis has logically pointed out that the so-called "farm problem" is in every way an agribusiness problem. Farmers are not its sole owners. Directly involving 40 percent of our economy, indirectly it affects all. The merchant on Main Street, the motor manufacturer, milkman, miller, miner, and meat packer all operate in agribusiness. The people who work for salaries or wages for these people are directly involved in it, too.

Two major developments have created the present farm problem.

One has arisen because high price supports were continued much too long. They prevented farmers from making normal adjustments to changing demand. Worse, they piled up the more than $11 billion mountain of products in Government hands, where they can't be sold in this country while they depress prices.

Congress, approaching the matter in a highly political mood, produced a conflicting, unworkable bill which the President vetoed. Congress can yet, if it will, adopt the useful soil-bank plan, and take other steps. Governmental mistakes built up the mess and have badly hurt farm income; Government has a responsibility for correcting its own mistakes. All agribusiness has a stake in seeing that this constructive action is taken.

The other major cause of the unbalanced situation has grown naturally. One farm worker now produces enough food and fiber for 18 consumers—twice as many as 30 years ago—and each acre yields more. Research and ingenuity have improved power, machinery, seeds, fertilizers, chemicals and other means to raise output. Farmers know how to use them.

The trouble arises from the fact that means to increase production have grown much faster than ways to expand markets and increase utilization of the farm output.

This, too, concerns agribusiness. Every town where farmers do their trading can be helped by better markets and more uses for what farmers sell.

Millions of people drink frozen orange juice now who bought but few oranges 10 years ago. That is only one example of how research has greatly enlarged the market for a farm product. Vastly increased research on the marketing and new-uses fronts is needed to catch up with the marvelous job that production research has done. The actual dollars and manpower in such newer kinds of research are pitably below what we've spent to help farmers produce more.

Sensible Government action to remedy past mistakes in legislation must be taken. But by itself no law will bring farm incomes up to proper levels. The agribusiness problem has a multitude of parts. Aggressive salesmanship, aggressive research, along with constructive legislation, can work it out, one part at a time.

Our farm surplus is only between 4 and 5 percent of the total farm output. Surely American ingenuity can find markets and uses enough to handle that much. Why not try that approach to the "farm problem"?

A Method To Encourage Employment of the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, in recent years science has made tremendous advances in the conquest and control of infectious and degenerative diseases. Life expectancy of Americans has increased as a result.

The average age of persons eligible for gainful employment has also increased. However, American employers have not revised their long-standing prejudice against hiring people of middle age and beyond, even though such persons are otherwise well qualified to perform the duties of the job.

Of course legislation might be enacted to prescribe discrimination against job applicants because of age but such legislation would undoubtedly be difficult and expensive to enforce and would probably not be very effective.

I have therefore introduced today a bill whose purpose is to effectively encourage the employment of mature and qualified citizens by a fair and persuasive but noncoercive method which would be practicable and inexpensive and self-operating.

The present revenue act allows employers, in computing taxable income, to deduct 100 percent of all wages and salaries paid to employees. My bill would amend the revenue act to permit employers to deduct from gross income, in computing taxable income, 101 percent of wages and salaries paid to employees between the ages of 60 and 61; 102 percent of wages and salaries paid to employees between the ages of 61 and 62; 103 percent of wages and salaries paid to employees between the ages of 62 and 63; 104 percent of wages and salaries paid to employees between the ages of 63 and 64; and 105 percent of wages and salaries paid to employees between the ages of 64 and 65. Thereafter, the tax deductions could rise by 1 percent as the employee increased in age beyond 65 and remained employed. The maximum deduction should not exceed 115 percent of such wages or salaries paid—but to reach 115 percent the employee would have to be 75 years old. The foregoing increased deductions should apply only to the first $5,000 of wages and salaries paid to each such employees in any tax year; and employers should be limited to the usual 100-percent tax deduction with respect to that part of any wages or salaries in excess of $5,000 paid to any such employees in any tax year.

Of course, such proposed increased tax deductions would slightly affect Federal revenues but this would be offset by the taxes on the income of citizens who otherwise might not be employed at all. More important, however, than the effect on Federal income is the immeasurable benefit to the country by effectively encouraging the employment of its mature and qualified citizens at a time when the number of our mature citizens is constantly increasing.

Unionism: This Is Big Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks the following article by Mr.

Russell Turner which appeared in Human Events for May 5 entitled "Unionism: The Growing Big Business":

Whether it's good or bad depends on the individual point of view. But whatever the view, the fact remains that unionism has become one of the Nation's biggest businesses; that its influence is reaching into every nook and corner of the Nation's economic and social structure; that it is achieving a political power rivaling anything known in American history.

Nowhere is this more true than right here in the Nation's Capital, which now houses the headquarters of 42 national labor unions representing some 6,500,000 workers, plus the national offices of the newly unified AFL-CIO and 2 additional unions which are moving their headquarters here this spring from other cities. Of major significance is the fact that 11 of the 42 have moved their headquarters here from other parts of the country in approximately the last decade.

The explanation of union leaders for this Washingtonward trek is that it facilitates maintenance of relations with other unions headquartered here and with governmental agencies with which they must deal, such as the National Labor Relations Board and the Department of Labor.

The explanation of all realistic observers is that the unions want their headquarters handy to the seat of Government, so that they can impress that impressionable Government with their economic and political power and influence.

It is by being here in Washington that union leaders can exercise their most effective influence on the policies of Government, both legislative and administrative. They need not even bother registering as lobbyists to do it. Cocktail party or luncheon conversations with legislators or executive department functionaries are far more effective in putting across a union's point of view than testimony before a congressional committee or a quasi-judicial agency hearing.

Furthermore, the same legislators and functionaries cannot help but be impressed when they see unions spending multiple millions of dollars for swank new buildings just to house their headquarters offices.

For example, the bumptious, freewheeling International Brotherhood of Teamsters, with a claimed membership of 1,400,000 (and growing rapidly) last year moved its headquarters into an ultramodernistic, marble-faced, plush-officed edifice three blocks from Washington's Union Station, on the construction of which it had just spent $5 million. It is directly across a small park from the Senate Office Building.

The teamsters' union has no legislative representative, none of its officers or employees even are registered as lobbyists. They piously profess disdain for such out-of-the-union-line activities.

But if a Senator happens to look out his office window on a contemplative moment, and sees the roof-gardened, tinted-glass-windowed Taj Mahal across the park, his thoughts may stray back to views on some pending legislative matter which were expressed at X's party a few days ago by an official of the teamsters' union. Quite conceivably, it might pass through his mind that he should consider carefully before crossing an organization powerful enough to erect such a structure just to provide office space for some 100 headquarters employees.

A Representative driving by the building, or viewing it from a back window of the Capitol itself, might well have the same reaction.

Other union headquarters' buildings may not be quite so strategically located, but they are impressive nevertheless. Some $3,500,000 is going into the soon-to-be-completed AFL-CIO headquarters building just across Lafayette Park from the White House. The Machinists Union has just moved into its still-being-completed $2,500,000 building on Connecticut Avenue just off famed Dupont Circle; the operating engineers are erecting a $2 million structure across 17th Street from the Mayflower Hotel; the electrical workers are being relatively pikerish with the $750,000 job they are putting up on 16th Street, one block up from the Statler Hotel. Old buildings presently are being razed to make way for a new home for the Bakery Workers Union across the street from the Statler; the United Steel Workers have bought property in the same block for a reported $1 million on which they apparently plan ultimately to erect a headquarters.

Some unions admittedly and openly indulge in lobbying, and so register under the 1946 Federal Lobbying Regulation Act. A congressional quarterly compilation of lobbying registrations and spending reports for 1955 shows 20 unions thus listed; 6 of them, however, are post office employee groups which in effect must bargain with Congress on such matters as wages and hours.

The AFL and CIO filed separate reports for the 11 months of 1955 prior to their merger, and a third report covering unified activities in December. Together, the three reports listed 1955 expenditures for the purpose of influencing legislation totaling $236,011—which would have been twice the amount so spent by any other oganization. The leading lobby spender for the year was the National Association of Electric Companies with $114,835. The six postal workers' unions, in their separate ways, together spent a total of $226,757.

These reports, in a major sense, are highly misleading, in that, as mentioned above, much of the most effective lobbying comes on a person-to-person basis and is far beyond the reach of any lobbying-expenditures report. That person-to-person influence, however, is tied in not only with the open manifestations of union power to be seen in such ways as luxurious new office buildings; it is tied in perhaps even more directly with the growth of another arm of the octopuslike power of unionism—its burgeoning political activities.

The political power of the labor union movement is becoming so great that, in effect, it threatens to topple of its own weight if given a more-than-gentle legislative nudge. For that weight is growing to the point where it is arousing much resentment in the minds of millions of Americans, including millions of unwilling dues-paying union members—resentment against union bosses who are trying to dictate a form of socialistic welfare state in lieu of the traditional free-enterprise system under which this Nation has prospered and grown for nearly 200 years.

That resentment is comparable to the unrest of a half to three-quarters of a century ago over the conduct of avaricious industrial and financial tycoons—unrest which led to enactment of such regulatory statutes as the antitrust laws and the Federal Corrupt Practices Act. The present-day resentment is headed in the direction of comparable regulation of union activities.

The union bosses realize full well that such feelings are developing throughout the country. Yet, even as they seek with one hand to allay the public fears and resentment with protestations about labor merely seeking to protect its rights, they drive ahead relentlessly with the other hand toward their goal of outright domination of all legislative and governmental processes.

For example, the official political arm of the AFL-CIO is its committee on political education, purportedly financed entirely by voluntary contributions in order to get around the Taft-Hartley law's ban on expenditure of union funds for political purposes. It is known as COPE.

The March 31 issue of the AFL-CIO News bore this headline across the top of its front page: "COPE Opens Dollar Drive to Protect Labor's Gains."

What this quaintly euphemistic union-ese means is that the AFL-CIO bosses would like a $1 contribution to the COPE campaign kitty, please, from each of the roughly 15 million AFL-CIO members.

No one seriously believes there is the remotest possibility that COPE will succeed in its dollar-per-member drive. But union bosses are persuasive; shop stewards, for instance, are highly influential among, and frequently greatly feared by, their constituents. It is entirely conceivable that COPE may gather in a dollar a piece from a third, perhaps a half, of the 15 million AFL-CIO members; some will give more than a dollar.

That will mean a COPE campaign fund of somewhere between five and ten million dollars, to be parcelled out as its managers see fit; a truly substantial sum, as campaign funds go.

This kitty will be used to promote the candidacies of liberals who, as legislators or executive officeholders, would be amendable to suggestions from the AFL-CIO or its affiliates. The major point of amenability this year in State races will be adamant opposition to right-to-work laws; in congressional races, support for repeal of the Taft-Hartley law's section 14b, which legalizes such State statutes. This is the big issue of the moment, to labor unions. This also is what the AFL-CIO News means when it says, "To Protect Labor's Gains."

But as substantial as it is, this prospective five-to-ten-million-dollar COPE kitty takes no account of other millions which will be siphoned from regular union treasuries into political channels by various means.

When it wrote the ban on union political exependitures into the Taft-Hartley law in 1947, Congress thought it would keep unions out of politics, just as corporations are prohibited by law from engaging in political activities. The ban has failed.

As a "for instance," there is the case of the United Automobile Workers, headed by the far-left Walter Reuther. The UAW for some time has sponsored regularly certain radio and TV news programs in Detroit. During the 1954 Congressional campaign, the UAW's commentator presented several Democratic candidates on these programs, interviewed them in the most favorable light, and openly stated the union's endorsement of them.

The UAW was indicted on charges of violating the Taft-Hartley law's no-politics clause; the violation, on the surface, appeared clear. But appearances can be deceiving a Federal judge in February ruled that since the UAW paid for the programs regularly, its endorsement of the Democratic candidates was not a political activity but rather was a valid exercise of its freedom of speech.

The political organization financial reports, filed with the clerk of the House of Representatives in compliance with Federal law, also indicate other means of evading the Taft-Hartley no-politics clause. The Senate Republican policy committee staff has gone through those reports, and compiled a full listing showing that union political arms spent $1,978,564 in connection with the 1954 congressional campaigns.

Theoretically, all of this money was accumulated through voluntary donations. But even here there are gimmicks. Again, we cite the UAW as a case in point.

The CIO-PAC reports are broken down into two sections—an "individual contributions account," and an "educational account." Presumably the first is for outright politics, the second merely to educate union members.

During the year 1954, and prior to election day, the UAW made six contributions to the national CIO-PAC educational account totaling $150,769. Coming from the union, the money must have come out of its general treasury and thus from its regular dues and initiation fees.

During the same period, there is listed an expenditure from the CIO–PAC educational account of $5,000 to the Michigan State CIO Council. Under the individual contributions account are listed these expenditures for 1954: May 17, Moody (the late Democratic Senator) for Senator committee, $2,500; August 13, 2 items to the UAW–PAC for $15,000 and $10,000; October 6, $5,000 to the (now-Senator PAT) MCNAMARA campaign committee, $3,000 to the Wayne County (Detroit) CIO committee, and $1,000 each to 3 Democratic congressional candidates in Detroit.

On their face, these reports seem to show the UAW contributing financially to the campaign funds of various candidates through the CIO–PAC. There undoubtedly are a substantial number of Republican members of the UAW who take a dim view of having their dues payments go for such purposes but, being a minority, they are unable to stop their union's leftist bosses.

Like the lobby reports, the political expenditures reports also are misleading, in that they give no hint of the amounts being ladled out by unions for the succor of favored candidates in local and State campaigns. Nor do they give any hint of items such as the UAW news program endorsements.

There is a growing tendency for Members of Congress, in private conversations, to say they think the time has come when unions should be subjected to the same antitrust and Corrupt Practices Act regulations as now apply to corporations. But Members of Congress are human; they face elections this fall; they are loath to incur new enmity by expressing these thoughts openly.

It should not be so. Few Americans quarrel with the Corrupt Practices Act ban on political expenditures by corporations; there should be no more quarrel with imposing the same ban on unions whose funds are collected from members required to join in order to hold their jobs.

Only by such a ban—and an effective one, with teeth—can the dangerously growing political power of unions be curbed. The national welfare demands that it be curbed.

Realtors, Mortgage Brokers, Savings and Loan Associations, and Private Citizens Endorse H. R. 10469

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, an early extension of the GI home-loan-guaranty program has been endorsed by newspapers, veterans' groups, labor, homebuilders, mortgage bankers, the President's Bradley Commission, and appliance and furniture manufacturers, wholesalers and retailers.

Realtors, mortgage bankers, savings and loan associations, and private citizens have now joined in urging that immediate consideration be given to an extension of this important program.

H. R. 10469, a bill I introduced April 12, would accomplish this extension and provide for a gradual, rather than an abrupt, termination. The following are a few of the comments which I have received from business people in the Fourth Congressional District of Florida:

DEAR DANTE: Congratulations.

Just finished reading your speech on extension of GI home-loan program.

Magnificent.

Only last week at the Miami Board of Realtors meeting we discussed your brilliant action and I felt proud to add my humble voice to all the others, praising you.

As always.

Sincerely,

RENZO ABBONDANDOLO,
Realtor.

CORAL GABLES, FLA.

DEAR MR. FASCELL: Mr. Keyes has been on an extended trip from which he will return to Miami around May 9, but rather than wait until he returns to the office he asked that we express to you now his hearty commendation of your introduction of H. R. 10469 and your active interest in seeing that it is passed. You deserve much credit for your efforts and Mr. Keyes wants you to know that he appreciates very much the work you are doing on behalf of this matter.

Cordially.

KATE CONSTANCE,
Secretary to Kenneth S. Keyes.

MIAMI, FLA.

H. R. 10469

DEAR SIR: In behalf of this association I should like to inform you that we are pleased to learn of your introduction of the above bill for extending the GI home-loan program.

For all of our 95-member brokers please let me take this opportunity of extending to you our congratulations on your fine presentation for extending the GI home-loan program.

Respectfully,

SOUTHWEST REAL ESTATE BROKERS' ASSOCIATION,
WILLIAM W. FLANAGAN,
Executive Secretary.
LESTER R. MAXWELL, *President.*

MIAMI, FLA.

DEAR DANTE: I think you've taken a wonderful step in the right direction in introducing H. R. 10469. It certainly would be a terrific blow to the veterans and to the building industry in south Florida, and throughout the country if the home loan benefits to veterans of World War II are not extended.

Sincerely,

J. I. KISLAK MORTGAGE CORPORATION OF FLORIDA,
JAY I. KISLAK, *President.*

MIAMI, FLA.

DEAR DANTE: On behalf of the Greater Miami Federal Savings and Loan Association, I wish to compliment you for the introduction of bill No. H. R. 10469. This bill will be of great benefit to the veterans and I know will be greatly appreciated by the veterans.

With kindest personal regards, I remain,

Yours very sincerely,

GREATER MIAMI FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION,
(BOB) ROBERT M. MORGAN, *President.*

MIAMI, FLA.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN FASCELL: Thank you very much for the copy of your speech made in the House regarding the extension of the GI home-loan program. I have read a newspaper summary of the legislation you have introduced and wholeheartedly support your recommendations.

Many of us realtors feel that any attempt to spread out the GI housing program will be beneficial. Our land costs have risen so fantastically in Dade County that it has become economically impractical to construct houses in the $8,500–$10,500 price bracket for which there is a tremendous demand. Certainly a rush to utilize the VA guaranty before the 1957 expiration would aggrevate this unfortunate land situation beyond imagination. Somehow there must be a restraining influence; your bill will be a major contribution.

There are many of us younger builders and realtors who are giving a great deal of thought to tomorrow.

Sincerely yours,

SUBURBAN REALTY CO.,
JOSEPH A. FRIEDMAN, *President.*

NORTH MIAMI, FLA.

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, May 10 is Rumanian Independence Day. It is only fitting that we should remember this day, for it serves as a grim reminder of Communist aggression and subversion which made captive satellites out of the once free nations of Eastern Europe.

An unwilling pawn in the power struggle of Nazi domination and Soviet Communist conquest, Rumania has long been a land of suffering. The high hopes which Rumanian patriots had for their country when on May 10, 1866, they crowned Charles, Prince of Rumania, and thus founded the Rumanian dynasty, have been badly shattered. Today, Rumania lies prostrate in the tight grip of the Soviet Union, which not only enslaves these proud people, but robs them of their national resources to help pay for the Communist trade offensive.

The Kremlin's tyrants who rule the country are trying their best to eradicate May 10 from the memory of the people. They have replaced Independence Day with the Day of Soviet Victory, which falls on May 9. But when the alien flags are hoisted on May 9, it must remind the Rumanian people of their own Independence Day. To them it is but a sign that the day will come again when they will rid themselves of the foreign oppressor and the local quislings who take their orders from the Kremlin.

I believe that the days of party boss Gheorge Gheorghiu-Dej and of his henchmen are numbered. They came to power under Stalin. But Stalin himself has now been toppled from his exalted position, and with him will topple all those who owe him allegiance. We have seen it happen in recent weeks in Bulgaria, in Poland, in Czechoslovakia. Though the Rumanian Communists are trying to postpone the day of reckoning, though they still are slow in following the de-Stalinization line prescribed by their masters in the Kremlin, they cannot escape the inevitable. As Stalin rid himself of those who became inconvenient to him, the new Kremlin bosses will not hesitate to liquidate those of their underlings who have become politically inexpedient, for communism devours its own children. May its appetite increase.

On May 10, we salute a suffering nation which has lost its independence through no fault of its own, but was the

tragic victim of brute Communist force. On this anniversary of their independence, we assure the Rumanian people that they do not stand alone, or abandoned, in their aspiration for freedom. Let us remind them of our pledge, which is part of official United States foreign policy, that the people of America will never consent to their continued enslavement; that the United States will continue its efforts to correct the wrong, and relieve the suffering, which has been brought upon helpless nations by Communist aggression, subversion, and betrayal.

A Lamentable Performance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Daily Globe of May 8, 1956:

A LAMENTABLE PERFORMANCE

The meeting of the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, at Paris, has ended lamely indeed. Far from revealing any bold confrontation of the urgent problems weighing on the alliance, the foreign ministers of the 15 member states have returned to their respective capitals trailing wisps of diplomatic fog.

Through these it is possible, nevertheless, to perceive the realities they failed to tackle, and the devices by which they would disguise the meagerness of their achievement. To understand the situation it is necessary to take note again of the issues NATO faces because of Soviet Russia's shift of policy last year. For it was then that NATO first began seriously to experience difficulties.

NATO was conceived as a purely military counter by the West against a very real threat of armed aggression from the East, in 1949–50. It now faces a Russia which, while continuing to build military power assiduously, has altered its entire political approach to the outside world.

This substitution of the diplomacy of trade, conciliation, and repudiation of Stalinism does not, however, proceed in a void. Simultaneously, Russia is swiftly integrating her European satellites, has endowed them with new 5-year plans, and already has begun to utilize the massive economic resources the process makes available further to buttress her diplomacy.

While this consolidation proceeds, the impact of her maneuver has made itself felt throughout the world, especially in Europe and the Middle East. At the same time, circumstances have tended to loosen NATO's military and political ties in Europe. Its professed military goals in strength have been tacitly shelved as no longer realistic.

Worse: Member Iceland demands elimination of NATO bases; member France is forced to drain away her NATO military components to north African wars; Denmark and the Low Countries flatly reject NATO's plea for 18 months' military service; West Germany's rearmament is tangled in threats of dislodgement of Chancellor Adenauer from power, while Bonn's finance minister flatly refuses any longer to support NATO forces on German soil. Member Greece is quarreling with member Britain. It is needless to continue.

This situation points up the three tasks which the latest conference of NATO foreign ministers—the NATO Council—obviously should have tackled with imagination and statesmanlike courage. They should have taken immediate steps toward rethinking NATO's military role, adapting it to the altering problems it faces; devised a method of coordination on the political level which would be limited, workable, and immediate in application; and defined clearly NATO's role vis-a-vis Russia's economic offensive. They did none of these.

Instead, the Council contended itself with platitudes. NATO's military posture, for instance, according to Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, the British Foreign Secretary, "is virile and robust." On the political side (doubtless with the election campaign in mind) Secretary Dulles proposes a vague continuous cabinet for NATO, endowed with powers "only a little below those of foreign secretaries," to assemble, sometime, after "three wise men," solemnly appointed for the task, bring in a study next winter about NATO's possible political and economic policies.

The simple, practical expedient of having the NATO Council meet quarterly to face issues apparently seemed too dangerous. Contradictory interpretations of all this nonsense are already rising among NATO members. The performance will scarcely disturb Russia. It should very seriously disturb all friends of NATO.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Pennsylvania Salutes the National Gallery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the April 1956 issue of Readers' Digest:

OUR NATIONAL TREASURE HOUSE

(By Andre and Assia Visson)

No visit to Washington, D. C., is complete without a tour of the National Gallery of Art, the impressive, dome-crowned building of pink-white marble that stretches over three city blocks on the north side of the Mall which connects the Capitol with the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial. Through its heavy bronze and steel doors, 40 feet high, more than 24 million visitors have passed since the gallery was opened in 1941. Now recognized as one of the world's 4 or 5 great art museums, the National Gallery belongs to the people of the United States; but it owes its existence to one man.

When Andrew William Mellon came to Washington as Secretary of the Treasury in 1921, he was reputed to be the wealthiest man (banking, steel) ever to hold a Government job. A man of vision, he predicted that Washington would become the center of the Western World. He wanted it also to be one of the world's great cultural capitals, a source of pride for every American. No one, however, suspected that he would use a large portion of his wealth to that end.

One day in 1927 Mellon disclosed a scheme he had been turning over in his mind. To David E. Finley, his young Special Assistant at the Treasury, he said: "Washington should have a national gallery to rank with those of London, Paris, Rome, and Madrid. Since a congressional appropriation is unlikely, I'm willing to put up the building myself and offer it, together with a collection of paintings, to the American people. I want you to head up this gallery."

Finley accepted the assignment, and during the following years helped plan the bold project.

The millions who visit the National Gallery today can hardly imagine the effort that went into assembling its treasures. It took most European museums centuries to gather their priceless collections. They inherited the art treasures of Europe's royalty, and European governments have always found funds to preserve and increase their national collections. But American museums must depend on donations from private collectors.

Andrew Mellon had started his own collection as a young man. Traveling abroad in 1882, he bought an old painting for $1,000. His business friends were shocked. How could this astute young industrialist pay so much for a canvas?

Mellon went on buying paintings, however—but only those that appealed to him. He turned down a portrait by Raphael merely because the sitter had an "evil face." The French 18th-century masters were too lavish with their colors and their nudes for the Pittsburgh Presbyterian. His preference went to pleasant Dutch and English paintings, which he found both inspiring and relaxing.

Soon, as his momentous project got under way, his approach to collecting changed. For his country he wanted nothing short of the best.

He learned that the Soviets were willing to sell a few masterpieces from the Czar's famous collection at the Hermitage Palace. So, in 1930 and 1931, Mellon acquired 21 of the paintings at a cost of more than $7 million. Among them was Titian's Venus With a Mirror, a nude which he would not have hung in his own house, but which he knew should have a place in a great gallery, and for which he did not hesitate to say $544,000. He gave $745,000 for Raphael's 8 by 11 inch St. George and the Dragon, and $838,000 for Botticelli's Adoration of the Magi. His top payment, $1,166,000 went for Raphael's famous Alba Madonna.

When Mellon left the Government in 1933, after 11 years as Secretary of the Treasury and 1 year as Ambassador to England, he decided the time had come to push his long-cherished project to completion. He chose famed architect John Russel Pope to design the gallery. "Never mind the cost," Mellon said, "it will be a building to last for centuries."

Together they selected the finest building materials: Tennessee pink-white marble for the walls, because it absorbed the sun instead of reflecting it like white marble; Italian dark-green marble for the 24 columns in the central rotunda; green marble from Vermont, gray marble from Tennessee, American fumed oak for the floors.

"It will be quite expensive," warned Finley.

"Just so it doesn't look expensive," answered Mellon, who hated ostentation.

As a result of the constant search for the finest materials and the latest air-conditioning and air-purifying equipment—to protect and increase the life span of the old paintings—Mellon had to raise his building budget from $9 to $15 million. In addition, he gave a $5 million endowment for new acquisitions and other expenses. Then, 1 month before announcing his donation, he suddenly decided that the masterpieces he had gathered during half a century were inadequate. Certain schools were not sufficiently represented.

Laid up with a bad cold, he called David Finley. "Take the first train to New York. Go to Duveen [Lord Duveen, one of his favor-

ite dealers] and pick up the best pictures he has been concealing. I know he has bought many masterpieces during these depression years."

Finley spent 3 days with Duveen, and together they brought to Washington 30 paintings and 21 sculptures—masterpieces of the Italian, Flemish, and English schools from the 14th to the early 19th century. Duveen rented an apartment below Mellon's, and there placed all his treasures under armed guard. A month later, at the luncheon table, Mellon concluded the greatest single art transaction ever made. He bought 18 sculptures and 26 of the paintings—for $11 million.

A few days later Andrew Mellon, now 81, sent a letter to President Roosevelt offering the Nation his $35 million collection of 126 paintings and 26 sculptures, together with funds for building the gallery.

He set only two conditions: First, his name was not to be connected with the gallery. A genuinely modest man, he did not want America's National Gallery to be thought of as a memorial to him. Second, the trustees should see to it that all art collections donated later were of the same high quality as his.

The opening of the National Gallery of Art on March 17, 1941, was a national event. It brought to the Capital 8,800 invited guests from all over the country. Unfortunately, Andrew Mellon could not hear their lavish praise. He had died in 1937.

But his hopes were already being fulfilled. In 1939 the gallery had received another great collection: 375 paintings and 18 sculptures of the Italian school from Samuel H. Kress, another multimillionaire originally from Pennsylvania. It was the most complete collection of Italian art ever brought together by one person. Kress had intended to establish a museum of Italian art in New York, but Finley persuaded him to bring his collection to Washington. Finley, Mr. Kress, and John Walker, a young scholar of Italian art who had been appointed chief curator of the gallery, selected the Kress masterpieces to come to Washington. With recent additions from Rush H. Kress and the Kress Foundation, Kress paintings and sculptures now form the largest collection in the gallery.

Curiously enough, a third highly important donation also came from a native Pennsylvanian. Joseph Widener, of Philadelphia, presented his collection of 100 paintings to the gallery in 1942. Among them were 14 Rembrandts, 2 of the rarest Vermeers, 8 Van Dycks, 1 Raphael, and 2 El Grecos. And with them came magnificent Italian Renaissance sculptures and an invaluable assemblage of rare furniture, small bronzes, tapestries, prints, and Chinese porcelains.

Another important collection is that of Chester Dale, now president of the gallery's board of trustees. A New York investment banker, Dale began in the 1920's to invest several million dollars in great French impressionists and post-impressionists, including Renoir, Degas, and Cézanne. Incidentally, the canvases he bought rose higher in price than any other paintings—modern or old.

The National Gallery also brought together an important collection of 763 American paintings. Covering 2 centuries of United States art, it contains works by America's best painters—from Gilbert Stuart and John Copley to Winslow Homer, James Whistler, Mary Cassatt and Childe Hassam. Among the canvases are nine contemporary portraits of George Washington.

On its opening night the National Gallery had on view 555 paintings and 61 sculptures. This year, on its 15th anniversary, it offers its visitors 960 paintings, 209 sculptures, a collection of 1,306 small bronzes, as well as antique furniture, tapestries and china. Moreover, it has in storage about 800 additional valuable paintings. And its print collection, thanks largely to a gift from Lessing J. Rosenwald, another Pennsylvanian, has jumped from 399 items in 1941 to 21,618 in 1956.

The setting in which these collections are placed is impressive. Entering the 100-foot-wide rotunda of the central hall, with its 16th-century Italian bronze fountain and 24 massive marble columns, visitors hush their voices is if in cathedral. Right and left from the rotunda run two long halls with French and Italian sculptures. These open into two garden courts, which feature 17th century French lead fountains that once stood in the gardens of Versailles. Around the halls and garden courts are 90 exhibition rooms. On Sunday nights the gallery's orchestra gives a free concert in one of the garden courts to audiences of as many as 1,000 persons.

A question frequently asked by visitors—"How much are the collections worth?"—is not an easy one to answer. Masterpieces are priceless because they cannot be replaced. But the market value of the collections is estimated to be about $300,000,000. To replace the building itself would cost more than $50 million today. For all this, American taxpayers have laid out only $15 million, for upkeep.

But the educational and spiritual value of the National Gallery is infinitely greater. The permanent collection as well as the loan exhibitions from French, German, Austrian, Italian, Japanese, and Spanish museums have offered millions of Americans an opportunity to become acquainted with the world's cultural past without leaving their own land.

The National Gallery was one of the first museums in the world to open an educational department on a national scale. School children are brought in by busloads, and the gallery also sends prints, slides, and film strips to schools all over America.

Many art students from abroad now come to Washington to study old masters of their native lands. Visiting statesmen take time from their official schedules to admire the collections. German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer told a reporter, "I have visited all the European galleries, and I think this one should be a model for them all."

Immediately after its opening in the war years, the gallery had 6 times as many visitors as the National Gallery in London, 6 times as many as the Paris Louvre in the prewar years. One soldier wrote in the visitors' book, "From 37 months of jungles to the rare beauty of art brings tears of joy from my heart to live again." A servicewoman wrote what millions of other visitors must have felt: "I'm proud of America."

Twice a month a group of wives of Government officials comes for a guided tour. Mrs. Sherman Adams and Mrs. Harold Stassen pay frequent visits to paint copies of the gallery's masterpieces. Many Government workers drop by during lunch hour. A riveter from New York who recently took up painting visits the gallery every year; having helped construct the dome, he has a personal pride in the place.

Washington taxi drivers taking their fares to the gallery no longer call it the "Mellon Galley," as they did 15 years ago. Andrew Mellon would have been pleased at this: his great objective has been achieved. The gallery he donated to the American people is now truly national, and it has made Washington one of the great art centers of the world.

Series of Hearings To Be Held by Joint Committee on Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce to my colleagues of the House a series of hearings to be held by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy starting Tuesday, May 15, to explore ways and means and develop, if necessary, legislative assistance for expediting the critically important program for the peacetime application of atomic energy. I feel impelled to make this announcement—as did the chairman of the committee yesterday in the Senate—because of the extremely important nature of these proceedings.

For many months the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has been carefully studying the progress of commercial application of atomic energy both domestically and in foreign countries. Last summer, for example, members of the committee attended the Geneva Conference as official observers and had an opportunity to study the status of progress in foreign countries.

When the current session of Congress reconvened, the committee conducted a series of comprehensive hearings to explore the development and status of peacetime applications of atomic energy here in the United States. These hearings were held under the statutory obligation of the committee to conduct such a review during the first 60 days of each session of Congress.

In addition to the foregoing, the committee a year ago established a panel of outstanding representatives of industry, science, and labor to study this same problem. The committee has before it for its consideration the report on the status of the peacetime applications of atomic energy of this group of men together with their recommendations.

As a result of these detailed studies and hearing one problem assumes major importance and that is the question of the financial liability of manufacturers and operators of nuclear reactors to the public in the extremely remote event of an operating accident.

Previous testimony received from representatives of the manufacturing and operating companies was to the effect that this was a major roadblock to further progress in the construction of reactors for power generation. For this reason the committee held an informal seminar of these representatives, together with spokesmen from the leading insurance firms and other interested organizations. This seminar was most beneficial in that for the first time, the committee was able to receive directly in an atmosphere of informality the views of all interested parties on this extremely critical problem.

As a result of the committee's long and thorough study of the problems involved, certain legislation has been introduced by members of the committee which have been designed to cope with these problems. The committee has before it for consideration during the forthcoming hearings to which I referred to above, commencing Tuesday, May 15, four bills: H. R. 9701, introduced by my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], and H. R. 9802, introduced by the gentleman from New York and former chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy [Mr. COLE], both of which deal in different ways with the insurance problem. These two bills in effect would obligate the Federal Government to assume varying degrees of liability up to—in one instance—$500 million, in the rare event of an accident to a privately owned power reactor. The problem here, Mr. Speaker, is the apparent inability of regular insurance companies to provide at an economical price sufficient liability insurance to cover manufacturers and operators of reactors, in the highly unexpected event of a major accident during the course of operation of these facilities.

It is generally the opinion of members of this Joint Committee who have studied the problem over a long period of time and in great detail that the United States is ahead of our competitors on both sides of the Iron Curtain in the development of atomic energy for peacetime purposes. It is just as generally held by members of this committee that this lead is rapidly becoming very tenuous. We feel as time goes along and more information becomes available, that there is an increasing need for additional efforts by this country to maintain this leadership.

Therefore, another purpose of the forthcoming hearings is to develop additional information as to what, if any, other conditions exist both now and in the immediate future which are delaying or could prevent a rapid acceleration of our effort in this field.

Two members of the committee feel that the most rapid progress in the construction of large scale power generating nuclear powerplants can be accomplished by the Federal Government. To this end, identical bills have been introduced during this session and are now before the committee for consideration. My colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], has introduced a bill—H. R. 10805, which is identical to the bill introduced earlier in the Senate by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], identified as S. 2725. These bills would authorize and direct the Atomic Energy Commission to build six nuclear power reactors at various locations around the United States to assure advancement of the art, in addition to or in the absence of similar activities of private industry.

If I may, Mr. Speaker, I would like to outline briefly the manner in which the committee plans to proceed in this matter.

Firstly, we are convinced that there is a considerable body of knowledge and fact as yet undeveloped and which needs to be made available as to what the potential hazards are in the operation of large scale power reactors. More specific information must be had as to what the standards are for the safe and efficient operation of such reactors. As an integral part of this problem is the need to know much more of the details of the methods and bases used by the insurance companies in computing the cost of and the limits to insurance coverage which this industry has made available up to the present time.

The committee also needs to develop information on any other roadblock that may now or in the future affect the most rapid progress in this program. The committee's attention has been drawn to the requests being made by private industry for changes to existing laws. For example, hearings have been recently held on a bill to amend the Holding Company Act so as to exclude those private utilities which join together in a common effort to construct a nuclear powerplant, from the provisions of that act.

Many of these same companies feel strongly that any funds they expend for research and development in the atomic energy field should be given special tax treatment.

Secondly, the committee plans to examine in executive session the most recent and up-to-date information available about progress of foreign governments in the peacetime applications of atomic energy in order to make the most current and factual comparison of our position vis-a-vis that of our competitors. To the maximum extent possible following these executive hearings, the committee will endeavor to make public this evaluation insofar as possible.

Thirdly, the committee will receive testimony from all interested parties on the Holifield and Gore bills in an effort to determine if the only manner in which the most rapid progress can be made is by means of a program of governmental construction of nuclear powerplants. To do this in the most impartial and effective way the committee needs to know much more than has been made available to it up to now about specific progress being made on the several projects initiated and financed by private industry. We hope that spokesmen for these organizations will come to us and frankly and candidly discuss their problems, their progress, and their plans for the future.

There are indications that the full responsibility for our progress in the field of peacetime applications of atomic energy may be too large and too technically complex for private industry to carry alone. I refer again to the report of the panel of civilian experts mentioned earlier—known as the McKinney panel. One of its most important conclusions was that if private industry does not or cannot assume the full risks and burdens of the nuclear power development program then the Government must do the job. Therefore, if it appears at the conclusion of these hearings that Congress must make unusual and far-reaching concessions to private industry in addition to providing large-scale insurance or indemnity coverage to bolster up the lagging program, it may very well conclude that a substantial program of direct Government sponsorship and initiative is required to get the job done. This does not necessarily mean that it must be done by means of complete governmental financing and construction of atomic powerplants. It could mean a cooperative undertaking, for example, similar to the arrangements made between the Atomic Energy Commission and the Duquesne Power Co. which will result in the nuclear powerplant now under construction at Shippingport, Pa. Here the Government is building and financing the reactor and private industry constructs and pays for the generating facilities and will operate the whole plant.

At the conclusion of this series of hearings, Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the committee will be able to report to both Houses of Congress what in its collective judgment needs to be done in order to maintain the world leadership by the United States in this vitally important field of the peacetime application of atomic energy. We dare not delay the necessary action any more than we dare to shirk our responsibility in this matter. The Congress will then be in a position to take such steps as it deems necessary to keep our country in the forefront—not only for the great economic benefits to our citizens but to all freemen.

A Remedy for Delayed Sugar Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate again to take the floor to plead for action on the sugar bill, but because of the extreme delay in submitting a conference report to the House I feel that I must do so.

To reiterate, last July 30, 1955, the House, at the urgence of the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, passed a bill amending the Sugar Act so as to give our domestic producers a more just and equitable share of the American sugar market. A part of the market that has been going to the Cuban and Puerto Rican sugar industry would be apportioned to the beet and cane sugar producers in the United States. Congress adjourned before this measure could be considered by the Senate, but promptly after the second session of the 84th Congress convened the other body began consideration of the bill, and on February 8 passed a bill which, in my judgment, is more satisfactory than the one approved by the House. Senate conferees were appointed that same day.

For some reason the gentleman from North Carolina failed to appoint House conferees until March 15, some 36 days after this action was taken by the other body, and then only after he had been repeatedly urged to do so by myself and

other colleagues who are interested in this legislation.

I am now extremely disappointed to learn that the conferees, some 55 days after they were appointed by the House and more than 3 months after they were appointed by the Senate, have not made a report to the House; and, as a matter of fact, they have not held a single meeting. This is hard to understand, because the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, on July 30, 1955, when this bill was passed, said of the bill: "It is of far-reaching importance because it affects people in far distant places and it vitally affects every one of your constituents."

The fact that the gentlemen have other important legislation to consider does not lessen the urgency or importance of the sugar legislation. It is the farm program to many of my constituents in the Fourth Congressional District of Nebraska, and because of its importance and the extreme delay I may feel constrained on Wednesday next to ask that the matter be brought up on a motion of privilege. I hope, however, that the conferees will make this action unnecessary. I understand the conferees have a meeting scheduled for this weekend. If progress can be made by the conferees then the motion of privilege may not be necessary. I hope a bill can be promptly reported. It is long overdue.

Nickel: Out of Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I place in the RECORD an exchange of registered letters between Mr. Charles F. Honeywell, Administrator of BDSA of the Department of Commerce, and Mr. Willard F. Rockwell, chairman of the board of the Rockwell Spring & Axle Co. It is to be noted that the Administrator of BDSA has "requested and required" that Mr. Rockwell supply full and complete answers to a number of questions. It is also noted that Mr. Rockwell has stated:

We are glad to learn that the responsibility for obtaining information and for law enforcement pursuant to the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is in your hands, but we cannot understand your order to us to furnish full information about the sources of our purchases of gray market nickel supplies. You have the power to get this information, and we do not.

Mr. Speaker, a few months ago I became aware of the fact that the nickel plating industry which uses some 15 percent of civilian-consumed nickel was suffering a severe squeeze on account of the real or artificial shortage of nickel. Some responsible members of that industry advised me that the allocation system imposed by the producers under an implied delegation from BDSA was not working. As a result it was necessary for them to buy nickel on the black and gray markets at a cost of 300 percent or more of the market price of nickel—64½ cents per pound.

More recently I have learned that other industries which use nickel have also felt the pinch—especially the smaller concerns. It is to be noted from the letters I insert in the RECORD that the Commerce Department has received over 1,000 complaints from businessmen in 1955 respecting the nickel situation.

Not only have businessmen suffered from a situation which has gone out of control but millions of consumers are receiving inferior plating jobs on cars and other products, whether they realize it or not. All taxpayers, likewise, are suffering since they have subsidized Government-owned plants and purchases of premium price nickel under lucrative contracts and research contracts to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars.

It now appears that the only solution to this problem will be more expansion type contracts with fast amortization write-offs whereby the contractors are well protected through Government financing and guarantees to buy the companies' products at prices sometimes double the regular market price of nickel.

One interesting facet of the nickel situation deal with the Government's $100 million investment in the Nicaro processing plant came to public attention yesterday at the President's press conference:

William McGaffin, of the Chicago Daily News: A House subcommittee has been trying for months to obtain a file of confidential material relating to the Government nickel plant expansion in Cuba. The allegation has been made that the Department of Justice, which has the file, is simply sitting on it because it would embarrass your administration if it were made public.

"Is there any prospect that this matter will be cleared up any time soon, sir?"

Answer. "You had better go and ask the Attorney General as to why he is sitting on this particular thing that you say he is sitting on, and then after you have gotten all you can out of him, why, probably I will be able to add some light to it."

Question. "Sir, I already have asked the Attorney General."

Answer. "You go and tell him that I asked you to see."

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Washington, May 4, 1956.

ROCKWELL SPRING & AXLE CO.,
Pittsburgh, Pa.
Attention: Mr. Willard F. Rockwell, chairman of the board.

GENTLEMEN: Your letter of March 23, 1956, addressed to the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, which was inserted by Congressman McCORMACK in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 10, 1956, has come to our attention. As I believe you know, the Business and Defense Services Administration has certain responsibilities for obtaining information and for law enforcement pursuant to the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended. Under the act and executive orders and delegations of authority issued pursuant to it we are empowered to obtain information, require reports and take sworn testimony as may be necessary or appropriate to the enforcement or administration of the act and regulations or orders issued thereunder.

In the exercise of this authority and because certain statements contained in your letter of March 23, 1956, above referred to, appear to disclose knowledge by you of matters which may require additional investigation or action by this agency, you are requested and required to supply full and complete answers to the questions hereinafter set forth.

In your letter of March 23, 1956, the following statement appears: "* * * our company paid over $750,000 in 1955 directly for the purchase of black-market nickel * * *."

With respect to this statement you are requested and required to supply the following information:

1. The names and addresses of your vendors of "black-market" nickel and the dates, prices, and quantities of each purchase.

2. Was any of this nickel acquired by you with the use of Government priority (DO) ratings?

3. If your answer to the foregoing question is in the affirmative, what nickel was so acquired, giving names and addresses of your vendors, and dates, prices and quanties of each such purchase, priority rating applied or extended, and authority for use thereof.

4. To your knowledge was any of the nickel purchased by you in 1955 acquired by your vendors by the use of Government priority (DO) ratings?

5. If so, state what nickel was so acquired, giving names and addresses of vendors, and date, price and quantity of each such purchase by you.

Your letter of March 23, 1956, also contains the following statement: "The alloy steel mill which furnishes our requirements is the fourth largest in the country, and their management tells me that they are buying 75 percent of their requirements in the black market at $2.80 per pound, and the balance at the market price of about 70 cents per pound for nickel alloy material."

With respect to this statement you are requested and required to supply the following information:

1. To what steel mill does this statement refer?

2. The name of the person or persons in the management of this mill who gave you this information.

Your letter of March 23, 1956, also contains the following statement: "We have absolute proof that some steel companies have sold nickel which they received in excess of their requirements for military orders."

With respect to this statement you are requested and required to supply the following information:

1. To what steel companies does this statement refer?

2. Specify in full detail the absolute proof of sales by such companies of nickel which they received in excess of their requirements for military orders, giving pertinent names, dates and quantities, together with all documentary and other pertinent supporting evidence or proof.

The information required herein should be in our hands not later than May 15, 1956.

Sincerely yours,

CHAS. F. HONEYWELL,
Administrator, Business and Defense Services Administration.

ROCKWELL SPRING & AXLE CO.,
Coraopolis, Pa., May 8, 1956.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Business and Defense Services Administration,
Washington, D. C.

(Attention: Mr. Chas. F. Honeywell, Administrator.)

DEAR SIRS: Your registered letter of May 4 was received today. We are glad to learn

that the responsibility for obtaining information and for law enforcement pursuant to the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is in your hands, but we cannot understand your order to us to furnish full information about the sources of our purchases of gray market nickel supplies. You have the power to get this information, and we do not.

Since we brought the attention of your department to our difficulties, several of the scrap market dealers who sold us gray market nickel are no longer making offerings to us, and we would like to have you tell us if you know the reason.

Our books are open to your investigators at any time, but our executives are so busy trying to find gray market nickel that we do not believe we should be called upon to make reports to you when you have failed to find out what becomes of the nickel which is turned over to the distributors of the International Nickel Co. According to our information, you were authorized by Congress to obtain records and ordered to maintain records covering nickel production and distribution, in order to prevent the gray market which is costing this company $10,000 a day.

The steel division of the Timken Roller Bearing Co. is asking us to pay a higher price for 3½ percent nickel steel, and both the chairman, Mr. H. H. Timken, and the president, Mr. William Umstattd, told me that they are forced to buy 75 percent of their nickel requirements in the gray market at the excessive cost of $2.80 per pound.

You must know that we cannot tell the source of the gray market nickel which is offered to us by scrap dealers, but we have been told by some how they acquire it, which is entirely secondhand information. We have heard that one of the AEC contractors offered 25,000 pounds of nickel anodes, and one of your assistants told us at the March 29 meeting with Secretary Weeks, that they knew of such a transaction and that you were considering a prosecution. No name was mentioned, and because we did not buy the nickel anodes, we can only tell you that 7,000 or 8,000 pounds of it was described as brand new anodes. Under the big loophole in the law, if these anodes had been immersed in the plating tanks, they could have been sold as scrap without any violation, even though they were received on DO or AEC orders, and were, to all intents and purposes, as good as new.

On March 29, 1956, accompanied by Mr. John Budinger, I talked with Secretary of Commerce and four assistants, at which time I disclosed most of the information which you are asking me to confirm. May we ask why you are following up at such a late date, in view of the critical situation exposed? You told us then that over one thousand complaints about nickel supplies had been received in your department, mostly from small business firms.

We think it is a rank imposition on us to be asked to do the work which your department has the authority to do. It is our intention to file a suit against the administrators of the law, because we believe that the gray market, and certainly the black market, would not exist if the administrators had followed the letter of the law.

Very truly yours,

WILLARD F. ROCKWELL,
Chairman of the Board.

[From the Wall Street Journal of May 1, 1956]

STRATEGIC STOCKPILE NEARS GOAL ON SOME ITEMS—PRODUCERS ASK FURTHER BUYING

The loudest outcry comes from tungsten firms. Federal stockpilers will achieve their objective on this metal by August at the rate they're buying. Uncle Sam pays domestic producers $3.15 a pound for tungsten, about $1 more than the world market. "In our area alone, about 25 small mines and the 5 mills may have to close if the Government stops buying," says Abram McCoy, president of the Tungsten Refining Co., of Boulder, Colo. Alloys containing tungsten are used in armor-piercing shells, jet engines, tool steels, lamp filaments.

Bills to extend the purchases of columbium and tantalum already have been introduced in Congress—the stockpile goal has been reached on both these metals. Although chrome and mica buying will likely continue until June 1957 producers of these materials also strive to get purchase programs lengthened. Even the South African cartel worries about a possible surplus of industrial diamonds when stockpile buying ends.

The Government now has $6.3 billion invested in strategic commodities, or about 56 percent of the $11.2 billion goal.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Both Houses received President's message on budgeting practices.

Senate passed, by vote of 61–7, bill on flood disaster insurance, and also passed bill on U. S. information and educational exchange.

Defense Department appropriation bill unanimously passed by House.

See Congressional Program Ahead.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 7052–7073

Bills Introduced: 8 bills and 3 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3830–S. 3837; S. J. Res. 170; and S. Res. 260–S. Res. 261. Page 7053

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 3332, changing name of Joint Committee on the Economic Report to Joint Economic Committee, requiring President to submit his report by January 15 of each year, and committee to submit its report to Congress by March 20, with amendments (S. Rept. 1961);

S. 2967, adding certain lands to Superior National Forest (S. Rept. 1962);

H. R. 7228, to amend title II of the act authorizing construction of bridges over the Potomac River (S. Rept. 1963);

H. R. 8130, designating bridge to be constructed over Potomac River at Jones Point, Va., as the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge (S. Rept. 1964); and

H. R. 10660, the Federal Highway Act of 1956, with amendment, together with supplemental and individual views (S. Rept. 1965)—referred to Committee on Finance. Pages 7052–7053

President's Message—Budgeting and Accounting: Message from President urging early enactment of legislation to implement recommendations of Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government for improvements in Federal budgeting and accounting practices was received—referred to Committee on Government Operations. Pages 7051, 7164

Farm Program: Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was authorized until midnight Friday, May 11, to file report and minority views on H. R. 10875, Agricultural Act of 1956; and

Committee on Public Works was authorized to file reports during recess of Senate. Page 7056

Bill Recommitted—Nuclear Ship: S. 2523, to authorize construction of a nuclear-powered prototype merchant ship for operation in foreign commerce of U. S., was by unanimous consent recommitted to Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Page 7056

Funeral Expenses: Senate adopted S. Res. 260, providing for funeral expenses of the late Senate Barkley. Page 7053

Contempt Citations: Senate adopted S. Res. 253–257, citing the following individuals for contempt of the Senate: Robert Shelton, Seymour Peck, Pauline Feuer, Alden Whitman, and William A. Price, respectively. Pages 7073–7074

Information and Educational Exchange: Senate passed, after adopting committee amendments en bloc, S. 3638, to promote the foreign policy of the U. S. by amending U. S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948. Pages 7074–7078

Juvenile Delinquency: Senate adopted S. Res. 261, printing of 2,000 additional copies of report of Committee on the Judiciary on Juvenile Delinquency (No. 62). Page 7053

Investigations Subcommittee: Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations was authorized to hold hearings in New York City on May 14. Page 7105

Flood Disaster Insurance: By 61 yeas to 7 nays, Senate passed S. 3732, Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956, after taking the following actions on amendments:

Adopted: By 39 yeas to 31 nays, Knowland amendment limiting insurance coverage only to property in those States which participate, and providing that after June 30, 1959, each State shall pay into disaster insurance fund an amount equal to half the difference between fees charged for insurance issued thereafter on property in such State and the amount which would be charged